Uscore2

Funded by
European Union
Civil Protection

Module 9: Ensure Effective Disaster Response

Uscore2: City-to-City Peer Review Tool

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Uscore2 is a peer-to-peer review process for cities, designed with funding from the European Commission, it enables cities to share and learn from good practice in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in other cities across the world. Uscore2 focuses on the use of city-level peer reviews as a tool with which the activities of one city in the area of disaster risk management and civil protection are examined on an equal basis by fellow peers who are experts from other cities. This approach facilitates improvements in DRR through the exchange of good practice and mutual learning, whilst also maintaining impartiality and transparency. This peer review programme integrates an evidence based methodology for impact evaluation, enabling participants to demonstrate the value generated by the investment in the peer review.

Cities undertaking a peer review of disaster response for DRR will generally be undertaking this as part of a wider review as outlined in the Uscore2 Step-by-Step Guide to City-to-City peer reviews for Disaster Risk Reduction. The Step-by-Step Guide provides an essential overview of the peer review process, the Impact Evaluation Methodology (IEM) used to measure the impact of the peer review, and the 11 Modules for conducting city-to-city peer reviews for DRR.

It is strongly recommended that cities interested in inviting another city to peer review their DRR activity work through the Step-by-Step Guide as a precursor to undertaking Module 9.

This Module Guide gives information relevant to those steps in the peer review process which are specific to Essential 9.

During the development of Uscore2, the peer review process has been piloted by three cities: Amadora (Portugal), Salford (UK) and Viggiano (Italy). The pilot cities spoke positively of their experiences:

> "Peer reviews are interactive and about mutual learning, exchange of best practice and policy dialogue, a support tool for prevention and preparation under the EU civil protection mechanism and promote an integrated approach to disaster risk management, linking risk prevention, preparation, response and recovery actions."

BACKGROUND

This Module explores how effective disaster response may be strengthened through increased preparedness and planning; enhanced emergency response services; and ensuring adequate funds are available for post event response and recovery. These issues should be supported with information regarding identified risks within a city (Module 2), and how these risks are effectively managed by disaster risk governance strategies (Module 1) (UNISDR n.d).

This topic is important as preparedness and planning for disaster response facilitates the identification of vulnerable populations and their exposure to risk (Harris et al. 2016), the resilience and response capabilities of a city (Basu et al. 2013), and the effectiveness of early warning systems (Keating et al. 2016).

Notwithstanding the social implications of effective disaster response mechanisms, the economic implications must also be considered. In 1998-2017 disaster-hit countries reported direct economic losses valued at US$ 2,908 billion, of which climate-related disasters caused US$ 2,245 billion or 77% of the total. This is arguably part of a rising trend compared with losses reported between 1978 and 1997 when 68% (US$ 895 billion) of losses (US$ 1,313 billion) were due to climate-related disasters (CRED and UNISDR, 2018).

In order to respond effectively to emergencies, cities should invest time and resources in the development of disaster preparedness. This includes having plans and procedures in place, technical and institutional capacities appropriate for the city's risk scenarios, mechanisms for the coordination and exchange of information including early warnings, exercises and drills, together with adequate funds for response (Cardona 2005).

The ultimate objective of the preparedness planning process is to develop joint working approaches to facilitate effective command and control and common understanding between a wide array of responders. Also important is the coordination of activities to support effective preparedness, effective coordination between local and central authorities, and a people centred approach that identifies who is vulnerable and why (Ostadtaghizadeh et al. 2015).

Peer review offers a systematic way to support cities in assessing their response capabilities which need to be in place and well-practiced and rehearsed. Systematic planning that involves all relevant actors is the foundation of effective disaster response and is facilitated by the peer review process.

References

Basu, M., Srivastava, N., Mulyasari, F., & Shaw, R. (2013). Making Cities and Local Governments Ready for Disasters: A Critical Overview of a Recent Approaches. Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy, 4(4), pp. 250–273.

Cardona, O. D. (2005). Indicators of Disaster Risk and Risk Management: Program for Latin America and the Caribbean: Summary Report, 43.

