



EVALUATION OF THE EC'S ACTIONS IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL PROTECTION
DECEMBER 2010

VIBEKE STOCKHOLM WEIGELT (ED.)

MALENE SAND JESPERSEN

TINE STRUNGE SKYTTEBJERG

ANISSA TOSCANO

HAROLD LOCKWOOD

COST OF THE REPORT IN €117.164.00

ECHO/ADM/BUD/2010/CONTRACT NO 01206

EUROPEAN COMMISSION



Humanitarian Aid

The report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only

Table of Contents

1	Executive summary	3
2	Purpose and method of evaluation	12
2.1	Purpose of evaluation	12
2.2	Methodologies and constraints	13
3	Findings of the evaluation	15
3.1	Monitoring and Information Centre	15
3.2	Preparatory actions and pilot projects	24
3.3	Training programme	29
3.4	The Transport Provisions	37
4	Conclusions	42
4.1	Overall conclusions	42
4.2	Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC)	43
4.3	Preparatory Actions and pilot projects	44
4.4	Training programme	45
4.5	Civil protection exercise programme	46
4.6	Transport Provisions	46
5	Appendices	48

Table of Appendices

Results from E-survey	
Interview guide and list of interviewees	
EU CP training programme	
List of abbreviations	
Reference list of literature received from DG ECHO - including desk reviews	
Terms of reference	

1 Executive summary

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the European Commission's activities in the field of civil protection. The evaluation was carried out by COWI A/S (DK) in collaboration with Aguaconsult (UK) in the period from late June to late October 2010.

The purpose of this evaluation is primarily lesson learning and accountability in view of improving performance. The specific purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the EC's actions in the field of civil protection in order to assess performance and improve future operations.

The evaluation considers the period 2007-2009 (inclusive). The evaluation focuses on the four main elements of the EC's Civil Protection mechanism, namely: 1) activities of the Monitoring and Information centre (MIC); 2) activities relating to training, exercises and exchange of experts; 3) the Transport Provisions; and 4) the Preparatory Actions and pilot projects.

A number of specific desk reviews had been carried out by DG ECHO prior to the launch of this evaluation. As part of the evaluation, some 30 interviews and an e-based questionnaire survey were conducted¹. This report provides the key observations and findings that can be derived from the combination of the e-survey results, the interviews and the desk-study evaluations.

There is, in general a very high level of alignment between observations and statements in the interviews; in the e-surveys; and in the desk review reports. EU CP activities are thus undertaken in a context where there is a good mutual understanding between different stakeholders; notwithstanding that there may be different points of views, but they are recognised.

The evaluators conclude that during the period of the review (i.e. from 2007 to 2009), the activities in the area of civil protection undertaken by the EU were for the most part coherent and well coordinated with the interventions and actions implemented by Member States and international organisations in particular the UN. There is a clear trend towards improvement in coordination and complementarity over the period of the evaluation, particularly between the EU

¹ Response rate was however fairly low, which can be caused by the fact that the e-survey was carried out over the summer period. The deadline was extended to improve the response rate.

mechanism and the UN system - but positive developments are also observed as regards other international organisations and other EU bodies and institutions.

This improvement is reflected in better communication, better coordinated and joint preparation activities and better coordinated responses, both in operational terms (i.e. through the increased effectiveness of the MIC, the scope and impact of the training programme and more effective use of transport assets) and in strategic terms (i.e. through an increasing familiarity and complementarity of roles and mandates) with other EU entities, Member States and the UN.

The trend towards improved coherence, coordination and complementarity of EU civil protection activities appears to be driven by increased professionalism, competency and heightened profile. In short, as the EU's capacity credibility in this domain has increased, Member States, recipient states and other international actors have responded to this improved 'offer' by being more proactively engaged with, and responsive to, the civil protection mechanism in all stages of the disaster life-cycle.

However, in spite of this overall positive trend, there appears to be a relative lack of progress in the pace of improvement in terms of coordination and coherence between the EU mechanism and the broader NGO community, including the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. There are also still opportunities to improve coordination and coherence further with the EU's own European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) and other international agencies such as NATO, and steps are noted in this direction.

The evaluators conclude that the Participating States underline their primacy of national leadership in civil protection and the subsidiarity for responding to crises and more specifically in terms of asset ownership and mandate.

In terms of satisfaction, respondents are split fifty-fifty when it comes to the ability to cross-fertilise lessons learned across the components. This leaves room for further improvement in integrating lessons and experience across the different components.

There are concerns, and issues of perception, regarding the distinction in mandate between civil protection interventions, humanitarian assistance and to a lesser extent interventions on the part of military forces given their very different operating principles.

The following tables present the specific conclusions and findings for each of the evaluation questions that the evaluators were asked to analyse².

² Disregarding the first question (Are EU CP activities coherent, well coordinated with and complementary to, interventions and actions implemented under other EU and international crisis management capabilities and Participating States interventions?) which is an overall question the answer to which is found above, and the substantive arguments found in the following tables

Table 1-1 To which extent have the MIC and the services supplied by it led to a more effective response to emergencies?

Conclusion	Findings	Source
MIC is a relevant and effective tool and constitutes a unique and important single entry point for CP information and coordination	More than 80% of respondents agree or tend to agree with the following statements: MIC has provided central coordination at EU level Contributes to more effective disaster response Is prompt and accurate in its communication Contributes effectively to an effective response	E-survey Report page 16
	Interview findings are consistent with the above, however some mentioned the desire for a 24/7 staffing of the MIC	Interviews Report page 17
	It is appreciated by interviewees that the MIC strives to identify the most pressing needs and advise Participating States as to which relief items are thus most needed. Continuing improvements to MIC performance are seen as a key factor in contributing to Member State buy-in and reducing bi-lateral responses, which in turn has improved MIC's effectiveness	Interviews Report page 18
Information tools are relevant and CECIS is highly appreciated overall. As regards EWS, they are relevant and effective, but there may be a potential in increasing awareness and application	Positive statements on CECIS were observed in many interviews - some also explicitly mention the MIC daily and the web-site	Interviews Report page 18
	Work on developing and improving EWS in the period has been strongly influenced by needs and knowledge of Member States and of experts - and have provided results e.g. in terms of reduced lead times.	Desk-study Report page 17 Report page 20
	Those that use the EWS have a fairly high level of satisfaction, but many appear not to be familiar with it	E-survey Report page 16 and 17
Cooperation and coordination between the MIC and other international entities has improved, in particular with regard to UN	The evaluation points to improvement through joint UN/EU meetings; CP Committee meetings and regular contact through MIC. More joint deployments have been found to take place over the period - also e.g. where MIC provides one associate expert to UNDAC teams. UN participation in EU training programmes is another coordination and cooperation improvement.	Interviews Reports from CP Committee meetings Report page 21 and 22
Coherence and coordination vis-à-vis the NGO environment remain limited. There may also be unused potentials in a stronger dialogue with NATO and with relevant EU bodies	Cooperation and strategic dialogue needed between MIC and the NGO community and cooperation and complementarity with NATO could be improved.	Interviews Report page 22
	Clarity and better division of responsibilities as regards EMSA is called for by Member States.	E-survey Report page 22
The merger of CP into DG ECHO is expected to further enhance coherence and complementarity	While interviews have been supportive of the merger, the challenges in merging the more political mandate of CP with the humanitarian one of ECHO has also been mentioned. In particular, representatives from the NGO Community have flagged the uncertainties and challenges - and possible contradictions - of these.	Interviews Report page 20 Report page 22

Conclusion	Findings	Source
Complementarity with Participating States is strong and supported through regular consultations, but reluctance to an extended mandate/role	The MIC, as a result of its structure and mandate, is designed to promote complementarity and the MIC has proactively promoted this by regular consultations (focal points, CP Committee, ad-hoc groups and expert groups). There is resistance or reluctance to an extended mandate for the MIC, which might impinge on such elements as ownership of deployable assets.	Interviews Report page 22
There are possibilities to be more effective as regards deployments	More effective teams could be put together if professional skills were put fully in focus. Briefings and Brussels and bureaucratic formalities can reduce the speed of deployment	Interviews Report page

Table 1-2 To which extent have modules set up under the Mechanism and projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response through enhancing the availability of key response assets?

To which extent have the projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response, and contributed to cooperation between Participating States in the field of civil protection?

Conclusion	Findings	Source
The modular approach is an important (future) contributor to effective disaster response	The modular approach can provide for more effective response through standardised and pre-arranged deployment, and the alignment with the UN approach is appreciated as is also the supporting interoperability and comparability between PS. Implementation can be complicated, in particular in decentralised countries where registration becomes a substantial task due to e.g. ownership issues. Another complication is that requests often are for material and not so much for the experts who form part of the module.	Interviews Report page 20
The Preparatory Actions and projects are seen to be relevant and helpful to innovation and testing approaches and new ways of working, thereby contributing to more adequate responses to disasters. There is significant demand to keep this facility after its expiry in 2010. However, it appears as though the Preparatory Actions have been largely limited to developing and testing (operational) modules for EU internal purposes with less emphasis placed on analysis and development of new mechanisms ('laws'). The system produces availability of key response assets, but since these are not often deployed the question is if they are exactly the right ones.	The majority of the respondents find that the Preparatory Actions/Pilot Projects are relevant. 76% agree or tend to agree that the Preparatory Actions and pilot projects contribute to the development of additional capacity which otherwise might not have been developed. Only 14% disagree or tend to disagree.	E-survey Report page 24
	Interview findings are consistent with the above, and almost all interviewees find the mechanism to be relevant. Preparatory Actions have been largely limited to developing and testing modules, There are only very few indications that preparatory Actions have led to new legislation.	Interviews Report page 24
	Interviews indicate that many modules have not yet been deployed. Numbers from the Commission show that 7 out of 12 have been deployed between 1 and 3 times. It	Interviews. Desk Review form DG

Conclusion	Findings	Source
	should be noted that some of the modules have only become available very recently and others have been produced for very specific purposes.	ECHO. Report page 25
<p>The system has produced enhance preparedness but it is difficult to prove that more effective disaster response is achieved. Responses from the e-survey and some of the interviews indicate that this might be the case.</p> <p>There are concerns that some Member States are applying for Preparatory Actions simply as a way of accessing (new) financing, rather than as a means of innovation. A further concern, or perception on the part of a significant number of Member States, is that this programme is a way of the EU to 'own' (for a defined period), and to have decision-making power over, the deployment of assets, thereby extending the central EU mandate 'through the back door'.</p>	90 % of e-survey respondents agree or tend to agree that the Preparatory Actions/Pilot Projects contribute to more effective disaster response.	e-survey Report page 25
	88% of respondents agree or tend to agree that the Preparatory Actions and the Pilot Projects complement existing capacities rather than duplicate.	E-survey Report page 26
	Interviewees express concerns over risk of gap filling. Others express the concern that the EC is using the mechanism of Preparatory Actions to extend the EU mandate 'through the back door'	Interviews Report page 25

Table 1-3 To which extent were the objectives of the EU civil protection training programme attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?

Conclusion	Findings	Source
The training programme has contributed to improved overall effectiveness in EU civil protection in a number of important ways and has succeeded in providing a broad pool of deployable experts, thereby meeting its overarching objective of improving response EU capacity.	90% of respondents found the training to be relevant.	E-survey Report page 30
	Training objectives have been met and a pool of experts is now available for deployment	Interviews Report page 30
	Main contribution from training courses were: creation of strong network among the experts, easier cooperation, common and recognised standards and procedures, and lessons learnt/sharing experiences across countries and specialisations.	Interviews Report page 33
The training courses have fulfilled the stated objectives, and are relevant to the skills needed for deployment and as being effective.	93% of the respondents found the training courses to be effective. 81-91% felt sufficiently or very well prepared during deployment.	E-survey Report page 30
	The training topics (the types of courses and the curricula) generally match very well with the skills needed for deployment.	Interviews Report page 30
	Each course is evaluated during and after its completion. The results for the 6 th and 7 th cycle were generally very positive.	DG Evaluation Report page 32
	Consistency of training providers is high and it has improved over the evaluation period.	Interviews Report page 31
	The EU training is regarded as a valuable addition to national training	Interviews Report page 32
Cross-training between the UN and the EU has increased cooperation in the field, both in terms of participant's skills, understanding of systems and networking opportunities. To other organisations such cross-training could be developed further.	Two reasons for benefits from cross-training: participant's skills and networking opportunities.	Interviews Report page 32
	There is good collaboration and alignment with the UN concerning the course content.	Interviews Report page 32
	Continued need for more training in coordination with organisations such as UNDAC, Red Cross and NGOs.	E-survey Report page 32
	Some Member States obtain a better organisation of national rescue preparedness.	Interviews Report page 32
	Relations to the UN were enhanced in terms of training	DG ECHO evaluation Report page 33
Although the quality of the training providers was seen as very high and benefiting from regular evaluations of perform-	Uneven balance between theory and practical exercises	Interviews Report page 30

Conclusion	Findings	Source
<p>ance during the period from 2007 to 2009, the evaluators note a number of concerns regarding the training programme.</p>	<p>Total number of participants on the courses is very high, about 10% of the participants are deployed.</p>	<p>Interviews Report page 31</p>
	<p>Respondents state the participants are sometimes selected as a form of reward rather than being based on merit or suitability, skills and experience level of participants differ. Some find that too many persons are nominated to participate in the courses, whereas a limited number of participants would create more focus, and criteria could be developed for enrolment, and participants should be graded.</p>	<p>Interviews Report page 31</p>
	<p>The Desk Review from the Commission supports the evaluation of participants, especially concerning the proposal to use criteria to select participants.</p>	<p>DG ECHO evaluation Report page 31</p>
	<p>Low level of English of some participants influences their outcome.</p>	<p>Interviews Report page 31</p>

Table 1-4 To which extent were the objectives of EU civil protection exercise-related activities attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?

Conclusion	Findings	Source
Overall the evaluators conclude that the civil protection exercise programme has been relevant and to the extent, to which this facility has been taken up, has contributed to the improvement of operational procedures and effectiveness.	Exercises were found to relevant (about 97% responses).	E-survey Report page 33
	Co-financed exercises have contributed to the improvement of operational procedures (77% responses). Exercises contributed to improvement of the legal basis (half the responses).	E-survey Report page 33
	Exercises found to be effective (88% responses).	E-survey Report page 34
	Main contributions: identifying gaps in responses in general, working together with international teams and establishing networks, development of shared methodology, common working procedures.	E-survey/Interviewees Report page 34
The costs of the exercises appear to be a major constraint for the take up of the exercise programme. High costs and the time required to prepare appear to have been disincentives to participation for some Member States.	Administrative procedures were found not to be smooth and to be challenging (60% responses). Exercises are costly and time consuming to prepare, and it is difficult to run and control the exercises.	E-survey Report page 34
	Several respondents are positively anticipating the modular approach to exercises that will allow the same people to build on experience through a series of similar exercises.	E-survey Report page 35
It is also apparent that potential participating Member States point to the need for a clearer policy or overarching contextual framework in which to better place the exercise programme, for example for planning purposes.	An exercise policy or/and overarching framework is needed (77% of responses).	Interviews Report page 34
	A challenge is to ensure the quality and similar level of the exercises across Europe.	Interviews Report page 35

Table 1-5 To which extent have the transport provisions of the CP Financial Instrument contributed to improve the delivery of civil protection assistance items and led to more effective disaster response

Conclusion	Findings	Source
The provisions have contributed to an overall improvement in the delivery of assistance items and led to more effective disaster response.	While the Provisions, and in particular the grant scheme, is supported by most interviewees, the extent to which it is used vary substantially	Interviews Report page 38
The provisions have closed an important gap	40% of respondents indicate that the Provisions have a decisive impact whereas slightly fewer (some 30%) say that this is not the case.	E-survey Report page 37
	Responses point to that the Provisions have closed a financial gap and a transport availability gap	E survey Report page 38
The financing grant is highly appreciated whereas provisions as regards pooling and transport broker appear to be of less importance	Broker only used once in evaluation period, but more in 2010 - and with a positive feedback	Materials provided by ECHO Report page 39
In 2007-2009, the provisions were used much less than in 2010. If this tendency continues, then the budgetary allocation may become a constraint	In 2007-2009, only 8 grants were provided. By mid-2010, more than 30 grants had been provided. Only 1.3 MEUR were used in 2007-2009, but the first half of 2010 saw a awards of almost 6 MEUR	Desks study statistics Report page 36-37
The procedures are complicated and the efforts of the CP unit to assist in these are highly appreciated	Procedures and formal requirements are rigid and difficult. More than 40% of e-survey respondents disagree/tends to disagree with a statement that points to a simple, transparent, smooth and uncomplicated process and seven out of 11 interviews with national focal points pointed in the same direction. Several interviews appreciate the professional assistance and coordination provided by the Commission	E-survey Interviews Report page 38 and page 39
The transport provisions should go hand-in-hand with an aspiration always to deliver assistance as effectively as possible	Diverging views on whether the current level of compensation is sufficient or should be increased	Interviews Report page 39
	Concerns raised by individual interviewees that a significant level of "self-financing" provides an incentive to really prioritise what to send; to decide on whether local or nearby purchases are relevant alternatives and that the transport costs provides an incentive to ensure that what is sent matches the needs	Interviews Report page 40

2 Purpose and method of evaluation

2.1 Purpose of evaluation

This report presents the results of an evaluation of the European Commission's activities in the field of civil protection. The evaluation was carried out by COWI A/S (DK) in collaboration with Aguaconsult (UK). The evaluation was initiated in late June 2010, and the final report was submitted in December 2010. The purpose of this evaluation is primarily lesson learning and accountability in view of improving performance. The specific purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the EC's actions in the field of civil protection, in order to assess performance and improve future operations. The full Terms of Reference can be found in Appendix 5.

Scope of evaluation

The evaluation considers the period 2007-2009 (inclusive). The evaluation focuses on the four main elements of the EC's Civil Protection mechanism, namely: activities of the MIC; activities relating to training, exercises and exchange of experts; the Transport Provisions; and the Preparatory Actions and pilot projects.

The evaluation pays particular attention to the following criteria:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Coherence, coordination and complementarity (3Cs).

This is an ex-post evaluation and in that sense the evaluators were tasked to review existing documentation (primarily desk reviews carried out internally by DG ECHO), carry out interviews and stakeholder consultations, and to draw conclusions, but *not* to provide recommendations for future activities or directions. It is understood that this will be a matter for DG ECHO and other Directorates and relevant stakeholders to agree on following the acceptance of this report. The specific questions that this evaluation should investigate are:

- Are EU civil protection activities coherent, well coordinated with, and complementary to, interventions and actions implemented under other EU and international crisis management capabilities and Participating States' interventions?

- To which extent have the MIC and the services supplied by it (in terms of early warning, information-pooling and sharing, and coordination) led to a more effective response to emergencies?
- To which extent were the objectives of the EU civil protection training programme attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?
- To which extent were the objectives of EU civil protection exercise-related activities attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?
- To which extent have the transport provisions of the CPFII contributed to improve the delivery of civil protection assistance items and led to more effective disaster response?
- To which extent have modules set up under the Mechanism and projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response through enhancing the availability of key response assets?
- To which extent have the projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response, and contributed to cooperation between Participating States in the field of civil protection?

It should be underlined that the focus of the evaluation is the period 2007-2009. However, 2010 was characterised by two major international disasters: the earthquake in Haiti and the flooding in Pakistan. While the evaluation still concentrates mainly on 2007-2009, allowance has been made to include particularly relevant experience and observations relating to these two major events.

2.2 Methodologies and constraints

The evaluators were provided a set of desk study evaluations that DG ECHO had prepared as part of the overall exercise, which formed an important input and contribution to the evaluation process. The evaluation team was not tasked with checking or verifying these internal desk studies, and it worked on the assumption that they were an accurate reflection of progress and issues relating to the Civil Protection Mechanism. These were further augmented by a series of direct interviews where the consultants carried out 30 personal interviews with national representatives in different Participating States as well as a number of other stakeholders. An e-survey was also conducted following a design process with collaboration and approval from the DG ECHO Evaluation Section. An e-survey was sent to a total of 408 people, of which 130 replied³. The evaluators

³ Based on the list of stakeholders outlined in the Terms of Reference, DG ECHO provided lists with contacts of relevant stakeholders. The list of stakeholders included national representatives of civil protection, the training policy group and national training coordinators, national marine pollution authorities, NGOs, stakeholders from other Commission Services

were guided by ECHO Evaluation Section in determining when to close the e-survey process and to base the analysis on the incomplete set of responses. The outcomes of the e-survey are presented in Appendix 6.

A full list of interviewees is attached in Appendix 2 and the interview guide that was used is found in Appendix 3. This report presents the consolidated observations and findings that combine the above desk review, the interviews and the e-survey. The report is structured as follows:

Chapter 3 provides the observations and conclusions as regards the four components, i.e. the MIC, the training programme, exercises and the exchange of experts programme; the preparatory actions and pilot projects, and the transport provisions. Chapter 3 thus provides the answers to the above evaluation questions under the sub-headings of 1) relevance and appropriateness, 2) effectiveness and 3) coherence, coordination and complementarity.

Chapter 4 synthesises the above findings and provides the overarching conclusions reached by the evaluation team with a particular view to answering the specific evaluation questions.

Chapter 5 contains the appendices.

and some national contact points for the modules. The respondents also included various UN bodies (UNEP, UN OCHA, UNDP, UNISDR). In addition participants from the Stakeholder Conference meeting July 22nd were included. During the e-survey process the evaluators were informed about two additional relevant NGOs from an interview participant. The list amounted to 408 respondents receiving the questionnaire.

3 Findings of the evaluation

This chapter presents the findings for each of the components structured around the three principal criteria of relevance/appropriateness; effectiveness and the '3 Cs', namely, coordination, complementarity and coherence.

Two main findings cut across the four components. One is that while interviews have been supportive of the merger, the challenges in merging the more political mandate of CP with the humanitarian one of ECHO has also been mentioned. In particular, representatives of the NGO Community have flagged the uncertainties and challenges - and possible contradictions - of these.

The other is about the linkage between lessons learnt across the four components. Overall, the linkage between the lessons learnt programme of real emergencies and the exercise and training programme is only rated sufficient by just under half (48%) of the respondents in the survey. Some ten per cent disagree, and the rest do not know. Fifty-eight per cent of the respondents agree to some extent or fully that a systematic and homogenous evaluation take place and lessons learnt are used adding value to the EU civil protection actions. One respondent mentions that in the period from 2007 to 2009, evaluations of the exercises started to improve. The interviewee results are more positive towards the usage of lessons learnt, and several mention the sharing of lessons learnt in connection with the main contribution from the programme.

3.1 Monitoring and Information Centre

The issue

The Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC) is the operational hub of the Civil Protection Mechanism. The MIC provides countries with a single entry point for civil protection information including information on the needs of the affected country, as well as an overview of assets available amongst the Participating States (PS). Any country inside or outside the European Union affected by a major disaster can request assistance through the MIC.

Functionally, the MIC is designed to fulfil three main roles: 1) as a communication hub at headquarters level between participating states, the affected country and dispatched field experts, 2) provision of useful and updated information on the actual status of an ongoing emergency and 3) support in co-ordination of EU assistance by matching requests from a disaster-stricken country with offers of assistance from participating states as well as identifying gaps in assistance. At the field level, this can entail the deployment of EU Civil Protection experts to the affected site.

Tables 3-1 and 3-2 below provide an overview of MIC activations in the evaluation period. The first table provides an overview of activations and level of activation whereas the second table categorises requests for assistance according to the type of disaster⁴.

Table 3-1 MIC activations 2007-2009

Type of activation	2007	2008	2009
Information and monitoring	4	3	3
Pre-alerts	4	6	3
Requests	18	21	27
of which requests outside PS	8	16	18
Total activations	26	30	33

Table 3-2 Categorisation of requests 2007-2009 according to disaster type

Disaster type	2007	2008	2009
Forest fires, PS	10	2	7
Other, PS	0	3	2
Floods, international	1	7	7
Oil spills, international	2		
Health			2
Earthquakes, international	1	2	5
Forest fires, Balkan not-PS	3	1	1
Cyclones, storms, typhoon		4	2
Other	1	2	1
Total requests	18	21	27

Early warning systems (EWS) are part of the MIC, and the CP Unit has undertaken a number of initiatives to contribute to the improvement of these systems. This includes the establishment of a working group to improve the exchange of information; the organisation of two stakeholder conferences in 2007 and 2008 respectively; and the financing of projects to establish and interlink alert tools with the MIC and Member States. With regard to the latter, the Joint Research Centre (JRC) is the key partner due to their long-standing experience in developing alert systems such as GDACS, EFFIS and EFAS. The two former initiatives have led to identification of gaps and shortcomings in national EWS and to the establishment of two⁵ important partnerships:

⁴ These tables have been produced based on information provided by MIC to the Consultants in July 2010

⁵ A third project handled in by UNESCO in the framework of the call for proposals on prevention and preparedness did not succeed as UNESCO could not accept the framework offered. The project aims at raising awareness on seismic and tsunami risks; it targets schools and it includes five Mediterranean countries.

- The European Meteorological Network where, through its Civil Protection and Financial Instrument (CPFI) the Commission is currently funding the further improvement of flood alerts (Meteoalarm) aiming at closing an important gap related to medium term forecasts.
- Cooperation with the Euro-Mediterranean Seismological Centre (EMSC) through a subcontracted project via JRC contributing to closing of an important gap as regards real time data transfer from measuring points off the Tunisian coast.

3.1.1 Relevance and Appropriateness

Overall, the interview and e-survey respondents indicate that the MIC is a relevant and generally effective tool. Of particular relevance is the MIC's role as a single point of entry for civil protection information and response. It should be noted that the e-survey here counts 105 respondents (all of whom have answered "yes" to some familiarity with the MIC).

