LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICE TOOL
Adapting coordination mechanisms to support national transitions

by OCHA, UNDP and DOCO
INTRODUCTION: SETTING THE CONTEXT

Post-conflict and post-natural-disaster contexts constitute some of the most challenging environments in which the United Nations (UN) operates. First, humanitarian crises often occur in countries with limited state capabilities and/or commitment to ensuring their citizens’ collective and personal security, in all of its dimensions. It is this nexus between capacity and will, and the vulnerabilities that it generates that frames the nature, scope and timing of the UN’s presence.

Second, the initiation of recovery and development focused responses, often in parallel with on-going humanitarian interventions, is a very delicate process in which various parts of the UN system that have different organizational cultures and operating principles are called to work together to achieve two distinct and often conflicting objectives, namely: (1) ensuring that the needs and rights of the population are continuously addressed in the face of continuing instability and/or incapacity of the government to fulfill essential sovereign functions, while (2) strengthening the leadership of national authorities over the post-crisis response, including, where possible, in its humanitarian dimension.

Finally, the post-crisis context is often one of great fluidity and uncertainty, with humanitarian, recovery and political responses needed simultaneously, a plethora of actors involved, and the aspiration for a stable and linear path towards development almost always frustrated by setbacks, including recurrences of violence, and other shocks (natural or man-made). Planning and implementing the UN’s support to a country’s post crisis priorities is, under such conditions, a significant challenge.

The reconfiguration of internationally-led coordination mechanisms that focus primarily on life saving needs into nationally led coordination structures geared towards recovery and longer term development objectives brings this challenge into sharp focus. UN actors must balance the need for cost-effective and sustainable ways to support national structures, capacities and systems, with the imperative to remain responsive and retain capacity in the event of recurrence of a crisis. In this process, conditions on the ground must be continuously monitored, capacities must be assessed, roles and responsibilities must be agreed to, and a range of sensitivities needs to be carefully addressed. It is therefore not just a technical exercise. It involves elements of UN leadership, negotiation, and engagement with national actors, requiring a set of specific planning, coordination and communication competencies.

As such, it is a process that can generate significant confusion both within the UN, and between the UN and its partners, which can undermine relationships, affect perceptions and erode the trust that UN has in-country. How the UN, with government and other actors, manages this process can also have important repercussions on the longer-term success of development-focused approaches. In a period where concrete and sustained adherence to the principle of national ownership is under close scrutiny, this tool is designed to help UN staff in the field navigate these challenges as efficiently and effectively as possible.

ABOUT THIS TOOL

This tool has been developed jointly by OCHA and UNDP in collaboration with DOCO to assist staff working in the field in coordinating UN post-conflict and post-disaster responses. The primary audience for this tool are Resident Coordinators(RCs)/Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs) and members of the UN Country Team (UNCT)/Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), as well as practitioners supporting those functions, such as strategic planners in the Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO) and heads of OCHA country offices.
This tool focuses on a specific aspect of post-crisis transition planning, namely the adaptation of humanitarian coordination mechanisms to other, more nationally-led structures which may focus more on recovery and longer term development functions although, in certain contexts, they will also assume coordination responsibilities for on-going, or residual humanitarian needs.

Therefore, for the purpose of this tool, we shall use the term "transition" to describe a context, defined both geographically and temporally, when conditions allow for the development by national and international actors of strategies, programmes, structures designed to support a country’s recovery from crisis and gradually (re) embark on a development path. In most situations, such efforts are undertaken while humanitarian needs persist.

The tool uses the words “transformation” and “adaptation” interchangeably to refer generically to the reconfiguration, within a transition context, of mostly internationally-led structures, systems and functions with a primarily humanitarian focus, into a coordination architecture led by national actors that emphasizes the planning and implementation of recovery and development initiatives. As described in this tool, depending on a number of variables, this adaptation may result in different outcomes, including closing a structure, modifying its membership, or transferring its leadership. It is therefore one component of the broader transition planning efforts that the UN, in conjunction with government, NGOs, and donors undertake.

Through the provision of practical guidance, comparative experience and readily accessible instruments, the tool’s objective is to assist staff in managing this particular dimension of transition planning, which can be summarized by the following three questions:

- Why and when does this adaptation occur?
- What gets "adapted" (structures, functions and services), and how?
- Who does what?

For a broader overview of other aspects of the broader planning required in a transition context, the reader is referred to the UNDG-ECHA Transition Toolkit.

This toolkit, which addresses both post conflict and post natural disaster settings, also builds on and complements the recent work carried out by OCHA to codify best practices in changing OCHAs presence and role in country, which are summarised in the OCHA Transition Toolkit. Users should refer to that toolkit for all issues related to OCHA’s internal and operational planning for transition.

This tool brings together experience and lessons on managing the transition of coordination mechanisms. This material has been compiled through a desk review and analysis of documents relating to transition planning and the phase down of humanitarian architecture and structured interviews with key staff in charge of planning, coordination and programming in countries that have recently undergone or are undergoing a reconfiguration of humanitarian structures. The focus countries chosen for this exercise were Uganda, Cote d’Ivoire, and Nepal. In addition to these case studies, other country examples have been included, where relevant, and a workshop was held in New York in June 2011 to gather views and experiences on transition planning from UN staff with experience from a wide range of transition contexts.

How to use this tool:

- **Section 1** offers a summary of the essential lessons learned that the study has collected from practitioners in the field. It also provides general references on available tools and resources, and suggestions for further reading.
Section 2 looks at the various parameters and questions that must inform, inter alia, the timing, structure, and content of the adaptation process, and how the transformation of coordination structures is related to the content and use of various planning and programmatic frameworks.

Section 3 explores the adaptation of coordination structures, including the HCT, the clusters and sub-national mechanisms.

Section 4 looks at the transfer of coordination functions including information management, resource mobilization, and disaster preparedness/risk reduction, with guidance on various field options for how to transfer them from a mostly internationally led framework to mostly nationally owned arrangements.

Section 5 identifies key roles and responsibilities, including how practical internal UN arrangements can be established and operationalized to best facilitate the adaptation.

We hope you will find this tool useful in improving the response provided by the UN to the increasingly complex challenges in post-crisis contexts.
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**LIST OF ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCPR:</td>
<td>Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BINUB:</td>
<td>Bureau Intégré des Nations Unies au Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP:</td>
<td>Consolidated Appeals Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA:</td>
<td>Common Country Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF:</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAP:</td>
<td>Common Humanitarian Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHF:</td>
<td>Coordinated Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO:</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP:</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO:</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCO:</td>
<td>Development Operations Coordination Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPKO:</td>
<td>Department of Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR:</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC:</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF:</td>
<td>Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT:</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC:</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFIs:</td>
<td>International Financial Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPP:</td>
<td>Integrated Mission Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISDR:</td>
<td>International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISF:</td>
<td>Integrated Strategic Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs:</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDTF:</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO:</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRRC:</td>
<td>Nepal Disaster Risk Reduction Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA:</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC:</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development- Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCNA:</td>
<td>Post-Conflict Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDNA:</td>
<td>Post-Disaster Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP:</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC:</td>
<td>United Nations Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO:</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG:</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSRSG:</td>
<td>Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF:</td>
<td>Transitional Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRM:</td>
<td>Transitional Results Matrices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAC:</td>
<td>United Nations Area Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT:</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF:</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDG:</td>
<td>United Nations Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP:</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION I MAIN LESSONS

Through the compilation of practices in country, the following main messages were identified as a good basis for planning and managing the adaptation of humanitarian coordination arrangements (structures, tools, and services):

1. It is as much a political exercise as a technical one: Transitions to recovery rarely follow a linear or predictable path, with conditions on the ground being determined by political and security considerations that may at times be beyond the UN’s control. The adaptation of coordination structures and systems, while seemingly technical in nature, may often expose significant political fault lines and competing interests, including on issues of national ownership and legitimacy, amongst national actors, between host countries and the international community, and, at times, within the international community itself. Such a challenging process requires careful political analysis, operational and programmatic flexibility and responsiveness to emerging needs.

2. Keep the focus on the essential: The issues are complex, but planning needs to be kept simple and concrete. The adaptation to new coordination structures must be planned and implemented by facilitating discussions around four central questions: Why and when would the adaptation of coordination structures take place? Which structures, and related systems and functions should be transformed, modified, or discontinued? How are roles and responsibilities assigned? Are additional human and financial resources required? Throughout the process, difficulties can be overcome by refocusing people’s efforts and discussions on these core issues.

3. Invest in communication: The decision to phase down the humanitarian presence in a country and transform coordination structures has profound implications for UN agencies, as well as local partners, government and beneficiaries of humanitarian programmes. It is a process fraught with uncertainties and misunderstandings, and the potential for confusion, and frustration, is high. Therefore, it is important that there be an open and active communication with all stakeholders (government, UN agencies, NGOs, HQ, donors) from the onset of a crisis about the implications of and conditions for initiating a transfer of coordination arrangements. Such active communication must be maintained throughout. Clear information on timelines, processes, roles, etc. will need to be shared, and repeated, frequently.

4. Initiate the planning for adapting coordination structures during the humanitarian phase: While it can be difficult to dedicate time and resources to the adaptation of coordination mechanisms in the midst of an emergency, planning for the exit of humanitarian actors should start at the outset of a crisis and should be a part of the UN’s emergency response strategy. Many development partners and national authorities need time to prepare for taking on responsibilities previously assumed by humanitarian capacities and ensure that adequate resources are in place. Transition thinking and planning should therefore start before it is decided that there would be a phasing down or exit of humanitarian capacities. As early as possible and appropriate, the HCT and UNCT should work to support the host government’s lead transition role by building capacity, involving national/sub-national actors in the international coordination mechanisms, including the clusters, and by engaging in national transition planning processes. This includes agreeing on common indicators and benchmarks for initiating planning and developing common strategies for the adaptation of coordination architecture, including the clusters, in support of national planning processes and assessing the government’s structures that are most likely, with additional support and capacity enhancements, to take over leadership from international structures, and planning the timing and scope of the adaptation accordingly.

5. Maintain attention on – and capacity for residual humanitarian coordination needs: Even if the transformation of coordination structures and functions usually marks an increased emphasis on recovery and development approaches, attention must be paid to ensure that there is adequate staff and resources to continue to assist the government and partners to respond to residual humanitarian needs, as well as preparedness concerns. In particular, on contexts experiencing a phasing out of humanitarian actors, there should be sufficient capacity in the RCO to integrate humanitarian coordination needs in longer term recovery planning, and to work with stakeholders to include humanitarian considerations in the UNDAF and other planning processes as necessary. Conversely they must ensure that humanitarian transition takes into account development, security and political process and issues. Throughout the process, it is essential to
continue to be guided by international humanitarian and human rights law, humanitarian principles and the principles of partnership of humanitarian action.

6. **Manage expectations**: Humanitarian operations often require and have funding for large and sophisticated coordination mechanisms. Therefore a shift towards a sustainable and nationally led development coordination structure will often require a downscaling of the ambition and complexity of those coordination mechanisms. The RC/HC must seek to manage the expectations of all partners and stakeholders, including the host government and beneficiaries, and ensure that all stakeholders understand the purpose and constraints of the exercise. In particular, the RC/HC, jointly supported by OCHA and the RCO can play a decisive role in coordinating planning efforts and in alerting and mobilizing donors to emerging needs and threats, as well as advocating with government.

---

**Where can I learn more about this?**

- UNDG-ECHA Toolkit on Transition
- OCHA’s transition toolkit
- RC Job Description
- UNDG Guidance Note on RC-UNCT Relations
- UNCT functions and composition
- IASC Guidance for Humanitarian Country Teams
SECTION II  PLANNING THE PROCESS

2.1 Organizational context

The planning process for the adaptation of coordination structures is best approached in the form of foundational questions, based on a range of parameters (timing, scope, etc.). While most of these parameters are highly context specific, a common point of departure lies in the institutional and organizational architecture from which such an adaptation takes place. Depending on the UN presence in country, and the stage of the transition, the coordination architecture of the UN system will be centred on one or more of the following structures and actors, many of which are also found in traditional development settings while others are more specific and restricted to transition contexts:

At the strategic decision-making level:

- **Resident/ Humanitarian Coordinator:** In most crisis contexts, the RC is also nominated Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), and as such, is responsible for coordinating humanitarian activities at country level. In some limited instances, the RC and HC function are kept separate, notably when responses to a humanitarian crisis are undertaken in extremely difficult political circumstances and where such a split is deemed essential to preserve humanitarian imperatives. Where principles of integration apply and a political or peacekeeping mission is in place, the RC/HC may also be appointed as deputy to the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG).

