In Memoriam

OCHA Annual Report 2009 is dedicated to the memory of all those we lost in the devastating earthquake in Haiti.
OCHA’s Mission

The mission of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) 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 for the rights of people in need;
- promote preparedness and prevention; and
- facilitate sustainable solutions.
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Foreword

In over three years as Emergency Relief Coordinator, I have seen OCHA’s strong partnership with the humanitarian community help produce effective responses to major emergencies. These include Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, massive displacement in Pakistan and the earthquake in Haiti, as well as continuing efforts in the protracted crises that unfortunately show few signs of ending, such as in Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

This essential progress is possible only because the humanitarian community is working together today in ways that were unimaginable a decade ago, or even five years ago when the Asian tsunami hit.

The humanitarian architecture that helps the system meet these challenges is now bedded in. Humanitarian Coordinators are stronger, Humanitarian Country Teams are more representative of the communities they represent, cluster coordination is more effective, and we have a toolbox of funding mechanisms that allow us to provide financial resources more quickly and predictably than ever.

In 2009, OCHA-coordinated CAPs and Flash Appeals had a value of some US$9.9 billion. Flash Appeals are now published and revised more quickly. Consolidated Appeals became more inclusive strategies, as well as more comprehensive barometers of humanitarian requirements, and outcomes are increasingly monitored. Pooled funding is more cost effective, promoting prioritization and coordination, while reducing gaps and overlaps, and thus avoiding wasted resources. The CERF in particular fills the critical gap between appeals and release of funds, allocating funds within days of an emergency to kick-start relief efforts.

OCHA’s advocacy efforts, both public and behind the scenes, have helped secure enhanced access for humanitarian actors in a range of conflict situations, including in Sri Lanka, Sudan and Somalia. Through media outreach, IRIN reporting and Member State briefings, OCHA’s advocacy efforts also helped draw attention to neglected emergencies, bringing much-needed political and financial support.

In the months and years ahead, OCHA will deepen these efforts and continue working to strengthen the humanitarian system further, so it can better prepare for and respond to ever more demanding and complex humanitarian emergencies.

Through its new Strategic Framework for 2010-2013, OCHA aims to engage with a wider group of Member States and regional organizations, to generate greater support for humanitarian action, and make better use of national and regional operational capacities in preparing for and responding to emergencies.

OCHA is also focusing on getting the right people to the right place at the right time. We have country offices in the 25 most difficult humanitarian situations, supporting national and international coordinated response. Our five regional offices represent our first line of humanitarian response when disaster strikes where we have no country office. But we need to do more. We are introducing a “suite of surge solutions” to ensure the right people are on the ground immediately after a new disaster, and a continuous OCHA presence thereafter. This will be coordinated with transition to longer-term staffing. We are already witnessing the first fruits of this effort in the Haiti response.

Now that the OCHA global footprint is better defined than ever before, we can focus on ensuring that our partner services and support evolve to meet the needs. To reflect the ever-changing context and increasing demands, OCHA wants to provide more predictable support to partners. This includes further reinforcing humanitarian coordination leaders on the ground to ensure that they possess the skills, knowledge and experience necessary to carry out their work, and strengthening coordination mechanisms. OCHA must also be in the lead on the framing and resolution of policy issues and the reduction of institutional frictions. And it must improve the evidence base for humanitarian decision-making, planning and resource allocation, as well as help devise better ways of measuring the real impact of humanitarian operations on the people we are trying to help.

OCHA’s cost is a small fraction of the overall humanitarian effort – around 2 per cent. But in my judgment, and the judgment of many of you, it is a critical one. We are the small cog that keeps the engine turning. So I ask you to continue to support us generously. Ninety-five per cent of our funding comes from voluntary contributions, and only 5 per cent from the United Nations regular budget (a proportion I want to see increase in the coming years).

To assist in further improving timely and effective humanitarian action, I therefore call on you, our stakeholders, our Member States, to do three things: provide more un earmarked funding for OCHA so that we can deliver on our mandated responsibilities; provide earlier disbursements of your pledges so that we can keep our services running across all our field locations without cash-flow problems; and to commit, when possible, to multi-year funding to allow us a predictable basis on which to plan for the years ahead.

John Holmes
May 2010
## OCHA Strategic Framework 2007-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A better coordinated, more equitably supported international humanitarian response system</strong></td>
<td>1.1 – A predictable and needs-based humanitarian financing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 – Improved coordination structures at country, regional and international level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 – Strengthened OCHA emergency response capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 – Greater incorporation of disaster risk reduction approaches and strengthened preparedness in humanitarian response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 – A strategy contributing to seamless transition and early recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognized OCHA leading role in humanitarian policy, advocacy and information management</strong></td>
<td>2.1 – Action-oriented analysis of humanitarian trends and emerging policy issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 – More strategic advocacy of humanitarian principles and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 – A common approach to needs assessments and impact evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 – Protection advanced at the global, regional and national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 – Strengthened information management based on common standards and best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>An effectively managed and responsive organization</strong></td>
<td>3.1 – Improved management practices for “one OCHA”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 – Application of better financial management tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 – Accountable and transparent human resources planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 – Competent management cadre effectively leading teams and accountable for results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I: Introduction

OCHA STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK 2007-2009
ORGANIZATIONAL DIAGRAM
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE — ANNOTATED
2007-2009 APPLICATION OF LESSONS LEARNED
Organizational Diagram
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The executive management of OCHA consists of the offices of the Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator and the Assistant Secretary-General/Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, as well as the offices of the Directors of New York, Geneva and the Coordination and Response Division.

The Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator (USG/ERC) serves as the principal adviser to the Secretary-General on all humanitarian issues. The USG/ERC has three primary tasks: humanitarian policy development and coordination in support of the Secretary-General; advocacy of humanitarian issues and provision of guidance and direction to United Nations Resident Coordinators and Humanitarian Coordinators (RCs/HCs); and coordination of international humanitarian response. The USG/ERC chairs the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the Executive Committee for Humanitarian Affairs (ECHA). With an emphasis on strategic planning, management, staff security and transition issues, the Assistant Secretary-General/Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator supports the work of, and is principal adviser to, the USG/ERC. The Assistant Secretary-General provides direct managerial supervision of OCHA, ensuring effective cooperation between Headquarters (New York and Geneva), Regional Offices (ROs) and Country Offices (COs). The Assistant Secretary-General oversees the Executive Office and the Strategic Planning Unit.

Executive and Administrative Offices

The Executive Office in New York and the Administrative Office in Geneva are primarily concerned with finance and budget; human resources, and staff development and training. The Executive Office is the OCHA internal authority on administrative policy issues. It interprets United Nations Staff and Financial Regulations and Rules, and provides overall guidance on related administrative instructions and procedures. The Executive Office supports senior management in formulating human resources development initiatives including training and development strategies, succession planning, staff mobility and rotation, and rostering. The Executive Office coordinates departmental programme budgets and presentations to legislative bodies, and manages the Trust Fund for the Strengthening of OCHA and its related Special Account for Programme Support (which funds administrative activities in New York).

Under the overall strategic direction of the head of the Executive Office, the Administrative Office manages the receipt and expenditure of funds; provides management and (financial) donor reporting; guides field staff and desk officers on the availability and use of funds; supports the procurement of goods and services; and undertakes the recruitment and deployment of field staff. It manages the Trust Fund for Disaster Relief (the main source of funding for field activities) and its related Special Account for Programme Support (which funds administrative activities in Geneva).

Office of the Director, New York

The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) Secretariat supports the ERC in managing the fund, which is composed of a loan element of US$50 million and a grant element with a funding target of $450 million ($500 million in total). In addition to vetting the proposals and advocating full and timely funding, the Secretariat also publicizes the fund’s successes.

The External Relations and Partnerships Section is mainly responsible for relationship management, partnership building and resource mobilization (primarily for CERF) with Member States and the private sector. The Funding Coordination Section (FCS) provides technical, programmatic and policy guidance in collaboration with internal and external partners on country-based pooled funds (Common Humanitarian Funds and Emergency Response Fund) to OCHA Headquarters and the field, partners and donors. FCS also actively supports OCHA COs on establishing and managing the funds.

The IASC, chaired by the ERC, is the inter-agency forum created as a result of the General Assembly Resolution 46/182 for humanitarian dialogue and decision-making among key humanitarian partners. The IASC is composed of the United Nations, international organizations, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs. The IASC’s primary role is to shape humanitarian policy and ensure coordinated and effective response. The Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs, also chaired by the USG/ERC, brings the humanitarian components of the United Nations together with the development, human rights, political, peacekeeping and security arms of the United Nations Secretariat and agencies to address important humanitarian issues and crises. The IASC/ECHA Secretariat in New York facilitates the work of the IASC and ECHA.

Communications and Information Services Branch

The Communications and Information Services Branch provides a range of services that allow OCHA to better manage its information and communicate it strategically
to influence the policies and practices of key actors. The branch works with OCHA at Headquarters and the field, donors and Member States. It also works with IASC organizations including cluster leads and NGOs, as well as international media, research initiatives, think tanks and academia, humanitarian information sources and partnership networks.

The Communications Services Section’s (CSS) key activities include formulating an agreed OCHA-wide communications strategy and related policy guidance for public information, advocacy, visual media and reporting. CSS supports OCHA with more targeted advocacy outreach by making creative use of multimedia including films and info-graphics.

The Information Services Section (ISS) helps to ensure the availability of the information resources and information management expertise that OCHA requires to function effectively in emergencies. ISS builds sustainable partnerships in advance of disasters that directly contribute to the predictable exchange of information in emergencies.

Information Technologies Section provides basic communications systems such as e-mail, and more complex infrastructure such as the Web Content Management and Document Management systems to Headquarters and the field, including for emergency operations.

IRIN brings quality humanitarian news and fresh, accessible analysis to audiences who otherwise would not hear about them. This includes French and Arabic services, photo, radio, podcasts and traditional media syndication. IRIN also re-broadcasts on major television channels and engages the younger generation through social and mobile media. It helps meet the needs of people in crisis by giving timely and original information to aid workers, decision makers, analysts and media.

ReliefWeb provides 24-hour daily coverage of natural disasters and complex emergencies, and produces analytical mapping including humanitarian profile maps. It aims to have a strong editorial presence to review content, to provide data to facilitate analysis and to deliver information in an effective, user-friendly way.

Policy Development and Studies Branch
The Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) supports effective emergency response coordination and advocacy by providing leadership on humanitarian policy, evaluation and best practice. PDSB ensures the integration of humanitarian principles, protection concerns, lessons learned and agreed policies into operational planning. PDSB identifies emerging humanitarian trends and supports the development of common policy positions among humanitarian agencies. It does this in cooperation with other OCHA branches, United Nations Secretariat partners and United Nations operational agencies, as well as with the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement and humanitarian NGOs, think tanks and the academic community. PDSB also works with OCHA offices in the field to identify emerging policy issues and adapt them into concrete guidance and analytical tools for use by field practitioners.

The Disaster and Vulnerability Policy Section develops guidance and tools to make policy more effective, specifically in relation to disasters associated with natural hazards and climate change. The section also monitors and analyses overall trends and factors related to vulnerability and their impact on humanitarian action. The Evaluation and Studies Section plans and implements evaluations of IASC and General Assembly-mandated evaluations, as well as internal evaluations, as accountability tools to measure the performance and effectiveness of humanitarian action (beyond OCHA) and as learning tools to improve OCHA response. The Inter-Governmental Support Section (IGSS) supports the work of intergovernmental bodies and contributes to greater awareness and application of humanitarian policies and principles. IGSS promotes systematic and informed policy dialogue among Member States, including through United Nations organs (the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council) as well as regional and sub-regional organizations. The Policy Planning and Analysis Section strengthens OCHA capacity to link humanitarian policies and practices more directly with operational decision-making at the country level. The Protection of Civilians Section promotes the systematic consideration of protection of civilians issues by the Security Council, as well as regional organizations at policy and operational levels. It advises the field on how to respond to specific issues affecting civilians in times of armed conflict. The Adviser to the Representative of the Secretary-General (RSG) on Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons supports the RSG in policy development in his/her missions and in dialogue with governments.

In 2009, PDSB also managed three thematic areas: the Assessment and Classification in Emergencies Project, which supports the inter-agency development of a common humanitarian classification system and definitions, including the Humanitarian Dashboard; the Guidance Management Project, which oversees the development of normative corporate guidance for greater organizational coherence and professionalism; and the Gender Advisory Team, which supports the mainstreaming of gender equality programming into humanitarian action, and protection against sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual gender-based violence-related activities within OCHA. An additional limited capacity also existed in 2009 to better equip OCHA and its partners to deal with the effects of the global food crisis.
Coordination and Response Division
The Director of the Coordination and Response Division (CRD) oversees the daily management of all OCHA ROs/COs and is responsible for coordinating all country-level humanitarian strategies. The Director assumes the lead role within OCHA in advising the USG/ERC on operational decision-making for response.

Through the geographic desks, CRD provides technical support to RCs/HCs, OCHA offices and Humanitarian Country Teams. In particular, CRD supports OCHA in-country efforts to promote effective and inclusive coordination mechanisms in humanitarian contexts, including in highly insecure environments, multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations or special political mission environments, and humanitarian crises in transition. CRD serves as the main conduit of information and support between the field and Headquarters, facilitating effective interaction among all OCHA branches and its ROs/COs.

Office of the Director, Geneva
The Director Geneva oversees the daily management of the office and serves as Chair of the IASC Working Group. The five primary tasks of the office in Geneva are stewardship of inter-agency coordination; administrative service to Geneva and the field; development and management of emergency preparedness and response tools; resource mobilization; and collaboration with International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and other partners in disaster mitigation and preparedness. There are two branches under the Director Geneva – the External Relations and Support Mobilization Branch and the Emergency Services Branch. There are also three stand-alone sections: the Displacement and Protection Support Section; the Humanitarian Coordination Support Section; and the IASC Secretariat.

The Displacement and Protection Support Section (DPSS) supports the USG/ERC in inter-agency coordination of the protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons. Working with country offices, country teams, national authorities and global cluster leads, DPSS has four key priorities: monitor and strengthen the inter-agency response to internal displacement; support the implementation of OCHA policy instruction on protection at international and field levels; strengthen OCHA capacity to incorporate protection into core functions; and augment and maintain...
inter-agency capacity to respond to protection crises, particularly in situations of internal displacement through the Protection Standby Capacity Project initiative.

The Humanitarian Coordination Support Section (HCSS) was formed as a result of the merging of the Humanitarian Reform Support Unit and HCSS project entities. HCSS supports OCHA, IASC and other stakeholders to build and maintain an effective humanitarian coordination system by improving and strengthening cluster coordination mechanisms and leadership capacities at the field and global level. To this end, HCSS formulates policy development on coordination issues; supports OCHA country offices in making coordination structures work; identifies and grooms candidates for humanitarian coordination positions; trains coordination leaders; and develops knowledge management tools to support their work.

The IASC Secretariat facilitates the work of the IASC including its Working Group, chaired by the Director Geneva.

**External Relations and Support Mobilization Branch**

The External Relations and Support Mobilization Branch mobilizes resources and support for humanitarian operations and OCHA requirements, strengthens humanitarian strategies for major crises, and promotes greater quality and quantity of humanitarian funding. It also strengthens partnerships and information exchange with Europe-based institutions. The Public Information Officer provides the media with timely and relevant information on emergencies and OCHA activities.

The Consolidated Appeal Process Section (CAP) supports country and regional application of the CAP as a tool for strategic planning, prioritization, and monitoring of joint humanitarian action and funding appeals. It also supports related normative guidance development in the IASC and manages the Financial Tracking System.

The Donor Relations Section is primarily responsible for mobilizing extra-budgetary financial resources for the effective implementation of OCHA-budgeted activities. It is the donor community’s first point of contact in OCHA and it works closely with the OCHA Donor Support Group. The section also works with the Executive and Administrative Offices on allocating donor contributions based on donor agreements. The Geographical Coordination and Monitoring Section (GCMS) is the substantive focal point in OCHA Geneva for all humanitarian operation matters. During sudden-onset disasters, GCMS backs up CRD outside New York working hours, thereby enabling round-the-clock OCHA coverage. The Brussels Liaison Office focuses on European-based organizations, particularly the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, NGOs and the United Nations in Brussels. It influences their policies and decisions on humanitarian issues. The Liaison Office also monitors humanitarian policy debates and promotes the adoption and use of United Nations principles, guidelines and operational standards among partners.

**Emergency Services Branch**

The Emergency Services Branch ensures quick and effective response to natural disasters and other rapid-onset emergencies, using an integrated package of internationally recognized services and tools such as the United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) and the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG). The Civil-Military Coordination Section is the United Nations focal point for humanitarian civil-military coordination (UN-CMCcoord) and use of foreign military and civil defence assets in humanitarian emergencies. The section is responsible for the United Nations Humanitarian and Civil-Military Coordination Training Programme, supports military exercises and is the custodian of related United Nations and IASC guidelines and documents. The Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS) reinforces systematic and coherent disaster preparedness work within OCHA, in support of international preparedness stakeholders at all levels. EPS works in partnership with the disaster management community to enhance national authorities’ disaster response capacity. It also works to promote the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, in particular to strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

The Environmental Emergencies Unit is the product of a partnership between OCHA and the United Nations Environment Programme to provide international assistance to countries facing environmental emergencies and natural disasters with significant environmental impact. The Emergency Relief Coordination Centre (ERCC) supports the organization’s coordination role in disasters and humanitarian emergencies. ERCC acts as the Secretariat for the Global Disaster Alert and Coordination System, which provides alerts and impact estimations after major sudden-onset disasters, and serves as a platform for operational information exchange and coordination to disaster responders worldwide. The Field Coordination Support Section (FCSS) supports the USG/ERC in rapidly deploying human and material assets in a major disaster. It also supports RCs/HCs in establishing an On-Site Coordination Centre and in-country field coordination structures to manage emergency response. FCSS is responsible for managing UNDAC, INSARAG, the International Humanitarian Partnership, Asia-Pacific Humanitarian Partnership and Americas Support Team. The Logistics Support Unit is the
focal point within OCHA for non-military logistics issues, such as a stock of basic relief items, the global mapping of relief stockpiles and the deployment of the Disaster Response Teams of OCHA corporate partner, Deutsche Post DHL. The Surge Capacity Section (SCS) plays a central coordination and advisory role on staff surge within OCHA. It is responsible for the timely deployment of humanitarian professionals from the Stand-by Partnerships Programme and the OCHA Emergency Response Roster during the initial phase of emergencies and disasters, in support of RCs/HCs, Humanitarian Country Teams and COs. ESB also has oversight of the Pandemic Influenza Contingency Project, which assists United Nations, country teams and national governments to prepare and plan for pandemics using a coordinated, multi-sector approach, improving readiness in a major catastrophe.

Regional, Sub-Regional and Country Offices
In 2009, OCHA had six ROs: Asia and the Pacific; Latin America and the Caribbean; the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia; Central and East Africa; Southern Africa; and West Africa. The ROs extend the implementation of the OCHA mandate by supporting RCs and governments not serviced directly by OCHA COs. In particular, ROs concentrate on three sets of activities: supporting preparedness, including early warning and contingency planning; supporting emergency response; and developing regional coordination networks. The OCHA African Union Liaison Office also supports regional cooperation and facilitates interaction with the African Union.

The Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia Regional Office began operating from Cairo, following its mid-2009 transfer from Dubai. Meanwhile, Nairobi began operating as a Sub-Regional Office (SRO), following reorganization of the African RO structure in July 2009, with Central Africa being covered from Dakar and Eastern Africa from Johannesburg. OCHA had two additional SROs in Fiji and Almaty.

OCHA had 25 COs in 2009, including 13 in Africa and new offices set up late in 2009 in Yemen and the Philippines. Through their coordination activities on the ground and interaction with governments and other partners, and with strengthened internal management and administration practices, OCHA COs aim to support a more enabling environment for humanitarian action and a more effective humanitarian coordination system. For example, this includes predictable provision of coordination tools and services, support to humanitarian leadership and accountability, and effective facilitation of the programme cycle.
2007-2009 Application of Lessons Learned

**Greater Predictability, Accountability and Partnership: The New Norm**

OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2007-2009 focused on striving to ensure “a better coordinated, more equitably supported international humanitarian response system”, building on the humanitarian reform process initiated in 2005. In the past three years, OCHA has played a critical role in consolidating reform across the humanitarian system, both at the policy and operational level.

The Principles of Partnership agreed on in 20071 underpin every area of reform and OCHA’s engagement with its partners. Humanitarian reform was premised in part on recognition that no single actor can meet all the needs of an affected population and that closer cooperation leads to greater efficiency. The last three years have shown the benefits, as well as the challenges, of an enlarged humanitarian community, including stronger partnerships between United Nations agencies, international and national NGOs, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and other humanitarian actors and stakeholders. OCHA’s coordination role has helped break down stove-piping in the humanitarian system, encouraging constructive interplay and dialogue across different sectors, both at global and country level. The result has been a humanitarian system that is better coordinated, more responsive, more accountable and more equitably supported.

The introduction of the cluster approach has been a key element in humanitarian reform, in which OCHA has been so closely engaged. The strengthened response and preparedness mechanisms that the international humanitarian system has helped establish at global and regional level have led to significant improvements in surge support and standby capacity for emergencies. The cluster approach has been applied in 36 countries around the world and is still being adapted and improved, based on continuous learning within the humanitarian system. OCHA plays a central role in supporting such learning by managing evaluations on behalf of the IASC, and feeding this back into the development of inter-agency normative frameworks and operational guidance. Such an evidence base provides the humanitarian system with the foundation for building consensus and making continual improvements.

In the past three years alone, OCHA managed inter-agency evaluations for Phase I (2007) and II (2009-2010) of the Cluster Approach, Common/Pooled Funds in DRC and Sudan (2007), and three Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluations for Myanmar (Cyclone Nargis, 2008), Pakistan (floods and cyclone, 2007) and Mozambique (floods and cyclone, 2007). In addition, OCHA managed a General Assembly-mandated two-year CERF review (2008). Each evaluation generates new lessons for OCHA and its humanitarian partners on how best to apply and integrate the various aspects of the reform, particularly at country level (see Mozambique box).

Improvements in the cluster approach that OCHA has helped facilitate include a clear designation of cluster lead agencies at global and country level. Cluster lead agencies

---

1 The Principles of Partnership are equality, transparency, results-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity, as endorsed by the Global Humanitarian Platform, July 2007.
now have more sharply defined roles and responsibilities for coordinating humanitarian action within a given sector, avoiding duplication and the possible neglect of key sectors, such as emergency shelter or protection in an emergency response. There are also numerous examples of clusters at the country level being led or co-led by NGOs, who are often best placed to fulfill these roles due to long-established relationships in the country and better access to the affected population (see case study below on the occupied Palestinian territory). IDPs’ needs are now firmly centre stage and addressed with comprehensive sectoral programming.

As part of the new humanitarian coordination architecture, the concept of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) has evolved in recent years, based on United Nations and non-United Nations actors as equal partners (recognizing

**occupied Palestinian territory – Partnership as the Foundation for the Cluster Approach**

The cluster approach in oPt highlights the crucial role of national and international NGOs in the leadership of and participation in clusters. Given the access challenges, particularly the continued blockade of Gaza and the fragmentation of the West Bank, as well as the geographical and de facto political separation between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, close coordination and cooperation between partners is an essential component of humanitarian action in oPt.

The Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees, the Palestinian Center of Organic Agriculture, the Palestinian Farmers Union and the Palestinian Hydrology Group were crucial actors in the response to the conflict in the Gaza Strip in early 2009. All four organizations are key players in the clusters and appealed for funds through the 2009 Gaza Flash Appeal.

Save the Children co-leads the Education Cluster with UNICEF. The Norwegian Refugee Council is the cluster lead for shelter, Handicap International leads the sub-cluster on disability and Oxfam GB leads the WASH Cluster in the Gaza Strip. National NGOs have been actively involved in all the clusters, and have supported the development of strategic response strategies and programme implementation. The PNGO Network is the principal coordination umbrella for Palestinian NGOs. It has played a critical role in ensuring the participation of Palestinian organizations in coordination mechanisms, including clusters.
Since the humanitarian reform process was initiated in 2005, OCHA has been at the forefront of strengthening the predictability and accountability of the international humanitarian system, both at policy and operational level. This overview of CERF funding, pooled funding, and cluster approach roll-out through 2009 exemplifies just a few important elements of OCHA field presence support.

**Cluster Approach Roll out by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IASC Pilot Country*
HUMANITARIAN REFORM THROUGH 2009

- CERF funds received
- Cluster approach rolled out
- Pooled fund established (ERF/CHF)

Disclaimer: The designations employed and the presentation of material on this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu & Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.
that 80 per cent of humanitarian operations in any emergency are carried out by non-United Nations entities). HCTs, or similar coordination mechanisms, have been established in nearly all HC countries, as well as in RC countries engaged in emergency response operations. They function as the main strategic forum guiding and coordinating humanitarian action at the field level.

Clusters function as fora for strategic planning. They provide a mechanism - though still not always realized to its full potential - for partners to jointly assess and prioritize needs, set agreed plans of action, provide sound evidence for financing decisions and monitor progress. The spread and deepening of the cluster approach have resulted in much broader consultation and participation in joint planning, manifested in the increased use of CAPs to map and coordinate actions of all humanitarian organizations. For example, for the past two years, the number of NGO projects in the appeals (1,034) has significantly exceeded the number of United Nations projects (683). The CAPs are also increasingly focused on outcomes and impact of collective humanitarian action in major crises.

Improved joint planning has begun to improve the basis for decision-making regarding the use of resources. OCHA has played a central role in developing flexible, reliable financial mechanisms that can rapidly be brought into play in the face of new emergencies and shifting circumstances.

Establishing the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) in 2006 has ensured better funding arrangements for humanitarian response operations, both kick-starting responses to new emergencies and channeling funds to underfunded emergencies. A total of $1.4 billion has been provided to 71 emergency situations since CERF was established. In 2009, CERF received $399 million in pledges and allocated some $397 million to 466 humanitarian projects in 51 countries.

CERF has also served as a catalyst for improving coordination in the field, as CERF applications are developed and coordinated within the framework of clusters. The CAP, Flash Appeal and Emergency Response Fund (ERF) guidelines have also been updated to facilitate disbursement of funds for coordination projects, providing much-needed sources of funding to support the new humanitarian coordination architecture.

For these improvements to work well, strong humanitarian leadership is needed. Over the last three years, OCHA has strengthened its relationship with UNDG and UNDOCO, which respectively govern and support the RC system. OCHA’s relationship with the RC system remains essential, as the humanitarian coordination leadership function is largely anchored to the RC system and RCs assume humanitarian coordination responsibilities in sudden-onset emergencies.

In working towards a more transparent, professional and effective recruitment process, and better availability for selection of qualified humanitarian candidates, an HC Pool has been established. All humanitarian agencies and organizations are regularly encouraged to submit candidates.

Terms of Reference outlining the roles and responsibilities of HCs and RCs have been revised to better reflect their responsibilities within the context of the humanitarian reform now taking root. OCHA has a clear role in offering guidance and support to humanitarian leaders at all levels, drawing on its extensive field experience, understanding of the new humanitarian architecture and knowledge of the ever more demanding emergencies the humanitarian community is confronting. OCHA is finalizing a handbook to be issued in 2010, offering guidance to RCs and HCs. Targeted training has also been provided.

Democratic Republic of the Congo – Pilot Country for Humanitarian Reform

The Democratic Republic of the Congo was one of five pilot countries targeted for humanitarian reform in 2005/2006, implementing the cluster approach, as well as using a Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) to support in-country funding priorities. Humanitarian activities in DRC are the largest recipient of CERF funding. They have received approximately $178 million since the fund was established in 2006.

Significant improvements have been registered. The cluster system, working at national and provincial levels, has led to better data collection, facilitated needs assessments and helped address gaps in humanitarian response. The Humanitarian Advocacy Group, bringing together United Nations and NGOs, has served as a critical forum for sharing information and helped in designating NGO co-leads for clusters at the field level. Clusters have been actively involved in planning CHF and CERF funding allocations, helping identify priorities. CHF and CERF represent 30 per cent of funding for the DRC Humanitarian Action Plan. While sustained progress in a consistently challenging environment requires strong leadership from the HC and the HCT, the successful initiatives taken in DRC have been closely studied by OCHA and other stakeholders. They form the basis for models to be replicated in other countries.
Challenges Ahead
Much has been achieved since humanitarian reform was initiated in 2005. However, OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2010-2013 is being introduced against a background of ever more demanding and complex humanitarian emergencies. The recommendations from the soon-to-be-released Cluster Evaluation Phase II, as well as findings from other evaluations, will be pivotal in locating and filling strategic and operational gaps within the global humanitarian architecture. Several key areas have been identified on which to focus further effort and energy:

• Strengthening support at country level by building on existing capacity and working with local actors (national authorities and civil society) to shape and improve the quality of the humanitarian response.
• Increasing accountability at all levels (global and country) of humanitarian stakeholders, both within the humanitarian response system and to affected populations.
• Improving OCHA-supported inter-cluster coordination at the country level, to better support strategic planning, joint needs assessments, coordinated resource mobilization efforts, multi-sectoral information management and the systematic integration of cross-cutting issues.
• Supporting global cluster lead agencies to better mainstream their cluster responsibilities and costs, ensuring awareness of the financial and managerial responsibilities involved.
• Ensuring adequate mechanisms are in place for a smooth transition from the cluster approach as countries move from the emergency phase towards recovery, building on the experience of several countries where transition is currently taking place.
• Harmonizing procedures related to pooled funds and other humanitarian financing mechanisms, particularly minimizing the transaction costs associated with pooled funds. Developing clear guidance on the relationships between funding mechanisms and cluster coordination in country operations.
• At a strategic level, humanitarian financing, including pooled funds, will be better integrated as an OCHA core function, including by promoting a more coherent and systematic coordination of the common humanitarian programme cycle (needs assessments, planning, financing, and monitoring and evaluation).
• Taking an integrated approach to leadership development, ensuring that leadership development initiatives target a broad range of humanitarian actors, including not only RCs and HCs, but also cluster lead agencies, cluster coordinators and OCHA heads of office.

Right People, Right Time, Right Place
In 2006, numerous evaluations, including those emanating from the Indian Ocean tsunami, emphasized that weak surge capacity was hampering early response to sudden-onset emergencies. More investment was recommended in surge staffing and emergency rosters, as well as the inclusion of qualified, geographically diverse staff with broad experience. From 2007, OCHA began phasing-in an improved and better-coordinated suite of surge solutions for a more predictable, reliable and effective response.

During the period, OCHA clarified the role of its regional offices as the “first line” of surge in new emergencies, systematically building regional staff capacity in emergency response. By 2009, ROs deployed staff to more than 70 missions in response to new emergency situations. Meanwhile, OCHA strengthened its centralized surge capacity mechanisms, creating the ERR in December 2007, with a first deployment in January 2008. Since that time, the ERR has continued to become more diverse and robust. The overall number of applicants to the roster rose from an initial 17 to 108 in the latest rotation, as the number of deployments over time increased from 18 per year to 35. The Stand-By Partnership Programme mechanism underwent a similar evolution as the numbers of deployments rose from 21 in 2006 to 62 in 2009, and the number of partners rose from six to 10. Surge deployments from the ROs and the ERR now include more diverse staff with both general coordination experience and specialized skills in areas such as information management, civil-military coordination, reporting and public information.

OCHA’s concept of internal surge capacity is now more integrated with long-standing, OCHA-supported mechanisms such as UNDAC and INSARAG. Since 2006, the UNDAC and INSARAG networks have been expanding, bringing in new countries from the Middle East, CIS countries and West Africa. This has been particularly useful to reinforce UNDAC’s ability to support a regional response to disasters in Francophone West Africa. There is now a broad network of donors, bilateral responders, disaster-prone countries, regional organizations, national disaster management agencies, United Nations agencies, IFRC, NGOs and private sector organizations who are now active in the UNDAC and INSARAG systems. This has fostered closer collaboration, mutual support and cooperation in emergency response and preparedness.

The enhancements to each of these mechanisms, now coordinated by cross-OCHA task teams, have led to fewer gaps and more appropriate surge support. The latest string of emergencies in South-east Asia (Padang, Indonesia and cyclones in the Philippines) demonstrated a smoother sequencing between the different surge actors throughout the duration of the emergencies.
OCHA recognizes that more work is needed to further strengthen and expand its suite of surge solutions. Two new surge tools have been developed for introduction in 2010: Roaming Emergency Surge Officers (RESO) on permanent surge duty, and an Associates Surge Pool (ASP) of internally pre-cleared consultants and independent contractors in a variety of disciplines. While the ERR, SBPP, RESO and ASP can help bridge the gaps prior to the arrival of regular, longer-term staff, OCHA recognizes that this transition needs to be more seamless and predictable. Accordingly, OCHA will continue investing in its Roster Management Programme, the primary mechanism for regular field recruitment. It was introduced in 2009 and is currently being refashioned in line with the wider Secretariat reform of contracts and recruitment processes.