Table 3-3 E-survey respondents' replies as to the performance of the MIC

Question/statement	Agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree/disagree	Don't know	Total agree/tend to agree
MIC has provided central coordination at EU level	60	26	4	10	86
Contributes to more effective disaster response inside Europe	53	30	3	14	83
Contributes to more effective disaster response outside Europe	42	44	9	5	86
MIC is prompt and accurate in its communication at all times of the day	38	49	5	8	87
MIC contributes effectively to an effective response	32	38	7	23	70

Virtually all interviewees noted that the MIC and its activities were considered relevant and appropriate. In the words of one e-survey respondent: *"With MIC as a central hub there is no need for time consuming bilateral coordination and exchange of information between receiving and assisting countries"*

The information tools of the MIC were generally viewed as relevant, and in particular Common Emergency Communication and Information System (CECIS) is highly appreciated by interviewees. According to the Evaluation of MIC Early Warning Systems, the relevance of the MIC EWS was found to be generally high, which was a view supported by subsequent interviews.

Table 3-4 E-survey respondents' feedback on early warning systems

Current early warning systems	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Undecided	Dissatisfied	Don't know
GDACS	10	33	11	2	44
EFFIS	3	13	14	1	69
EFAS	3	9	15	2	71
Meteoalarm	4	20	12	1	63

It is worth noting that a high proportion of people in the e-survey responded "don't know" which could indicate less familiarity with the systems, and that only 42 per cent responded that they regularly use the systems.

Respondents highlighted significant improvement in the functioning and service provision of the MIC during the period of the evaluation. Many praised the MIC emphasis on capturing lesson learning and their commitment to integrating those lessons identified into operating approaches.

The improvements provided and research funded in 2007-2009 for the EWS have been guided largely by needs assessments brought forward by the initiatives undertaken by the Commission (as described above). Thus, the informal Commission working group outlined current gaps and the Member State expert group provided guidance to the Commission as to the direction of its activities and undertook a questionnaire survey to assess the situation and gaps. The early warning conferences among other things resulted in the above partnerships. Thus, the relevance and appropriateness of the directions of Commission activities with regard to EWS have been informed by and guided by the users, partners and beneficiaries. One result of this was that the initial strong focus on tsunami warning systems gradually shifted towards a multi-hazard approach. The minutes of the DG meeting in Porto in 2007 confirmed the Commission's approach as did also the technical reports of the two stakeholder conferences and the minutes of the meeting with MS experts on EWS in 2008. The evaluators consider that the management of the MIC has taken significant strides to improve its relevance and appropriateness for primary users and clients.

3.1.2 Effectiveness

Interviewees and e-survey respondents generally agreed that the MIC has contributed to more effective EU responses to major disasters, as compared to pre-MIC responses (cf. also the above table). The overall trend has been one of improving operational performance. Many attributed this to an increase in involvement of operationally experienced MIC staff. However, most interviewees and e-survey respondents do not support a further enhanced role for the MIC. Thus, 56 per cent of e-survey respondents indicate that stronger EU level coordination (through the MIC) would not lead to a more effective response. Some interviewees mentioned that they do not support the idea of EU stand-by capacity even though this was not a formal question in the interview format.

The MIC as a single point of entry has been widely appreciated by most interviewees and e-survey respondents and, reportedly, contributed to its overall ef-

fectiveness. In supplement to the e-survey results on MIC performance, it should be noted that 65 per cent of respondents state that the MIC could not have met their needs better and only 4 per cent are of the opinion that the MIC has not made a useful contribution to either coordination amongst Participating States or coordination more generally. However, quite a few of the interviewees reflected that effectiveness could be improved by establishing a 24/7 operations room.⁶

Respondents appreciated that the MIC has improved its ability to match requests for assistance with offers from participating states. In particular, some interviewees highlighted that the MIC has become better at pre-screening requests for assistance and providing recommendations based on the emerging needs in a disaster, thereby making the response more relevant and appropriate. The below table illustrates this trend (the table considers only international interventions and disregards five such requests regarding forest fires):

Table 3-5 Number of requests that we not reacted upon/responded positively to

	Number of requests not followed/responded to	Assessed as a MIC decision/recommendations	Other reasons
2007	1	1	0
2008	5	1	4
2009	5	4	1

In spite of this apparent improvement, some Member State focal points indicated that the MIC could further improve in its ability to analyse needs.

Many respondents reflected that the work of the MIC has led to increased visibility and recognition of the EU as a key civil protection stakeholder both internally and globally. They cited this as a major achievement and noted that the MIC as a single point of entry has significantly contributed to this development. The below two quotations emphasise this and the positive achievements as regards coordination and cooperation with external partners:

"The MIC's role in 'collection and compilation of information – and the UN integration - are strong factors that facilitate coordination and assist to avoid duplication on the ground':

'The most important contribution of the Mechanism is the harmonisation – both internally and externally.'

Most interviewees and respondents appreciated the MIC's information tools such as CECIS. 88 per cent of e-survey respondents reflected that the MIC was prompt and accurate in its communications at all times of the day. Some interviewees reflected that the MIC daily reports were useful and that the MIC website had improved. CECIS is highly appreciated by almost all interviewees:

⁶ We understand that this was addressed in 2009/2010, outside of the timeframe for this evaluation.

"CECIS is useful and effective" and "CECIS increases transparency and clarity"

The role of the EU Civil Protection Teams was generally appreciated. 92 per cent of e-survey respondents indicated that the work of an EU Civil Protection Team contributed to better information and coordination of assistance. However, many interviewees noted that the MIC ability to compose the most effective team remained constrained. It was mentioned by several interviewees that some experts, including team leaders, were selected and deployed more for political reasons than for the relevance of their skills. At times, therefore, the nomination of experts by dispatching countries has resulted in less than optimal team composition and skill sets. Many noted that it would be an advantage if the MIC could be mandated to select the most appropriate and skilled experts for deployment. Some also suggested that MIC should be empowered to bring non-performing experts home early from mission if necessary.

The speed of deployment was noted by a small number of respondents as a constraint to MIC effectiveness. For example, the bureaucracy involved in obtaining written requests for deployment, briefings in Brussels prior to deployment and financing decisions slowed down overall MIC response in some instances. However, most of the deployed experts reflected that MIC back-up support was helpful - and had developed positively over the period assessed.

That being said, there is a clear tendency of more experts being deployed. The table below shows the number of deployed experts in the evaluation period. It should be mentioned that teams have also had other members e.g. from DG RELEX and from EMSA. Sweden and France have had the highest number of experts deployed followed by Denmark and Germany. Over the period, experts have been deployed from 19 Participating States (PS), meaning that 12 PS have not had experts participating in missions in this period as part of MIC teams. Countries from which experts were not deployed are mainly to be found among the small countries and among the newer Member States.

Table 3-6 Number of deployments - based on desk review on MIC provided by DG ECHO

Deployed experts	2007	2008	2009
National experts	17	33	30
MIC	3	9	6
Total	20	42	36

Many interviewees highlighted that effectiveness is dependent on Member States engaging and channelling support through the MIC (as opposed to sending bilateral support), a quotation from an e-survey respondent illustrates this point well: *"A better discipline of Member States respecting MIC coordination would be required"* for greater effectiveness. One respondent noted the primary challenge to the MIC functioning was the role of the PS and their differing approach to the Mechanism (i.e. varying levels of support with some viewing civil protection as a national issue). However, many saw the continuing im-

provements in MIC performance as a key factor in contributing to Member State buy-in and reducing bilateral responses, which in turn has improved MIC's effectiveness in a positive or virtuous circle.

Feedback on the current early warning systems was less clear as also shown in the introductory part to this chapter. Many of the e-survey respondents were not familiar with the current early warning systems, and the number of respondents who had actually used the EWS was low (41%). This may reflect the proportion of respondents that are focal points and/or involved in national civil protection. However, the Evaluation of MIC Early Warning Systems noted that effectiveness was high with the MIC developing new EWS to minimise gaps in coverage and working to reduce warning timeframes. Gaps still remain in terms of harmonisation of alert protocols; for example, EU risk maps still require harmonisation across borders with regard to indicators and collection of multi-source historical data.

That being said, it should be noted that lead time is a crucial aspect of EWS, and the Commission, in its own evaluation, considers that efforts have led to significant improvement of lead times and to a much better coverage of hazards than in 2007. Overall, total spending on EWS in 2007-2009 amounted to MEUR 1.4 - with a spending of less than EUR 500,000 per year the MIC receives an almost full multi-hazard coverage of near-real time EWS. Participating States have free access to the EWS provided by the MIC through CECIS and the MIC portal. A careful translation of the satisfaction survey shown above indicates that the main challenge has more to do with dissemination and awareness or familiarity of the system. This was indicated by the fact that a high proportion of respondents gave "don't know" as an answer to questions about the EWS.

Modules were introduced in 2007. The Recast defines modules and preparatory actions also focuses on supporting and widening the modular approach. All interviewees are very positive overall about the modular approach and for instance positively commented on its alignment with the UN approach, thereby supporting synergies and joint efficiency. The following quotation from one interview captures the essence of the statements most often heard: "*Main benefit is that there is a minimum standard of what a module provides - hence the requesting state knows what is coming. However there is no 'test' that modules do actually meet the criteria*". The benefit of supporting interoperability and comparability between PS is mentioned, as well as the advantages of standardised response and pre-arranged deployment.

The main challenges that were reported by interviewees related to two factors: 1) the fact that modules are fixed and include equipment and experts. The deployment of the experts can slow down response time and can render the module less attractive, as the requesting State do not always see a need for the expert, and 2) in decentralised countries it can be an administratively and legally difficult task to register the modules (i.e. where the asset may be owned by local rather than central government entities).

3.1.3 3Cs: Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence

Respondents noted a general trend towards improved internal **coordination** in the triangle of the MIC, the Participating States, and the different EU institutions including country Delegations. Some challenges still remain as reflected by some interviewees having explicitly welcomed the merger of CP within DG ECHO.

Significant improvement was noted during the period 2007-2009 in the areas of performance, visibility, effectiveness and coordination, particularly with the United Nations. This can also be seen from the desk review undertaken by the MIC where there is a clear trend towards emphasising the coordination and collaboration aspects, which is also reflected in an increasing number of joint (or associated MIC expert) United National Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC)/MIC teams. Table 3-7 below summarises⁷ requests where coordination and cooperation with partners external to the EU was explicitly noted⁸ by the MIC. Internally, the typical coordination and cooperation partners are first and foremost DG ECHO as well as DG RELEX and the delegations and the Presidency. In that regard, the desk review also points to better and smoother cooperation. Also, depending on the specifics of the disasters, others may be involved, e.g. EMSA for oil spills and DG SANCO for health issues.

Table 3-7 International requests for assistance where coordination/collaboration with external partners were noted by DG-ECHO (bold marks an explicit mentioning of a positive response)

2007	2008	2009
Bolivia: UNICEF and OCHA. Peru: OCHA. Albania: NATO/EADRCC Russia: EMSA, Black Sea Commission South Korea: UNEP/OCHA. Joint UNEP/MIC assessment team. Kyrgyzstan: OCHA.	Bolivia: UNICEF. Ecuador: UNDAC China: UN Philippines: UNEP/OCHA made the request, IMO. Moldova: UN Haiti: UN Turks and Caicos islands: UNEP/OCHA Yemen: UN Moldova: UNICEF	Gaza strip: UN Namibia: UN, ECHO Benin: UNDAC Georgia: UN Philippines: UN Indonesia: UNDAC, OCHA Samoa: UN Ukraine: WHO Malawi: UN

There was general agreement among interviewees that cooperation with the UN had improved in terms of both preparation and response. Regular meetings between the EU and the UN have contributed to this as well as some joint EU-UNDAC deployments. Interviewees pointed to an increasingly strategic approach with the MIC and the UN collaborating on the most effective political or diplomatic front, as well as operational approaches in each third country disaster response. Burma/Myanmar, China and Ukraine are three notable examples

⁷ This table is also produced based on information provided to the Consultants in July 2010

⁸ Where coordination and cooperation with other EU institutions is *also* mentioned this is noted.

of in-country collaboration, secondments and/or joint deployments. Regarding EWS, there is extensive cooperation between the MIC and various UN services with the MIC seeking to integrate existing systems, wherever feasible. However, this could be further improved. For example, one respondent noted that increased clarity of mandates and expectations of the deployed UNDAC and EU Civil Protection teams would promote greater coordination at the field level.

Some respondents indicated that, while UN – MIC cooperation was improving, further cooperation and strategic dialogue was needed between MIC and the NGO community as well as the International Movement of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies.

Two respondents indicated that cooperation and complementarity with NATO could be further improved. They specifically noted that there has been duplication of information provision between MIC and NATO/EADRCC.

Coordination with EMSA was also highlighted as an area for improvement. Some duplication was noted between the MIC and EMSA. Additionally, a respondent noted that there is insufficient expertise within the MIC on marine pollution issues that represents an additional challenge for accurate technical analysis of such incidents.

The MIC, as a result of its construction and mandate, is designed to promote **complementarity** with Member State initiatives and activities, and the MIC has proactively promoted this complementarity by holding regular consultations. This has been done both through the system of civil protection focal points as well as through regular contact through the Civil Protection Committee as well as different expert groups and stakeholder fora. There is general acceptance from e-survey respondents and some interviewees that the work of the Civil Protection Committee contributes to relevance, complementarity, coordination and coherent policy making.

Some two-thirds (64%) of respondents indicated that coordination and communication from and with the MIC was complementary to national or bilateral activities. However, there was strong feedback from interviewees that many Member States view civil protection as a national issue. Consequently, there is a resistance to an extended mandate for the MIC, which might impinge on such elements as ownership of deployable assets, Member States' national civil protection policies and their capacity to mount international responses. The activities and approaches of the MIC were reportedly broadly coherent with the wider objectives or policies of the EU. As the MIC improves in effectiveness, it is anticipated that MIC coherence with broader EU civil protection objectives will also continue to improve.

The merger of Civil Protection into DG ECHO (now the DG for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection) is expected to enhance further coherence. A number of interviewees reflected on the potential challenges with this merger, however, particularly regarding how the more political nature of civil protection will maintain coherence with the humanitarian objectives of DG ECHO activities.

3.2 Preparatory actions and pilot projects

The issue

The purpose of the Preparatory Actions is to develop knowledge, address the management cycle and contribute to improved legislation across all types of natural or man made disasters. There have been two calls for proposals within the evaluation period. The call in 2008 focused on rapid response capability looking for key resources and essential equipment to be on stand by (for a specified period) in relation to major disasters. The 2009 call more deliberately focused on innovative arrangements to ensure stand by capacity.⁹

It is a requirement for the preparatory actions that at least two countries must apply together. The duration is maximum three years. The more specific purpose of the Preparatory Actions has become to test and develop new stand-by modules and EU level complementary assets. This is reflected in the financing of the Preparatory Actions, which has solely financed modules.

The table below gives an overview of the number of projects financed.

Table 3-8 Overview of projects financed

Financing year	No of projects financed	Modules
2008	5	X
2009	7	X

Source: DG ENV web

For the preparatory actions, it is a condition that they are available for deployment a specified number of times over the three-year period. The table below shows the projects that have been deployed and the number of times for each. It appears that out of the 12 projects financed, seven were deployed 1-3 times:

⁹ From DG ENV web

Table 3-9 Projects deployed and number of deployments

Owner of modules	No of deployments	Availability
Ministry of the Interior FR - EU rapid response capability	3	2009-2010
Estonian Rescue Board EE - BloodFloodCombat	1	May 2010 till end 2010
Die Johanitter DE - European Technical Assistance	1	July 2010 till end 2010
Ministry of the Interior CZ - USAR Team	1	February 2010 till end 2010
TASTs:	3	January 2010 till end 2010
a) Small TAST		
b) Medium TAST	2	January 2010 till end 2010
c) Small TAST	2	January 2010 till end 2010

Source: Desk review DG ECHO staff.

Pilot Project to step up cooperation between Member states on combating forest fires

In the 2008 budget, EUR 3.5 million were earmarked for a *pilot project to step up cooperation between Member States on combating forest fires*. The aim was to improve mobilisation of resources and enhance mutual help between member States. The outcome was the EUFFTR (EU forest fire technical reserve) project. The project has two fire-fighting planes at its disposal¹⁰.

Cross-border pilot projects

In 2006, a budget was set aside for cross-border pilot projects. Six projects were financed for a total sum of EUR 5.6 million.¹¹ The projects should *test innovative approaches in the field of civil protection by developing operational cross border civil protection modules*.

3.2.1 Relevance and appropriateness

The interviews show that almost all interviewees find the Preparatory Actions and pilot projects to be relevant. It is seen as a good mechanism to test innovative approaches and new ways of working, and contributing to more adequate responses to disasters. The result of the e-survey supports this, where the majority of respondents can mention relevant features, except in relation to marine pollution.

The concept of modules is appreciated for planning purposes. There is general agreement that the standards for what a module provides make planning easier

¹⁰ Internal Commission review and

http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/pilot_project08_en.htm

¹¹ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/crossborder.htm

at both donor and recipient ends. The modules are seen to be readily available even if several have not yet been deployed.

However, the practical steps of arranging for the assets to become available are problematic, particularly in decentralised contexts. As one respondent puts it:

"..the administrative procedures, however, could be better balanced against the size of the project."¹²

The e-survey shows that 76 per cent agree or tend to agree that the Preparatory Actions and pilot projects contribute to the development of additional capacity which otherwise might not have been developed. Only 14 per cent disagree or tend to disagree.

It appears as though the Preparatory Actions have been largely limited to developing and testing (operational) modules for EU internal purposes with less emphasis on analysis and development of new mechanisms ('laws')

The e-survey shows that the most relevant contribution of the system is that it increases capabilities and helps the Member States prepare their modules. It is also noted in the survey that the projects give the Member states *"the ability to strengthen the preparedness and response in areas where there is a gap."*

Some of the answers caution against the gap between research and concrete deployments, since several of the modules have not yet been deployed thus questioning the urgency of the projects. It should be noted, however, that some of these are specialised and targeted for very specific purposes e.g. repatriation of EU citizens in case of acts of terrorism outside Europe.

There are indications that an overall strategy is missing in the sense that it is not immediately clear how these actions and projects interlink with the rest of the programme and which direction they should take in the future. The fact that around half have not yet been deployed may indicate a need for stronger prioritisation.

Some concerns

One concern reflected in the interviews is that some Participating States are applying for Preparatory Actions and/or pilot projects simply as a way of accessing (new) financing, rather than as a means of innovation. Another concern expressed by respondents is that this programme is a way of the EU to 'own' (for a defined period) and to have decision-making power over deployment (extending their mandate - through the back door).

Another concern is how modules are used once they are deployed.

"There are cases where a module is deployed solely for the respondent to increase its national visibility"¹³.

¹² Interviews

¹³ Interviewee

3.2.2 Effectiveness

In the e-survey¹⁴ 50 per cent of respondents agree and 40 per cent tend to agree that the preparatory actions contribute to more effective disaster response, whereas only a tiny proportion (2%) tends to disagree. In the open answers to the e-survey, some also add, that they contribute to a more adequate response to disasters.

One of the common remarks from interviewees is that their modules have not yet been deployed. One reason could be that some modules have only recently become available; another reason is mentioned by some interviewees, stating that constraint for deploying modules are transport and travel costs to and from a site. A third reason may be that even if the purpose is stand-by capacity and the hope must be for no disaster to take place, it may be that the needs assessment and the prioritising could be stronger.

The evaluators found concerns that the funding of pilot projects of preparatory actions are not fully complementary but rather gap-fillers of incomplete prevention activity in a country or region. Further, the interviewees raised some concern that there is some type of ‘unintended incentive’ whereby some MS rely on assistance through the MIC instead of the individual MS making the investment themselves e.g. for preventive measures.

Regarding adequacy and timeliness of the financing of the preparatory actions and pilot projects, 22 per cent find that the system provides adequate and timely support, 46 per cent tend to agree, while 12 per cent disagree or tend to disagree. There appears thus to be a challenge of smooth financing of these projects.

The e-survey shows a strong interest from almost all respondents in maintaining the system of preparatory actions after its expiry in 2010 (20 say yes out of 25 responses). There is thus common agreement to keep the instrument. Remarks to this are that a specific part for marine pollution emergencies should be developed and other remarks recommend better evaluation and visibility of these actions.

On the pilot project EUFFTR, view points from the interviews conducted seem to be divided between those involved in the project who find it to be of good value and those not concerned with forest fires, who see the project as superfluous and a matter to be solved by improving preventive measures in the countries concerned.

3.2.2 3Cs: Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence

The e-survey shows that there is major agreement that the preparatory actions and the pilot projects complement existing capacities (35% agree, 52% tend to agree, while 4% tend to disagree).

Complementarity

¹⁴ Out of the 130 responses to the e-survey, 40 respondents indicated to be familiar with the preparatory actions and the pilot projects

Based on your experience with schemes for supporting development and testing of modular systems, do you agree that they: Complement existing capacities rather than duplicate	Frequency	Percent
Agree	18	36.0%
Tend to agree	26	52.0%
Tend to disagree	2	4.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	4	8.0%
Total	50	100.0%

The vast majority of respondents confirm the complementarity when asked if they see any overlaps of the preparatory actions and pilot projects with similar EU/UN activities. (13 say 'no', two say 'yes' and two 'don't know'). The overlaps seen are most markedly with the UN.

Coordination and coherence

On the issues of coordination and coherence, the viewpoints are quite scattered, making it difficult to present a uniform picture. Some respondents are afraid that pilot projects and preparatory actions will twist the balance between the EU Member States and the EC. One interviewee formulates it as follows:

"It is important for the trust between the Member States that MIC does not decide who delivers assistance and this is the danger with pilot projects."

Another remark from the e-survey illustrates a concern:

"A great opportunity to develop new modules and approaches, but it is still with no overall strategy."

Another viewpoint raised is that some Member States have longstanding bilateral arrangements that are implemented without applying modules, thus demonstrating that cross-border issues can be solved without modules. Other respondents formulate a concern for over emphasis on modules risking oversight of non-modular capacities and solutions.

A third line of comment is that the TAST modules do not exist in the UN system, thus indicating that they do not necessarily contribute to improved coordination. One suggestion given in the e-survey is to plan and organise these actions together with the UN system.

Overall findings

The preparatory actions and projects are seen to be relevant and helpful to innovation and testing. They also contribute to more adequate disaster response. There is a wish to keep this facility after its expiry in 2010.

There is a risk of under-deployment of the resources produced and a risk of dependency on EU funding that can be counterproductive to serious prevention work.

3.3 Training programme

The EU Civil Protection Training Programme includes 11 training courses, the Civil Protection Exercises Programme (CPEP), and the Exchange of Experts Programme.

Training courses

The objective of the EU training courses *'is to reinforce and facilitate co-operation in civil protection assistance interventions'*¹⁵ Since 2003, seven course cycles have been completed¹⁶. This evaluation examines the 6th and 7th cycles¹⁷. During these two cycles, 74 courses were completed and 1252 experts were trained. In the 6th cycle, only 72 per cent of the seats on the courses were filled while in the 7th cycle 90 per cent of all course seats were filled. On average 87 per cent of available seats were filled¹⁸.

Table 3-10 Courses and Budget for the Training Courses

	6 th cycle	7 th cycle
Number of courses	25	49
Budget	EUR 2.8 million (73% spent)	EUR 5.9 million (85% spent)

Training has been conducted in training centres (selected through a tendering process) in Sweden, Denmark, Germany, UK, Poland, Italy, and Spain. Course seats are allocated to participating states and external partners as identified by a quota system. Specially appointed national training coordinators nominate participants. Until the 6th cycle, only UNDAC participated as external partners. This has now been expanded to include ECHO, EMSA, UNDAC, EMERCOM, EUROMED, Ukraine, Western Balkans, Eastern partners (not specified).¹⁹

A Training Policy Group was formed in 2009 (first meeting in Sept 2009). This is first step towards establishment of European Disaster Management Training Arrangements (DMTA). Course directors meet up to seven times per year and hold evaluation meetings twice a year. An annual meeting of training coordinators is held at end of each year.

¹⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/activities.htm

¹⁶ Training cycles run from June to May and currently the 8th cycle is ongoing.

¹⁷ The 5th cycle is not included in the analysis, due to lack of data.

¹⁸ As of end of 7th cycle, 142 courses were completed and about 1,400 experts had been trained. Approximately 2,500 out of 2,900 available places have been used. The programme is expected to train additional 350-450 experts in the 2010 work plan. Source: Excel 'Statistics all cycles'

¹⁹ As per the EU Desk Review on Training

During the period from 2007 to 2009, about 76 experts have been deployed about 112 times, mainly outside the EU²⁰. In total, 99 trained experts have been deployed a total number of 147 times during the period 2003-2010²¹. Comparatively 1,366 persons have been trained on a total of 2,462 course places.

CP Exercise Programme

The **exercise programme** is a "learning opportunity for all actors involved in operations under the Mechanism and enhance operational co-operation between them"²². Overall, there have been 22 full-scale exercises since 2002²³ supported by the Mechanism.

On average five countries participate in any given EU exercise, and on average there are three exercises per year. On average, 14 mechanism countries (some 44 per cent of participating states) participate annually in a simulation exercise. The most active countries are Germany, France, Sweden, Belgium, the UK and Italy²⁴.