- **The UN Country Team (UNCT)** constitutes the main coordinating body for the development activities of the UN system at country level. The UNCT is chaired by the RC and is composed of the heads of UN agencies, funds and programmes in country. The UNCT is active before the crisis, during and after the transition, and is often active alongside other coordination mechanisms, in the case of protracted or localised crises.

- The coordination of humanitarian operations at country level is the responsibility of the **Humanitarian Country Team (HCT).** The HCT is chaired by the HC and is composed of organisations that undertake humanitarian action in-country. As such, it is not restricted to UN agencies (for more detail, see IASC Guidance for Humanitarian Country Teams).

- In situations where there is a peacekeeping or political mission with a DSRSG/RC/HC, there will usually be specific mechanisms set up to coordinate the interventions of the mission with those of the UNCT. These should be headed integrated decision making mechanism, often called Senior Planning Team, which is usually chaired by the SRSG and which may be co-chaired by the DSRSG/RC/HC (for more detail, see Integrated Mission Planning Process Guidelines).

At the programmatic level:

- In most countries theme groups are set up to coordinate UN interventions in specific sectors, or around common objectives defined, for instance, in the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). More commonly, development focused sector coordination will be carried out in government-led sector working groups composed of relevant ministries and donors.

- The humanitarian coordination structure is often organised around sector-specific cluster and/or sub-clusters, which may or may not include government counterparts depending on national capacity and the nature of the issues being discussed. The number and nature of the clusters is context specific. This model is often replicated at a subnational level in areas of intense humanitarian activity.

- In UN mission contexts, coordination of joint or complementary mission/UNCT activities are usually carried out by a joint structure, of varying level of formality, and composed of strategic planners from the mission and from the RC office, and usually includes planners from OCHA.

---

1 Additional coordination mechanisms may be established, as necessary, to coordinate specific functions related to transition. In Uganda, for instance, separate coordination mechanisms were set up under the UNCT to coordinate funding from the Peacebuilding Fund and activities related to peacebuilding.
At the level of coordination support:

- The Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO) is responsible for supporting the RC in his/her functions, in particular, as concerns the chairing of the UNCT and various donors coordination groups.
- OCHA has primary responsibility for supporting the humanitarian coordination mechanisms and supporting the HC to fulfil his/her responsibilities in leading the coordination of humanitarian efforts in country.

In most cases, various coordination arrangements are in place and active at the same time, reflecting the complexity of the situation on the ground (which will combine government led development initiatives with ongoing humanitarian efforts mostly coordinated by the international community).

In addition, country-level structures receive policy guidance and technical support from headquarters-based coordination mechanisms, including, inter alia:

- The Integrated Task Forces (ITF) and Integrated Mission Task Forces (IMTF) for countries where a peacekeeping or political mission is temporarily deployed alongside UN agencies.
- The UNDG-ECHA Working Group on Transition, which brings together members UNDG and ECHA to initiate, develop, and review policies and tools related to the UN system’s joint humanitarian and recovery responses in transition contexts.

These coordination mechanisms complement the bilateral support that various UN actors on the ground receive from headquarters counterparts.

2.2 Defining a process for the adaptation of coordination structures

The shift from humanitarian to development coordination mechanisms should be part of the mind-set of humanitarian actors from the onset of the crisis. While the timing, content and pace of the process will vary from one context to the other, the adaptation of coordination mechanisms should always be planned jointly with national actors, and with government in particular playing a lead role in the decision-making structures, and start well before the decision to phase out, in order to ensure that the humanitarian coordination mechanisms and functions performed by humanitarian actors can be smoothly phased out or handed over in an orderly manner to national authorities or development partners. In one example, the RC/HC began setting provisional timelines for this transformation with the government and other partners immediately after the launch of the initial Flash Appeal.

The planning of such a process is based on a number of key foundational questions. OCHA and the RCO can support the RC/HC in leading and coordinating discussions within the UN, and with partners of the following issues in particular:

- **Definition: What does the adaptation mean in your context?** Initial efforts to define what the adaptation is, to frame the relevant issues in the local context and to clarify the different potential elements of the adaptation can help mitigate future controversy and misunderstandings. A mapping of existing coordination mechanisms at the national and sub-national level, as well as a functional review of core functions performed by humanitarian actors in-country provides a solid base to sustain those conversations. This information should also include current recovery/development structures and the role, participation and capacities of national actors in these various structures to ensure that everyone has the same, complete understanding of the coordination architecture on which adaptation options can be explored, discussed, agreed to etc. If possible, conducting this mapping effort as a technical and neutral joint fact finding exercise with government and other actors beyond OCHA and the RCO can add legitimacy and support to the process.

- **Timing: What conditions on the ground need to be met in order to adapt all or several humanitarian led arrangements into a recovery/government-led framework?** The conditions can include nature and scale of on-going lifesaving needs, government legitimacy, the level of armed violence and the status of
the peace agreement. This question may yield different answers depending on the structure and/or function being considered.

- **Triggers:** What benchmarks can be agreed upon to assess whether those conditions are realized? Those benchmarks need to be easily measured, with clear targets (change in conditions on the ground, specific milestone realized, etc.). Note however that many will inevitably be controversial. It is important to include in the discussion an agreement on measurement method and the entity responsible for such measurements.

- **Process:** What is the most appropriate arrangement to manage the adaptation process, including for building consensus on difficult issues, such as when and if the national government takes over certain humanitarian functions? In some cases, existing structures (HCT, UNCT, etc.) may need to be strengthened, or new ad hoc mechanisms may need to be established. A key factor in the decision made is the extent to which the arrangement allows for meaningful participation by government representatives and local and international NGOs. Leadership, political legitimacy, and more mundane considerations such as location and working procedures of the mechanism (how often it meets) should be considered.

The answers to this question should inform the content, pace, and structure of the process, which will in most cases involve the following steps:

- **Consultation:** It is crucial that a consultation process be held with all relevant members of the HCT and the UNCT, the host government, donors and other relevant partners to help answer the planning questions collectively and effectively, including which services will need to be maintained, and in what form, and what services are no longer required and can be discontinued.

- **Prioritisation:** The aim of the consultation should be to identify which functions are (a) essential and (b) can be accommodated within development programmes, within existing budgets and capacities. Keep in mind as well that it will not necessarily be feasible or even desirable to transfer all or most humanitarian functions to national or international partners after the end of the emergency phase. Nor will it be feasible or possible to keep all functions with the UN or other international actors.

- **Formalisation:** The conclusions of this consultation process can be formalised in a joint inter-agency plan describing which functions and coordination mechanisms will be transformed and transferred to whom, when and with what support and what actions are needed thereof (timelines, benchmarks, etc.). Based on this common plan, each relevant participant (government, UN, donor, NGO) can then detail its own functions and responsibilities in the process using its own internal planning tools.

- **Handover:** In most cases, the aim should be to hand over functions to national counterparts, if need be with support from international partners. In exceptional cases, essential functions may be handed over to other international partners if a mandate exists and it is deemed that a handover to national authorities would incapacitate the perpetuation of the said function (e.g., monitoring of human rights abuses).

- **Communication:** To ensure that there is a clear and consistent communication on the adaptation process, a joint communication plan can be developed, explaining the why, how, what and when of the transition process. Given the nature of this process, the plan will most likely be changed frequently, and therefore be disseminated regularly. It is particularly important that OCHA’s communication on the adaptation process be closely coordinated with the public information offices of the RC/HC, members of the HCT and the UN mission (where one exists). The expectations, concerns and misgivings of all actors involved need to be managed and addressed.

---

**Box 1: Securing commitment!**

In order to ensure adherence to the agreed plan, it is a good idea to formalize the plan with a written agreement between HCT/UNCT members. Other suggestions for increasing accountability include: drawing up a checklist so that the RC/HC can monitor transition progress per sector with country team members; seeking formal, high-level endorsement at headquarters to monitor progress; involving the regional directors to endorse the plan and hold country representatives accountable for its implementation.
Tips for planning the adaptation of coordination mechanisms

- Engage the government from the outset through high-level bilateral discussions, followed by technical consultations throughout the transition process.
- Develop a communication plan (preferably joint with government and other concerned actors) to explain the why’s and how’s of the adaptation and to manage expectation.
- Engage relevant UN agencies and government in the identification of functions that need to be transferred or maintained.
- Only preserve humanitarian coordination functions that are essential and cost effective.
- Conclude the consultation process with a joint inter-agency plan describing which functions and coordination mechanisms will be transferred to whom.

Where can I learn more about this?

IASC guidelines on working with national authorities

UNDG and OCHA website (www.undg.org and www.unocha.org)
2.3 Links to national and international planning frameworks

The adaptation of coordination mechanisms, services and functions should be carried out in a way that supports the broader strategic and programmatic objectives of national authorities and the UN system. As such, there should be clear links between the coordination mechanisms and the national and UN strategic and programmatic frameworks that they support.

National and UN frameworks

Before analysing these links and how they inform the way the UN should manage its involvement in the broader transition, it is essential to establish a clear distinction between national programmatic frameworks and UN programmatic frameworks.

Led by national authorities with the support of international actors when requested, national frameworks include a range of potential instruments such as Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS - generated through the PRS process), Compacts, and Transitional Results Frameworks (TRF, generated through a post conflict/disaster needs assessment). The name, time horizon, geographical focus (national or sub-national) and content (long term development, or transitional) may vary but they represent the vision and priorities of national actors for a transition out of crisis.

UN programmatic frameworks articulate the UN’s response to such national priorities. While the Consolidated Appeals Process provides the agreed strategic, programmatic and fundraising coordination framework for humanitarian interventions, the UN’s contribution to national recovery and development priorities may be captured in various frameworks, depending on the context and the UN configuration in country. In most instances, the UN’s transitional objectives, geared towards the country’s recovery and development priorities, can be captured in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), developed jointly with the national government, and based on sufficiently flexible guidelines to accommodate different types of planning parameters (shorter timeframe, etc.). However, in some instances, the UN may decide to prepare a specific UN recovery, or transition plan before a full-blown UNDAF. This may be done for resource mobilisation purposes or in cases where it has not been possible or practical to adequately incorporate transitional issues into existing planning frameworks due to conflicting planning cycles or lack of national capacity. In Uganda, for instance, the UN developed a UN Peace Building and Recovery Assistance Plan (UNPRAP) in support of the Government Peace Recovery and Develop Plan (PRDP), which covered the period 2009-2011. This transition plan was later incorporated into the UNDAF for 2010-2014. In Cote d'Ivoire, on the basis of extensive consultations with national authorities, the country’s humanitarian needs and responses were recently incorporated in the National Development Plan, with national coordination structures integrating humanitarian issues as part of their coordination responsibilities. Simultaneously, to ensure full alignment, the UNDAF incorporated the UN’s humanitarian response.

In countries that have a political or peacekeeping mission, transitional issues may be incorporated into the Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF), which focuses more specifically on issues related to peace consolidation. Even when it is not possible to have a single planning framework, at a minimum, coherence between the different plans used by the UN system and its partners should be ensured.

Experience indicates that failure to establish and articulate such a distinction between national and UN plans generates confusion over process, roles, responsibilities and accountability. Different instruments serve different purpose, and the roles of various actors vary significantly for each one of them.

Since coordination mechanisms and functions offer the platform for developing, implementing and monitoring planning frameworks, the shift from one set of arrangements to another must be closely tied to the broader strategic and programmatic transition. The UN needs to provide clarity on the following three questions in particular:

- What are the relevant programmatic frameworks guiding humanitarian, recovery and development interventions?
- Which coordination structure has the responsibility for developing and/or monitoring the implementation of each programmatic framework?
What implications would the transition of existing humanitarian coordination structures, services and functions have on the design, development and monitoring of national and UN programmatic frameworks?

Where can I learn more about this?
UN Transitional Strategy Guidance Note
PCNA Toolkit
Nepal’s UNDAF 2008-2010
UN Peace Building and Recovery Assistance Plan for Uganda
UNDG Transitional Strategies webpage
New CCA/UNDAF guidelines
Conflict Analysis Framework
Integrated Missions Planning Process Guidelines
SECTION III ADAPTATION OF COORDINATION STRUCTURES

While the principle of sovereignty (UN Resolution 46/182) affirms the primacy of national government responsibility for the well-being of its people in all situations, a range of factors account for the presence of often large international humanitarian operations, including limited national capacity and/or government involvement as a party to the conflict. However, when conditions permit, increasing national capacity and/or the gradual shift away from essential life-saving interventions to the recovery and development agenda, over-time should catalyze a shift away from internationally driven humanitarian coordination processes toward nationally driven processes. Given the capacity and resource constraints that exist in most countries where humanitarian partners operate, this will often mean downsizing the complexity and ambition of coordination mechanisms so as to facilitate the sustainable transfer to national partners. This section contains a review of issues to keep in mind, as well as examples of transformation models for the key components of the humanitarian coordination architecture.