CRED, UNISDR (2018). Economic Losses, Poverty and Disasters 1998 – 2017, p3.

Harris, M., Shaw, D., Scully, J., Smith, C. M., and Hieke, G. (2016), The Involvement / Exclusion Paradox of Spontaneous Volunteering, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Vol. 46 No.2, pp. 352–371.

Keating, A., Campbell, K., Szoenyi, M., McQuistan, C., Nash, D., & Burer, M. (2016). Development and testing of a community flood resilience measurement tool. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions, (May), pp. 1–39.

Ostadtaghizadeh, A., Ardalan, A., Paton, D., Jabbari, H., Khankeh, HR., (2015). Community Disaster Resilience: a Systematic Review on Assessment Models and Tools. PLOS Currents Disasters, available from: http://currents.plos.org/disasters/article/community-disaster-resilience-a-systematic-review-on-assessment-models-and-tools/

UNISDR. (n.d), Essential Nine: Ensure Effective disaster response, available from: http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/index/Essential%20Nine:%20Ensure%20Effective%20Disaster%20Response%C2%A0/?id=9

Further Information

For further information on peer reviews visit: www.Uscore2.eu. Also refer to ISO 22392 when published. Currently it is in draft and will contain further information about peer reviews.

HOW CAN DISASTER RESPONSE BE ASSESSED AND IMPROVED?

The description of Essential 9: Ensure Effective Disaster Response taken from the UNISDR's Making Cities Resilient website and given below, describes the activities a city should be demonstrating to improve resilience in this area. Local governments are often the closest level of government to local communities and are therefore critical in leading any response to a disaster.

Essential Nine: Ensure Effective Disaster Response

Create and improve preparedness plans

- Create and regularly update contingency and preparedness plans which are communicated to and understood by all stakeholders. These may include law and order, providing vulnerable populations with food, water, medical supplies, shelter and staple goods.
- Hold regular training, drills and exercises for all aspects of the wider emergency response 'system' including community elements and volunteers.

Ensure the Provision of and Strengthen early warning systems

- Develop and install detection, monitoring equipment, early warning systems and effective associated communication systems to all relevant stakeholders and community groups.
- Ensure interoperability of emergency response system and capabilities with adjacent regions and countries, between agencies and with neighbouring cities to enhance the ability to provide mutual aid to each other.

Upgrade the city's emergency response services

- Integrate risk reduction and emergency response with wider groups including responders or support capabilities such as engineers, contractors, etc. to be able to effectively engage in preparedness, response and recovery operations.
- Ensure that a viable mechanism will exist for the rapid, rational and transparent collection and disbursement of funds after a disaster.
- Assign adequate funds for post event response and recovery.

HOW CAN THIS BE MEASURED?

The following table describes the high level indicators for Essential 9 taken from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. These are used in this Module as indicators against which to gather evidence and make recommendations.

Ref	Subject / Issue	Question / Assessment Area
P 9.1	Early warning	Does the Host City have a plan or standard operating procedure to act on early warnings and forecasts? What proportion of the population is reachable by early warning system?
P 9.2	Event management plans	Is there a disaster management / preparedness / emergency response plan outlining the Host City mitigation, preparedness and response to local emergencies?
P 9.3	Staffing / responder needs	Does the responsible disaster management authority have sufficient staffing capacity to support first responder duties in surge event scenario?
P 9.4	Equipment and relief supply needs	Are equipment and supply needs, as well as the availability of equipment, clearly defined?
P 9.5	Food, shelter, staple goods and fuel supply	Would the Host City be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event?
P 9.6	Interoperability and interagency working	Is there an emergency operations centre, with participation from all agencies, automating standard operating procedures specifically designed to deal with "most probable" and "most severe" scenarios?
P 9.7	Drills	Do practices and drills involve both the public and professionals?

