Step 5: Assess viability and make design recommendations

The viability of FbF in a country will be assessed for each prioritized hazard: institutional commitment, available components for trigger modelling, ideas for meaningful early actions that can be taken after a trigger, and the capacity to implement the actions in the lead time afforded by the trigger model. Based on this, the study team can classify the system for the specific hazard as having high, medium or low viability.

The study can also make recommendations regarding which FbF system design components should be further explored, as well as whether more detailed stakeholder analysis is needed. The study team can also flag potential risks that might render the system ineffective unless addressed, such as a technical service being unwilling to have their forecasts verified for accuracy.

The classification of 'high', 'medium', or 'low' viability for introducing FbF in a given context for each hazard, is less important than the specific recommendations of how the system could operate. It does not need to be a prominent feature of the final report. It should be used to guide the thinking of the study team, rather than to produce a grade or ranking for a country. Use the following indicators to help assess the level of viability.

Ideal viability for a specific hazard

- An impact-based forecast exists for the prioritized hazard, or
- There is a well-established early warning system or extreme event forecast that has been assessed to have high accuracy.
- There is a strong evidence-base for the short-listed early actions, based on rigorous evaluations.
- There is potential to integrate the FbF trigger model or FbF actions into established social protection systems.
- The National Society is a thought leader and able to work closely with technical services, government authorities and other stakeholders to establish the FbF system.
- The prioritized hazard has been prioritized within the National Society's strategic plan.
- There is a high level of buy-in within the technical services (hydro, met) for co-producing an FbF trigger model.
- There is a functional FbF working group in the country.
- There is an established system for collecting data on vulnerability and exposure nationally.

Medium to high viability for a specific hazard

- There are available forecasts for the prioritized hazards which can be skill-assessed and combined with global sources can provide a sufficiently rigorous basis for the hazard forecast.
- There are meaningful actions that could be taken within the lead time of the forecast for the prioritized hazard.
- The prioritized hazard has high negative impacts on the affected populations, meaning there is a humanitarian imperative to act.
- There is buy-in within the National Society and the technical services to establish the system.
- There is commitment to develop an Early Action Protocol.
- There is commitment to evaluating the impact of the FbF system rigorously.

Low viability for a specific hazard

Significant changes necessary prior to the set up of an FbF system:

- There are financial management concerns such that it would be impossible for the National Society to access FbA by the DREF funds.
- There are no forecasts for the prioritized hazard, or no forecasts that have sufficient accuracy at lead times that would allow for meaningful action (e.g. only forecasts with 1-3 hours lead time have sufficient skill).
- The National Society does not have the capacity to implement meaningful actions in the lead time of available forecasts.
- The National Society is uninterested in pursuing the development of an FbF system.