Exchange of experts

The **Exchange of Experts Programme** was initiated in January 2007 with "*the aim to increase contact and build networks between participating countries as well as knowledge through familiarising experts with different methods and practices in emergency management*"²⁵. An exchange can last from two days to two weeks, and the programme is open to all EU Member States and EEA countries, and most recently to Croatia²⁶.

Overall, 17 countries hosted 170 experts in the period from 2007 to 2008. The top four countries – Germany, Austria, Sweden and Cyprus – accounted for 53.5 per cent of the total number of countries hosting experts²⁷.

Training objectives

Relevance and appropriateness

The training programme was generally acknowledged to be relevant to the skills needed on deployment and of very high quality. Based on survey responses, 90 per cent of respondents found the training to be relevant. This is widely supported by the interviewees who find that training objectives were met, and a pool of experts is now available for deployment.

Balance between theory and practise

The balance between theory and practical exercises on the courses is perceived by some interviewees as being too heavy on theory. Several interviewees ask for more

²⁰ Count from excel sheet – overview of trained experts, accessed from CIRCA, 7th cycle. The MIC chapter includes a counting based on the evaluation done by that unit. The total number of deployments varies. The reason is probably to be found in it that the MIC evaluation focuses on TA/assessment teams.

²¹ Before evaluation period 2003-2006, 28 experts had been deployed 28 times. (Same source as above)

²² http://ec.europa.eu/echo/civil_protection/civil/prote/exercises.htm

²³ 11 earthquake (incl. 3 CBRN), 7 floods, 5 CBRN, 4 terrorism, 1 forest fire, 1 volcano.

²⁴ As of 2008 - Study on National Participation.

²⁵ Study on National Participation

²⁶ The 'exchange of experts' programme (CPEP) is managed by Germany's civil protection organisation Technisches Hilfswerk (THW). (Study on National Participation)

²⁷ (Study on National Participation.)

practical or operational training related to realistic situations. One interviewee estimated the current balance at 70/30 for theory, while optimally this should be 50/50. Some also suggest better usage of lessons learnt.

Match between training and deployment

Interviewees agree that the training topics (the types of courses and the curricula) generally match very well the skills needed for deployment. There has been positive development in the evaluation period from 2007 to 2009. In particular, interviewees mentioned the new technical training courses, the information management courses and the international coordination course as positive developments.

Some interviewees suggest that future courses should target more specific areas, e.g. the modules, rescue teams, specialists, mapping/use of Google and GHS, disaster risk management including guidelines and tools. Others suggested more preparation on country-specific and cultural issues outside the EU and diplomacy, and an NGO pointed to the need for courses in crisis management, and also to the inclusion of more training on humanitarian aid actors and law in the courses. The desk review by the Commission also suggested additional focus on core activities during deployment within the existing specialised courses²⁸.

Effectiveness

Based on the survey answers, 93 per cent of the respondents found the training courses to be effective. Of the respondents that had been deployed, 91 per cent felt sufficiently or very well prepared when deployed within the participating states, 81 per cent when deployed outside the participating states²⁹.

Number of courses

Interviewees generally find that the number of courses offered should not be higher. Some interviewees found that it would not be possible to attend new courses, and the experts are also obliged to participate in the refresher courses. One pointed to the fact that it was increasingly difficult to find well-suited candidates for each course. This could be the reason for the 87 per cent average level of participation in the courses, and the lower skill level of participants, in some cases.

Number and profile of participants

Interviewees noted that the total number of participants on the courses is very high, limiting to some extent the effectiveness. One interviewee estimated that about 80 per cent of participants are highly relevant to the courses, although only about 10 per cent of the participants are actually deployed. One of the reasons for this is, as some of the interviewees report, that the training system also works as a filter whereby the individual assesses the wish to participate in international operations and the interpersonal skills of the individual are assessed. However, effectiveness must also be measured by the impact on the general CP system rather than just on the limited cadre of deployed experts. It was acknowledged by some respondents that Member States often use the basic level training in order to ensure that relevant

²⁸ General information note about the European CP Training Programme, 20100602 (Desk review)

²⁹ A bit more than one-third of respondents had not been deployed. This indicates that respondents are over represented with people that have been deployed, compared to actual share that is only about 10 percent of course participants.

personnel have some form of interaction with the Civil Protection field and are familiar with the systems.

The profile of participants for courses was raised as a concern by interviewees. In some cases, the national participants were reportedly selected as a form of reward rather than being based on merit or suitability. The skills and experience level of participants differ, and sometimes participants lack of skills or experience challenge achievement of the project objectives. Some interviewed experts agreed that too many persons are nominated to participate in the courses, including persons that are not intended for deployment such as administrative staff. Some respondents would prefer to train a more limited number of experts that will subsequently go on the missions. This would limit the number of participants and potentially create more focus on the courses. Some suggested that criteria should be developed for enrolment, and participants should be graded with a post-training assessment to give them a qualification for deployment. The latter is in line with the Desk Review³⁰ from the Commission that supports the evaluation of participants. Further, the desk review also suggests contemplating using some courses (CMI, OPM and HLC) as prerequisite for deployment.

Many interviewees noted that the low level of English of some participants challenges the achievement of course objectives. Some indicated that this was an urgent problem. Some countries would prefer if courses were also held in other major languages as Spanish or French.

One interviewee pointed out that in some cases there is dominance of fire fighters compared to other specialist areas such as oil spills and water and sanitation. Female participation in the training courses (as well as the subsequent deployments) is low.

Training providers

Interviewees find that consistency of training providers is high and that it has improved over the evaluation period. The issue has received much attention, and evaluations have been made to improve on this point. The workshops held by the Commission for trainers will further support this³¹. Interviewees pointed to advantages of trainers that had experience as participants in the training courses themselves and also directly from field operations. It was also suggested to increase the specialisation among trainers. One pointed out that a wider number of specialities should be represented among the trainers, such as trainers from CP and doctors (e.g. for tropical medicine, engineers and water purification experts as well as diplomacy experts, etc.). Such new topics would also allow for cross training with a broader range of organisation (e.g. WHO within tropical medicine).

Evaluations

Each course is evaluated during and after its completion. For the 6th cycle, most evaluations were done qualitatively, and the results were generally positive. For the 7th cycle the courses were ranked on a 1-5 scale, and average assessment

³⁰ General information note about the European CP Training Programme, 20100602 (Desk review)

³¹ Section 2.4 General information note about the European CP Training Programme, 20100602 (Desk review)

ranked between 4,38 and 4,73 on average. For the 7th cycle, it is notable that 7 of 11 courses have an average above 4.5 (4 is good and 5 is excellent), and all courses have a general average above 4.30. For an overview of scores, see annex in Chapter 5.

Coherence

3Cs: Coherence, Cooperation and Complementarity

The EU training is regarded as a valuable addition to national training. Some interviewees noted the EU as the most important training provider. Interviewees found that the EU plays an important role when creating a common platform for all MS in order to exchange information, create personal relations, share best practice and lessons learned, etc. This can also influence Member States towards better organisation of national rescue preparedness; for example, one country has used the experiences from both the EU and UN trainings and established a national platform that is able to cooperate widely with all actors.

External cooperation

Interviewees found that cross training between the UN and the EU increases the beneficial cooperation in the field. Advantages of cross training are both related to the participants' skills and networking opportunities. The EU training programme uses trainers from UNDAC for example. Such approach supports good integration among the two. Interviewees found that there is good collaboration and alignment with the UN in terms of course content. It appears that efforts have been successful to delimiting duplication with UNDAC; however, some respondents still find room for continued improvement. Generally, the internal desk review from the Commission supports the, finding that relations to the UN were enhanced in terms of training.³²

However, several e-survey respondents mentioned a continued need for more training in coordination with organisations such as UNDAC, Red Cross and NGOs, as well as training in how best to coordinate between the participating countries, the MIC and the beneficiary country.

Decreased duplication within courses

Interviewees found that there is good collaboration and alignment with the UN in terms of course content. Both participating states and external organisations noted that courses are complementary and that overlap is minimal. It appears that efforts have been successful to delimiting duplication with UNDAC; however, some respondents still find room for continued improvement.

Generally, the internal desk review from the Commission found that relations to the UN were enhanced in terms of training.³³

Main findings related to the training courses are:

- Generally, respondents agree that the training courses fulfil its objectives, and are relevant and effective. Training has contributed to civil protection quality, and prevention and preparedness has gained more focus. The European CP community has been taken to a global level.

³² Section 2.2 and 4.0 General information note about the European CP Training Programme, 20100602 (Desk review)

- The main contribution from training courses mentioned by respondents was creation of a strong network among the experts, easier cooperation both within and outside (e.g. to the UN) the EU teams during deployments, common and recognised standards and procedures, lessons learnt/sharing experiences across countries and specialisations that contribute to better preparedness.
- The main challenges are balancing theory and practice, the number and profiles of participants, and structured collection and usage of lessons learnt.
- Many interviewees mentioned that the EU Training Courses are unique and cannot be found elsewhere.

The desk review carried out by the Commission was in agreement with a highly positive assessment of the programme. Further, the desk review suggested discussing a revision of the programme to take into account the changed situation of recent years' developments,³⁴ especially with regard to the purpose of each course.

3.3.1 Findings related to CPEP

Many respondents are generally very positive about the Exercise Programme and regard this to be an important part of the training programme.

Relevance

Almost all respondents familiar with the exercises found them to be relevant. Slightly less than half of the respondents from the survey had participated in exercises.

Overall, approximately 77 per cent of the respondents tended to agree or agreed completely that the co-financed exercises had contributed to the improvement of operational procedures. Furthermore, half of the respondents found that exercises contributed to improvement of the legal basis.

Effectiveness

Eighty-eight percent of respondents familiar with the exercises found them to be effective. In the survey, there are differing views on the suitability of the number of exercises. Some find that there are too many exercises and others advocate for more exercises.

Survey respondents commented that exercises are helpful in identifying gaps in responses in general, and that exercises cover topics well. In particular, interviewees and e-survey respondents noted the value of the exercises in terms of the following: working together with international teams and establishing networks among the participants, development of a shared methodology, common working

³⁴ General information note about the European CP Training Programme, 20100602 (Desk review)

procedures and standards. Sometimes participants discovered new, unexpected issues, i.e. different perceptions of danger and of the importance of using protection gear or not. Additionally, they noted the value of more training and practice for preparing experts for deployment and improving the overall response.

Grants for exercises

Approximately 45 per cent of respondents that participated in an exercise have submitted applications for grants to organise a full-scale exercise. Regarding the administrative procedures, 60 per cent of the survey respondents found that the procedures were *not* smooth and somewhat challenging.

The costs of the exercises appear to be a constraint on the exercise programme. Several respondents noted that exercises are considered costly and time-consuming to prepare and that it is difficult to implement and control the exercises. There were diverging opinions on whether the size of the EC contribution was sufficient.

Until now, each team has only arranged an exercise event once, and one interviewee explained that much knowledge is lost. Several respondents are positively anticipating the modular approach to exercises that will allow the exercise planners to build up experience through a series of similar exercises. One survey respondent explained the benefit of having developed a new methodology of observation and evaluation of an exercise after which the new methodology had subsequently been adopted by another exercise, and a third exercise had shown interest in it. Such sharing or replication of systems will increase effectiveness.

Key challenges to effectiveness

One interviewee summarised the key gaps within CPEP as lack of common language for communication, inoperability of equipment, different operational procedures as well as different level of safety awareness in different countries. A challenge to the success of the exercises was that participants expect real life scenarios. The experts in particular mentioned that exercises could be more realistic, e.g. one suggested that participants should live in a tent and be self-sufficient, and have a full back-up system; the message was that things ‘run too smoothly during exercises’.

Seventy-seven per cent of the respondents found that an exercise policy or/and overarching framework is needed. For instance, they mentioned the importance in relation to planning purposes and the need to clearly define civil protection. The explicit needs could differ across the countries.

3.3.2 3Cs: Coherence, Cooperation and Complementarity

Cooperation

Interviewees described that a joint MIC/UNDAC exercise allowed for development of guidelines, and it allowed for improving cooperation among the two. Issues such as clarifying reporting and improvements to responses, structure and information were addressed.

Coherence

A challenge is to ensure the quality and similar level of the exercises across Europe. Some interviewees found that the EU should provide guidelines to ensure

a similar level and procedures for exercises, e.g. a minimum standard. One survey respondent mentioned that coherence externally could be enhanced by increasing the use of the UNDAC field handbook and OSOCC guidelines during exercises to increase coherence with other international standards.

3.3.3 Findings related to the exchange of experts programme

Most respondents are positive towards the exchange of experts programme; however, there are large differences between the activities of each country. In some countries, the programme has been used extensively, while others have not used it at all. About 31 per cent of respondents have participated in the exchange programme as hosts, and about 25 per cent as seconded experts or another role. More than half of the respondents have no experience with the exchange programme at all.

Relevance

About 92 per cent of the survey-respondents that are familiar with the programme found that it is relevant to the needs of the participants. Almost 89 per cent found that the programme provided new and relevant insights, and 87 per cent found that the programme increased their competences. This observation was supported across visitors and hosts.

However, based on the interviews the perception of the relevance of the exchange of experts programme differs more between the countries. For instance, the newer Member States and the countries that use the programme a lot are generally more positive.

Survey respondents found the main strength of the programme to be the possibility to share knowledge and experience, and to become acquainted with other systems. The main weakness is its lack of publicity and its image as being an exchange of 'leisure'.

The country that used the programme the most (42 visits and 22 exchanged) found that the programme has a wide range of possibilities both for personalised and specialised operations. As they explained, it is an option to get the best methods used in other countries (e.g. federal alarm centres, first aid providers etc.) It is also a good first step towards a bigger project between two countries, and it strengthens the network among participants.

Many other countries were also positive towards the programme and its potential; however had not yet used it much or at all. One respondent characterised the exchange programme as a sleeping organisation.

Effectiveness

Application procedure

According to interviewees, the on-line application form is fairly simple to complete, and the wide scope of the programme is positive. One interviewee noted that the EC programme coordinators are very helpful, which makes it easier to enter the programme.

Time/resources consuming	There appear to be some constraints on resources. It was mentioned that it could be challenging to find a host organisation that would allocate the necessary resources, or for an expert to find time to participate.
Formalised reporting	Another issue raised by a few interviewees was that feedback and sharing of lessons learnt after the exchange should be more formalised to ensure a wider sharing of information and experience from the exchanges.

3C's : Coherence, Cooperation and Complementarity

The interviewees who had experience of the programme state that it is a great opportunity for exchange of knowledge and ideas between the participating countries. It is a swift way of gaining inspiration and input for a national civil protection entity.

3.4 The Transport Provisions

The issue	The Transport Provisions aim to facilitate the deployment and increase the level of assistance by addressing the transport deficit. Participating States are responsible for the transport of their assistance, but the EU can facilitate, co-finance or contract transport assets. Co-financing of up to 50 per cent is possible both within and outside the EU. All transport modes are covered, but in practice the provisions are mainly applied for airlift. The legal basis is the 2007 Recast and the Financial Instrument as well as the Implementing Rules, both of which were also adopted in 2007 ³⁵ . The EC contributes through direct grants to Member States and through using the service of a transport contractor (broker Kuehne Nagel contracted for this) ³⁶ . From 2007-2013, a total budget of maximum EUR 90 million can be used for transport ³⁷ .
Use of transport provisions in the period 2007-2009	Co-financing provided in the evaluation period is shown in table 8 below. An estimate (up to June 2010, i.e. before the flooding in Pakistan) is included for illustrative purposes:

³⁵ Recast of the 2001 Council Decision establishing the Community Mechanism adopted on 8 November 2007, Financial Instrument for Civil Protection - Council decision adopted on 5 March 2007 and Implementing rules of transport provisions in Financial Instrument Commission Decision 2007/606/EU Euratom) of 8 August 2007

³⁶ The provisions include specific time tables and procedures: First, the Commission immediately communicates a request for transport to all Participating States in order to investigate the opportunities for pooling and sharing. The expiry period may be maximum 24 hours and may be reduced down to 6 hours if necessary. Specific factors are defined that must be taken into account when setting the expiry period. Thereafter, and if unsuccessful, a request for Commission financing becomes eligible. Requests must be forwarded by fax, mail or through CECIS and must be signed. Requests may be for a grant or for a transport service. In both cases, the request must indicate the percentage that the requesting stage will reimburse (minimum 50%).

³⁷ Information for this and the next section: the desk study undertaken by CP unit and study of the documents listed in the above footnote as well as screening of reports from meetings of the CP Committee

Table 3-11 Transport grants 2007-mid 2010

	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Annual costs	30,418	424,420	434,968	5,000,000	
Accumulated costs	30,418	454,838	889,806	5,889,806	5,889,806
Number of grants	1	2	5	> 30	

It was a long and complicated procedure to establish the Transport Provisions and to make them fully operational (essential steps are explained in footnote 36). This could partly explain why only a very few requests were put forward during the first years.

In the e-survey quoted below, 39 out of 82 respondents indicated that they were fully, or to some extent, familiar with the Transport Provisions. The below extracts from the e-survey build on the replies from these 39 respondents - of whom only eight have made use of the Transport Provisions.

3.4.1 Relevance

The responses to the e-survey indicate that the Transport Provisions have closed a gap. In total, 66 respondents indicated some level of familiarity with the Transport Provisions, and out of those 16 respondents had made use of the provisions. About 40 per cent of those familiar with the Transport Provisions express that the existence of the mechanism has a decisive impact on the decision to offer assistance whereas slightly less (one third) respond that it does not have a decisive impact:

Table 3-12 E-survey respondents on the decisive impact of the transport provisions

	Yes	Not	don't know	Total
Does the existence of the transport provision have a decisive impact on your decision to offer assistance	26	22	18	66

As to what type of gap the provisions have closed, answers point to both financing and the (absolute) existence of transport gaps - the financing gap with a slightly higher score (44 respondents indicate that the provisions have assisted to close this gap). Overall, respondents find the time set by MIC for pooling of transport to be appropriate and indicate that the transport grant is a decisive element.

Table 3-13 E-survey respondents' feedback on the functioning of the Transport Provisions

Percentage distribution (minus don't know)	agree		disagree		Total	Don't know/ total
	agree	tend to agree	tend to disagree	disagree		
The time set by MIC for the pooling of transport is appropriate	48	43	09	00	100	30
The transport grant is a decisive element in regard to whether you are able to offer assistance	34	39	20	07	100	33
The identified transport solution was adequate and effective	44	35	18	03	100	48

The relevance is further illustrated by statements from respondents indicating that assistance would not have been offered or supplied if the provisions had not been in place.

Among the Member States interviewed by the evaluation team, some were found to have used the Transport Provisions quite extensively and some had never done so. At the one extreme, one respondent noted that it was a principal approach of the Member State in question always to apply for EU funding when the option exists, and another respondent said that assistance was never applied for, as the Member States' military aircraft were used for that purpose.

3.4.2 Effectiveness

As regards effectiveness, respondents both in the e-survey and in the interviews indicate that procedures and formal requirements are rigid and difficult to manage. This becomes even more of an issue given the importance of timeliness in this context. More than 40 per cent of respondents indicate that they tend to disagree or completely disagree with statements that point to a simple, smooth and uncomplicated process.

Table 3-14 E-survey respondents on the processes involved in making use of the Transport Provisions

Percentage distribution (minus don't know)					Total	Don't know/ total
	agree	tend to agree	tend to disagree	disagree		
The process leading up to the transport grant being awarded is smooth and uncomplicated	0.25	0.33	0.30	0.13	1.00	0.39
It is transparent and easy to understand which of the costs are eligible for support	0.28	0.44	0.23	0.05	1.00	0.35
The reimbursement process is simple	0.10	0.43	0.30	0.17	1.00	0,5

This picture is further confirmed through the interviews, where seven of the 11 interviewees representing Member States explicitly mentioned the complicated procedure, including for example the approval procedure and the time for reimbursement. No interviewees expressed an opinion that pointed in another direction. However, several interviewees pointed to the professional assistance and coordination provided by the Commission including:

- The training and the usefulness of the templates (two interviewees)
- Appreciation of the timeliness despite the complicated procedure (one interviewee)
- The effectiveness and active assistance from the CP unit has made the system work (one interviewee).

Four of the interviewees were of the opinion that the current level of compensation was sufficient or the maximum level, whereas a further four expressed that it should be higher (e.g. 80%-100%). The argument for the latter being for example that transport is a large – and often the largest - cost item when providing assistance (one interviewee) and that transport cost and activities are essential budgetary constraints (one interviewee).

The option of using the broker to close a transport deficit was only used once in the period from 2007 to 2009. Thereafter, however, it has been used for instance in Haiti and with a very positive feedback from the recipient State and activated again in September with a positive feedback, although the intervention was stopped for other reasons.

3.4.3 3 Cs: Coordination, Complementarity and Coherence

In terms of contributing to better coordination, the Transport Provisions are found to have succeeded. As indicated above, and further confirmed through interviews, the Transport Provisions have closed a gap, which previously prevented some Member States from offering and providing assistance.

That being said, some interviews pointed to the need for more regular coordination and collaboration with NATO's Movement Coordination Centre.

The Transport Provisions are means of supporting the complementary nature of EU's CP activities. More specifically, the Transport Provisions aim to ensure that availability and finance of transport does not constitute a barrier to some Member States in offering/delivering relevant assistance.

As the same time though the role of the Commission in facilitating Member States' coordination is emphasised by most interviewees. In this regard, one interviewee notes that the six hours for search for pooling is adequate and cannot be lowered - because it ensures that Member States take the lead and the EU assistance is complementary.

As regards pooling though, the views on that are more diverse. Fewer interviewees reflect on it; in addition to the above, one mentions that it is slow, and two note that this is typically done bilaterally and that if a Member State has a flight it makes sure to fill it up. Haiti is mentioned though as a good example of successful pooling. One e-survey respondent mentions that EU should do more in the field of pooling.

Some interviewees were concerned that the transport provisions, in particular the financial support element, could lead to inefficiencies:

One interviewee thus stressed that in his view, the level of 50 per cent is the maximum, and an increase will reduce the incentive to prioritise what kind of assistance to send. The same interviewee also says that it is his impression that the opportunity of financial support is not really seen as the 'last resort' option. An e-survey respondent notes that it is important that there is still an incentive to take into consideration the option of purchasing on-site or nearby rather than to fly all assistance in from Europe.

Along the same lines, an NGO has raised the concern that there may be a risk in some cases where large contributions are being provided that may not be really relevant to the needs.

A further comment provided through the e-survey noted that the transport provisions were to be seen as a 'last resort'.

4 Conclusions

Based on the findings and analysis of the documentation, interviews and responses to the e-survey, the conclusions of the evaluators are presented in the following chapter. Conclusions are presented along the lines of the primary evaluation questions and are grouped according to the four main elements of the Civil Protection Mechanism.

4.1 Overall conclusions

- C.1 The evaluators conclude that during the period of the review (i.e. from 2007 to 2009), the activities in the area of civil protection undertaken by the EU were for the most part coherent and well coordinated with the interventions and actions implemented by other EU entities, Member States and international organisations. Further, there is a clear trend towards improvement in coordination and complementarity over the period of the evaluation, particularly between the EU mechanism and the UN system.
- C.2 This improvement is reflected in better communication, better coordinated and joint preparation activities and better coordinated responses, both in operational terms (i.e. through the increased effectiveness of the MIC, the scope and impact of the training programme and more effective use of transport assets) and strategic terms (i.e. through an increasing familiarity and complementarity of roles and mandates) with other EU entities, Member States and international organisations.
- C.3 The trend towards improved coherence, coordination and complementarity of EU civil protection activities appears to be driven by an increased professionalism, competency and heightened profile. In short, as the EU's capacity credibility in this domain has increased, Member States, recipient states and other international actors have responded to this improved 'offer' by being more proactively engaged with, and responsive to, the civil protection mechanism in all stages of the disaster life-cycle.
- C.4 However, in spite of this overall positive trend, there appears to be a relative lack of progress in the pace of improvement in terms of coordination and coherence between the EU mechanism and the broader NGO community, including the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movements. There are also still opportunities to improve coordination and coherence further with the EU's own EMSA and other international agencies such as NATO.

- C.5 The evaluators conclude that the Participating States underline the primacy of national leadership in civil protection and the notion of subsidiarity for responding to crises and more specifically in terms of asset ownership and mandate.
- C.6 There is a fifty-fifty split on satisfaction when it comes to cross-fertilising the lessons learned across the components.
- C.7 There are concerns, and issues around perception, regarding the distinction in mandate between civil protection interventions, humanitarian assistance and to a lesser extent interventions on the part of military forces given their very different operating principles.

4.2 Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC)

- C.8 Overall, the evaluation concludes that the MIC is a relevant and generally effective tool, with a particular relevance and value-added as a single point of entry for civil protection information and response. Significant improvement was noted during the period 2007-2009 in the areas of performance, technical capacity, visibility, effectiveness and coordination, particularly with the United Nations.
- C.9 The information tools of the MIC were generally viewed as relevant, and in particular CECIS is highly appreciated. The MIC Early Warning System is relevant and generally effective, although there are continued requirements for operational improvements. The evaluators consider that the management of the MIC has taken significant strides to improve its relevance and appropriateness for primary users and clients through pro-active consultation and review.
- C.10 The potential impact and effectiveness of the MIC is to a large extent dependent on Member States engagement and use, or channelling, of information through the MIC. By and large, this has been satisfactory over the period of the evaluation, but there are still variable levels of support, with some Member States viewing civil protection as a national issue. The continuing improvements in MIC performance is a key factor in contributing to Member State buy-in, which in turn has improved MIC's effectiveness in a positive or virtuous circle.
- C.11 The utility and effectiveness of the MIC Early Warning System appears to be relatively good, and although there are still gaps in coverage, and in terms of harmonisation of alert protocols, the MIC is working hard to improve these areas as well as to reduce warning timeframes. It appears that there are also gaps in dissemination and awareness or familiarity of the system among key civil protection stakeholders within the EU.
- C.12 Cooperation and coordination between the MIC and other international entities has improved, in terms of both preparation and response. Regular meetings between the EU and the UN have contributed to this as well as some joint EU-UNDAC deployments. Increasingly strategic approaches to response have been

adopted, as well as operational approaches in each third country disaster response.