The full Detailed Assessment from the Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities is available through the following link: http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities/home/toolkitblkitem/?id=4

METHODOLOGY
PHASE 2, STEP 7: INFORMATION TO SEND TO REVIEW TEAM PRIOR TO THE REVIEW TEAM VISIT

Please refer to the Step-by-Step Guide for advice on both conducting and hosting peer reviews. This section sets out information that is specific to this Module, which begins in Phase 2, Step 7

As set out in the Step-by-Step Guide if Modules 1 (Organise for Disaster Resilience) and 2 (Identify, Understand and Use Current and Future Risk Scenarios) are not undertaken at the same time as Module 9, then an overview of both the Host City's disaster risk governance and DRR risk assessment should be included in the pre-visit information sent to the Review Team.

The Host City should aim to send the pre-visit evidence to the Review Team three months ahead of the review visit. It is recommended that the pre-visit evidence is limited to 3 – 8 items for each Module.

Suggestions for the type of pre-visit evidence that could be shared between the Host City and Review Team
A selection of evidence should be sent to the Review Team before their visit to the Host City. This could include the type of information listed below or any other information that the Host City and the Review Team agree would be of benefit.

It is **highly recommended** that the Host City prepare a summary of how the city ensures effective disaster response including:

- How the Host City's stakeholders are involved in drawing up the city's emergency plans
- A chart illustrating the response activation protocols including key stakeholders / organisations and community representation. If a chart is not available, a list of key stakeholders could be submitted
- An example or case study describing how the Host City's response plan(s) have helped in responding to a specific incident(s), including how any plans have reduced the impact of the incident(s) and helped to maintain city resilience (economic, social, health or environmental)

- A summary of the lessons learnt from the incident including what worked well and what issues have been addressed to improve responses to emergencies in the future.

In addition, evidence to support one of the indicators, **P9.6 Interoperability and Interagency Working,** offers an opportunity to provide an overview of roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the Host City and, as such, including some information relevant to this indicator can give a useful introduction for the Review Team. One of the following would demonstrate the Host City's baseline for P9.6:

- An emergency plan or other document that provides an example of how different agencies in the Host City will work together in a disaster and their roles and responsibilities in an emergency
- An example of a protocol or procedure that sets out the principles under which agencies will work together in an emergency
- A debrief report capturing the lessons identified following a cross-sector exercise or emergency
- The outcomes of local completion of the UNISDR's Disaster Resilience Scorecard for Cities, Module 9.

For the remaining indicators, **no more than 4 other items in total** should be selected from the suggestions below to demonstrate the Host City's baseline capacity.

P9.1 Early Warning
- An overview of the Host City's early warning systems and a short explanation of how the effectiveness of these systems is evaluated
- A plan that illustrates how the Host City would act and its standard operating procedures when early warnings are issued

- Details of any public facing websites, applications or social media platforms that give information on potential disaster scenarios
- An example of any public information issued to citizens that advises them what to do in an emergency.

P9.2 Event Management Plans
- An example of a disaster management plan in the Host City that would be used to respond to an emergency
- A formal report, perhaps drafted for the local government or Mayor, evaluating the Host City's disaster response arrangements
- A report from, or description of, an example of a city-to-city knowledge exchange that has strengthened the Host City's disaster response.

P9.3 Staffing / responder needs
- A short description or overview as to how the Host City ensures it has skilled, knowledgeable and experienced staff in place to respond to disasters
- Sample rosters and rotas that show how the Host City ensures it has sufficient staff available at all times to respond to a disaster
- An example of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or a Mutual Aid Agreement that will enable the Host City to draw on responders from elsewhere in the country if the city's own resources are stretched.

P9.4 Equipment and Relief Supply Needs; P9.5 Food, Shelter, Staple Goods and Fuel Supply
- An example showing how the Host City models the requirements for food, shelter, fuel and essential supplies that would be needed by its population in the most severe scenario the city could face
- An extract from an inventory of the equipment and supplies that the Host City maintains in case

of an emergency, together with a short description of how these supplies meet predicted need in an emergency
- A typical agreement or Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Host City government and a private sector organisation for supplies or services in an emergency.

