



© UNICEF/to come

# Managing Results for Humanitarian Action

## Why is this important?

In humanitarian situations, UNICEF is accountable for making a difference in protecting children and women, and saving lives, in line with the strategic results in the Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action. In these contexts, managing for results requires quick analysis and decision-making, often in politicized contexts and with significantly increased resources; as well as managing different and sometimes disconnected groups of partners and Inter-Agency architectures across development, peace and security and humanitarian. These features all bring risks to programme results. COs are also required to demonstrate accountability to communities and people affected by humanitarian crises, especially from the most vulnerable groups, women and wherever possible, engaging adolescents and youth. These accountabilities and the management of risks require COs to have access to and use adequate information on the situation of children and women, and the progress and results of programmes, including analysis and use of inputs and feedback from affected people.

## What are Representatives accountabilities related to RBM?

- Development, monitoring and quality control of UNICEF humanitarian action aligned to UNICEF CCCs and relevant Inter-Agency standards, adapted as relevant to context, ensuring Inter-Agency coherence and coordination, and integrating longer term recovery priorities and opportunities.
- Oversight of Cluster/Areas of Responsibility where UNICEF is Cluster Lead Agency against agreed cluster coordination functions<sup>1</sup> and cluster level mechanisms for accountability to affected populations.

## What are the key elements?

Needs assessment and analysis are led where possible by the government and by the Humanitarian Coordinator with the Humanitarian Coordination Team (HCT) and clusters/sectors. UNICEF is committed to supporting a “transparent, collaborative needs assessment and analysis process” and “ensuring that any sector-specific assessments are undertaken under the umbrella of a coordinated ... plan at inter-cluster/sector level.” UNICEF plays a supporting role: providing inputs to pre-crisis secondary data analysis related to the situation of children and women; supporting specialized sector/cluster-specific assessments where UNICEF is cluster lead agency; and advocating for inter-cluster planning and coordination of assessment work to support efficiency and transparent common analysis.

<i>Key planning &amp; monitoring milestones</i>	
<i>Humanitarian Programme Cycle</i>	<i>UNICEF inputs and milestones</i>
Inter-agency situation analysis – day 3	UNICEF inputs to secondary data analysis
Flash Appeal – day 3-5	Finalize Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) appeal
Multi-Sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) – day 14	UNICEF-led clusters coordination and/ or UNICEF contributes to sector data collection & analysis
Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) – day 30	Finalize UNICEF planning (including links / implications for existing work plans)
Operational Peer Review – by day 90	Reporting in SitRep at frequency agreed with RO (Level 1), REMT (L2) or global EMT (L3)
Periodic Monitoring Report – by day 90	
Humanitarian Needs Overview -- September	UNICEF contributes to sector data collection & analysis
HRP – November	Input to Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) appeal
Global Appeal – December	Annual Work Planning

<sup>1</sup> The six core functions are: support service delivery; inform the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian Country Team's (HCT) strategic decision-making; plan and develop strategy; monitor and evaluate performance; build capacity in preparedness and contingency planning; and advocacy

**Development of response plans and funding appeals** are undertaken in a fast iterative process, with Inter-Agency and UNICEF plans feeding into each other as they are drafted in parallel (see box). In rapid onset crises, the appeals are based on the initial macro level planning objectives and targets, and are finalized within days. Where UNHCR is coordinating refugee response, Refugee Response Plans are added to this.

Where humanitarian situations are protracted, there is an opportunity and a need to push toward **better integration of humanitarian and development programming** at an Inter-Agency level. Among the key elements promoted to operationalize this are integrated development/humanitarian assessments and a shift to multi-year planning, and within that, a more localized blended approach to programming that fits sub-national contexts and programming opportunities. Where the inter-agency Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) moves into an annual or two-year rolling plan, it is linked to narrative and outcomes in the UNDAF, and in an integrated UN presence (peacekeeping operation or a special political mission), this is in turn linked to the wider Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF).

**Performance monitoring for humanitarian response is a suggested adapted approach** due to the demand for higher frequency information at scale and the contextual limitations on data collection systems. Monitoring should allow the CO to answer the following key management questions:

- Are we making progress against targets? – i.e. what is the coverage on key results?
- What is the quality of the response on the ground?
- Do we have the resources to achieve results? – money, people, supplies
- Where relevant, are we meeting our Cluster Lead Agency accountabilities?

The recommended minimum approach for a CO with HAC appeals combines: partner reporting on a few priority indicators for coverage estimates; a scaled up and systematic field monitoring focused on quality dimensions and including feedback from affected people; ensuring periodic assessment of clusters against agreed core functions and measurement tools; and good use of internal data on resources from VISION. The CO needs to invest resources to ensure these different streams of data collection are in place, that the data is analysed for use by the country or emergency management team, and that summary data feeds then into reporting including for the SitRep.

## What are the key considerations in applying and contextualizing this?

While planning is iterative across multiple levels of nesting Inter-Agency plans and result frameworks, **it is critical to keep coherence and consistency on targeted results for which UNICEF is accountable.**

**The big picture across sectors is important.** COs often fail to bring sector colleagues together to think through planning figures (affected population, overall and activity specific targets, geographic focus); targeting and outreach strategies (how to get to the most vulnerable); sequencing of priorities, operational modalities, evolution to longer term perspectives and building resilience; cross-sectoral coordination; as well as cross-cutting programming issues such as protection, cash transfer programming and community engagement and accountability mechanisms. Ideally the CO inputs to and aligns with IA strategy and planning assumptions agreed at the HCT, inter-cluster and cluster levels.

**The level of government capacity will shape UNICEF approach to performance monitoring.** Wherever possible, the different streams of monitoring – for prioritized high-frequency coverage indicators; for field monitoring on quality and feedback from affected people; and on cluster coordination – should be government coordinated and owned.

**UNICEF should advocate to and align with Cluster level performance monitoring** frequency and indicators. This is a key to streamlining CSO partners reporting burden.

**Performance monitoring approaches should adapt as fits the programming.** In acute situations, the focus is on narrow data collection matching priority life-saving and protection results. As the situation allows, programming expands to longer-term issues and so should monitoring approaches. However, this will be a mix of higher-frequency and more traditional monitoring approaches, integral to the overall monitoring plan for the CO.

There is a call on all humanitarian actors to include the people and communities affected by humanitarian crises in decisions-making. This requires providing accessible information; ensuring that an effective process for participation and feedback are in place; ensuring that design and management decisions are responsive; and strengthening capacities of local first responders in this same vein. It also requires collective and coordinated approaches to community engagement and accountability, to reduce burden on at risk and affected people and communities and increase mutual accountability for quality and effectiveness. (see *Putting People at the Centre*)

## Resources

- [The Humanitarian Performance Monitoring Toolkit](#)
- [HumanitarianResponse.info](#) provides guidance on templates for the HRP, Appeals and On-line Project System.

**For more information please contact:**

[Kate Alley](#), Assessment, Planning and M&E Specialist EMOPS,