3.1 Adaptation of the HCT

The HCT plays a crucial function in coordinating the humanitarian relief effort during the emergency phase. It provides the main decision-making forum for humanitarian interventions and for engagement with national authorities. When the aforementioned parameters for a transition to recovery and development approaches are in place, a decision will be required as to whether and how the HCT should be maintained.

Depending on the type of operations and the nature of the broader transition, the following options may be considered to support a transformation of the HCT:

- **Merged HCT-UNCT:** If the volume of humanitarian issues being discussed is insufficient to warrant a separate coordination body, residual humanitarian issues may be discussed as part of the UNCT meetings. One option may be to have thematic UNCT meetings, which deal with different issues at each meeting, in which case it might ask different members to attend according to the subject and it might meet less frequently than before. If this option is chosen, consideration will need to be given to ensuring continued coordination with non-UN actors, as the UNCT does not include NGOs and CSOs.

- **Streamlined HCT:** In some instances, it may be appropriate to retain an HCT to focus on specific residual humanitarian issues or disaster preparedness and risk reduction. If the HCT is maintained, the HC/RC and UN members of both groups are responsible for ensuring complementarity with other coordination mechanisms, such as the UNCT. This option was chosen in Uganda, where the HCT was maintained but reduced the frequency of meetings and shifted to focus principally on the coordination of disaster preparedness and to support the Office of the Prime Minister National Platform on preparedness.

- **National leadership of coordination structures:** The need to maintain specific humanitarian coordination platforms to address outstanding humanitarian concerns does not in itself imply continued international leadership over such mechanisms. With continued participation by the UN and other international partners, convening and coordination responsibilities can be transferred to either government, or national NGOs as was the case in Libya, depending willingness and capacity to assume leadership, and with due regard for adherence to humanitarian principles.

**Box 3: Case Study - Dissolution of the HCT in Cote d’Ivoire**

Through efforts of the RC/HC, the RCO and OCHA in CD’I there was close consultation with NGOs who were regularly involved in the policy dialogue. Their participation in the UNCT retreat was instrumental in ensuring an inclusive process. The RC/HC also led a deliberate discussion with the HCT about its future role in CD’I and a clear strategy developed for its evolution to adapt to the changing environment. It was agreed that the HCT would be folded into the Comité de Coordination Elargi (CCE) to cover recovery and development planning. Efforts were made to ensure that the consultation and link with NGOs was retained as the situation shifted more towards recovery programming.
Note that depending on the situation on the ground, these options may be combined. For example, the scale and depth of outstanding needs on the ground may require an HCT to be maintained while its leadership is transferred to national partners. Each option will lead to adjustments in the terms of reference of the structures being modified, merged or created.

The three most important factors driving the choice of options are:

1. **Needs**: Does the situation on the ground warrant separate humanitarian and recovery/development structures?
2. **Legitimacy**: Which entity is best placed to convene all relevant stakeholders and fulfil impartial and needs driven coordination functions?
3. **Capacity**: Which entity has the resources to lead coordination structures and take on various coordination functions?

While the issue of legitimacy requires careful, politically based analysis and consultations, the capacity of potential national actors to take over the leadership of an HCT like forum can be assessed, planned for and supported well in advance. How does one define coordination capacity? UNDG has developed standardized tools for assessing the capacity of national counterparts and experience from practitioners indicates that the following elements apply: access to information and access to decision makers, facilitation and organizational skills, administrative resources, geographical access (for other partners) and dedicated time. In preparation, the UN may want to lead and implement a capacity strengthening initiative focusing on several of those elements. It is important however not to over-state what is required to lead such coordination mechanisms as a tactic to delay or prevent the transfer of coordination structures and leadership when appropriate.

In several cases, the UN and other partners can support the development of national coordination capacity, at both national and local level. In Uganda when the security situation allowed the Government to resume most coordination functions, the transfer of leadership was confronted with a significant capacity gap that needed to be filled. International assistance to fill this gap has therefore taken the very concrete forms of:

- DFID funding advisors to the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM)
- UN provision of ‘embedded’ staff to the OPM’s sub-regional coordination units (often former OCHA staff) – to be taken over on Government contracts.
- UN support to the OPM’s implementation of the Government’s reconstruction plan for northern Uganda (PRDP) and sub-regional field coordination (Acholi and Karamoja)

In all cases, it is crucial that the transition process be supported by an inclusive consultation process, which reaches all constituents who have a stake in the HCT to ensure that residual humanitarian efforts and development programming are properly synchronised. If need be, purpose made events, such as a workshop or focus group consultations, can be organized to bring different development and humanitarian actors together in a systematic and formal manner. Formal engagement with NGOs and political dialogue is required to achieve an inclusive process as well as maintenance of formal dialogue with NGOs on recovery programming after the dissolution of the HCT.

**Tips for phasing out the HCT**

- Build in the criteria for dissolving or transforming the HCT into the overall adaptation plan from the start, based on clear and mutually agreed benchmarks, so as to facilitate the decision-making process.
- Ensure consultation of all relevant stakeholders, including through the organisation of workshops or focus group consultations (see Box 3).
- Anticipate the creation of mechanisms to ensure the continued engagement and consultation of NGOs and CSOs after the dissolution of the HCT.
Review the coordination architecture and revise its terms of reference where appropriate.

Where can I learn more about this?
IASC Guidance for Humanitarian Country Teams
Guidance Note on Resident Coordinator and UN Country Team Working Relations

2.1 Sub-national coordination structures

One of the strengths of the humanitarian coordination system is its presence at the subnational level, including in areas where the sovereign authorities may have limited reach or capacity. This is also the reason why this is one of the features of the humanitarian coordination system that may be most difficult to maintain after the departure of the main international humanitarian actors.

Box 4: Case study of sub-national transition - Uganda

In Uganda, in February 2010, the UNCT agreed to institute an “Integrated Coordination” system at the field level. The aim of the system was to enhance effective and efficient UN coordination in Northern Uganda, and to support the transformation from humanitarian to recovery programming. The approach sought to provide decentralised leadership of recovery coordination in the three most affected regions of the country while recognising the low availability of funding for recovery coordination. It also sought to vest agency leadership in field coordination in recognition that the RC Office may not be able to achieve the deployment a senior level staff in the three regions.

Under this model, three agencies agree to take on coordination roles in support of the RCO by double-hatting their senior-most staff in each region as the UN Area Coordinator. UNDP agreed to undertake coordination responsibilities for the integrated system in Acholi, UNICEF in Karamoja and UNHCR in West Nile and provided a UN Area Coordinator (UNAC) for the respective sub-regions (this has since been completed with UNAC for South Western Uganda). The UNACs identified are, on behalf of the RC/HC responsible for coordinating recovery and development efforts in their respective sub-region of operation. They have established and run UN “Area Teams” for coordination and act as liaison persons between the UNCT and UN agencies in the sub-region, and have supported the role out of joint projects (including funded under the UN peacebuilding fund) in their regions.

The system has facilitated regular and structured coordination among UN agencies, the development of and communication on policy responses from the field level for the consideration of the UNCT at the national level, and the enhancement of joint programming. The system has also allowed the UN to provide significant support to the government’s nascent post-humanitarian coordination structures and efforts to monitor the implementation of key national policy frameworks. In one region where donors had deployed field presence, the UNAC also established and chaired a ‘local development partner’ forum to engage these large players. This forum was recently handed over to Government to continue running.

Operationally, each UNAC has been supported by a Field Coordination Officer, a driver and a car provided by the RCO. These positions and equipment were made possible by project funding from BCPR. Ultimately however, the system has worked because of the contributions made by the agencies providing the UNACs in terms of resources in-kind (office space, logistics, human resources). The UNACs have also overseen the phase out of the OCHA field presence in the North, and a residual humanitarian staff has been folded into the UNAC structure (although still funded by OCHA) focusing mainly on contingency planning, disaster preparedness etc.
The integrated coordination system provided a common coordination framework for UN humanitarian, recovery and development, and coordination support to the district local authorities, supported the districts in particular to foster coherence amongst international aid efforts, and capacity building of the district sector leads in coordination responsibility. District sector meetings were initially chaired by the UN cluster leads, but these functions were handed over to district officials as their capacities increased. In some areas for example in Acholi land, UNACs managed to foster linkages with multilateral institutions in particular the World Bank (co-located with the UNAC/RCO), and bring the UN and donors together. UNACs also contributed to bridging the gap in information sharing between the central and district levels.

The success of the integrated coordination system was mainly due to support of all relevant stakeholders (government, UN agencies, donors and NGOs) for strong UN engagement at the sub-regional level and the active involvement and leadership of the RC/HC and the UNCT. The commitment and capacity of humanitarian, recovery and development coordination by designated agencies who were able to recruit senior staff to fulfil the functions of UN Area Coordinators also greatly contributed to its success as well as pooling of resources by designated agencies, RCO and OCHA and integration of OCHA staff with UNACs also contributed to its success.

The following options may be considered for adapting coordination subnational level structures:

- **National handover:** In many cases, the situation on the ground may not justify maintaining costly and complex coordination structures at the subnational level, as many conventional development actors try to work through national government structures where possible. In such cases, efforts should be made to phase out or transfer humanitarian coordination structures at the subnational levels and/or integrate them into nationally led structures.

Where the size and complexity of transitional activities, including the persistence of humanitarian operations albeit at reduced intensity, justifies the maintenance of coordination structures at the subnational level, and where national authorities are either unwilling or unable to take over, there are different models to draw upon. In integrated mission contexts, it may be possible to draw on mission presence and staff to maintain a coordination capacity at the subnational level, provided that this as contributing to the core strategic objectives of the mission, as defined in an ISF or in the mission’s mandate.

- **Agency-led transformation:** One option is for the UN to nominate one UN agency to act as a UN Area Coordinator (or similar name) to coordinate the programmatic transitions of UN activities at the subnational level, with NGO participation. See Box 4 for a detailed description of this model, as applied in Uganda.

- **Joint UN sub-Offices:** A more ambitious model of subnational coordination was chosen in Nepal, where the RCO established four sub-offices. Dedicated heads of sub-offices were recruited using a pooled fund of resources to head the Joint UN Offices, without being attached to any particular agency. Similar models have been tried in both Sudan and the DRC with initial support from the respective peacekeeping missions, but have proven difficult to sustain in extended transitions (e.g. protracted crises) due to their high financial cost. The establishment of Joint UN Offices can provide a platform for other international partners to maintain a presence at the subnational level, as was the case in Uganda, where World Bank staff was embedded in the joint UN office.