P9.7 Drills
- A copy of the programme together with a list of the stakeholders that participated in a recent training and exercising event to rehearse the response to a disaster
- A video recording a recent drill within the Host City
- A newspaper article or similar public information describing an emergency drill in the Host City.

PHASE 2, STEP 8: ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PEER REVIEW VISIT

As described in the Step-by-Step Guide, in the 3-6 months before the peer review visit, the Host City and Review Team are recommended to agree an agenda for the visit. This will include a range of activities to enable the Review Team to understand how the Host City is ensuring it has effective disaster response arrangements. The types of activities could include some or all of those listed below, or any other relevant actions. It is anticipated that the review of this Module will take a day. For all interviews, the Host City should ensure translators are available if they are required.

At the start of the Review Team's assessment of Module 9, the Host City is **highly recommended** to make a summary **presentation** to the Review Team which sets out the approach to disaster response. This could include information about:

- The stakeholders in the Host City that are involved in responding to a disaster
- The governance arrangements in the Host City to oversee and ensure an effective and coordinated disaster response.
- The arrangements in the Host City for organisations to react to early warnings and to start to mobilise and deploy the city's resources for dealing with an emergency.
- The emergency operations centre(s) in the Host City and how these support agencies in working together effectively, as well as enabling agencies to maintain their own essential services.

Who should the Review Team interview?

When considering who is important for the Review Team to interview and / or receive a presentation from, it is **highly recommended** that **the Mayor** and / or other key local political leaders who give leadership in a disaster response and a mandate to strengthen disaster response arrangements across the Host City are included and available. The Host City and Review Team should consider all Modules

being assessed during the peer review and combine relevant questions with each senior politician or officer into one appointment.

The Host City and Review Team may also wish to consider who would be most appropriate in light of their initial exchange of pre-visit information and also given the most probable and most severe disaster scenarios for the Host City. Suggestions include:

- Senior managers of institutions that are responsible for issuing early warnings within the Host City, whether part of the city government or the private sector
- Representatives from any institutions or community groups that will be mobilised when early warnings are issued to help the population to prepare for predicted events
- Officials who are responsible for drawing up the Host City's emergency plan(s)
- Community representatives who have drawn up an emergency plan for their local community, perhaps to promote 'self-help' and a community response alongside the Host City's emergency response
- Senior managers in different organisations and from different sectors who have a responsibility for and an investment in ensuring an effective disaster response
- Practitioners and technical experts who have been involved in disaster response
- People in the Host City who are responsible for, or who are part of, the city's supply chains for essential supplies and services to explore how key supply chains will be maintained in a disaster
- Representatives from civil society, NGOs and volunteer organisations that can provide assistance to the Host City in an emergency
- Representatives from neighbouring municipalities or regional or national government who can offer support to the Host City in a disaster.

How can the Host City multi-agency capacity be demonstrated?

In addition to interviews and presentations, suggestions for activities within the programme for the visit include but are not limited to:

- Visiting one of the research establishments, monitoring centres or other sites that issues early warning information
- Visiting an emergency operations centre, especially any facility that enables participation from all agencies
- Visiting at least one of the key emergency response agencies with a significant role in disaster response to understand and view the capabilities available for an effective disaster response
- Site visits to key institutions to see staff at work in preparation for disaster response, to explore how institutions are protecting the delivery of critical services in disasters or to see demonstrations of specialist capabilities
- Visiting one of the Host City's emergency supplies stores and one of its distribution centres through which it will disperse supplies to citizens
- Site visits to protection systems that defend the Host City from emergencies and help to reduce the severity of an emergency
- Site visits to pre-identified assembly points in case of evacuation and areas identified for temporary housing and shelter.

Exercises and Training

Especially in the context of this Module, observation by the Review Team of a public or practitioner training event taking place in the Host City at the time of the visit, or observation of a table top or live exercise to rehearse the city's emergency response would be very helpful. If required, 'real time' translation of the training / exercise into the preferred language of the Review Team should be organised by the Host City.