**Transition: Staging an Orderly Departure**

In 2007, it was recognized that more needed to be done to provide strengthened and more predictable coordination to the RC in managing the transition from relief to development. To that end, OCHA, together with the United Nations Development Group Office (UNDGO, now DOCO) and UNDP/BCPR launched the Joint Initiative on Recovery Coordination. Under this initiative, OCHA, UNDGO and UNDP/BCPR reviewed coordination arrangements for the transition and recovery phase in eight countries (DRC, Haiti, Indonesia, Nepal, Pakistan, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda), identifying gaps and recommending actions to address them.

As a result, significant advances have been made at the policy and operational levels to systematize an approach to transition planning.

- Internally, OCHA has clarified its own transition policy for phasing down its COs and begun applying it systematically in countries where transition is foreseen. The formalization of OCHA’s field architecture, defining operating parameters for ROs, COs and Humanitarian Support Units (HSUs), provides clarity on roles and responsibilities during phase-out.

- OCHA has developed multi-year country office strategies and identified benchmarks for transition, agreed well in advance with partners, to ensure that appropriate agencies are forewarned and prepared for assuming coordination responsibilities.

- The approach facilitates more rigorous OCHA financial and human resource planning for COs, and contributes towards more consistent delivery of services across OCHA country offices.

- Through consistent engagement with DOCO, BCPR and the Peacebuilding Support Office, OCHA has helped clarify and communicate its role in transition vis-à-vis external partners. This has helped to establish clearer expectations of OCHA’s role and a clearer division of labour between OCHA, DOCO and BCPR in country situations.

- At a policy level, OCHA’s work on the Secretary-General’s first two reports on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, and their follow-up, has helped
OCHA define its role in peacebuilding contexts where political or peacekeeping missions are in place or anticipated.

Securing predictable and adequate funding for transition activities remains a major challenge for the international system. An additional major challenge is ensuring RCs receive adequate humanitarian coordination support once OCHA phases down country operations.

**Leadership on Global Challenges**

OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2007-2009 recognized how global challenges become drivers of humanitarian needs, requiring a strong policy response. This was highlighted by the food price crisis of 2007-2008 and the record number of Flash Appeals for climate-related disaster responses in 2007. Since then, OCHA has continued to prioritize engagement in food security and climate change policy, while expanding its focus on the implications of global challenges for humanitarian operations.

**Food Security:**

- **Establishment of the High-Level Task Force on Food Security in April 2008,** under the leadership of the Secretary-General and chaired by the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator throughout 2008. It was established to promote a unified response to the challenge of achieving global food security by promoting urgent action to meet the immediate needs of vulnerable populations and to address long-term structural issues.

- **Creation of the Comprehensive Framework for Action,** introducing a two-pillared approach to address acute vulnerability caused by food insecurity by providing quick impact, immediate relief assistance while investing in longer-term initiatives to build resilience against future shocks, such as through investment in smallholder agricultural productivity.

**Climate Change:**

- **Increased understanding of the humanitarian implications of climate change through studies,** including:
  - “Monitoring Disaster Displacement in the Context of Climate Change”: OCHA-IDMC-NRC, September 2009. OCHA funded and led inter-agency steering group. IDMC recruited and managed consultant to manage process. OCHA and steering group heavily involved in drafting results.

OCHA increased its engagement with the climate change and academic communities. It also worked with Member States to better understand how climate change will affect humanitarian need and how humanitarian systems can best adapt to support climate change adaptation. Work supported the ERC’s advocacy on climate change and inputs to the UNFCCC process.

- **Engagement in the UNFCCC process,** in collaboration with the IASC Task Force on Climate Change, to ensure humanitarian issues are adequately and appropriately reflected in a new global climate change agreement. Humanitarian concerns are now increasingly recognized as core to a strong, effective and fair agreement. These concerns include disaster risk reduction; disaster preparedness; early warning; emergency response; early recovery; migration and displacement; health impacts; food security; gender-sensitive approaches; and the need to prioritize the most vulnerable communities and countries.

**Global Challenges:**

- **Awareness-building about global challenges within the Member State community,** including hosting a ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment side event during the 2009 ECOSOC Session, focused on addressing the impact of current global challenges and trends on the effective delivery of humanitarian assistance. Frequent mention of global challenges during 2009 General Assembly Session and inclusion of language on global challenges in General Assembly resolutions.

- **Based on learning over the past three years,** OCHA has adopted a threefold strategy for 2010-2013 to help the humanitarian system respond more predictably, effectively and equitably to humanitarian needs in this environment:
  - Increase awareness and understanding of how vulnerability affects humanitarian need and how a vulnerability-based approach can improve the efficacy of humanitarian action.
  - Initiate a shift within OCHA, from the current focus on shocks to responses informed by assessments of acute vulnerability and humanitarian need.
  - Consider issues of chronic acute vulnerability as a basis on which to promote closer cooperation between humanitarian and development actors.
Advocacy: Making Messages Matter

The 2007 Annual Report noted the need for consistency and coordination in OCHA’s advocacy efforts, encompassing public information, media outreach and mass communications. Without providing these essentials, humanitarian assistance will inevitably be criticized for lacking transparency, responsiveness and an understanding of local contexts. Three years later, OCHA has taken a number of steps to ensure that its advocacy work is consistent, predictable and well coordinated.

The ERC’s role has been enhanced through more consistent support to his advocacy efforts, both during missions to crisis-affected countries and through engagement with the Secretary-General, the Security Council, the General Assembly and the media. Advocacy has been effectively mainstreamed across the organization through the provision of policy guidance, training for key staff working on public information and through key events such as World Humanitarian Day. The Advocacy and Information Management Branch has been completely revamped. It is now the Communications and Information Services Branch and focuses more clearly on communicating OCHA’s advocacy messages:

- ERC Key Messages have been consistently used for all large-scale emergencies. They require community consensus on what the ERC is saying on a specific crisis. They are provided as a way to ensure clarity around advocacy requirements on key issues throughout the entire humanitarian community.
- Situation reports have improved with not only a uniform look and feel, but also greater consistency on content and clarity around defining humanitarian needs, responses and gaps.
- OCHA’s film unit and IRIN have produced some 30 films for external and internal advocacy purposes.
- OCHA has enhanced visual media and graphics for advocacy purposes, making more strategic use of maps and other graphics to tell a more effective story around advocacy issues.
- The Public Information Unit has been overhauled, with an increased focus on supporting the ERC and OCHA senior management.

Much of OCHA’s work in the context of advocacy remains outside the public domain by necessity. OCHA’s approach often requires quiet diplomacy either at the country level or in the corridors of capitals and the United Nations. Working with Member States to reach consensus on humanitarian principles, supporting inter-governmental processes that support the reform of the humanitarian system, and advocating quietly with non-State actors and governments to protect affected populations, respect humanitarian principles and improve access are all forms of advocacy which, by their very nature, cannot be highlighted publicly.

Protection: Ensuring the Safety of Civilians

Concerted efforts made in recent years by OCHA and others to highlight protection issues finally bore fruit in 2009, with the creation of an informal Security Council Expert Group on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict. This was established on the Secretary-General’s recommendation and chaired by the UK Permanent Mission. From January 2009, OCHA began providing briefings to the Expert Group. By the end of 2009, Council members were receiving more detailed analysis and information on protection-related issues than ever before. Rather than relying on bilateral approaches to Council members, as in the past, the humanitarian community, both at Headquarters and in the field, participates in OCHA-led consultations to prepare for Expert Group briefings, allowing a more comprehensive consideration of protection concerns, as well as possible actions to address them.

This approach is expected to lead to greater coherence in formulating humanitarian policy and operational activity aimed at enhancing the protection of civilians in armed conflict. In particular, greater focus can be placed on protection issues, including more robust language in Security Council resolutions on actions of parties to conflict and the steps of peacekeeping missions to protect those on the ground.

Since 2002, when the first major scandal broke concerning sexual exploitation and abuse by humanitarian workers and peacekeepers, the United Nations and NGOs have made significant advances. They include the 2003 adoption of the Secretary-General’s Bulletin affirming the prohibition on sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA). More recently, OCHA has co-led the ECHA/ECPS United Nations and NGO Task Force on Protection from SEA, which has produced guidance and support, and served as a forum for sharing good practice and pooling resources. However, implementation across agencies and across the globe is uneven. Strengthened institutional leadership will be essential in bringing compliance on the ground. To address this, in 2009 OCHA initiated an inter-agency Review of Protection from SEA to clarify how far the United Nations and NGOs have come, identify remaining obstacles to progress and recommend how to overcome them.

Since 2006, OCHA has worked closely with the Global Protection Cluster (lead and members) to provide a range of support services to ensure that the cluster functions at the field and global levels in line with humanitarian reform. OCHA has made significant contributions to the cluster’s work at the global level, including seconding staff to the cluster Support Cell, providing secretariat services, supporting resource mobilization, and contributing to policy development and field support. Helped by OCHA’s efforts, the Protection Cluster meets regularly, has a clear workplan,
has dedicated staff to run the cluster and is providing concrete support to the field (e.g. training, advice, policy, resource mobilization). In the field, there are currently 30 protection clusters in operation with clear lead agencies. Most have regular coordination meetings, and workplans or strategies either under development or being implemented.

Moreover, OCHA has supported a more predictable procedure to determine protection cluster leads in natural disasters – a gap area identified in the original 2005 agreement on leadership arrangements for protection clusters in the field. Following OCHA advocacy, UNHCR announced in 2009 that it would increasingly attempt to provide that leadership. A challenge remains to obtain similar commitments from OHCHR and UNICEF where they are in a position to lead, e.g. in countries where they have a strong presence prior to a sudden-onset disaster.

**Information Management: Improving Standards and Services**

Timely, relevant and reliable information remains central to effective humanitarian coordination and response. It is also increasingly needed to support evidence-based advocacy, decision-making and resource allocation.

From 2007, OCHA began addressing these challenges, undertaking an extensive review of its own information products, services and information management practices. Next, in collaboration with cluster/sector leads and their members, OCHA established agreement on the roles and responsibilities of partners operating in emergency contexts in managing information according to the principles and goals of humanitarian reform. At the international level, OCHA convened global fora on information for humanitarian action in order to build consensus across the humanitarian community.

Responding to the recommendations of the 2007 Information Management Review, OCHA has significantly improved its reporting and communications practices and the quality of its products. The introduction of a new, unifying visual design, using common templates and logos, has been supported by an overhaul of core external information products, including situation reports, press releases, key messages and maps.

In 2007, OCHA led the development of “Operational Guidance on Responsibilities of Cluster/Sector Leads & OCHA in Information Management”. This document clearly defines OCHA’s roles and responsibilities for
information management within the cluster approach, and has provided much-needed clarity in what was once an ambiguous area. Establishing the Inter-Agency Information Management Working Group in 2007, and its successor, the IASC Task Force on Information Management in December 2008, has provided new fora for policy-level discussions, improving coordination and the harmonization of inter-agency information management efforts. There is still much to be done in this area, as highlighted by some of the information gaps in the early response to the 2010 Haitian earthquake.

In response to the recommendations on consolidating OCHA’s web presence, a new OCHA Portal was envisioned. The first phase of this was completed by the end of 2009 (it went ‘live’ in January 2010). OCHA Online has been revamped to streamline content and move the site more towards a portal function, channeling web visitors to other main OCHA sites. OCHA’s intranet was redesigned to provide more opportunities for collaboration and knowledge sharing within OCHA.

Implementing a More Strategic Approach to Planning and Performance Management

In early 2006, OCHA recognized that progress in broader humanitarian sector reform needed to be matched by an internal reform process to meet the evolving expectations of partners and stakeholders. Two external reviews were commissioned to help determine how to realign the organization in response to the changing external environment. Both reviews urged OCHA to focus on strengthening its administrative structures, performance management and strategic planning. In response, OCHA management launched an improved annual performance management and reporting system. The Strategic Framework 2007-2009, developed by a small internal planning task team, set out a joint vision for OCHA globally and in the field. The framework formed the basis for each subsequent annual plan, which reflected how this joint vision was translated into concrete action across OCHA Headquarters branches and field offices. The joint programme allowed OCHA to track performance and achievements more systematically and to achieve a greater focus on results.

By the end of 2009, OCHA had made substantial progress towards fulfilling these earlier commitments, incorporating lessons learned along the way. OCHA has institutionalized a system that minimizes much of the stove-piping and rigidity that had undermined collaboration in the past, with corporate planning, monitoring and reporting now centred on strategic objectives rather than each organizational unit. Performance monitoring helps ensure accountability against clearer indicators, while the application of annual risk analysis in planning and a more robust mid-year review have helped adjust corporate strategies to meet end-of-year targets. Clear policy instructions and standard operating procedures provide clarity of roles and procedures and help ensure that expectations are met in performance assessment. And finally, OCHA has put in place a new system to ensure that the results and recommendations of evaluations, reviews and audits are addressed, as formalized in the 2009 evaluation policy.

While implementation of the 2007-2009 Framework was largely an internal exercise, it was recognized at the outset that future planning should be preceded and informed by strategic discussions with key partners in the humanitarian community, including the IASC, the ODSG and Member States. The creation of the new framework for 2010-2013, developed over the course of 2009, was a widely consultative and transparent process, reflecting shifting paradigms, while drawing on policy debates, key United Nations and external reports and evaluations, and other developments affecting humanitarian assistance. While the 2007-2009 Framework comprised the goals and objectives around which OCHA planned, the launch of the new framework includes multi-year strategies detailing risks, milestones and a path to achieving the ends stated by 2013.

The evolution of these frameworks has brought a change of thinking, making staff more responsive to corporate planning and reporting, and helping OCHA become a more forward-thinking, results-oriented and mature organization.
Part II:
Funding and Financial Analysis
A. Introduction

2009 was a difficult economic year worldwide, particularly for the humanitarian community. OCHA was not exempt. It was hit hard by the combination of the impact of the strong dollar, the financial crisis and protracted underfunding against budgetary requirements. With early warning in January 2009 that donor governments would not be able to meet the extra-budgetary requirements in the original US$240 million budget, OCHA voluntarily reduced its budget by $18 million. With a more consistent and effective outreach and a number of increased contributions in national currencies, at year’s end donor contributions rose by $10 million from the previous year. OCHA’s 2009 expenditure remained stable compared to the previous year ($208 million versus $209 million in 2008). Despite budgetary increases due to establishing new offices during the year, the final 2009 budget was almost zero net growth from the final budget for 2008 ($238 million versus $234 million). The increase in donor contributions was offset by a large decrease in miscellaneous income from interest, accounts liquidation and other transfers. Despite cost-cutting, resource mobilization efforts and tight discipline, OCHA’s expenditure on programme activities exceeded the total of voluntary contributions received.

In 2009, OCHA received $157 million, or 75 per cent, of its total 2009 expenditure from donors. A total of $18.5 million, or 9 per cent, was covered from the programme support account and $13.7 million, or 6 per cent, from the Regular Budget (RB). The resulting 10 per cent shortfall ($19 million) was covered by a combination of miscellaneous income, a drawdown on OCHA’s cash reserve funds and redeploying funds from dormant accounts. The net result was a reduction of OCHA’s programme funding closing balance by approximately $13 million and a further depletion of OCHA’s cash reserve funds.

B. OCHA budget in 2009

In its Annual Plan and Budget for 2009, OCHA published a comprehensive budget of $240 million, which was revised to $253 million following the finalization of plans to open

---

**TABLE 1: Budget Total for 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Mid-year</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular budget</td>
<td>12,292,600</td>
<td>13,472,800</td>
<td>13,472,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be covered from voluntary contributions</td>
<td>202,258,427</td>
<td>199,176,734</td>
<td>201,891,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget to be covered from programme support account</td>
<td>25,066,317</td>
<td>22,333,077</td>
<td>22,333,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget 2009 (US$)</td>
<td>239,617,344</td>
<td>234,982,611</td>
<td>237,717,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: 2007-2009 Donor Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>19,053,781</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>26,006,846</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>22,382,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>18,029,166</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>16,803,339</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>19,548,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>14,487,271</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14,844,865</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>17,752,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14,381,141</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>13,855,362</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>17,695,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>12,547,599</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>11,569,297</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>10,477,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>10,372,796</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7,062,349</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7,308,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>7,030,229</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6,241,620</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6,647,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>6,852,566</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6,164,898</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>6,000,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5,332,266</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5,983,807</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5,665,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3,001,058</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4,400,367</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4,896,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,984,282</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3,894,081</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,747,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2,938,097</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,555,142</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3,487,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2,533,965</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3,407,631</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3,330,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2,453,477</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,487,931</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,021,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1,536,220</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,293,694</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,532,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,352,909</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1,996,800</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>2,491,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,340,188</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,514,667</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2,487,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,272,549</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,316,348</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,278,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1,150,641</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>849,960</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>924,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>927,211</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>249,980</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>156,028</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>121,454</td>
<td>Austrian Emirate</td>
<td>299,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>121,454</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>82,292</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>162,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>82,292</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>39,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>32,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>201,910</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>28,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>188,502</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>27,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>139,341</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>138,487</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>27,360</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>69,984</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>11,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>10,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>38,772</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>13,402</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>31,949</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>12,620</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>31,104</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Funds*</td>
<td>10,174,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>21,459</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>11,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Donor Funds*</td>
<td>16,478,336</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Funds*</td>
<td>7,444,124</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Funds*</td>
<td>10,174,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multi-donor funds include the three field-level Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs) and the Central Fund for Influenza Action (CFIA)

The figures in 2009 include Paid and Pledged Contributions

The total funds received in 2009 includes $2 million contributed to OCHA by Italy from its Pre-Positioned Fund. This amount was recorded in UN accounts as a transfer rather than income, meaning that OCHA’s official donor income (see Table 3) is $2 million lower than the actual amount contributed to the Office by donors, which is reflected in the present table.

UK contribution includes $1.8M meant for 2008 but paid in 2009
a substantial office in Afghanistan. Of this total, OCHA sought $216 million in voluntary contributions, the remainder being covered by the RB ($12 million) and the Programme Support Account ($25 million). In January 2009, after analysing projected income and consulting with the donor community, OCHA took the difficult decision to cut $18 million from the budget and held to this revised total budget of $235 million at Mid-Year Review. Later in the year, the sudden-onset crises in the Philippines, Indonesia and Yemen extended the budget. However, the increase was partly offset by cuts in other areas and the final budget for 2009 was $237.7 million. A detailed budget breakdown is presented in Annex II (Table 5).

C. How OCHA is funded
OCHA is funded mainly through voluntary contributions from Member States. The European Commission is also a major donor. OCHA receives very limited contributions from private and/or corporate donors. Voluntary contributions cover 94 per cent of the OCHA global budget. OCHA’s remaining funding needs are met from the RB, covering approximately 6 per cent of OCHA’s global budget. The General Assembly approves the RB every two years. It is funded from assessed contributions paid by each United Nations Member State according to a formula that takes into account their relative gross domestic product. The amount of RB funding appropriated for use by OCHA has decreased in relative terms as a proportion of the OCHA budget, from 12 per cent in the 2002-2003 biennium to 6 per cent in the 2008-2009 biennium.

D. How and where OCHA spent its funding in 2009
Total expenditure, including expenditure under the RB and extra-budgetary spending, amounted to $208 million (compared to $209 million in 2008). Just under three quarters of combined OCHA RB and extra-budgetary expenditure in 2009 was spent on field-based humanitarian

---

**OCHA Donor Support Group**

The OCHA Donor Support Group (ODSG) is an informal group that provides financial, political and technical support towards fulfilling OCHA’s mandated coordination activities. The group currently consists of Australia (Chair), Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States and the European Commission. Members commit to annual funding of a minimum threshold (currently $0.5 million), preferably unearmarked.

ODSG’s goal is to support OCHA in fulfilling its mandate by acting as a sounding board and a source of advice on policy, management, budgetary and financial questions. The group also acts as a mechanism for feedback, donor consultation and the exchange of views on OCHA’s strategic priorities, new project initiatives, evaluations and reviews. The group discusses concrete measures that members may take individually or collectively to assist OCHA in better fulfilling its mission and goals on the basis of the humanitarian principles. The group also encourages a widening of donor support for OCHA on the basis of the principles.

ODSG meets regularly at the technical level in Geneva and New York, and annually at the high level. In addition, an annual ODSG field mission is undertaken to evaluate the work of OCHA at the country level. Donor members are invited to the mission at senior level from capitals or Permanent Missions. The Chair and OCHA are jointly responsible for organizing the mission, through consultation with the other ODSG members. The Chair drafts a mission report in consultation with mission participants and OCHA.
coordination (57 per cent spent in the field, 13 per cent on direct Headquarters’ support for humanitarian coordination in the field). The remaining expenditure was spent on supporting the delivery of its core mandates: normative and policy development, humanitarian financing, information management and advocacy. Expenditure by thematic area and region is outlined in Chart 1 and Chart 2.

In 2009, 73 per cent of OCHA expenditure was on staff costs and 27 per cent on non-staff costs. This underscores the important legal and contractual constraints that OCHA faces in reducing its expenditure in light of underfunding. The overall expenditure rate during 2009 was 87 per cent, which is fully in line with the average OCHA expenditure rate. Annex II (Table 6) shows a detailed breakdown of expenditure.

E. Cash management and closing balance in 2009

Table 3 reflects the financial status at 31 December 2009 and shows the resources available to fund the OCHA budget during 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3: OCHA Financial Status as at 31 December 2009 (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCHA-Mandated Programme and Administrative Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance - 1 Jan 2009 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Donor Contributions 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available funds 2009 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Programme Support Charges (PSC) 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditure 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure charged against Budget 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Available Funds before Other Income, adjustments, transfers, refunds and ISDR costs 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income, Adjustments, Transfers, Refunds and ISDR Costs 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Balance 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/(Decrease) in opening balance 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Reserves 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Balance for Spending (US$) 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) The opening balance reflects the situation as at 1 January 2009.
2) For programme activities, includes paid contributions and unpaid pledges of $7M. Does not include $2M of Italian contribution transferred from its bilateral fund for programme activities. This is reflected as a transfer - see note 8. For regular budget, corresponds to the appropriations for 2009.
3) = 1 + 2
4) Programme support cost (PSC) levied on programme expenditure and transferred to the Administrative Account to cover cost of administrative activities.
5) Includes disbursements and unliquidated obligations as at 31 December 2009.
6) = 3 + 4 + 5. For programme activities, expenditure charged against budget is the programme direct expenditure plus programme support transfers. For administrative and regular budget activities, it is the direct expenditure only.
7) = 3 + 4 + 5. Regular budget balances are not carried forward to the next biennium.
8) Includes $2M of Italian contribution to OCHA via transfer from its bilateral fund; transfers of PSC from other trust funds, Specially Designated Contributions and ISDR; interest and miscellaneous income; foreign exchange adjustments; transfers, refunds and savings on prior period unliquidated obligations; prior period adjustments to income and expenditure; and administrative costs of ISDR.
9) = 7 + 8. Includes mandatory reserves of $22M for programme activities and $8M for administrative activities, which were not available for spending in 2009.
10) Regular budget balances are not carried forward to the next biennium.
11) Reserves mandated under the UN Financial Regulations and Rules for extrabudgetary activities (programme and administrative activities).
12) Closing balance (9) less Opening balance (1).
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in the field; depleted cash reserves following two years of underfunding; and the overall mismatch between donor income and OCHA expenditure. OCHA thus stretched reliance on its unearmarked income and cash reserve funds to the very limit.

For the first time, due to a lack of cash, OCHA took a reimbursable loan against unpaid pledges from the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) in November. The quarterly cash allocation process was disrupted several times, with cash requirements for only one or two months covered instead of the planned three months. In some cases, allocations were also delayed by a few weeks.

Despite these challenges, through prudent management of the cash reserve funds, OCHA got through the year with all projects and offices having the required amount of cash. However, the organization was left with a significantly depleted closing balance. Consequently, in December 2009 there was cash to cover salaries for only two months and costs for 2010 (excluding well-funded projects carrying forward programmed funds). This is not

### OCHA Resource Mobilization Strategy

In 2009, OCHA fund-raising was guided by a resource mobilization strategy developed early in the year, following an assessment of needs and challenges, and building on the findings of an external review of OCHA’s resource mobilization and fund management practices. The 2009 strategy called for an OCHA-wide, proactive and coherent fund-raising approach backed by enhanced analysis, and more effective targeting and marketing of OCHA added-value, and the services provided by the Office for Member States.

The top priorities identified in 2009 were to encourage donors to increase their overall support for the Office by providing a greater share of their funding without earmarking and by consulting closely with OCHA before earmarking to avoid overfunding high visibility offices.

A funding target of $160 million for 2009 was set. This target would have been exceeded but for the impact of the strong dollar on major European currencies, coupled with decreased earmarked funding from a major donor.

Lead responsibility for implementing the OCHA strategy in this area lies with the Donor Relations Section (DRS) in Geneva. The section’s primary responsibilities are to solicit contributions, negotiate funding agreements, and ensure regular reporting on the results of OCHA work and use of funds. DRS also manages the day-to-day aspects of the Office’s engagement with ODSG, including the relevant aspects of the monthly ODSG meetings, the annual ODSG field mission and the ODSG high-level meeting.
in line with the OCHA target of having enough cash in the bank to cover 12 months of staff costs and three months of operating costs.

OCHA’s overall closing balance was $164 million of which $118 million was for programme activities, a reduction of $13 million from the 2008 closing balance. As Chart 3 reveals, over two thirds of this total could not be spent in the first quarter. This illustrates the cash challenges OCHA faces, in particular the low level of unearmarked funding and cash reserves available in December 2009 to cover Headquarters’ requirements and underfunded offices in the first quarter of 2010.

F. OCHA donors in 2009

Table 4 lists all donors that made a voluntary contribution in 2009. As in previous years, Member States made the overwhelming majority of voluntary contributions: $138.8 million, or 89 per cent, of all contributions. International organizations, including the European Commission and United Nations partners, contributed a further $17.8 million, or 11 percent. Other donors (mainly private individuals) provided the remaining $0.04 million.

G. Good Humanitarian Donorship: Funding Trends in 2009

Unearmarking

OCHA relies heavily on unearmarked funds. They give the organization more flexibility and autonomy in the way it allocates its resources and helps it to ensure adequate cash flow to all of its mandated activities. A key tenet of OCHA’s resource mobilization strategy is to secure increases in unearmarked funds from donors and, where possible, tie such commitments into multi-year funding frameworks. Chart 4 shows the top 10 donors of unearmarked funding.

In 2009, 40 per cent ($63 million) of OCHA’s income was unearmarked, continuing the trend of previous years and showing a slight decrease ($3 million) from 2008. Following OCHA’s outreach, nine major donors increased their unearmarked contributions in their local currencies. However, three major donors’ increases were completely offset by the strong dollar, resulting in net decreases. Six of the major donors held their unearmarked contributions steady, of which three resulted in net decreases due to exchange rates. Only three donors actually decreased their unearmarked contributions in local currency; two of these decreases were directly due to the financial crisis and one was compensated...
by increased loose earmarking. Sixty-six per cent of OCHA’s unearmarked income was spent on Headquarters’ activities and the remainder was spent in the field.

**Earmarking**
In 2009, nine of the top OCHA donors significantly increased their earmarked contributions, in many instances due to increased and more coherent OCHA outreach and follow up. The combined total increases from the European Commission, the United Kingdom and the United States amounted to over $13 million. However, Norway and Sweden reduced their earmarked funding to OCHA in national currency. Adverse exchange rates also diminished the dollar value of both donors’ earmarked contributions. Five smaller donors decreased their earmarked funding to OCHA. In total, OCHA secured an additional $12 million in earmarked funds from existing donors for 2009, despite the adverse effects of the strong dollar and the actual decreases.

Eighty-two per cent of OCHA earmarked income was earmarked for country offices and 7 per cent for regional offices (an increase following an initial regional office ‘marketing’ effort). Seven per cent of earmarked funding was for Headquarters.

**Broadening the donor base**
The number of OCHA institutional donors (governments, international organizations and others) decreased between 2008 and 2009. This seems to be primarily because OCHA attracts “new” donors primarily when there are high-profile, sudden-onset emergencies, such as Cyclone Nargis in 2008 and the Haiti earthquakes in 2010. Thirty-five Member States provided funding (three less than in 2008). Western countries continued to provide the vast majority of contributions to OCHA, despite an effort to recruit new donors from outside the traditional international donor community. This effort will be re-doubled in 2010, building on CERF’s success.

**Earmarking Trends 2006-2009**

**Timeliness of payment**
Timely disbursement is critical to alleviating OCHA cash management challenges, particularly given the heavy reliance on voluntary contributions and the fact that OCHA may incur expenditure only against cash received and not against pledges. In 2009, 49 per cent of paid contributions were made in the first half of the year, down from 61 per cent in 2008. This disappointing downward trend impedes the smooth continuation of ongoing activities. Unpaid pledges, while recorded as income, cannot be used until the cash contributions are actually received, so the time lag between pledging and receipt of donor contributions is critical. As OCHA does not have access to a large reserve account, it cannot incur expenditures until pledges are followed through disbursement. Donors are encouraged to continue efforts to provide timelier funding and to increase the proportion of contributions transferred during the first half of the year to 75 per cent. OCHA will work further with donors to address this issue in 2010.

**Predictability**
As part of the effort to secure predictable funding, OCHA is prioritizing the negotiation of multi-year funding agreements.
In 2009, a new multi-year funding arrangement (covering unearmarked contributions) was signed with Norway. OCHA also initiated discussions on new, multi-year funding frameworks with Denmark and Switzerland, and separately with Australia and New Zealand to plan in advance for the update of these respective multi-year funding agreements upon their expiry, so as to realign them with the new OCHA Strategic Framework for 2010-2013. OCHA now has multi-year funding arrangements in place with five donors: Australia, Belgium, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom. OCHA also aims to increase predictability in its earmarked funding. To this end, it plans to explore a model agreement for flexible and predictable earmarked funding with various donors in 2010.

Note on OCHA Trust Funds

Income and expenditure against OCHA budget is managed through two trust funds and the Special Account for Programme Support. The Trust Fund for the Strengthening of OCHA was established in 1974, pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 3243. This fund is financed mainly from unearmarked voluntary contributions to cover Headquarters’ staff and non-staff costs incurred in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

The Trust Fund for Disaster Relief Assistance was established in 1971, pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 2816. This fund receives earmarked and unearmarked voluntary contributions to finance humanitarian coordination and relief activities. Earmarked contributions provided for specific projects or countries are accounted for separately. The fund’s activities fall within two main categories: OCHA-mandated activities, which OCHA implements under its Annual Plan and Budget primarily in the field, and Specially Designated Contributions (SDCs), which are implemented by OCHA partners and cannot be used for OCHA coordination. See Annex III for more details on SDCs, including the Emergency Response Funds.

The Special Account for Programme Support funds OCHA administrative costs and common services provided by the United Nations in support of OCHA extra-budgetary activities. Income to this account is derived from programme support levy on direct programme expenditure of the OCHA trust funds. This levy is 3 per cent on grants to NGOs and 13 per cent on most expenditure incurred by OCHA activities.
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A. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

B. PERFORMANCE OF THE FIELD
A. Strategic Objectives

GOAL 1: A BETTER COORDINATED, MORE EQUITABLY SUPPORTED INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE SYSTEM

GOAL 2: RECOGNIZED OCHA LEADING ROLE IN HUMANITARIAN POLICY, ADVOCACY AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

GOAL 3: AN EFFECTIVELY MANAGED AND RESPONSIVE ORGANIZATION
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Goal 1: A better coordinated, more equitably supported international humanitarian response system

1.1 – A predictable and needs-based humanitarian financing system

Adequate and Equitable Funding

In a year characterized by global economic downturn, the level of funding that OCHA helped to secure on behalf of the humanitarian system represented a major achievement. Funding for CAPs nearly doubled from the 2007 level to $7 billion, which is the most ever raised for appeals in a single year. Despite currency fluctuations, funding for CHFs and ERFs remained steady. Those same less-favourable exchange rates negated the increased CERF contributions that 22 Member States made in their national currencies, causing CERF to fall short of its $450 million target when measured in US dollars. Despite the difficult global economic climate, 17 Member States, the majority of them developing countries, became first-time CERF donors in 2009, bringing the number of countries that have made contributions to more than 115. Most importantly, CERF, which is now an established part of the humanitarian response architecture, allocated $397 million during 2009. In keeping with the mandate, the $268 million in rapid response funding was allocated in an average of three days after final requests were received.