In many cases, national needs and capacities will vary from province to province depending on the nature of the conflict or humanitarian emergency. Moreover, humanitarian coordination mechanisms often divide thematically into sub-groups quite early on in the relief phase. Some groups may naturally shift their focus towards recovery and development concerns fairly rapidly, while others take longer. It is therefore important to allow for flexibility for coordination structures to change at different speeds (both geographically and thematically) to adapt to local requirements and sector specific challenges, and local capacities. In collaboration with partners the UN may lead a provincial level assessment to determine where they need to maintain an international presence during transition and where national authorities can take over (see Cote d’Ivoire example in table below). A similar model was adopted in Haiti, which used a decentralised approach to determine the need to maintain a coordination capacity at the subnational level, depending on the specific context and challenges of each region. The potential diversity of needs and requirements at the subnational level puts in sharp focus the importance of managing stakeholder expectations and communicating clearly about options and criteria for decision-making.
Table 1: Examples of subnational coordination structures during the transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **UN Joint Coordination Offices at sub national level (RC/HCO sub-offices or joint Mission-RCO offices)** | • Low government capacity  
• Considerable humanitarian needs or risks.  
• Expected high needs for recovery/development coordination to continue.  
• Many UN entities present. | RC/HC field offices providing coordination support to both humanitarian and development activities – including joint needs assessments, contingency planning, and local disaster preparedness, crisis management, analysis and reporting on humanitarian as well as development issues.  
In mission settings, joint Mission-RC/HC field coordination offices perform similar functions, in addition also political monitoring, mediation and state support functions (e.g. civil affairs). | **NEPAL** - In an environment such as Nepal, where many natural and man-made factors put recovery and development approaches at risk during a complex political transition, the UN and its partners foresaw a clear need to retain coordination capacity at the sub-national level beyond the acute humanitarian phase. The RC/HC office therefore developed a plan for an expanded field presence that included four sub-offices - two former OCHA offices and two new field offices – which would continue to provide a mixture of humanitarian and development coordination support and ensure an immediate response capacity in the event of a natural disaster.  
**SUDAN** – In Sudan, the UNCT was able to draw on mission staff and resources to maintain a coordination capacity at the subnational level during the transition. The integrated coordination presence therefore included mission and agency staff. |
| **Agency led coordination system at the sub-national level under the RC/HC (UN Area Coordinators)** | • Medium to low government capacity  
• Medium to high coordination needs or risks. | Establishment of a coordination system at the field level under the leadership of a UN Area Coordinator (or similar), an agency representative with double reporting lines to the RC/HC and its own organisation. This is a cost-effective UN presence (cost-shared by the agencies involved) but with limited capacity. If funds are available, or if agencies agree to pool resources, a dedicated UN coordination capacity can be established. | **UGANDA** - The model with one UN agency facilitating coordination at the sub-national level provided among other things a common coordination framework for UN humanitarian, recovery and development, and coordination support to the district local authorities. There was also agreement for OCHA to support the UN Area Coordinators in coordinating preparedness and Disaster Risk Reduction, humanitarian action and contingency planning.  
**DRC** – UN agencies pooled resources to fund UN Area Coordinators recruited by the RC Office, and reporting directly to the RC/HC, rather than to a specific agency. In some provinces, the Area Coordinators were able to draw on remaining mission presence during the transition phase to facilitate transport, as well as access to common services and political/security reporting. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple approaches tailored to regional context.</th>
<th>Different approaches developed to suit the context in the specific region - including joint UN Offices with cost sharing and agency lead, either UN or NGO taking on coordination functions.</th>
<th>COTE D’IVOIRE - In Cote d’Ivoire, all OCHA sub-offices undertook detailed consultations with local partners to determine a transition plan for each sub-office. In Khorgo, a joint Head of Office (cost shared by OCHA and UNDP) was established. In Bouake, OCHA was co-located with UNICEF, before phasing out. In Man, OCHA handed over coordination responsibility to UNICEF, and in Zou, IRC agreed to serve as a focal point for humanitarian issues. In Guilo, OCHA was co-located in a joint UN office.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Tips for adapting sub-national coordination structures**

- Work closely with national authorities at the national and subnational level to ensure national leadership and engagement of subnational coordination efforts during the transition phase.
- Identify capacity building needs and incorporate these into programme budgets and local and global appeals².
- Use existing capacity in place, wherever possible, and think creatively about how to support local and national capacity, however limited it might be to start with (e.g. by embedding their own staff in government departments).

**Where can I learn more about this?**

UNDG Policy on Common Premises
UNDG Guidance Note on Common Services and Harmonized Business Practices
Establishing joint UN offices and Area Coordinators in DRC
UNDP Capacity assessment practice note

---

² Where humanitarian actors feel that such activities cannot be built into existing programmes without undermining humanitarian objectives or principles, it is important that such constraints be identified during the transition planning process to allow for appropriate alternative arrangements to be found and/or resources to be mobilised for complementary capacity building activities.
3.3 Cluster adaptation and deactivation

The humanitarian cluster system is central to the international humanitarian community’s coordination architecture in emergency relief settings. While the cluster system should where possible involve national partners from the outset of an emergency, in practice clusters are often managed and led primarily by international partners. This is a result of the capacity constraints of the national government and sometimes a consequence of issues related to neutrality and impartiality – particularly where the government is a party to the conflict.

At the same time, the clusters should never be considered permanent and should be subject to regular review, to ensure that they respond to a real need, that they represent the optimal way of responding to a need, and that they do not unnecessarily crowd out national coordination structures and capacities.

As such, the humanitarian community recognizes that a strategy for de-activation or adaptation to national structures should be developed within each cluster early in its inception, with benchmarks to guide the analysis of de-activation for that sector of work. Current discussions within the IASC are focusing on standardizing the process for de-activation or adaptation of clusters. Elements of decision-making may include a regular review by the HC and HCT of national coordination capacity, and country team assessment of clusters on an annual basis to ensure “they remain active only when they add value”. This review may be complemented by an annual country review of clusters by IASC Emergency/Operational Directors.

Models for adaptation of clusters

Depending on the specific context, remaining humanitarian needs, and existing national capacities, various models can be envisaged to enable a seamless and sustainable shift from internationally led clusters to a coordination system led by national actors:

- **Merging clusters into existing national coordination structures:** In cases where national coordination structures have continued to operate alongside humanitarian clusters (e.g. in the case of protracted or localized crises), the IASC Operational Guidance for Cluster Lead Agencies outlines that clusters should merge with sector working groups at the national level and technical department meetings at the district level. The decision to adapt a cluster would be made through an agreement by the majority of cluster membership to modify the cluster and presentation of the cluster agreement to the HCT for discussion and a recommendation made to the HC, who would seek IASC endorsement of the decision. Cluster leads would be retained for some time to foster coherence among the international efforts during transition, act as liaison between government leadership and international efforts within sectors, as well as mentoring sector leads in coordination responsibility. Under this arrangement and as part of capacity building efforts, clusters should arrange for co-chairing with relevant government counterparts where government officials formally chair cluster meetings, while cluster lead organizations organize meetings and provide secretariat functions.

- **Modifying clusters into sector working groups:** Where national coordination structures have been suspended for the duration of the crisis, the clusters themselves can provide the basis for the establishment of a national coordination structure, by gradually shifting their focus towards more recovery and development oriented activities, while strengthening the leadership of national partners in the coordination of the cluster. The first step in such a process would be to align the clusters with national structures (e.g. PRSP pillars or ministries), and ensuring that each cluster has a national lead or co-lead. As with the transformation of the HCT, an assessment should be made of capacity building needs required to enable national leads/ co-leads to fulfil their coordination functions.

- **Adapting the cluster system to focus on residual needs:** In cases where there is a significant risk of relapse into conflict, humanitarian actors may choose to maintain parallel coordination structures for a longer period. In this case clusters may loosely retain their form but choose to meet less frequently, and focus on disaster preparedness and national capacity building.
As in all cases where the adaptation involves a downscaling and/or modification of functions carried out by humanitarian partners, it will be crucial to have a thorough consultation process with all stakeholders and a clear communication strategy to ensure that the aims and limitations of the transition process are well understood by all cluster members. Cluster coordinators and cluster members have a role to play in capacity building and supporting national/local actors in the transition process of coordination functions. It may be useful to formalize such decisions in an agreed framework, indicating the most relevant parameters that inform the choice of options, timing and milestones, and roles and responsibilities. As indicated previously, not all cluster transitions need to be similar. The pace and content of the transformation will in fact vary from one cluster to the other, depending primarily on the needs on the ground and national capacity and willingness to take over responsibilities. Furthermore, given the capacity and resource constraints that exist in most countries where humanitarian operations are deployed, the transfer of responsibilities to national authorities may necessitate simplifying the coordination system to allow for a sustainable national leadership. This may be achieved by reducing the number of coordination groups and frequency of meetings.
### Table 2: Examples of cluster phase-out strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Merging clusters into existing national coordination structures | ● Residual humanitarian needs.  
● Medium to high national capacities.  
● On-going development coordination (e.g. localized transition or protracted crisis) | Merging clusters with national coordination mechanisms with focus placed on capacity building ensuing co-chairing with relevant government counterparts with cluster leads organizing meetings, the international partner providing secretariat functions and where possible transfer of information and data management systems to local authorities. Eventually clusters would be merged into government led coordination structures. | **UGANDA** - Following consultations with relevant stakeholders, formal guidance was articulated in a document called “Adapting the cluster during transition in Uganda”, which guided clusters to merge with sector working groups at the national level and technical department meetings in the districts. |
| Modifying clusters into sector working groups | ● Residual humanitarian needs.  
● Low national capacities.  
● No on-going development coordination (e.g. sequenced transition) | Modification of clusters to sector groups in support of the national plan (PRSP or similar) or aligned with the UN coordination structure (UNDAF). | **COTE D’IVOIRE** - As no national coordination mechanism was not in place, clusters were adapted into thematic groups to support the principal priorities of the UNDAF with a view to integrating these into national structures at a later stage, once such structures had been established. |
| Adapting the cluster system to focus on residual needs | ● Non-negligible humanitarian needs persist (e.g. protracted crisis or risk of relapse).  
● Medium to low national capacities. | Clusters re-oriented to focus on disaster risk reduction, preparedness and contingency planning. A useful approach when the political situation is not conducive to merging with government structures. Cluster work should focus on strengthening capacity of the government to prompt more active engagement of national stakeholders. | **NEPAL** - Maintenance of clusters focused on preparedness and risk reduction and strengthening of national capacity. |
Sector specific issues

In practice, the adaptation of the cluster system will often involve a mix of the above described models, as different clusters will transition at different rates and in different ways depending on the characteristics of each sector and the capacities of national counterparts to take over coordination functions. Some sector specific issues to take into account include:

- **Clusters with natural national coordination counterpart:** Programme-oriented clusters such as health or education, for instance, often have a natural counterpart on the government side. In these cases, the cluster can easily merge or transform into a sector working group, as described above. In many cases, these clusters will have started to work closely with national authorities already during the emergency phase, as their focus gradually shifts from emergency to recovery. Other clusters, such as WASH or Nutrition, often do not benefit from such natural counterparts. In these cases, any transfer to ministries such as Infrastructure and Social Affairs, or other related public entities or utilities, needs to be undertaken with an analysis of capacities and expertise. Temporary embedment of expertise may be required to ensure that coordination remains focused on service delivery and access by the most vulnerable populations.

- **Service-based clusters:** Service-based clusters (e.g. Logistics, Emergency Telecommunications) often do not have a natural national counterpart, such as a ministry or department to work with, and if they do, these are typically not part of the development planning process. Very often though, the service-based clusters continue to play an essential role during the transition and need to maintain some residual capacity in case of a new emergency. Arrangements should be made to retain a residual capacity within these areas during the transition phase, particularly at the subnational level. In some instances, several functions and systems carried out by service-based clusters can be transferred to central institutions such as the national bureau of statistics (e.g. MIS, data) or the ministry of planning.

- **Protection cluster:** Protection issues should continue to be addressed throughout a country’s recovery. As the protection cluster often does not have a natural governmental counterpart, adaptation of the cluster can be problematic. Furthermore, in cases where the government is a party to the conflict, it may not be desirable to hand-over sensitive functions to national authorities, as this could jeopardize protection imperatives. If real protection concerns remain during the transition phase, it may be preferable to maintain international leadership of the cluster and the future of the cluster should be considered at HCT/UNCT level according to the particular circumstances in country.

- **Early Recovery:** Early recovery is not a specific sector as such, but represents an approach that should be integrated into the activities of all clusters to make their interventions more sustainable by building local resilience and capacity to address humanitarian needs and sustain a recovery process. A key principle of this approach is for international actors to engage with national actors whenever possible during a crisis (in a protracted situation) or as early as possible after a crisis. This is one way of enhancing the potential for sustainable programming in the humanitarian environment. Depending on identified needs and availability of resources, UNDP, as the global lead for the Cluster Working Group on Early Recovery (CWGER) may deploy an early recovery advisor to assist the RC/HC to ensure early recovery approaches are integrated into humanitarian plans, are implemented in humanitarian response, and provide advice and support in planning the transition from humanitarian to development programming generally, and the adaptation of coordination structures (specific to this tool kit). The Early Recovery Advisor would be well positioned for supporting the links between humanitarian and development work and supporting transition structures (coordination or otherwise).

3 Protection is defined as all activities aimed at ensuring full respect for the rights of the individual in accordance with international human rights law, international humanitarian law and refugee law.
Tips for phasing out clusters

- Where appropriate, involve government officials both at national and regional levels in cluster activities, and identify opportunities for capacity building of national counterparts from the outset (both government and NGOs).
- Develop a framework with benchmarks to monitor progress and ensure accountability with an exit strategy and capacity building requirements as part of the cluster response plan.
- Involve all relevant partners in planning for the adaptation of clusters and be realistic about the services and tools that will continue to be provided by government mechanisms.