Observing a training event or exercise is beneficial in that it will enable the Review Team to visualise how the Host City emergency plans are practically applied and how different responding organisations interface and coordinate with each other. Such exercises will provide the Review Team with an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each organisation and will assist identifying current strengths and gaps in local capacity. Such exercises should assist in identifying the best and most-effective approaches to strengthen the Host City's disaster response.

The stakeholders involved in such exercises should not be restricted to governmental institutions and should include many stakeholders, from different sectors, that would be called upon in a disaster response.

PHASE 2, STEP 9: REVIEW TEAM: GATHERING EVIDENCE

The Review Team will gather evidence from the pre-review information submitted before the peer review visit, together with information from interviews and activities undertaken during the visit, to gain a view of the effectiveness of the existing Host City disaster response capability. This will include:

- Effectiveness of the multi-agency assessment of the risks to the Host City and whether there are suitable, sufficient and scalable plans and procedures, capabilities, systems and arrangements to respond to disasters in place
- Effectiveness of the strategies within the Host City in engaging all relevant agencies and organisations to support and augment the disaster response, including where surge capacity is needed, to ensure comprehensive and sustainable arrangements
- Effectiveness of communication, how the population is informed about the best actions to take when a disaster is predicted or occurs
- Effectiveness of how the Host City acts to maintain essential services during and in the aftermath of a disaster.

The Review Team will structure their evidence gathering and interviews to enable the Host City to describe and demonstrate their approach against each of the indicators included in the Disaster Resilience Scorecard Preliminary Level Assessment. Overall, the Review Team should determine:

- Who leads / contributes / coordinates / assesses performance in this area? Is this effective? Is shared ownership of DRR evident?
- Who is missing / underperforming or underrepresented?
- What skills and experience are evidenced? Are there deficits?
- What activities currently support performance in this area, are these activities effective?

- What, if any, additional activities would the Host City like to undertake in future? What are the barriers to extending activities?
- How are resources / information / training shared? Are there exclusions or barriers to access?
- How is the Host City accessing local / national / international sources of expertise to improve DRR in this area? Which networks is the Host City part of to support this activity?

Although the Review Team should design their own detailed questions in order to explore issues they consider relevant in the context of the Host City, the following questions are offered as suggestions that may be helpful in stakeholder interviews for Module 9. They are example questions and it is wholly acceptable to tailor them or, equally, not to use them, according to the individual peer review. The Review Team could choose to select just the relevant questions as well as asking additional questions that have not been listed below.