OCHA’s target of increasing funding to CHFs/ERFs by $125 million was not achieved, due to external factors of unfavourable exchange rates and the planned Somalia CHF, with a target of $50 million, not being implemented in 2009. However, the support for country-based pooled funds has generally been consistent and positive. The Somalia CHF was finally endorsed at the end of the year after a consultative process with partners on the ground. Five new ERFs in critical humanitarian contexts were established in 2009, which bolstered assistance and coordination for those countries (Afghanistan, Colombia, Kenya, Nepal and Uganda). This brought the total number of ERFs up to 15. In addition, discussions on two other ERFs (Pakistan and Yemen) commenced in the fourth quarter. Most donors maintained their funding size and a few key donors significantly increased their contributions to country-based pooled funds in 2009. Belgium and Spain tripled their contributions, while Denmark increased from $1 million in 2008 to $15 million in 2009.

Funding for CAPs was markedly increased compared to previous years. Only one CAP (Côte d’Ivoire) was less than 64 per cent funded. Generally, the differences in funding among CAPs (in proportion to requirements) were far less steep than before. Factors responsible for this improvement include CERF targeting of underfunded crises for injection of funds, and apparently better coordination among donors regarding macro-level allocations spread between different crises. Improvement could also be attributed to the IASC’s engagement with the Good Humanitarian Donorship process, increased donor confidence in the CAP, and better information systems (including an improved Financial Tracking Service).

The CAP process has become significantly more rigorous, particularly in monitoring progress on reaching targets at cluster level. Nearly all CAP Mid-Year Reviews in 2009 referred back to targets set out in original CAPs six months earlier and adjusted where appropriate, noting how clusters had performed on key outputs. This is a major advance on the situation in preceding years, when there was little aggregate information about outputs, outcomes and the collective impact of humanitarian action in major crises. While such monitoring is still in its infancy and some conceptual development remains to be done, the experience in 2009 has established the key elements of what should become a standard framework.

Regarding the Flash Appeals, OCHA failed to meet ambitious targets. In 2009, only one out of seven Flash Appeals were published within seven days of the disaster, mainly due to the gradual onset of most of the emergencies, slowing the decision of RCs to develop an appeal.

Guidance and Accountability

At the system level, OCHA drove the process of creating the IASC Humanitarian Finance Group, which provides a platform for a more coherent approach to the new humanitarian financing architecture. OCHA made significant strides in managing humanitarian finances by developing and refining SOPs, particularly for managing CHFs and ERFs. Guidelines for CHF, ERF and start-up SOPs were developed, with the ERF Guidelines piloted for new ERFs in 2009.

In 2009, OCHA worked with partners to begin assessing progress in CAPs against key strategic indicators. These are the selected set of outcomes that, taken together, signal the overall trend of the crisis, the degree of effectiveness of the
humanitarian response, and the key gaps and remaining needs. Pilots to introduce a standard, integrated reporting and monitoring framework were rolled out in Iraq and Somalia, and partially implemented in CAR, oPt and Uganda. Meanwhile, nearly all CAPs in 2009 reported to some extent on outputs per cluster versus the targets set out in their original CAPs six months earlier. This is a major stride forward from preceding years, in which there was very little aggregate information about outputs, outcomes and impact of humanitarian action on a collective level in major crises. While such monitoring is still in its infancy, and some conceptual development remains to be done, the experience in 2009 establishes a useful precedent.

OCHA continued to update and strengthen CERF guidance, implementing recommendations from the two-year evaluation, including revisions of the life-saving criteria and reviewing the underfunded window. OCHA developed a draft Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) linked to CERF’s three main objectives: promoting early action and response to save lives; enhancing response to time-critical requirements based on demonstrable needs; and strengthening core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises. The CERF Advisory Group asked that the PAF be sufficiently rigorous, without being too onerous, and make maximum use of existing agency reporting processes. The PAF focuses on measuring the CERF’s added value and its impact on the overall humanitarian response in a country, distinguishing the impact of individual CERF-supported projects only where possible and sensible.

Field Support and Capacity-Building
During 2009, more than 15 field missions were undertaken to support country-level pooled funds. These not only helped with the start-up of new funds, but provided training, workshops, evaluations and donor consultations for new and existing funds. The CERF Secretariat conducted six training workshops in regional hubs.

OCHA has also strengthened its capacity to manage ERFs financially. A dedicated pooled fund unit was created within the Administrative Office in Geneva (staff to be in place in early 2010). The unit’s main function will be processing grants and disbursements for all OCHA-managed ERFs.

The establishment of ERFs has previously been ad hoc and purely field driven. However, the creation of an ERF is now given careful consideration in the planning process for new OCHA offices and field presences. All existing offices have gone through some level of analysis to gauge if an ERF is feasible and adds value.

Strategic Linkages
OCHA’s new Strategic Framework for 2010-2013 integrates humanitarian financing as a core function. This is based on lessons learned in 2009 regarding strengthening linkages between pooled funding mechanisms and other aspects of a coordinated humanitarian response, such as needs assessment, planning and monitoring. The new Strategic Framework will help ensure that different sections of OCHA work closely together on improving support to the overall programme cycle, rather than addressing individual components in isolation, both at the Headquarters and field level. For example, improving the evidence base for decision-making through better improved needs assessment is expected to have knock-on benefits for planning, financing, and monitoring and evaluation. In 2009, OCHA engaged at inter-agency level on how to start linking needs assessments more formally with CAPs and Flash Appeals. OCHA also held inter-branch discussions on how the Humanitarian Dashboard could become a key tool in presenting and categorizing information contained in appeal documents.
**Performance Evaluation**

**Humanitarian financing mechanisms properly resourced and supported.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CERF receives target funds of $500 million ($450 million for grant funding).</td>
<td>• $50 million loan window maintained; $401 million contributed towards $450 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAPs at an average level of 70 per cent across appeals.</td>
<td>• Cumulative funding levels of 71 per cent of CAPs and Flash Appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding committed to country-level pooled funds increased by $125 million by December 2009.</td>
<td>• Funding levels of ERFs maintained (no increase); CHF funding levels decreased by 15 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase in the number of donors supporting country pooled funds to 12.</td>
<td>• Twelve donors supporting pooled funds (policy level), with 10 contributing financially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two new ERFs established by mid-year and three additional by end 2009.</td>
<td>• Three new ERFs established by mid-year and two additional in place by year end.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance, training and support provided on the proper and complementary use of the humanitarian financing mechanisms.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Guidance documents prepared for revised CERF application guidelines for the loan and grant elements; revised guidance on synergy between Flash Appeals and the CERF Rapid Response Window; standardization guidelines for establishing ERFs; revised guidelines for standardizing CHFs; and draft guidance on harmonizing management of pooled fund processes at the field level.</td>
<td>• CERF life-saving criteria and underfunded-window guidance to be issued in early 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development and roll-out of an integrated humanitarian financing training package developed and field tested in two locations by December 2009.</td>
<td>• 2009 CAP section document on Flash Appeal overhaul included a section on the interaction between CERF and Flash Appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least two consultative processes held on humanitarian financing with IASC/inter-agency forums and Good Humanitarian Donorship Implementation Group.</td>
<td>• ERF Guidelines drafted and under review, but used as a working document for new and existing ERFs since mid-2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CHF guidelines revised and approved by the CHF Working Group in 2009.</td>
<td>• CHF guidelines revised and approved by the CHF Working Group in 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ERF and CHF guidelines reference alignment of CERF country-level decision-making processes with ERF/CHF systems and processes.</td>
<td>• ERF and CHF guidelines reference alignment of CERF country-level decision-making processes with ERF/CHF systems and processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The integrated financing training module to be used in early 2010.</td>
<td>• Humanitarian financing on agenda of two IASC WG meetings, resulting in creation of IASC Humanitarian Financing Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanitarian financing levels maintained through 2009 despite financial crisis.</td>
<td>• 2009 CAP section document on Flash Appeal overhaul included a section on the interaction between CERF and Flash Appeals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accountability measures strengthened.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a PAF for the CERF by September 2009.</td>
<td>• CERF Advisory Group reviewed PAF concept paper in April and initial draft in November; final draft to be presented at April 2010 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of the use and management of pooled funds mechanisms at the field level by 2009.</td>
<td>• Reviewed ToRs/guidelines, procedures and practices of all country-based pooled funds in 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three pilot countries using a standard, integrated reporting and monitoring framework (development by June) as part of CAP to assess overall humanitarian outcomes at the sector or cluster level.</td>
<td>• Framework pilots in CAPs in 2009: Iraq and the region, Somalia, and partially in Central African Republic, occupied Palestinian territory and Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100 per cent of countries meeting the deadlines for monitoring reports to the ERC for activities implemented with CERF funding.</td>
<td>• The number of reports received on time more than doubled. A total of 22 out of 55 reports (40 per cent) received on time (10 of 53 in 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanitarian financing levels maintained through 2009 despite financial crisis.</td>
<td>• Total CAP and Flash Appeal funding in 2009 was $7 billion, significantly above the levels of $5.1 billion in 2008 and $3.7 billion in 2007.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding disbursed in a timely manner in sudden-onset emergency contexts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 80 per cent of Flash Appeals published within seven days of declaration of disaster and revised within one month of initial launch.</td>
<td>• A total of 15 per cent (one out of seven) Flash Appeals published within seven days of disaster; 85 per cent (six out of seven) revised within two months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At least 50 per cent of the total amount provided by CERF to Flash Appeals is provided within the first two weeks.</td>
<td>• A total of 81 per cent of CERF funds for Flash Appeals allocated within the first two weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 – Improved coordination structures at country, regional and international level

In 2009, humanitarian leadership at all levels has benefited from improved policy guidance, a clearer definition of responsibilities and a move toward stronger accountability systems.

At the global level, much focus was placed on working with humanitarian partners to provide clear guidance supporting humanitarian leadership, particularly in the area of partnership. By late 2009, IASC guidance for HCTs had been developed and disseminated, promoting greater consistency in HCT modus operandi, and reinforcing guiding principles, including a focus on partnership and strategic decision-making. Meanwhile, the development of a draft ToR for cluster coordinators, providing more specific guidance for cluster leadership at the field level, has helped demarcate responsibilities and improve accountability and efficiency.

The establishment of an HC Pool, including 27 individuals from a wide range of organizations, has made the selection of candidates for senior humanitarian posts, notably RC, RC/HC, HC and DHC positions, more transparent and participatory. The development of clearly defined Humanitarian Coordination Competencies and revisions of the HC ToR and the humanitarian section of the RC job description have clarified individual roles. As a result, IASC partners and donors now have clearer, more closely aligned expectations of how humanitarian leadership should function. The imminent publication of the Emergency Handbook for RCs and HCs will provide additional guidance, including a concise checklist of key actions to take in an emergency. The development and rollout of the ERC/HC Compact and the humanitarian section of the RC/HC/DO Performance Appraisal System have made appraisals more systematic, and provided an improved feedback loop between the ERC and HCs. OCHA’s engagement with UNDG and UNDOCO has brought better alignment between the RC system and the HC system.

Humanitarian leaders have been increasingly equipped with new skills and knowledge. Training was given to HCs and HC Pool members on using international legal frameworks for humanitarian advocacy, while RCs were trained on emergency preparedness, response and recovery.

Securing appropriate funding mechanisms to cover cluster coordination costs has been a key priority. The facilitation of a high-level meeting between donors and global cluster lead agencies (and preparatory work for a follow-up meeting in 2010) helped strengthen linkages and explain cluster coordination needs at global and field levels. Support has also been given to establishing an IASC Mainstreaming Task Team to support the mainstreaming of cluster responsibilities and costs in global cluster lead agencies’ budgets.

Work continued to strengthen the synergies between the humanitarian financing and resource mobilization tools, and reinforce coordination. As a result, coordination was included in the life-saving criteria for CERF, paving the way for humanitarian agencies to apply for CERF funding for coordination activities. The CAP, Flash Appeal and ERF guidelines were also updated to facilitate disbursement of funds for coordination projects. The IASC Humanitarian Financing Working Group was established to address issues regarding humanitarian pooled funds and broader humanitarian financing issues/trends, focusing inter alia on guidance and overall coordination to IASC/ad hoc subsidiary bodies on matters related to humanitarian financing.

At the country level, HCTs were established in nearly every HC country by the end of the year. OCHA began assessing the application of the newly agreed IASC guidelines, and worked to support improving field-level partnership. Cluster coordination mechanisms became increasingly integral to humanitarian response. They were set up or brought into use for all new major emergencies and for new crises within chronic emergencies during 2009. These included oPt, Pakistan, Samoa, Indonesia, the Philippines, El Salvador and Yemen. The cluster approach was formalized in Sri Lanka, Sudan, Niger and Timor Leste.

Inter-cluster support missions, led by OCHA and including representatives of various global cluster lead agencies, were
sent to Sudan and Pakistan. OCHA surge support missions went to Sri Lanka and Afghanistan to reinforce cluster coordination at the field level. Modules on humanitarian action were developed for training field staff and surge rosters.

The Humanitarian Reform Tracking Tool aimed to provide a snapshot of the progress on the roll-out of clusters from a qualitative perspective and to identify in-country capacity gaps. The tool was discussed at the Global Cluster Lead Retreat in 2009. It was put on hold following concerns expressed by some global cluster lead agencies and the IASC Working Group’s decision to wait for the outcome of the Cluster Evaluation Phase II (due in March 2010). The tool will be reviewed in 2010 within the broader context of strengthening accountability structures and monitoring.

Participation in global workshops has helped contribute to the development of humanitarian policy, for example the Sphere Handbook Revision, with its focus on Minimum Standards in Disaster Response. OCHA also took part in preparatory work for the third meeting of the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) (postponed to early 2010), focusing on humanitarian space and humanitarian-military relationships. The GHP will also focus on a new business model for humanitarian action, particularly through greater support to local communities and local actors, but also including the continuum of activities from prevention, preparedness and response, right through to development. In particular, this will look at local capacity enhancement. The meeting will also maintain a focus and sense of accountability on the Principles of Partnership.

**Challenges and Lessons Learned**

The recruitment process for the HC Pool has been challenged by uneven involvement of IASC agencies in sponsoring candidates for the IASC HC Pool, and participating in the screening and interview panels. The busy schedules of RCs and HCs have prevented some from attending training events. OCHA will need to engage in high-level advocacy with IASC agencies, RCs and HCs to ensure a greater level of participation and input.

To strengthen the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian response in new emergencies, it is critical to ensure that during the preparedness phase, work is done with all relevant partners, including government, RC and development actors, to raise awareness and understanding of the new global humanitarian architecture. This has been particularly challenging in contexts where there is limited experience of humanitarian action. In some cases, this inexperience has had a negative impact on the efficacy of the response. A priority for 2010 and beyond will be to continue building partners’ capacity, knowledge and understanding in non-humanitarian contexts regarding their roles and responsibilities in emergency response operations, and the tools and services that exist to support them.

OCHA will prioritize the development of operational guidance on inter-cluster coordination, specifically on OCHA’s responsibilities.

Much needs to be done to clarify the role and functions of clusters in transition situations, as opposed to emergencies. There needs to be a more integrated approach to planning, preparedness and response at country level, identifying key challenges in advance and promoting actions that reduce vulnerability in the long term. The seamless transfer of coordination responsibilities to development partners depends on building strong partnerships beforehand between humanitarian and development actors and host governments.

It is clear that cluster leadership roles must be more closely defined. Cluster lead agencies should not be over-burdened and must be capable of guaranteeing the same level of engagement, leadership and resources across different clusters. Cluster lead agencies must also be capable of accomplishing the tasks assigned, and have sufficient knowledge, support and resources. The achievements made at global level in terms of strengthening response capacity, building surge rosters and stockpiles, and developing appropriate guidance, standards and tools, must be mirrored at field level with the provision of targeted and adequate support for clusters.

While progress has been made in strengthening partnerships between United Nations and non-United Nations actors at the field level, effectively engaging and building the capacity of national NGOs and civil society has remained a challenge for all partners in humanitarian operations. The relationships built between partners in an international humanitarian response operation and their government counterparts who lead the response have often not been sufficiently systematic. A major focus for 2010 and beyond will be consolidating critical relationships with national partners, host governments and the hitherto neglected private sector.
### Coordination in Integrated Missions

Dedicated OCHA capacity was established at Headquarters in 2008 to provide substantive support on integration. This was maintained in 2009. This capacity focused on global policy discussions and immediate operational challenges, allowing simultaneous progress on both. On the policy front, OCHA participated in developing the guidance package for the Integrated Mission Planning Process, which includes the strategic assessment, role of Headquarters and role of the field, to ensure that humanitarian concerns were incorporated. The strategic assessment and Headquarters planning notes were endorsed by the Secretary-General in May 2009, clarifying modalities, roles and responsibilities of the various actors supporting integrated United Nations presences.

The guidance note on the role of the field was close to finalization at the end of 2009. The OCHA Policy Instruction on Structural Arrangements within Integrated United Nations Presences was also endorsed in May by the USG for Humanitarian Affairs. For the first time, the policy laid out the criteria OCHA uses to determine its recommendations on the structural arrangements between an HC, an OCHA office and a United Nations peacekeeping or political mission. The aim is to guide OCHA staff, but also to explain OCHA’s position to United Nations and non-United Nations partners. OCHA participated in all Headquarters integrated and integrated mission task forces, provided support to HCs and HCTs on operational integration issues, and participated in technical assessment missions to DRC and Guinea-Bissau, keeping humanitarian concerns at the forefront of discussions. In addition, OCHA was an active member of the Principal Level Integration Steering Group, ensuring that the integration agenda continued to respect humanitarian principles and operational realities.

### Performance Evaluation

#### Trained and accountable humanitarian leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seventy-five per cent of RCs trained in humanitarian advocacy.</td>
<td>• Eighty per cent of sitting RCs trained on humanitarian coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All HCs trained in humanitarian advocacy.</td>
<td>• Out of the 28 HCs and 3 DHCs, 14 HCs and two DHCs (52 per cent of the total) were trained in humanitarian advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sixty-five per cent of emergencies in which there is an HC vacancy are filled by an HC Pool member.</td>
<td>• All 28 HCs have signed or initiated compacts with the ERC. Sixty-three per cent of HCs (all 15 seated HCs at the time) underwent a mid-year review, including a progress report and a discussion with the ERC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coherent guidance provided by OCHA to RCs, HCs and OCHA field offices on implementing and strengthening the use of the cluster approach, in addition to wider reform principles in new and ongoing emergencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bi-annual completion of the Humanitarian Reform Tracking Tool in consultation with the cluster leads to be included in the Global Cluster’s annual report to ERC.</td>
<td>• Indicator not yet achieved (see Part II below for explanation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### External evaluation of the main outcomes of the joint humanitarian response at the country level, including overall operational effectiveness of the cluster approach and other components of the humanitarian reform process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Second phase of the cluster evaluation completed by September 2009.</td>
<td>• Cluster Evaluation Phase II rescheduled for completion in March 2010, due in part to initial procurement delays. Field work was completed in December 2009 and the final report was to be presented and discussed at the IASC WG in April 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Framework for implementation of the evaluation’s conclusions and recommendations developed by December 2009.</td>
<td>• The framework for implementing the evaluation’s conclusions and adopted recommendations will be drafted by Q2 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strengthened partnerships between United Nations and non-United Nations organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All HCTs and clusters in the field based around the Principles of Partnership.</td>
<td>• HCTs established in almost all HC countries, informed by IASC guidance finalized and circulated in late 2009. Guidance formalizes OCHA’s role as HCT secretariat and increases HC leadership and accountability, while promoting the Principles of Partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 – Strengthened OCHA emergency response capacity

OCHA was increasingly consistent and predictable in response to new emergencies in 2009, particularly in its mobilization and deployment of surge resources. Establishing OCHA-wide task forces served to combine surge capacity with other OCHA tools, thus improving management and decision-making in support of a more coordinated humanitarian response.

This approach ensured a smoother transition from UNDAC and INSARAG deployments in the first days of a response, to regional or Headquarters-based surge provision, to longer-term staffing requirements. It also allowed OCHA to respond better to simultaneous emergencies, notably the multiple disasters that struck the Asia and the Pacific region in the second half of the year.

The UNDAC and INSARAG systems continued to be among the most visible of OCHA’s tools and services in sudden-onset disaster response, particularly earthquakes and collapsed-structure disasters. UNDAC teams were deployed on 14 missions in 2009, of which 11 were to sudden-onset disasters. All teams were deployed within 48 hours of the request, with new and existing UNDAC members appropriately familiarized with the latest developments in humanitarian response/reform and training.

Regional Offices (ROs) serve as the first line of OCHA staff response, particularly in providing support in the early stages of natural emergencies. In 2009, ROs conducted 70 missions in response to emergencies around the world. The emergency response activities included deploying surge capacity, supporting the deployment of UNDAC response teams and leading trouble-shooting RDT missions to support the RC/HC in responding to a crisis. ROAP alone responded to seven simultaneous emergencies in Asia and the Pacific in September and October 2009, with a combination of surge capacity deployments and remote support to RCs/HCs and country teams.

Where demand exceeded RO capacity in replacement of short duration RO surge, Headquarters-based Emergency Response Roster (ERR) deployments were put in motion. In major emergencies, surge requests were based on the response strategies developed in OCHA-wide task forces. Established in 2008, the ERR expanded its membership in 2009 and now includes humanitarian affairs officers (at levels ranging from P-2 to P-5), civil-military coordination officers, information management officers, information technology specialists, administration/finance officers and public information officers. The number of applicants to join the ERR increased during the last year, with over 100 applicants in the last rotation. Membership on each rotation has increased from 14 to 35.

The Stand-by Partnership Programme (SBPP) serves to complement OCHA’s surge capacity needs in humanitarian emergencies through seconding experts on mission by external partner organizations. These partners can often bolster OCHA’s capacity in new, complex emergencies where access may be restricted and where surge deployments are generally longer than for natural disasters. In 2009, they played a critical role in supporting coordination in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Sudan. OCHA also worked to improve the availability and quality of SBPP secondees in technical disciplines, particularly in the Civil-Military Coordination and Information Management domains. This allowed for the rapid sourcing of experienced experts during the first two weeks of a crisis. A consultation event in November, along with bilateral conversations during
2009, enabled OCHA and SBPPs to examine opportunities and constraints in making the existing mechanism more responsive and professional, while also lending clarity to the differences in strategic vision between different partners. OCHA conducted two training courses for potential deployees from SBPP rosters. Work was also initiated on conceptualizing a new surge training for ERR members and other OCHA-internal surge providers (to be completed in 2010).

In 2009, two new surge mechanisms were developed and endorsed by OCHA management for roll-out in 2010: an Associates Surge Pool of consultants and retirees, for deployment at short notice to fill post-initial surge gaps for three to six months, before the arrival of regular staffing; and two full-time Roaming Emergency Surge Officers in the Humanitarian Affairs Officer and Administrative/Finance Officer domains. These mechanisms are expected to help fill the gap between short-term deployments and longer-term staffing solutions through regular recruitment.

Improved internal coordination between OCHA’s response mechanisms has increasingly eliminated staffing gaps. This has helped ensure a fast, effective response, with the RO surge or ERR deployments usually on site before UNDAC leaves. Over the course of the year, the practice of inserting UNDAC-trained OCHA members onto UNDAC teams became more frequent and ensured a smoother transition. UNDAC training courses served to ensure that succession planning and decisions were informed by clearer information and policy guidance. In 2009, this guidance included updated SBPP and ERR guidance material; an initial draft Policy Instruction on Surge Management; the development of an Easy Guide to Surge Management; and use of GANTT charts in emergencies. The latter is a visualization tool, representing deployment timelines, highlighting the sources of surge and facilitating improved management for sequencing/staggering deployments.

A key challenge to rapid UNDAC deployments was the delay in receiving a request from a disaster-affected Government and/or RC. This was often due to prolonged decision-making processes at the country level. When a request is received, UNDAC can deploy within 48 hours, but the request process may take two to three days, wasting valuable time. Working through its ROs and the Geneva-based Permanent Missions, OCHA is making an effort to inform governments on the procedures to follow when there is a disaster of international dimensions. OCHA is working with UNCTs to provide information on the UNDAC team’s role and the approach for requesting UNDAC assistance.

Post-crisis lesson-learning exercises have identified a number of key constraints that can hamper the rapid deployment of surge staffing. These include delays in the decision-making process in the field and at Headquarters. Efforts have been increased to avoid recurrent bottlenecks, including proposals to invoke expedited procedures in major crises that are likely to require a large, multi-faceted surge. In addition, more efforts are needed to ensure that surge staff can be replaced by long-term OCHA staff in a timely manner, before the surge period ends.

Efforts will continue to harmonize and formalize (through policy papers) agreements across the organization, and with Stand-By Partners, concerning best practice in sequencing and coordinating the different surge mechanisms available to OCHA, including the two new mechanisms being launched in 2010.

The Equipment Reserve was established as part of improving OCHA’s response to sudden-onset disasters/emergencies by filling gaps in OCHA’s emergency response capacity. It became operational in June. This has made OCHA better equipped for deploying staff to the field during major disasters or emergencies. While the full deployment of the equipment was not warranted, parts of the Equipment Reserve, especially safety and telecommunications equipment, were deployed in humanitarian situations in Afghanistan, Chad, Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka. OCHA also finalized an agreement with WFP for the provision of vehicles. These measures allowed OCHA to cover urgent needs from its offices in the field and to bridge gaps created by regular procurement processes.

### Performance Evaluation

**OCHA strengthens surge capacity through the timely and appropriate provision of staff to new emergencies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 75 per cent of rapid-onset emergencies (following a decision for OCHA to respond), surge staff are deployed within 72 hours. A core team (which may include key coordination, IM and administrative staff) is deployed within seven days and additional support staff are deployed within two weeks (if necessary).</td>
<td>Twenty-three per cent of ERR deployments were within 72 hours. Excluding the four most challenging ‘force-majeure’ situations (e.g. difficult visa regimes), 74 per cent of deployments were within one week; 89 per cent were within 10 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A standardized framework for deployment of technical surge is developed by June 2009.</td>
<td>Modus operandi agreed with all OCHA technical sections on surge collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 1.4 – Greater incorporation of disaster risk reduction approaches and strengthened preparedness in humanitarian response

OCHA continued working towards strengthening the response capacity of international, regional and national stakeholders. OCHA partnered with members of the IASC, UNDP, ISDR and regional organizations and networks in developing new initiatives to ensure a more systematic, inclusive and coordinated approach to incorporating disaster risk and strengthening preparedness for humanitarian response.

Recognizing the need for more clarity on disaster preparedness, OCHA decided to devote a full objective of its Strategic Framework for 2010-2013 to this issue. In 2009, OCHA began developing its internal policies and guidance, while working with partners, notably through the IASC Sub-Working Group (SWG) on Preparedness, to promote greater coherence across the humanitarian system, and in governments and regional organizations.

OCHA advised countries on the tools and services available in emergencies, and how best to join relevant networks and build capacity within existing emergency management agencies. The importance of these networks was demonstrated during the Padang earthquake, where international and national search-and-rescue teams worked side by side, coordinated by an UNDAC team. Broadened disaster response networks were built around INSARAG and UNDAC, and included technical NGOs, the private sector and other actors. These networks provided common guidelines and methodologies, and shared experience, information and resources.

At the country level, the INSARAG International External Classification process classified international search-and-rescue teams according to their response capacity. This enabled disaster-affected countries to better assess and prioritize the type of assistance needed in collapsed-structure disasters. Three UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions were deployed in response to requests from governments and RCs. The missions were staffed by UNDAC members with expertise in emergency services, and associates from United Nations agencies, donors and NGOs. They aimed to evaluate national disaster response preparedness plans in Cambodia, Peru and Papua New Guinea. Reports with recommendations and timelines for functional improvement were shared with stakeholders to help guide next steps in improving national disaster response preparedness.

OCHA strives to schedule three UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions per year, providing no-cost support to countries in building up national disaster management systems and capabilities. Limited funding and human resources have reduced OCHA’s ability to meet fast-expanding demand. There is an obvious need for a coherent follow-up strategy for these missions. The Strategic Partnership for Preparedness, for now a pilot project, will involve the government, the United Nations Country Team and various partners engaged in preparedness activities before and after the actual assessment missions. The IASC SWG on Preparedness continued to foster inter-agency collaboration on issues related to early warning, contingency planning and preparedness.

Humanitarian civil-military cooperation featured strongly in OCHA’s disaster preparedness work. OCHA conducted training events on humanitarian civil-military cooperation in Africa, Central and South America, South-East Asia and Europe, with additional support to military staff colleges and peacekeeping training centres. OCHA helped establish closer ties between UNDAC and UN-CMCoord. OCHA organized pre-deployment training for UN-CMCoord officers en route to Afghanistan and Sudan, and participated in the pre-deployment training of military organizations sending troops to Afghanistan and Chad. The Asia-Pacific Conference on Military Assistance to Disaster Relief Operations, facilitated and co-chaired by OCHA, finalized draft regional guidelines to assist the planning of foreign military assistance in disaster response. These guidelines will be brought to the national decision-making level for endorsement at a final conference in October 2010.

There was also a strong focus on engaging with national governments and humanitarian stakeholders on the development of collaborative guidelines for disaster response. This included securing agreement on simplifying customs procedures in advance to speed up delivery of humanitarian assistance during a disaster. The use of a signed customs agreement as a quick clearing device proved effective in Nepal, where NGOs got quick access to relief items released from customs entry points by the Government in response to floods in October 2009.

The revised ToR for RCs clearly outline RCs’ responsibilities for inter-agency planning. OCHA now maintains a matrix that tracks inter-agency contingency planning in priority countries, including those in which OCHA does not have a country office. According to the Global Focus Model, which ranks countries based on levels of risk, vulnerability and capacity, all but four of the 60 countries identified in six regions now have inter-agency contingency plans in place. Forty-two of the same countries initiated, updated or revised contingency plans in 2009. In Haiti, revisions in August 2009 of the inter-agency contingency plans covering cluster activation in sudden-onset emergencies proved instrumental in ensuring that clusters were rapidly established to respond to humanitarian needs arising from the January 2010 earthquake. In some countries, sub-regional planning was
successfully applied, for example in Guinea, where six other countries in the region participated. Two-day inter-agency simulations are increasingly being used to test contingency plans to ensure that they lead to improved response. Simulations have recently been organized in Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Iran, Papua New Guinea, Côte d’Ivoire, Uzbekistan, Benin/Togo, Nepal, Colombia and Tanzania.

Tackling pandemic preparedness, OCHA worked with the Humanitarians in Pandemics network and the Humanitarian Preparedness programme, among others, to support humanitarian organizations and countries requiring assistance. OCHA used its links with organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Tourism Organization to extend its reach. This type of work has significantly strengthened national and global capacities to respond to the H1N1 pandemic, and contributed towards the relatively modest impact of H1N1.

OCHA continues to be one of the principal agencies in the Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative (CADRI), whose materials include online capacity assessment tools and a toolkit for conducting capacity assessment of national disaster management organizations. CADRI held workshops in Jamaica, Kenya and Europe to advance disaster risk reduction at national and regional levels.

OCHA made extensive use of public information campaigns and media initiatives to highlight the importance of preparedness and disaster risk reduction as crucial elements of climate change adaptation. It collaborated with WMO, ISDR and other agencies, and worked with the IASC Task Force on Climate Change before and during the Copenhagen Summit in December 2009.

---

### Performance Evaluation

#### Integrated approach to strengthening national preparedness enhanced, in accordance with Priority Five of the HFA.

**Indicators**
- At least two UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions undertaken.
- Operational classification of international urban search-and-rescue teams with at least three Member States.
- The Guidance and Indicator Package for Implementing Priority Five of the HFA rolled out in at least four countries.

**Achievements**
- Three UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions undertaken in Cambodia, Peru and Papua New Guinea.
- Five International External Classifications successfully conducted in Poland, UK (re-classification), Iceland, China and UAE.
- GIP for Implementing Priority 5 of the HFA rolled out in five countries (Benin, Guinea, Jamaica, Lesotho and Montenegro).

#### National and regional response capacity enhanced through participation in and familiarization with international response networks.

**Indicators**
- Two regional familiarization workshops conducted for Member States on international response networks.
- Forty Member States attending regional disaster response network meetings conducted by OCHA.
- Forty-five Member States participating in international response networks in UNDAC and INSARAG.
- Three regional military disaster response exercises supported by OCHA.
- Four training courses conducted, involving participation of national and regional military and humanitarian partners.

**Achievements**
- Two INSARAG familiarization modules delivered (Croatia in April, Jakarta in April/May).
- Twenty-five Member States attended the regional disaster meeting in Singapore; 28 attended in Brazil.
- Sixty-seven countries participate in INSARAG; 76 countries have active UNDAC members.
- Thirteen medium- and large-scale regional military exercises supported by OCHA in Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the Caribbean.
- Nine UN-CMCoord training courses conducted in Africa, Asia, Europe and South America.

#### Customs procedures streamlined.

**Indicators**
- Two “Model Agreement on Customs Facilitation” signed with Member States.

**Achievements**
- One customs agreement on customs facilitation measures signed with the Government of Mali.

#### Contingency plans updated. Strengthened country-level preparedness for an influenza pandemic.

**Indicators**
- All countries with an HC and 80 per cent of GFM priority countries have contingency planning processes based on IASC Contingency Planning Guidelines.
- Forty pandemic influenza simulations at country level.