Where can I learn more about this?
- IASC Guidance on Cluster Deactivation
- Guidance Note on Early Recovery
- IASC Operational Guidance for Cluster Lead Agencies
- UNDG Capacity Assessment Methodology and Tools
- PCNA capacity assessment tools

3.4 Phasing out of the HC function

The decision to disestablish an HC is made by the ERC in consultation with the HC Panel. The procedure can be initiated by the IASC or by OCHA on behalf of the ERC. Consultations should be conducted with the HC and HCT. The process of disestablishing the HC should be built into the overall HCT transition plan and should begin as soon as it is determined that the HC function is no longer necessary. The same flexible criteria, indicators and benchmarks that were used to determine when to launch system-wide transition planning and phase down or close an OCHA country office may be used to guide the decision on when to remove the HC position for a country.
SECTION IV COORDINATION FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES

This section provides guidance on how to transfer a set of core coordination functions to national counterparts, and ensure that adequate capacities, including financial resources, are secured to ensure that such functions are properly undertaken, albeit at lower intensity in certain cases.

The section explores the following issues in particular:

- The transfer of information and data management systems to national counterparts
- Support to national preparedness capacities
- Finance coordination, resource mobilization and funding for recovery and development coordination.

It is important to highlight that the implementation of these functions do not necessarily follow the same timeline as the adaptation of coordination structures. For example, the support to national preparedness capacities should begin as soon as the humanitarian response is initiated, and constitutes a key deliverable of the humanitarian community throughout its lifecycle in country, even before adaptation is envisaged and initiated. The funding of recovery and development coordination functions concerns both the UN (and the RC Office in particular) and is, in its UN dimension, an essential coordination function throughout the crisis, not just when recovery and development programs are (re)-activated.

The process of adapting coordination structure puts these three issues into sharp focus; the following section highlights specific considerations to ensure they are given sufficient attention and support.

4.1 Information and data management systems

Humanitarian coordination is extremely data intensive, due to the need for timely and targeted information to inform responses in rapidly evolving situations. Typically, a standard set of tools and services are developed by an OCHA Information Management Unit, which includes narrative situation reports, statistical assessment databases including the Who What Where database and a wide range of annotated maps. In addition specific clusters often develop their own information products and tools on specific sectors. While development interventions tend to address structural issues and are therefore less dependent on instant information generation, the successful transition to recovery and development approaches does require a range of data to target assistance, avoid coverage gaps and support the formulation of long term policy reforms. In resource and capacity constrained environments, the wealth of data collected by humanitarian actors can provide an essential base from which recovery and development efforts can be conceived and implemented.

Consequently, it is important to understand from the outset that not all humanitarian data management systems can or should be maintained after the end of the humanitarian phase. However, the UN and its partners should consider this dimension of the transition as an opportunity to sustain the humanitarian and recovery efforts and strengthen national institutions at the same time, notably through assistance to the national bureau of statistics and/or central government functions such as planning, finance and geographic data/mapping line ministries. Efforts should therefore be made to harmonize data collection and information management from the onset of emergency assistance so as to facilitate and enable transfer during the transition phase to national authorities. Information generated during the emergency phase about the impact of disasters, though humanitarian assessment tools such as Multi-seCTORal Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) can be useful for recovery assessment tools such as the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA). Mechanisms should be in place to facilitate the transfer of this information to recovery actors, both international agencies and national institutions and agencies

How to transition humanitarian information management systems?

To plan and implement a transfer of information management systems, the following steps may be considered:
• Carry out a functional review of what humanitarian IM functions/services exist, which ones need to be continued or tailored to the local context and whether there is a need for new services. This includes data that need to be preserved for future usage. A client discussion/survey of needs is often the most useful means of conducting this review but needs to be matched with realistic assessment of capacity and funding to maintain IM functions. To facilitate this process, humanitarian and development actors should review which tools and data sets are deemed essential, where they may need to be adapted and where these tools can, actively interface with development tools e.g. OECD/DAC systems, DEVINFO and national systems, and determine what is compatible (see box).

• Analyse existing IM capacity and plan for strengthening the capacity of key partners, particularly national counterparts to ensure that any handover of IM functions will be sustainable. A key factor for the sustainability of a function is the willingness of government counterparts to include information and data management in their national budgets. For functions that are deemed essential, partnerships should be developed between humanitarian actors and recovery/development actors, to initiate capacity building and training of government officials to take over information management services early and ideally before cluster closure and before the OCHA phase down is underway. Efforts to imbed relevant governmental partners in humanitarian teams as well as humanitarian staff into government structures and forums should be made as early as possible after a humanitarian event. This should include cross-representation in key forums related to information management, but ideally this should include governmental and humanitarian staff physically working within counterpart offices. This best practice has proven to be the most effective in the cross-fertilization of ideas, alignment of systems/standards and capacity building to ensure a smooth transfer.

Box 6: Humanitarian IM services: Which ones to keep and which ones to close?

• Humanitarian responses usually include the production of the following IM services and products;
• Core Humanitarian Products (Situation reports, humanitarian bulletins, humanitarian dashboard)
• Coordination Services (meeting schedules, contact lists, Who is Doing What, Where (3Ws) database, and project tracking).
• Geographic Services (Geodata management, mapping and products eg humanitarian snapshot.
• Website Platforms Services (Humanitarian One Response, Reliefweb)
• Assessment and Monitoring Systems (Access and situation analysis, Populations etc.)
• Funding updates (FTS)

Box 5: Development information management platforms

DevInfo (UNICEF): database system that helps to organize and present data on social development indicators. Primarily tracks socio-economic data and MDG related indicators.

Development Assistance Database (UNDP): Web-based information collection, tracking, analysis and planning tool for use by national governments and the broader assistance community. Primarily designed to track financial aid flows.

Aid Management Platform (World Bank): project management tool that is designed to support the Paris Declaration agenda. Primarily designed to track financial flows but can be used to evaluate impact indicators.

• Make provisions for the phase down and handover of each of the key IM service areas, including the reorientation of key products and services to focus on recovery, development and peacebuilding. Despite their importance during the humanitarian phase, it may be needed at times to close down services that may not be a priority to sustain after the humanitarian assistance and coordination phases down.

• Prepare an IM fund-raising strategy, which might involve leveraging public-private partnerships and making more use of international IM partnerships (e.g. with academic institutions) to be able to sustain core IM functions. It is also essential that government counterparts incorporate information and data management into their national budgets.

• Plan for retaining dedicated IM capacity within the UNCT for services that could be progressively
transferred to government counterparts over an extended period of time. This should draw upon existing capacity within the UNCT and wherever possible be common services to support the work of the UN System at the country level.

**Models for transferring information management services**

The decision as to what functions should be continued after the emergency phase should be made on a case by case basis in close consultation with government and other stakeholder, depending on local needs, capacities and resources. Depending on the local context, the following models can be considered for the transfer of IM functions:

Handover the information management services to the appropriate government entity: For this option to be viable there should be a natural institutional home for such an integrated information management unit in the government (e.g. statistics office, cartographic office). The receiving government entity should display adequate capacity to take over functions as well as willingness to integrate the additional cost into the regular government budget. Alternatively, if there is low capacity but high willingness, it is possible to look for an international partner/donor to fund/assist in building the capacity of the receiving entity during the transition phase.

- **Transfer of information and management system to RC/HCO or relevant UN agencies to support recovery and peacebuilding:** If there is lack of willingness/capacity by national government counterparts to take over essential information management functions, a decision can be taken to transfer the information management capacity from OCHA to the RC Office or to a specific UN agency that has the capacity and experience to manage complex information management systems. This should be considered as a temporary step towards a later transfer to national counterparts. In this case, IM functions should be reoriented to cover recovery, development and peace building needs (as well as residual humanitarian activities). Personnel and material assets would be transferred to the RCO or UN agency with separate phase-down or handover plans developed for each service.

- **Mixed approach – function-by-function transfer:** In some cases it may be preferable or necessary to break up the various functions of an information management unit (IMU) into different parts, if there is specific interest by different partners and/or government entities to take over specific functions (e.g., WFP could take over food security assessments, while DSS takes over the security incidents database). Some tools and services may be closed down and discontinued as they may not be a priority or can’t be sustained. A critical analysis of costs compared to the needs for the particular tool or service by the government and UN may need to be undertaken.

**Box 7: Transfer of IM functions in Uganda**

IMU services were handed over to the Northern Uganda Data Centre (NUDC) to deliver IM services and monitor the PRDP in the short term; and provide comprehensive IM services including preparedness and DRR in the long term. An agreement was drawn up with the Office of the Prime Minister, initially involving dual tasking and joint reporting of the IMU to OCHA and RCO. The government committed to create a national data centre for all of Uganda and include information and data management requirements in the budget. To facilitate transfer and support capacity building, OCHA seconded staff to the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) to train and coach OPM staff for the last six months of their contracts, and entered into an agreement with UNDP to take over OCHA staff and ensure service continuity. OCHA also transferred software and assets.
### Table 3: Examples of IMU transfer strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Handover information management to an appropriate government entity | • Moderate or significant residual need for humanitarian data.  
• High government capacity, or  
• Medium government capacity and donor willingness to fund capacity building | With the support of relevant UN agency (usually UNDP), adaptation of OCHA IMU to support recovery and development needs as well as humanitarian needs and eventual hand over to a government entity. | UGANDA – see Box LIBERIA – As part of the national recovery strategy, in July 2006 the Humanitarian Information Center (HIC) transitioned into the National Information Management Centre (NIMAC) Project, jointly administered by the Government of Liberia and UNDP. In July 2007, the Data were transferred to LiberiaInfo (DevInfo) with support of Unicef, and hosted in the government’s Liberia Institute of Statistics & Geo-Information Services (LISGIS) |
| Transfer of information and management system to RC/HCO to support recovery and peace building | • Significant need for humanitarian data.  
• Lack of government capacity/ or interest | Transfer the information management capacity to the RC Office or UN agency as a first step towards later transfer to national counterparts. | NEPAL – Transfer of the IMU to the RC/HCO SIERRA LEONE - As OCHA drew down, it was agreed that equipment and staff from the Sierra Leone Information System (SLIS) would be transferred to UNDP, and the SLIS would shift its approach from humanitarian/relief information gathering to development related data gathering, and provision of statistics/mapping services to relevant government Ministries. In 2008, the SLIS was transferred to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. |
| Mixed approach – function-by-function transfer | • Limited to moderate residual humanitarian needs.  
• Low or uneven donor interest | Break up the various functions of the IMU into different parts, if there is specific interest by different partners and/or government entities to take over certain functions. | SRI LANKA - In mid-2006 the HIC closed but its core functions transitioned into the OCHA Sri Lanka office with the establishment of an Information Management Unit. As the conflict ended in the East, the OCHA office started to wind down in the East, UNDP and OCHA jointly decided to transfer core information management functions, key staff and equipment to UNDP’s Early Recovery Team. MoU detailing the terms of transfer was developed, and transfer took place in mid-2009. AFGHANISTAN - The Afghanistan Information Management Services (AIMS) originated in 1997 with the creation of the Project Management Information System (ProMIS) under the direct supervision from OCHA. UNDP will assume in July 2002. |
Since its inception, AIMS has served the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRoA), humanitarian organizations and the international donor community as a provider of information management (IM) services including the development of geospatial information, software applications, database solutions, and country maps. As a preferred trainer for Government employees and provider of management and monitoring systems, AIMS has significantly improved the coordination and delivery of such services within Afghanistan, offering a dynamic approach to capacity development and resolving information management challenges facing the entire development sector.

Tips for transferring information management services

✓ Carry out a functional review to determine suitable scale of IM services and products essential to support recovery and development, and look at the compatibility of systems, national capacity to handle systems, maintenance of costs and prioritization of what to continue.

✓ Identify capacity building needs of government counterparts from the outset of a humanitarian response in preparation of taking over IM services.

✓ Work with national authorities to include information and data management in their national budget to ensure sustainability.

✓ Explore suitability of transfer to human rights entities, where there are protection issues, and take steps to ensure adequate data protection.