- C.13 Despite clear improvements in coordination and complementarity with Member States and UN agencies, further cooperation and strategic dialogue have been limited more broadly. It is apparent that coherence and coordination between MIC and the NGO community, as well as the International Movement of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies remains limited. Coordination also remains limited with other key international agencies including NATO, and more specifically there appears to have been duplication of information provision between MIC and NATO/EADRCC. Coordination with EMSA was also highlighted as an area for improvement, with some duplication noted between the MIC and EMSA.
- C.14 Complementarity with Member States has been strong and supported through regular consultations, both through the system of civil protection focal points as well as through regular contact through the Civil Protection Committee, which is widely recognised as having played a key role in maximising Member State inclusivity.
- C.15 The merger of Civil Protection into DG ECHO is expected to further enhance coherence and complementarity with other EU mechanisms. There are some risks, however, associated with this merger particularly regarding how the more political nature of civil protection will maintain coherence with the humanitarian objectives of DG ECHO activities.
- C.16 The module system is considered to be important in making the civil protection disaster response more effective; one key aspect of this is that modules are relevant and useful for planning purposes and handling of requests for assistance. However, the practical steps of arranging for the assets to become available are problematic, particularly in decentralised contexts.
- C.17 There is a concern that as long as modules consist of both equipment *and* staff (which is true at the present), that this slows down the speed of deployment as it is faster and easier to deploy only equipment modules.

4.3 Preparatory Actions and pilot projects

- C.17 The Preparatory Actions and projects are seen to be relevant and helpful to innovation and testing approaches and new ways of working, thereby contributing to more adequate responses to disasters. There is significant demand to keep this facility after its expiry in 2010. However, it appears as though the Preparatory Actions have been largely limited to developing and testing (operational) modules for EU internal purposes with less emphasis placed on analysis and development of new mechanisms ('laws').
- C.18 The system has produced enhanced preparedness but it is difficult to prove that more effective disaster response is achieved. There are indications, however, that this might be the case.

There are concerns that some Member States are applying for Preparatory Actions simply as a way of accessing (new) financing, rather than as a means of innovation. A further concern, or perception on the part of a significant number of Member States, is that this programme is a way of the EU to 'own' (for a defined period), and to have decision-making power over, the deployment of assets, thereby extending the central EU mandate 'through the back door'.

4.4 Training programme

- C.19 The training programme has contributed to an improved overall effectiveness in EU civil protection in a number of important ways and has succeeded in providing a broad pool of deployable experts, thereby meeting its over-arching objective of improving response EU capacity. The training programme has resulted in a strong network and a community among experts. Such a network provides common principles and knowledge of common and recognised standards and procedures, as well as a shared vocabulary. The training programme has promoted easier cooperation both within and outside the EU team, for example with the UN and allowed experts to share lessons learnt and best practice.
- C.20 The training courses have fulfilled the stated objectives, and are relevant to the skills needed for deployment and as being effective. Training has contributed to civil protection quality, and prevention and preparedness has gained more focus. The European civil protection community has been taken to a global level through the EU training, which is seen as being unique in nature and highly regarded both inside and outside the EU. It is also seen as a valuable addition to national training programmes by Member States.
- C.21 Cross-training between the UN and the EU has increased cooperation in the field, both in terms of participants' skills, understanding of systems and networking opportunities. Such approaches support a good integration between the two organisations. Similar cross-training has, however, not taken place with other international organisations including the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and major international NGOs active in humanitarian response.
- C.22 Although the quality of the training providers was seen as very high and benefiting from regular evaluations of performance during the period from 2007 to 2009, the evaluators note a number of concerns regarding the training programme. Firstly, there is a challenge in finding the right balance between theory and practice, with the current make-up lacking emphasis on more practical or operational training related to realistic situations. The second area of concern is with the profile of participants, which still appears to be determined as much on a political basis (i.e. as a form of reward) rather than being based on merit or suitability. Inappropriate candidates and big differences in the skill and experience levels of participants can create very practical difficulties for trainers as well as influence the outcome of the training.

4.5 Civil protection exercise programme

- C.23 Overall, the evaluators conclude that the civil protection exercise programme has been relevant and the extent to which this facility has been taken up, has contributed to the improvement of operational procedures and effectiveness. More specifically, the exercise programme has been helpful for identifying gaps in responses, and has encouraged a culture of working together with international teams and establishing networks among the participants, a better understanding of shared methodologies, common working procedures and standards.
- C.24 The costs of the exercises appear to be a major constraint on the take up of the exercise programme. High costs and the time required to prepare appear to have been disincentives to participation for some Member States.
- C.25 It is also apparent that potential Participating States question the need for a clearer policy or overarching contextual framework in which to better place the exercise programme, for example in relation to planning purposes.

4.5.1 Exchange of expert programme

- C.26 The exchange of expert programme has a lot of potential, but limited uptake and experience with this programme appears to be restricted to a smaller group of Member States. That said, there appears to be a positive impact and value in the programme in the more limited number of countries that have participated. Benefits appear to be transfer of knowledge and some similar to the training and exercise components, with increased familiarity of procedures and systems and better understanding of team work.

4.6 Transport Provisions

- C.27 The Transport Provisions have contributed to an overall improvement in the delivery of assistance items and led to more effective disaster response. The provisions also provide a valuable contribution in allowing for the presence and visibility of all Member States in international disaster situations. Coordination in the area of provision of transport assets has improved among Member States. The Transport Provisions appear to have also closed a critical gap in response and provided for more positive and effective responses to requests, particularly in terms of financing.
- C.28 The broker mechanism was not utilised much in the evaluation period. The procedures for use of the Transport Provision are complicated, and the documentation requirements are considered to be excessive and appear to represent a barrier to take-up. Nonetheless, the Transport Provisions are appreciated by many, as is the approach taken by the Commission staff to facilitate up-take through for example, training, templates and active assistance.
- C.29 The current compensation rate (50%) was much debated in this evaluation. While some argue it should be increased, there are important concerns to take into consideration including 1) making sure that pooling opportunities are util-

ised as much as possible, and 2) making sure that there is sufficient incentive to ensure cost-effective assistance (delivering what is really needed and flying in only what cannot be purchased locally). That being said, the recent large-scale disasters of 2010 (Haiti and Pakistan) appear to have invoked a heavy demand on the compensation mechanism.

- C.30 There may be a risk that the Transport Provisions reduce the attention of individual Member States with regard to ensuring that assistance really meets needs, and that assistance is provided as cost-effectively as possible taking into account also the opportunities of undertaking purchases on site or nearby.
- C.31 Although coordination within Member States has been improved through the development of the Transport Provision, there has been less improvement in regular coordination and collaboration with NATO's Movement Coordination Centre.

5 Appendices

Results from E-survey

General questions

General questions

Table 5-1 Q1. What characterises your relationship with the civil protection activities of the European Commission? (please select several options if relevant)

	Frequency	Percent
National focal point	57	43.8%
Other role in national CP coordination vis-à-vis the EU Commission	26	20.0%
National expert (member of a deployment/intervention team)	28	21.5%
Trainer	11	8.5%
International organisation (NATO, UN, etc..)	9	6.9%
Non-Governmental Organisation	7	5.4%
COM official in CP unit of DG-ECHO	1	0.8%
Seconded national experts (SNEs) in CP unit of DG-EHC	1	0.8%
COM official outside of the CP unit	22	16.9%
Research institution	3	2.3%
Government outside the EU	3	2.3%
Other	25	19.2%
Total	130	

General questions

Table 5-2 Q2. Please mark which (one or more) of the following areas where your organisation has been involved (several answers possible)

	Frequency	Percent
MIC (activations in respect of emergencies within the EU)	72	55.4%
MIC (activations in respect of emergencies outside the EU/Mechanism area)	77	59.2%
Training	75	57.7%

Exercises	77	59.2%
Exchange of experts	60	46.2%
Preparatory actions/pilot projects	40	30.8%
Transport	23	17.7%
Deployment under the Mechanism	49	37.7%
Total	130	

General questions

Table 5-3 Q3. Are you a member of the Civil Protection (CP) Committee?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	31	23.8%
No	99	76.2%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Questions concerning the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC)

Table 5-4 Q4. Does your organisation have experience with the MIC?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	88	67.6%
To some extent	17	13.1%
No	25	19.2%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-5 Q5 Please assess the following statement about the MIC:
The MIC has provided central coordination at EU level

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	63	60.0%
Tend to agree	27	25.7%
Tend to disagree	2	1.9%
Disagree	2	1.9%
Don't know	11	10.5%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

*Table 5-6 Q5 Please assess the following statement about the MIC:
The MIC contributes to more effective disaster response inside Europe
through its information and coordination role, as well as the dispatch-
ing of field experts and facilitation of transport.*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	56	53.3%
Tend to agree	31	29.5%
Tend to disagree	3	2.9%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	15	14.3%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

*Table 5-7 Q5 Please assess the following statement about the MIC:
The MIC contributes to more effective disaster response outside Europe*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	44	41.9%
Tend to agree	46	43.8%
Tend to disagree	8	7.6%
Disagree	1	1.0%
Don't know	6	5.7%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

*Table 5-8 Q5 Please assess the following statement about the MIC:
The MIC is prompt and accurate in its communication at all times of the day*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	40	38.1%
Tend to agree	51	48.6%
Tend to disagree	4	3.8%
Disagree	1	1.0%
Don't know	9	8.6%
Total	105	100.0%

Table 5-9 Comments/examples to Q5 (Table 5-5 to Table 5-8)

Some MS give assistance without informing MIC
Recent deepwater horizon response.
I only exchange information with the regional ECHO office
In Lebanon oil spill it took some 3 months before the equipment we dispatched via MIC arrived to Lebanon - our container was lost for several weeks without MIC knowing where it was. The equipment was never returned back to us. During the Deepwater Horizon accident request for assistance were sent to marine pollution contact points AND to civil protection contact points which caused a lot of extra work in Finnish administrations as three different organizations received the request for assistance and each of them reacted to the requests. Alerts should be sent only to competent authorities. We think that the EMSA daily reports on the Deepwater Horizon accident should have been sent to MS directly by EMSA, and not via MIC (as this route caused delays)
The response to Haiti is an example of efficient coordination through the MIC.
Coordination outside of Europe involves working closer with the UN in particular although not only and such coordination is at times challenging for both.
I feel that member states are to use the MIC set up much more than it our impression it is used today.
We have practical experience of working with MIC and look forward to continuing this.
Between 2003 and now there is a huge positive increase in the working relation of the MIC. MIC must be strengthened but also should still be in close contact with UN OCHA , not to duplicate it.

<p>From the view of marine pollution! Lebanon marine and coastal pollution 2006 Black Sea oil spill in 2007 Gulf of Mexico oil spill 2010</p>
<p>From the view of marine pollution: Lebanon marine and coastal pollution 2006, Black Sea oil spill in 2007, Gulf of Mexico oil spill 2010</p>
<p>The MIC could be even more effective if closer links with UN agencies and humanitarian clusters could be established. In addition, a better "discipline" of Member States respecting MIC-coordination would be required.</p>
<p>We have only one example where the MIC was activated with an inspection visit to Pueru (15.8.2007 earthquake)</p>
<p>MIC is providing central INFORMATION rather than COORDINATION. This information is almost always disseminated by the national information centres and we have the impression that at the time of receiving information and requests "it's all over" anyway.</p>
<p>Within EU it is my experience that in Maritime/Coastal accidents, direct communication is established and MIC is informed. This is especially the case where assistance is required by a MS. In the case of the recent USA incident, involving Deepwater Horizon, I found the MIC very efficient.</p>
<p>Quality of MIC's information is highly dependent on the quality and completeness of the information from Member States, and the accuracy of its communications depends on this</p>
<p>Under the Civil Protection Mechanism the MIC can facilitate coordination of assistance in disasters within the EU and undertake operational coordination in the event of responses in third countries. It is therefore difficult to answer the first question.</p>
<p>The lack of comparative data and evidence makes it difficult to assess the degree to which the MIC has contributed to more effective disaster response. However, the MIC does make a very positive contribution in terms of information exchange.</p>
<p>Before adopting the Council decision on the Community Mechanism 2001 in the case of response to emergencies in and outside the EU there were only loose coordination procedures among the Member States. On the basis of Council decision the Community has enhanced response and coordination by setting up its' own intervention procedures.</p>
<p>Good coordination during deepwater horizon incident in US</p>
<p>The information and coordination capacities of the MIC have been improving.</p>
<p>Delays during a number of exercises</p>
<p>The MIC Team has been deployed after the 27 February 2010 earthquake here in Chile and arrived rapidly. It was the first time they work with ECHO on field and the EU Delegation in Chile assured the role of focal point of the EU Coordination with ECHO-MIC.</p>

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-10 Q6. To which degree are you satisfied with the current early warning systems? GDACS

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	11	10.5%
Satisfied	35	33.3%
Undecided	11	10.5%
Dissatisfied	2	1.9%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Don't Know	46	43.8%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-11 Q6. To which degree are you satisfied with the current early warning systems? EFFIS

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	3	2.9%
Satisfied	14	13.3%
Undecided	15	14.3%
Dissatisfied	1	1.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Don't Know	72	68.6%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-12 Q6. To which degree are you satisfied with the current early warning systems? EFAS

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	3	2.9%
Satisfied	9	8.6%
Undecided	16	15.2%
Dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Very dissatisfied	2	1.9%
Don't Know	75	71.4%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-13 Q6. To which degree are you satisfied with the current early warning systems? Meteoalarm

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	4	3.8%
Satisfied	21	20.0%
Undecided	13	12.4%
Dissatisfied	1	1.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Don't Know	66	62.9%
Total	105	100.0%

Table 5-14 Comments/examples to Q6 (Table 5-10 to Table 5-13)

We use our own methods and sources for early warnings.
We use the HELCOM defined early warning and alerting system.
Via the Virtual OSOCC (as I am UNDAC (8) and EUCP (1) missions)
GDACS alerting system is very good and prompt.
These systems have no Maritime relation and with regard Meteoalarm I have to rely on our national WX
EFFIS rarely used
We used this early warning systems for the training of the French Fire-fighter ans Civil Protection officers
For example EFFIS don't serve the needs of Northern Member States. That is why we have our own procedures for early warning about the threat of forest fires.
We use our own early warning systems
EFAS is not user friendly
EFAS could be more user friendly
There are several early warning systems, but it would be more convenient for national operational centres to have one platform of information. National early warning systems provide prompt and more accurate information, therefore, in most cases information provided by GDACS, EFFIS, EFAS and Meteoalarm is used to collect information about emergencies in other countries.
we consult them regularly as an abroad reference, not for inside our country because we have our own systems.
GDACS is the only system used by us.

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-15 Q7. Does your organization use the early warning systems frequently/on a regular basis?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	44	41.8%
No	61	58.1%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-16 Q8. Is there a geographical area or type of disaster which has not been covered by the early warning systems?

No (frequency = 11 respondents)
The EWS adopted is the CP of the country
YES
Coverage in Africa should be extended
Atlantic EWS for tsunamis
Flooding
Yes - The North of the Africa, especially Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. Indeed, this country are outside of the UE community, but they are in the Mediterranean area and work currently with French Civil Protection.
On one hand look at the comment in point Q.6. On the other hand the question is unclear, it needs more clarification to be answered properly.
They are more informative than early warning systems.
DISASTERS CAUSED BY NATURE ARE COVERED SATISFACTION BY GDACS

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-17 Q9. Have you identified overlaps of the MICs monitoring, information and early warning systems with similar EU or UN activities?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	46	43.8%
No	59	56.2%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-18 Q10. What would you suggest to reduce/avoid overlaps?

Harmonisation of maritime response in MIC or EMSA
Better communication among actors
Improve coordination
Strengthen communication between MIC and other international organizations
More communication with sitcen at Council Secretariat (EEAS)
EMSA should be the focal point for marine pollution early warning and alerting. EMSA has 24/7 MSS duty officers and knowledge about marine pollution matters
Closer and more frequent contacts are needed. More importantly, planning together is essential as both institutions (EC and UN) aim at same objectives and member states participate in both.
Closer cooperation.
UN should be strengthened - but find a way of closer cooperation in the UN system (esp. as a lot of tools, like VO are sponsored by ECHO...)- but avoid overlaps, like the current Pakistan ECHO reports, which are a copy of the OCHA reports!!
Better coordination with UN OCHA
From the view of marine pollution MIC and EMSA carry out the international used POLREP procedure in double manner! MS have to receive or report twice for example at the last exercise BALEX DELTA 2010 in Klaipeda.
Better integration with UN organizations
Information exchange and coordination
Expert rosters. Lots of experts belongs to both rosters. Can problems with availability. Information from emergencies comes from two sources => harmonizing information management.
From the view of marine pollution: MIC and EMSA carry out the international used POLREP procedure in double manner. MS have to receive or report twice, e.g. at the last exercise BALEX DELTA 2010 in Klaipeda.
It might be an overlap related to IMO activities, ref. deepwater Horizon accident.

Use of a common platform
Better communication/exchange of information and MoUs defining the division of labour would be helpful.
More coordination between EU-UN
Better coordination with the UN.
Better coordination with RELEX Crisis Room and Council's SITCEN.
Already been done, by integrating within Echo
Global(EU, UN etc) co-operation in the field of civil protection monitoring systems
More cooperation and coordination as well as flexibility among all stakeholders.
To communicate with regional agreements and other national/international bodies
Joint assessment teams
Joint assessment teams would be an improvement
In the field of response to marine pollution accidents (e.g. oil spill) Clarify the relationship between the MIC (DG ECHO) and the MSS of the European Maritime Safety Agency.
Not sure if there are overlaps, but it seems to be likely. Regular coordination best way to avoid any.
Activites regarding marine pollution.
IN THE CASE MENTIONED, THE SOLUTION WOULD BE TO HAVE MIC AS PRIORITY PARTNER FOR IN/OUT MISSIONS, IF MIC IN ONLY PRESENT. EARDCC AND SOMETIMES (TO SOME EXTENT)UN OCHA COVER THE SAME EMERGENCIES,SO THE NATIONAL FOCAL POINT RECEIVES THE SAME INFORMATION FROM MORE THAN ONE ORGANIZATION (POINT OF CONTACT)

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-19 Q11. During the period 2007-2009 (three years) did you send a request for assistance to the MIC?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	22	21.0%
No	81	77.1%
Don't know	2	1.9%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-20 Q12. During the period 2007-2009 were you involved in responding to requests for assistance via the MIC (i.e. did you offer or provide goods, services or finance)?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	71	67.6%
No	32	30.5%
Don't know	2	1.9%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-21 Q13. How many requests (different emergencies) did you approximately respond to positively during the period 2007-2009?

	Frequency	Percent
0	29	27.6%
1-5	49	46.7%
6-10	8	7.6%
11-20	8	7.6%
21-50	10	9.5%
>50	1	1.0%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

*Table 5-22 Q14. Based on your experience with requests for assistance, please rate the following statement:
The coordination and communication from and with the MIC met your requirements and needs*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	35	33.0%
Tend to agree	42	40.0%
Tend to disagree	4	3.8%
Disagree	2	1.9%
Don't know	22	21.0%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-23 Q14. Based on your experience with requests for assistance, please rate the following statement:
The coordination and communication from and with the MIC was complementary to national or bilateral activities

	FFrequency	PPercent
Agree	37	35.2%
Tend to agree	35	33.3%
Tend to disagree	2	1.9%
Disagree	6	5.7%
Don't know	25	23.8%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

*Table 5-24 Q14. Based on your experience with requests for assistance, please rate the following statement:
The offers for assistance were made in a timely manner*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	28	26.7%
Tend to agree	43	41.0%
Tend to disagree	3	2.9%
Disagree	1	1.0%
Don't know	30	28.6%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

*Table 5-25 Q14. Based on your experience with requests for assistance, please rate the following statement:
The offers for assistance were relevant to your needs*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	21	20.0%
Tend to agree	28	26.7%
Tend to disagree	5	4.8%
Disagree	4	3.8%
Don't know	47	44.8%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

*Table 5-26 Q14. Based on your experience with requests for assistance, please rate the following statement:
The MIC contributes significantly to an effective response*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	34	32.4%
Tend to agree	40	38.1%
Tend to disagree	5	4.8%
Disagree	2	1.9%
Don't know	24	22.9%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-27 Comments/examples to Q14 (Table 5-22 to Table 5-26)

A significantly contribution of MIC for the successfully of RODELTA 2009 exercise organised by Romania.
THE INFORMATION AND REQUEST ITS MAKES THROW THE ECHO REGIONAL OFFICE
MIC does not have sufficient expertise on marine pollution response related matters.
Q14 can't be answered since we have not requested assistance from the MIC.
The role of the institution (UNISDR) that I conducted until 2008, is risk reduction which includes prevention, mitigation and preparedness, not response nor recovery of disasters, hence the collaboration with MIC and civil protection has been exclusively in the above areas.
As the role of Kuehne+Nagel towards MIC is as transport supplier to the requests MIC receives from Member states we are responding to the questions as supplier to MIC - NOT as user
My experiences according to the Austrian MOI
No. My country didn't send/made any request for assistance yet.
In our case, the mission concentrated on evaluation of the situation and concluded that the local assistance was enough.
This information is relevant regarding Estonian offers of assistance as Estonia has not requested any assistance itself (expect transport pooling).
On Q14: We did not introduce or respond to requests, but WHO interacted with the MIC field experts in the framework of health cluster coordination. My earlier comments on EU Member State "discipline" remain valid. Also, MIC requests for assistance could still be better coordinated with the humanitarian cluster system.
"The offers for assistance were relevant to your needs" Austria did not send out any request for assistance
This section seems rather badly suited to my particular role, as an EU Head of Delegation - we have not initiated or respond to, but we have helped organise 3 MIC interventions
No request for assistance
Until the MIC has an independent capacity to assess needs, it is difficult to assess whether or not the assistance offered is relevant. Currently MIC depends fully on the recipient country's assessment. ECHO takes a more critical view. Combining elements of both approaches could improve the relevance of assistance
The offers were relevant to your needs: Austria didn't send any requests for assistance
I am not concerned as we are not an operational organization
At least currently the communication with MIC is complementary. If the Mechanism and its scope will be developed covering also major accidents in the sense of smaller MS the situation might change.
The question answered are referring to response of disasters
Offers of assistance prepared by EMSA and then submitted by MIC

<p>During 2009 summer two Spanish forest fires fight aircrafts, demanded by Greece through the MIC, offered by Spain and accepted by Greece, should have been retained in Cerdeña and go back from there to Spain, when communicated by Greek authorities than they needn't help anymore. Demanded an explanation to MIC, it just answered driving us to Greek authorities, which in our opinion means a lack of commitment or an absolute lack of coordination capability.</p>
<p>The EU Delegation in Chile coordinated closely with the MIC and had permanent contact to help the Member States embassies to deliver their aid coming from their countries and coordinated with the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Emergency Office the delivery.</p>
<p>EXPERIENCES GAINED DURING THE EMERGENCIES MONITORED IN CECIS.</p>

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-28 Q15. Could the MIC have met your needs better?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	37	35.2%
No	68	64.8%
Total	105	100.0%

Table 5-29 *Yes to Q15. Please explain how*

MIC should get timely information from all MS as regards their bilateral assistance
Having more meetings with the Focal Points from each EU and out of EU countries.
Better integration with EMSA and more day to day liaison
By improving the coordination with national civil protections
The MIC should co-operate better with other organizations and they should avoid duplicities.
MIC should give the responsibilities (or at least delegate) the marine pollution incidents to EMSA as the MIC has not expertise on marine pollution which sometimes makes the MIC messages inaccurate and confusing.
This question can't be answered properly since it is linked to receiving assistance which we have no experience of. However, on a general level when it comes to assistance from the MIC, coordination with other EU institutions and instruments could be improved.
Maybe because it depends on how much efforts MIC wishes to develop on risk reduction, which goes beyond response to disasters
Quicker response, experts a bit more competent
Better daily situation reports

<p>To make some steps concerning better understanding of local/national level(MS) in emergency response</p>
<p>Better coordination and clear responsibility between EMSA and DG Echo</p>
<p>Better coordination and clear responsibility between EMSA and DG ECHO</p>
<p>Direct information channel more than mic-daily</p>
<p>We could have a closer dialogue regarding the composition and skill set of the EU-CPT teams deployed</p>
<p>Better coordination with ECHO office in Central America (based in Managua)</p>
<p>Better coordination with relevant DG for improved coordination with respective Delegations. Also, the need for better communication/coordination with UN bodies outside of Europe.</p>
<p>In one case (a PDNA), the expert sent had little awareness of local issues, and gave me the impression of spending more time complying with MIC reporting requirements than assessing the real situation</p>
<p>Make better use of the expertise of the response team, who currently work under a very limited mandate</p>
<p>Probably a need to make EU Delegations more aware of existence of MIC and how to make use of their services</p>

<p>The MIC could have played a stronger/"real" coordination role during maritime emergencies.</p>
<p>Include ECDC experts in assessment and response teams when health impact, particularly concerning communicable disease, is foreseen</p>
<p>MIC can be more active in demanding complementary information to the requests and offers made through CECIS, making easier the help effectiveness.</p>

Table 5-30 No to Q15. Please explain how

<p>No requests have yet been made.</p>
<p>I have no role to assess the MIC activities</p>
<p>The local disaster relief services are pretty well organized and resources were enough. The MIC team provided support to the office and facilitated communication with local authorities.</p>
<p>Estonia has not requested any assistance.</p>
<p>Better coordination/information sharing with, both, the health cluster at field level and at HQ level. Also cooperation between the MIC and WHO would need to be defined more clearly.</p>
<p>It was the first time MIC and ECHO worked together, and MIC worked in Chile for an emergency and it was a very positive experience</p>

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-31 Q16. Has the MIC in your view made a more useful contribution in co-ordination among the Participating States or for assistance outside Europe? (several answers possible)

	Frequency	Percent
Yes, the MIC has made a more useful contribution to coordination amongst Participating States	64	61.0%
Yes, the MIC has made a more useful contribution to coordination of assistance outside Europe	64	61.0%
No, the MIC has not made a more useful contribution to either co-ordination amongst Participating States or coordination	4	3.8%
Don't know	17	16.2%
Total	105	

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-32 Yes, the MIC has made a more useful contribution to coordination amongst Participating States (Q16) - Please explain why

<p>The MIC has gained experience and improved its work and analysis of the situation in an affected country. The cooperation with other EU institutions has started to improve and the cooperation with other international organisations such as the UN is developing.</p>
<p>Better information and cooperation</p>
<p>Allowing a better information exchange and avoiding gaps and duplications.</p>
<p>With MIC as a central hub there is no need for time-consuming bilateral coordination and exchange of information between receiving and assisting countries.</p>
<p>Coordination of assistance outside Europe could still be improved.</p>
<p>Please consider that all requests for assistance outside EU (and less for inside EU) will be judged by NL government. So, in the case of the Lebanon Oil Spill (due to bombing by Israel) our government declined the request for assistance.</p>
<p>Despite the difficulties to coordinate with the Chilean authorities, the information provided by the MIC was very useful.</p>
<p>THERE IS STILL A LOT OF SPACE FOR IMPROVMENT:</p> <p>BETTER PREPARATION / TRAINING FOR THE DEPLOYED EXPERTS, BETTER VISIBILITY WHILE WORKING TOGETHER WITH OTHERS (UN OCHA) WHEN OUTSIDE EU.</p>

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-33 Yes, the MIC has made a more useful contribution to coordination of assistance outside Europe (Q16) - Please explain why

National civil protections tend to keep their independence of activity
The MIC has gained experience and improved its work and analysis of the situation in an affected country. The cooperation with other EU institutions has started to improve and the cooperation with other international organisations such as the UN is developing.
It is more difficult for one country to send assistance outside the EU.
Le MIC est un Centre d'Information et de Suivi à l'interieur de l'UE. Il peut également avoir un rôle de planification pour l'engagement des modules . A l'interieur de l'UE, le Pays sinistré est souverain dans l'organisation et le commandement des opérations de secours . Par contre à l'extérieur de l'UE, le MIC peut avoir un rôle de planification et de coordination des moyens de l'UE
Better information and cooperation
Allowing a better information exchange and avoiding gaps and duplications.
With MIC as a central hub there is no need for time-consuming bilateral coordination and exchange of information between receiving and assisting countries.
It gathers the information and act as a focal point. There is also a need to ensure good communication with the delegation on the ground who is chairing HoMs meeting and other coordination meetings.
Good coordination and information of the assistance during Deepwater Horizon Incident in the Gulf of Mexico (2010)
Is the area that I'm involved in as a RELEX official.
Please consider that all requests for assistance outside EU (and less for inside EU) will be judged by NL government. So, in the case of the Lebanon Oil Spill (due to bombing by Israel) our government declined the request for assistance.
Useful contribution in case of Deepwater Horizon incident in the Gulf of Mexico
Despite the difficulties to coordinate with the Chilean authorities, the information provided by the MIC was very useful.