**Achievements**
- Among the 60 priority countries identified, 56 countries (93 per cent) have an IACP in place. Among the 28 countries with an HC, 19 countries have initiated/revised IACP in 2009.
- Forty-two pandemic influenza simulations conducted by PIC/OCHA.

#### Strengthened collaboration with ISDR/WMO PI counterpart.

**Indicators**
- At least five joint public information initiatives, press briefings.

**Achievements**
- Participated and contributed to ISDR Communications Group meetings throughout the year. Supported ISDR in public information initiatives and press conferences that took place during the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.
1.5 – A strategy contributing to seamless transition and early recovery

In 2009, OCHA made significant progress in planning for a more systematic approach to phasing down and closing OCHA country offices. There was a careful analysis of country offices in countries where the focus of response is shifting from humanitarian to longer-term recovery and development. In each case, a decision on OCHA’s future was taken by the USG.

Drawing down a country office is an elaborate process. It takes several years and requires careful planning and consultation with key partners, including government counterparts, the RC/HC, UNDOCO and UNDP BCPR. For each transition country, and for those where the humanitarian situation is expected to improve or change, the strategy now includes an approach to handing over substantive programming to local counterparts, including preparedness for response and coordination functions for the residual humanitarian caseload. At the operational level, OCHA has developed and begun applying practical guidelines to support transition planning, phase down and exit. These guidelines include making appropriate administrative and financial arrangements and archiving. The key principles for an OCHA draw-down have become institutionalized and are being codified in a policy instruction.

In 2009, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea, Niger, Uganda, Indonesia, Myanmar and Nepal were identified as being in transition. Planning for their phase-down began in the middle of the year. In addition to engaging with Headquarters counterparts, planning was carried out at the country level with RCs/HCs, HCTs and relevant government counterparts. The decisions on transition shaped the work of the country offices in 2010, where OCHA began to discontinue certain activities or hand them over to other agencies. Draw-down will be regularly reviewed to take into account any significant change in the humanitarian situation. In cases where there is still an obvious requirement for humanitarian coordination, OCHA may decide to downgrade from a full country office to a smaller support structure to respond to residual humanitarian needs, maintaining the possibility of scaling up again should the situation deteriorate in the country. These Humanitarian Support Units will be established within an RC’s office with support from OCHA’s regional offices. The offices in the transition countries are expected to be closed at the end of 2011, with a smaller number to follow in 2012.

OCHA had intended to phase down in two other countries. However, in Niger, given the significant deterioration of the humanitarian situation, OCHA decided to maintain a full office in the country. In Myanmar, attention shifted from the Delta region, where recovery is in full swing, to other parts of the country where there was a need for humanitarian coordination in mid-2009.

At the global level, OCHA contributed to the Secretary-General’s report, “Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict”, which was submitted to the Security Council at the end of May. The report recognized that the costs of the inability to secure post-conflict environments are significant: protracted displacement, chronic disease, renewed violence and, potentially, full-scale war. In such situations, OCHA and its humanitarian partners are compelled to remain in situations longer, to maintain high levels of staff and to direct resources toward short-term solutions that delay national capacity-building and long-term development. The report represents a point of departure, outlining a bold vision for an international peacebuilding system, to be developed over the next five to 10 years. The principal elements here are achieving global consensus on key peacebuilding areas, prioritizing leadership, coordination and accountability, and developing common strategies around which the international system can rally.

With UNDOCO, OCHA also continued to co-chair the UNDG- ECHA Working Group on Transition (WGT). In 2009, the group focused on tackling capacity and strategy gaps in transition countries, including through the development of a minimum standard support package. OCHA in particular led an initiative aimed at streamlining the method of communication among WGT members to ensure a broader and consistent representation of the transition perspective in the Integrated Mission Planning Process, Integrated Missions Task Forces, Peacebuilding Support Office, and Secretary-General’s Policy Committee processes.

OCHA has been working through the humanitarian IASC to improve training, preparation and support for HCs, most...
of whom are still active during the post-conflict phase. It has also been requested that HCs be involved in the early, field-level strategic planning exercises that encompass all United Nations security, political and development activities. OCHA is also working with United Nations development agencies and coordination bodies to strengthen RC leadership. RC offices need substantial additional capacity and funding at an early stage if they are to take over coordination functions when the HC role ends. OCHA will look to work closely with UNDP to identify potential opportunities within a crisis situation where early recovery assistance can be provided to complement humanitarian aid.

OCHA has recognized that it must work strategically with development partners to address the funding gap for early recovery and transition. Studies commissioned in 2009 went some way to addressing these issues, indicating that elements of early recovery are embedded in most humanitarian projects, but noting that the funding provided falls short of requirements. In a context where humanitarian funding generally is insufficient relative to needs, development funding should fill early recovery gaps. Regarding broader financial support for transition, guidelines on using humanitarian funding mechanisms to reinforce early and longer-term recovery were developed in early 2009. Further guidance on strategic planning and funding tools were drafted with the WGT, while work continued with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee’s International Network on Conflict and Fragility Task Team on Aid Architecture and Financing to develop a transition strategy for donors.

### Performance Evaluation

**OCHA’s corporate position on early recovery and transition situations, including phasing down operations, is clarified and communicated internally and to partners. OCHA field offices are supported, as needed, to begin implementation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Package of transition-focused guidance agreed by OCHA senior management by June 2009.</td>
<td>• Policy instruction on OCHA’s role in transition drafted to guide country offices in post-emergency situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All field offices operating in priority transitional settings (Côte d’Ivoire, Nepal, Myanmar and Uganda) have a phase-down and exit strategy based on agreed guidance.</td>
<td>• Supporting guidance developed on key transition arrangements, including administration and finance, country strategies and disestablishment of the HC position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporation into annual work plans (2010) of initial benchmarks on a phase-down and exit strategy for all offices in the field, including new offices established in 2009.</td>
<td>• Transition strategies, phase down and exit plans prepared for all country offices in priority transition contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More predictable and systematic coordination arrangements for early recovery and recovery at the country level are established in a timely manner.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Standard procedures for consultations between OCHA UNDP/BCPR and UNDOCO desks (or equivalent) at Headquarters level developed and implemented by December 2009.</td>
<td>• Planning cells were set up for all transition countries and a contact list developed to facilitate communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IASC Working Group presented with proposed operational guidance on cluster phase-out or handover to national structures and development actors by December 2009.</td>
<td>• Due to competing priorities, cluster leads requested that finalization of consultations and development of operational guidance be deferred until early 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review of existing humanitarian planning mechanisms (Consolidated and Flash Appeals) and funding mechanisms (CERF, CHF, ERF) as planning and resource mobilization tools for early recovery and longer-term recovery activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Dissemination of planning and funding tools providing guidance on which instrument is most appropriate for a given situation by June 2009.</td>
<td>• UNDG/ECHA Task Team on Transitional Financing set up to provide guidance on strategic planning and funding tools, while work continues with the OEDC/DAC-INCAF Task Team on Aid Architecture and Financing to develop transition strategy for donors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of guidance and submission to the IASC for endorsement, regulating early recovery and recovery in Consolidated Appeals (guidance already exists for Flash Appeals) by June 2009.</td>
<td>• Guidance development postponed pending IASC donors meeting in early 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forthcoming review of CHFs to include a thorough analysis of use and impact of CHFs to fund early recovery activities and informing future policy and guidance by December 2009.</td>
<td>• Analysis undertaken of the use of CHFs. A clear policy and guidance on the use of CHFs in transition contexts will be developed in 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III: PERFORMANCE

Goal 2: Recognized OCHA leading role in humanitarian policy, advocacy and information management

2.1 – Action-oriented analysis of humanitarian trends and emerging policy issues

OCHA’s policy research agenda in 2009 aimed at providing more detailed analysis on the impact of global challenges to humanitarian action. In particular, OCHA’s research during 2009 focused on how global challenges, including food and financial crises, resource scarcities and climate change, affected humanitarian needs and operational environments individually and cumulatively. Drawing on a series of expert consultations, dialogue with field offices and partner agencies, and a survey of relevant research, OCHA released the “Occasional Policy Paper: Global Challenges and their Impact on International Humanitarian Action”. Findings from this research were reflected in the Secretary-General’s annual report, Strengthening of the Coordination of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance of the United Nations. This informed the 2009 ECOSOC Humanitarian Segment for Member States, and provided important background for developing OCHA’s Strategic Framework for 2010–2013.

On climate change, OCHA continued to play a key role in initiating research and sharing knowledge about the intersection of climate change adaptation and humanitarian concerns. Specifically, OCHA focused on obvious gaps in the research base, one of which was the effect of climate-related disasters on forced displacement. This resulted in a study, carried out jointly with the Norwegian Refugee Council, titled “Monitoring Disaster Displacement in the Context of Climate Change”. This quantified the number of people displaced by disasters in 2008 and developed a methodology...
for monitoring disaster replacement on an ongoing basis. OCHA also convened several workshops with participants from IASC agencies, research institutes and Member States to share analysis and discuss emerging climate change finance mechanisms; the effect of climate change on displacement and migration; and the International Panel on Climate Change special report on managing extreme events. The results of this work were used to strengthen the ERC’s advocacy on climate change, support IASC participation in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change process, and therefore ensure humanitarian concerns are reflected in a new global climate change agreement.

Given the significant complexity of climate change and other global challenges, it is clear that OCHA – and indeed the humanitarian community – does not have sufficient research capacity to analyse fully their implications for humanitarian action. Therefore, OCHA’s approach in these areas has been to work closely with the climate change, development and academic communities, as well as IASC partners. This has often involved participating in consortia, such as the Climate Change and Environmental Migration Alliance. OCHA is currently initiating a consortium with a number of organizations to support its own work in understanding the humanitarian implications of global challenges and vulnerability.

OCHA’s policy research agenda also focused on the issue of protection of civilians. A joint OCHA-DPKO study was undertaken to review successes, setbacks and remaining challenges in protecting civilians in the context of United Nations peacekeeping operations. OCHA, in collaboration with UNICEF, also initiated a study on strengthening prevention of sexual violence in conflict, which is aimed

---

*John Holmes, Under Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and United Nations Emergency Relief Coordinator, talks to IDPs in Akobo, Sudan.*
at developing a set of tools and approaches for engaging with State and non-State parties in conflict. Also in close collaboration with DPKO and DPA colleagues, OCHA focused on translating the United Nations concept of integration into OCHA policy guidance and operational plans.

*OCHA in 2009* presented an overview of the evolution of humanitarian legislation in United Nations intergovernmental fora since the adoption of General Assembly Resolution 46/182, which led to the creation of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs in 1991. Analysing the normative development and gaps in General Assembly (GA), ECOSOC and Security Council humanitarian legislation, OCHA’s study concluded that United Nations intergovernmental decisions had been able to advance normatively on the protection of civilians and IDPs, and the safety and security of humanitarian personnel. However, little progress had been made on rapid and timely access to communities in need.

The analysis identified the transition from relief to development as the area where the least normative progress had been made. The most progress had been made in humanitarian coordination. The study highlighted some of the elements that have either facilitated or hindered humanitarian development. It concluded that OCHA’s coordination function and the trust it enjoys from Member States place the organization in a unique position to support the GA and ECOSOC in advancing on access.

In 2009, OCHA continued to analyse policy developments with regional organizations. OCHA, through its regular engagement with the EU and NATO, succeeded in influencing humanitarian policy development. The policy dialogue with AU counterparts was reinforced, focusing on the issue of strengthening institutional arrangements with humanitarian actors, as well as the implementation of protection of civilians mandates, although the AU’s lack of capacity constrained these efforts.

### Performance Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A prioritized policy research agenda on current issues affecting humanitarian action.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One expert forum and policy paper on the implications of today’s global challenges for humanitarian caseloads and operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Four specific studies and one thematic review completed and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lessons learned and best practices, analysis and general guidance on humanitarian policy consideration converted into country-specific policies and planning inputs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seventy-five per cent of policy recommendations relevant to OCHA incorporated into plans and coordination models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Secretary-General’s reports reflect key humanitarian priorities and concerns.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three policy priorities promoted and 75 per cent of policy priorities endorsed at the inter-agency level are reflected in inter-governmental reporting and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 – More strategic advocacy of humanitarian principles and issues

Advocacy is one of the five pillars of OCHA’s work and a central element of the OCHA mandate. As such, all OCHA staff members are responsible for advocacy and it is carried out in different forms throughout the organization on a daily basis. Over the years, against a backdrop of increasing global challenges, OCHA has continued to look for new ways to raise awareness of humanitarian concerns and policies, and speak out on behalf of those in greatest need.

Common messaging played an integral role in advocacy in 2009. The ERC continued to brief the Security Council on the humanitarian dimensions and impact of key crises, thus enabling the Security Council to factor humanitarian concerns into its deliberations and resolutions. The ERC frequently gave interviews and briefed the media at Headquarters and during field visits. An increased number of ERC op-eds were produced and disseminated in over 40 countries in 15 languages to amplify awareness of key issues and events. Other senior staff at Headquarters and in the field also continued to brief the media and provide them with background information on specific issues and countries of concern in less high-profile crises.

ERC Key Messages on particularly active crises were shared with Member States and cluster lead agencies to support the ERC in his role as chief advocate, and to form the basis of coordinated media outreach and communications products. These messages were developed in consultation with partners in the field and at Headquarters. In countries such as Sri Lanka and Pakistan, where effective humanitarian advocacy has to consider highly sensitive political contexts, ERC Key Messages enabled the humanitarian community to speak with a unified voice. RCs/HCs and OCHA country offices also used country-level key messages to highlight principal areas of concern.

Advocacy campaigns on climate change, gender-based violence and internal displacement were conceptualized in the early part of 2009 and rolled out progressively throughout the year. Further information on these is provided in the box below. With the effects of climate change taking their toll on already overstretched resources, the ERC led OCHA in supporting the implementation of the IASC media strategy for COP15 in December 2009. This was in order to raise awareness of the serious humanitarian concerns related to climate change, and to encourage people to understand that their governments need to play a role in reducing vulnerability through investment in preparedness at home, or in funding adaptation in developing countries.

As part of its efforts to advocate international humanitarian law and principles, OCHA played a major role in launching the first World Humanitarian Day in August 2009. Efforts focused on increasing public understanding of humanitarian assistance activities worldwide and honouring humanitarian workers who lost their lives or who were injured in the course of their work. In parallel with public advocacy, quiet diplomacy and dialogue continued with parties to conflicts to reduce the number of security incidents affecting humanitarian workers and to gain better access to people in need.

Throughout the year, OCHA placed a strong emphasis on training its own personnel on required skills in public information and advocacy. A Global Advanced Communications Training course, held in Nairobi in December 2009, was attended by 35 reporting staff.

Training Journalists in the Middle East

Among its efforts to support Goal 2 of OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2007-2009 (“Recognized OCHA leading role in humanitarian policy, advocacy and information management”) and to improve humanitarian reporting in the Middle East, CISB held a number of media trainings in 2009. Topics included the media’s role in humanitarian crises; IRIN’s role in providing relevant and timely information to humanitarian partners; humanitarian standards; and reporting on the humanitarian implications of climate change.

Training was conducted for the media in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; Dubai and Abu Dhabi, UAE; Jordan; and Tunisia. CISB staff also participated in several other Middle East workshops designed to foster a better understanding of humanitarian work and explain the roles and mandate of the various United Nations agencies.

Feedback on these trainings/workshops was positive. Many participants commented that the sessions helped them through practical examples to apply what they had learned.

Following on from these trainings, it was agreed that OCHA should widen the groups and organize a larger workshop to help the flow of information between humanitarian organizations, media and other stakeholders for better humanitarian response, and to provide an opportunity to develop a more thorough understanding of the realities of managing information in a Middle Eastern context. Planning for this workshop started in late 2009.
and public information officers. The course was designed to help improve the quality of reporting from the field. It went hand in hand with one-on-one mentoring by staff from OCHA’s Reporting Unit. A number of joint workshops, organized by OCHA, were also held in the Middle East to improve understanding of the United Nations role and humanitarian assistance in general. Media workshops, co-sponsored by IRIN, were also held in a number of Arab states to help young journalists improve the quality of their humanitarian reporting (see below box on training journalists).

IRIN also continued to enhance its reputation for unique analysis and reporting on trends and developments of concern to the humanitarian community. According to a reader survey, 78 per cent of regular users polled rated IRIN as good/very good at bringing attention to events, people and issues not widely covered elsewhere. Ninety per cent described IRIN as accurate and objective. Some 8 million page views were recorded on the website, and 5,432 news articles, special features, weekly digests and analytical reports were published. IRIN’s e-mail subscriber base reached 43,500 users, which was up 15 per cent from 2008.

The Gathering Storm was produced, which is a regularly updated compilation of video shorts and articles on the impact of climate change, produced in collaboration with UNEP. Other key products included Zimbabwe’s Humanitarian Crisis, a package of thematically linked articles; and TB+HIV: Deadly Allies and Countdown to Universal Access, both rolling productions maintained by the IRIN/Plusnews team.

ReliefWeb continued to enhance its products to support advocacy. A key product was the Humanitarian Snapshot of emerging crises and disasters, which provides an overview of what is happening where in affected countries. OCHA’s web platform (OCHA Online) continued to host OCHA advocacy materials, but required a long-overdue overhaul. This did not take place in 2009 due to budget limitations. However, it is hoped that the OCHA Portal Project, which will provide a gateway to all OCHA web services, can progress in 2010.

Advocacy in Action: OCHA led two advocacy campaigns during the year and provided technical support to a third campaign, run collectively by United Nations agencies and their partners.

**Internal Displacement**

OCHA helped create a stronger inter-agency advocacy focus on internal displacement, raising awareness and promoting an exchange of experiences and concerns. A strong audio-visual campaign featured the use of slideshows and a video primer. IRIN produced a series of six films under the title Forced to Flee, portraying IDPs’ stories around the world. IRIN also released a longer film, Under the Gun – Displacement in the Central African Republic, bringing much-needed attention to an often-neglected crisis. IRIN posted some 593 articles related to IDPs and refugees during 2009.

OCHA coordinated an inter-agency advocacy group on IDPs, bringing together United Nations and non-United Nations organizations, focusing on IDP human rights. Technical support was provided to a workshop organized by the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) on IDP Protocols in July 2009, and to the African Union Special Summit in Kampala in October 2009, at which the African Union Convention on Protection and Assistance for IDPs in Africa was adopted.

**Climate Change**

An advocacy campaign on climate change was launched leading up to the Copenhagen COP15 Meeting in December. OCHA developed a series of messages, supporting the insertion of humanitarian issues into the COP15 negotiations. An OCHA Climate Change Toolkit was produced and disseminated widely to partners and posted online. IRIN released eight films (in cooperation with UNEP) highlighting the impact of climate change in Asia. The Road to Copenhagen film was posted online, together with a slideshow on climate change. This project was recognized at the Copenhagen climate change conference in December and widely broadcast beforehand. It formed a key part of UNEP’s advocacy strategy. Ahead of COP15, OCHA coordinated the IASC Communications Sub-Group on Climate Change, and led coordination and public information planning at events in New York, Barcelona and Copenhagen.

**Gender-Based Violence**

OCHA’s contribution to the United Nations Stop Rape Now campaign was a Stop Rape Now Campaign film, which featured high-profile United Nations Goodwill Ambassadors and other eminent individuals as focal points for calls to action. The campaign will be fully rolled out in 2010.
## Performance Evaluation

### Advocacy on behalf of affected populations.

#### Indicators
- Media and communications campaigns on IDPs, climate change and gender-based violence launched in at least 40 countries.
- At least two IDP country-specific advocacy strategies developed and supported.
- At least three Security Council briefings by the ERC or DERC.
- At least four op-ed articles in major publications by the ERC or DERC.
- Three campaign web specials launched on OCHA Online, each with photo galleries, key messages, case studies, interactive content and direct links to relevant policy documents and guidance.
- At least 20 multimedia products developed (videos, websites, etc.).

#### Achievements
- OCHA revised strategy to cover roll-out of campaigns at Headquarters level only due to lack of resources for outreach to field (see box for further information on campaign achievements).
- CAR country-specific inter-agency advocacy strategy on internal displacement developed and supported by OCHA.
- 9 Council Briefings (8 by ERC; 1 by DERC). Technical support provided to African Union on advocacy and communications component to AU Kampala Convention Work Plan, December 2009.
- 11 op-eds in 102 outlets in 40 countries in 15 languages.
- All three campaigns received online coverage at http://OCHAOnline.un.org
- Support provided for posting campaign web specials: planning of site navigation; building and customizing pages; writing and editing; image optimization and captioning; arrangements for video hosting at IRIN; and web metrics reporting.
- Graphics to show funding analysis for ERF and CERF; formatting and design of PDSB policy papers.

### Common advocacy messages for the USG, RCs, HCs, the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs and IASC were agreed and widely disseminated.

#### Indicators
- At least four common key messages endorsed by IASC Principals.
- At least 10 Country Key Messages endorsed by priority-country RCs and HCs.

#### Achievements
- 17 ERC Key Messages issued: Sri Lanka, 9 issues; Zimbabwe, 1 issue; Pakistan, 5 issues; Sudan, 1 issue; Yemen, 1 issue.
- 18 Field Key Messages endorsed by RCs/HCs.
- ERC Key Messages reflect the position of the wider humanitarian community, on whose behalf the ERC is mandated to speak.

### Support to advocacy on humanitarian issues and principles.

#### Indicators
- At least two public information/strategic communication trainings undertaken.

#### Achievements
- Reporting trainings conducted for Sri Lanka, Kenya and Somalia offices (3).
- Global communications training held for 30 OCHA staff in Nairobi.

### Greater alignment of IRIN coverage with OCHA geographic and thematic priorities, reinforcing awareness-raising and advocacy activities.

#### Indicators
- At least four IRIN in-depth reports and four short films on major themes (such as food security, climate change and humanitarian reform), reflecting OCHA priorities.

#### Achievements
- IRIN published four in-depth multimedia packages.
- Partnership agreements with PBS, Al-Jazeera English and several smaller TV networks, which allowed the broadcast of IRIN films to millions of viewers in North America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East and Asia.

### Production of high quality video and still images supporting advocacy efforts.

#### Indicators
- Video capacity and photo gallery established and functioning in Nairobi.
- OCHA stock photo library established by December.

#### Achievements
- 2,959 new photographs selected for archiving, the majority taken by staff and freelance contributors.
- 25,000 images held in IRIN library.
- 455 new photos selected for the public gallery; now 2,207 high-resolution images.
- More than 19,000 full-resolution images downloaded and 6,650 users registered.
- Eight slideshow and photo features published.
- Video capacity established in New York and Nairobi.
- Library architecture in place – sourcing photographs to be addressed in 2010.
2.3 – A common approach to needs assessments and impact evaluation

Work to improve the evidence base for humanitarian decision-making through needs assessment and evaluation continued on two parallel but closely interconnected tracks in 2009.

Well-targeted humanitarian response needs to be based on credible needs assessment and analysis. However, humanitarian decision-making has been previously hampered by a lack of resources for needs assessment, a sectoral approach to data collection and difficulties in consolidating information in a systematic manner to help determine overall needs and priorities. A viable multi-sectoral approach depends on clear agreement between different partners on language, methodology and indicators. In 2009, OCHA led an inter-agency process to promote a harmonized approach to assessments and data consolidation. OCHA recognizes that this is a long-term process. However, tangible progress has been made, indicating that there is a humanitarian system-wide agreement on the need to work collectively to improve evidence-based decision-making.

In mid-2009, OCHA assumed the chair of the IASC Needs Assessment Task Force. It began leading an inter-agency process to produce practical operational guidance on coordinated assessments, develop a key set of assessment indicators and build capacity in assessments. Achievements in 2009 include the development of a framework for needs assessments in sudden-onset disasters. This framework provides the basis for further development of the operational guidance. In addition, a chapter outlining the responsibilities of RCs and HCs with regard to coordinating needs assessments has been included in the Emergency Handbook for RCs and HCs. OCHA also began work in 2009 on a web-based toolbox incorporating needs assessment tools and guidance documents for use by clusters and agencies at the field level. It also began working closely with clusters and sectors to establish key indicators for needs assessments.

Work on the Humanitarian Dashboard1 proceeded in 2009, although the need for extensive inter-agency consultations and buy-in delayed timely implementation of the intended development process. The purpose of the dashboard is to present needs assessment and other core information on an emergency in a standardized manner, ideally in a single- or double-page graphic format, supported by additional underlying layers of information, to make such core information more easily accessible to humanitarian decision makers. The dashboard provides an overview of key aspects of a humanitarian crisis, such as needs, response gaps, national capacity, humanitarian access and funding. This will aid a shared understanding of the severity of a crisis and the identification of priority areas and sectors for intervention. The tool was initially envisaged primarily as a global-level decision-making tool for the ERC, donors and heads of agencies to inform resource-allocation decisions across emergencies. However, the results of field testing and inter-agency consultations changed this focus towards developing a tool that is useful primarily for Humanitarian Country Teams, while other audiences would continue to benefit from its implementation.

During the year, three prototypes of the Humanitarian Dashboard were developed based on lessons learned from field testing, as well as feedback received during technical consultations. Efforts concentrated on better reflecting a rights-based approach, early recovery considerations, and greater emphasis on gender, protection and the quality of the humanitarian response. Although field testing was planned in four countries, only one field test took place in Kenya. Agencies at the field level in Kenya were generally supportive of the tool and provided useful suggestions for improvement. Further field testing was postponed due to the IASC Working Group’s request for further consultations at the Headquarters level to ensure greater inter-agency engagement and understanding of the dashboard. To this end, a three-day inter-agency workshop was held in November 2009, followed by technical inter-agency meetings and bilateral consultations. On this basis, a guidance note on the Humanitarian Dashboard was developed, specifying the purpose, scope and expected use of the tool.

At the end of 2009, the IASC Working Group added the Humanitarian Dashboard to the Task Force for Needs Assessments as its fourth objective. This consolidation of needs assessment work and the dashboard development further strengthened inter-agency collaboration and ownership of both processes, and emphasized the links between assessments and the dashboard.

Efforts to strengthen the evaluation component of the humanitarian programme cycle were focused on the development of new tools and approaches to joint evaluation, such as inter-agency real-time evaluations (IA RTEs) and impact evaluations, as well as OCHA’s internal evaluation functions.

At the IASC’s request, OCHA coordinated an inter-agency review on the future of joint evaluations. The review

---

1 The Humanitarian Dashboard has been building on, and eventually replaced, the OCHA-internal Rough Severity Estimation Tool (RSET).
concluded that joint evaluation missions often produced higher quality results than single-agency evaluations, bringing more accountability and learning to the process. Based on these results, OCHA commissioned an options paper on Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluations (JHIE). While the paper was discussed during the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance 2009 Annual Meeting, it was concluded that in-depth consultations with a wide range of stakeholders were required before designing and implementing any new evaluations. A JHIE Working Group has been established and will begin work in 2010, chaired by OCHA.

The pilot phase of IA RTEs (which included Pakistan, Mozambique and Myanmar) was reviewed, and the IASC agreed to move beyond piloting to regular implementation. The learning from the pilot phase will be used to develop a set of standard operating procedures and methodologies for conducting IA RTEs. The latter half of 2009 saw significant progress in this regard. Proposals are expected to be discussed by the IASC WG in July 2010.

The Cluster Evaluation Phase II was the focus of significant OCHA and inter-agency attention in 2009. The process of conducting the evaluation highlighted the challenges of assessing the impact of coordination on meeting the needs of affected populations. Following extensive research and consultations with key stakeholders, the Cluster Evaluation 2 developed a model for assessing operational outcomes of clusters, using a set of 21 indicators.

The Cluster Evaluation II model is a significant advance towards measuring the impact of coordination. It represents the collective view of the IASC Cluster Evaluation II Steering Group, comprised of a cross-section of stakeholders. It is the most sophisticated attempt yet to assess higher-level outcomes of a coordination mechanism. There is significant potential for this model to be applied in other contexts. It has been used to inform the forthcoming evaluations of the CHFs and CERF.

During 2009, OCHA also strengthened its internal evaluation function. A new evaluation policy and strategy for 2010 to 2013 was developed and approved by senior management. The policy and strategy will help guide OCHA’s evaluation work over the life of the new Strategic Framework. The policy provides for a strengthened internal evaluation system within OCHA and a clear set of management accountabilities for conducting and using internal evaluation. A major emphasis will be on using independent evaluation to strengthen OCHA’s performance reporting and to provide in-depth and contextual analysis around key performance issues, especially as this relates to OCHA’s new strategic objectives for 2010 to 2013.

---

**Performance Evaluation**

**Needs assessment and other core humanitarian information better consolidated at the multi-sectoral level for enhanced decision-making and humanitarian action.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A working version of a multi-sectoral information consolidation tool is developed through piloting in four to six countries in consultation with partners.</td>
<td>• First prototype of the Humanitarian Dashboard was developed and presented to the IASC WG in March 2009. Two further prototypes were developed based on lessons learned from field testing in Kenya and feedback from technical consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The tool was field tested in one country (Kenya) in 2009.</td>
<td>• The tool was field tested in one country (Kenya) in 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment initiatives and processes further harmonized for more effective inter-sectoral field assessments and improved sectoral information consolidation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Best practice examples and guidance (two documents) provided to partners and OCHA staff to facilitate improved multi-sectoral assessments and sectoral information consolidation.</td>
<td>• The Framework for Needs Assessments in Natural Disasters (sudden-onset) was developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Needs assessment guidance completed for the RC/HC’s handbook.</td>
<td>• Needs assessment guidance completed for the RC/HC’s handbook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common evaluation framework for assessing the results and impact of the cluster approach.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Common set of cluster assessment and impact indicators for all clusters developed by the end of 2009.</td>
<td>• The Cluster Evaluation II was designed to assess operational results: an evaluation framework in the form of a logic model was proposed. It included a set of system-wide cluster performance indicators, as well as specific indicators to measure cluster performance at the country level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 – Protection advanced at the global, regional and national level

Promoting the protection of populations in disasters and armed conflict continued to be a key priority for OCHA in 2009. OCHA provided critical analysis at the global level, and practical guidance and technical support at the country level.

Under the chairmanship of the UK Permanent Mission, the Security Council’s informal Expert Group on protection of civilians in armed conflict was established in January 2009. It met on seven occasions during the year, with consistent levels of participation by most Security Council Member States. OCHA’s role in relation to the Expert Group has been to gather and present information and analysis from humanitarian actors from specific contexts of armed conflict on the Council agenda. This new mechanism has contributed to a more transparent and rigorous consideration of protection-related issues, including the type of actions taken to address them, under Security Council mandates. The Expert Group is well positioned to provide the Security Council with information and guidance on protection-related issues, but would benefit from a greater participation of Security Council members.

In May 2009, the Secretary-General’s seventh report to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict outlined five core challenges to enhance the protection of civilians in armed conflict: (i) compliance with international humanitarian law and human rights law by parties to conflict; (ii) increasing compliance by non-State actors in particular; (iii) the implementation of protection of civilians mandates in peacekeeping operations; (iv) humanitarian access; (v) accountability.

For the first time, the report included an annex on issues related to humanitarian access to conflict-affected civilian populations. The report was based on access monitoring information from 15 situations of armed conflict, including Somalia, DRC, Sudan, Chad, Sri Lanka and oPt. It informed the new resolution on protection and civilians in armed conflict adopted by the Council later in the year. The Security Council welcomed systematic monitoring and reporting on access constraints. Systematic access monitoring and reporting in the absence of a database to accommodate and structure the information flow was a challenge in 2009. However, OCHA country offices that have established and maintained...
access monitoring and reporting activities are now well placed to provide precise input.

An important contribution to policy affecting the protection of civilians in armed conflict was the independent study jointly commissioned by OCHA and DPKO, titled “Protecting Civilians in the Context of UN Peacekeeping Operations: Successes, Setbacks and Remaining Challenges”. The study identified key success factors that need to underpin effective implementation of protection of civilians mandates by United Nations peacekeeping missions, provide an important basis for follow up in 2010 in conjunction with DPKO and through greater interaction between the humanitarian and peacekeeping communities. These include steps to develop an operational concept for protection of civilians and peacekeeping, guidance on development of comprehensive protection strategies, and benchmarks and reporting on protection of civilians to the Security Council.

In November 2009, the Security Council’s thematic resolution on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, S/RES 1894 (2009), strengthened reference to the obligations of parties to conflict towards civilian populations; underscored the need for comprehensive operational guidance on protection of civilians for peacekeeping missions; and sought to strengthen the Council’s working methods, not least through more consistent reference to the aide memoire.

