



CENTRAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND

CERF Two-year Evaluation: Management Response Matrix¹

1. The CERF Two-year Evaluation outlined key challenges for the Fund and presented a set of 37 strategic and operational recommendations to ensure that the Fund continues to meet its objectives. In response to these recommendations, OCHA prepared a management response matrix (MRM) that detailed the action to be taken for each recommendation based on inputs from a wide-range of stakeholders. A working draft of the matrix was shared with the Advisory Group in advance of its meeting in November 2008.

2. As the matrix serves as a “road map” for the work that needs to be completed before the next evaluation of the Fund in 2011, it will be updated on a bi-annual basis in order to reflect the implementation status of the recommendations. The first revision of the matrix took place in March/April 2009 and any significant changes have been highlighted in yellow in the accompanying text. The principal focus of the revision was to set more precise due dates and to detail action that has been taken with respect to the implementation of the recommendations. United Nations (UN) agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the three Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) consortia, and the Office of the Controller were invited to provide inputs to the revised matrix. A discussion on the matrix also featured on the agenda of a CERF inter-agency meeting in April 2009. The next review and revision of the matrix will take place in October/November 2009.

3. A number of recommendations that have been partially accepted or which remain ‘pending’ require further review and in-depth discussion with the Office of the Controller, or with UN agencies, IOM, and NGOs (through the IASC Working Group or other fora). These recommendations focus on issues related to UN-NGO partnerships and the administration of the Fund, including OCHA’s authority to approve adjustments to the CERF Secretariat cost plan, the ratio of programme support costs provided to OCHA to cover costs related to the management and oversight of the Fund, and financial reporting for grant recipients. Further discussion with relevant stakeholders is planned throughout 2009, with the aim of moving forward on these issues.

¹ As of 21 April 2009

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

The strategic recommendations were accepted in the Secretary-General's Report on the Central Emergency Response Fund (A/63/348). Due to the broad-based nature of these recommendations, individual responses and actions to be taken were not included as they are reflected in the responses and actions to be taken for the operational recommendations.

Strategic Recommendation 1: The CERF should continue under its current mandate. The size of the Fund should be allowed to increase progressively, in line with demands, and in parallel to improvements in the implementation capacity of the UN agencies and the management capacity of the CERF Secretariat.

RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
1.	<p>OCHA and the UN agencies need to acknowledge that NGOs have unique strengths to contribute to the objectives of the CERF, and hence the NGOs need to play a more important role in CERF processes than they have been playing so far.</p> <p>Accepted</p> <p>Note: By agreeing to the Principles of Partnership and through their specific partnership frameworks, UN agencies have acknowledged that NGOs and other humanitarian partners have unique strengths to contribute to humanitarian response delivery carried out by the UN system. Despite this, NGO involvement varies considerably and depends largely on the composition and structure of a country team as well as the existing relationship between UN entities and non-UN partners on the ground, in both substantial and procedural/financial terms. This is a longstanding issue affecting humanitarian response and coordination, and is not specific to the CERF.</p> <p>OCHA has applied a three-pronged approach to ensuring NGOs are involved in CERF processes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved consultation and stronger communication links (e.g. establishment of a CERF partnership task force in 2007); 2. Improved access to funding (e.g. provision of CERF to several ERFs); and 3. More targeted guidance and training (e.g. CERF guidance training materials have continuously emphasized the importance of NGOs in the field-based grant development process, and the HC/RC is required to detail the involvement of NGOs in the CERF application process when submitting a request). 	<p>Through telephone and email communication with HC/RCs and OCHA regional/field offices, the CERF Secretariat regularly reviews and ensures compliance with the requirement that NGOs and other humanitarian actors are present in the field-based CERF application process.</p> <p>To continue to improve existing humanitarian response architecture, the ERC advocates for broad-based humanitarian country teams, which adhere to the Principles of Partnership, with due emphasis placed on the principles of equality and transparency. Establishing more inclusive humanitarian country teams will encourage more active involvement of NGOs in the programme management cycle, and ensure that NGOs are engaged in strategic and operational discussions regarding prioritization, programming, and fund allocations (from the CERF). The IASC Working Group discussed draft guidance for establishing humanitarian country teams in Washington, DC in March 2009; this guidance is likely to be endorsed by the IASC at the end of the year.</p>	ERC, CERF Secretariat, Director of OCHA New York, Agencies, NGOs, HC/RCs, country teams	Expected: December 2009 (HCT Guidance)	Partially implemented
2.	<p>The 'underfunded' window should be renamed the 'underfunded'</p> <p>Partially accepted (pending outcome of review in 2009)</p>	This recommendation will be further examined within the context of a review	CERF Secretariat	Expected September 2009	Partially Implemented