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-34 No, the MIC has not made a more useful contribution to either coordination amongst Participating States or coordination (Q16) Please explain why

In terms of humanitarian aid the MIC comes when there is already a system in place. MIC's added value in terms of humanitarian assistance is still unclear.

Questions concern-
ing the MIC

Table 5-35 Don't know (Q16)
Please explain why

I did not follow the cooperation between the MIC and WHO in Europe. Therefore, I cannot compare.
As per earlier answers it is difficult to assess the MIC's contribution without comparable data.

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-36 Q17. Has the work of an EU Civil Protection expert team contributed to better coordination and information of the assistance?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	48	45.7%
To some extent	50	47.6%
No	7	6.7%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-37 *Yes (Q17). Please explain how*

Liaison officer on spot very useful
The work within an EU Civil Protection expert team could contribute for a better coordination and information of the assistance as a result of the experience of individual the team member from different countries.
Better information from on site
In the Lebanon oil accident, the team had on side information and that contributed to the work of the MIC
Better information from the site and better coordination on site
Better information from the operational area, support when deploying assets
In one case, in relation to a toxic chemicals spill, the experts were relevant and contributed specialised technical know-how which was well appreciated by local stakeholders
EUCP teams contribute to the uniformity of information and enable the "bundling" of incoming EU assistance, which facilitates the overall UN coordination in emergencies in third countries.
Provided more information of the situation on the ground which supports Member States' assessment.

Better info from the site and better coord. on site
However, it was difficult to assess the real needs from the Chilean side due to a certain extent to their reluctance to receive support from international organizations

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-38 *To some extent (Q17). Please explain how*

Not in all cases. MS have bilateral contacts which are valuable as well as good cooperation with the UN. Therefore it is important for MS to choose how they want to deploy their assistance.
Hard for K+N to say. We have during the last two years only handled 1 full charter for MIC. This is despite the fact that for eg. Haiti we have been flying more than 3000 tons of aid cargo to Haiti. Same goes for the other emergencies we have experienced during the last two years.
Information gathering by EU CP team on the ground is very useful for assisting countries - to deliver such accurate information to the public and the media in the respecting country.
Given that the team is composed of experts coming from different MS but all sharing the same background, it is really showing one single action of the EU.
Depending on team and situation
It helped to act in a timely manner
Experts participated actively in the health cluster coordination mechanisms.
It has allowed a more streamlined reception of assistance provided by Member States, but did not pro-actively identify needs, and therefore fell short of its potential to better coordinate assistance
Not aware of any action in the countries I worked in
In specific health related emergencies, better coordination needed with EU bodies mandated to protect health of citizen

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-39 *No (Q17). Please explain how*

During the Lebanon incident we did not get additional operational information from the expert teams that were dispatched to the incident site - the information would have helped us in delivering correct equipment and users to correct location at correct time.

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-40 *Q18. Have you experienced situations where a stronger role of the EU level coordination and information (through the MIC) would have rendered assistance more effective?*

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	15.2%
To some extent	30	28.6%
No	59	56.2%
Total	105	100.0%

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-41 *Yes (Q18). Please explain and quantify, if possible*

Kerch incident - Black Sea.
Deepwater horizon.
The main problem is that some member states still choose to send assistance "outside" the Mechanism. For political reasons, this is something we must get used to, but coordination would have been more effective if more nations made use of the Mechanism
Haiti earthquake
The Haiti examples shows that in these (rare) types of major disasters, even within the framework of the Mechanism, Participating States tend to duplicate efforts. A more operational coordination by the MIC could solve the problem, to the mutual benefit of Participating States, e.g. sending less USAR teams, but with more logistical support instead. The congestion of airspace at that time made the careful choice of which assistance was sent even more pivotal.
It could be more effective in the case of the Mexico Gulf
Deepwater Horizon
HAITI EARTHQUAKE 2010 FOR EXAMPLE: MORE COULD BE DONE TO ORGANIZE SUPPORT FOR PLANES LANDING IN PORT AU PRINCE (LACK OF SUCH POSSIBILITIES AND THE NEED TO LAND IN DOMINICANA).

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-42 *To some extent (Q18). Please explain and quantify, if possible*

<p>From 2010 - as it was similar to the yeras before: Pakistan - assessments like UNDAC and stronger involvement of EU (also e.g. use of military aircrafts for transport of goods/food from Europe to Pakistan)</p>
<p>Lebanon marine and coastal oil spill 2006</p>
<p>The example of the assistance provided to Haiti is a good one. Although this was practically a complex emergency, in my perspective, the EU intervention, in Terms of facilitating coordination and info exchange, could have been much better, even in cooperation with the UN structures on the ground. We were in fact expecting a deeper level of support from this team, namely upon arrival and after through the whole mission.</p>
<p>Lebanon marine and coastal oil pollution in 2006.</p>
<p>As mentioned previously, need for better coordination with the UN, since the UN is initiating agency and primary coordinating body with national Governments for emergency appeals.</p>
<p>The role of the MIC work is depending on the co-operation with the requesting member state. Therefore one should not over estimate the coordinating work of the centre.</p>
<p>Ukraine (H1N1); Haiti earthquake</p>

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-43 *No (Q18). Please explain and quantify, if possible*

<p>In the Baltic Sea the marine pollution response cooperation has been carried out successfully under the well established rules, procedures and guidelines of the HELCOM. Our opinion is that MIC should not have stronger coordination role. Regional incidents should be coordinated regionally, EMSA should coordinate the EU-wide assistance.</p>
<p>Have no personal experince, however the general answer would be the same as in Q17. The way MS deploy their resources should be in accordance with what they find most efficient.</p>
<p>Coordination could always be better, but I'm not at all convinced that MIC is the way to do this, at least in distant situations which are highly technical</p>

Questions concerning the MIC

Table 5-44 Do you have further comments to your experience with the MIC?

In general very mechanism
Be more open don't be afraid for political consequences.
I DONT HAVE EXPERIENCE WITH THE mic
My very limited experience is related to activities in connection to the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico.
Necessary coordinating function to all PS, also MIC should organise common airlift (to save money...)
Basically I have the function to coordinate the Danish participation in the training programme. I have no part in planning for missions and sending teams and material.
I would highly appreciate if the MIC could have a strong representation in the EMSA/CTG meeting and that a special meeting is scheduled in Brussels with the MIC and representatives of MS both in Maritime and Civil protection incidents. MIC should make more commercials for their role/work
We had three MIC interventions in my country, where in each case the Delegation played a major role in coordinating logistics, briefing, and contributing local knowledge. One (re toxic chemicals) was very useful, if extremely technical. The second (re massive floods) was largely irrelevant and useless. The third (an international exercise) was appropriate and well-received

Just a thought: Why not consider using warning SMSs for Mechanism activations (like the GDACS system)?

Analytical capacities of the MIC should be strengthened. In case of major emergencies MIC could be supported by national experts. More cooperation with NATO EADRCC would be welcome.

MIC DUTY OFFICERS ARE ALWAYS VERY HELPFUL AND PROFESSIONAL

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-45 Q19. Are you familiar with the EU Civil Protection Training Programme, which includes training, exercises and exchange of experts?

	5.1	5.2
Yes	5.3	5.4
To some extent	5.5	5.6

No	5.7	5.8
Total	5.9	5.10

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-46 Q20. Have you registered for EU CP training or have you had staff registered for training in 2007-2009 (three years)? Or do you have other experience with training? (several answers possible)

	5.11	5.12
No	5.13	5.14
Yes, I have attended training	5.15	5.16
Yes, staff from my organization have attended training	5.17	5.18
Yes, I am/have been a trainer on the training courses	5.19	5.20

Yes I have other experience with training courses	5.21	5.22
Total	5.23	5.24

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-47 Q21. Based on your experience, please rate the following statement:
The training was effective

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	43	63.2%
Tend to agree	20	29.4%
Tend to disagree	1	1.5%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	4	5.9%
Total	68	100.0%

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-48 Q21. Based on your experience, please rate the following statement: The training was relevant

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	45	66.2%
Tend to agree	16	23.5%
Tend to disagree	3	4.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	4	5.9%
Total	68	100.0%

Table 5-49 Comments/examples to Q21 (Table 5-47 to Table 5-48)

<p>The training are nice but need more professional trainers, not only trainers with a nice story build on there own experiences.</p>
<p>Necessité de mettre en place le réseau des Ecoles et Instituts universitaires de protection civile.</p>
<p>Attended HLC and MSC, being trainer at all EU CP courses - in my opinion too many courses; there should be one induction course but also for diplomats and other keyplayers; then there should be a separation for those who will be operational - all necessary courses and those sitting in HQ as CP experts - only one additional course. One course for modules. This could lead to less but more qualified courses!</p>
<p>Need to avoid of differences (practical exe in last day) in same level courses, for example, CMI course in Hamburg vs CMI course in Rome.</p>
<p>I get feed back from Danish participants and almost all of them rate the training as being very effective and relevant.</p>
<p>One of the participants attended a general Civil Protection course. He belong to Marine Pollution and felt that some of the topics in this course was not very relevant.</p>
<p>The Delegation has to support ECHO activities and manage rehabilitation and conflict prevention projects. Internally Our Administration section has organized a pre-paradnes training for all the Delegation staff, which was very effective.</p>
<p>The possibilities should explored for training diplomats in order to strengthen the EU's capacity in crises in third countries which affect a large number of EU citizens. An important role for the Commission is in supporting Participating States with information packages on the role of the Mechanism but other forms of joint courses at the EU-level could provide a useful complement to our national efforts.</p>
<p>In order to ensure an efficient process when receiving aid from Participating States and third countries in case a disasters inside the EU, a training course on host nation support would also be welcome, as well as training on prevention and preparedness in order to strengthen the commitment of EU civil protection in this respect.</p>
<p>The curricula of some new courses should be more balanced.</p>
<p>Focus of training was on Civil Protection, little reference to marine pollution.</p>

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-50 Q22. Which training was particularly useful (several choices possible)?

	Frequency	Percent
Assessment Mission Courses	31	45.6%
Community Mechanism Introduction Course	39	57.4%
High Level Coordination Refresher Course	12	17.6%
Modules Basic Course	24	35.3%
Media and Security Strategy Course	14	20.6%
Operational Management Course	36	52.9%
Operational Management Refresher Course	6	8.8%
Staff Management Course	15	22.1%
International Coordination Course	17	25.0%
Technical Experts Course	23	33.8%
Total	68	

Table 5-51 Comments/examples to Q22 (Table 5-50)

Make use of the national training institutes.
The marked are the courses i attended to, i was told by my colleagues,that the other courses were also useful and interesting.
Technical Experts Course (TEC)2009 in Sweden
TEC course especially useful to rapidly get technical experts updated on the mechanisme
CECIS Courses
Information Management Course
And the SERM: the project "European Support for Evacuation, Reception and Movement" (SERM).
I only attended the CMI - comments from staff who followed the other courses were equally positive.
Difficult to compare the courses. Feedback has been very good from all.
I have attended just those two courses. I believe all are very usefull.
Training of staff was useful

Q23. How well did you feel prepared to fill your designated role upon arrival at the site?

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-52 Q23. How well did you feel prepared to fill your designated role upon arrival at the site concerning deployments in Participating States

	Frequency	Percent
Very well prepared	9	13.2%
Sufficiently prepared	23	33.8%
Slightly unprepared	2	2.9%
Very unprepared	0	0.0%
No deployments	34	50.0%
Total	68	100.0%

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-53 Q23. How well did you feel prepared to fill your designated role upon arrival at the site concerning deployments outside the area of Participating States

	Frequency	Percent
Very well prepared	4	5.9%
Sufficiently prepared	25	36.8%
Slightly unprepared	7	10.3%
Very unprepared	0	0.0%
No deployments	32	47.1%
Total	68	100.0%

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-54 Comments/examples to Q23 (Table 5-52 to Table 5-53)

I have never deployed by EU Civil Protection.(MIC)
It actually depends more on how prepared the UN are at working with you outside Europe.
Especially as I had already a lot of field experience with UNDAC; the HLC and AMC cover most of the issues which are needed on site.
No deployments of ECDC staff were performed through the MIC, but coordination in the field was effective in one event (Ukraine) with ECDC experts deployed with a WHO mission.
WE DID SENT THE MODULES, NO INDIVIDUAL EXPERTS.

Q24. Please state the number of deployments

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-55 Q24. Please state the number of deployments in Participating States

	Frequency	Percent
0	48	72.7%
1	10	15.2%
2	5	7.6%
3	1	1.5%
5	1	1.5%
10+	1	1.5%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-56 Q24. Please state the number of deployments outside the area of Participating States

	Frequency	Percent
0	40	59.7%
1	7	10.4%
2	7	10.4%
3	4	6.0%
4	1	1.5%
5	1	1.5%
6	1	1.5%
7	0	0.0%
8	1	1.5%
9	3	4.5%
10+	2	3.0%
Total	67	100.0%

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-57 Q25. Are there specific areas where you feel that more training could be offered?

CECIS Trainings
cultural awareness
NO
Safety and Security
No
UN cluster system
None - reduce the system
All territories outside EU - it is not enough, to provide some info about targeted area at last moment and during last meeting only before deployment.
Operational/international coordination
No
Procedures and co-operation between MIC - EU delegation -affected country.
In the security field, both personal and team's. Practical full-scale exercises for all types of modules. Joint training with UNDAC, Red cross and NGOs, incl. exercises.
Coordination
EU CP Systems
CBRN AND EARTHQUAKES
Security
Marine pollution
-Technical coordination of teams in disaster interventions. -Use of telecommunications.

Questions concerning the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme

Table 5-58 Q26. Do you have further comments to your experience with the EU Civil Protection Training Course Programme?

Certain Training centres are not up to the desired level
One Introduction course for all interested key players; one special course for HQ personnel and for operational personnel - OPM; HLC; AMC and Media and Security! One course for modules!
More practice close to reality
More focus should be given to the operational side of the courses;
The training programme has fine variety. There is no need to widen the Programme further for the time being.
Training Course Programme IS A BIG SUCCESS, BUT IT SHOULD BE ESTIMATED THE NUMBER OF EXPERTS FOR MISSIONS TO BE DEPLOYED OUTSIDE AND INSIDE EUROPE TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE GROWING NUMBER OF ACTIVATION OF THE MECHANISM

Questions concerning exercises

Questions concerning exercises relating to the EU Civil Protection Training Programme

Table 5-59 Q27. Has your organisation participated in exercises co-financed by the EC through the Civil Protection Financial Instrument during the period 2007-2009 (three years)?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	56	43.1%
No	55	42.3%
Don't know	19	14.6%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning exercises

Table 5-60 Q28. Based on your experience with exercises, please rate the following statement:
The exercise(s) was (were) effective

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	23	41.1%
Tend to agree	26	46.4%
Tend to disagree	3	5.4%
Disagree	1	1.8%

Don't know	3	5.4%
Total	56	100.0%

Questions concerning exercises

*Table 5-61 Q28. Based on your experience with exercises, please rate the following statement:
The exercise(s) was (were) relevant*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	24	42.9%
Tend to agree	27	48.2%
Tend to disagree	2	3.6%
Disagree	1	1.8%
Don't know	2	3.6%
Total	56	100.0%

Questions concerning exercises

Table 5-62 Comments/examples to Q28 (Table 5-60 to Table 5-61)

Albis 2008
We developed a new way of observation and evaluation of big EU funded exercises and that was very successful. After our exercise Floodex 2009, the ORION 2010 project team adopted our system and recently Poland send in a draft proposal and in that draft their was attention to our way of working.
No 100% evaluation and sometimes the feeling, that no-one cares about the result - the only thing is that it was conducted.
PTQUAEE09
Exercise Floodex 2009. More liaison/coherence with the mechanism and other international standards, such as UNDAC Field handbook, OSOCC guidelines was needed.
Exercise SWENOR
The exercise was a static display of equipment in the Philippines in the framework of the ASEAN Regional Forum. Participation was politically important.
Depends on exercise, but always good to learn lessons from experiences and exercises.
If you attend and follow the exercise as an observer it is almost impossible to assess how effective (to whom) the exercises were.
There have been a large number of exercises on earth quakes and CBRN the past years and a greater diversity could be encouraged. This is perhaps an area where certain improvement can be made in the following years.

Questions concerning exercises

Table 5-63 Q29. Have you ever submitted a proposal to be awarded a grant to organise a full scale exercise (previously called simulation exercise) in the field of European Union Civil Protection Mechanism?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	25	44.6%
No	31	55.4%
Total	56	100.0%

Questions concerning exercises

*Table 5-64 Q30. Based on your experience with grant proposals, please rate the following statement
The application procedure is efficient*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	6	24.0%
Tend to agree	12	48.0%
Tend to disagree	3	12.0%
Disagree	2	8.0%
Don't know	2	8.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing exercises

*Table 5-65 Q30. Based on your experience with grant proposals, please rate the following statement
The Grant Application Guide is a useful tool*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	7	28.0%
Tend to agree	15	60.0%
Tend to disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	4.0%
Don't know	2	8.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing exercises

Table 5-66 Q30. Based on your experience with grant proposals, please rate the following statement

The administrative procedures are smooth

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	3	12.0%
Tend to agree	5	20.0%
Tend to disagree	6	24.0%
Disagree	9	36.0%
Don't know	2	8.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing exercises

*Table 5-67 Comments/examples to Q30 (Table 5-64 to
Table 5-66)*

The process of applying is one of the biggest hindrances for organisations to make use of this system
Too much bureaucracy!
The application procedures are very bureaucratic and complex. There are lots of kilogrammes of paper to handle, especially when you would like to have partners.
Exercise EU CREMEX 2011.
Inflexibility and too much bureaucracy

Questions concerning exercises

Table 5-68 Q31. What are the key strengths/weaknesses of the exercise programme?

Mutual exercises are very helpful for finding gaps in mutual cooperation.
Make it easier to write a good draft proposal
Full coverage, however, too many exercises
We have submitted several rates during MIC exercises but that is also all we know about the exercise programme so we are not in a position to evaluate the programme.
Too many exercises, but a possibility to train people.
Gradations of course levels - key strength need to involve more participants from other authorities - Medical, energetics, IT, environment, etc.

5.25	Strengths: There have been many exercises with different scenarios.
5.26	Weakness -limited number of participation per country/per year
5.27	One of the strengths is the possibility to work together with the Civil protection Modules from all over EU and to gain experience in different environment and building of relationships.
5.28	Weaknesses: The exercises seems to be too large and there is too much administrative work
5.29	Strengths: it is multinational and multisectoral. Weakness: low knowledge of international coordination mechanisms on the field
5.30	It is important that the exercise program reaches out to key partners
5.31	Strengths: all stakeholders working together/practicing. Lack of these exercises outside the EU space.
Strengths include opportunity to train teams and test policies and procedures. However, weaknesses include lessons not always being shared and learned.	

5.32 The Commission should streamline all exercises that today are funded via different Calls, the “regular exercises”, modules exercises and the exercises that the preparatory action projects are supposed to conduct if their modules are not deployed. Many of those exercises should be possible to combine which would create a more coherent exercise strategy.

5.33 Strengths- improvement of teams interoperability weaknesses- lack of an evaluation standard, financial limitation to the no. of team personnel (20 per team)

5.34 Lessons learnt from the exercise could be more disseminated. Exercise is a good way to test caspacity to respond to an emergency.

5.35 Strong points:give continuity to the operative relation among intervention teams of the MS. Allows to contrast methodologies and work procedures.

5.36 Weak points:too much wide and complex which makes difficult and expensive its organization.Many objectives in a limited time, which makes difficult evaluation and obtaining results like lessons learnt.The experience of before exercises is not taken into account for the future ones.In general aren't useful to improve MIC procedures nor for modules progress and much less to get an armonization in intervention procedures.

5.37 LONG SELECTION PROCEDURE FOR ORGANISATION OF THE EXERCISE. MANY EXERCISE, NO CLEAR CALENDAR.

Questions concern-
ing exercisesTable 5-69 *Q32. Please describe any improvements you may have experienced in the exercise programme in the period of 2007-2009?*

Co-operation
It is much to bureaucratic
We have submitted several rates during MIC exercises but that is also all we know about the exercise programme so we are not in a position to evaluate the programme.
More focus on the evaluation component.
n° of vacancies has increased
I have not any
Good opportunity to test possibilities and limitation in the cooperation
Better planning of the programme, where the input of the MS have been taken into account, would be desirable.
Variety of the scenario types
More simplified procedures for submitting a proposal.
LESS OBSERVERS WERE INVITED. MORE REALISTIC SCENARIOS WERE OBSERVED.

Q33. Based on your experience with exercises, please rate the following statementsQuestions concern-
ing exercisesTable 5-70 *Q33. Based on your experience with exercises, please rate the following statement
The co-financed exercises have contributed to the improvement of operational procedures*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	22	39.3%
Tend to agree	21	37.5%
Tend to disagree	3	5.4%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	10	17.9%
Total	56	100.0%

Questions concerning exercises

*Table 5-71 Q33. Based on your experience with exercises, please rate the following statement
The co-financed exercises have contributed to the improvement of the legal basis?*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	7	12.5%
Tend to agree	21	37.5%
Tend to disagree	9	16.1%
Disagree	3	5.4%
Don't know	16	28.6%
Total	56	100.0%

Table 5-72 Comments/examples to Q33 (Table 5-70 to Table 5-71)

Exercise is planned to take place in 2011.
--

Questions concerning exercises

Table 5-73 Q34. Is an exercise policy and/or overarching framework needed?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	43	76.8%
No	13	23.2%
Total	56	100.0%

Table 5-74 Comments/examples to Q34 (Table 5-73)

If we did not exercise the incoming foreign assistance during Floodex, we did not learn so much. Secondly our experiences are shared with a lot of other countries and a part of new exercises.
For planning reasons
This could differ between the countries
It is important to define what is CP and what is humanitarian aid and the different approaches that have to be taken into account in the different scenarios.
THERE WERE MEETINGS ON EXERCISES ORGANISED BY THE EC. IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO CREATE A NETWORK OF NATIONAL EXPERTS RESPONSIBLE FOR ORGANISATION OF THE EXERCISES IN MS.