Within the framework of the IASC Task Force on Climate Change, OCHA contributed to submissions on migration, displacement and climate change to the UNFCCC process. In addition, OCHA integrated protection and displacement issues into the Secretary-General’s report to the General Assembly on international cooperation in humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters, from relief to development. There have been difficulties in getting a predictable arrangement for the Protection Cluster’s leadership in natural disaster situations. OCHA was closely engaged in developing standard operating procedures to implement the current arrangement (agreed by IASC in 2005) and in building awareness and capacity among protection-mandated agencies on protection in natural disaster situations.

Through increased advocacy on internal displacement throughout 2009, OCHA contributed to the enhanced awareness and engagement of regional organizations on the protection of IDPs through support to the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region and the African Union (ICGLR) on regional legal and policy frameworks. In July, OCHA co-organized (with the Representative of the Secretary-General on the Human Rights of IDPs) a conference for the ICGLR Secretariat and the Member States to develop an implementation plan (at the regional and national level) of the ICGLR protocols on internal displacement. Throughout 2009, OCHA provided technical guidance and advice to the African Union Commission on developing and endorsing the new Convention on Protection and Assistance for Internally Displaced Persons in Africa. The ERC participated in the Kampala Summit on this issue in October. In addition, OCHA held a number of global advocacy events on internal displacement targeting Member States, including a side event at ECOSOC in 2009 (see objective 2.2).

In collaboration with OCHA regional and country offices and the Protection Cluster, OCHA also worked with national authorities in Afghanistan and several countries in Africa, Central America, the Middle East and Asia to increase their familiarity and understanding of relevant legal frameworks and their responsibilities. Protection of civilians concerns were raised in the context of UN-NATO dialogue, where responses indicated an interest on the part of NATO members to engage in more systematic dialogue on this in 2010.

At the country level, OCHA provided consistent technical guidance and support for HCTs and protection clusters in all major emergencies in 2009, focusing strongly on protection and displacement issues. This resulted in stronger inter-agency responses in several countries. For example, OCHA helped facilitate dialogue between the parties in conflict in Darfur; deployed surge capacity on protection and displacement to Pakistan; provided training to OCHA staff in Sri Lanka; and advised OCHA Yemen on how to reinforce the Protection Cluster.

OCHA supported development of global operational policy on internal displacement, including acting as contributing author for the Revised IASC Framework for Durable Solutions, and the Protection Cluster’s revised Handbook on Protection of Internal Displacement.

ProCap deployments played a key role in developing and implementing protection strategies, supporting national capacity-building and an enhanced response to situations of internal displacement in Timor Leste, the South Pacific (including Samoa), Myanmar, Afghanistan, Zimbabwe and oPt. ProCap also worked in partnership with NGO standby partners to build the relevant skills and knowledge within their rosters.

OCHA, together with DFS and UNDP, produced and disseminated most components of an inter-agency guidance package for focal points on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA). While approximately 10 country teams took measures to set up or re-establish a PSEA network, failure to activate these networks prompted OCHA to persuade the IASC to undertake an inter-agency review to look at country teams’ performance in fulfilling their PSEA obligations. OCHA will facilitate the IASC’s consideration of the review’s recommendations, once they are issued in 2010.
## Performance Evaluation

### Security Council actively and systematically engaged on protection of civilians issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Security Council Protection of Civilians Experts Group established and functioning. Meetings are held before the establishment or renewal of all peacekeeping and other missions.</td>
<td>• Security Council informal Expert Group on the Protection of Civilians established and serviced by OCHA. The group was briefed seven times on various protection of civilians concerns on the occasion of mandate renewals. In every case, the briefing resulted in significant language changes or inclusions in peacekeeping and special political mission mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protection of Civilians aide memoire applied by the Security Council in 75 per cent of its discussions of conflict-affected countries.</td>
<td>• The aide memoire on the protection of civilians was used as a key point of reference in each meeting (100 per cent) of the Expert Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Systematic monitoring and reporting on constraints to humanitarian access. Security Council kept informed of situations of grave concern, as well as operational strategies of humanitarian organizations to address access constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use of access monitoring and reporting framework and database in six pilot countries. Reports on trends in humanitarian access submitted to the Security Council by June 2009.</td>
<td>• Six pilots of monitoring and reporting framework implemented, providing specific access information for the Secretary-General’s Protection of Civilians report to the Security Council in June. The accompanying database not developed in 2009 due to the continued lack of sufficient IM expertise. By the end of 2009, IM expertise was assigned to the project with anticipated roll-out by Q3 of 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support for strengthened inter-agency response to protection in humanitarian crises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Technical advice, guidance and surge support provided to OCHA country offices, HCs and HCTs in Afghanistan, Chad, Iraq, Kenya, oPt, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Zimbabwe.</td>
<td>• Technical advice and guidance provided to OCHA offices and HCs/HCTs in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen, including the development of HCTs, Protection Cluster strategies, advocacy, humanitarian access and supporting compliance with humanitarian principles. For Pakistan, a surge deployment helped address issues related to internal displacement. Support for Chad, oPt and Zimbabwe was not requested by country offices during this period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fifteen ProCap senior protection officers and 20 GenCap officers deployed to support field-level responses.</td>
<td>• ProCap Senior Protection Officers deployed to support HCTs in Afghanistan (UNAMA March-July 2009); Kenya (UNICEF November-March, UNHCR April-December 2009); oPt (OHCHR, March-December 2009); Zimbabwe (UNHCR May 2009-May 2010); five ongoing and 14 new deployments; 20 GenCap officers deployed in 15 countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ProCap skills-based protection training provided to 100 members of NGO standby rosters.</td>
<td>• Seventy-one standby protection experts training in three events (Kenya, Australia, Switzerland); three trainers trained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targeted field support for PSEA is provided, including mechanism for monitoring compliance with United Nations rules on SEA, and for assessing and monitoring implementation of United Nations SEA-related policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PSEA inter-agency network is active in at least five countries.</td>
<td>• Approximately 10 country teams took measures to either set up or re-establish a PSEA network, but only some of these are fully operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fifteen countries participating in SEA compliance mechanism; HCs participating in mechanism.</td>
<td>• An alternate approach to strengthening accountability was identified early in 2009: an IASC review of PSEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focal point guidance package produced by end of 2009.</td>
<td>• All but two components of the inter-agency package were produced and disseminated (UNHCR and UNDP were responsible for the two remaining components). The full package will be completed in 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 – Strengthened information management based on common standards and best practices

There was important progress in strengthening information management (IM) across OCHA and within the humanitarian community in 2009. The comprehensive 2007/2008 Information Management Review recommended that OCHA improve its internal oversight of information and take a service approach with its key stakeholders. Efforts were made to introduce standards and regulation of information products and websites, with a view to being a more consistent and predictable information provider. The Advocacy and Information Management Branch was renamed the Communications and Information Services Branch (CISB) to emphasize this transformation into a consciously service-oriented entity.

An internal inventory found over 700 individual information products and dozens of websites being operated under OCHA’s auspices, but confirmed that OCHA lacked a unifying visual design, with wide variations in quality. In 2009, OCHA took the first steps to rectify this situation.

A Visual Identity Guide was developed, with an agreed standard OCHA logo and colour palette. Templates and guidance were introduced for core products such as the situation report, press release and key messages. OCHA’s previously ineffective and neglected internal Note to Management was replaced by country and regional office internal weekly reports and a Headquarters overview of activities called the Weekly Actions for Management, which provides concise, actionable information for senior managers. Plans for an external global product with an overview of humanitarian situations were not met due to capacity constraints, but a pilot will be launched in 2010.

To improve the quality of OCHA writing and reporting, a global reporting and communications training took place in Nairobi in December 2009. Country-specific workshops were held with a number of country offices. This followed four regional-level reporting trainings at the end of 2008 and in early 2009 in Bangkok, Cairo, Nairobi and Panama. An OCHA Reporting Network was established as an avenue to assess further implementation.

The task force also agreed to undertake two pilots of the inter-agency web platform in 2009, provisionally called OneResponse. An initial pilot was undertaken in Pakistan in December 2009. The second pilot, planned for the Philippines, was not implemented due to technical problems. OneResponse was eventually rolled-out in Haiti in January 2010. A review will be undertaken to assess further implementation.

On the web front, ReliefWeb developed a blueprint and business plan for a new, modern web platform for release in 2010. The new ReliefWeb service will draw on recent advances in web technology and offer highly improved information services for those engaged in humanitarian action. ReliefWeb also introduced customized briefing kits to allow users to get a concise overview of a humanitarian situation in a single PDF file. ReliefWeb saw a 12 per cent increase in the number of users in 2009 (9.9 million people) and a 7 per cent increase in the number of e-mail subscribers (152,000 people).

A Web Services Section was created to focus on OCHA’s web presence. OCHA’s corporate website, OCHA Online, was improved with a new look and feel and simplified navigation. The revised site was officially launched in early January 2010. Further improvements in its underlying technology were not made due to budget constraints.

At inter-agency level, OCHA supported the global coordination of humanitarian information management through the IASC Task Force on Information Management. The objective of the task force is to strengthen the management of information in humanitarian emergencies. It does this by supporting the development of inter-agency tools for the collection, processing and dissemination of information. A wide range of actors participate in the task force, such as IASC members and global cluster leads. ICT4 Peace Foundation and Microsoft Corporation have participated as observers.

One of the task force’s main outputs in 2009 was a review of implementation of the Operational Guidance Note on Responsibilities of Cluster/Sector Leads and OCHA in Information Management. OCHA assessed the level of use of the Operational Guidance Note through regular teleconferences with field offices and through field visits. While approximately 70 per cent of field offices had made the guidance operational in some form, common constraints to implementation emerged, including lack of IM capacity within the clusters/sectors and varying levels of support for IM from senior leadership in the field.

The task force also agreed to undertake two pilots of the inter-agency web platform in 2009, provisionally called OneResponse. An initial pilot was undertaken in Pakistan in December 2009. The second pilot, planned for the Philippines, was not implemented due to technical problems. OneResponse was eventually rolled-out in Haiti in January 2010. A review will be undertaken to assess further implementation.

To build the IM capacity of OCHA and humanitarian partners, OCHA conducted a global IM training in Sweden in November 2009, and contributed IM components to UNDAC and OCHA ERR training. IM training modules are being planned for 2010 with technical support from UNITAR. The first pilot training is expected to start in
the second half of 2010 and is likely to include six to seven modules.

In terms of mapping and datasets, there was agreement on standard map guidelines, and a review was undertaken of existing common operational datasets and their use in humanitarian emergencies. OCHA has also introduced a draft Policy Instruction on Records Management to ensure compliance with United Nations Archives and Records Management Section metadata standards.

Taken together, OCHA has progressed in meeting the IM Review’s recommendations to improve IM based on common standards and best practices. At an organizational level, OCHA has recognized that change only happens with a bottom-up approach that involves significant consultation with the field. At an inter-agency level, collecting and sharing information within the humanitarian community relies on partners’ active participation and contribution. OCHA will need to continue to strengthen partner collaboration and buy-in over time. The centrality of IM and reporting to an effective response also needs to be constantly reinforced at leadership level.

### Performance Evaluation

#### Global IM coordination processes established and led by OCHA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inter-agency agreement on Operational Guidance on Responsibilities of Cluster/Sector Leads and OCHA in Information Management operational in at least 50 per cent of countries with a HC.</td>
<td>• Guidance Note operational in various degrees in 18 countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training materials produced to support guidance implementation.</td>
<td>• Training materials produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information platform is launched for exchanging in-country emergency or disaster information by cluster IM focal points in all new emergencies.</td>
<td>• Information platform — provisionally called OneResponse — piloted and launched in Pakistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoption of cartographic standards and agreement on minimal operational datasets improve quality and reliability of mapping and graphic products produced by and for cluster partners.</td>
<td>• OCHA Policy on Map Production updated and rolled out to all field offices and shared with the United Nations Geographic Working Group and IASC Task Force on Information Management. Sub-group established by IASC Task Force to review minimal operational datasets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OCHA’s policy and standards for managing information developed to better serve decision makers and inter-agency coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Guidance developed for targeting, storing, managing and retrieving information, business records and publications by third quarter 2009.</td>
<td>• Completed review of current record holdings at Headquarters in New York and Geneva to ensure compliance with ARMS standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corporate taxonomy developed and implemented by third quarter 2009.</td>
<td>• Policy drafted for records management in OCHA, review phase initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SOP drafted for records management in country offices in transition, review phase initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy developed for web archive approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Established a taxonomy working group with other parts of OCHA to build agreement on the structure and implementation of a corporate taxonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OCHA’s policy and standards for humanitarian reporting developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Common visual design, templates and content guidelines adopted for OCHA core information products by first quarter 2009.</td>
<td>• Policy, guidelines and SOPs produced and made available to support the production of standard core information products in OCHA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training and mentoring programme established during first quarter 2009.</td>
<td>• Training materials developed to support improved humanitarian reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Global communications training held for 30 OCHA staff in Nairobi, supported by field training missions to Sri Lanka, Kenya and Somalia offices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Humanitarian coordination website implemented in support of global and country-level operational partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Global website introduced, including previous content from humanitarian reform website and the Humanitarian Information Centre website launched by January 2009.</td>
<td>• Partially achieved with establishment of inter-agency web platform, provisionally called OneResponse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two countries with country-level sites.</td>
<td>• One pilot conducted in December 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3: An effectively managed and responsive organization

As OCHA embarked on the final year of implementing its Strategic Framework 2007-2009, much effort was devoted to developing a strategy for the next four years. This became a wide-ranging, “bottom-up” exercise, as plans for the Strategic Framework 2010-2013 drew upon in-depth analysis of global trends and reflected the ideas, insights and feedback from a broad consultative process.

The new framework was built on the achievements of the previous framework and included key lessons derived from a meta-evaluation, which aggregated and analysed evaluations since 2004. For the first time, OCHA’s goals and objectives were further supported by detailed underlying strategies, with benchmarks to guide the 2010 and subsequent planning processes.

In 2009, OCHA also worked to improve its performance monitoring and reporting systems. It introduced a cross-branch mid-year review process, which provided an opportunity to assess progress and re-evaluate priorities for the remainder of the year. OCHA also implemented a new evaluation policy, which makes internal evaluation of OCHA performance routine practice. The new policy will ensure that select areas of work in the new Strategic Framework are evaluated, with learning feeding back more systematically into planning, guidance and OCHA training programmes.

As OCHA has grown, it has continued to bring greater clarity and cohesion to its overall operations through the issuance of corporate guidance. Building on lessons learned and good practice, OCHA began work on a suite of guidance to standardize operations of ROs, COs and the work of OCHA in preparedness, emergency response and transition. In 2009, guidance to standardize the relationship between HCs and OCHA heads of office was completed and disseminated. OCHA also finalized the first element in a package of guidance clarifying OCHA’s organizational stance on integration, in particular OCHA’s structural relationships within Integrated United Nations Presences. Since 2006, OCHA’s policy and guidance system has become well entrenched and increasingly utilized by OCHA staff. However, adequate implementation of guidance products remains a challenge, due in part to the fragmented state of OCHA’s training efforts. New initiatives outlined under the Strategic Framework 2010-2013 aim to close this gap.

Toward the end of 2009, OCHA introduced the first edition of its online induction programme, providing staff with orientation on OCHA and the wider United Nations system. This was complemented by the development of special induction modules for heads of offices and administrative and finance officers in the field. The Humanitarian Field Coordination Programme, launched in 2008, continued to be offered to staff, particularly field-based staff, to provide basic training on field coordination.

Funding and financial management

OCHA’s donor relations capacity was significantly enhanced in 2009, as the findings of a review of OCHA’s resource mobilization and fund management practices were implemented. There was a clarification of internal roles and responsibilities between the New York and Geneva offices. Increased staff capacity enabled OCHA to significantly improve funding and donor trend analysis, and devise better annual and long-term fundraising strategies. Communication with donors improved, with OCHA providing regular updates on its priorities, financial status and challenges, such as the imbalance in earmarked funds. The OCHA Donor Support Group continued to act as a key sounding board for OCHA. In 2009 it was closely consulted on several key processes, most notably the development of the OCHA Strategic Framework 2010-2013 and monitoring of OCHA’s surge capacity performance.

Better contributions management calls for an integrated information system combining income, allocation and expenditure data. While the OCHA contributions tracking system is being finalized, its full capacity will only be reached when it can be integrated with OCHA’s other financial data management systems. Developing these tools is part of OCHA’s 2010 work plan.

Financial management continued to focus on coordinating and supporting the departmental budgeting process, and ensuring that resources are effectively allocated and monitored. In 2009, efforts were targeted at ensuring more realistic and disciplined budgeting through increased use of standard costs, and providing regular and accurate reporting on critical aspects of OCHA’s financial and funding situation.

Regular reporting and forecasting of OCHA’s financial situation informed senior management decision-making and monthly budget performance for programme managers at Headquarters. This facilitated better financial management through improved monitoring and review of expenditure. The monthly reporting allowed for timely redeployment from unused and under-used budget lines to underbudgeted lines. In addition, more effective financial and funding analysis for COs and ROs enabled more targeted fundraising for underfunded offices.
To achieve more efficient and timely preparation of monthly financial reports, OCHA established a single repository of integrated financial data encompassing Headquarter and field locations. As the development of procedures to ensure data integrity proved an extensive exercise, the next step will be to automate and further improve the design of financial reporting based on the consolidated repository.

At the country level, OCHA does not have the delegated authority to certify and approve financial transactions, which means that local procurement of goods and services is provided by UNDP’s country offices. The charges related to such goods and services are transmitted to OCHA through inter-office vouchers. In 2009, OCHA managed to clear a long-standing backlog of these vouchers, allowing additional focus on providing core services to field staff.

To standardize the services that UNDP provided in the field, OCHA pursued the finalization of a global service level agreement with UNDP Headquarters. The agreement is expected to be signed in 2010, as differences on issues that are critical to the smooth operations of OCHA’s field locations, including the administration of petty cash, needed further clarification in consultation with the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Accounts at United Nations Headquarters and the United Nations Office in Geneva.

OCHA undertook eight missions to regional and country offices, aimed at a clearer understanding of, and more systematic application of, financial policies and procedures by these offices. In addition, a three-day administrative workshop for heads of offices and administrative staff in the field was held in Nairobi to further build capacity in finance, human resources and procurement. The selection of a standard information technology system for OCHA’s field locations was put on hold pending the outcome of the review of administrative and management functions. That review began in 2009 and will be completed in early 2010.

As standard procurement procedures can lead to delays, OCHA established a centralized Rapid Deployment Stock (RDS) to allow for immediate mobilization of equipment at the onset of an emergency. RDS also satisfies the urgent requirements of existing offices in a timely manner and allows a regular rotation of pre-positioned items. Additional sources for acquiring pre-positioned supplies were added through the conclusion of inter-agency agreements for the provision of goods and services on a cost-recovery basis.

Significant progress has been made in developing a catalogue of commonly used equipment to improve the standardization and harmonization of physical assets in the field. Policies and procedures related to the management of such assets have been revised. Tools have been developed to help improve the maintenance of property records and the custodial control over assets throughout their life cycle. Furthermore, a more centralized management of official travel has reduced significantly the time frame for processing travel requests and claims, while at the same time improving client orientation and responsiveness.

**Human resources management**

As OCHA is continuously working to improve staffing for new and escalating emergencies, the ability to attract, quickly deploy and retain regular staff remains crucial. In early 2008, OCHA was delegated authority to recruit, deploy and administer its staff in the field. Combined with the launch of the roster management programme, measures were established to expedite the deployment of an increasing number of recruitments for field positions and provide more timely administrative support to field staff.

With the full implementation of the roster management programme in early 2009, OCHA was able to draw from a pool of qualified and pre-screened candidates. This had a significant impact on the vacancy rate for field positions, which at mid-year reduced the rate from 30 per cent to close to 10 per cent. In addition, OCHA reduced the time for filling vacant field positions from 140 to 75 days. At Headquarters, it took an average of 250 days in 2009 to fill a professional post through Galaxy because of the need to clear an existing backlog. Of the posts advertised in 2009, the average reduced to 163 days. To ensure a transparent and fair selection process, as well as using the roster for effective workforce planning, a senior Selection Review Board was established at the programme’s outset.

The General Assembly’s decision to streamline contractual arrangements, effective from 1 July 2009, introduced a unified contract for all staff, simplifying and standardizing administration in the long term. The reform provided OCHA with an opportunity to regularize the contractual status of its field staff, facilitating better mobility and workforce planning. However, it also meant that OCHA would be required to fill field positions through the official staff selection system, similar to positions at Headquarters. This entailed circulating vacancies using the Galaxy system and a review of recommended candidates by the United Nations Central Review bodies.

Following negotiations with the United Nations Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM), OCHA was allowed to pilot a new roster. The efforts to re-populate this roster through the official system put tremendous strain on OCHA’s administrative resources. The lack of a fully-fledged mechanism for rapid recruitment of staff for field positions caused the vacancy rate to rebound to 15 per cent at the end of the year.

In the second half of 2009, OCHA re-advertised the roster. By the end of the year, close to 6,000 candidates had applied.
Due to the large number of applicants, OCHA anticipates that the pilot roster will be fully populated by June 2010. In the meantime, OCHA has implemented transitional measures to ensure that field recruitment can draw on the pool of readily available candidates as it increases.

While working within the parameters of the United Nations Secretariat provides a number of benefits, OCHA cannot offer competitive entitlements for staff serving in hardship duty stations in comparison to other United Nations organizations. This has an adverse effect on OCHA’s ability to attract and retain talent. It also has an adverse effect on staff morale and staff turnover, especially considering the increasingly difficult and demanding circumstances under which many field staff serve. To counter this, OCHA is giving special consideration to the mobility needs of staff serving in hardship duty stations and has conducted outreach activities to broaden the pool of applicants.

In 2009, OCHA has increasingly partnered with OHRM to engage in pilot programmes that will accommodate OCHA’s special requirements for flexibility and speed in emergency situations. OCHA has also contributed to the development of the new talent management system of the United Nations Secretariat, INSPIRA, which is the replacement for Galaxy. OCHA also contributed to work on the forthcoming enterprise resources planning system, UMOJA, to ensure that the applications will support OCHA’s operational needs.

Since 2008, OCHA has worked to improve client orientation in serving the needs of staff. As part of this, the Administration is now regularly providing staff with updates on entitlements, benefits and similar issues. There have been improvements since 2007 in the use of the performance appraisal mechanism. In 2009, OCHA’s compliance rate exceeded 60 per cent for staff at Headquarter locations. The rate is expected to increase in 2010 due to OCHA’s new policy not to extend staff without an updated performance appraisal. Staff participation in mandatory training activities also improved, including in the area of preventing workplace harassment, sexual harassment and abuse of authority. Following increased efforts to promote appropriate training opportunities for programme managers, participation improved markedly in the management and leadership development programmes of the United Nations Secretariat.

Management Review

In 2009, OCHA initiated an external review of selected management and administrative functions. The focus was on roles and responsibilities, reporting lines, management and delivery of administrative services, and measurement of performance and results, especially in the areas of financial and human resources management. The review is expected to give OCHA a range of actionable recommendations to streamline administrative procedures and improve client orientation, with agreed actions beginning to be implemented in the first half of 2010.
### Performance Evaluation

**Corporate strategy revised to reflect emerging priorities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Framework 2010-2013 launched by end June 2009.</td>
<td>• Strategic Framework 2010-2013 goals and objectives endorsed by senior management in July at Global Management Retreat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prioritized thematic frameworks for guidance materials developed and implemented.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Six prioritized frameworks created, agreed and in the process of implementation.</td>
<td>• Frameworks created, agreed and in the process of implementation on preparedness, surge capacity, emergency response, country offices, transition and integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lessons learned gathered from OCHA evaluations and incorporated into OCHA policy guidance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Forty per cent of existing lessons learned incorporated into newly developed policy guidance.</td>
<td>• Thirty per cent of existing lessons learned incorporated into newly developed policy guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Better compliance with financial regulations and rules.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seventy per cent reduction (from 2008 statistics) in the number of unfavourable financial audit recommendations issued by OIOS.</td>
<td>• Sixty per cent reduction from the number in 2008 (from 14 down to 6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More timely, accurate and accessible data on contributions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Phase II contributions management system launched and available to all field offices by end of 2009.</td>
<td>• Phase II of OCHA’s contribution management system was launched and real-time information on donor pledges and contributions available online to all programme/office managers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Timely, transparent and fair recruitment of vacant posts, including through a well-functioning roster and better workforce and succession planning in coordination with substantive offices.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Updated departmental workforce and succession plan for 2010-2013.</td>
<td>• OCHA workforce plan updated. OHRM cancelled the Secretariat-wide pilot for strategic workforce planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seventy per cent of field vacancies filled through the roster management programme.</td>
<td>• Eighty per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average number of days a field vacancy is vacant is reduced from 140 days to 100 by the end of 2009.</td>
<td>• Seventy-five days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average number of days Galaxy post vacancy remains unfilled until selection is reduced to 170 days.</td>
<td>• 251 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improved staff management, including feedback on staff performance and career development, and regular review of learning opportunities by staff and managers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One hundred per cent Performance Appraisal System compliance with clear goals, actions and success criteria, including indication of training plans.</td>
<td>• Sixty per cent for staff at Headquarters locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Induction programme launched and 50 per cent of new staff received induction training.</td>
<td>• Induction programme launched in November 2009. The second edition, which is to be launched in 2010, will allow monitoring of usage by new staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Performance of the Field

REGIONAL OFFICES
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC)
Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia (ROMENACA)
Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa (ROCEA)
Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSA)
Regional Office for West Africa (ROWA)
African Union Liaison Office (AULO)

COUNTRY OFFICES: AFRICA
Central African Republic (CAR)
Chad
Côte d’Ivoire (CDI)
Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Guinea
Kenya
Niger
Somalia
Sudan
Uganda
Zimbabwe

COUNTRY OFFICES: MIDDLE EAST
Afghanistan
Iraq
occupied Palestinian territory (oPt)
Pakistan

COUNTRY OFFICES: ASIA
Indonesia
Myanmar
Nepal
Sri Lanka

COUNTRY OFFICES: LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN
Colombia
Haiti
1. The Country Office for Iraq is in Amman, Jordan.
2. The Country Office for Somalia is in Nairobi, Kenya.
3. The Country Office for Kenya is in Nairobi, Kenya.
2009 PRESENCE

ROMEACA
Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa, and Central Asia
Cairo, Egypt

In 2009 the location of the Regional Office was moved from Dubai to Cairo. Dubai is now a Liaison Office.

SROCA
Sub-Regional Office for Central Asia
Almaty, Kazakhstan

ROAP
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Bangkok, Thailand

SROP
Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific
Suva, Fiji

ROWA
Regional Office for West Africa
Dakar, Senegal

In 2009, ROWA became the Regional Office for West and Central Africa extending its coverage to Chad, Sudan, Cameroon, Central African Republic, São Tomé and Príncipe, Gabon and the Congo.

ROSA
Regional Office for Southern Africa
Johannesburg, South Africa

ROSA became the Regional Office for Southern and Eastern Africa in 2009, extending its coverage to Eritrea, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Somalia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Tanzania.

Disclaimer: The designations employed and the presentation of material on this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu & Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.
Performance of the Field – Overview

In 2008, the OCHA realignment process and standardization of regional offices was completed. 2009 was the year for review of in-country units, establishing clearer priorities and more rigorous bi-annual budgetary analysis. As a result, the OCHA global footprint became more consistent and better defined. New definitions of OCHA field-based organizational units – coupled with clearer reporting lines and basic operating parameters – aimed to reinforce the predictability of services and give staff a clearer sense of priorities. Working with improved global humanitarian architecture, OCHA was better placed to define the triggers for supporting preparedness and response, scaling its operations accordingly and applying the OCHA-supported suite of tools. To this end, OCHA began a more rigorous classification of disasters, leading to a progressively more predictable, tailored and timely response to individual humanitarian crises.

In 2009, along with all the continuing complex emergencies that required support at all levels, OCHA responded to 43 new emergencies: 33 natural disasters, nine armed conflicts and one epidemic. The regional patterns that emerged showed that 15 emergencies occurred in Africa; 14 in Asia and the Pacific; eight in Latin America and the Caribbean; and six in Central Asia. Compared with 2008, the number of OCHA responses to new emergencies in 2009 increased in Africa and Asia and the Pacific. It decreased in Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Central Asia.

In 2009, OCHA reinforced its response tracking of new emergencies to increase the effectiveness of country, regional and global coordination structures and its support to humanitarian coordination leaders: HCs, RCs and cluster leads. By maintaining an increasingly detailed log of response activities – including surge capacity, field coordination and leadership structures, humanitarian financing, information and staff management – OCHA aimed to increase accountability in response to new emergencies and better tailor Headquarters’ support to field operations. This included making available clearer guidance and standard operating procedures responsive to the realities on the ground.

OCHA field work focused on timely and efficient support to RO/HCs, HCTs and OCHA offices. This was in line with the OCHA Strategic Framework 2007-2009, and the envisioned OCHA leadership in coordination, financing, humanitarian policy, advocacy and information management. The OCHA response to minor emergencies was often limited to information exchange and situation updates in the first hours or days. The response to major emergencies was characterized by activating a series of tools, including, but not limited to, the designation of an HC, the roll-out and support of clusters and the launch of a Flash Appeal. There were no “corporate emergencies” declared by the ERC in 2009 that demanded a “whole of OCHA” effort to activate tools and services. The Haiti corporate response occurred in January 2010.

Regional Offices

In 2009, OCHA worked towards developing a more consistent approach to building up RO resources, structures and approaches. This included a rationalization of RO geographical coverage. By the end of 2009, OCHA had phased down the Nairobi-based RO to an SRO, and placed it under the existing regional leadership in South Africa. The Nairobi SRO’s main focus now is on cross-border issues in the Horn of Africa and monitoring the situation in the Great Lakes. OCHA also ensured the full functioning of the ROMENACA office in Cairo, following the mid-2009 transfer from its location in Dubai. The Cairo base is expected to allow improved access to areas with the most significant concentration of programme coordination activities. Regional backstopping responsibility for the country office in Pakistan was also transferred from Bangkok to Cairo.

RO activities in 2009 included implementing the new Policy Instruction on the roles and responsibilities of the ROs. With the adoption of the 2009 policy, OCHA ROs focus on three key areas, particularly where there is no country office: response preparedness, including early warning and contingency planning; support to emergency response; and developing regional coordination networks. Representing about 11 per cent of the 2009 OCHA global budget and 18 per cent of OCHA field-based humanitarian coordination entities, the ROs were particularly cost-effective with regard to surge capacity. ROs directly responded to more than 30 new and ongoing emergencies in 2009, more than double the OCHA response of previous years.

By the end of 2009, OCHA’s improved regional operations – including Humanitarian Support Units in RC offices – had significantly extended OCHA’s global reach. OCHA also strengthened internal linkages between ROs, and between ROs, COs and Headquarters units. OCHA worked closely...
with key partners, particularly UNDP-led Regional Director Teams (RDTs), ISDR and BCPR regional presences, and regional organizations (e.g. ASEAN, ECOWAS), OCHA ROs now actively participate in shaping the RDT agenda, ensuring the inclusion of humanitarian issues and advising regional directors of corrective actions necessary in priority countries.

With the groundwork done in 2009, ROs will now become the primary vehicle for delivering OCHA’s forthcoming policy on preparedness in RC countries, while continuing to provide a key “first line” field-based emergency preparedness and response platform.

New OCHA Field Architecture

Over the past few years, OCHA has brought more consistency and transparency to its organizational structure worldwide. In late 2009, OCHA formalized definitions of its field-based organizational units following recommendations from three initiatives: the Regional Office Working Group, the Field Office Review and the Sub-Office Review, and the internal review of field presences. It also clarified reporting lines and set basic operating parameters for these unit types. They will take full effect on 1 January 2010.

Regional Office

An RO is located in a strategic hub of regional humanitarian significance. For countries with no permanent OCHA unit, an RO concentrates on three sets of activities: response, preparedness and regional networks. ROs are OCHA’s first line of emergency response in countries where there is no CO. They provide surge capacity to COs when required.

Sub-Regional Office

An SRO, formerly called Regional Disaster Response Advisors, enables an RO to extend its coverage to areas in the region of concentrated humanitarian requirements. SROs report directly to the RO, and follow their strategy and planning systems.

Humanitarian Support Unit

The HSU includes and replaces all current types of non-RO and non-CO field presences, including national disaster response advisors, national officer presence and international officer presence. An HSU also includes all deployments from the OCHA suite of surge capacity tools, including deployments from the RO, the Emergency Response Roster and from standby partners. An OCHA HSU, reporting to an RC, is an integral part of the RO and subject to the regional strategy.

Country Offices

OCHA made significant progress in defining CO operations in 2009. The OCHA 2009 Review of Sub–Offices built on the 2007 Review of Field Offices, and brought more clarity to OCHA’s in-country unit terminology and functions. OCHA also became more consistent and rigorous in its approach to CO work planning, cost planning and the CHAP/CAP, based on sounder inter-agency needs assessments and analysis. This proved particularly helpful in countries where a longer-term presence is necessary, such as DRC.