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
	protracted crisis' window, or similar. A clearer more widely supported process for this window is required. A transparent set of data should be used to determine eligible countries and the process reviewed by the IASC Working Group for submission to the ERC.	<p>Note: The phrase 'underfunded protracted crisis' does not adequately describe the intent of this window. Furthermore, the General Assembly resolution governing the CERF makes specific reference to the phrase 'underfunded crises'. Changing the name would not be in line with the resolution and does not seem to provide added value.</p> <p>With respect to the IASC Working Group, the infrequency of meetings and process would affect timeliness and predictability of underfunded allocations. In March 2007, the IASC Working Group formally recommended that the CERF inter-agency group be used to discuss day-to-day issues, such as the discussions with agencies regarding underfunded allocations.</p>	of the underfunded window (planned for mid-2009) which will look at criteria and data utilized, stakeholders involved, and types of crises funded in order to make improvements/adjustments. To ensure that the underfunded decision-making process is communicated to a wide-range of stakeholders, improved and more comprehensive allocation information has been posted on the CERF website, including a summary of the underfunded allocation process. Additionally, a briefing on the underfunded allocation process was conducted for Member States in February 2009.	(ERC and Director of OCHA New York), Agencies		(Plan for underfunded review developed and internal consultations started in March 2009)
3.	In situations when agencies are awaiting funds from donors, or where they are required to set up common services on behalf of the UN system, the CERF loan window can be used creatively to strengthen time-critical response, provided that loan approval processes can be simplified, by removing the requirement for a pledge letter for smaller loans, and by allowing larger short-term loans against pledges. The loan window should be promoted among country teams as another tool available for humanitarian work.	Partially accepted (pending outcome of review in 2009)	<p>The loan procedure will be reviewed in consultation with the Office of the Controller.</p> <p>The CERF Secretariat is reviewing grant funding to common services, and will discuss the findings with the agencies. The goal is to develop a guidance note, which outlines the framework and conditions (particularly related to security phases) to fund common services. Agencies have noted that providing advances from the loan element for common services may not be feasible.</p> <p>The use of the loan window is promoted regularly in correspondence and in guidance from the ERC to HC/RCs. Procedures for the loan process will form part of the CERF Application Guidelines package and will be shared broadly.</p> <p>The ERC will continue to prefer pledge letters in order to be satisfied that firm pledges have been made in an amount sufficient to cover the funds advanced. However, he will review each loan application on a case-by-case basis and reserves the right to waive the requirement, as he deems appropriate. There is also no limit on the size of a loan request. However, the ERC may choose</p>	CERF Secretariat (ERC and Director of OCHA New York), Agencies, the Controller	<p>Expected September 2009 (review of loan element; development of common services guidance note)</p> <p>May 2009 (Application Guidelines)</p>	Partially implemented

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
			to cap a request based on the availability of loan funds.			
4.	The ERC and RC/HCs should re-emphasize the importance of impartial and objective chairing of cluster meetings, particularly when CERF funding allocations are being discussed. Ideally, clusters should be chaired by officials without agency management responsibilities. Where this is not possible, cluster leads should consider inviting their co-leads or other members to chair funding discussions.	Partially accepted Note: According to the principles of the cluster approach, all cluster partners must have the opportunity to participate in the joint prioritization of projects. The cluster lead should serve as a facilitator and represent the interests of the cluster, regardless of their role of provider of last resort. In some situations (depending on the size/capacity of the emergency response and resources available), clusters have dedicated full-time cluster coordinators, with no other agency-specific responsibilities. This is strongly encouraged and often helps to ensure increased impartiality, particularly with respect to prioritization, resource mobilization and advocacy on behalf of the cluster.	In partnership with the agencies, OCHA will continue to provide comprehensive cluster coordination training in addition to providing guidance to HC/RCs and country teams on the proper implementation of the approach. In line with the IASC TORs for cluster leads, cluster leads are expected to chair meetings in an impartial and objective way, and take up their responsibilities in line with the TORs.	ERC, OCHA, clusters, Agencies, HC/RCs,	Ongoing	Ongoing
5.	The ERC should work with UNDGO to ensure that, when RCs receive CERF funds, lines of accountability to the ERC are fully adhered to, and that the RCs make full use of the humanitarian coordination mechanisms available.	Accepted (Action to be taken by OCHA, not UNDGO/DOCO)	The revised terms of reference for RCs (approved by UNDOCO on 29 January 2009) as well as the revised joint UNDP/ERC letter to RCs includes language which spells out the responsibilities and reporting lines in the disaster cycle and which clarifies the responsibilities of RCs with respect to humanitarian financing. OCHA is carrying out regional trainings for RCs that include information and guidance on humanitarian financing to increase their awareness of the available mechanisms. OCHA is also developing a Handbook for RCs on Humanitarian Coordination, which will provide them with guidance and information on humanitarian financing mechanisms. Responsibilities of RCs with respect to the CERF will be outlined as part of the Performance and Accountability Framework for the Fund.	ERC, OCHA, Agencies	Expected: September 2009 (PAF); December 2009 (remaining activities related to RC)	Partially implemented
6.	The UN agencies/IOM should work to promote the Principles of Partnership with NGOs throughout their organizations.	Accepted Note: This is part of the work of the Global Humanitarian Platform and has been presented to the IASC Working Group in June 2008, where agreement was reached on the adherence to the Principles of Partnership as a standard for UN-NGO partnership, including processes related to the Fund.	The CERF Secretariat has included the Principles of Partnership in the draft CERF Application Guidelines package. Consideration will be given to establishing an integrated training package on the various elements of the humanitarian reform.	UN and NGOs and CERF Secretariat	Expected: May 2009 (Application Guidelines)	Partially implemented (draft of guidelines developed)