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

Table 5-75 Q35. Have you or your staff participated in the exchange of experts programme? Or do you have experience with the programme?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes - as a host	40	30.8%
Yes - as a seconded expert	20	15.4%
Yes - other experience	13	10.0%
No	76	58.5%
Total	130	

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

*Table 5-76 Q36. Based on your experience with the exchange of experts programme, please rate the following statement
The programme was relevant to your needs*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	33	61.1%
Tend to agree	17	31.5%
Tend to disagree	1	1.9%
Don't know	3	5.6%
Total	54	100.0%

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

*Table 5-77 Q36. Based on your experience with the exchange of experts programme, please rate the following statement
The programme provided you with new and relevant insights*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	34	63.0%
Tend to agree	14	25.9%
Tend to disagree	1	1.9%
Disagree	1	1.9%
Don't know	4	7.4%
Total	54	100.0

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

*Table 5-78 Q36. Based on your experience with the exchange of experts programme, please rate the following statement
The programme increased your relevant competence*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	28	51.9%
Tend to agree	19	35.2%
Tend to disagree	2	3.7%
Disagree	1	1.9%
Don't know	4	7.4%
Total	54	100.0%

Table 5-79 Comments/examples to Q36

I have a very good relations with this programme, otherwise I think their are more possibilities to exchange information. It seems to me like a sleeping organisation.
Excellent tool, but not sure if it does not tend to a kind of "disaster tourism"...
It is very important to learn about other countries organisation, performance and organisation of units and agencies.
INSARAG Classification and as mentors for new teams
The cooperation with the implementing agency (THW) was smooth and target oriented.
EoE programme is a very good tool to raise your knowledge, to establish personal contacts.
GREAT IDEA, GREAT CHANCE TO EXCHANGE THE KNOWLEDGE AND BIULD A NETWORK FOR THE FUTURE COOPERATION.

Questions concerning the exchange of experts programme

Table 5-80 Q37. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of the exchange of experts programme?

Exchange of knowledge and procedures.
I get not updates from this programme, a newsletter good help.
Seconded experts to the MIC improves the knowledge in the MIC on what MS can provide and how it could be done in an efficient way. The MIC can also take advantage of the contacts etc that the seconded expert's MS has. When the expert return to her / his country valuable experience of the work in the MIC.
It is valuable as all exchange programmes, it contributes greater diversity in expertise and knowledge; it could be improved by involving experts from other regions, matching the geographical areas in which the EC wishes to offer collaboration.

Excellent possibility to learn from others, but as said before - with some exchanges I had the feeling, that officials needed some "free days" in another PS
A huge lack of publicity, meaning that a lot of MS do not know how it really works. It could be much more explored.
Personal networking with colleagues/participants from other countries in specific areas of civil protection; too long preparation procedures (sometimes).
Long process. The internet application program does not work well.
Strengths: The programme gives the experts the possibility to share experience
Extrem long decision time for EoE
Exchange of experts can strengthen preparedness and response but is not currently equally balanced across Member States.
Strengths - facilitation of exchange of practical experience
Some support could be given to host countries.
<p>STRENGTHS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OPEN FOR ALL INTERESTED CP EXPERTS - ABLES TO PROVIDE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR EXPERT FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES - PROVIDES THE POSSIBILITY TO LEARN MORE ABOUT CP SYSTEMS OF OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES AND HELPS TO SHARE EXPERIENCE

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Table 5-81 Q38. The lessons learned programme of real emergencies is sufficiently linked to exercises and training?

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	11	11.8%
Tend to agree	32	34.4%
Tend to disagree	5	5.4%
Disagree	6	6.5%
Don't know	39	41.9%
Total	93	100.0%

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Table 5-82 Agree/Tend to agree (Q38). Please state why

It shows gaps at real operations
Tend to be a bit to politically correct rather than focusing on good and bad experiences.
Real examples from real emergencies - very good.
LL SHOULD BE MORE LINKED TO EXERCISE AND TRAINING PROGRAMME

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Table 5-83 Tend to disagree/Disagree (Q38). Please state why

Difficult, while the custodians of the lessons learned program is laying with the EU Civil Protection and the raining implementation with the organisation being rewarded the tasks
I do not know about CP but Maritime part is surely open for improvements
lessons learned meetings focus on EU civil protection assessment and coordination team deployments not exercises and training.
I have attended just one lessons learned meeting, which did not provide enough analysis for me
Lack of sense of urgency in exercises

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Table 5-84 Don't know (Q38). Please state why

Based in the Delegation in Jamaica I have not worked with the MIC
I am only involved in Marine Pollution Emergencies for which no exercises (except communication exercise) have been organized so far.

Questions concerning the lessons learned programme

Table 5-85 Q39. Does a systematic and homogenous evaluation and lessons learned take place that enriches all parts of the EC's civil protection actions (i.e. across the different parts of the Mechanism: MIC, training, missions, exercises and prep actions/pilot projects)

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	23	24.7%
Yes, but limited	31	33.3%
No	2	2.2%
Don't know	37	39.8%
Total	93	100.0%

Table 5-86 Comments/examples to Q39

Currently have different evaluations of quality and hardly be called independent. I therefore prepared a grant proposal to create a unique training for evaluators. Trained evaluators can then end up in a European pool and then be deployed under supervision at EU exercises.
As far as we know during 2007-2009 there has not been any trainings nor lessons learned programmes that would have concerned marine pollution incidents.
Only during last two years system of observing/evaluation/assessment (in Exes) is started to improve.
Not enough dissemination. It could be interesting to have a common exchange platform for sharing the benefit of lessons learnt
Systematic and homogenous evaluation and lessons learned made by the EC should be better communicated to MS.

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions, incl. modules

Table 5-87 Q40. Are you involved in, or familiar with, the EU grant schemes that are offered for pilot/preparatory actions, preparedness and prevention and for development and testing of modules (modular systems)?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	34	26.2%
To some extent	16	12.3%
No	80	61.5%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-88 Q41. What are the relevant contributions and/or shortcomings of the Preparatory Action/pilot projects programme for the development of civil protection

Increase capabilities
It helps member states to prepare their modules.
It seems to be complicated to have a actual overview. Share al these information on a proper way.
Real readiness. MIC should promote the usage of this tool in deployments
Innovative solutions is to be encouraged. However these projects are not endorsed by the council which is a problem from a political point of view.
It provides valuable inputs but would have greater impact if planned and organized jointly with the UN and jointly with the UN, also with other relevant institutions (IFRC, NGOs, etc.)
Importance de ces projets qui permettent le renforcement des capacités de l'UEnotamment dans les cours de formation , échanges d'experts et surtout le déploiement des modules avec mise en oeuvre de l'assistance mutuelle européenne
Good idea behind the programme, but not enough control and consequences if they don't perform well!
Preparatory actions are needed to investigate new/innovative solutions in EU Civil Protection. Shortcomings are in the (still) wide gap between research and concrete deployments.
They allow a good testing of new ideas and new projects before any legislative proposal is presented. This was, the EC is able to assess the true added value of this projects.
More adequate response to disasters.
Preparatory action was very good, but the addmin and paperwork is really difficult and needs lots of effort.

<p>The projects gives the member state the ability to strengthen the preparedness and response in areas where there is a gap between the need and demand for a capacity. The projects or initiatives should not be in such a manner that MS rely fully on the EU capacity, and therefore do not take necessary actions to prevent or prepare for incidents that could be forecasted or expected in the given MS.</p>
<p>To develop civil protection capacities</p>
<p>A great opportunity to develop new modules and approaches, but it is still with no overall strategy</p>
<p>Modules</p>
<p>The most relevant contribution is the possibility to test initiatives, regarding e.g. relevant experience for specific needs, complementing the existing and currently reviewed modules.</p>
<p>We don't yet have any experience. In fact CMCFinland (Civilian Crisis Management Centre) under the Ministry is taking part to the Preparatory Action by one or two pilot projects.</p>
<p>Regarding the possible development of Community financed modules, a feasible way would be to include a prerequisite that the modules are of value for a number of Participating States and not perhaps one Participating States. Should a similar initiative as the Preparatory action be created again, it is important that the Commission makes a thorough assessment of whether proposed modules would contribute to EU overall crisis response.</p>
<p>Exchange of experts through EMPOLLEX, managed by EMSA (European Maritime safety Agency)</p>
<p>Nothing explicitly/specifically for Marine Pollution Emergencies</p>
<p>Innovative approach. Contribution to the strengthening of EU capabilities.</p>
<p>THE PROGRAMME IS A GOOD TOOL TO COVER GAPS WHERE SOME SMALL PARTS PREVENT THE MODOULE FROM BEING REGISTERED + SMOOTH, QUICE DEPLOYMENT</p>

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-89 Q42. Do you see reasons to support that the innovative arrangements tested through the Preparatory Action be maintained after its expiry in 2010?

Yes (frequency = 9)
No
YES, IT'S A WAY TO PREPARED THE VULNERABLE POPULATION WITH A FOCUS OF PRIORITYS IN EVERY COUNTRY
Experince gained should of course be evaluated but also discussed on a political level (Council).
Il est important de maintenir ce programme après 2010 . Il permet de disposer de modules en "Stand By Modules "pour faire face à tous les risques dans le cadre de l'UE et surtout de disposer de capacités opérationnelles additionnelles à disposition du Mécanisme . Par ailleurs, les cours de formation associés à une politique d'exercice permettent de renforcer la cohésion et l'opérationnalité des modules des Etats membres.
Yes, but better organised and evaluated during the duration!
Yes, after an evaluation of the different projects are done.
Preparatory action framework is an effetive tool to test existing modules and bring out new ideas/improvements for new modules
Do not know
Yes - The modules is the way for a fast and an efficient operational response.
Yes, definitely: as the area of civil protection demands high flexibility, we therefore identify and underline the importance of the financial and technical support by the European Commission.
Why not
Yes if specific part for marine pollution emergencies
Yes. Deployment of those capabilities was tested in several emergencies. In all cases they contributed to the EU response.
YES IT SHOULD BE MAINTAINED

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-90 Q43. Do you see any overlaps of the preparatory action/pilot project programme with similar EU/UN activities?

No (frequency = 9)
Not at this moment, there might be some.
ITS MORE COMPLEMENTARY THAN OVERLAPING
Not that I am aware of.
Yes, overlaps with the UN
No, but cooperation with UN projects should be preferred
I am not familiar with all the projects
No, but I am not very familiar with UN activities. During a recent visit to our institution of the UN secretary for risk reduction representative, Dr. Wahlstrom has been very positively impressed by our activities, among which the pilot project STEP and the current preparatory action DRHOUSE.
Do not know
Yes

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-91 Q44. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting development and testing of modular systems, do you agree that they: Contribute to more effective disaster response

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	25	50.0%
Tend to agree	20	40.0%
Tend to disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	4	8.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-92 Q44. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting development and testing of modular systems, do you agree that they: Provide adequate and timely financial support

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	11	22.0%
Tend to agree	23	46.0%
Tend to disagree	3	6.0%
Disagree	3	6.0%
Don't know	10	20.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-93 Q44. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting development and testing of modular systems, do you agree that they: Complement existing capacities rather than duplicate

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	18	36.0%
Tend to agree	26	52.0%
Tend to disagree	2	4.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	4	8.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Table 5-94 Comments/examples to Q44 (Table 5-91 to Table 5-93)

I would say that the modules is a way of informing participating states on available resources that could be deployed by affected countries.
There should be a "evaluation process" of modules, before they are inn CECIS operational - I assume that only 1/3 of the existing modules/TAST's are really operational!

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-95 Q45. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting pilot and preparatory actions, do you agree that they: Contribute to more effective disaster response

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	24	48.0%
Tend to agree	17	34.0%
Tend to disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	1	2.0%
Don't know	7	14.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-96 Q45. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting pilot and preparatory actions, do you agree that they: Provide adequate and timely financial support

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	12	24.0%
Tend to agree	25	50.0%
Tend to disagree	1	2.0%
Disagree	2	4.0%
Don't know	10	20.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-97 Q45. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting pilot and preparatory actions, do you agree that they: Complement existing capacities rather than duplicate

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	13	26.0%
Tend to agree	27	54.0%
Tend to disagree	2	4.0%
Disagree	3	6.0%
Don't know	5	10.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-98 Q45. Based on your experience with schemes for supporting pilot and preparatory actions, do you agree that they: Contribute to the development of additional capacity which otherwise might not have been developed

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	23	46.0%
Tend to agree	15	30.0%
Tend to disagree	2	4.0%
Disagree	5	10.0%
Don't know	5	10.0%
Total	50	100.0%

Table 5-99 Comments/examples to Q45 (Table 5-95 to Table 5-98)

Nice products should be strengthened and also the evaluation should be the same between 2 years period (e.g. EUREGI - one year - the right call, next year (as EGEOINFO) it should have been in another call - that is confusing and makes no sense!
For example the development of Cold conditions module, which is a brand new development of response in the area.

Questions concerning preparatory and pilot actions

Table 5-100 Q46. Do you have further comments to your experience with the Preparatory and pilot actions, incl. modules?

An evaluation and discussion on political level (in the Council) is necessary.
Excellent programme qui doit être poursuivi .
Excellent idea behind that, but more control and evaluation during the duration -it's our money!
There is great potential in the existing module system. There is however a need for improving and consolidating the existing modules before the work with developing new modules continues. The Preparatory action concept has helped push the development of SOP:s, which improves the quality and the interoperability of modules.
More attention should be paid to the quality and interoperability of the civil protection capabilities. Capabilities should be need-driven and based on risk analysis.

Questions concerning transport provisions

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-101 Q47. Are you familiar with the transport provisions of the Civil Protection Financial Instrument?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	33	25.4%
To some extent	33	25.4%
No	64	49.2%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-102 Q48. Have you made use of the transport provisions?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	24.2%
No	50	75.8%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-103 Q49. On how many occasions during the period 2007-2009?

	Frequency	Percent
1	3	25.0%
2	1	8.3%
3	4	33.3%
10	4	33.3%
Total	12	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-104 Q50. Did you succeed in the search for pooling/identification of transport resources?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	100.0%
No	0	0.0%
Total	16	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-105 Q51. Did you request a grant, and did you succeed?

	Frequency	Percent
Requested and received a grant	15	93.8%
Requested but did not receive a grant	1	6.3%
Did not request a grant	0	0.0%
Total	16	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-106 Q52. Did you request a transport service, and did you succeed?

	Frequency	Percent
Requested and received the service	10	62.5%
Requested but did not receive the service	0	0.0%
Did not request the service	6	37.5%
Total	16	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-107 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
The time set by the MIC for the pooling of transport (6-24hrs) is appropriate*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	22	33.3%
Tend to agree	20	30.3%
Tend to disagree	4	6.1%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Don't know	20	30.3%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-108 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
The process leading up to the transport grant being awarded is smooth and uncomplicated*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	10	15.2%
Tend to agree	13	19.7%
Tend to disagree	12	18.2%
Disagree	5	7.6%
Don't know	26	39.4%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-109 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
It is transparent and easy to understand which of the costs are eligible for support*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	12	18.2%
Tend to agree	19	28.8%
Tend to disagree	10	15.2%
Disagree	2	3.0%
Don't know	23	34.8%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-110 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
The transport grant is a decisive element in regards to whether you are able to offer assistance*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	15	22.7%
Tend to agree	17	25.8%
Tend to disagree	9	13.6%
Disagree	3	4.5%
Don't know	22	33.3%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-111 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
The identified transport solution was adequate and effective*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	15	22.7%
Tend to agree	12	18.2%
Tend to disagree	6	9.1%
Disagree	1	1.5%
Don't know	32	48.5%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

*Table 5-112 Q53. Please assess to which extent you agree, based on your experience with the transport provisions, on the following statement:
The reimbursement process is simple*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	3	4.5%
Tend to agree	13	19.7%
Tend to disagree	9	13.6%
Disagree	5	7.6%
Don't know	36	54.5%
Total	66	100.0%

Table 5-113 Comments/examples to Q53 (Table 5-107 to Table 5-112)

Transport - especially air - is strategic factor in providing assistance.
We have not used the MIC transport services 2007-2009
I have not been involved with the practical procedures of requesting transport provisions.
More pooling of air transport by MIC!(Lower costs), Also using EU Military aircrafts!
Experienced only in transportation exes, through The CECIS.
The mission was cancelled.
Bilateral assistance is usually quicker than pooling phase.
Procedures could be more simplified.
The EU Delegation in Chile only provided assistance to MS embassies and their capital cities were directly implicated in this process. As far as we know, no MS manifested discontent even if it was not easy to assure coordination of the delivery, or better said to have access to this information.

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-114 Q54. Does the existence of the transport provisions (i.e. transport provided by the Mechanism) have a decisive impact on your decision to offer assistance?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	26	39.4%
No	22	33.3%
Don't know	18	27.3%
Total	66	100.0%

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-115 Q55. Would you consider that the transport provision mainly addresses: (several answers possible)

	Frequency	Percent
A lack of access to transport resources or assets	38	57.6%
A financing deficit	44	66.7%
Other	6	9.1%
Total	66	

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-116 Q56. In your opinion, what have been the main merits of the transport provisions?

Decreasing of financial means needed to provide help.
Supports the deployment of resources.
Easier for some states to offer assistance
We are supplier - not for us to answer
Easier transport to the affected area
Financial aspects
Supporting MS financially.
Definetely the co-financing part by the commission but also easier allocation of joint transport means - more countries using the same transport means.
Reinforces solidarity

Sometimes it is the only way to send assistance. e.g. Chile earthquake
Additional options.
It make it easier to provide assistance
Pooling, and thus increasing efficiency (both economic and as regards coordination)+ Assistance arrives on the spot, which might not have been sent there otherwise, be it for financial reasons or lack of transport means.
As time is of importance in in the first hours of decisions after a disaster strikes, and transport being the second crucial element influencing the question whether to send a team or not, the transport provisions are a main merit.
The possibility of co-financing of transports and the transport broker service very valuable since it allows a more rapid deployment of national resources. The transport provision is also a way of making sure that the resources that are being sent correspond to what has been requested since the Commission that way can decide on what assistance should be prioritized. This aspect of the transport provision can be further strengthened in the future by greater restrictions on what kind of assistance that should merit financial aid for transport. Along the same lines, the 50 % limit is important in order to give an incitement to countries to send assistance that is so adequate that they are, themselves willing to partly finance it.
Enabling the states with resources (teams or inkind) but without transport possibilities to provide assistance to affected states
Facilitate provision of assistance.
To assure an integrated and common response of the EU as a whole and facilitate the European aid by this co-financing.
Eligibility / time / costs

Questions concerning transport provisions

Table 5-117 Q57. In your opinion, are there areas where changes in rules, procedures or practices could provide for increased effectiveness of the transport provision?

Yes
Easier provision of transport
50 % limit on cofinancing, simpler procedure
The administration of the grants ought to be simpler.
We are supplier - not for us to answer
Pooling by MIC
Not enough information to answer.
Simpler procedures would contribute to more effective transport provisions.
Administrative procedures
In some situations should the total cost of transport be covered
Identified modules should be able to benefit from easier procedures or get priority - maybe even increased co-financing?
Opportunity to request only 50% EC funding rather than full 100% and then reimbursement of 50% would be more pragmatic and reduce paperwork and administration. Lead state concept would be helpful for shared transport options so that only one Member State need apply for assistance, not all.
Yes, the areas include the procedure in applying for transport provision. A suggestion could be to offer a registration instrument for interested organisations to smoothen the process of request in situ. But, of course, offer the possibility to register and apply for transport provision in the hot phase samelike.
Absolutely
More percent could be covered by the Commission.
We don't know really know but when a disaster occur outside the EU it would be good to inform the EU Delegation in charge of the local coordination on the real costs of transports as the MS does not provide this information and take into account the overall financial aid they receive from the MIC and not the 50%.

Questions concern-
ing transport provi-
sions

*Table 5-118 Q58. Do you have further comments to your experience with the trans-
port provisions?*

The only time that MT was going to use this provision, we were only offered less than a ton of space and for us it was more worth sending the items directly to the struck country, than sending them to a pooling area.
Must not be a "sleeping pillow" so that states don't establish such a resource themselves
Use of military(not NATO), but keep in mind - in many of my missions it would have been cheaper and more effective to pay goods on site (or near by!!)
When transport provisions were negotiated in the Council working party the aim of the articles were interpreted and understood differently to current practices.

Questions concern-
ing the Mechanism**Questions concerning general assessment of the Mechanism**

Table 5-119 Q59. Based upon your experience with the Mechanism, please rate the following general statement:

The Mechanism has led to more effective response to disasters

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	61	46.9%
Tend to agree	35	26.9%
Tend to disagree	1	0.8%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	32	24.6%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the Mechanism

Table 5-120 Q59. Based upon your experience with the Mechanism, please rate the following general statement:

The Mechanism is coherent with other European, regional and national measures

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	41	31.5%
Tend to agree	42	32.3%
Tend to disagree	5	3.8%
Disagree	3	2.3%
Don't know	39	30.0%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the Mechanism

*Table 5-121 Q59. Based upon your experience with the Mechanism, please rate the following general statement:
The Mechanism contributes to better co-ordination of disaster response (inside and outside EU)*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	49	37.7%
Tend to agree	45	34.6%
Tend to disagree	5	3.8%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	30	23.1%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the Mechanism

*Table 5-122 Q59. Based upon your experience with the Mechanism, please rate the following general statement:
The Mechanism is largely complementary to Member State policies*

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	25	19.2%
Tend to agree	57	43.8%
Tend to disagree	6	4.6%
Disagree	6	4.6%
Don't know	36	27.7%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the Mechanism

Table 5-123 Q60. How could the Mechanism have contributed to a better response in regards to relevance, efficiency, coherence, coordination and complementarity? (several answers possible)

	Frequency	Percent
Assessment function of the team	49	37.7%
Ensuring good use of the assistance deployed on site	54	41.5%
Support to the participating state wishing to receive or send assistance	62	47.7%
Satellite maps	32	24.6%
MIC liaison officer	45	34.6%
Don't know	38	29.2%
Other	11	8.5%
Total	130	

Questions concerning the functioning and impact of the Civil Protection Committee

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-124 Q61. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statement: The CP committee is a relevant and valuable tool for sharing experiences and lessons learned.

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	36	27.7%
Tend to agree	35	26.9%
Tend to disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	3	2.3%
Don't know	56	43.1%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-125 Q62. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy MAKING: Overall, the CP committee contributes to more effective policy making

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	19	14.6%
Tend to agree	43	33.1%
Tend to disagree	5	3.8%
Disagree	2	1.5%
Don't know	61	46.9%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-126 Q62. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy MAKING: The Committee ensures complementarity between the EU level and the Member States

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	22	16.9%
Tend to agree	40	30.8%
Tend to disagree	6	4.6%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	61	46.9%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-127 Q62. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy MAKING: The Committee provides for good coordination vis-a-vis the policies of external stakeholders

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	21	16.2%
Tend to agree	33	25.4%
Tend to disagree	8	6.2%
Disagree	3	2.3%
Don't know	65	50.0%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-128 Q62. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy MAKING: The Committee ensures that policies deliver their intended outcomes (i.e. relevance)

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	17	13.1%
Tend to agree	38	29.2%
Tend to disagree	6	4.6%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	68	52.3%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-129 Q62. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy MAKING: The Committee contributes to coherent policy making?

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	19	14.6%
Tend to agree	39	30.0%
Tend to disagree	7	5.4%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	64	49.2%
Total	130	100.0%

Table 5-130 Comments/examples to Q62 (Table 5-125 to Table 5-129)

We are not involved in the civil protection and thus are not familiar with the work of the civil protection committee.
Have some reservations about a 'one size fits all' approach that appears from time to time.
The difficulty of point Q.62 is that to whose policy it tends to refer. We suppose it refers to the policy of the Community, which don't follow and reflect exactly national policies of each MS.
Not participating in CP committee
Not a member of Civil Protection Committee

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-131 Q63. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy IMPLEMENTATION: Overall, the CP committee contributes to more effective policy implementation

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	25	19.2%
Tend to agree	36	27.7%
Tend to disagree	4	3.1%
Disagree	3	2.3%
Don't know	62	47.7%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-132 Q63. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy IMPLEMENTATION: The Committee ensures complementarity between the EU level and the Member States

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	22	16.9%
Tend to agree	40	30.8%
Tend to disagree	5	3.8%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	62	47.7%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-133 Q63. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy IMPLEMENTATION: The Committee provides for good coordination vis-a-vis the policies of external stakeholders

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	19	14.6%
Tend to agree	36	27.7%
Tend to disagree	7	5.4%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	67	51.5%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concerning the Civil Protection Committee

Table 5-134 Q63. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy IMPLEMENTATION: The Committee ensures that policies deliver their intended outcomes (i.e. relevance)

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	18	13.8%
Tend to agree	36	27.7%
Tend to disagree	8	6.2%
Disagree	1	0.8%
Don't know	67	51.5%
Total	130	100.0%

Questions concern-
ing the Civil Protec-
tion Committee

Table 5-135 Q63. Based upon your experience, please rate the following statements about the CP Committee's contribution to policy IMPLEMENTATION: The Committee contributes to coherent policy implementation?