There is now a clearer definition of OCHA’s overall humanitarian coordination role at the country level. OCHA
has worked towards direct HC support, as reflected in the HoO-HC reporting lines guidance, the provision of a secretariat to the HCT, inter-cluster activities, and administration and managerial support to pooled funds. The introduction of clearer HC and RC ToRs enabled OCHA to increase the use of contingency planning and preparedness measures in all COs.

There were no new corporate emergencies in 2009 and no new large OCHA COs were established. However, following the deterioration of the situation in Northern Yemen, in consultation with the main humanitarian actors in country, the ERC decided to open an OCHA CO in Sanaa to support the RC and the HCT in addressing the needs of the affected population. OCHA also established a CO in the Philippines, with a sub-office in Mindanao, to help coordinate international assistance during current and future humanitarian emergencies.

Difficulties that OCHA had to contend with included staffing shortages in some offices and unpredictable funding. Nevertheless, OCHA made important gains in rationalizing its CO staffing. New norms were introduced, whereby each CO will be headed by a P5/D1, with a more distinct position defined for the Deputy Head of Office. OCHA also implemented the policy of placing an international Administrative Officer in each CO, and a more systematic use of the National Officer category was initiated in the field.

Other advances related to the development of country strategies for OCHA COs, beginning in transition situations, for example in Côte d’Ivoire and Nepal. Transition strategies incorporated an approach to handing over substantive programming, such as response preparedness and coordination functions, to local counterparts. Further elements included the management of human resources and assets, such as intellectual capital. OCHA is now better placed to agree with partners on appropriate transition benchmarks, with roles and responsibilities clearly demarcated well in advance of actual transition processes.

In 2009, the Humanitarian Country Team model became accepted globally as the standard, putting into practice the partnership principles agreed between United Nations and non-United Nations organizations. This was an important milestone for ensuring improved partnership and decision-making at the country level. OCHA sought to reinforce the role of COs in inter-cluster coordination, as the cluster approach is now an accepted, standardized way of operating in emergencies. However, significant challenges remain and are now being addressed through the implementation of the new OCHA Strategic Framework for 2010-2013 and the application of lessons from the Cluster Evaluation Phase II.

With the endorsement of the full Integrated Mission guidance package in 2009, OCHA COs are now in a position to support partners more effectively in situations where the principles of integration apply, for instance Chad, Haiti, DRC and Sudan. This means that the relevant CO will now be more informed and educated about integration developments, and be in a better position to fulfill integration obligations, including, but not limited to, participation in integrated field coordination mechanisms and shared analytical and planning capacities.

The attacks on United Nations staff in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Somalia in 2009 underscored the increasing violence faced by the humanitarian community and the difficulties that the United Nations and NGOs encounter when attempting to ensure access for humanitarian action. The number of deaths, kidnappings and attacks also increased in Chad, DRC and Sudan. The worsening security situation and constrained humanitarian access continue to constrict the operating space for international and national aid organizations in high-risk environments. For example, the level of security incidents in Afghanistan rose between approximately 30 to 35 per cent from 2008 to 2009. This has had an increasingly harmful impact on the population. A deadly, targeted attack on a United Nations guesthouse in Kabul in late October 2009, along with increasingly direct threats against the United Nations, have forced aid organizations to review security arrangements and reassess the impact and viability of their programmes.
Regional Offices

Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC)
Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia (ROMENACA)
Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa (ROCEA)
Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSA)
Regional Office for West Africa (ROWA)
African Union Liaison Office (AULO)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)

Highlights

- OCHA responded successfully to seven simultaneous emergencies in Asia and the Pacific in September and October 2009, with a combination of surge capacity deployments and remote support to Resident Coordinators/Humanitarian Coordinators (RC/HCs) and country teams. The emergencies included Bhutan (earthquake); Indonesia (earthquake); the Philippines (Typhoons Ketsana, Parma and Lupit); Viet Nam (Typhoon Ketsana); Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR) (Typhoon Ketsana); Cambodia (Typhoon Ketsana); and Samoa (earthquake and tsunami).

- ROAP staff directly supported the preparation of CERF requests totalling over US$47 million in 2009. They also contributed to rapid response or strengthening core humanitarian interventions in underfunded crises in Bhutan, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the Lao PDR, Myanmar, Pakistan and the Philippines.

Asia and the Pacific remains the world’s most disaster-prone region. In September and October 2009, typhoons struck the Philippines, Vietnam, Lao PDR and Cambodia. Indonesia and Bhutan experienced the deadly effects of earthquakes and Samoa was hit by a devastating tsunami. The region is also increasingly exposed to new and emerging threats, such as pandemics. Conditions in the region make it a possible flash point for new and potentially deadly pandemic virus mutations.

The succession of emergencies in Asia and the Pacific in 2009 highlighted the need for effective coordination and a rapid response capability from the humanitarian community and governments across the region. ROAP worked closely with different partners to ensure that contingency planning and disaster preparedness looked at all available response tools and anticipated key coordination challenges. These included agreeing on possible cluster leadership configurations, external funding requirements and response options prior to an emergency.

ROAP’s preparedness activities were a key element in the successful engagement with country teams and national authorities during emergency responses in the region, particularly in Bhutan, the Philippines and Viet Nam. Better preparation ensured roles and responsibilities were understood before disaster struck.

ROAP deployed surge capacity to provide hands-on guidance and coordination support for Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs) in the region. ROAP’s response activities included establishing clusters, preparing CERF applications and appeals, and establishing important technical services, such as IM, civil-military coordination and public information support.

Between September and October, ROAP staff members were deployed to concurrent disaster responses in Bhutan, the Philippines, Samoa, Lao PDR and Indonesia, supporting three appeal processes and four CERF requests. During the year, 929 staff days were spent on surge deployments or technical support missions. ROAP also facilitated the deployment of four United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) response teams to disasters in Indonesia, Samoa and the Philippines. ROAP staff members led three of these teams. ROAP’s experiences with disaster response in 2009 highlighted the need for continuous staffing beyond the initial response phase and the value of appropriately focused preparedness activities.

ROAP’s use of humanitarian financing mechanisms and the cluster approach brought clear benefits, particularly in sudden-onset disasters. Perhaps the most notable success in 2009 was in the Philippines, where the clusters were rolled out in response to Typhoon Ketsana, which struck less than a week after a ROAP-facilitated workshop on cluster management.

There is now a solid understanding of humanitarian reform, the availability of response tools and the need for inter-cluster cooperation at regional and international levels. However,
ROAP is addressing the same issues at the country level, particularly in countries that have not faced regular humanitarian challenges. Humanitarian reform needs to be accompanied by a high level of awareness of roles and responsibilities, particularly given the high turnover of humanitarian coordination leaders. In addition, continuing efforts are required to ensure that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement are included in central decision-making processes during emergencies. Finally, ROAP will work to improve accountability in emergency response through participation in the Regional Directors Team (RDT).

ROAP has worked closely with regional networks and organizations, including the Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Pacific Islands Forum and Pacific Islands Applied Geo-science Commission. Collaboration with such entities has enabled OCHA to promote a better understanding of its role and to support ongoing efforts at strengthening regional disaster management and risk reduction. For example, ROAP has worked closely with the ASEAN Secretariat on developing a work plan for the implementation of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response.

As outlined in ROAP’s Gender Action Plan for 2009-2010, the Regional Office continued to try to ensure that gender considerations featured strongly in emergency response and preparedness efforts. ROAP worked with partners to ensure that it supported process for Flash Appeal, CERF and Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) and included gender analysis and initiatives designed to respond to identified gaps. In its own data for disaster preparedness and contingency planning, ROAP routinely highlights disaggregated data on age and sex. It also shares and distributes tools such as the IASC Gender Handbook for Humanitarian Action with partners.

Primarily due to recruitment delays and resulting long-term vacancies, ROAP’s expenditure rate in 2009 was below the average for an OCHA Regional Office. Recruitment delays were linked to the introduction of United Nations contractual reforms in mid-2009 and the related, ongoing effort to build an OCHA roster for recruiting field personnel.

Sub-Regional Office: Fiji

OCHA’s Sub-Regional Office (SRO) for the Pacific supports 14 Pacific Island countries and two RCs based in Fiji and Samoa. The office played a leading role in strengthening coordinated disaster response and preparedness. OCHA helped set up the Pacific Humanitarian Team (PHT), a coalition of all the relevant humanitarian actors in the Pacific region, including United Nations agencies, the Red Cross Movement, NGOs, regional organizations and donor partners. The PHT has established regional clusters that work on preparedness for national and local response in Pacific Island countries when requested.

The clusters and the PHT were officially activated following the tsunami in Samoa during September, which led to a well-coordinated response by the Samoa Government and the PHT. Clusters also responded effectively to floods and cyclone responses in Fiji and the Solomon Islands, with national government agencies, Red Cross and local NGOs all engaged.

The PHT also provides a good forum to reinforce response capacity in Pacific Island countries that do not have a presence of United Nations agencies or international organizations yet are highly disaster prone. OCHA facilitates inter-agency contingency planning workshops that bring together local, national and international response actors to improvise a disaster scenario relevant for that Pacific Island country. The PHT structure also allows OCHA to mobilize resources and support for multi-agency assessment missions, such as those to the Ambrym and Gaua volcano eruptions in Vanuatu.
Since its establishment in 2006, the OCHA Humanitarian Support Unit (HSU) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) has supported the United Nations RC in his responsibilities for coordinating humanitarian assistance and disaster response preparedness. In September 2009, the HSU provided on-site coordination support in Morobe Province in response to the country’s first confirmed cholera outbreak, serving as a member of the National Cholera Task Force. During the height of the response, the HSU assisted the provincial taskforce by coordinating a consolidated cholera response action plan, preparing situation reports, establishing a contact list and facilitating coordination meetings and liaison with donors. OCHA continued to be a key player in the national response as the outbreak spread to other parts of the country.

The HSU is responsible for leading the Disaster Management Team’s activities in PNG. It has also been actively involved in the PHT’s work. That team is led by the RCs for Fiji and Samoa, and composed of all humanitarian organizations with capacity to respond in the Pacific. In December 2009, the Government of Vanuatu requested the HSU’s assistance following increased volcanic activity in the Pacific Island country. OCHA immediately deployed its Humanitarian Affairs Analyst to support the Government and humanitarian partners with evacuating 500 people and preparing an evacuation plan for 3,000 people.
The Latin American and Caribbean region is extremely vulnerable to natural disasters, including hurricanes, storms and droughts. One third of the population is exposed to natural catastrophes. Global economic crises, pandemics, food insecurity, urbanization and chronic poverty make for an increasingly complex environment for humanitarian work.

Comparatively few surge missions were deployed in 2009 due to a relatively low number of natural disasters in the region in that year, and a quiet hurricane season due to the El Niño phenomenon. Nevertheless, ROLAC provided direct staff support to help in several disasters, including the Costa Rica earthquake in January; the drought and related nutritional crisis in Guatemala in August/September; the floods in El Salvador and Nicaragua in November; and the drought in Honduras in December. A more severe hurricane season is expected in 2010, making it likely that more surge missions will be deployed.

In 2009, approximately $24.8 million was granted to Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Uruguay through emergency financial mechanisms coordinated by OCHA. They included Emergency Cash Grants and CERF funding.

In 2009, ROLAC’s main focus was on fortifying regional structures, particularly REDLAC and sub-regional disaster management organizations. ROLAC took part in several missions aimed at improving risk reduction and preparedness.

ROLAC supported country teams in developing more effective disaster preparedness response plans. This led to a broader participation of humanitarian actors in other processes, notably identifying project priorities for CERF requests. Local governments were also receptive to the importance of a well-organized humanitarian coordination system. Ten HCTs are already in place or in the process of being established. ROLAC helped eight countries develop or update their inter-agency response plans. ROLAC will continue to work with United Nations Country Teams (UNCTs) and HCTs on looking for strategic partnerships and common approaches to maximize the use of limited resources. Alternative methods of distance learning and training will be explored, including for UNCTs/HCTs facing imminent emergencies.

In Honduras, two contingency planning missions led to a better understanding of the humanitarian consequences of the political crisis. The crisis culminated in the forcible removal and exile of the Honduran President by the Honduran military acting on the Supreme Court’s orders. In Peru, a REDLAC mission supported the HCT in setting up a cluster coordination structure and led to the development of a strategic plan, including a seismic risk study and preparedness planning for high-risk urban zones. In Panama, Bolivia and Colombia, OCHA supported disaster response simulations. OCHA also co-facilitated a workshop with the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC) in Panama, which underlined the importance of legal standards in humanitarian operations.

Regional partners showed a firmer commitment to pandemic influenza preparedness, leading to a more robust level of
planning and preparation compared with the beginning of 2009. Most of the 35 countries in the region now have an updated preparedness plan.

OCHA also initiated a disaster response guide for governments. This allows authorities in the region to better understand the roles, responsibilities, services and tools that humanitarian actors offer during disasters. The guide is expected to be released in early 2010.

In collaboration with ROLAC, the Brazilian Government held the Second Regional Meeting on Enhancing International Humanitarian Partnerships. An important outcome was the creation of an online platform, which will enable governments to share information about humanitarian needs and contributions. Governments also pledged to compile and promote a regional document detailing national customs standards, protocols and procedures on the entry of relief items. Brazil is expected to present this virtual tool before a third meeting that Argentina will host in 2010.

Redhum was included in several governmental preparedness and response plans as the main platform to support IM. Its partners included national disaster management authorities, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, NGOs and academic institutions.

During November, a workshop on gender and gender-based violence in humanitarian contexts was organized in Panama, with participants from seven countries in the region. The workshop mainly sought to reinforce partnerships among national and sub-regional women’s organizations, national civil defence/protection institutions, United Nations agencies and NGOs. Participants will have the opportunity to review national contingency plans and define next steps to ensure a gender perspective is integrated into these documents.

Due to the relatively low intensity of the hurricane season in 2009, ROLAC provided less response support to countries in the region compared with previous years. This resulted in savings against original budget requirements for surge and other direct support measures. In addition, the office experienced some delays in finalizing the recruitment of various positions, including national disaster response advisors. As a more intense hurricane season is expected in 2010, the expenditure rate is likely to return to pre-2009 levels.
Several countries in the region required a rapid and expanded RO response to fast-developing humanitarian challenges in 2009. In Yemen, worsening political instability led to the displacement of some 250,000 people and huge humanitarian needs. To help plug the gaps in humanitarian coordination, ROMENACA deployed staff to prepare consolidated appeals and liaise with donors, resulting in much improved prioritization of needs and mobilization of resources. Prompt action was critical. For example, with RO support, the Yemen Flash Appeal was produced within two weeks of the outbreak of fighting in Sa‘ada Governorate in August 2009. The RO also supported the HCT in preparing the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan for 2010, which targets the humanitarian needs of 1.4 million vulnerable people throughout the country.

In Syria, the RO assisted the UNCT in developing two consecutive drought appeals in 2008 and 2009, which allowed the United Nations to mobilize assistance to drought-affected populations in the east of the country, supplementing and augmenting the Syrian authorities’ efforts. The RO also supported the HCT in preparing the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan for 2010, which targets the humanitarian needs of 1.4 million vulnerable people throughout the country.

The RO assisted UNCTs in Morocco and Syria in preparing contingency plans, while conducting two emergency preparedness and response workshops targeting national disaster management authorities in Egypt and the occupied Palestinian territory (oPt). The RO also supported pandemic influenza preparedness in Egypt, Jordan, Qatar and Tunisia.

Progress was also made in integrating MENACA Member States into international response structures, notably the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG). A regional UNDAC induction workshop was organized in Oman in April 2009, while two MENACA countries, Tajikistan and Kazakhstan, were scheduled to join INSARAG.

OCHA provided a joint analysis of threats in the region and the prioritization of preparedness actions. ROMENACA’s SRO in Almaty collaborated with IFRC in promoting adherence to International Disaster Response Laws, Rules and Principles (IDRL).

OCHA continued to bring together a network of regional offices of IASC organizations in the Middle East and North Africa. Its main role has been providing coherent support to HCTs in emergency preparedness and response. In December 2009, the network agreed on an action plan for 2010, identifying priority countries and thematic areas for collective action. From April 2009, the RO has been a member of the United Nations Regional Directors’ Team (RDT), facilitating discussions on strategic humanitarian issues. Responding to the crisis situation in Yemen, ROMENACA, in consultation with United Nations Regional Directors, advised the RC and UNCT on establishing appropriate humanitarian coordination.
architecture. Similarly, in Central Asia, with increased tensions over scarce resources, OCHA focused on inter-governmental cooperation as one of the most effective ways to increase capacity in the region, supporting the establishment of the Central Asia Disaster Management Centre.

To improve disaster preparedness and build a platform to advocate humanitarian principles, OCHA also enhanced collaboration with regional inter-governmental organizations, including the League of Arab States (LAS), the Gulf Cooperation Council, the Organization of Islamic Conference, and the Economic Cooperation Organization. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been finalized with LAS and will be signed in the second quarter of 2010.

ROMENACA continued to work on consolidating humanitarian reform, promoting a better understanding of the cluster approach within the United Nations and among local NGOs, civil society representatives and non-traditional actors. Insistence on the importance of the cluster approach, particularly its relevance in preparedness and in development settings, helps ensure an improved overall capacity for emergency response. In Yemen, for instance, an early roll out of the cluster approach was seen to have tangibly improved humanitarian coordination and response, particularly via the CAP. There is now a firmer engagement of cluster leads within the region, while follow-up training and inter-cluster priority-setting exercises have taken place in several countries. They have successfully engaged local NGOs, civil society and non-traditional actors in the coordination mechanisms.

Sub-Regional Office: Almaty

Central Asia is experiencing the full impact of many emerging global threats: climate change; an increase in small- and medium-scale disasters; conflicts over water and energy resources; financial and food-price crises; migration; inter-ethnic tensions; and growing security threats. These vulnerabilities are not offset by strong national emergency response systems and present a serious challenge, even in small-scale emergencies. In addition, despite these risks and frequent small- and medium-scale emergencies, Central Asia remains predominantly a developmental context, with only a handful of United Nations humanitarian agencies and NGOs present – all with limited staff for whom emergency response is not the first priority. Regional collaboration also remains weak and requires a contemporary legal basis.

With increased tensions over scarce resources, the promotion of regional cooperation remained a key priority in 2009. In support of Member States, OCHA focused its catalytic capacity on inter-governmental cooperation as one of the most effective ways to increase capacity in the region. In particular, OCHA continued to support the establishment of the Central Asia Disaster Management Centre. Progress was also made in integrating Central Asian Member States into international response structures, with three new UNDAC members from the region and two countries on the verge of joining INSARAG. To increase regional cooperation between operational partners, OCHA fostered a joint analysis of threats in the region and subsequent prioritization of preparedness actions. In cooperation with IFRC, OCHA promoted adoption of IDRL as a contemporary legal basis for humanitarian action in the region.

At the country level, OCHA reinforced coordination among humanitarian responders by strengthening the cluster approach or similar local coordination mechanisms. OCHA organized regional induction training on the cluster approach, reaching over 40 participants from five countries in the region. The training led to greater engagement of global cluster leads in a region previously somewhat overlooked, leading to several in-country follow-up training and inter-cluster priority-setting exercises. The combined efforts have led to a greater understanding of the role of clusters in preparedness, and an adaptation of strategies to ensure the cluster approach is relevant in developmental settings that experience frequent small- and medium-scale emergencies.

Strengthening the cluster approach as part of preparedness has enhanced the overall capacity for emergency response by successfully engaging local NGOs, civil society and non-traditional actors in the coordination mechanisms.

Humanitarian financing is a key outstanding issue of humanitarian reform still to be addressed in the region. Central Asian Member States are increasingly engaged with humanitarian action as donors. Better understanding of humanitarian financing may help them optimize their resources for humanitarian response. Information dissemination in the languages of the individual countries is crucial.
The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) visited the country in October 2009, following the deteriorating situation in the northern part of Yemen, as well as additional needs related to the presence of refugees and the population’s overall vulnerability. In consultation with the main humanitarian actors in-country, the ERC decided to open an OCHA Country Office in Sanaa. This was done to support the RC and HCT in addressing the needs of the affected population by strengthening field coordination, IM, analysis and advocacy.

In a first phase, the office’s main objective was to create conditions conducive to humanitarian action, including establishing adequate coordination architecture at national and governorate level. The office also focused on strengthening advocacy to gain access to affected populations and increase awareness of the humanitarian situation in Yemen.

In the last three months of the year, following the opening of the office, the OCHA team established and maintained good working relationships with key partners, including Government counterparts, on issues related to humanitarian action. By the end of 2009, clusters were set up in Sanaa and the RC had been nominated HC. OCHA also supported the HCT in devising a joint strategy to respond to the crisis, culminating in the November 2009 launch of the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan as part of the global Consolidated Appeal. OCHA initiated discussions with key stakeholders about a possible Emergency Response Fund (ERF) in Sanaa to provide a quick, coordinated response to unforeseen emergencies and cover funding gaps.

The logistical set up of the office, including the procurement of necessary equipment, was completed before the end of 2009. However, OCHA had to rely on surge and temporary deployment mechanisms to ensure continued coverage of core coordination functions. Security conditions in Yemen, as well as the complexity of the operational and humanitarian context, create important human resource constraints. In this context, it has proven difficult to deliver suitable Arabic-speaking staff members on a medium- to long-term basis. In 2010, OCHA will continue its efforts to strengthen the existing structure and ensure continuity of ongoing activities.
Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa (ROCEA)

**Highlights**

- An integrated approach on disaster preparedness involving United Nations, Government, Red Cross and NGO partners was adopted, using improved inter-agency contingency planning and emergency simulations. Priority countries included Tanzania, Djibouti and Burundi.
- OCHA collaborated with the International Conference on the Great Lakes Region (ICGLR) in organizing a conference aimed at improving IDPs’ rights and status.

OCHA online.un.org/rosea

Hopes of stability and growth in the Central and East African region continue to be undermined by a series of complex emergencies, sometimes interrelated, fuelled by political instability, ongoing battles for resources and cross-border conflicts. Recurrent droughts, floods and sharp rises in fuel and food prices have dramatically affected the livelihoods of already vulnerable communities.

The African Regional Office was restructured from July 2009, with Central Africa being covered from Dakar and Eastern Africa from Johannesburg. This has left Nairobi operating as an SRO, but still with a substantial workload. There is a clear remit to prioritize critical cross-border and sub-regional humanitarian trends and sharpen the focus on disaster preparedness.

The restructure also meant redeploying a number of international and national personnel. But the RO showed considerable flexibility, ensuring that core activities were maintained and support to target countries was unaffected. With a refocus on the Horn of Africa and the Great Lakes regions, the Regional Humanitarian Partnership Team (RHPT), comprising regional IASC agencies, reaffirmed its commitment to both regions, while the Nairobi SRO can work closer with the countries covered.

According to the Financial Tracking Service (FTS), more than $3.3 billion out of $5.2 billion required had been allocated to humanitarian response in Central and East Africa (CEA) at the end of October 2009, with the seven CAPs in the region 64 per cent funded. The second round of the CERF Underfunded Emergency Window was completed at the end of October, allocating $35.2 million to countries in the CEA region. Funding covered a variety of sectors, including food, child nutrition, maternal health, agriculture, water and sanitation, and drought response.

The Regional Humanitarian Partnership Team has made disaster preparedness response activities a clear priority, with an emphasis on contingency planning. OCHA worked with other United Nations agencies, governments and NGOs across the region on developing contingency plans in anticipation of the impact of El Niño on vulnerable communities. Meteorologists warned of a sharp increase in rainfall through the end of 2009 due to the recurrence of El Niño. Concerns focused particularly on flooding risks, crop destruction, the outbreak of waterborne diseases and the likely problems of humanitarian access to affected populations.

The search continued for long-term solutions to the chronic humanitarian situation in the Horn of Africa, which experienced one of the most severe droughts of the past decade. The High-Level Meeting on the Horn of Africa Crisis in Nairobi in February 2009 highlighted the need for an integrated approach and the harmonization of development and humanitarian agendas. But much needs to be done to reduce the impact of climatic and political shocks in the region. As of October 2009, OCHA was reporting 23 million people in the Horn of Africa as severely affected by food insecurity and drought.
Consolidated regional reports on the Horn of Africa, displaced populations reports, funding updates and pastoralist bulletins attracted considerable media interest and the attention of foreign missions. In some cases this attention ensured better funding for emergency or rehabilitation activities, as with OCHA’s Pastoralist Voices project, which aims to bring pastoralists’ perspectives to the forefront of humanitarian planning and decision-making. Advances were noted on a common approach to needs assessment and impact evaluation, with the finalization of a second prototype dashboard and field testing in two countries.

In Burundi, OCHA supported the inter-agency contingency planning process and organized two simulations on pandemic and natural disasters.

ROCEA collaborated with the ICGLR Secretariat and other partners in a three-day workshop on IDPs. Discussions focused on progress made in implementing the ICGLR’s own Protocol on the Protection and Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons. Workshop recommendations are to guide national and regional actors in their efforts to assist, protect and find durable solutions for the increasing number of displaced persons in the region. OCHA estimated the number of IDPs in the CEA region in October 2009 to be close to 10.2 million. IDP numbers declined in Sudan, Uganda, Chad and Kenya, but there were strong increases in DRC, CAR and Somalia. OCHA and regional partners looked to reinforce the cluster system that has been widely adopted in the CEA region since 2006.

ROCEA staff facilitated more than eight regional trainings and workshops, including with the African Stand-by Force for the Eastern Africa Sub-region, which focused on understanding OCHA’s role in humanitarian assistance and civil-military relations in peacekeeping operations.

As co-chair for the Regional Inter-agency Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Task Force, OCHA participated in the monthly coordination meetings and workshops aimed at facilitating support and coordination of GBV capacity in emergency response, as well as in transition and development contexts in the region. During a two-day regional workshop, the GBV task force disseminated the IASC Guidelines for Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings. The GBV Working Group has since merged with the HIV sub-group to ensure effective coordination.
Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSA)

ROSA faced a series of coordination challenges in 2009. Despite the strengthened capacity of SADC, support to Member States in preparedness and response could be further improved. In some cases, the lack of legislative and institutional frameworks to facilitate response coordination and contingency planning equated to limited resources available for preparedness at country and regional level. The lack of IM systems in some countries meant comprehensive contingency planning suffered from a deficit of information on vulnerability and risks.

Responding to a range of challenges, ROSA led RDT missions to Madagascar and Angola, and assisted UNCTs in Angola, Namibia, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Madagascar in responding to sudden-onset disasters. The crises ranged from the simultaneous expulsion of Angolan nationals from DRC and Congolese nationals from Angola, to flooding in Namibia and cholera outbreaks in Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia and South Africa. OCHA helped coordinate cholera response operations in partnership with the SADC Secretariat, WHO, UNICEF and NGOs. As most of the countries developed national contingency plans, this made subsequent operations easier.

ROSA deployed a wide range of humanitarian experts in disaster preparedness, humanitarian response and coordination in support of HCTs, SADC Member States and other humanitarian partners. OCHA support to humanitarian partners in the region included IM services such as mapping, development of a web-based data repository and targeted support to the Seychelles on IM. ROSA also continued to support the organization of the annual SADC Emergency Preparedness Workshop for Southern Africa, and assisted in updating multi-hazard contingency plans in all SADC Member States, in line with IASC guidelines.

ROSA continued to strongly support humanitarian reform in 2009. ROSA facilitated a regional workshop on humanitarian reform and financing for RCs and humanitarian partners, focusing on implementing the cluster approach in future emergencies. The workshop also provided the RDT and Regional Inter-Agency Coordination Support Office partners with valuable guidance on how to better support country-level preparedness and response.

On humanitarian financing, ROSA provided assistance to UNCTs in Swaziland and Madagascar regarding access to CERF funding through improved proposals based on life-saving criteria.

Key lessons from the humanitarian reform still need to be addressed in the region. They include better aligning clusters with existing Government coordination mechanisms, and stronger partnerships with the media and the private sector. While HCTs operating under the Principles of Partnership are in place in most countries, more inclusiveness is still required.

OCHA has systematically ensured that gender issues are incorporated into contingency plans and in multi-sector rapid assessments.
Humanitarian Support Unit: Madagascar

Given Madagascar’s vulnerability to floods, cyclones and drought, as well as its fragile socio-political situation, OCHA has positioned staff in the RC’s office since 2004 to support humanitarian coordination. Over the years, this has expanded to include early recovery coordination support, cost-shared with the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR). This was due to be phased out at the end of March 2009. However, the ongoing political crisis and a worsening drought in southern Madagascar in 2009 created the need to reintroduce a HSU. This has proved instrumental in supporting humanitarian coordination, resource mobilization, support to IM, and to preparedness efforts for response, mainly to cyclones and drought in 2009.

Regional Office for West Africa (ROWA)

West Africa faces a range of complex crises, ranging from chronic malnutrition to natural disasters, such as floods. Meningitis, cholera and hemorrhagic fevers kill hundreds of people every year. The deteriorating human security environment in many countries is fuelled by socio-political instability, poor governance, rapid demographic and urban growth, and a host of other factors.

ROWA covers 16 countries, 11 of which have no OCHA presence. In many instances, the RC system does not have the means to appoint dedicated humanitarian coordination officers to liaise with NGOs and other actors during emergencies, or with the RO on regular humanitarian activities. Despite these constraints, ROWA provided effective and necessary surge capacity in response to flooding, epidemics and political violence throughout the region, while also strengthening governments’ ability to react effectively to emergencies.

ROWA deployed staff to four major emergencies in the region: floods in Benin and Burkina Faso; a dengue fever epidemic outbreak in Cape Verde; and a political crisis in Guinea. ROWA also worked with the UNCT in Senegal to secure funding for emergency operations after floods that affected over 770,000 people. The RO helped secure CERF funding for eight countries in the region, responding to emergencies including floods; meningitis outbreaks; measles; yellow and dengue fever; severe malnutrition; and political violence. In addition, ROWA provided emergency surge support to assist Chad in securing $7.5 million in CERF funds.

ROWA also provided technical support to UNCTs and HCTs to strengthen coordination, specifically in countries where there is no OCHA presence, including Mali, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Togo, Benin and Sierra Leone. ROWA also strengthened regional sectoral coordination structures,
implementing a new approach in identifying humanitarian thresholds and indicators, providing key information to better assess vulnerabilities of the population in the region.

ROWA supported regional preparedness through updating or elaborating inter-agency and/or national contingency plans in seven countries, and one sub-regional contingency plan in response to the crisis in Guinea. ROWA organized inter-agency simulation exercises in two countries and trainings in IM for preparedness in five countries. With the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), ROWA mainstreamed human rights in the contingency planning tool used throughout the region. ROWA also organized the first regional UNDAC induction course in French, and worked with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Inter-State Committee Against Drought in the Sahel (CILSS) to establish a humanitarian depot in Bamako. ROWA advocated alongside WFP, WHO and UNICEF to increase inclusion of food security and nutrition to strengthen programmes managed by CILSS and the OECD-backed Club du Sahel. The RO also discussed a new ERF for West Africa with donors, which should allow small-scale, flexible financing to NGOs and United Nations agencies operating in regions affected by new crises.

With ECOWAS and OHCHR, the RO jointly organized the first regional conference on climate change and protection of human rights. This ensured the inclusion of protection issues related to climate change in the National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs) of ECOWAS countries, as well as advancing international understanding of the responsibility to protect. The outcomes served as a policy platform for ECOWAS during the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen in December 2009. In June, ROWA and IFRC organized a consultation with the heads of national civil protection agencies from 18 countries to improve preparedness capacity ahead of the rainy season.

To strengthen gender mainstreaming in the CAP, ROWA provided gender analysis and sector-specific considerations. ROWA also collaborated with UNIFEM on planning and preparing the regional conference on climate change and protection of human rights. The conference successfully ensured that NAPAs included programmes and activities to address the most vulnerable groups affected by climate change, including women and children.

Threshold indicators to better assess vulnerabilities

To strengthen the CAP process, ROWA introduced a new approach in 2009. It identifies humanitarian thresholds and indicators to provide priority information to better assess vulnerabilities of the population in the region. Fifteen humanitarian indicators have been identified that will trigger emergency humanitarian intervention. Data have been collected at the second administrative level in each country in the region. The new approach offers humanitarian actors a comprehensive overview of the humanitarian situation throughout the West Africa region; allows improved identification of needs; and provides early indication on humanitarian risks and triggers for emergency humanitarian response and activities. It will also triage needs that require an urgent humanitarian approach. This innovative approach will span several CAP cycles and be continuously improved through methodological adjustments.
Establishing the OCHA African Union Liaison Office (AULO) in 2008 helped OCHA’s efforts to streamline collaboration with the AUC. However, the lack of an institutional framework for relations between OCHA and the AUC, notably an MoU, remains a challenge.