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 9.1	Early warning	**Describe the city's plan or standard operating procedure to act on early warnings and forecasts? What proportion of the population is reachable by early warning system and does the city feel this is comprehensive enough** • What arrangements are in place for the Host City to understand the risks it faces and those for which early warnings can be given? • What early warning systems exist within the Host City and how does the Host City ensure these reach both organisations that respond in an emergency and the city's population? • How does the Host City's disaster planning contribute to and support public awareness and education about responding to a disaster, facilitate community engagement and advocate for an all-of-society response to a disaster? • How do the Host City's early warning systems reach vulnerable communities and those in the Host City for whom the city's language is not their first language? • How does the Host City evaluate the effectiveness of its early warning systems? • How would the emergency response organisations respond to early warnings, especially in the case of the most probable and most severe disaster risks? • How would the Host City want to improve its early warning systems? • How does the Host City test its plans and arrangements for acting on early warnings and which stakeholders are involved in doing this?
P 9.2	Event management plans	**Describe the disaster management / preparedness / emergency response plan outlining city mitigation, preparedness and response to local emergencies?** • How does the Host City assess and decide which risks it should prepare an emergency plan for? Are response plans developed for all risk scenarios identified by the Host City? • What arrangements does the Host City have in place to monitor new and changing disaster risks?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 9.2	Event management plans	• How has the Host City prepared its disaster response plan and which stakeholders have been engaged in its preparation? • Are response plans developed for the common consequences identified in relation to the different risks? • What governance structures and processes are in place to ensure the Host City has the capabilities in place to deliver its plans? E.g. specialist equipment, expert responders and operations centres? • What powers and capacity does the Host City government have to act in an emergency? Does the Host City consider these sufficient? • What access does the Host City have to a budget for disaster response activities (national or local)? Does the Host City consider these sufficient? • In a disaster, what arrangements are in place to ensure that decisions are informed and evidence based? How does the Host City draw on scientific, technical or academic advice and knowledge in a disaster? • What makes the Host City's disaster response plan effective? What are the particular strengths of current arrangements? • Does the Host City's disaster response planning regularly draw on learning and good practice from other cities? • Does the Host City actively promote principles of equality and non-discrimination in planning to respond to disasters? • Does the Host City model how climate change might affect the impact and consequences of future disasters and how this may affect disaster response? • Is the Host City resourced to respond to future disaster scenarios modelled using climate change projections? • When was the Host City's disaster response plan last reviewed? • How does the Host City activate its major incident plan? • How was the plan used during a recent incident?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 9.3	Staffing / responder needs	**How does the responsible disaster management authority ensure they have sufficient staffing capacity to support first responder duties in surge event scenarios?** • Does the Host City have access to the capabilities it needs to respond to the risks it has identified? • Who can mobilise and allocate resources for disaster response activities? • What plans are in place to resource the response to incidents? • Do all agencies in the Host City understand their roles and responsibilities in a disaster? • Are contracts in place to procure additional resources if required in a disaster? • Do the Host City's contractors within its supply chains have tested contingency arrangements in place so they can continue to provide supplies and services to the Host City during a disaster? • Has the Host City got plans in place to address surges in demand for basic services e.g. healthcare in an emergency?
P 9.4	Equipment and relief supply needs	**How are equipment and supply needs, as well as the availability of equipment, clearly defined and ensured when needed?** • How does the Host City ensure it has the supplies, services and specialist capabilities available to deal with the most probable and most severe scenarios? • How does the Host City access additional support in a disaster from the private sector? From neighbouring areas? From regional and national governments? • What arrangements does the Host City have in place to finance any equipment and supplies needed in an emergency? • How does the Host City plan for a long-term, sustained and continuous disaster response? • What plans does the Host City have to ensure supplies can be transported into the city and can be effectively distributed to those in need? • How does the Host City plan for complex logistical operations in an emergency with adequate storage and distribution arrangements in a disaster?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 9.5	Food, shelter, staple goods and fuel supply	**How would the city be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event?** • How does the Host City model the food and shelter needs of its population in the most probable and most severe scenarios? • How does the Host City promote and try to ensure the continuity of its essential services in a disaster? • What arrangements are in place for the evacuation and shelter of citizens? • How does the Host City plan for long-term, sustained and continuous support for people in need of food and shelter? • How does the Host City plan to provide basic services such as education and healthcare post-event? • What arrangements does the Host City have to support communities in staying together after a disaster? • How does the Host City plan to maintain and support community cohesion and to avoid civil disturbance in a disaster? • What arrangements does the Host City have to help communities to recover and build back better after a disaster?
P 9.6	Interoperability and interagency working	**Describe the arrangements for an emergency operations centre, with participation from all agencies, automating standard operating procedures specifically designed to deal with "most probable" and "most severe" scenarios?** • Who is in overall charge in the Host City for disaster response? Who has the authority in the city to strengthen approaches to disaster response? • How is the input from different sectors and stakeholders coordinated? How do different stakeholders Command and Control their response to an incident? • How does the Host City plan and fund its emergency operations centre(s) and how does it ensure emergency operations centres are resistant to known risks, especially the most severe scenario? • How do regional and national governments work with the Host City government to strengthen disaster response? How does the Host City influence the regional and national direction in disaster response? • How does the Host City ensure an integrated response to incidents and emergencies?