	Frequency	Percent
Agree	19	14.6%
Tend to agree	40	30.8%
Tend to disagree	6	4.6%
Disagree	2	1.5%
Don't know	63	48.5%
Total	130	100.0%

Table 5-136 Comments/examples to Q63 (Table 5-131 to Table 5-135)

I am not familiar with the CP committee
Not a member of Civil Protection Committee

Final question

Final question

Table 5-137 Q64. Are there any additional comments you would like to make and which could help assess the relevance, effectiveness, coherence, co-ordination and complementarity of the EU CP actions.

<p>Work more together with good educated and trained people out of the field and please let policy people do their own work.</p>
<p>EU institutions have several overlapping sitcens and programmes in the field. How can we operate as unite and promote esprit de corps, if there are several competing EU institutions in the beneficiary countries (EU CPT, ECHO, CSDP, Cion Projects, EUSR etc...)</p>
<p>Even this questionnaire indicates that DG ECHO/MIC is civil protection oriented and marine pollution response issues are of a lesser interest to DG ECHO/MIC.</p>
<p>Comments made before on importance of greater collaboration with the UN</p>
<p>In the evaluation period, the Mechanism has come of age. Its important that it will be allowed to further evolve after its merger with DG Echo.</p>
<p>Being through the questions I believe we - Kuehne + Nagel - were not the right company to ask for input. We are purely supplier of transport solutions to MIC in respect of live emergency requests and exercises. Will therefore suggest you disregard this input. Our answers are based on our experience as SUPPLIER to MIC. The questionnaire is as we see it to USERS</p>
<p>Within the field of pollution response there has not been very much interaction and experience from my organisation, however the policy is a good one and reflects the need to have a focus point for both response and requests.</p>
<p>More integration of EUCPT in UNDAC; less courses; PrepActions should continue; Use of also military assets according to humanitarian principles...</p>
<p>As LSO in my Delegation (Guatemala), I'd love to be given the chance to register as CP member and participate in ad hoc trainings.</p>
<p>As you see from the many "don't know" answers, we as a humanitarian NGO are not very familiar with the mechanism. We only have small lines of connection, though we are part of a bigger national organisation with a civil protection branch. These branch is, as far we can see, not using the instruments provided by the EC mechanism either and is rather oriented towards the national (German) structures and mechanisms.</p>
<p>Not enough is known of how it works outside the EU; if this were known, it could prove useful</p>
<p>Please take into consideration that my response is based on the MAritime side of the EU - CP actions and date from the period that the MCMP (former ACPH) was under the CP. As from the moment EMSA was founded this part shifted to EMSA</p>
<p>Sorry, my only comment is that this survey was of little relevance to our own "MIC-experience". The perspective of an EU Delegation involved in receiving a small number of MIC interventions in a distant foreign country was not easy to capture in a survey which seemed to be addressed more to specialists in Europe.</p>
<p>Enhance coordination and cooperation between MIC, (old) ECHO, and Military Staff</p>
<p>Unfortunately some of the questions were partly unclear so that we could have answered there differently and used other options to cross.</p>

MRCC Klaipeda was moved from Ministry of Transportation to Ministry of Defense from 2009-01-01. Since that time we have no touch point with civil protection except rescue at sea.

Great progress has been made in developing cooperation and avoiding duplication between the UN and the EU. This allows a more rational use of available resources. The EU should continue its work on providing a coordinated response to support the UN's efforts on the ground. The ambition to avoid duplication should however also be stressed in relation to cooperation within the EU-system. Making different EU instruments function well together both in the field and in Brussels is an important challenge. It must be clear how responsibilities are divided in any given situation. An important aspect in this context is to make sure that all the work that is being done within the Mechanism is well known in other parts of the EU, such as the bodies within the emerging External Action Service and other DGs. It is important to promote and to ensure the MIC's coordinating role in disaster response.

We believe that exercise program should be further developed by the Member States and encouraged by the Commission, in order to improve to the maximum extent, the existing procedures related to the assistance needed by the affected countries in case of major disasters with cross-border effects and to accelerate response in major emergencies, both inside and outside Europe. The main outcome of these activities is and should remain the improvement of the interoperability of the civil protection response teams and their special intervention equipment. Also Lessons learned from exercises and real emergencies should be implemented through exercises scenarios.

As mentioned, it should not be assumed that actors / stakeholders outside of the EU are aware of the EU civil protection mechanism and there is certainly a need to better inform such stakeholders and the public at large.

MIC plays an important role for ensuring good communications between MS involved in the response to disasters.

In the field of marine pollution emergencies (such as large oil spill accidents) the role of the MIC/CP mechanism needs to be clarified. There are apparently some gaps left between the tasks respectively covered by the MIC/CP Mechanism and EMSA compared to the situation before 2007. Despite similar or better level of resources and more EU actors, the EU action for dealing with marine pollution emergencies seems to be less efficient than in the past from a MS point of view.

I have to apologize that for not being that familiar with this subject, because I have recently started to work in this field. I belong to military structures and have not gained yet the needed insight in the civilian EU-Mechanisms as I would like to have (should have)...

Prevention activities should be promoted and strengthened. More attention to the resilience of the society should be given. EU risk analysis should be made. Cooperation of National Civil Protection Schools should be strengthened.

Our organization is still "young" in the system so there is a lack of information and experience to make comments on the EU CP.

None. We just recall that the EU Delegation in Chile has only the experience of the 27 February 2010 and considered that the coordination ECHO-MIC has been smooth and complementary on site and have been very helpful to ensure the coordination role of the EU Delegation. The local circumstances were quite specific as here in Chile the military provided the logistic support on site as the civilian National Emergency Office collapse and was partly unable to fulfil his functions, i.e. to provide effective information and ensure coordination at the airport for aid delivery.

Interview guide and list of interviewees

Interview guideline:

Background

COWI, together with Aguaconsult, is conducting an evaluation of the European Commission's actions in the field of civil protection.

The evaluation considers the period 2007-2009 (both years included).

The evaluation is mainly to consider the following aspects: relevance and effectiveness as well as coherence, complementary and coordination:

- **Relevance:** the extent to which an intervention's objectives are pertinent to needs, problems and issues to be addressed
- **Effectiveness:** the extent to which objectives set are achieved
- **Coherence:** the extent to which the CP actions are non-contradictory/do not contradict other interventions with similar objectives
- **Coordination:** the extent to which two or more partners succeed in the intended mobilisation of resources and/or harmonisation of policies and practices so that the effectiveness of the resources is maximised.
- **Complementarity:** the extent to which Community CP policy is complementary to the CP policies pursued by Member States.

In carrying out the evaluation we are informed by the wealth of information and evaluations that is available from DG ECHO; by the conduct of an e-survey expected to be launched in August and by a more limited number of personal interviews.

The evaluation considers the four elements of the civil protection actions:

- The MIC
- Training including training programme, CPEP exercises and the exchange of experts programme
- The 'modular approach including modules tested under the Pilot Projects and Preparatory Action
- Transport provisions

It should be underlined that the evaluation is in its very early phase, and hence, this interview/conversation/talk is highly informal and serves two purposes: one is to inform our preparation of the data collection phase (are we asking the right

questions, do we ask too many/too few questions, are there important themes/issues that we have missed out) and second, to inform - albeit informally (and without any subsequent quotations whatsoever) - our preliminary assessment and desk study.

Organisation Details

Organisation name:	
Name of contact person:	
Position:	
Address:	
Telephone Number:	
Fax Number:	
Email address:	
Which (one or more) area(s) are you most familiar with	<p>MIC (activations in respect of emergencies within the EU)</p> <p>MIC (activations in respect of emergencies outside the EU)/operational coordination on-site in third countries</p> <p>Training/exercises/exchange of experts</p> <p>Preparatory action/pilot projects</p> <p>Transport</p>

MIC

1 What is your relation with/use of MIC:

1.1 Requesting assistance

1.2 Delivering assistance

1.3 Other - please specify?

- 2 Would you consider the mechanism or model of response by the MIC relevant and appropriate to each event?
 - 2.1 Which features do you consider particularly relevant and appropriate and why?
 - 2.2 Are there features that you consider less relevant and appropriate and, if so, why?
- 3 Would you consider that existence of the MIC and the way it has acted in the period 2007 to 2009 has:
 - 3.1 Provided for more expedient response to disasters - if so, please provide examples and elaborate on the main reasons?
 - 3.2 Provided for more efficient response to disasters - if so, please provide examples and elaborate on what has characterised the more efficient response. If possible, please provide examples related to specific experience as well as reflections, if any, on the possible contributions of the modalities and functioning of the MIC in general.
- 4 In your experience and from your point of view, what would you consider to be the most important contributions from the MIC in the period 2007-2009?
 - 4.1 As regards actions within the EU and other Member States?
 - 4.2 As regards actions in third countries:
- 5 What have been the main challenges/constraints for effective functioning of the MIC during this period?
- 6 Do you think there is sufficient complementarity between MIC activities and the work of others?

Training

- 7 Would you consider that participants in the EU courses have the right skill sets and experience level to make effective use of training? - please also explain the underlying reasons for your answer?
- 8 Would you consider that the training programmes contains the right skill areas to match the current range of deployments?
 - 8.1 Within the EU?
 - 8.2 Outside of the EU?
 - 8.3 If relevant: where would you consider the main gaps to be?

- 9 Would you consider that the training programmes contains the right knowledge areas to match the current range of deployments? If possible, please provide examples.
 - 9.1 Within the EU?
 - 9.2 Outside of the EU?
 - 9.3 If relevant: where would you consider the main gaps to be?
- 10 Have training programme objectives been met?
 - 10.1 And has the training programme led to make available to the MIC an appropriately trained pool of professionals ready to deploy in support of civil protection activities either in the EU or abroad?
 - 10.2 If there is, in your opinion, a gap please characterise this gap and explain why you consider it important?
- 11 Are trainings/trainers sufficiently consistent across different providers? - Please elaborate on your answer?
- 12 Is the training programme complementary to other similar trainings in the field?
- 13 What would you consider to be the main contributions that the EU training and exercises have provided to civil protection both in the EU and in non Member States? (e.g. ease of communication, common typologies, better preparedness, etc.)
- 14 Are there areas where you would consider that the EC has contributed something that could not similarly have been provided nationally/regionally or via other means?
- 15 If you are familiar with the exercise programme (CPEP), how effective has it been in preparing MS and EU MIC for coordinated civil protection activities?
 - 15.1 What have been the main contributing factors for success?
 - 15.2 What have been the challenges/constraints?
- 16 If you are familiar with the exchange of experts programme, how effective has it been in strengthening preparedness in MS for civil protection activities?
 - 16.1 What have been the main contributing factors for success?
 - 16.2 What have been the challenges/constraints?

Preparatory Action/Pilot Projects

- 17 Do you consider that the pilot projects are relevant? Please elaborate on the underlying motivations for your answer?
- 18 Do you consider that preparatory actions and pilot projects have resulted in more or speedier availability of assets for response? Please elaborate on your answer?
- 19 Can you provide concrete examples where you think that preparatory actions and pilot actions are likely to lead to/will impact upon consequent legislative actions - please explain?
- 20 The introduction and use of modules
 - 20.1 What has been the nature of your engagement with the modules?
 - 20.2 What would you consider to be the main benefits, if any, of the modules?
 - 20.3 What are the main costs, if any, of using the modules - to the Participating State? to the EU?
 - 20.4 What have been the main challenges/constraints for use of the modules during this period?

Transport provision

- 21 Do you find the EU co-financing rate of 50% to be sufficient and do you find that the way it is administered is effective? Please elaborate on your replies?
- 22 What specific experiences have you had/examples do you know of where the transport provisions have "made the difference"? Please elaborate on your replies?
- 23 Have you personally had experience with making use of the transport provisions? In that case,
 - 23.1 Do you consider that requests for transport assistance were dealt with by the Commission in a timely manner?
 - 23.2 Do you consider that communication was effective?
 - 23.3 Do you find that the transport solutions identified were cost effective?
 - 23.4 Did the transport solution contribute to closing a transport deficit?

23.5 Had this opportunity not existed, what would alternatively have been done?

24 Overall, in your opinion, have the transport provisions contributed to closing an important gap, and if so, in what way?

Other issues

Are there issues or themes that we have not discussed but which you would think that we should take into consideration (noting that this does not entail a commitment on our side to do so)?

Are there specific organisations, institutes, institutions or agencies that you think should be consulted?

Interviewer's note

Duration of the interview, conditions under which it was held and other information that may have affected the quality and thoroughness of the interview.

List of respondents:

- **30 interviews completed**
- **27 notes approved**

Organisation/Country	Person	Status	Notes approved
Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency, Sweden	Patrick Jansson	COMPLETED	OK
General Secretariat of Civil Protection for Greece	Kalli Saini	COMPLETED, via email	OK
CAB Civil Contingencies UK	Simon Strickland (Training policy group)	COMPLETED	OK
Ministry of the Interior France	Philippe Nardin (Civil protection)	COMPLETED	OK
CEDRE France (non-profit org.)	Fanch Cabioc'h	COMPLETED	OK
Danish CP authorities (ministry of defense, international CP unit; and Danish Emergency Management Agency) Denmark	Simon Søborg Agger m.fl	COMPLETED	OK
State Fire Service, Poland	Mr Feltynowski	COMPLETED	OK
Italian Civil Protection Department, Italy	Giovanni De Siervo (Civil protection)	COMPLETED	OK
National Command for relief Operations Portugal	Patricia Gaspar (Civil protection)	COMPLETED	OK
Spanish Civil Protection, Spain	Juan-Pedro Lahore	COMPLETED	-
Federal Ministry of the Interior, Germany	Peter Simoncelli	COMPLETED	OK
Technisches Hilfswerk, Germany	Susanne Wacht	COMPLETED	OK
Slovakia	Mrs Zupkova	COMPLETED	OK
FEDERAL MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, Austria	Christian Krol Michael Felferning	COMPLETED COMPLETED	OK OK
International Organisations			
VOICE, NGO	Kathrin Schick	COMPLETED	-
Johanitter	Sabine Lurz	COMPLETED	OK
ISDR	Mrs Paola Albrito	COMPLETED	OK

Organisation/Country	Person	Status	Notes approved
OCHA	Antoine Gerard	COMPLETED	-
ICRC	David Horobin	COMPLETED	OK
UN OCHA/UNDAC	Jesper Lund	COMPLETED	OK
UN	Mr. Rene Nijenhuis	COMPLETED	OK
UN - Head of Regional Office for Europe ISDR	Ms Paola Albrito	COMPLETED	OK
IFRC – FACT coordinator	David Lynch	COMPLETED	OK
Experts (that have been deployed)			
Italy	Paolo VACCARI	COMPLETED	OK
Estonia	Enn EBERG	COMPLETED	OK
DK	Peter Riisberg Kragh	COMPLETED	OK
Austria	Bernd NOGGLER	COMPLETED	OK
Finland	Kimmo Tuominen	COMPLETED	OK
Netherlands	Van Ginkel	COMPLETED	OK

* An additional number of potential respondents were approached but they never replied to our request. Countries include: Romania, Belgium, Luxemburg, Slovenia; in addition two experts.

EU CP training programme

The Training programme contains the following types of courses:

- Community Mechanism Induction Course (CMI)
- Operational Management Course (OPM)
- High Level Coordination Course (HLC)
- Assessment Mission Course (AMC)
- Staff Management Course (SMC)
- Media and Security Strategy Course (MSC)
- International Coordination Course (ICC)
- Operational Management Refresher Course (OPMR)
- High Level Coordination Refresher Course (HLCR)
- Modules Basic Course (MBC)
- Technical Experts Course (TEC)

The following table display the number of courses of each type.

Table 5-138 Number of each type of course

Cycle		CMI	OPM	HLC	OPMR	HLCR	AMC	SMC	MSC	ICC	TEC	MBC	IMC
1	2003-2004	3	4	3									
2	2004-2005	9	3	2									
3	2005-2006	3	3	2									
4	2006-2007	5	3	2		3	3	2					
5	2007-2008	5	3	2		4	3	3					
6	2008-2009	5	3	2	3	4	3	3	2				
7	2009-2010	11	6	4	2	3	3	3	3	2	4	6	
8	2010-2011	12	6	4	2	2	3	3	3	2	4	4	2
TOTAL		53	31	21	7	16	15	14	8	4	8	10	2

The following table display an overview of the results of the courses assessments made during the 6th and 7th cycles.

Table 5-139 Overview of participants evaluations of courses

Course ³⁸	6 th cycle	7 th cycle
MBC	Na (evaluation is available but no ranking)	Average 4,73 ³⁹
AMC	Na (evaluation is available but no ranking)	Average 4,55 ⁴⁰
SMC	Grand averages between 4,17 – 4,29	Average 4,65 ⁴¹
MSC	Grand averages between 4,34 – 4,38	Average 4,56 ⁴²
HLCR	NA (evaluation is available, qualitative)	Average 4,7
OPMR	NA (evaluation is available, qualitative)	Average 4,42 ⁴³
HLC	NA (evaluation is available, qualitative)	Average 4,37
OPM	NA (evaluation is available, qualitative)	Average 4,38 ⁴⁴
CMI	NA (evaluation is available, qualitative)	Weekly evaluation average range 4,54 – 4,67
TEC	-	Average 4,67 ⁴⁵
ICC	-	Average 4,30

The following table display the types of exercises.

³⁸ Where nothing else is stated data are from the respective evaluation reports.

³⁹ Calculated based on participants level of satisfaction on 15 criteria, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of MBC)

⁴⁰ Calculated based on participants level of satisfaction on 15 criteria, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of AMC)

⁴¹ Calculated based on participants average level of satisfaction on 3 courses, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of SMC)

⁴² Calculated based on participants average level of satisfaction on 3 courses, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of MSC)

⁴³ Calculated based on participants level of satisfaction on 15 criteria, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of OPMR)

⁴⁴ Calculated based on participants level of satisfaction on 15 criteria, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of OPM)

⁴⁵ Calculated based on participants level of satisfaction on 15 criteria, weekly evaluations (Evaluation report of TEC)

Table 5-140 Exercise programme

Exercise Type (Acronym)	Call
Orientation exercises (ORE)	Preparatory action
Tabletop exercises (TTE)	Exercises on modules Preparatory action
Functional exercises (FUE)	Exercises on modules Preparedness Preparatory action
Command Post exercises (CPE)	CECIS Exercises on modules Exercises
Full scale exercises (FSE)	Exercises

List of abbreviations

AMC	Assessment Mission Course
CEDRE	Centre of Documentation, Research and Experimentation on Accidental Water Pollution
CECIS	The <i>Common Emergency Communication and Information System</i>
CPFI	Civil Protection Financial Instrument
CMI	Community Mechanism Induction Course
CP	Civil Protection
CPE	Command Post exercises
CPEP	Civil Protection Exercises Programme
CPFI	Civil Protection Financial Instrument
DG ECHO	Directorate-General Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
DG	Directorate-General
DMTA	Disaster Management Training Arrangement
EADRCC	Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre
EC	European Community
ECHO	Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
EEA	European Economic Area
EFAS	Early Flood Warning System
EFFIS	Early Forest Fire Information System
EMERCOM	Federal State Establishment “Agency for Support and Coordination of Russian Participation in International Humanitarian Operations” (<i>EMERCOM</i> Agency)
EMSA	European Maritime Safety Agency
EMSC	Euro-Mediterranean Seismological Centre
EU	European Union
EWS	Early Warning Systems
FSE	Full scale exercises
FUE	Functional exercises
GDACS	<i>Global Disaster Alert and Coordination System</i>
GHS	Globalised Harmonized System
HLC	High Level Coordination Course
HLCR	High Level Coordination Refresher Course
ICC	International Coordination Course
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFRC	<i>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</i>
IMO	International Maritime Organisation
ISDR	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

JRC	Joint Research Centre
MBC	Modules Basic Course
MEUR	Million EUR
MIC	Monitoring and Information Centre
MS	Member State
MSC	Media and Security Strategy Course
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	<i>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</i>
OPM	Operational Management Course
OPMR	Operational Management Refresher Course
ORE	Orientation exercises (Exercise type)
OSOCC	On-Site Operations Coordination Centre
PS	Participating States
RELEX	Directorate General for External Relations
SANCO	Directorate General for Health and Consumer Affairs
SMC	Staff Management Course
TEC	Technical Experts Course
TTE	Tabletop exercises (
UN	United Nations
UNDAC	United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	UN International Children's Emergency Fund
VOICE	Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies
WHO	World Health Organization

Reference list of literature received from DG ECHO - including desk reviews

Topic	Document name	Title/content
Operations	CP review - case studies	Civil Protection Review - Case studies
Early warning	2010 GDACS Stakeholders Chairman Summary	GDACS Stakeholders Meeting, Geneva, Switzerland, 6/7 May 2010 - Chairman Summary
	Evaluation EWS	Evaluation: MIC early warning systems, analytical capacity and information tools
	MIC2 Progress Report 4	Support to the Community Mechanism for Civil Protection : enhancing the monitoring, early warning and analytical capacity of the Monitoring and Information Centre (MIC2)
	Minutes - 3. May 2010 - final	Commission internal meeting on Early Warning Systems
	Minutes - 21 May 2010 - final	Expert meeting on Early Warning Systems
Prevention and preparedness	Evaluation - Prevention and preparedness	Evaluation of Prevention and preparedness projects under the Financial instrument for civil protection (2007-2009)
	Email: Preparatory Action on an EU Rapid Response Capacity + list of projects	-
EUFFTR	EU FFTR 2009 Rapport Final partie 1	Rapport Final - EU Forest Fires Tactical Reserve - EU FFTR 2009
	Evaluation_EU FFTR_27 01 draft	EUFFTR Evaluation
Exercises	Concept paper EXERCISES program revision 03062010 ver 1	Concept paper - Civil Protection Exercises Programme (CPEP)
	Evaluation	Evaluation - Exercise Programme Desk
Trainings	0863_appendix1_curriculum_amc	Assessment Mission Course (20 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_cmi	Community Mechanism Induction Course (25 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_hlc	High Level Coordination Course (15 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_hlcr	High Level Coordination – Refresher Course (15 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_msc	Media and Security Strategy Course (15 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_opm	Operational Management Course (21 Participants)
	0863_appendix1_curriculum_opmr	Operational Management – Refresher Course (30 Participants)

0863_appendix1_curriculum_smc	Staff Management Course (15 Participants)
0863_appendix2_evaluation	Course Evaluation
0863_appendix3_daily_evaluation	Daily Course Evaluation
0863_appendix4_status_report	Model Status report
0863_appendix5_diploma	Diploma
20100602 Final Desk Review on Training	The European Civil Protection Training programme
Budget 6th and 7th cycle	Budget
clarification0863	Clarification - to call for tender - ENV.A.3/FRA/2008/0063
clarification0863b	Clarification no. 2 - to call for tender - ENV.A.3/FRA/2008/0063
Contract award notice	B-Brussels: framework contracts for services related to offering capacity to design, plan, conduct and evaluate Community civil protection mechanism training courses (7 lots) - 2009/S 16-021627 - Contract award notice - Services
Contract notice	B-Brussels: framework contracts for services related to offering capacity to design, plan, conduct and evaluate Community Civil Protection Mechanism training courses (7 lots) - 2008/S 150-201458 - Contract notice - Services
Email: Desk review EUCP training programme	-
Invitation to tender	Contract
Model framework_contract0863	Framework Service Contract
Prior information notice	B-Brussels: prior information notice 2008 - 2008/S 28-036830
statistics all cycles	statistics all cycles
Tender specs 6th cycle	Specifications To Invitation to Tender DG ENV A.3/SER/2007/0040
Tender specs 7th cycle and more	Specifications To Invitation to Tender DG ENV.A.3/FRA/2008/0063

	Training brochure	The European Community Civil Protection Mechanism Training Programme
		List of Training Coordinators
	Final evaluation 6th cycle june 2009	Final evaluation, 6th cycle of Civil Protection training courses - 3 – 4 June 2009 - DRAFT Minutes
	Mid-term evaluation 6th cycle dec 2008	Mid-term evaluation, 6th cycle of Civil Protection training courses - 9 – 10 December 2008 - Meeting Minutes
Exercise programme	Pres EXE concept paper	Discussion on the ways to develop the EU Civil Protection Exercises Programme (CPEP)
Minutes from CP Directors meetings	Report DG meeting 26 27 April 07	Report: 18th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey
	D 22986 report	Report: 19th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey
	20080603 report DGs Ljubljana final	Report: 20th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	Report DGs Marseille	Report: 21th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
	20090602 report	Report: 22th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

	Report DGs Gothenburg final	Report: 23th meeting of the Directors-General for Civil Protection of the European Union, of the European Economic Area and of Croatia, Turkey and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Minutes from Network of national correspondents	Draft summary record 23 and 24 june 2008	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, Monday 23 and Tuesday 24 June 2008
	FINAL Mins 1 and 2 oct 2007	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 1 – 2 October 2007
	Minutes 14 and 15 sept 2009	Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, Monday 14 and Tuesday 15 September 2009 - Report
	Minutes 21 and 22 oct 2009	Summary record - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels on 21-22 October 2009
	Minutes 24 and 25 march 2009	Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, Tuesday 24 and Wednesday 25 March 2009 - Report
	Minutes final 14-15-16 nov 2007	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 14-15 and 16 November 2007
	Minutes final version 27-28 feb 2008	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 27 and 28 February 2008
	Minutes June 2007	Minutes 2nd meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 18th June 2007 (10:00 – 18:00, CCAB 0B)
	Summary record 5 6 July 2007	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 5-6 July 2007
	Summary report 090207rev2	Ad Hoc meeting of the Permanent Network of National Correspondents (PNNC) for Civil Protection - BRUSSELS, 9 FEBRUARY 2007 - Summary Report
	Summary report 15 03 07rev3_track	1st meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, 15-16 March 2007 (10h00 - 1800, CAB 4C) - Summary Report
	Summary report 1st PNNC_9jan07	Ad Hoc meeting of the Permanent Network of National Correspondents (PNNC) - meeting of 9 January 2007 - Summary report

	Summary report 25 and 26 nov 2008	Summary report - Meeting of the Civil Protection Committee - Brussels, Tuesday 25 and Wednesday 26 November 2008
Training mat from Circa	Accessed material from CIRCA regarding the 6 th and 7 th training cycles	Including evaluations of training and training experts overview 7th and training participant numbers 6 th .