In 2009, the AULO’s main priority was strengthening the capacity of the Humanitarian Affairs Division of the AUC, enabling it to play a coordinating role in tackling Africa’s multiple humanitarian problems. AULO ensured a regular, direct exchange of views on humanitarian issues of mutual concern among the ERC, the Chairperson of the AUC and relevant AUC commissioners. This dialogue proved critical in addressing NGOs’ expulsion from Sudan in 2009, and in facilitating the adoption of the African Union Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa. AULO also represents the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) at high-level AU and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa meetings in Addis Ababa.

AULO was a conduit between OCHA’s field, regional and global offices, and the AUC and its own Regional Economic Communities on humanitarian issues. Support to the AUC in policy development improved considerably, notably in developing the Commission’s first legally binding instrument on protection and assistance to IDPs, adopted by the AU Special Summit on Refugees, Returnees and IDPs. OCHA provided support to the AUC on advocacy and advised on funding opportunities in support of humanitarian operations in AU Member States. For example, following OCHA’s advice, the AUC funded UN HABITAT in supporting a shelter project in Burkina Faso following the flooding that left thousands of families homeless. The AUC’s access to OCHA’s information and analysis from the field, made available by AULO, enabled the Commission to report more effectively to the AU Executive Council and other bodies on critical humanitarian challenges and trends on the continent.

AULO supported the mainstreaming of humanitarian principles and standards into the operational concepts and plans of the Africa Standby Force and regional standby forces (e.g. the East African Standby Brigade). The AULO also made several presentations to the AU, explaining key elements of humanitarian reform, including the cluster approach. Presentations emphasized the importance of civil-military relations and policies on protection, including protection against sexual exploitation and abuse in complex emergencies.

### African Union Liaison Office (AULO)

**Highlights**

- Enhanced coordination with the African Union Commission (AUC) on critical humanitarian issues.
- Improved support to the AUC on policy development and relevant frameworks, notably the African Union Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons and in civil-military relations.
- Effective advocacy in favour of AU humanitarian activities in support of its Member States.
Country Offices: Africa

Central African Republic (CAR)
    Chad
Côte d’Ivoire (CDI)
    Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)
    Eritrea
    Ethiopia
    Guinea
    Kenya
    Niger
    Somalia
    Sudan
    Uganda
    Zimbabwe
Central African Republic (CAR)

Highlights

- Helped secure humanitarian access to key areas after negotiations with Government military and rebel representatives.
- Ensured prompt response to recurrent humanitarian problems in the north-east resulting from insecurity. This response helped meet the needs of communities displaced by fighting.
- Instigated a 16 per cent increase of the Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) through constructive dialogue with donors and OCHA’s support of the HC’s management of the CHF.

ochaonline.un.org/car

Key areas of CAR were still prone to outbreaks of violence and instability in 2009. This was despite the gains made following the December 2008 Inclusive Political Dialogue and progress with the ongoing Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) campaign. Contending with security problems and logistical constraints, humanitarian organizations faced a steady erosion of the humanitarian space in key areas of operations. CAR still suffers from poor visibility, largely overlooked by the international community. However, needs are rising. Serious humanitarian situations have emerged in the east and south-west of the country, affecting up to one third of the population. There is a substantial presence of humanitarian agencies, but limited funding means there has been limited expansion of humanitarian activities.

OCHA was instrumental in consolidating the humanitarian coordination architecture, with new fully functioning clusters, each with updated sector strategies and a work plan. OCHA’s sub-offices in Ndélé and Paoua helped ensure more effective inter-cluster coordination among the nine clusters at field level. Until October 2009, OCHA chaired monthly inter-cluster meetings in Bangui with the participation of cluster leads and NGO co-leads. Discussions focused on substantive programming issues, funding mechanisms and the clusters.

At the national level, OCHA took the lead in creating a HCT by the end of December 2009. ToRs for a HCT based on IASC principles were drafted by OCHA, discussed with clusters and endorsed by the HC in December 2009. The HCT is expected to improve high-level decision-making processes and ensure that key issues regarding funding

Cooking oil awaits distribution in a World Food Programme warehouse in Bangui, CAR.
allocation and humanitarian access are properly addressed. The HCT should have a strong overview of overall strategic priorities regarding humanitarian assistance in-country.

The long-awaited arrival of a new HC in October 2009 is also helping reinforce linkages and coherence between OCHA and the UNCT, particularly in areas such as emergency preparedness.

Faced by new humanitarian emergencies, OCHA took the lead in coordinating a rapid and adequate response through establishing ad hoc operational task forces in different regions. These task forces helped provide assistance to 5,000 IDPs and 1,200 refugees fleeing attacks from the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) in the south-east; 12,000 IDPs fleeing inter-ethnic conflict in the north-east; and 18,500 Congolese refugees fleeing violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). A task force was also deployed in the south-west to help tackle a nutritional crisis.

OCHA continued to play a key role in addressing protection-related issues. It provided relevant information and led advocacy efforts with national forces and non-State actors on ensuring greater respect for International Humanitarian Law (IHL). With Government armed forces and rebel movements, OCHA has helped advocate safer humanitarian access and increased respect for human rights, working on a case-by-case basis. OCHA’s negotiations led to a humanitarian corridor to open between Ndélé in the north and the Chadian border, resulting in the safe delivery of food assistance to 19,000 refugees in a remote area of Daha in Southern Chad. OCHA helped negotiate the release of three humanitarian workers detained by a rebel group in the Kabo area in May 2009, and the release of an international journalist arbitrarily arrested by the national forces in Ndélé in June. Working with UNHCR, OCHA has played a supportive role in launching a national advocacy campaign for the protection of IDPs, which was launched in February 2009.

The CAP 2009 mobilized up to $72 million, allocated to emergency and early recovery projects, out of $100 million requested. The consolidation of a more inclusive humanitarian coordination architecture gave donors more confidence, resulting in a 16 per cent increase in contributions to the CHF compared with 2008. Gender is one of several criteria taken into account in the selection of CHF projects. There has been a strong emphasis on transparency and accountability in the allocation process, with fund allocation and project selection discussed within the cluster system. The CHF Advisory Board is made up of United Nations agencies, donor representatives and NGOs. A gender training session was held during the OCHA CAR office retreat in February 2009. Staff designed an office gender policy plan on the basis of discussions at the retreat.

Chad still hosts large refugee populations from Sudan (248,850) and CAR (65,834). There are also around 170,000 IDPs, while some 150,000 people in host communities remain affected by insecurity and displacement. Several parts of the country continue to experience acute malnutrition rates, notably in the Kanem region, north-west of N’Djamena.

OCHA has five offices in Chad. Delays in recruiting staff have seriously weakened operations. However, redeploying and refocusing staff in place and using standby partners have enabled OCHA to pursue its main priorities. These include advocacy for wider and safer humanitarian space, improving civil-military coordination mechanisms and coordinating resource mobilization efforts. The 2009 CAP mobilized some $361 million, representing 90 per cent of revised requirements. In real terms, this amounted to an increase of more than $100 million from 2008, and in terms of overall requirements a 10 per cent increase from 2008. CERF allocations in 2009 amounted to approximately $7.46 million.

Strong emphasis has been placed on strengthening inter-cluster coordination, with monthly inter-cluster meetings now established and a clear commitment to encourage NGO input as co-facilitators. There are now seven clusters in N’Djamena, with others in the major humanitarian hub in the east, Abéché, and in the deep-field locations of Farchana, Goz Beida and Koukou. Cluster priorities include keeping the contingency plan up to date, revising response plans for the CAP and the MYR, and defining CERF projects and advocacy strategies.

A civil-military coordination forum was established, with regular meetings between humanitarian and military actors. OCHA organized civil-military workshops for newly deployed troops from the MINURCAT peacekeeping force, along with DIS elements and UNPOL, to sensitize them on humanitarian principles and IHL. OCHA also supported the strategic partnership between MINURCAT and the UNCT through participation in the integrated coordination mechanisms.
OCHA Chad continued to advocate humanitarian concerns using a variety of approaches. Issues such as the use of armed escorts, respect for humanitarian principles and access to vulnerable populations were raised with the Government and addressed at press conferences. Preliminary work has been undertaken to review humanitarian space to prepare for a potential round-table discussion on the issue. This should help open a dialogue with the Government on the protection of civilians and the safety and security of humanitarian staff in the wake of the possible withdrawal of MINURCAT, which has a POC mandate.

OCHA elected two gender focal points (female and male) during the reporting period. In humanitarian operations, UNFPA leads the response to SGBV.

The second half of 2009 saw the active involvement of United Nations agencies in supporting the Government’s launch of the Secretary-General’s campaign to end violence against women and children. Appealing agencies were required to provide data on beneficiaries by sex and age for CAP and CERF processes.

Transition activities have commenced and UNDP’s Early Recovery Adviser supports the mainstreaming of early recovery mechanisms into the clusters. But in-country capacity has to be strengthened, particularly for work on IDP issues. IDPs face three possibilities: return to their villages of origin; be properly integrated into the areas where they have been displaced; or relocate to other areas. Despite the continuing insecurity hampering the implementation of transition activities, an early recovery cluster in Goz Beida has been established. It focuses on durable solutions and intercommunity dialogue, in collaboration with existing programmes funded by the EU and Agence Française de Développement.

Côte d’Ivoire (CDI)

**Highlights**

- Outlined and implemented detailed transition plans to support OCHA phase-out and handover of coordination functions to recovery actors for 2010.
- Timely CERF submissions covered needs in promoting social cohesion, and combating malnutrition and epidemics.
- The HCT prioritized disaster response preparedness. Relevant mechanisms reviewed to meet local requirements.

[ochaonline.un.org/chad](http://ochaonline.un.org/chad)

The overall situation in CDI remained fragile in 2009. The country was still in a post-crisis phase, awaiting full implementation of the Ouagadougou Peace Agreement of March 2007. Further delays in holding the elections raised political tensions, but did not jeopardize humanitarian operations. In terms of its coordinating role, OCHA continued to help guide the gradual transition from relief activities to recovery and development, but faced significant challenges. These included limited funding, the lack of disaster response preparedness and the need for effective coordination and handover mechanisms.

As humanitarian activities and funding decreased rapidly, it was important to ensure a better understanding of residual needs. OCHA therefore encouraged and supported more needs assessment, especially regarding food security and malnutrition.

OCHA also worked with the Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO) and aid partners, notably the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Coordination Committee (IAHCC), to develop a responsible transition coordination framework to be rolled out in 2010, based on best practices of partnership, leadership and accountability. A key part of OCHA’s overall exit strategy was establishing a well-devised preparedness plan.

OCHA continued to support HCT and IAHCC members in identifying priorities, based on the Critical Humanitarian Needs strategy, and submitting proposals to CERF. Grants worth around $2.4 million were allocated to CDI in 2009. OCHA remained pivotal in advocating the protection of vulnerable groups, including IDPs who have yet to be reintegrated, returnees, and women and children. OCHA’s brief included ensuring that sectoral response adhered to international requirements at national and regional level.

OCHA continued to provide updated information products such as humanitarian bulletins and an updated Who Does What Where (3W) database. But more resources were invested in building the information capacity of organizations involved in recovery, particularly in areas such as Geographic Information Systems and mapping.

In 2008, CDI was selected as a pilot country for the United Nations system to achieve greater integration in supporting a joint vision and maximizing resources towards peace consolidation priorities. As part of this process, in 2009, OCHA played a significant role in developing an Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF), bringing together ONUCI and the UNCT. OCHA is also a member of the Integrated Strategy and Planning Team, which coordinated the development and implementation of the ISF and reports to the senior Strategic Coordination Group.

The transitional context in CDI required OCHA to look critically at the implementation of humanitarian reform. The volume of humanitarian activity has diminished considerably from 2008 onwards, with most assistance partners shifting focus from relief work to recovery and/or national capacity-
building. For example, most IAHCC participants now reconvene in an Extended Coordination Committee, part of the transition coordination platform in 2010. OCHA ensured that its work plans in 2009 mirrored the priorities outlined in the HC Compact. Regular meetings between the Head of Office (HoO) and the HC took place throughout the year to take stock and follow-up on implementing the plans outlined.

OCHA used its National Protection Officer to liaise between the Protection Cluster and the gender theme group, both working on issues of GBV. OCHA often relayed information to relevant bodies on reported cases of abuse. OCHA joined all meetings on developing a national strategy against sexual abuse and violence. OCHA also played a central role in establishing the Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) network in collaboration with ONUCI. In October 2009, a workshop for focal points and managers was organized to reinforce institutional support to victims of abuse.

The Senior Management Team (SMT) approved OCHA’s exit strategy from CDI in June 2009. This allowed enough time to scale-down operations in an orderly, appropriate manner by the end of June 2010. Four sub-offices closed in December, leaving 24 of the original 46 staff still active in 2010. An OCHA Administrative Office mission in September supported development of the exit strategy, while emphasizing the need for adequate warning to service providers to meet the phase-out deadlines and follow all appropriate administrative and financial rules. Terminated staff members have received support and references from the Executive Office.

Continuing armed attacks and military operations in several parts of DRC triggered new waves of displacement and left hundreds of thousands of people more vulnerable than ever. In this context, humanitarian coordination proved highly challenging. OCHA and its partners contended with a highly volatile security environment, related access problems, diverse needs among the target population and often limited capacities of local authorities.

Responding to a series of crises, OCHA maintained a presence in areas most affected by conflict and with the biggest humanitarian needs, using a broad network of sub-offices to coordinate effectively and ensure a proper information exchange among key actors. OCHA DRC

Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Highlights

- OCHA DRC ensured a principled, well-coordinated and timely response to emergency humanitarian needs of displaced populations, refugees, returnees and other vulnerable groups.
- Greater participation and support from partners in implementing key humanitarian reforms such as the cluster approach, with enhanced cooperation on humanitarian funding mechanisms, including the Pooled Fund and the CERF.
- Mobilized adequate financial resources to cover DRC’s most pressing humanitarian needs.
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work closely with clusters and provincial coordination committees, and maintained regular contact with the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) and local authorities to ensure a common understanding of humanitarian issues and facilitate humanitarian access.

Despite staffing constraints due to the rotation of personnel in key posts, OCHA contributed substantially to the overall efficiency of the humanitarian response. Except for areas inaccessible due to insecurity or logistical constraints, such as significant parts of Haut and Bas Uélé, the most basic needs of populations affected by violence were addressed, especially shelter, food, health, and water and sanitation sectors.

The Humanitarian Advocacy Group, chaired by the HC, continued to serve as a wider information-sharing forum and helped outline humanitarian strategies, *cadres de concertation* with provincial authorities (in Katanga, North and South Kivu).

OCHA used clusters and provincial coordination committees to improve participation, IM and decision-making at national and provincial levels, resulting in more timely and coherent humanitarian responses. OCHA facilitated the humanitarian response in remote areas, such as Shabunda and Walikale in the east, where armed conflict triggered mass displacement and led to a huge increase in rape incidents.

Through regular contacts with authorities, armed groups and community leaders, OCHA continued to advocate the protection of civilians and humanitarian principles. Supported by a legal consultant, OCHA participated in the *commission mixte* (composed of representatives of the Ministry of Planning, Belgian Cooperation, UNDP and NGOs) and finalized a provincial draft law to govern non-profit organizations in DRC. The law is currently under discussion in the provincial assembly of North Kivu and should be rolled out to other DRC provinces later. It will be complemented by a national framework law.

The Humanitarian Action Plan (HAP) constituted the main resource mobilization tool for humanitarian projects in DRC. OCHA and the wider humanitarian community successfully used the HAP to prioritize funding, based on emergency threshold levels of the five key humanitarian indicators for DRC: mortality and morbidity rates; malnutrition levels; protection of civilians; population displacement; and return. Regular monitoring of these humanitarian indicators by clusters considerably strengthened the quality of data and the ability to address gaps in the humanitarian response.

Common funds, notably the Pooled Fund set up in 2006, provided 30 per cent of HAP funding. Clusters and provincial committees were also involved in the early stages of the funding allocation process, especially in needs assessments and establishing priorities. Common funds helped organizations improve their programme planning cycle through designated funding envelopes, and allowed for a more flexible and timely response to sudden or emerging needs.

With support and guidance from a Gender Standby Capacity (GenCap) Advisor, gender has been mainstreamed in all new humanitarian programmes and cluster strategies for 2010. The GenCap Advisor also consistently reviews Pooled Fund projects. On a systemic level, the Comprehensive Strategy against Sexual Violence was developed by the MONUC Peacekeeping Operation and the UN Country Team in the course of 2009 and its objectives fully integrated into the HAP 2010.

OCHA DRC closed sub-offices in Lubumbashi and Moba. This was in line with OCHA’s entry/exit benchmarks, taking into account the end of the armed conflict and further stabilization of the humanitarian situation in Katanga province. The sub-office in Kalemie (Tanganyika territory) remained open to deal with the humanitarian consequences of the armed conflict in South Kivu, including the outflow of IDPs. In Orientale Province and North and South Kivu, OCHA DRC kept a strong presence in provincial capitals and remote areas due to the ongoing armed conflict and the resulting humanitarian situation.
Comprehensive planning and coordination in 2009 were complicated by continuing strains in the relationship between the Government and the United Nations system. In the absence of a CAP or similar resource mobilization tool, United Nations agencies continued to face significant financial shortfalls.

With humanitarian agencies confined to Asmara, the United Nations capacity to assess and monitor the situation in other parts of the country was heavily limited. However, high-level discussions involving the RC/HC, OCHA and key agencies suggested the ochaonline.un.org/car Government’s willingness to engage in a more strategic dialogue with the United Nations, particularly regarding food insecurity.

Despite problems gaining access to vulnerable populations across the country, humanitarian agencies played a critical role in addressing the needs of around 1.1 million people in Eritrea. OCHA worked with partners, including NGOs and donors, using existing coordination and humanitarian planning mechanisms, particularly the Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP).

OCHA facilitated the inter-agency process of prioritizing CERF projects in line with CERF criteria. A total of $3.5 million was made available through two consecutive CERF underfunded allocations of $3.5 million altogether, addressing key humanitarian needs for 1.1 million people.

In 2009, OCHA Ethiopia focused on enabling more effective humanitarian coordination through strengthening the operating relations between clusters and Government-led Sectoral Task Forces. OCHA used task force and cluster meetings to focus on a more timely and effective response to humanitarian needs at regional level, determining priorities and identifying key gaps in humanitarian response. OCHA provided information sharing and technical expertise on humanitarian issues to the Government, United Nations, NGOs and donors, establishing stronger partnerships between these actors. OCHA helped broker greater access for humanitarian actors in the eastern Somali region. It also provided continued support to humanitarian partners and government counterparts at regional level, including rapid assessments of the needs generated by conflict-induced displacement.
OCHA played a critical role in mobilizing support at cluster lead level to the Government in developing a multi-sectoral, national Contingency Plan, as well as the annual Humanitarian Requirements Document.

The Contingency Plan outlined potential hazards and subsequent sectoral response requirements in 2010 to assist some 3.2 million food and non-food beneficiaries identified during a global assessment. However, the Government still needs to agree on working with humanitarian partners to establish realistic figures for beneficiaries based on data acquired through assessments.

OCHA continued to support the Government and humanitarian partners in finding ways of using a Disaster Risk Management approach. OCHA Ethiopia helped strengthen partnerships between the Government and United Nations agencies within UNDAF. Strengthened partnerships with the Government helped ensure that critical issues, including access, needs assessments, early warning preparedness and contingency planning, were systematically addressed, particularly in relation to humanitarian response and Government interventions. OCHA supported the establishment of the Government-led Early Warning Unit of the Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector (DRMFSS) and the Disaster Risk Management Technical Working Group on preparedness and response planning. Regional early warning systems are in place, underpinned by better information and contingency planning. However, more needs to be done to strengthen government capacity at regional levels and to ensure proper linkages with DRMFSS.

In the Somali region, where humanitarian problems are most acute, OCHA Ethiopia strengthened local government-led coordination structures and fora, which benefited from a greater participation of partners. OCHA activated the sub-office in Gode and boosted the coordination capacity of the Kebridehar sub-office. This reorganization enabled a joint identification of gaps in the provision of humanitarian assistance, for example reaching those at risk to drought, while allowing better joint planning in response to emergencies, including Acute Watery Diarrhea outbreaks and displacement. While access to the Somali region remains difficult for humanitarian actors, OCHA has invested considerable efforts in establishing a platform for dialogue between the United Nations, NGOs, donors and Government at federal and regional levels. Significant efforts were made to create a platform for open discussion with Government counterparts on IDP-related issues.

The HRF successfully enhanced response capacity in 2009, enabling the humanitarian community to reach more beneficiaries. Eighty-one project activities were undertaken in all sectors, at a cost of over $39 million. The Ethiopia Humanitarian Country Team is currently evaluating mechanisms to strengthen its strategic focus over the coming year, specifically on advocacy, influencing policy on assessments and response, and supporting capacity at all levels.

With support from the GenCap Advisor, gender is now mainstreamed into project proposal and reporting templates. OCHA Ethiopia undertook a gender audit process from September to October 2009, monitoring the office’s progress in establishing gender equality in humanitarian coordination and identifying means of improving gender mainstreaming. A workshop was organized for OCHA to raise overall gender awareness. OCHA Ethiopia was also engaged in continuous gender capacity-building activities with the Government and other partners. For example, OCHA provided technical support to the Oromia regional workshop on gender mainstreaming and development of data collection/assessment tools in November 2009.
Guinea

While Guinea did not experience acute humanitarian problems in 2009, political tensions within the country made it imperative for OCHA to develop a strong focus on emergency preparedness and response. OCHA retained a strong commitment to working with Government partners and encouraging their participation in coordination mechanisms, including the cluster system. This was not without complications, with the Government’s presence in the Protection Cluster proving particularly sensitive after the events of 28 September, when security forces opened fire on an opposition rally in Conakry, killing over 150 people.

OCHA consolidated its partnerships with NGOs and the Red Cross Movement in Guinea, cooperating on security arrangements in accordance with best practices on security collaboration, as outlined by the HCT in its *Saving Lives Together* guidelines.

Drafting a national contingency plan was initiated through a workshop organized by OCHA in Conakry in June 2009. Three regional workshops were held to encourage effective preparedness and response mechanisms outside the capital. The HCT’s contingency plan was thoroughly revised in the wake of 28 September, while a Conakry-specific planning process was initiated in July 2009 looking to cover existing gaps. This had not been completed by the end of the year.

Advocacy efforts in 2009 highlighted the need to maintain consistent levels of humanitarian funding. There was a strong focus on maintaining WFP-managed humanitarian flights to the end of the year through the financial support of donors and CERF. OCHA convened meetings with cluster leads and focal points to review humanitarian priorities and ensure effective information sharing. The latter was particularly important, given prevailing tensions in the last few months of 2009.

Regular monthly HCT meetings were supplemented by ad hoc meetings following 28 September. National partners from the Government and national NGOs were regularly invited to meetings.

Over 100 women and girls were victims of rape and other forms of sexual violence during and after 28 September. The Protection Cluster proved unable to address the problems deriving from these events. After the OCHA-led inter-cluster forum reviewed the issues raised, it was decided to shift the Protection Cluster’s leadership from UNICEF to UNHCR, while also soliciting external assistance from the Protection Standby Capacity Project (ProCap) and GenCap to help strengthen the cluster. Working groups on gender-based violence and child protection are being created, while moves are being made to devise a comprehensive protection strategy.

With OCHA scheduled to scale-down its coordination role in 2010, the Government has been encouraged to build national and local capacity, particularly in disaster preparedness.

Kenya

The political tensions that triggered a serious post-elections crisis in 2007/2008 have diminished. However, Kenya still faced persistent humanitarian problems. There was a clear vulnerability to natural disasters, including droughts and floods during the El Niño-enhanced short rains season, as well as complex emergencies.

Successful establishment of Kenya Emergency Response Fund in June 2009 and support for eight projects in the second half of the year.

OCHA led a series of meetings with cluster leads, including a series of cluster leadership workshops, to ensure comprehensive, coordinated and effective humanitarian response to the worst drought in Kenya’s history. OCHA convened meetings with cluster leads and focal points to review humanitarian priorities and ensure effective information sharing. The latter was particularly important, given prevailing tensions in the last few months of 2009.

Regular monthly HCT meetings were supplemented by ad hoc meetings following 28 September. National partners from the Government and national NGOs were regularly invited to meetings.

Over 100 women and girls were victims of rape and other forms of sexual violence during and after 28 September. The Protection Cluster proved unable to address the problems deriving from these events. After the OCHA-led inter-cluster forum reviewed the issues raised, it was decided to shift the Protection Cluster’s leadership from UNICEF to UNHCR, while also soliciting external assistance from the Protection Standby Capacity Project (ProCap) and GenCap to help strengthen the cluster. Working groups on gender-based violence and child protection are being created, while moves are being made to devise a comprehensive protection strategy.

With OCHA scheduled to scale-down its coordination role in 2010, the Government has been encouraged to build national and local capacity, particularly in disaster preparedness.
predictable and needs-based financing, OCHA facilitated the establishment of the Kenya Emergency Response Fund under the HC’s leadership. It also supported five applications to the rapid response and underfunded CERF windows. Much of the funding was directed at combating the impact of severe drought, with the highest levels of vulnerability in the Arid and Semi-Arid Land areas.

Poor short rains at the end of 2008 were followed by poor long rains from March to June 2009. Pastoralist communities, who inhabit over 80 per cent of the land mass, were hit particularly hard, facing livestock disease and a loss of pasture. Food consumption and dietary diversity were at record lows in the worst affected areas. The drought’s intensity brought a reappraisal of requests to donors. As of late November, the Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan (EHRP) for 2009 had received $370 million of $576 million requested (64 per cent). But serious shortfalls were registered in sectors such as coordination, education, health and food security. Four CERF allocations, supported by OCHA, provided $25.85 million for rapid response activities. Against this background, the EHRP agreed by the Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team (KHPT) for 2010 requested $508.5 million.

OCHA continued to push to incorporate Disaster Risk Reduction into strategic planning, including through the EHRP. Preparedness progress included the release of early warning reports on the flood threats as a result of El Niño conditions during the short rains season. This led to comprehensive contingency planning and implementing relevant measures throughout the country. Despite heavy flooding, the high level of preparedness led to an appropriate and coordinated response in the affected districts and mitigated the impact on vulnerable populations. Contingency plans were also established to respond to urban violence and are being reviewed for refugee inflows. In addition, OCHA provided significant technical support towards developing the National Disaster Response Plan. Issues highlighted in individual campaigns included the impact of climate change on pastoralist communities and urban vulnerability.

OCHA Kenya continued to facilitate coordination at the technical level through regular inter-sector consultations, and provide support to specific sectors through technical guidance and IM. OCHA facilitated a review of the IASC structure and supported its transition - including NGOs’ expanded participation - to the KHPT in line with the Principles of Partnership. OCHA worked with the HC to ensure the OCHA Kenya work plan and EHRP are fully aligned.

Through efforts between OCHA, the Government and the humanitarian community, an inclusive Government-led coordination system was established. The Crisis Response Centre now forms the national humanitarian coordination framework for Kenya and brings together the key technical sectors. Further measures will continue into 2010 to ensure its effective operation at all levels. With the Minister of Justice, the Legal Aid Sub-Working Group began the planning process for drafting a national policy on IDPs.

While there was still a strong residual impact from the Post-Elections Violence (PEV) in 2007/2008, most IDPs continued to return to their home area, although around 20,000 were still in transit sites across the Rift Valley. OCHA field offices in Nakuru and Eldoret that were established in response to the PEV were replaced by a mobile field unit. The unit will be deployed to selected areas when needed, ready to build and strengthen partnership networks.

OCHA Kenya continued promoting a gender perspective in inter-agency planning processes and other activities, using sex- and age-disaggregated data where appropriate.

The In-Country Network (ICN) on PSEA, involving United Nations and NGO partners, was launched in May 2009 under the joint chair of OCHA and the Kenya Red Cross Society. To date, the ICN has developed and tested a reporting tool, and a web-based resource centre has been established.

**Niger**

**Highlights**

- Coordinated humanitarian response to a series of crises, including flooding in Agadez, which affected over 100,000 people, and a meningitis epidemic.
- Mobilized around $11 million through CERF to help cover emergency needs.
- Established a broad-based HCT, including donors, ICRC and five NGOs.
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As political tensions increased in 2009, the biggest challenge for humanitarian coordination was maintaining and improving the partnership between the Government and humanitarian actors. The prompt assessment of and response to humanitarian crises proved difficult, with the national authorities slow to highlight concerns. For example, the Government did not declare the meningitis epidemic and did not request international assistance during the Agadez floods. Consequently, some assessment and response tools, including UNDAC and a Flash Appeal, could not be activated. This affected the timely nature of the humanitarian response.

Despite these problems, OCHA Niger and humanitarian partners adopted an expanded advocacy role, raising issues of humanitarian access and humanitarian space with the
Government. The HC and OCHA maintained regular contact with the authorities, including the Prime Minister’s Chief of Staff and the Government’s humanitarian agency Dispositif National de Prevention et de Gestion des Crises Alimentaires.

This approach helped when serious flooding hit Agadez in September. NGOs on the ground confirmed the heaviest flooding in several years, with at least 30,000 people left homeless as houses were washed away. A week-long United Nations-led mission was rapidly dispatched to the region to assess needs and identify priorities, particularly the arrangement of temporary sites sheltering flood-affected populations.

Restricted humanitarian access made it difficult to mobilize adequate resources for humanitarian agencies working in the country. Niger only received 59 per cent of the $61 million required, as set out in the 2009 West Africa Appeal. Of that amount, $11.7 million was from CERF for 14 projects from four agencies. This represented an increase of almost $1.5 million from 2008. OCHA also initiated a resource mobilization effort for the United Nations Humanitarian Air Service. More than $2 million was received from Belgium and CERF towards this service.

OCHA continued its engagement in disaster risk reduction by supporting the consultation to finalize the draft National Disaster Response. OCHA also organized regional workshops in disaster preparedness in five regions. A regional response plan was subsequently developed and shared with the humanitarian community and donors. OCHA Niger also drafted four early warning reports to Headquarters.

OCHA Niger advised cluster/sector leads on activating the cluster approach and advised the HC on creating a HCT. Both initiatives should help improve humanitarian coordination within Niger, but are proving difficult to implement. OCHA participated in all major inter-agency assessments and supported the analysis and implementation of recommendations for the Food Security Assessment.

OCHA Niger’s information materials included weekly humanitarian bulletins and notes to management, while the FTS was used to provide regular funding updates to partners. OCHA also established a humanitarian website for coordination and information sharing. Monthly humanitarian information and sharing meetings were regularly organized by OCHA in Niamey and at the field level, attended by the entire humanitarian community.

During 2009, OCHA Niger appointed a gender focal point in Niamey and developed a gender action plan. This plan has been implemented in Niamey and in field offices. Information materials on sexual exploitation and abuse have been distributed to all staff and partners. OCHA is involved in a gender and human rights inter-agency group. Data broken down by gender have been considered during elaboration of CERF proposals and in reporting.

OCHA initially planned to start its transition and phase-down in 2010. This was to be reflected in the 2010 planning process, which started in October 2009. However, given the deterioration of the political situation and the early signs of a severe food and nutrition crisis in 2010, OCHA delayed implementing its transition plan. The transition strategy for OCHA Niger will be reviewed later in 2010.

**Somalia**

**Highlights**

- Coordinated response to continuing high humanitarian needs against an increasingly difficult political, security and funding background.
- Supported key HCT and UNCT policy initiatives, including IASC Ground Rules for Negotiations and UNCT Policy on Humanitarian Engagement.
- Successfully advocated the use of Gaalkacyo as an operations hub, which raised the profile of IDP needs, and facilitated coordination, inter-agency assessments and humanitarian response in Central Somalia.

OCHA Somalia worked against a background of increasing violence and breakdown in 2009. Serious fighting broke out in Mogadishu in May, forcing the displacement of 100,000 people by the first week of June. Sporadic fighting continued in Mogadishu throughout the year.

The violence spread to several major towns in South/Central Somalia. The renewed hostilities aggravated an already dire humanitarian situation, particularly in terms of shelter and food aid. Rains were erratic and insufficient. In addition, due to escalating threats and attacks against its staff and unacceptable demands by armed groups, WFP later suspended its work in much of Southern Somalia, impeding nutrition coverage in certain critical areas.

Due to operational constraints and limited funding, OCHA and humanitarian partners prioritized emergency relief activities over medium- and long-term humanitarian programming. However, strategic objectives remained the same, with a strong focus on a sustainable and integrated approach.

OCHA helped oversee improved information gathering from the field and its prompt dissemination, particularly on the humanitarian consequences of flooding and fighting in Mogadishu in May.
OCHA Somalia made improved partnerships and coordination its key priorities in 2009. OCHA helped the HCT work towards stronger agenda setting, decision-making, monitoring activities and policy guidance. OCHA ensured regular meetings between the HCT and the Inter-Cluster Working Group to improve decision-making on response. The HCT, chaired by the HC and comprising seven NGO and seven United Nations members, met twice a month. OCHA supported the development and monitoring of the HC Compact with the ERC, which is fully aligned with the OCHA Somalia work plan and CAP processes.

