**Trigger Evaluation Workshop Guidance & Agenda**

**(example from Mozambique, 2019)**

**Objective:** Triggers are based on historical impact data, DREF fund requirements for magnitude and return period, and stakeholder acceptance of acting in vain. According to protocol rules, triggers need to be evaluated after each activation. The stakeholder process described below should take place after individual stakeholder interviews (if resources allow) to focus discussion of key themes that emerged from the interviews and an update of the existing trigger, if necessary.

**Format:** The trigger evaluation workshop should be conducted during a small (maximum 15 people) stakeholder meeting involving appropriate technical and decision-making personnel from the following agencies in Mozambique:

- INAM (the national meteorological agency)

- INGC (the national institute for disaster management)

- DNGRH (the national water resources management agency)

- HCT (the humanitarian country team)

- CVM (Mozambique Red Cross)

Other key organizations may be identified in the course of the process or impact evaluations and may be included in this review.

**Key questions to be addressed by this review:**

● Are there any major problems with the trigger that would require it be redefined? (One false alarm is not enough to warrant reevaluation of the trigger. Acting in vain is to be expected on occasion).

○ Did we have enough time to activate?

○ Was there enough damage to justify action?

○ Were any erroneous assumptions underlying the trigger identified?

● Are there any new products or data (impact data, new forecast or hydrological models, longer lead times) in existence that could be used to improve the trigger? This question is more likely to be relevant in the long-term but should be addressed after each activation.

○ Did the activation (or other analyses) reveal any problems with the models?

○ Are the models being used the best approximation of reality available?

● Are there new products that could be created or tested to help improve the trigger and facilitate FbF activation? This question can help to direct future research, development, and partnership efforts.

**Sample Meeting Agenda**

Resources permitting, the discussions in the agenda below should be informed by an analysis of 6-9 Key Informant Interviews (see tool MOZ M&E TE:1).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activity** | **Description/Facilitation** |
| **8:00-9:00** | **Registration** | NA |
| **9:00-9:15** | **Welcome & Introduction to the day - introduce the purpose:**- Are there any major problems with the trigger?- Are there new produces in existence or new data that should be incorporated into the trigger calculation?- Are there new products that need to be developed to address challenges with the trigger? | CVM - Presentation |
| **9:15-9:30** | **Review of protocol basics:**- What were trigger levels?- What were actions?- What were anticipated results/ToCs? | CVM Project Manager - Presentation |
| **9:30-10:00** | **Presentation of results of process and outcome/impact evaluations** | Evaluation Consultant or CVM PMER focal point - Presentation |
| **10:00-10:30** | **Presentation of trigger evaluation interview results** | Evaluation Consultant or CVM PMER focal point - Presentation |
| **10:30-11:00 Coffee Break** |
| **11:00-12:00** | **Discussion of theme 1:**Are there any major problems with the trigger? (Emphasize that one false alarm is not enough to warrant reevaluation of the trigger. Acting in vain is to be expected on occasion).● Did we have enough time to activate?● Was there enough damage to justify action? | Group discussion facilitated by CVM(and/or INGC focal point) This could be facilitated in plenary or discussed in small groups, depending on the number of people in the audience. The key is to determine whether there is agreement on the findings from the interviews or whether there are additional concerns to be raised. |
| **12:00-12:30** | **Discussion of theme 2:**Are there any new products or data (impact data, new forecast or hydrological models, longer lead times) in existence that could be used to improve the trigger? This question is more likely to be relevant in the long-term but should be addressed after each activation.● Did the activation (or other analyses) reveal any problems with the models?● Are the models being used the best approximation of reality available? | Group discussion facilitated by CVM (and/or INAM & DNGRH focal points)**Part 1 Discussion** (15 minutes)**:** Group brainstorm/listing of new products and/orDiscussion of whether there are any new products not captured in the interviews? If appropriate, it might be useful to have someone present on the new products that were mentioned in the interviews to make sure all parties are aware of them.**Part 2 Action Plan** (15 Minutes)**:** If there are new data and models, agree upon a preliminary plan to incorporate those into the trigger. CVM will likely have to take the lead on this, but it would be good to have agreement on which data/models should be the focus of future capacity building. |
| **12:30-13:30 Lunch** |
| **13:30-14:30** | **Discussion of theme 3:**Are there new products that could be created or tested to help improve the trigger and facilitate FbF activation? This question can help to direct future research, development, and partnership efforts. | Group discussion facilitated by CVM(and/or INAM & DNGRH focal points)**Part 1 Discussion** (15 Minutes)**:** Group brainstorm/listing of new products and/ or discussion of whether there are products that did not come out of the interviews that might be useful. **Part 2 Discussion** (15 Minutes)**:** Which products should be prioritized? **Part 3 Discussion** (15 Minutes):Which partners, funding sources might be appropriate to target for support for development? **Part 4 Action Plan** (15 minutes)**:** Who/how can future funding and collaborations be sought? What are the next steps? |
| **14:30-14:45** | **Wrap Up -** Summary of agreements and next steps | CVM - Presentation |

**Key considerations:**

- Acting in vain once, is not in and of itself a reason to revise the trigger. There will always be some risk of acting in vain. That is accepted within the mechanism. In the case of having acted in vain, this should be made clear in the presentations.