Where can I learn more about this?
Devinfo website
Operational Guidance on Responsibilities of Sector Cluster Leads and OCHA in Information Management
Common Operational Datasets
4.2 Disaster preparedness and risk reduction

One of the key imperatives of a nationally led recovery and development process is the establishment or restoration of sufficient national capacity for disaster preparedness and risk reduction. Successful efforts in this area can both help speed up the exit of humanitarian actors and improve the sustainability of the transition by ensuring that national authorities have the capacity to prevent, respond to, and recover from future crisis with minimal reliance on international assistance.

How to plan for strengthening national preparedness capacities?

The following is an indicative list of steps to follow and issues to consider when planning for the strengthening of national capacities for disaster preparedness and risk reduction in transition contexts:

- **Assessment:** Lead and coordinate inter-agency efforts to carry out a multi-sector assessment of the Government’s and civil society’s capacity to respond and recover from crisis. This should include a review of national, sub-national and local efforts for preparedness, including existing national and local preparedness plans and structures. Where possible, the assessment should result in a costed gaps analysis that can be used to advocate within government and with donors to address those gaps.

- **Advocacy and technical support:** Based on the result, coordinate inter-agency efforts to strengthen government and civil society capacity to respond to emergencies and recover from their impact. Preparedness for response and wider disaster risk reduction should be embedded in development coordination and assistance frameworks. The RC with the support of the UNCT should seek to embed UN technical experts in government counterpart entities and civil society organizations to develop capacity for response coordination at all levels, including the creation/reinforcement of rapid response and recovery teams and ensuring that disaster preparedness, response and risk reduction are included in national plans and budgets. An important part of the capacity building effort involves helping the government build and invest in relationships with stakeholders who are likely to play an important role in an emergency, particularly regional organizations, neighbouring or other Member States, UN entities (e.g. DPA, integrated UN presences), civil society, community- and faith-based organizations, and other relevant actors.

- **Legislation:** Work with the government to help ensure that existing national legislation for disaster relief and recovery is comprehensive and advocate with the government for legislative changes to fill any gaps. As part of this, efforts should be made to align the policies and operations of international systems and disaster management teams with existing national systems, such as the national Red Cross/Red Crescent chapter or national disaster management authority. A legal framework is also required to provide guidance on the country’s arrangements for managing the recovery process. This includes laws, regulations, acts underpinning sustainable recovery with a clear definition of roles and responsibilities, levels of accountability, on coordination and management tasks including the establishment of local level recovery management responsibilities.

- **Institutional arrangements for recovery:** The complexity of the recovery process requires dedicated institutions supported by clearly defined inter sectoral, and inter-ministerial coordinating mechanisms for organizing recovery process.

- **Coordination and Planning:** Work with the government to initiate contingency planning, including by developing policies and procedures for requesting and receiving international assistance, if needed, during an emergency, using the Guidelines for the Domestic Facilitation and Regulation of International Disaster Relief and Initial Recovery Assistance as a model. Prior to exit, OCHA should also work with UN partners to review and update the UN’s internal contingency plans to be used should humanitarian indicators deteriorate. As part of this the RC should appoint a UNCT partner to assume the responsibility for providing in-country coordination support in the event of an emergency. In addition, OCHA should work with the OCHA regional office to take over support to key preparedness activities, such as early warning and contingency planning, and the establishment of
partnerships with those regional organizations that will become critical to an emergency response once the OCHA country office is closed. Relevant UN agencies should work with the government institutions responsible for recovery to support their efforts in developing appropriate recovery policies, prioritises, strategic guidelines, normative tools and methodologies.

Examples of UN support to national preparedness capacities

The following is a non-exhaustive list of examples of capacity building initiatives undertaken by the UN to support transition processes:

- **Inter-Agency collaboration with government**: In Uganda, an Inter-Agency Workshop on Emergency Preparedness and Response mapped out a forward-looking strategy. OCHA supported the government with a National Officer to develop contingency plans in priority districts through the National DRR Platform and District Disaster Management Committees. UNDP provided support to capacity building efforts of government on preparedness and DRR.

- **Disaster Management Team established under the UNCT**: In Côte d’Ivoire, OCHA led a substantial revision of the inter-agency Contingency Plan in 2009/10 to integrate elements of the cluster approach. An ISDR mission to Côte d’Ivoire supported the establishment of a National DRR Platform in late 2009. A Disaster Management Team was established in 2010 under the UNCT and WFP led a disaster response simulation exercise supported by the OCHA Regional Office for West Africa.

- **Joint Approach with OCHA/UNDP/ISDR**: In Nepal, OCHA developed a joint approach with UNDP on DRR (as part of a larger ISDR strategy) to support the Nepal Disaster Risk Reduction Consortium (NRRC) which brings together financial institutions, development partners, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, and the UN in partnership with the Government. As part of this programme, OCHA maintained a Disaster Preparedness Advisor to continue to work with government and IASC counterparts on contingency planning, and appointed an OCHA-funded Response Advisor in the RC Office to be focal points for residual humanitarian needs and preparedness activities. UNDP provided support to the government for steering a series of flagship programmes identified by the consortium, including on strengthening preparedness capacities.

Tips for strengthening disaster preparedness recovery and risk reduction capacities

- Support the elaboration of a national policy on disaster preparedness for response and recovery and a functional DRR Platform for national coordination.
- Provide capacity-building support to government on DRR and preparedness for response and recovery, including establishing national DRR Platforms and the provision of national officers to work with government to develop contingency and preparedness plans, national recovery strategic plans both at national levels and risk reduction capacities.
- Establish a permanent Disaster Management Team of the UNCT.

Where can I read more about this?

- UNDG Disaster Risk Reduction Guidance Note
- Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction
4.3 Resource Mobilisation & Funding for Coordination

In an environment of competing funding needs and declining financial resources, it may be challenging to find funding for residual humanitarian and recovery activities that fall neither into the priority areas defined by humanitarian donors, nor those of development donors. Furthermore, many donors have separate funding sources and approval mechanisms for humanitarian and development funding, which means that eligibility criteria and modes of financing may change radically during the transition (see OECD’s INCAF Guidance for a detailed discussion on challenges related to transition financing).

This section provides options to phase out the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) as humanitarian sector’s main tool for coordination, strategic planning and programming, and a summary of the main sources of funding available during the transition phase focusing on for residual humanitarian interventions.

Funding for transition and recovery activities

Models for phasing out of the Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP)

The phasing out of the CAP as the main funding mechanism is a delicate decision that should be managed carefully and planned for to ensure that residual humanitarian needs are covered during the transition phase. The CAP is a humanitarian planning and resource mobilization tool so prolonging a CAP for longer than necessary can result in loss of interest in funding and could undermine the humanitarian agenda. At the same time, premature phasing down of the CAP before appropriate funding mechanisms are in place for recovery and development efforts, can lead to a dangerous funding gap for humanitarian and transitional activities. In order to determine when to discontinue the CAP, the HCT and UNCT and partners should be consulted broadly. Once the appeal is phased down, an alternative document can be developed if necessary enabling the HCT and partners to discuss with donors priority residual humanitarian needs that continue to require support.

The following models have been used to manage the phase out of the CAP:

- **Replace the CAP with a “humanitarian profile”:** Based on consultations with the Government of Uganda, the United Nations, the non-governmental community and donor representatives, the HCT decided in August 2010 that the humanitarian situation in Uganda would no longer warrant a CAP in 2011. Instead, it was agreed that an Inter-Agency Working Group, with participation of the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), should develop a humanitarian profile for Uganda as a tool to guide decisions on humanitarian action in 2011. This approach is appropriate in sequenced transitions, or where residual humanitarian needs are fairly small in scope. The humanitarian profile does not necessarily need to be used as a separate fundraising platform but could ideally be integrated into existing planning and funding instruments, such as the PRSP, where applicable, and the UNDAF or other UN frameworks, for a presentation of the UN’s response to those humanitarian needs. In Uganda, for instance, the humanitarian profile was used to advocate with government to increase expenditure of ministerial budgets in health, education, water, agriculture, social development, gender and local government for the fiscal year of 2009 - 2010.

- **Subsume residual needs in broader transition appeal or other programmatic frameworks:** In cases where there are significant funding needs for recovery activities as a transition towards more standard development interventions, it may be possible to use a CAP-like process to fund both residual humanitarian activities as well as recovery programmes. Transitional appeals help to fill funding gaps at the end of a crisis, when humanitarian funding wanes and longer term funding instruments are either inadequate or yet to be established. Although a transitional appeal often includes large humanitarian components, its strategic and substantive focus is on the shift from humanitarian relief to recovery and reconstruction. These appeals should be based on the overall HCT/UNCT transition strategy and an accompanying transitional results matrix, which sets out the financial requirements for transition activities. The development of such appeals is led by the RC in consultation with the government, UNCT partners, donors, including the IFIs and civil society groups.
Refer to the UNDG Guidelines on Transitional Appeals for more detailed guidance. Where possible, use should be made of national processes, by for instance, integrating residual humanitarian needs into the overall national transition plan (see example of Georgia in Table 4 below).

- **Develop a separate transition appeal that runs parallel to the CAP to fund a transition plan:** This approach was used, for instance, in Somalia and is appropriate for protracted crises or complex transitional environments, where several phases of transition co-exist. It may be particularly appealing to choose this approach in cases where a PCNA has been conducted or some other high profile initiative that provides a rallying point for donors interested in transition issues. This approach will be applicable in situations with considerable donor resources and the RC/HC should ensure that there is sufficient donor interest for both appeals before engaging on a parallel fund raising process to avoid situations in which the recovery appeal crowds out the humanitarian appeal or vice versa. In Cote d’Ivoire, for instance, the RC established a local transition fund similar to a multi-donor trust fund, which did not succeed in raising sufficient funds, possibly because donors were not engaged early on in the process.

- **Extend the CAP and shift its focus to longer-term recovery requirements:** As part of transformation of the CAP, it may be advisable to move the CAP from being project-based to being programme-based to facilitate alignment on national sector strategies. This approach was used in Zimbabwe. In Cote d’Ivoire, by contrast, a conventional but streamlined CAP was produced in 2009, after six years of appeals, focusing on critical humanitarian needs and residual humanitarian requirements. In either case, to avoid donor fatigue, it is advisable to ‘stretch’ the CAP only if the rationale is firmly grounded in the specifics of the local situation and it has been discussed, and agreed with major donors.

**Box 6: Resource Mobilisation Capacity: the case of Cote d’Ivoire**

Recognising the importance of resource mobilisation, the Cote d’Ivoire UNCT agreed to hire a Resource Mobilisation focal point cost shared by members of the UNCT. Once transition planning was actively underway, the HCT conducted dedicated and broad discussions with partners in order to determine when best to bring an end to the formal consolidated appeals process. In 2009, after six years of consolidated humanitarian appeals (2003-2008), the country team developed an alternative, joint and streamlined funding document, entitled ‘Critical Humanitarian Needs’, which took the form of a mini-CAP and focused on residual humanitarian requirements. This enabled the HCT and partners to discuss with donors priority residual humanitarian needs that continued to require support. At the same time, the RC/HC also established a basket of transition funds, which had donor support and became instrumental in supporting small scale programmes after the CAP, particularly at the sub-national level.
### Table 4: Examples of models for phasing out the CAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase out of CAP and development of a simplified resource mobilisation document (e.g. Humanitarian profile) | - Limited humanitarian needs  
- Well-functioning development planning and coordination mechanisms  
- Low to moderate donor interest | As the CAP is phased out a simplified resource mobilisation document is prepared as a tool to guide decision-making on humanitarian action. Pros: supports restoration of normal development programming mechanisms. Cons: may lead to low visibility for outstanding humanitarian needs. | **UGANDA** - When the CAP was phased out, the Humanitarian Profile was prepared as a tool to guide decision making on humanitarian action in 2011. The Humanitarian Profile was not a fundraising tool but brought the government, humanitarian community and donors together to agree on a common analysis of humanitarian needs. The HC and cluster leads and members increased advocacy efforts with government to increase expenditure of ministerial budgets in health, education, water, agriculture, social development, gender and local government for the fiscal year of 2009 - 2010. |
| Residual humanitarian needs subsumed under a transition Appeal (or other frameworks) to replace the CAP | - Limited to moderate humanitarian needs  
- Significant transition-specific needs and/or lack of functioning planning and coordination for development activities  
- Moderate donor interest | Consolidated appeal replaced by a Transitional Appeal covering both residual humanitarian needs and longer term recovery programming. Pros: supports clarity in the transition process. Cons: May lead to low visibility for outstanding humanitarian needs. | **NEPAL** - The 2009 Humanitarian Appeal was articulated as a Transitional Appeal. A second Transitional Appeal was considered for 2010 but was not issued due to limited donor interest and the subsequent planned departure of many humanitarian NGOs. It was decided not to have an appeal in 2011. All aspects of donor relations and future resource mobilisation will be fully handed over to RC/HCO in 2012. **SIERRA LEONE/ CONGO BRAZZAVILLE** - Transition appeals were developed, using a CAP-like process to fund both residual humanitarian activities as well as recovery programmes. **GEORGIA** - The Joint needs assessment in Georgia (PCNA in Georgia) was undertaken at the same time as the review of the Flash Appeal. This allowed each process to complement the other and provided a strong basis for identifying possible gaps, inconsistencies and overlaps. The cost of the revised Flash Appeal was integrated into the JNA budget which gave donors the “full picture” of the required financing for humanitarian, recovery, and development activities. It also strengthened the credibility of both documents and pioneered the more integrated assessment approach envisioned in the revised PCNA-TRF methodology. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Appeal running parallel to the CAP</th>
<th>CAP is maintained and separate appeal is carried out to fund a transition strategy. Pros: Ensures visibility for humanitarian needs. Cons: undermines clarity and may lead to competition for funding.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOMALIA - A separate appeal was launched in parallel to the CAP, to fund the transition plan. Agency, Funds and Programmes funded the RCs Office on a cost-sharing basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEMEN - Based on the PCNA a project based action plan was developed for post conflict recovery and other transitional requirements (including peace consolidation/peacebuilding needs). The UN committed its own resources to some of the projects encouraging donor buy-in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streamlined appeal focusing on critical humanitarian needs</th>
<th>CAP is maintained but streamlined to focus on critical humanitarian needs, and reoriented to cover transitional activities. Pros: visibility for humanitarian needs. Cons: Donor fatigue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COTE D’IVOIRE - In 2009, after six years of appeals, a streamlined funding document Critical Humanitarian Needs focused on residual humanitarian requirements. In addition Fonds Local de Transition were established under the direction of the RC/HC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGANDA - With the phase out of the CAP and no collective resource mobilization efforts, the ERF was retained to address chronic and residual humanitarian needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIMBABWE - The focus of the CAP shifted to focus on longer term recovery requirements (also covering residual humanitarian needs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding for coordination