Strategic Recommendation 2: The quality of CERF-funded programmes needs to become more consistent. To that end, the criteria for project approval and their application need to be further refined, including the application of the ‘Life-Saving Criteria’, assessments of agencies’ capacity, the timeframe for implementation and the use of needs assessments.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
7.	In order to ensure that CERF only funds activities arising out of humanitarian emergencies (both rapid and chronic), place the existing ‘life-saving criteria’ for CERF grants in the context of core emergency humanitarian needs to emphasise the principles articulated in the Secretary-General’s bulletin, and target the CERF more precisely so that prioritisation of needs becomes clearer.	Accepted in principle (pending outcome of review in 2009)	The CERF Secretariat will undertake a review of the life-saving criteria – along with partners in the CERF inter-agency group – to ensure they are appropriate and applied consistently. This review will also take into account the possibility of separating the application of the life-saving criteria by window. Regarding prioritization, guidance for field teams will be incorporated into the CERF Application Guidelines . Surge support, coaching and training for field staff will continue. Through telephone and email communication with HC/RCs, as well as field/surge missions, the CERF Secretariat will review and collect information on the prioritization process to prepare best practices and provide additional guidance.	CERF Secretariat, Director of OCHA New York, ERC, Agencies	Expected: October 2009	Partially implemented (plan/timeline for life-saving review developed)
8.	Appraisals of proposals by the CERF Secretariat for the rapid response window need to factor in the applicant agencies’ preparedness to launch a response immediately on approval of funds by the ERC (without waiting for Letter of Understandings and disbursement from the Controller’s office), and the RC/HC’s assessment of the agencies’ capacity to deliver timely response.	Accepted	The CERF application template will be revised to include a check box which asks the requesting agency (through self-assessment) to certify that it has capacity for immediate implementation and the timely delivery of assistance. This information should be confirmed by the HC/RC before submitting the request to the ERC.	CERF Secretariat, Agencies, HC/RCs	Expected: May 2009	Partially implemented (draft prepared; circulated to agencies in March 2009)
9.	In exceptional cases, particularly involving activities in the agricultural sector, the ERC needs to allow, from the outset, an extension of the project duration for RR grants.	Accepted Note: After careful review, the ERC has determined that the implementation period for all rapid response grants should be extended to six months. This will be implemented after the Secretary-General’s Bulletin has been updated.	The revised implementation period for rapid response grants (from the current period of three month to the revised period of six months) will be included in the updated Secretary-General’s Bulletin, which is currently under revision, and this will be subsequently reflected in the umbrella Letter of Understanding to be finalized in 2009.	CERF Secretariat (ERC and Director of OCHA New York), Agencies	Expected: December 2009 (revised SGB finalized; Umbrella Letter of Understanding approved)	Partially implemented
10.	Donors must continue to support agencies’ individual emergency response funds in addition to mechanisms such as CERF to ensure timely response.	Accepted NOTE: This recommendation is for donors.	This recommendation was included in the 2008 Secretary-General’s Report on CERF to the General Assembly . In addition, the ERC continues to advocate for improvements in humanitarian financing, including continued and timely	Donors and Agencies	Ongoing	Implemented

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
			support to agencies' individual emergency reserves and the CERF, in bilateral meetings with Member States as well as discussions at High-level Working Group meetings. At a donor retreat in Montreux in March 2009, the Director of OCHA New York stressed the importance of maintaining a diversity of humanitarian funding channels, and for providing consistent and predictable support to these channels to meet growing humanitarian needs.			
11.	Where feasible, CERF funds should be allocated based on coordinated needs assessments.	Accepted Note: Conducting coordinated needs assessments should form part of the standard operating procedures for humanitarian planning and response and should not be conducted for the CERF application process only	CERF Secretariat revised the CERF application template to include a check box, which requests the HC/RC to certify whether the grant request is based on coordinated and participatory needs assessments conducted by the country team/agencies and to provide information on when the assessments were carried out. The revised template has been circulated to the CERF inter-agency group for comment. Additional guidance will be included in the CERF Application Guidelines regarding the fact that CERF funds should be allocated based on coordinated, common needs assessments, where feasible.	CERF Secretariat, Agencies, HC/RCs	Expected: May 2009 (revised application template in place)	Partially implemented (draft prepared; circulated to agencies in March 2009).
12.	The CERF application template should include a section on important issues of principle such as gender equity.	Accepted	The CERF Secretariat revised the CERF application template in line with this recommendation, and circulated it to the CERF inter-agency group for comment. HC/RCs and country teams can also make use of GENCAP advisors, and the IASC Gender Handbook.	CERF Secretariat, Agencies	Expected: May 2009 (revised application template in place)	Partially implemented (draft prepared; circulated to agencies in March 2009).

