

HUMANITARIAN PERFORMANCE MONITORING (HPM) – MoRES IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION: CHECKLIST FOR THE CCCS

UNICEF policy

Strengthening humanitarian monitoring – through the four levels of the Monitoring of Results for Equity System (MoRES) – has been a corporate priority since 2011. In 2012 the [Humanitarian Performance Monitoring \(HPM\)](#) approach was formally adopted as “MoRES in Humanitarian Action”¹.

Minimum Standards for strengthening UNICEF humanitarian results based monitoring

Key considerations for a Country Office depend on their specific humanitarian context.

<i>When COs start to strengthen humanitarian results based monitoring / implement HPM</i>	<i>Minimum monitoring & reporting frequency</i>
As part of preparedness planning	All COs
Level 1 ² humanitarian responses (without a humanitarian appeal)	Optional
COs with appeals outside of Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) appeal, less than US\$10million	
Humanitarian Action for Children (HAC) chapters / IASC Strategic Response Plan (SRP) countries	Twice per year
COs with HAC chapters / SRPs that experience multiple sudden onset emergencies or ongoing chronic emergencies that require significant humanitarian programmes	Every 2 months
UNICEF part of the IASC SRP Flash appeal > US\$ 5 million or sudden deterioration requiring increase in CO appeal (HAC/SRP) by US\$ 5million	Every 2 months
Declaration of Level 2 or Level 3 Corporate Emergency	Monthly

Lessons learned and best practice

1. Do not wait for an emergency to become familiar with HPM

- Incorporating a specific Early Warning/Early Action Key Action (#13) can be used as a framework for familiarization on the HPM approach, and to carry out a few key preparedness actions
- During Q3 and Q4 2014 EMOPS and REAs will offer webinars on HPM and the EW-EA KA13 on strengthening humanitarian action

2. Define accountabilities for HPM at the CO level

- Without clear accountabilities for ‘who does what’, HPM risks becoming no-one’s job
- There is no ‘one size fits all’ approach to CO accountabilities given COs’ different capacities
- A guide to [CO Accountabilities for HPM](#) is in the HPM toolkit and is now part of key preparedness actions

3. Allocate funding for humanitarian results-based monitoring

- Best practice (examples from Philippines and Lebanon COs) suggested that COs allocate a set % of funds for M&E activities
- For Philippines CO it is 2% for M&E; for Lebanon CO it is 3% for M&E and Innovations
- These resources can be used to bring in additional CO M&E/HPM staff and hire additional Field Monitoring capacity in high threat environments

¹ See [PPP presentation on Humanitarian Performance Monitoring \(HPM\) – MoRES in Humanitarian Action](#) and [ESARO M&E Network meeting in 2012](#)

² See [CF/EXD/2011-001 UNICEF's Corporate Emergency Activation Procedure](#)