The funding gap that follows the phase out of the CAP has implications not only for programme delivery but also for coordination in support of the country’s recovery efforts. Funding constraints in transition (see the UNDG guidance note on funding for transition) are particular severe when it comes to funding the adaptation of coordination mechanisms, which are often seen as overhead costs by donors. While some donors are willing to fund such costs during the emergency phase, (notably through the CAP, where coordination services are included) an increasing number of them now take the view that coordination of recovery and development activities are a core responsibility of recipient governments, and should therefore be funded out of the recurrent national budget, or by the UN core resources.

Sensitizing donors

Given these constraints, it will be crucial to sensitize donors to the relevance of coordination structures and functions to the success of the transition. The elements of a compelling resource mobilization argument for coordination mechanisms, services and functions include:

- **Link with needs on the ground and national priorities:** the importance of sustaining coordination mechanisms, functions and services beyond the humanitarian imperative must be understood in relation to the concrete outputs that these arrangements produce, and how these outputs demonstrably contribute to the recovery process and the achievement of national priorities. While often “one level” removed from direct programmatic impact, coordination tasks can be presented in terms of how they facilitate the delivery by the UN, the government and other partners, of recovery and development results, through the provision, inter alia, of timely and accurate information, common analytical products, facilitated strategy development, and agreements on division of labour.

- **Focus on capacity building and handover to national actors:** Beyond functions and tasks linked to internal UN coordination, funding for broader recovery and development coordination activities to be undertaken by the UN should emphasize their temporary nature and their focus on essential functions that need to be sustained during the transition period, and/or which can be easily integrated into existing national structures at the end of the transition period. The argument should demonstrate efforts to hand over, through capacity building efforts when necessary, functions that should ultimately be fulfilled by national actors.

- **Cost effectiveness:** coordination mechanisms, functions and services must be undertaken, and presented as a public good, fulfilling tasks to the benefit of a range of actors, and thereby reducing costly redundancies if these tasks had to be performed separately by each actor.

**UN internal sources of funding, some options**

- **Mixed sources of funding:** While most donors are reluctant to fund staff positions through voluntary contributions, departments falling under the UN secretariat, such as DPKO, for instance, often find it easier to use assessed contributions to fund staff positions than to fund the implementation of programmatic activities. In Burundi, staff from the Bureau Intégré des Nations Unies au Burundi (BINUB), funded by DPA, was in charge of coordinating and implementing activities funded by voluntary contributions through UN agencies. Similarly, in Libya and the oPt, UNSMIL and UNSCO respectively have posts for the coordination of UN recovery and statebuilding activities while in Sudan, assessed contributions were used to fund key positions in the decentralised UN Coordination structures throughout the country. For this option to be viable, however, it is important to ensure that the staff positions are seen as contributing to the core mandate and strategic objectives of the mission.

- **Cost-sharing:** cost-sharing is an important way of generating savings on fixed costs related to office maintenance and certain staff positions that are of common interest to the UN system. In DRC, for instance, all agencies pooled resources to fund four UN Area Coordination positions during a two-year
transitional period, as well as to establish joint UN offices in four provincial hubs. Such provincial hubs can also serve as platforms for actors to embed staff, who would not otherwise be able to have a presence at the sub-national level, due to the high fixed costs of establishing a sub-national office, relative to the size of the agency programme.

- Headquarter funding for the RCO: The RC system is funded by the Support to Resident Coordinator (SRC), which are managed separately from UNDP’s regular funds for development support services. Additional funds can be made available to RC office by DOCO, through the RC “Capacity Gap effort” for crisis and transition countries, depending on needs and available resources.

Additional funding sources and pooled-funding mechanisms

- The Peacebuilding Fund (PBF): The PBF for post-conflict peacebuilding initiatives was established by the Secretary-General following a request from the General Assembly and the Security Council in October 2006. The PBF is a component of the enhanced UN architecture to provide for a more sustained engagement in support of countries emerging from conflict. The PBF is a global fund designed to support several country situations simultaneously and therefore combines the scope of a global fund with the country-specific focus of a multi-donor trust fund. The PBF relies upon voluntary contributions from Member States, organizations and individuals. The PBF is managed, on behalf of the Secretary-General, by the Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support, supported by the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF Office) is the PBF fund administrator. For additional information see the PBF webpage http://www.unpbf.org.

- Multi-Partner Trust Funds (MPTFs): MPTFs cover coordination costs through country level funds focusing on supporting recovery, transitional, stabilisation and peace programmes. In the context of transition, such MPTFs can provide rapid and flexible responses to national priorities whilst ensuring a strategic UN approach that is sensitive to the unique country’s transitional needs. MPTFs also enhance UN and donor coordination to ensure more coherent international support to such countries at a time when resource mobilization may be a challenge. For example, in Nepal the UN Peace Fund for Nepal (UNPFN) was established in March 2007 to mobilize UN agency support to the implementation of the peace process. Initially operating under the UN Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) and answering to the immediate needs of the peace process, the UNPFN was transferred at the beginning of 2009 to the office of UN RC/HC. Common humanitarian funds can also co-exist with recovery/transitional MPTFs (for example in South Sudan). See the MPTF web page for additional information www.undp.mptf.org.

Tips for securing funding for coordination

- Keep track of the main funding sources, deadlines and criteria, and plan for anticipated decreases in certain funding sources.
- Appoint or recruit a Resource Mobilization focal point to create a dedicated capacity.
- Favour joint resource mobilization efforts through the RC/HC, based on common plans, in order to minimize interagency competition, funding imbalances, and possible donor fatigue.
- Link resource mobilization to national efforts.

Where can I learn more about this?
UNDG Guidance note on funding for transition
OECD’s INCAF Guidance
Guidance Note on Transitional Appeals
http://www.unpbf.org
www.undp.mptf.org
SECTION V ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The adaptation of humanitarian coordination mechanisms, functions and services to a recovery/development framework involves a range of actors, with the RC/HC playing a leadership role in coordinating the roles and responsibilities of OCHA, the RC Office (RCO), UN Country Team, and liaising with local NGOs and INGOs, the government, and donors. Engagement in the process occurs at several levels, which can be categorized as follows:

- **Decision-making**: RC/HC, UNCT, HCT, government
- **Planning, process design, and overall coordination**: OCHA and RCO
- **Direct implementation, including capacity building (disaster preparedness, IM, etc.)**: OCHA and RCO, UN agencies, government counterparts, NGO
- **Provision of inputs**: government counterparts, NGOs, UN agencies, donors, other actors
- **Funding**: UN agencies, UNHQ and/or missions, donors

5.1 How to manage engagement in the process?

Feedback from colleagues who have participated in such a process highlights the importance of:

1. Clarifying the various tasks required to implement the adaptation of coordination structure (roadmap or similar)
2. Agreeing with partners on the allocation of such tasks with clarity on what is expected from each partner (output, timing)
3. Regularly following up on progress achieved
4. Providing support to partners throughout the process, with a focus on process management, options generation, and consensus-building/facilitation

To manage expectations and avoid misunderstandings, engagement in the process must be based on clear and agreed definition of roles and responsibilities. Participation in a consultation is very different from participation in a decision-making process, yet the two are often confused. Various actors operate under the assumption that their consent is required to move forward when in fact their views are only solicited in order to inform someone else’s decision. It is therefore important that the RC/HC and his or her supporting offices be transparent about what is expected of other actors and the nature of their engagement. For each participant in the process, the key questions to ask are:

- Are we soliciting information from them?
- Are we asking for their views?
- Do these views need to be fully incorporated in a decision?
- Do we seek their approval?

What the UN seeks from partners, how and when it chooses to bring them into the process must be carefully thought through, based on an analysis of their interests in the process and their capacities.
5.2 Main actors, roles and responsibilities

The RC/HC: leads the adaptation process, providing leadership within the HCT and UNCT structures and oversight for the planning and implementation of the transition requirements. In particular, he/she is responsible for:

- Articulating the vision for a context specific transition and building buy-in for the process among UN actors (including peacekeeping/political missions where relevant), government, NGOs and donors
- Engaging with government at the decision-making level
- Liaising with major donors to secure adequate political and financial support throughout
- Ensuring alignment of UN activities in support of the process
- Engaging with HQ to maintain support (financial, technical)

The RC/HC is supported throughout by OCHA and the RCO (see section below).

UN Agencies: UN agencies actively engage in the process both as decision makers through their participation in the HCT and the UNCT, and, where relevant, as implementers of various adaptation requirements. Agencies such as UNDP and UNICEF often have capacity building support programmes in the areas of information management, supporting, inter alia, the national statistics institute or similar entities, and disaster risk reduction.

National Actors: The adaptation of coordination structures, functions and services to recovery and development frameworks is ultimately about national ownership. Where possible, UN actors should bring relevant government line ministries and emergency management authorities into key coordination functions, including, in some cases, the clusters and building government capacity in critical coordination areas, such as information management and emergency preparedness. This also means working with traditional authorities and civil society actors, to bring multiple voices for early priority-setting and to broaden the sense of ownership around a common vision for the country’s future.

5.3 RCO/OCHA collaboration

The transition of coordination mechanisms, functions and services is planned and its implementation is coordinated primarily by OCHA and the RCO, under the leadership of the RC/HC. Effective collaboration methods between the two offices need to be established from the onset, through:

1. Identified focal points
2. An agreed division of labour for the various tasks and responsibilities
3. Regular working sessions to co-manage the transition process, take stock of progress made and plan next steps and corrective actions.

The division of labour between OCHA and the RCO should be informed by an understanding of the various functions that will need to be fulfilled to manage and support the transition. These functions include:

- Process design and management: timing for initiating the adaptation process, steps to undertake, identification of roles and responsibilities for UN actors and for other partners, planning of resources, follow up
• **Options generation and research:** presentation of various models (e.g. transformation of clusters), with pros and cons for each, based on contextual analysis, and most relevant decision-making mechanisms to reach agreement on options (models, representation, modus operandi of each decision making structure, etc.)