Strategic Recommendation 3: The capacity of the CERF secretariat and OCHA field teams need to be strengthened, to ensure timely review of applications and high-quality decisions, and onward disbursement of funds from UN agencies/IOM to implementing partners needs to be speeded up, thereby guaranteeing faster response and better value for money. In addition, overhead charges need to be reviewed and the mandate of the CERF Advisory Group should be extended for a further period.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
13.	The CERF Secretariat officers should have discretion to seek the advice of Coordination and Response Division (CRD) during the appraisal of projects, when they feel it would be useful. While the CERF Secretariat should continue to copy all correspondence to CRD, formal reference of projects to CRD for review should no longer be a requirement.	Partially accepted (pending outcome of review in 2009)	The proposal review procedures are being internally reviewed; due consideration is being placed on the added value that CRD desk officers provide to the review of projects given their knowledge of country contexts. After taking in account the performance and timeliness of grant processing, and accountability lines, the standard operating procedures will be reviewed and revised (as appropriate).	CERF Secretariat, CRD, Director of OCHA New York, Director of CRD, ERC	Expected: September 2009	Partially Implemented (internal review started)
14.	When significant CERF funding is envisaged for countries without an OCHA presence, the ERC should ensure that a core team of OCHA or UN agency surge staff is deployed for a sufficient length of time to support the RC/HC in prioritisation, the CERF application process and coordination of the immediate response. Staff selected for deployment as part of OCHA and UN agency surge teams should be adequately trained and, where possible, include specialists in cross cutting issues, such as gender. Where such staff are required to assist RCs with the development of CERF proposals and with subsequent reporting, it is the view of the evaluation team that such costs should be considered a reasonable charge against the 3 percent overhead fee levied by the UN Secretariat.	Partially accepted Note: The provision of surge support for overall coordination of the immediate response is outside the scope of the Fund.	Surge support (an individual from OCHA or an agency) will continue to be provided to HC/RCs and country teams to support the prioritization and application process for Fund allocations; an increased number of missions is planned for 2009 and budgeted within the CERF Secretariat cost plan (which is covered by the 3 percent programme support cost retained by the UN Secretariat ²). Staff with experience in cross-cutting issues, such as gender and HIV/AIDS, will be given priority consideration. A surge capacity toolkit is in the process of being developed by the CERF Secretariat and will be circulated to the CERF inter-agency group for information. Part of the toolkit was developed in February 2009 and field-tested through surge capacity missions undertaken during the first round of funding from the underfunded window. The introduction of CERF Application Guidelines and the continuation of the CERF training programme will improve the knowledge of OCHA/agency staff on the CERF application process.	CERF Secretariat, Agencies, HC/RCs	Expected May 2009 (Application Guidelines); September 2009 (surge toolkit)	Partially implemented (part of the toolkit developed and field tested; standard TORs for surge missions drafted; draft of guidelines developed)
15.	The staffing of the CERF Secretariat should be strengthened to reflect	Accepted	The necessary paperwork for the reclassification of the Chief of the CERF	ERC and the Controller	Expected December 2009	Partially implemented