Ref	Subject / Issue	Suggested Questions
P 9.6	Interoperability and interagency working	• How do multi-agency partners coordinate their response? • How does the Host City work across silos to make disaster response "everyone's business"? • How does the Host City's disaster response work in partnership or alongside the arrangements in neighbouring cities, especially if a wide-area disaster occurs? • How do existing institutions within the Host City charged with disaster response and recovery understand and engage in their broader DRR responsibilities? • How has the Host City used training, exercises and drills to test and rehearse the effectiveness of inter-agency working?
P 9.7	Drills	**How often do practices and drills involve both the public and professionals and does the city feel this is adequate?** • How does the Host City ensure individual agencies have well trained and rehearsed capabilities in place? • What arrangements are in place to practice cross-sector and multi-agency disaster response? How often is this done? • How does the Host City engage citizens in emergency exercises and drills? How often is this done? • What arrangements are in place to identify and to act on learning from exercises and drills? • How does the Host City evaluate the effectiveness of its programme for exercises and drills?

PHASE 3, STEP 11: RECORDING INFORMATION AND DRAFTING INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Step-by-Step Guide describes how the Review Team can record information during the peer review visit and includes a generic form that can be used to capture information during individual presentations, interviews and other activities.

At the end of each day, it is recommended that the Review Team assemble to consider all the information that it has heard during the day and summarise the evidence to understand:

* areas of good practice and strengths on which the Host City can build
* areas where further information may be needed before the peer review visit is finished
* areas where possible recommendations for the future may be made.

This process will help to inform both the remainder of the visit and the drafting of the peer review outcome report.

The two tables below are offered as a way of recording the overall findings for Module 9 together with the initial recommendations arising from the activities experienced during the day.

SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
P 9.1 Early warning a) Does the Host City have a plan or standard operating procedure to act on early warnings and forecasts? b) What proportion of the population is reachable by early warning systems?			
P 9.2 Event management plans Is there a disaster management / preparedness / emergency response plan (strategy) outlining the Host City mitigation, preparedness and response to local emergencies?			
P 9.3 Staffing / responder needs Does the responsible disaster management authority have sufficient staffing capacity to support first responder duties in surge event scenarios?			
P 9.4 Equipment and relief supply needs Are equipment and supply needs, as well as the availability of equipment, clearly defined?			
P 9.5 Food, shelter, staple goods and fuel supply Would the Host City be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event?			

SUMMARY OF INITIAL FINDINGS

	Comments	Justification for assessment	Good practice identified
P 9.6 Interoperability and interagency working Is there an emergency operations centre, with participation from all agencies, automating standard operating procedures specifically designed to deal with "most probable" and "most severe" scenarios?			
P 9.7 Drills Do practices and drills involve both the public and professionals?			
Other			

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
E.g. Extent to which data on the city's resilience context is shared with other organisations involved with the city's resilience.	E.g. Ensure a consistent flow of information between multi-agency partners.	E.g. A regular flow of information would improve understanding of risk and aid planning for partner agencies.	E.g. Short, medium, long term implementation.
P 9.1 Early warning a) The Host City has a plan or standard operating procedure to act on early warnings and forecasts.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
b) The proportion of the population that is reachable by early warning system.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
P 9.2 Event management plans There is a disaster management / preparedness / emergency response plan (strategy) outlining city mitigation, preparedness and response to local emergencies.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
P 9.3 Staffing / responder needs The responsible disaster management authority have sufficient staffing capacity to support first responder duties in surge event scenarios.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
P 9.4 Equipment and relief supply needs The equipment and supply needs, as well as the availability of equipment, are clearly defined.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
P 9.5 Food, shelter, staple goods and fuel supply The Host City would be able to continue to feed and shelter its population post-event.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

	Description of areas for potential development	Justification	Time horizon
P 9.6 Interoperability and interagency working There is an emergency operations centre, with participation from all agencies, automating standard operating procedures specifically designed to deal with "most probable" and "most severe" scenarios.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
P 9.7 Drills The practices and drills involve both the public and professionals.	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		
Other **Area / issue**	Action 1		
	Action 2		
	Action 3		

NOTES:

Module 9: Ensure Effective Disaster Response

NOTES:

Further information is available from: www.Uscore2.eu

ISO22392 is being drafted and will contain further information about peer reviews