• **Facilitation:** convening and support to stakeholder discussions on adaptation issues, including, when appropriate, consensus building function to reach agreement on various options, and/or negotiation support

• **Secretariat functions to HCT, UNCT and other coordination mechanisms:** invitations, agenda setting, document sharing, logistics, note taking and follow up on decisions

• **Resource mobilization:** identification of needs (human, technical) to implement the adaptation and fund new coordination structures, preparation of resource mobilization strategy (options, proposals), follow up

• **Communication, information sharing, and liaison with partners:** development and implementation of communication strategy on the transition (focusing on i. Why, ii. When, and iii. Who is involved?), dissemination of key adaptation related documents (meeting notes, agreements, options paper, etc.), outreach to partners, response to queries, and provision of regular updates.

This list gives an indication of the level of effort required to support the RC-HC in leading the adaptation process, and of the breadth of skills and competencies needed throughout. As experience shows, it is a resource intensive process. OCHA and the RCO must work closely to plan accordingly, and engage early on with HQ counterparts (OCHA, DOCO) to secure appropriate support and additional resources if required. How these tasks are allocated and shared across the UN system, and between OCHA and the RCO in particular, will depend on available resources within each office (both current and expected) and the content of the adaptation process, including which elements of the coordination architecture (structures, functions, services) are transformed, when and to whom.

**Phase down of OCHA country offices**

If and when the conditions on the ground allow for a phase down of large-scale humanitarian operations, the adaptation of coordination structures may involve a reduction, and eventual closing down of OCHA’s country office. Typically when OCHA phases down its presence in a country it will do so by phasing down the full country office into a small humanitarian advisors team (HAT) or a sole humanitarian advisor. Models for phase down in the past have included:

• **Downsizing the OCHA office:** In cases where humanitarian needs persist and a humanitarian coordinator is maintained, OCHA may decide to scale down its presence while maintaining a small country office to assist the HC in managing residual humanitarian needs.

• **Establishing a joint RC-HC Office:** If the remaining OCHA office is sufficiently small, it may be possible to phase the OCHA office into a small humanitarian advisors team within the RCO. This may allow for savings through sharing of fixed costs associated with running the office.

• **Embedding humanitarian advisors:** In situations where an HC has been disestablished, but humanitarian needs remain which are beyond the national planning/response capacities, OCHA may decide to maintain a humanitarian advisor in the RCO to provide timely and appropriate assistance in preparedness and response as well as capacity building efforts to the Government, UN Resident Coordinator, UN agencies and humanitarian partners in risk-prone countries that do not have an OCHA country office. Such a service should be defined around specific deliverables and should be time limited. Maintaining a minimal capacity within the RCO can be
Box 9: Minimum functions of the RC Office

Not all RC Offices need to look the same and they should be adapted to the local context and resources available, however there is a call for a minimum of capacity and predictability. The study on Capacity Requirements for Resident Coordinator Offices in the Context of Crisis and Post-Crisis Recovery and Peacebuilding concluded that in a post-conflict environment, a standard RCO office should fulfil the following four minimum functions: coordination, strategic planning, communications and information management. However the capacity of the RCO is largely determined by the funding levels which in the last year have decreased considerably affecting the ability to reliably ensure sufficient RCO capacity.

particularly helpful in cases where there is a strong risk of relapse, and has proven to be more efficient and cost-effective than leaving and having to come back when there is a sudden resurgence of humanitarian needs.

Any option that foresees joint OCHA-RCO structures or teams (see above) should also include planning of a range of administrative issues that can significantly delay the adaptation process. These include:

- Transfer of contractual modalities
- Cost sharing of shared services
- Inter-operability of IT systems (emails, etc.)
- Supervision and reporting lines

RCO Capacities

The adaptation process will place additional responsibilities on the RC Office in terms of transition planning. Furthermore, the RCO may need to take on additional responsibilities as a result of the downsizing and exit of OCHA. It is therefore essential that donors and HQ are sensitized at an early stage on the need for additional capacity to the RC Office to fulfil adaptation obligations. Experience shows that successful planning for the transformation of coordination mechanisms requires strong leadership from the RC/HC, a strong HCT/UNCT working as a team, with the support of the OCHA office and the RCO. If RCO capacity is insufficient, this might justify delaying OCHA's phasing out process.
Table 5: Examples of approaches to phasing down the OCHA office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated RC/HC Office               | • Medium or weak national capacity to take over coordination functions.  
• Significant humanitarian residual or risk of relapse.                  | In integrated offices reporting lines have been unified or harmonised under the leadership of the head of the RC Office. It is desirable but not essential that integration is supported by an operational integration (e.g. cars, emails, etc.), as well as cost-sharing.                                                                   | NEPAL - The OCHA office was transferred into a joint RCHCO. The main strategic focus of the humanitarian side of the RCHCO is to affect a shift from response and relief to preparedness. The Humanitarian Support Unit (HSU) of the RCHCO is focusing on disaster preparedness, building and strengthening the capacity of the Government to respond to emergencies in a timely and effective manner. |
| Maintenance of a small OCHA office during the transition | • Adequate humanitarian funding  
• Medium to weak national capacity to take over coordination functions  
• Significant humanitarian residual or risk of relapse | Under the leadership of the RC/HC close joint analysis and planning of OCHA and the RCO to support the transition of the coordination architecture, guiding the adaptation of the HCT and phase down of clusters.                                                                                                            | COTE D’IVOIRE - Initial steps towards scaling down the OCHA office began in 2008 with the OCHA sub-office in Khorogo phasing into a joint OCHA-UNDP office. The OCHA office phased into a Humanitarian Support Unit supporting the RC/HC mid-2010 and was due to close at the end of 2010. However, with the contested elections in November 2010 and the subsequent violence triggering high levels of displacement, OCHA scaled up its presence and has re-established a full Country Office in CDI. |
Tips for OCHA-RC office models

- Ensure that staffing needs in the RC Office are included in the detailed operational planning for the transformation of humanitarian coordination mechanisms.
- Identify additional staff and resource requirements early on in the adaptation process to allow enough lead-time for recruitment and transfer of contracts, etc.
- Keep the office lean without compromising core functions, and encourage agencies/government to fulfil as many responsibilities as possible.

Where can I learn more about this?

Coordination Post-Titles
Description of models and organigrammes plus TORs
Capacity Requirements for RC Offices in Post-Crisis Countries
Common Country Assessment (CCA): The CCA is a UN-wide development assessment tool that aims to analyse the national development situation and identify key development issues with a focus on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally agreed development goals and treaty obligations. While it provides the analytical basis for the UNDAF, a key function of the CCA is to support and strengthen the host government’s national development framework. Where a PCNA has been undertaken, this can be used by the UNCT in place of a CCA. Conversely, where a recent CCA has been done, its analysis should be factored into any CHAP, PCNA, PDNA or Strategic Assessment that is undertaken.

Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP)/ Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAPs): The CAP is an annual planning, costing, and resource mobilisation process initiated and managed by the HC during a crisis that brings together humanitarian agencies around a joint situation analysis, a set of common priorities, and an integrated program of response. The CHAP is the planning framework that underpins the CAP by providing a shared analysis of the context, a needs assessment, an identification of roles and responsibilities, and a clear statement of longer-term objectives and goals grouped by sector. CAPs exist in both acute and protracted humanitarian crises and often include early recovery activities.

Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF): An integrated strategic framework is a peace consolidation plan that presents i) a joint mission/UNCT strategic vision and related priorities; ii.) a shared accountability framework that documents these joint priorities; and iii.) a living management and operations tool to facilitate the regular stocktaking and prioritisation of key initiatives. In 2008, the Secretary-General decided that in conflict and post-conflict situations where there is a peacekeeping operation/political mission and a UNCT, all parts of the UN must operate on the basis of a shared vision of the UN’s strategic objectives, and a set of agreed results, timelines, and responsibilities for the delivery of tasks critical to consolidating peace. The ISF aims to be the planning tool that implements this decision. As part of this decision, the Secretary-General also clarified that while humanitarian assistance and protection activities must maintain strategic coherence with political or peacekeeping operations operating in-country, humanitarian personnel, structures or operations need not be subsumed or integrated into the structures or operations of peacekeeping or political missions.

UN Integration: Integration is the guiding principle for all conflict and post-conflict situations where the UN has a Country Team and a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation or political mission/office, whether or not these presences are structurally integrated (Secretary-General’s decision No. 2008/24). Defining elements of integration include a strategic partnership between UN mission/office and the Country Team under the leadership of the SRSG (or ERSG) that ensures that they work in a mutually supportive manner. In all cases, they should include (i) a shared vision of the UN’s strategic objectives, (ii) closely aligned or integrated planning, (iii) a set of agreed results, timelines and responsibilities for the delivery of tasks critical to consolidating peace, and (iv) agreed mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. Integration arrangements should take full account of recognised humanitarian principles, allow for the protection of humanitarian space, and facilitate effective coordination with all humanitarian actors.

Post Conflict & Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PCNA/PDNA): The post-conflict needs assessment is a methodology to map the needs of a country emerging from crisis or conflict and managed by the HC during a crisis that brings together humanitarian agencies around a joint situation analysis, a set of common priorities, and an integrated program of response. The CHAP is the planning framework that underpins the CAP by providing a shared analysis of the context, a needs assessment, an identification of roles and responsibilities, and a clear statement of longer-term objectives and goals grouped by sector. CAPs exist in both acute and protracted humanitarian crises and often include early recovery activities.

Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP): A poverty reduction strategy paper is a country’s plan to promote growth and reduce poverty through implementation of specific economic, social and structural policies. PRSPs are intended to help aid recipient countries meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and are required by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank before a country can be considered for debt relief within the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative. The World Bank bases its own country assistance strategies on PRSPs, as do several bilateral donors.

The Development Operations Coordination Office (DOCO): The three critical DOCO functions include support implementation of the UNDG strategic priorities at global, regional and country levels; support setting UNDG
strategic priorities and global UNDG coordination; and gather evidence and lessons learned from implementation to feed into UNDG decision-making and dissemination back to countries. In certain crisis situations, DOCO can provide limited short-term financial resources to support the leadership role of the RC. In addition to the mobilization of resources for deployment of staff in country, DOCO also assists the UNDG in participation and coordination of input at HQ level. In crisis situations where Task Forces do not exist, DOCO can provide on demand support to RCs and UNCTs on policy issues and technical needs, where possible leveraging UNDG expertise.

The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA): OCHA is the office of the United Nations Secretariat responsible for bringing together humanitarian actors to ensure a coherent response to emergencies. OCHA also ensures there is a framework within humanitarian actors can contribute to the overall response effort. OCHA’s mission is to: Mobilize and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors in order to alleviate human suffering in disasters and emergencies; Advocate the rights of people in need; Promote preparedness and prevention; and Facilitate sustainable solutions.

Transitional Appeals: A transitional appeal is a strategic planning tool to help the UNCT prioritize its interventions and mobilise resources to finance programmes and activities by the UN and associated partners in a transition setting. Its purpose is to mobilize resources to fill the transition gap, when humanitarian funding wanes as the crisis recedes and instruments for longer term support are either inadequate or yet to be established. These appeals are based on the HCT/UNCT transition strategy and an accompanying transitional results matrix, which sets out the financial requirements for transition activities.

UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF): The UNDAF is the strategic programmatic framework that describes the collective response of the UN system to national development priorities. In 2010, the UNDG revised the guidance on ‘How to prepare an UNDAF.’ The Guidelines emphasize:

- National ownership that is inclusive of all stakeholders in all stages of the process;
- Alignment with national development priorities, strategies, systems and programming cycles;
- Inclusiveness of the UN system with full involvement of specialized and non-resident agencies;
- Integration of the five programming principles (the human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, and capacity development) tailored to the country context;
- Mutual accountability for development results.

UNDG-ECHA Working Group on Transition: The UNDG-ECHA Working Group on Transition unites the development, political, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, and humanitarian actors of the broader UN System to develop policies, guidelines and methodological approaches to support countries in post-conflict transition settings. The working group includes UNDG and ECHA members and observers, as well as the UN Secretariat’s Peacebuilding Support Office, Department of Political Affairs and Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): UNDP is partnering with people at all levels of society to help build nations that can withstand crisis and drive and sustain the kind of growth that improves the quality of life for everyone. The organization supports countries to manage conflict and disaster risks, and to rebuild for resilience once crisis has past. The crisis recovery work is based on joint needs assessments and acts as a bridge between humanitarian and longer-term development efforts. UNDP leads the Cluster Working Group for Early Recovery. As such, it is responsible for initiating early recovery activities during the onset and protracted phases of a crisis as well as supporting the incorporation of early recovery programming across all humanitarian clusters.

---

4 See UN Transitional Strategy Guidance Note
5 Multi-Donor Trust Funds for example,