² The use of programme support costs is governed by the provisions of administrative instruction ST/AI/286.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
	levels of responsibility, and the consequence of error, and to ensure credibility with agency counterparts. Specifically, the Chief of the CERF Secretariat should be at the D1 level. In addition, the CERF Secretariat should be moved into proper office space as soon as possible.	Note: OCHA and the Office of the Controller have moved forward on a number of points elaborated in this recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing levels of the CERF Secretariat have been reviewed, and additional staff posts were approved in September 2008. The revised cost plan also included a request for the post of the Chief of the Secretariat to be upgraded to a D1. Funds have been allocated for the relocation of the CERF Secretariat to a new office space (which took place on 10 October 2008). 	Secretariat post from a P5 to a D1 was completed and submitted to the ACABQ. The next step is for ACABQ to schedule a meeting with the ERC on the proposal. <p>Some of the additional posts that were approved are in the process of being filled; others are in the process of being classified (by OHRM) and advertised as per standard procedure.</p>	and Department of Management		
16.	The UN Controller should delegate to the ERC the authority to approve adjustments to the CERF Secretariat budget, within agreed limits.	Pending discussion between OCHA and the Office of the Controller <p>Note: Further discussion between OCHA and the Office of the Controller is required. The Office of the Controller has inquired about the nature of the “rapidly changing environment” that would necessitate additional delegated authority to the ERC regarding the CERF Secretariat budget.</p>	Consultations between OCHA and the Office of the Controller are planned for the second quarter of 2009. This issue is on the agenda for those meetings.	ERC/Director of OCHA New York and the Controller	Pending	Pending
17.	The evaluation recommends that OCHA should initiate a discussion in the IASC on the harmonization of various humanitarian pooled funds, including the CERF. In order to improve consistency and coherence, the ERC should consider the appointment of a Director of Humanitarian Financing, through whom the Chief of the CERF Secretariat would report, to advise him on issues relating to all humanitarian pooled funds.	Accepted	IASC discussions on this topic have taken place regularly, including at the last Working Group meeting in November 2008, and should continue. Further discussion on humanitarian financing issues is likely to take place at an upcoming IASC-GHD meeting in July 2009, and at an IASC Working Group meeting in November 2009. The newly created unit with OCHA dealing with humanitarian financing (FSC) will work toward establishing guidance on the harmonization of the various pooled funds managed by OCHA. <p>Regarding the appointment of a director for humanitarian financing, the Director of OCHA New York currently manages the humanitarian financing (supply side) portfolio. The ERC may further review this issue in the context of OCHA’s resource planning.</p>	Pooled Funds: Director of OCHA New York Humanitarian Financing Director: ERC and the Controller	Expected November 2009 (IASC Working Group discussion on humanitarian financing)	Partially implemented (background paper produced for IASC Working Group discussion in Nov 2008)
18.	Negotiations with the RC/HC on the initial envelope for a CERF contribution should be handled on the telephone in the first days following a disaster by the ERC	Accepted	This recommendation will be incorporated into the standard operating procedures and CERF Application Guidelines. The standard practice of the ERC approving envelopes for funding	CERF Secretariat, ERC, Director of OCHA New York	Expected May 2009 (Application Guidelines)	Partially implemented (draft of guidelines developed)

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
	personally or by his Deputy or by the Director overseeing the CERF Secretariat. As a rule of thumb, an initial contribution to a medium-scale disaster could be between 10 and 20 percent of the initial Flash Appeal, with a special focus on those components of the Appeal required to get operations underway.		(based on needs, to the extent possible) will be continued. Envelopes of 10 to 20 percent will be considered, following an initial assessment of needs and a review of the context and type/scale of disaster. In the long-term, a tool for the categorization of crises should be developed which would determine the range for the initial contribution according to the severity and scale of the disaster.			
19.	The ERC should continue to routinely remind RC/HCs that the CERF funds emergency humanitarian needs, was never intended to fund everything, nor was it meant to fund all agencies. Requests must focus on the most urgent enabling activities and on those sectors where government or civil society capacity is weakest, or where donor support is least likely to be available.	Accepted Such information is regularly included in correspondence and guidance to HC/RCs and the country teams. Field visits undertaken by the ERC, Director of OCHA New York, and the CERF Secretariat will continue to expand these messages, as based on the lifesaving criteria, which were discussed and agreed upon by agencies in the CERF inter-agency group.	Part of regular work of the CERF Secretariat	ERC (and the CERF Secretariat)	Ongoing	Implemented
20.	Through its field-based staff, OCHA should continue to articulate clearly the CERF allocation criteria and funds availability, and through better communication, including greater use of telephone and satellite links, the CERF Secretariat should ensure that initial CERF proposals for rapid response are received within a maximum of ten days after the disaster.	Partially accepted (pending outcome of review in 2009)	Coaching (through telephone and email communication) as well as training of OCHA and agency headquarters/field staff on the application process are part of the regular work of the CERF Secretariat. The CERF Secretariat will explore the possibility of holding regular teleconferences with OCHA regional offices. With the introduction of a CERF Application Guidelines package, OCHA and agency field staff will have clearer written guidance on the application criteria and process. As for establishing a deadline for the submission of rapid response proposals, this issue will need to be revisited following a review of the timeliness for the development of grant requests in the field. In principle, ten days should be a reasonable target (depending on the context). When reviewing this recommendation in 2009, consideration will be given to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing guidance to the field on the trigger, steps, and timeline for the development of an application based 	CERF Secretariat, CRD, Agencies	Expected: May 2009 (Application Guidelines) December 2009 (remaining issues)	Partially implemented