Terms of reference



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HUMANITARIAN AID – ECHO

ECHO 01 – Evaluation Sector

ANNEX I

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S ACTIONS¹ IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL PROTECTION

CONTRACT N°: ECHO/ADM/BUD/2010/012XX

NAME OF CONSULTANT(S):

FIRM:

¹ The term "Action" might refer here to a Global/Intervention Plan as well as to a specific action (operation, grant, etc.).

Table of Contents

Mandate and legal basis	3
Background/Introduction	3
Justification and timing of the evaluation	4
Evaluation purpose, objective and scope	5
Purpose and objectives	5
Management of the evaluation	5
Evaluation questions	6
Tasks to be accomplished.....	6
Methodology, outputs and schedule	9
Inception meeting	9
Outreach phase	9
Report drafting phase and presentation in Brussels	10
Final report	10
Dissemination and follow-up	10
Management and supervision of the evaluation	11
Contractor's team	11
Timetable	11
ANNEX	13

Mandate and legal basis

1. Article 14 of Council Decision 2007/779/EC, Euratom of 8 November 2007 establishing a Community Civil Protection Mechanism (recast) ('Mechanism Decision' or 'Mechanism' or 'Recast'; OJ L 314, 1.12.2007, p. 9) and Article 15 of Council Decision 2007/162/EC, Euratom of 5 March 2007 establishing a Civil Protection Financial Instrument ('CPFI' or 'Financial Instrument'; OJ L 71, 10.3.2007, p. 9) provide for the evaluation of actions in the field of civil protection (please see text in Annex of the Terms of Reference). Article 21(3) of Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities ('OJ L 357, 31.12.2002, as subsequently amended) provides for the evaluation of preparatory actions and pilot projects (please see text in Annex of the Terms of Reference).

Background/Introduction

2. The Civil Protection Mechanism aims to facilitate reinforced cooperation between the EU and the Member States in civil protection assistance interventions in the event of major emergencies, or the imminent threat thereof. The protection to be ensured by the Mechanism covers primarily protection of people but also the environment and property, including cultural heritage, in the event of natural and man-made disasters, acts of terrorism and, technological, radiological or environmental accidents, including accidental marine pollution, occurring inside or outside the EU, taking also into account the special needs of the isolated, outermost and other regions or islands of the EU.

3. There are currently 31 Participating States in the Civil Protection Mechanism (which are thus also eligible under the Instrument): the 27 EU member States, Norway, Iceland, Lichtenstein and Croatia.

4. The Financial Instrument aims to support and complement the efforts of the Member States for the protection, primarily of people but also of the environment and property, including cultural heritage, in the event of natural and man-made disasters, acts of terrorism and technological, radiological or environmental accidents and to facilitate reinforced cooperation between the Member States in the field of civil protection. The Instrument covers the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013.

5. Financial assistance is provided under the CPFI for

(a) actions in the field of the Mechanism;

(b) measures to prevent or reduce the effects of an emergency²; and

(c) actions designed to enhance the Union's state of preparedness for responses to emergencies.

6. In addition, the CPFI makes special provisions to fund certain transport resources in the event of a major emergency, to facilitate a rapid and effective response thereto.

² Prevention of, and preparedness for, accidental marine pollution at sea are covered under other instruments.

7. Countries other than Participating States may request civil protection assistance intervention under the Mechanism; third countries are, however, not eligible for financial support under the Instrument.

8. The Preparatory Action on an EU rapid response capability purported to improve the overall capacity of the EU to respond immediately, through the deployment of civil protection operations, to critical needs arising from major disasters inside and outside the EU. To that effect, the PA purported to improve the availability of assistance by ensuring that key civil protection resources are either available or on standby during relevant periods.

9. The Pilot Project on forest fires purported to improve the mobilisation of operational resources and emergency support from Member States through the Mechanism to assist a Member State in coping with forest fires too numerous and too intense to be handled by that State using its own logistical capacity and manpower.

Justification and timing of the evaluation

10. Article 14 of the Mechanism Decision requires the Commission to evaluate the application of the Decision every three years and transmit the conclusions of that evaluation to the European Parliament and the Council.

11. Article 15(2)(b) CPFI requires the Commission to evaluate, on an interim basis, the results obtained and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the CPFI³.

12. Article 21(3) IR requires evaluating preparatory actions and pilot projects in terms of the human and financial resources allocated and the results obtained in order to verify that they were consistent with the objectives set.

13. The objective of the evaluation is to provide the Commission with key findings and lessons of experience from the Commission's above-mentioned actions in the field of civil protection. It will present those findings and lessons in a report designed primarily to provide the Commission with a valuable aid both for the continued implementation of the Mechanism and the Instrument (until 2013 in the latter case) and for further programming. Concerning further programming, the evaluation aims to inform the preparation of a comprehensive policy package (possibly in 2011) reviewing EU disaster management cooperation alongside the following key themes: (1) responsibility according to which Member States take preventive and protection measures, and (2) solidarity that guarantees the provision of assistance by the EU and the Member States. It will also inform the preparation of the communication on the continuation of the Financial Instrument to be presented no later than 31 December 2011 (pursuant to Article 15(2)(c) CPFI), as well as the communication on Reinforcing the European Union's Disaster Response Capacity (to be adopted by the Commission late 2010).

14. In support of the above-mentioned evaluation, there is a need to collect certain primary data not currently available to the Commission.

³ This evaluation will also the transport related provisions of the CPFI. A first evaluation thereof was mandated under Article 15(2)(a) CPFI, but, by the given deadline (31 December 2008), no sufficient practical experience had been gained on the basis of which a meaningful evaluation could have been done.

Evaluation purpose, objective and scope

Purpose and objectives

15. Lesson learning and accountability in view of improving performance are the main purposes of the evaluation. The specific purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the European Commission's actions in the field of civil protection, in order to assess performance and improve future operations.

16. The scope of the evaluation will cover the implementation of the European Commission's actions in the field of civil protection carried out between 2007 and 2009, which has contributed to the following objectives:

- Facilitating a rapid and effective civil protection response in the event of a major emergency.
- Contributing to enhance the Union's state of preparedness for responses to emergencies.
- Contributing to develop measures preventing or mitigating long-term damage of major disasters on the European Union.

17. More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following components of the overall action (referred to collectively, hereinafter, as 'EU civil protection activities'):

- The functioning of, and services delivery by, the Mechanism/Monitoring and Information Centre ('MIC') referred to in Article 2(5) of the Mechanism Decision.
- The operation of the transport provisions of the CPFI (Article 4(2) points (b) and (c) and (3)).
- The arrangements implemented in the context of the so-called "modular approach" and those tested under the Pilot Projects and Preparatory Action in order to enhance the availability of response assets.
- The training programme referred to in Article 5(5) of the Mechanism Decision (including the exercises component thereof).

18. The key users of the evaluation report include, *inter alia*, DG ECHO staff, other Commission departments, EU institutions, Member States and other stakeholders with an interest in the evaluation findings.

Management of the evaluation

19. The desk research currently conducted by an internal team of evaluators will provide a building block for the remaining work to be done by external consultant. These terms of reference define the role and tasks of external consultants in the evaluation process, who will be tasked with the identification, collection, processing and analyzing of primary data in support of the evaluation, which will primarily be obtained through appropriate forms of stakeholder consultation. The consultants will then bear overall responsibility for drafting the final evaluation report, based on the findings of the internal desk review and external stakeholder consultation.

20. In so doing, the contractor needs to bear in mind that the evaluation will focus on the **relevance/appropriateness and effectiveness** of the Commission's actions in the field of civil protection. The evaluation will also assess the 3Cs: **complementarity, coordination and coherence**⁴.

21. The contractor's report should be factual and analytical, setting out its main findings in the shape of conclusions, without containing policy or operational recommendations.

Evaluation questions

22. The evaluation will address, among other, the following questions:

- Are EU civil protection activities coherent, well coordinated with, and complementary to, interventions and actions implemented under other EU and international (in particular UN sponsored) crisis management capabilities (such as those available in the field of humanitarian aid – see, in particular: <http://ochaonline.un.org/>), and Participating States' interventions?
- To which extent have the MIC and the services supplied by it (in terms of early warning, information-pooling and sharing, and coordination) led to a more effective response to emergencies?
- To which extent were the objectives of the EU civil protection training programme attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?
- To which extent were the objectives of EU civil protection exercise-related activities attained and to which extent were the intended results achieved?
- To which extent have the transport provisions of the CPFI contributed to improve the delivery of civil protection assistance items and led to more effective disaster response?
- To which extent have modules set up under the Mechanism and projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response through enhancing the availability of key response assets?
- To which extent have the projects funded under the Preparatory Action/Pilot Project led to enhanced preparedness and more effective disaster response, and contributed to cooperation between Participating States in the field of civil protection?

Tasks to be accomplished

23. It is with the objective of assisting the Commission services to answer the above-mentioned evaluation questions (more information about the various EU civil protection activities concerned by the evaluation questions will be provided to the contractor after the

⁴ <http://www.three-cs.net/>

signature of the contract) that the contractor will plan, design and conduct actions whereby the views and opinions of the most relevant stakeholders (both public and non public entities) will be collected, processed (from a statistical viewpoint), analysed (as far as their content is concerned), summarised and presented in a well-structured and reader-friendly report to be delivered within the deadline specified in the contract.

24. More specifically, the contractor shall accomplish the following tasks:

- Planning a coherent series of actions geared towards fulfilling the tasks described in point 23 above to be carried out within the time-table laid down in the contract.
- Identifying and designing the most relevant methodological tools (open or closed, or a combination of, questionnaires; interviews; etc.), whereby the views and opinions of the most relevant stakeholders (both public and non public entities) will be collected, enabling wherever possible quantitative treatment of the data and information so collected (statistical treatment) and, in any case, providing a sound basis for analysing the collected data and information.
- The following stakeholders must, as a minimum, be either sent questionnaires to or interviewed:
 - Civil protection competent authorities of Participating States:
 - Members of the Permanent Network of National Contact Points (contact details will be supplied by the Commission);
 - Members of the Training Policy Group (contact details will be supplied by the Commission);
 - National Training Coordinators (contact details will be supplied by the Commission);
 - Marine pollution competent authorities;
 - International partners:
 - UN family (UN-OCHA, UN-ISDR, and UNEP/OCHA JEU);
 - EADRCC (Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre);
 - Red Cross Family (ICRC, IFRC);
 - Academia/think-tanks:
 - Centre for the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED);
 - The European Policy Centre (EPC);
 - Professional organisations:
 - International Association of Emergency Managers;
 - International association of fire and rescue service (CTIF);

- Relevant Commission departments and EU agencies invited to take part in the Evaluation Steering Group (contact details will be supplied by the Commission);
 - EU delegations in selected third countries which have requested EU civil protection assistance intervention through the Civil Protection Mechanism (contact details will be supplied by the Commission);
 - NGOs:
 - VOICE (Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies);
 - Johanniter International (JOIN);
 - Malteser International;
 - Samaritan International.
- The contractor shall consider whether there are additional stakeholders whose views and opinions would be directly relevant for the purpose of the evaluation, and make suggestions to the Commission as their possible inclusion in the actions to be conducted by the contractor. Among those, the contractor shall, inter alia, consider the following: CEN; European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control; European Environment Agency; European Space Agency.
 - Draft questionnaires and/or interview guides shall be designed by the contractor, presented to the Commission and agreed with the latter, as specified below under "Methodology, outputs and schedule".
 - The purpose of the questionnaires and interviews is to collect information, data, views and opinions directly relevant to assist in answering the evaluation questions listed in paragraph 22 above.
 - The contractor shall ensure that replies to questionnaires are collected and interviews be conducted in due time to enable them to deliver the various reports required under the contract by the specified deadline(s), as specified below under "Methodology, outputs and schedule".
 - Once collected the relevant data and information will be processed and analysed by the contractor with a view to extracting therefrom elements directly relevant to answer the evaluation questions listed in paragraph 22 above. The results of the external stakeholder consultation will be triangulated against the results of the internal desk review, and presented in an overarching report outlining overall findings and conclusions for the evaluation.. It will, however, not be the task of the contractor to make policy or operational recommendations on the basis of the fact-based findings and conclusions derived from the data and information collected during the outreach phase.
 - The processing and analysis by the contractor of the collected data and information should be objective in that the findings and conclusions reached by the contractor should be based on, and duly reflect, the data and information collected during the outreach phase.

- The contractor will incorporate in their work the information and data resulting from the desk based review carried out by the operational units concerned of DG ECHO, which will be shared with them during the inception phase and on a regular basis afterwards (as and when new documents become available). The contractor and the operational units concerned of DG ECHO will liaise on a regular basis to discuss all relevant issues pertaining to the desk based review carried out by those units.
- Throughout the consultation process (see "Outreach phase" below), the contractor will liaise on a regular basis with DG ECHO to inform them of the progress made and first results. As a minimum, the contractor is required to prepare, by mid-July 2010, a stock-taking report informing DG ECHO of the state of progress at mid-term point of the mission.

Methodology, outputs and schedule

Inception meeting

25. An inception meeting will take place at DG ECHO premises with the relevant DG ECHO staff after the signature of the contract on a mutually agreed date.

26. In preparation of the inception meeting, the contractor shall send the draft questionnaires and interview guides to be discussed at that meeting to DG ECHO no later than 5 working days before the date of the meeting, as well as any other documents intended to be discussed at that meeting (concerning, for instance, methodological issues and additional stakeholders to be included in the outreach activities to be carried out by the contractor).

27. During the inception meeting, the contractor and DG ECHO shall review and discuss the draft questionnaires and interview guides, including the appropriateness thereof in the light of their intended addressees/persons planned to be interviewed on that basis. Insofar as those issues would not have been sufficiently considered in the contractor's tender, the work plan and the methodology to be used for processing and analysing the collected data and information shall be discussed and agreed.

28. The contractor shall review the drafts in order to incorporate and reflect any comments made by DG ECHO during the inception meeting. The contractor shall submit a revised version of the drafts to DG ECHO no later than 5 working days after the meeting. DG ECHO shall have 5 working days to formally approve the revised drafts or otherwise. Should there still be modifications to be brought to the draft questionnaires and/or interview guides, DG ECHO and the contractor shall agree a reasonable time-table to do so, duly reflecting the need for the final report to be delivered within the deadline specified in the contract.

Outreach phase

29. Following the formal approval of the questionnaires and/or interview guides (including the identification of the persons to be consulted on that basis) and the methodology to be used for processing and analysing the collected data and information, the contractor shall proceed according to the work plan agreed with DG ECHO.

30. In the conduct of their work the consultants should use a multi-method approach and triangulate between different sources of information.
31. Should there be difficulties in complying with the workplan, the contractor shall contact DG ECHO forthwith with a view to finding a solution.
32. At any rate, irrespective of any problems encountered in proceeding in accordance with the work plan, **the contractor shall ensure that replies to questionnaires are collected and interviewed be conducted in due time to enable them to deliver the various reports required under the contract by the specified deadlines.**

Report drafting phase and presentation in Brussels

33. The first **draft report (maximum 30 pages)** in accordance with the format given in point 5 of the Annex of the Terms of Reference shall be submitted by electronic transmission to DG ECHO no later than 7 working days after the completion of the outreach phase.
34. A **presentation** will be organised in Brussels after the submission of the first draft report. The contractor shall make a PowerPoint presentation to DG ECHO management and key staff of main findings and conclusions. The date for this presentation will be decided by DG ECHO in agreement with the contractor.
35. Prior to the meeting, DG ECHO will have provided consolidated written comments on the first draft report to the contractor within 5 working days from the receipt of the draft report.
36. On the basis of the results of the presentation and taking into due account the comments received before and during the meeting, a **draft final report (maximum 30 pages)** will be submitted to DG ECHO no later than 5 working days after the presentation. DG ECHO should inform the contractor of its agreement with, or requests further amendments to, the draft final report within 5 working days after the receipt thereof.

Final report

37. On the basis of the comments made by DG ECHO, the contractor shall make appropriate amendments and submit the **final report (maximum 30 pages)** within 5 working days. If the contractor rejects any of the comments they shall explain and substantiate the reasons why they do so in writing.
38. The report (to be prepared by the contractor) shall strictly reflect the structure outlined in the Annex of the ToR under point 5.
39. While correcting the report and its annexes, the contractor will always highlight changes (using track changes) and modifications introduced further to the presentation and the comments received from DG ECHO.

Dissemination and follow-up

40. The **executive summary and/or the entire final report** of the contractor may be placed in the public domain on the Internet.

Management and supervision of the evaluation

41. DG ECHO Evaluation Sector bears the responsibility for the management and the monitoring of this evaluation, in consultation with the operational units concerned. DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, and in particular the internal manager assigned to the evaluation, should therefore always be kept informed and consulted by the contractor and copied on all correspondence with other DG ECHO staff.

42. The DG ECHO Evaluation manager is the contact person for the consulting team and shall assist the team during their mission in tasks such as providing documents and facilitating contacts. The travel and accommodation arrangements, the organisation of meetings and facilitating the obtainment of visas remain the sole responsibility of the consulting company.

Contractor's team

43. The contractor's team will comprise a number of experts commensurate to the tasks to be accomplished within the schedule specified in the contract.

44. Proficiency in English and French is obligatory. Knowledge of additional official languages of the EU would be an advantage.

45. The consultants' profiles should include knowledge and experience in:

- (1) Civil protection assistance intervention related activities and operations.
- (2) Training activities related to the above-mentioned activities and operations.

46. Guidelines for the evaluation team are provided in point 4 of the annex of the Terms of Reference.

Timetable

47. The tasks will be undertaken in a period of working days that will be proposed by the consulting firm, ending no later than **21 September 2010** with the acceptance of the final report.

48. The tasks may only start being carried out at the actual signature of the contract and by no means may any contact and/or expense occur before it.

49. The following is an imperative schedule (on the basis of which the consultants should prepare their workplan):

Dates	Evaluation Phases and Stages	Meetings	Notes and Reports
May 2010	Call for Tender		
End of May – beginning of June 2010	Starting Stage (signature of contract)		
June 2010	Inception phase	Inception meeting	Draft questionnaires/interview guides and all other necessary preparatory documents (work plan, etc).
June – August 2010	Outreach Phase		July 2010: Information note (informing DG ECHO of the state of progress at mid-term point of the mission)
Early September 2010			Draft final report
21 September 2010			Final Report
	Dissemination		

ANNEX

Guidelines for the consultants

1. Regulatory basis

Article 14 of Council Decision 2007/779/EC, Euratom of 8 November 2007 establishing a Community Civil Protection Mechanism (recast) (OJ L 314, 1.12.2007, p. 9) reads in its relevant part:

"The Commission shall evaluate the application of this Decision every third year from the date of its notification and transmit the conclusions of that evaluation to the European Parliament and the Council."

Article 15(2)(b) of Council Decision 2007/162/EC, Euratom of 5 March 2007 establishing a Civil Protection Financial Instrument (OJ L 71, 10.3.2007, p. 9) reads:

"2. The Commission shall submit the following to the European Parliament and to the Council: [...] (b) no later than 30 June 2010, an interim evaluation report on the results obtained and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of this Decision".

Article 21(3) of Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities (OJ L 357, 31.12.2002, as subsequently amended) provides in its relevant part:

"3. All programmes or activities, including pilot projects and preparatory actions, where the resources mobilised exceed EUR 5 000 000 shall be the subject of an interim and/or ex post evaluation of the human and financial resources allocated and the results obtained in order to verify that they were consistent with the objectives set [...]".

2. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference set out the scope of the contractor's mission, the issues to be considered and the timetable. They allow those commissioning the evaluation and/or the review to express their needs (guidance function) while providing the consultant(s) with a clear idea of what is expected from them (control function).

3. Scope of the evaluation and topics of study

In addition to the initial information contained in the ToR, the first briefing session in Brussels provides everyone involved in the evaluation (DG ECHO requesting service and particularly the responsible desk, DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, the consultants and other Commission services) with the opportunity to discuss the contents of the ToR and to establish priorities for the evaluation. This meeting should also allow the consultants to clarify any doubts they might have about the scope of their mission. Any important remark or comment on the content of the ToR at this stage will be considered an **integral** part of these and will be set out by the team leader in the inception note that must be submitted to DG ECHO

Evaluation Sector at the end of the briefing session, and before the team's departure to other locations in Europe and elsewhere.

During the process of the evaluation the consultants must try to follow all the items listed in the Terms of Reference. Their treatment, the importance given to them and their coverage in the final reports will depend, however, on the consultants' own opinion as a result of the information found, both during the documentation phase and in the field. Any decision not to cover one or more of the main task assignments described in the ToR will have to be justified in the text of the reports, if inappropriately justified DG ECHO may choose to not accept the final report.

4. The evaluation team

Each team member is jointly responsible for the final accomplishment of the tasks; however, the separate elements of work necessary for the accomplishment of the tasks may be allocated between the consultants. The members of the team must work in close co-ordination.

A team leader shall be named who shall have the added responsibility of the overall co-ordination of the tasks to be completed, of the elaboration of Executive Summary and of the final coherence of the report and other works both in terms of content and presentation.

If possible/advisable, at least one of the team members shall be a woman.

The consultants are required to carry out their work in accordance with international standards of good practice in approach and method. All conclusions must be substantiated with adequate data.

During the contract, consultants shall refrain from any conduct that would adversely reflect on the European Commission or DG ECHO and shall not engage in any activity that is incompatible with the discharge of their duties. Consultants are required to exercise the utmost discretion in all matters during their mission.

5. The report

By commissioning an independent evaluation and/or review DG ECHO expects to obtain an objective, critical, readable and transparent analysis of its policy. Above all, the report should be a document that can function as a learning tool. Therefore, while writing it, the consultants should always bear in mind why the report is done, for whom, and how the results will be used.

Furthermore, the report is a working tool of value to DG ECHO only as long as it is feasible and pragmatic (keeping in mind DG ECHO's mandate constraints) and it clearly reflects the consultant's independent view. DG ECHO's concern is to respect this independence.

The evaluation methods should be clearly outlined in the report and their appropriateness, focus and users should be explained pointing out strengths and weaknesses of the methods. The report should briefly outline the nature (e.g. external or mixed) and make up of the team (e.g. sectoral expertise, local knowledge, gender balance) and its appropriateness for the evaluation. It should also briefly outline the evaluators' biases and/or constraints that might have affected the evaluation and how these have been counteracted (past experiences, background, etc.).

The report shall be written in a straightforward manner in English with an Executive Summary at the beginning of the document. Final editing shall be provided by the consulting firm. The report should be in the font Time Roman 12, have single line spacing and be fully justified. Paragraphs must be sequentially numbered.

The final report should contain:

- An Executive Summary of maximum **5 pages**.
- The main report.
- Technical annexes and a summary table of results (confidential).
- Other annexes as necessary.

This report format should be strictly adhered to:

- *Cover page* (a template is provided at the end of this annex)
 - title of the report;
 - date of completion of the mission;
 - name of the consultant(s) and the company;
 - cost of the report in €and as a percentage of the budget evaluated;
 - the contract number;
 - indication that “the report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only”,
- *Table of contents*
- *Executive Summary*

A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing **Executive Summary is an essential element**. It should be short, **no more than 5 pages**. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the mission, outline the main points of the analysis, and contain a **matrix made of three columns clearly indicating the sources (from which the findings and conclusions derive), the findings and conclusions**. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text. EU Member States receive each Executive Summary, which is also published on DG ECHO website. The consultant should take this into account when drafting this part of the report.
- *Main body of the report*

The main body of the report will elaborate the points listed in the Executive Summary. It would include references to the methodology used and the context of the mission. In particular, it should clearly demonstrate how each finding and conclusion relate to the primary data collected during the mission. Conclusions should be fully substantiated.
- *Annexes of the report:*
 - Annex A: Terms of Reference;
 - Annex B: List of persons interviewed and sites visited;
 - Annex C: Abbreviations and Acronyms.

All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex. The consultants are to be particularly aware that any risk of libel is to be avoided. Where necessary the name of any partner that is criticised should be replaced with an anonymous title.

Each report shall be drawn up in five paper copies and transmitted to DG ECHO - To the attention of DG ECHO 01/Evaluation sector, AN88, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

An electronic copy of the report (CD-ROM, Word 7.0 format or a more recent version) including all its annexes must be submitted to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector, together with the hard copies.


The final report should be sent by email to DG ECHO Evaluation Sector in three separate documents in PDF format each containing: the executive summary, the report without its annexes and the report with its annexes.

TEMPLATE FOR COVER PAGE

NAME AND LOGO OF THE CONSULTING COMPANY

(EVENTUAL INSERTION OF PICTURE/DRAWING/MAP)

TITLE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT;
DATE OF THE REPORT EVALUATION;
NAME OF THE CONSULTANT(S);
COST OF THE REPORT IN €AND AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE BUDGET EVALUATED.
THE CONTRACT NUMBER (ECHO/ADM/BUD/200./...)

 <p>EUROPEAN COMMISSION Humanitarian Aid</p>	<p>The report has been financed by and produced at the request of the European Commission. The comments contained herein reflect the opinions of the consultant only</p>
---	--