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
			<p>on the type of emergency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introducing a new project management system for the Fund to enable project tracking from the field Ensuring that the application process for CERF funding is clearly elaborated in inter-agency preparedness and contingency plans, to accelerate the process in the event of a sudden onset emergency. 			
21.	Given that the ERC is accountable to donors for the use of the funds, he should request a commitment from the UN agencies to forward project funds to implementing partners within a target number of days and to publish tables of performance in the same way as the CERF Secretariat.	<p>Pending</p> <p>Note: With respect to the implementation of this recommendation, agencies have noted that a distinction needs to be made when providing funding to NGOs on a programme versus project basis. For programme-based agencies, funds from various sources are pooled together, making it impossible to attribute timeliness of funding to implementing partners to one source, including CERF. It is also important to note that since some UN agencies are currently revising their NGO partnership arrangements procedures, a more comprehensive response to this point will be possible once these processes are completed.</p>	<p>This issue was presented to the IASC Working Group at its meeting in November 2008; no specific conclusions were reached at that time. A follow-up IASC Working Group meeting to discuss system-wide partnership issues from a programme-based perspective may take place in late 2009.</p> <p>OCHA is considering transforming the CERF inter-agency group (as well as the partnership task force) into a broader humanitarian financing forum, which would look at issues related to pooled funds and partnerships (from a programme-based perspective). Periodic IASC-GHD or similar meetings on partnership issues may be necessary for targeted and strategic discussions on policy issues stemming from this broader humanitarian financing task force.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the challenges, attempts will be made to develop appropriate measurement tools.</p>	ERC and Agencies	Expected December 2009	Partially Implemented (background paper prepared for IASC Working Group meeting in Nov 2008; range of bilateral consultations undertaken)
22.	The evaluation recommends that the ERC should seek to negotiate with the UN Controller an understanding that two-thirds of the UN Secretariat's 3 percent programme support cost (PSC) charge will be made available to OCHA to meet all legitimate costs associated with the management and oversight of the CERF.	<p>Pending discussion between OCHA and the Office of the Controller</p> <p>Note: Further discussion between OCHA and Office of the Controller is required. The utilization of the programme support account is governed by the provisions of ST/AI/286 and by instruction from the Controller. According to current practice, 40 percent of the programme support costs may be used by the implementing offices and 60 percent of the income is used for central administrative functions. Actual budgets are based on operational requirements.</p>	Consultations between OCHA and the Office of the Controller are planned for the second quarter of 2009. This issue is on the agenda for those meetings.	ERC/Director of OCHA New York and the Controller	Pending	Pending

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
23.	OCHA should seek agreements with the five main humanitarian agencies and UNDP on ways of categorizing projects depending on the level of administrative support and oversight required from the UN agency, and on the indirect support cost structure of the agency concerned. PSC rates up to 7 percent could then be applied accordingly. An agreement should also be sought in the context of the IASC to standardize the provision of fair overhead charges for NGOs implementing projects funded by the CERF.	<p>Categorization of UN PSC rates: Partially accepted</p> <p>There is considerable variation in the terminology that humanitarian organizations use to describe their indirect support costs. In order to be able to categorize projects, agreement would need to be reached on the names and definitions of different categories of costs as well as the classification of costs per category. Under the auspices of the United Nations' High Level Committee on Management (specifically the Finance and Budget Network), a Working Group on Cost Recovery Policies is reviewing the issue and its results are expected in 2009.</p>	OCHA will continue to advocate for resolution of this issues through the Office of the Controller and through his Office, with the United Nations' Finance and Budget Network.	OCHA, Agencies	No specific timeframe can be given	Ongoing
		<p>Standardization of NGO overheads: Pending (to be presented to the IASC Working Group)</p>	See response under Recommendation 21.	ERC and Agencies	Expected: December 2009	Partially Implemented (background paper prepared for IASC Working Group meeting in November 2008; range of bilateral consultations undertaken)
24.	The evaluation recommends that the mandate of the CERF Advisory Group be extended for a further period of two years, and that its membership should rotate regularly, in keeping with its status as a group of members serving in their individual capacities. Members should continue to be drawn from a range of backgrounds and geographical origins. The practice of designating alternate members of the Advisory Group is no longer required. The Group should consist of 16 members. In addition, a wider platform involving all Member States contributing to the CERF needs to be created, which would be convened every six months by the ERC, where he could report on CERF progress, challenges and funding needs, and provide a forum for open discussions.	Accepted	<p>The terms of reference (TORs) of and the section in the Secretary-General's Bulletin (SGB) regarding the Advisory Group will be amended to take into account this recommendation (extension of mandate and change to the size of the group).</p> <p>A 'wider platform' for Member States was introduced during the high-level conference on CERF in December 2008, which included both a pledging conference and a half-day briefing/discussion with Member States on progress and challenges related to the Fund. The next 'wider platform' session will take place six months later. These 'wider platform' discussions will be in addition to the activities already planned for Member States throughout the year.</p>	<p>CERF Secretariat (ERC, Director of OCHA New York)</p> <p>(SGB revision: OCHA, Agencies, Office of the Controller, Office of Legal Affairs)</p>	<p>Implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ November 2008 (rotation) ■ December 2008 (wider platform) <p>Expected: December 2009 (Revision of the SGB; revision of TORs)</p>	<p>Partially implemented</p> <p>Note: The first rotation of one-third of members was completed, as was the first 'wider platform' meeting with Member States.</p>

Strategic Recommendation 4: The multiple lines of accountability for CERF need to be clarified, in consultation with the UN Controller and the operational agencies, to specify the roles of each actor³; the ERC needs to ensure that the operational agencies have in place appropriate monitoring and reporting systems, and to make use of quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation of CERF projects, without increasing the bureaucratic burdens in implementing humanitarian programmes.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
25.	The ERC should ask the Controller to work with the UN agencies/IOM to rationalize the CERF financial reporting system.	Pending discussion between OCHA and the Office of the Controller	Initial consultations have taken place. Further consultations between OCHA and the Office of the Controller are planned for the second quarter of 2009. This issue is on the agenda for those meetings, and will be discussed in the context of the revision of the Secretary-General's Bulletin. Any amendments will be reflected subsequently in the final umbrella Letter of Understanding.	CERF Secretariat (ERC and Director of OCHA New York), Agencies, Office of the Controller	Expected 2009	Pending
26.	When agencies receive more than one grant for the same emergency at the same time (through different sectoral/cluster proposals), the LOU ought to allow agencies flexibility to amend budgets, with the agreement of the HC, to reflect changing imperatives or priorities, and to prepare one comprehensive financial report.	Pending Financial reporting follows UN financial rules and regulations, and is managed by the Office of the Controller	The parameters of funding redeployment will be included in the draft Secretary-General's Bulletin, which is currently under revision. This has also been included in the draft interim umbrella Letter of Understanding, which will be implemented following approval of the interim umbrella Letter of Understanding by the Office of the Controller and operational agencies. Consultations between OCHA and the Office of the Controller are planned for the second quarter of 2009. Financial reporting is on the agenda for those meetings.	CERF Secretariat (ERC and Director of OCHA New York), Agencies, Office of the Controller	Expected December 2009 (Revised SGB finalized; umbrella Letter of Understanding approved)	Partially implemented (Internal discussions undertaken)
27.	Clear parameters for Monitoring and Evaluation, with detailed statements of specific interventions to be carried out, need to be included in all proposals and Letters of Understanding and the outputs made available to all through the in-country humanitarian country teams.	Accepted	This issue will be taken up in the context of discussions on the revised Secretary-General's Bulletin and will be reflected in the umbrella Letter of Understanding (as well as through the development of a Performance and Accountability Framework). Every effort will be made to ensure that existing monitoring and evaluation systems are used in addition to building on the work of the IASC CAP Sub-Working Group. Parameters, which are agreed upon, will be included in the CERF Application Guidelines package, the Performance and Accountability Framework, as well as in the umbrella Letter of Understanding	CERF Secretariat, Agencies, Office of the Controller	Expected December 2009	Partially implemented (Draft revised SGB prepared)

³ This will be tackled through the development of a Performance and Accountability Framework.

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
28.	The ERC could make use of independent assessors to conduct rapid appraisals of proposals (for large and complex operations) – these assessors will have been selected through a vetting process involving IASC, and trained in CERF-related requirements	Not accepted Note: The use of independent assessors may be detrimental to the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of the Fund. The function of the assessors is already adequately covered by a range of actors, including at the field level: the HC/RC, clusters/sectors, and the country team, and at the headquarters level: the CERF Secretariat and CRD. Surge capacity may serve to further support the HC/RC and country team in the rapid appraisal of proposals.	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
29.	In order to fulfil his responsibility for quality assurance, the ERC should from time to time commission independent programme audits, real-time evaluations and end-of-project evaluations, where appropriate using the roster of assessors. The evaluations/real-time evaluations (RTE) should include a mix of country studies, evaluations of randomly selected individual CERF-funded projects and sector grants, as well as overall evaluations like the current one. All reports should be made available to all stakeholders.	Partially accepted Note: The suggestion to commission independent programme audits (understood to include a financial component) is not in accordance with the Secretary-General's Bulletin (ST/SGB/2006/10), which states that CERF grant or loan recipients need to comply with their own financial regulations and rules, including internal and external audit procedures. With respect to end-of-project evaluations, the grant element is predicated on the principle that the recipient UN agencies and IOM follow their own internal system of monitoring and evaluation to ensure the implementation and delivery of results; changes to this will need to be carefully considered/reviewed in consultation with the agencies. With respect to real-time evaluations, agencies have noted that these should be done in conjunction with evaluations of other elements of the reform to promote a comprehensive approach. Furthermore, a review of the CERF should be incorporated into a more programme/response oriented review of results and impact, particularly as a number of CERF grant recipients have a programme-based approach to the delivery of assistance.	Real-time evaluations (as part of the IASC approved project) are planned for 2009 and evaluators will be selected according to standard procedure. As part of this, CERF processes/results will be reviewed in those countries, which received funds. A real-time evaluation of all the reform elements will be considered. Another independent review of the Fund is planned for 2011 (pending GA decision). An internal, interim review is planned for late 2009/early 2010 to review progress made on the recommendations of the Two-year Evaluation. Other performance and accountability measures - to ensure that the ERC is satisfied that the CERF application and project implementation processes are being properly undertaken and to determine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out with CERF funds - will be defined in consultation with the agencies through the negotiation of the umbrella LoU and the development of the Performance and Accountability Framework. The ERC may also decide to undertake other assessments/evaluations as he deems appropriate.	OCHA and Agencies	Expected: September 2009 (PAF) December 2009 (umbrella Letter of Understanding finalized)	Partially Implemented

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
30.	The CERF Secretariat should produce an annual report on activities for a wide audience, and ensure a wide distribution for its monthly update on activities.	Accepted	A CERF annual report for 2007 was published and distributed in 2008; the 2008 annual report is being drafted and will be distributed in May 2009. The distribution list for and the type of information in the CERF newsletter has been expanded to ensure that a broader range of partners receives information on the Fund. A communication strategy has been finalized, which would detail systems for information dissemination and aid in improving transparency and accountability to primary stakeholders of the Fund.	CERF Secretariat	Expected: April 2009	Partially implemented
31.	OCHA and the UN agencies should explore setting up in-country rapid response mechanisms, or Emergency Response Funds (ERFs), part-funded by CERF, in countries in protracted crises or subject to disasters, as a way of funding reputable and principled civil society organizations with recognised programme capacity. Where appropriate, UN agencies may be encouraged to 'pre-qualify' competent national and international NGO partners, and to agree consistent arrangements for payment of overheads.	Partially accepted Note: ERFs are established by HC/RCs to provide grants not only to NGOs but also to UN agencies and IOM for small-scale rapid response activities to meet unforeseen critical needs and fill gaps within the existing response.	The decision to establish an ERF is made by the HC/RC. The ERC is encouraging HC/RCs to set up ERFs where appropriate, and OCHA will help facilitate and support existing and new ERFs. As ERFs have developed organically at the field level, they vary considerably. A 'policy' on CERF funding to ERFs is being developed as the defining features of ERFs are established (e.g. structure, size, etc) and ERF guidelines are developed. The CERF Secretariat has reviewed the handful of ERFs that received grants from the Fund to determine lessons learned, which will be applied when developing CERF policy on ERFs. In exploring the relationship between CERF and ERFs, due consideration should be placed on ensuring complementarity while at the same ensuring that they remain distinct funding mechanisms. Using the CERF loan element to bridge gaps in donor contributions to ERFs also will be explored. Pre-qualifying NGO partners and the issue of establishing consistent arrangements for the payment of overheads was presented to the IASC Working Group given that these issues relate to internal policies and frameworks of the agencies and to broader humanitarian financing concerns (See	ERFs: Director of OCHA New York (With support from relevant units) NGOs: Agencies and NGOs and IASC	ERFs: Expected December 2009 NGOs: December 2009 (With limitations)	Partially implemented (Background paper prepared for IASC Working Group meeting in Nov 2008; range of bilateral consultations undertaken)

	RECOMMENDATIONS	Response	Action Taken or Planned	Responsible Entity	Time frame	Status
			<p>response under recommendation 21). Programme-based agencies have noted that this recommendation is not applicable to them. Pre-qualification should be given careful consideration and if implemented, done so in a fully transparent way as this may have negative implications for local/national NGOs. Lessons learned from the HACT/UNDG rollout should be taken into account.</p> <p>It is important to note that some agencies (most notably UNICEF) are in the process of improving their partnership frameworks.</p>			
32.	Within the limitations of CERF, OCHA and UN agencies should explore various options for enabling NGOs to have meaningful access to CERF funds rapidly, and at low cost.	Accepted	The CERF Secretariat will explore increased use of ERFs contingent upon the resolution of issues raised in Recommendation 31. The establishment of a “managing agent” for CERF grants to NGOs will also be explored.	CERF Secretariat (Director of OCHA New York) and Agencies	December 2009	Partially implemented (internal consultation process underway)
33.	The General Assembly should consider inviting all Member States to contribute to the CERF, and requesting the Secretary-General to commission a further independent evaluation in early 2011.	Accepted NOTE: This recommendation is for the GA/Member States and was included in the Secretary-General’s Report on CERF to the General Assembly.	<p>This recommendation was included in the Secretary-General’s Report on CERF to the General Assembly. In the ensuing General Assembly resolution, Member States requested that another independent review be conducted in 2011.</p> <p>The ERC continues to advocate for the achievement of the annual funding target of \$450m set by the General Assembly. The funding target was surpassed in 2008 with \$453 million committed by from 67 Member States, one Observer State, six private organizations, and individual contributions through the United Nations Foundation. CERF now has 104 contributing Member States altogether since 2006.</p>	General Assembly; OCHA	Implemented: December 2008 (High-level conference on CERF; General Assembly resolution finalized)	Implemented (Funding target met in 2008; resource mobilization plan in place)