OCHA strengthened the HRF, streamlining the project review process based on lessons learned, and piloted a monitoring system for the HRF. All projects were reviewed by the cluster chairs to ensure they were in accordance with cluster priorities and technical guidelines. Several clusters established review committees to ensure transparent and inclusive proposal review. Cluster coordination improved in Nairobi and at the field level, aided by the recruitment of national cluster support officers and the establishment of clear leadership.

Two major donors significantly reduced CAP funding for reasons connected to attitudes to the al-Shabaab group. Despite this, sustained advocacy led to a broader donor base with funds secured through CERF and the HRF.

The HRF received $16.6 million in 2009, up from $12 million in 2008, and supported 52 projects, with an increase in national organizations funded. The CAP mobilized $542 million in 2009, up from $477 million in 2008. Work on establishing a CHF continued and should be rolled out in 2010.

OCHA Somalia worked to ensure the protection of civilians through more responsive programming, community mobilization and access to services. OCHA co-chaired the Protection Cluster and supported the establishment of four focal points on PSEA networks in Somalia. The UNCT developed and signed an inter-agency protocol document and Code of Conduct on PSEA. The IASC’s ground rules on negotiation were approved in April 2009 with OCHA’s support.

A common approach was adopted on needs assessments and impact evaluation. A monitoring strategy was included in the CAP and, for the first time, CAP strategic objectives with specific indicators were monitored by the HCT. Quarterly inter-cluster reports were produced and a monitoring strategy was developed and piloted for the HRF.

The quality and usefulness of IM tools improved significantly, based largely on the work of NCSOs trained in IM and systems.

A 3W system was developed by region and cluster, based on improved quality and regularity of information available. By December 2009, eight out of nine clusters had submitted standardized 3W information. Hits on OCHA Somalia’s website increased by 22 per cent in 2009.

Significant progress was made against the OCHA Gender Action Plan indicators. Staff received training in gender awareness, mainstreaming gender concerns, PSEA and the Framework for Gender Equality Programming. Sex- and age-disaggregated data were used in situation reports when available. OCHA supported the development of a common gender indicator across clusters in 2009, to be continued in the CAP 2010.

OCHA Somalia continued to collaborate and coordinate effectively with the RCO in Nairobi. As part of the process of developing the Consolidated Appeal 2010, projects were jointly analysed to ensure careful delineation between humanitarian response initiatives and recovery and development activities that fall within the United Nations Transition Programme (managed by the RCO). Priority areas of unfinished business included the review of the HCT ToR to align it with the Global IASC Guidance Note on HCTs and CHF implementation.

Sudan

**Highlights**

- Supported establishment of an expanded High-Level Committee in Khartoum and state-level joint monitoring committees in the three Darfur states to address security, access and programme challenges with the Government following expulsion of NGOs from Darfur in March 2009.
- Responded to deteriorating humanitarian situation in Southern Sudan by refocused and strengthened presence in Juba, from an early warning/monitoring entity to a standard OCHA presence.
- Provided timely analysis of the humanitarian situation and facilitated information sharing and coordination among humanitarian partners.
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OCHA maintained a strong focus on issues of humanitarian access in the western region of Darfur, where persistent insecurity as well as bureaucratic impediments constrained efforts to reach people in need. The Government’s decision in March 2009 to expel 13 international NGOs and dissolve three national NGOs significantly reduced humanitarian capacity in Darfur. OCHA’s efforts towards restoring trust between the Government and the humanitarian community, and advocating an improved operational environment proved critical in ensuring the continuity of humanitarian operations in Darfur so that the most critical gaps were met to avoid a major deterioration of conditions.

The expulsion of NGOs left more than 1 million vulnerable people without humanitarian assistance. The significant shift in the role of United Nations agencies, NGOs and the
Government required revisions to the work plan via the MYR. OCHA provided dedicated capacity to support the clusters. However, due to decreased humanitarian presence in Darfur, strengthening sector coordination progressed slower than anticipated.

Despite staffing levels being below the required capacity, OCHA facilitated rapid needs assessments and led coordination efforts in handing over service delivery to available providers, including United Nations agencies, NGOs and Government partners.

Coordination efforts with the Government were strengthened through the High-Level Committee and State-level joint monitoring committees that OCHA helped establish. The Area HCT was instituted in the three Darfur states, transitioning from the Inter-Agency Management Group. At the Khartoum level, the HCT was streamlined to senior-level participation to enable more substantive policy decision-making. The CHF, managed by OCHA, provided $110 million towards meeting urgent humanitarian needs throughout Sudan.

In Southern Sudan, increasing violence and food insecurity demanded an urgent response within a vast area suffering from poor infrastructure, minimal Government capacity and low development indicators. Rising violence and food insecurity increased the vulnerability of some 40 per cent of the population. OCHA, in cooperation with the RCO, facilitated assessments of affected areas and coordinated the delivery of assistance to communities affected by food shortages, violent conflict caused by inter-tribal clashes and attacks by the LRA. OCHA Juba facilitated the establishment of the HCT for Southern Sudan, to better address simultaneous emergencies in multiple locations.

The ERF for Southern Sudan allocated $1 million towards unforeseen emergencies and emerging gaps.

With the situation expected to deteriorate leading up to the April 2010 elections and the 2011 referendum, OCHA led efforts to refocus programming on emergency response and state-level contingency planning, as well as to improve monitoring of displacements caused by conflict.

OCHA Sudan continued to reinforce the gender perspective in humanitarian programmes, with field assessments and reporting emphasizing priority needs of women and children. Protection issues, including GBV, remained a challenge regarding coordination, response and advocacy, while OCHA assisted in efforts to engage Government partners in constructive discussions on the nature and scope of civilian protection.
With new transitional humanitarian and development priorities emerging in Uganda, the biggest challenge to coordination in 2009 was securing the necessary Government capacity and commitment to lead, or at least participate in, the clusters or sectors. The north-eastern region of Karamoja remained highly problematic, with humanitarian access complicated by insecurity and extremely poor road conditions. In the CAP 2009, there were serious funding shortfalls in sectors including education and health, which affected partners’ capacity to address humanitarian needs.

OCHA Uganda strengthened its presence in Karamoja by deploying a Senior Humanitarian Affairs Officer for the first time. Karamoja exemplified a new challenge, related to the humanitarian implications of climate change, as outlined in OCHA’s new strategic framework.

In northern Uganda, OCHA consolidated its operations, continuing to provide critical coordination support to plug emerging gaps in meeting humanitarian needs. Joint district authority - cluster/sector lead meetings in Acholi and Karamoja were initiated to ensure increased Government participation in discussion and decision-making at local level. OCHA maintained its regular coordination support functions, including mapping and IM. An ERF proposed and managed by OCHA became operational in 2009.

OCHA led efforts to strengthen Government response and preparedness in line with the recommendations of the November 2008 UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness mission to Uganda. OCHA continued to be a key participant in the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), helping to develop the forum’s work plan for 2009. Additionally, OCHA contributed to developing the national contingency plan for El Niño and played an important advocacy role in developing district preparedness plans.

OCHA augmented its IM capacity in 2009, providing partners with a range of products to aid informed decision-making. For example, OCHA maps have become the premier information product of their kind among agencies, donors and some Government departments. Additionally, the Uganda clusters’ website, managed by OCHA on behalf of the clusters, continued to gain popularity as a one-stop information-sharing portal, with hits doubled in the year.

As of February 2010, the IASC Country Team should give way to a HCT, while retaining the same membership structure and meeting schedule.

During 2009, OCHA Uganda designated a Gender Focal Point and distributed information materials to staff on sexual exploitation and abuse. The Focal Point ensures that issues related to sexual abuse, exploitation and gender inequality in the work place are reported and then addressed by management.

Given the wider transitional context, OCHA’s planning for Uganda in 2010 anticipates a budget reduction of 41 per cent from 2008 and a staff reduction from 44 to 28.

OCHA Uganda has already significantly reduced operations in the Acholi sub-region, closing sub-offices in Pader and Kitgum districts and consolidating its Gulu sub-office. Intensified advocacy succeeded in ensuring stronger leadership and participation in cluster coordination at the district level, while a joint chairing of heads of cluster meetings with UNDP was initiated in Gulu and Amuru in recognition of the transition to recovery. In 2010, there will be a concerted effort to conclude humanitarian activities in regions of Uganda affected by LRA operations and to establish finalized contingency plans in support of a robust National Platform for DRR in Uganda.
Zimbabwe faced an array of humanitarian and social problems at the beginning of 2009. It was confronted by a major cholera epidemic, and 6 million Zimbabweans had limited access to safe water and sanitation. However, moves towards a political settlement and signs of economic recovery have had repercussions on the overall humanitarian situation. Zimbabwe benefited in 2009 from improved rains and better preparedness for epidemics. A changing situation has encouraged OCHA and humanitarian partners to focus on partial moves to transition. For example, the CAP launched at the end of 2010 included early recovery and “humanitarian plus” interventions, such as repairs to water and sanitation systems.

There was a serious gap in the operations of humanitarian coordination structures at provincial and district levels. While clusters were fully functioning at the central level (Harare), only one cluster out of eight was operational at the provincial level in 2009. Cluster roll-out was initially seen as contrary to a desired move towards recovery and development. However, once dedicated cluster coordinators took on their proper functions, clusters proved instrumental in bringing clarity and predictability to humanitarian planning and resource mobilization, while providing a coherent response of significant benefit to national and international partners. This was particularly relevant in relation to the cholera epidemic, where better coordination between Health and WASH Clusters proved crucial.

OCHA Zimbabwe oversaw the development of improved humanitarian coordination architecture at country and regional levels. The status of the HCT is still under development. Efforts are underway to adopt clear terms of reference to guide its members on objectives and expected outcomes, and ensure the necessary level of transparency and accountability. Five NGOs are HCT members, though the participation level has often been low.

In 2009, OCHA Zimbabwe facilitated the roll-out of three additional clusters (Protection, Early Recovery and Education), bringing the total to eight. An inter-cluster forum, chaired by OCHA, was also established in 2009. All clusters are supported by OCHA focal points.

OCHA has developed cluster-specific portals on its website to provide easier access to humanitarian information on areas such as health and education. There is an IM shortfall in some clusters. Continuing support from OCHA will be crucial in raising the levels of information sharing, mapping, and analysis of trends and deficiencies.

OCHA Zimbabwe ensured the HCT’s active involvement in allocating CERF grants from the underfunded and rapid response windows, in accordance with humanitarian strategies outlined in the 2009 CAP. The 2010 CAP required $378 million, as opposed to $710 million in 2009. The CAP is strongly aligned with the Government’s priorities, including the Short-Term Economic Recovery Programme.

ERF guidelines were reviewed in June 2009 and realigned to better serve NGOs as the main applicants in the funding process. Clusters can now put more emphasis on reaching out to and building the capacity of local NGOs. For example, in September 2009 WASH sponsored a three-day training on cluster coordination, targeting potential district, provincial and national government representatives from the health and water sectors.

Working towards a greater incorporation of DRR approaches and strengthened preparedness in humanitarian response, OCHA continued to provide regular updates, maps and data on humanitarian needs and response in-country. OCHA assisted the HC and HCT in updating the multi-hazard contingency plan in June 2009 and preparing a cholera response plan. OCHA also supported the development of the capacity of the Government’s focal agencies for disaster prevention and preparedness.

OCHA made significant headway in changing the Government’s approach to IDPs, including its official designation as IDPs rather than simply ‘vulnerable’ or ‘mobile’ population groups. Joint assessment missions were carried out by Government and United Nations agencies in August 2009 to get an overview of IDP needs and preferences for durable solutions. OCHA’s advocacy resulted in the Government granting full access to populations in need in 2009.

Gender was included as one of the selection and prioritization criteria for CAP 2009 projects, while cluster monitoring reports are all disaggregated by age and sex. Gender issues featured in the preparation of CAP 2009 and 2010 and in the cluster needs assessments. CERF and ERF projects included gender in the needs analysis, and in project sheet outcomes and activities.
OCHA OFFICES MIDDLE EAST

1. The Country Office for Iraq is in Amman, Jordan.
2. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu & Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu & Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.

Disclaimer: The designations employed and the presentation of material on this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
Country Offices: Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia

Afghanistan
Iraq
occupied Palestinian territory (oPt)
Pakistan
### Afghanistan

#### Highlights

- OCHA re-established its presence in Afghanistan, with an office in Kabul and five sub-offices in different locations.
- Development of two HAPs, bringing together more than 40 NGOs and United Nations agencies to identify common priorities.
- Creation of IM systems largely focusing on sudden-onset disasters.
- Increased confidence in the humanitarian system, encouraging donors to support the establishment of an Emergency Response Fund.

OCHAonline.un.org/afghanistan

The decision to re-establish an OCHA presence in Afghanistan at the end of 2008 was motivated by the need to address a deteriorating humanitarian situation and provide much-needed coordination to an expanded humanitarian community. The growing impact of the armed conflict was taking its toll on the Afghan population, as were drought and other natural disasters. There was a certain predictability to the humanitarian situation – the conflict intensified steadily over the years, while floods, droughts and severe winter weather were recurring phenomena. However, the international response was largely uncoordinated and ad hoc.

The sheer number of United Nations agencies and NGOs made it essential to provide clearly defined coordination structures that were not wholly based in the political mission (UNAMA).

The military’s continued involvement in relief and reconstruction, directly or through Provincial Reconstruction Teams, made effective civil-military coordination an important issue. OCHA is uniquely positioned to tackle these challenges, not only because of its expertise in IM and coordination, but also because it is in a position to advocate humanitarian principles in a context where the battle for ‘hearts and minds’ results in a deeper involvement of military actors in humanitarian and developmental affairs.

OCHA revived dormant coordination structures while creating much-needed new ones. It gave new impetus to the cluster system and the HCT, led civil-military coordination structures (in close coordination with the NGO community), and strengthened ties between the humanitarian community and its donors. As a result, NGOs have become more involved in humanitarian coordination, information is more widely shared and more readily available, and donors have shown more interest in, and have easier access to, humanitarian actors in Afghanistan.

OCHA also led the 2009 and 2010 CAP – involving more than 40 humanitarian actors – and established an ERF, aimed at providing quick funding to respond to unforeseen emergencies. Less tangible, but equally important, was that OCHA’s presence and consistent advocacy attracted attention to the humanitarian needs in Afghanistan, particularly in the conflict-affected areas, and to the need for principled humanitarian action.

It was not easy to establish, equip and staff a separate office and a field presence (OCHA opened sub-offices in Herat, Jalalabad, Kandahar, Kunduz and Mazar). While the budget for Afghanistan was ambitious, the capacity to implement, particularly in the first part of the year, was not commensurate; the expenditure rate of 68 per cent shows this clearly. In addition, the increased threats against the United Nations – tragically clear in the attack in October resulting in the deaths of five staff members – underscored the importance of mitigating measures. All of this slowed the rapid roll-out of OCHA in the country.

Much of Afghanistan remains inaccessible for humanitarian actors. Therefore, information about the humanitarian situation can sometimes be unreliable, making it difficult to get a comprehensive view of the needs in-country. With the conflict intensifying, OCHA will focus on field coordination to enhance civil-military coordination and IM.

The foundation laid in 2009 will allow OCHA to consolidate and further improve in these areas in the year ahead. OCHA is committed to stay in Afghanistan while there are large-scale humanitarian needs.

### Iraq

#### Highlights

- Improved humanitarian coordination, IM and reporting.
- Completion of a major DRR study with UNDP BCPR following high-level workshop with senior Iraqi Government officials in Baghdad.
- Expanded HRF, helping fund 43 emergency projects for vulnerable Iraqis at a value of around $7.3 million.

OCHAonline.un.org/iraq

Despite an often difficult working environment in 2009, OCHA managed a significant increase in staffing levels. OCHA recruited and deployed 35 national Iraq Field Coordinators (IFCs) and Information Management Officers (IMOs) across all 18 governorates. This significantly improved OCHA Iraq’s ability to facilitate humanitarian coordination at the governorate level, manage information and undertake monitoring and reporting.

Activities included collecting data to help identify existing gaps in governorate-level responses to national disasters such as floods, drought and landslides, and in Government-run health, education and water facilities. There were spot
checks and assessments on the impacts of drought at the governorate level, and monitoring and evaluation visits to sites where projects supported by the Expanded Humanitarian Response Fund (ERF) were implemented.

In September and December 2009, the IFCs and IMO participated in two training workshops to build their capacity in coordination, networking, reporting, monitoring and support to the ERF. OCHA also contributed to the work of the Inter-Agency Information and Analysis Unit through direct management oversight and personnel support, which further enhanced the strategic use of information.

Throughout 2009, nearly all of Iraq continued to be designated as United Nations Security Phase 4, with Anbar, Wasit and Diyala remaining at Phase 5. International staff in all United Nations agencies, including OCHA, continued to be largely confined to the International Zone in Baghdad, the United Nations Compound in Erbil and other hubs established by the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI). These restrictions, coupled with the shortage of ‘slots’ (or beds) in Baghdad and Erbil, have limited OCHA’s presence in Iraq to a maximum of three or four international staff at any one time. However, security gradually appeared to improve in 2009, with incidents down by 85 per cent compared with August 2007. The improved security situation enabled national staff from United Nations agencies, including OCHA, as well as NGOs to gain access to many outlying and hard-to-reach areas to better assess and respond to humanitarian needs.

Following the June 2008 external evaluation of the ERF, OCHA Iraq implemented improvements in ERF management. Revisions were made in the ERF Charter, enabling quicker processing of proposals and improved systems for monitoring and quality assurance. In 2009, the ERF funded 43 emergency projects for vulnerable Iraqis at around $7.32 million. Around 58 per cent of these projects were in the shelter and water and sanitation sectors, and implemented by 36 Iraqi NGOs and seven international NGOs. OCHA conducted three ERF training sessions for 120 Iraqi NGOs, explaining the ERF Charter and providing guidance on the ERF application process, needs assessment and results-based management to ensure better monitoring.

In September 2009, the joint OCHA/UNDP BCPR study on DRR was completed, resulting in three reports: A Strategic Framework for Natural Disaster and Risk Reduction in Iraq; Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction in Iraq; and Action Plan for Implementing Disaster Risk Reduction Initiatives in Iraq. Following this, a high-level workshop chaired by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General was held in Baghdad in December 2009, with senior-level Iraqi Government officials, UNCT members, Iraqi Red Crescent

*United Nations staff in Afghanistan pay their final respects to colleagues from the United Nations Development Programme election team killed in an attack on a Kabul guest house. Five United Nations workers died in the attack and several others were injured.*
Society and UNDP (BCPR). This led to first moves by the Iraqi Government to establish an Iraq National Disaster Management Authority under the Prime Minister’s Office and to draft a law for DRR coordination in Iraq.

The UNCT has continued to use the Sector Outcome Team (SOT) as the key mechanism for development and humanitarian cooperation, rather than using multiple coordination structures. ‘SOT’ rather than ‘cluster’ remains the preferred nomenclature. OCHA Iraq continued to support and participate in the SOTs during 2009.

OCHA delivered three training sessions in 2009 to SOT leads, covering the CAP 2009 MYR, the ERF operations, including project selection criteria and needs assessments, and IAU tools (3W, EmergencyInfo database and SOT file management). NGOs and other partners also continued to be represented and actively participate in SOT and sub-SOT planning and response activities in Amman, Baghdad and Erbil.

In December 2009, the UNCT for Iraq agreed to reconstitute the HCT for Iraq in early 2010. Complementing the HCT is the Baghdad Humanitarian Coordination Group, which continued to meet monthly throughout 2009 to discuss emerging humanitarian concerns and coordinate responses, as needed.

While gender has been mainstreamed throughout OCHA Iraq’s programmes, specific strategies are in place within the ERF to make gender considerations a key part of the approval process for funding projects. This includes responding to the needs of vulnerable groups, in particular female-headed households. Another important gender-specific initiative was producing a short documentary on vulnerable groups in Iraq, including women, and how they have been affected by conflict.

All OCHA and IAU reports published in 2009 included gender-specific information. IAU’s Labour Force Analysis highlighted Iraq’s low female labour force participation rate, while OCHA’s Humanitarian Update emphasized women’s particular vulnerability to poverty and food insecurity. IAU produced a fact sheet on Iraqi women for International Women’s Day, which included data on female illiteracy, domestic violence and United Nations projects aimed at improving gender relations. Research has also been conducted on gender-based violence for United Nations internal strategic and planning purposes.

During 2009, IAU identified more than 200 relevant indicators for Iraq, disaggregated by gender, age and urban/rural locations. This information was disseminated in various reports and tools including the Common Country Assessment, the Iraq HAP, governorate profiles, IAU Info, fact sheets and other products.

In 2009, OCHA’s efforts focused on strengthening operational coordination in a still volatile context in the aftermath of Operation Cast Lead. The formal establishment of key clusters in January (Protection, Health, Education and WASH), followed by others in March, led to improved needs assessments, analysis and planning.

While the effectiveness of some clusters still remains uneven, important progress was made, particularly in inter-cluster coordination, around key issues such as humanitarian response in Gaza, West Bank and Area C.

OCHA oPt maintained its presence in the field with four offices in Jerusalem and the West Bank, while it strengthened the sub-office in Gaza through new personnel. This enabled OCHA to improve operational coordination at field level and strengthen day-to-day coordination with municipalities in the West Bank. OCHA developed response strategies and response plans to address humanitarian concerns in Area C and east Jerusalem, while the humanitarian community agreed on the framework for the provision of assistance in Gaza.

A key priority for OCHA was improving strategic planning and coordination on access and protection, which have presented serious challenges. A hotline on access was among the services introduced to help improve monitoring and reduce the number of access incidents. On protection, OCHA supported the Protection Cluster and chaired the Displacement Working Group, which began implementing a coordinated prevention and response strategy on protection issues.

The revised CAP 2009 for oPt was $805 million, and 78 per cent funded. OCHA’s emphasis on dialogue with different parties for 2010 led to improved coordination with the PA and the donor community. The PA was closely
consulted on drafting the CAP 2010, with ministry representatives from the Ministry of Planning and Development taking part in cluster/sector assessments and planning.

This helped avoid duplication, fill strategic gaps in assistance and ensure adequate linkages between the CAP and long-term national priorities. OCHA and ECHO now co-chair a newly established coordination group. Plans to further improve monitoring and evaluation systems on humanitarian assistance have been drawn up in advance of the next CAP. The HCT met monthly to coordinate humanitarian relief and discuss operational and advocacy issues affecting the humanitarian community in oPt.

OCHA also chaired the HCT’s Advocacy Working Group. During the year, this group developed and implemented an advocacy strategy on the Gaza blockade, organizing four media events and preparing statements and fact sheets. The group was also responsible for developing HCT common messaging on the Goldstone report and developing advocacy steps on the Sheikh Jarrah evictions. OCHA continued to produce its regular reports and maps on protection, movement and access, which are shared with Palestinian, Israeli and international media, humanitarian actors and decision makers.

The HRF expanded its donor base from three to seven donors and increased in size, with over $5.1 million in funding provided to 35 projects. This compares with $2.1 million covering 16 projects in 2007 and 2008 combined. The increase in 2009 was mainly a result of humanitarian projects set up in response to needs in Gaza following Operation Cast Lead and in the West Bank following the drought. With a balance of over $7 million at the beginning of 2010, the HRF is well placed to respond to an unforeseen emergency of similar
scale to Operation Cast Lead. The HRF operated through the cluster system, with cluster leads acting as an integral part of the HRF’s governance structure, while agencies seeking funding coordinated with relevant clusters before submitting project applications. The HRF still required a permanent manager in place to ensure continuity in its management and administration.

The 2010 CAP (prepared in 2009) specified that gender analysis would be incorporated into programme design and the selection of beneficiaries. The GenCap Advisor provided advice to the different units within OCHA oPt and the field offices on how to incorporate gender analysis into their work. Under the guidance of the gender task force, the GenCap Adviser developed checklists for each sector/cluster based on a gender needs assessment in the aftermath of the Gaza crisis. However, these checklists were not used by CAP vetting panels to establish whether the CAP gender criterion had been met. OCHA will therefore aim to improve understanding of how to apply the gender criterion for the development of the CAP 2011. The office reviewed and provided comments on an initial draft of the proposed IASC gender marker to track gender allocations in the CAP.

**Pakistan**

**Highlights**

- Consolidation of OCHA’s presence in-country with re-establishment of fully functioning OCHA office in Islamabad, a sub-office in Peshawar and an antenna office in Buner, Swat district.
- Assisted with establishing the HCT.
- Supported the development and revision of a Pakistan Humanitarian Response Plan (PHRP) for 2009, outlining requirements for $680 million, and worked closely with humanitarian and donor communities to secure 79 per cent of PHRP funding.

With an OCHA office reestablished in Islamabad and a sub-office in Peshawar, OCHA’s humanitarian activities in Pakistan continued to focus on meeting needs in the main conflict zones, particularly the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), as Government forces continued to battle insurgents. While the ebbing of violence in some regions enabled large-scale returns of IDPs to home areas, the unpredictable military situation and the sudden population movements triggered by the fighting stretched the planning capacity and resources of humanitarian actors and the Government.

Access to target populations was seriously compromised by continued insecurity. Missions to NWFP were regularly cancelled due to credible security threats. In 2009, 12 United Nations employees were killed and 12 injured in various terrorist attacks. This gradually caused the United Nations and wider humanitarian community to lower their operational profile. Security concerns meant that international United Nations staff traveled daily to Peshawar to meet with the provincial Government and other counterparts, while unmarked cars were used for needs assessments and meetings in D.I. Khan, Swat and Mohmand Agency. OCHA and the United Nations Department of Safety and Security conducted security reviews on the ground prior to any inter-cluster assessment missions.

Given these constraints, there was a clear need for Government help in improving access. OCHA facilitated regular meetings with federal and provincial authorities, while engaging in a strong advocacy campaign, focusing on areas where needs were most acute. The result was improved access during 2009. For example, OCHA led several missions to D.I. Khan and Tank, the hosting districts for IDPs from South Waziristan.

Furthermore, two OCHA-led missions went to Kohat and Hangu, the two hosting districts for IDPs from Orakzai. These missions enabled OCHA to assess the situation on the ground and determine what assistance was needed. Reports based on the missions were widely disseminated within the humanitarian community and formed the basis for decisions on securing a timely and adequate response to the affected population’s needs.

Due to the security situation, the opening of a planned satellite office in Daggar, the main town of Buner district in NWFP, was postponed. But OCHA strengthened its presence in Swat, looking to cover Buner and Lower Dir districts from Swat.

OCHA facilitated the return of IDPs to Malakand Division in the NWFP after the Government judged the area safe. The returns began in July, although some humanitarian organizations voiced concern about the Government’s ability to guarantee the returnees’ safety. The process was successful: by the end of 2009 almost 1.7 million of the 2.7 million IDPs had returned to their homes in Malakand Division.

Improved coordination of humanitarian structures remained a key priority. Given the immense complexities of the response, a dedicated HC for Pakistan was appointed and took over leadership of the HCT. Weekly HCT meetings were held, common strategic issues were developed and common policies related to humanitarian action were agreed.

During the height of the emergency, weekly situation reports were produced at the HCT’s request. The Public Information Unit ensured regular, high-quality reporting during the displacement crisis, providing analytical data and information used as the baseline for information among humanitarian
stakeholders. OCHA developed and produced high-quality mapping during the peak months of the crisis.

When the OCHA office was established in April 2009, the cluster system was not structured properly, which meant a lack of proper coordination between United Nations agencies, and national and international NGOs. With the introduction of the 12 clusters, OCHA laid the foundation for a well-coordinated response. Each individual cluster met once a week to discuss the needs of IDPs in NWFP and FATA, and the appropriate humanitarian response.

OCHA organized an Inter-Cluster Diagnostic Mission that made recommendations on how to improve the cluster system. OCHA further ensured that the terms of reference for all humanitarian meetings and fora were developed and observed. Gaps and needs in the clusters were identified and addressed.

OCHA worked closely with donors, keeping them regularly briefed on ongoing humanitarian requirements. OCHA took on a high profile advocacy role on behalf of the wider humanitarian community to ensure that regular external support was forthcoming through 2009. Such efforts ultimately saw the PHRP for 2009 funded by 79 per cent.

The consolidated efforts of OCHA Headquarters, Regional Office and the field helped secure a pledge of $100 million from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to the humanitarian response as part of a much wider financial contribution to relief/development efforts in Pakistan.

OCHA and partners engaged in three-month negotiations with the Government prior to launching the PHRP process for 2010, which demonstrated the sensitivity of many of the main issues. Close contact with the Economic Affairs Division and Ministry of Foreign Affairs helped iron out different perceptions on terminology and humanitarian operations, though misunderstandings remain.
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Indonesia
Myanmar
Nepal
Sri Lanka
While the recovery phase of the 2004 tsunami is over, many humanitarian agencies continue to support other regions of Indonesia that are susceptible to natural disasters.

The national disaster management structure in Indonesia is evolving significantly. While the Government of this medium-income country has improved its overall capacity to respond to large-scale disasters, limited funding and operational capacity continue to challenge local government’s ability to react effectively. In this context, at the national level, OCHA shifted its focus of support from response to preparedness, while continuing to work with local authorities to reinforce capacity in response and preparedness. The shift of focus also involved working with United Nations agencies under the Technical Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction (UNTWG-DRR) on mainstreaming DRR into UNDAF and developing the United Nations Joint Strategic Programme on Disaster Risk Reduction.

OCHA liaised effectively with national, provincial and local authorities in response to disasters of different scales, providing appropriate capacity-building and IM support, helping the Government develop its sub-national disaster management agencies.

The availability of CERF and ERF funding was crucial in filling funding gaps during emergencies. Access to the ERF, managed by OCHA, allowed NGOs to respond rapidly to disasters, particularly during the West Sumatra earthquake response. The West Sumatra experience highlighted the need for stronger engagement with national actors. OCHA will continue its efforts to involve Government counterparts in coordination structures and activities, including in clusters and the inter-agency contingency planning process, while also looking to engage other actors, including representatives from the private sector and academia.

Contingency planning also looked to address the increasing need for local language services, which are vital in engaging Government agencies and other national actors capable of responding within existing coordinating structures.

The cluster approach proved increasingly important. OCHA continued to lead inter-cluster coordination at national and local levels. At the local level, the OCHA Head of Office served as the Inter-Cluster Coordinator for localized emergencies. The Government clearly acknowledged the importance of the cluster approach mechanism, particularly in response to large-scale disasters (for example in the West Java earthquake response). OCHA used its membership of existing coordination fora, including the DDR and the community-based Disaster Risk Management and Consortium for Disaster Education to advocate broader humanitarian issues. OCHA continued to monitor potential unfolding natural disasters and conflict situations, making timely responses as emergency needs unfolded.

OCHA Indonesia has a Gender Action Plan that includes the appointment of focal points on gender and sexual exploitation and abuse. Gender considerations are mainstreamed in project documents including ERF, HRP and the Inter-Agency Contingency Plan. Sex- and age-aggregated data have been applied in ERF reports where possible. OCHA also facilitated the deployment of a GenCap Adviser from standby partners to the UNTWG-DRR. The GenCap Adviser will support the preparation of the regional South-East Asia networking trainings and gender mainstreaming within the UNDAF.

**Myanmar**

- Facilitated emergency relief coordination and transition to recovery in areas hit by Cyclone Nargis in 2008, targeting cyclone-affected populations and handing main coordination functions to the Recovery Coordination Centre (RCC).
- Provided sustained support to emergency/disaster preparedness and risk reduction efforts, including the Inter-Agency Contingency Plan and the Myanmar Action Plan of Disaster Risk Reduction.
- Used involvement in the cluster system and other coordination mechanisms to help ensure more effective humanitarian assistance to the country’s most vulnerable populations.

During 2009, OCHA Myanmar continued to support an all-inclusive coordination mechanism through the cluster system and the HCT. The implementation of the cluster approach ensured a coherent approach to aid delivery to those affected by Cyclone Nargis. Looking to the transition to longer-term recovery coordination, the establishment of an RCC gradually took over the coordination of recovery activities in cyclone-affected areas from July 2009 onwards.

The RCC was established by the Tripartite Core Group, comprising the Government, ASEAN and the United...
Nations. OCHA has worked with the RCC to ensure a smooth transition. OCHA staff remained in the Delta to ensure capacity-building and the transfer of knowledge to incoming partners.

OCHA continued to assist the HC in areas such as advocacy for increased funding, helping create common advocacy messages, and providing monitoring and analysis on issues such as access constraints for humanitarian workers. OCHA facilitated the exchange of information and promotion of a better understanding of the humanitarian situation in Myanmar between Thai-based and Myanmar-based organizations.

While the creation of the RCC has helped strengthen coordination, funding constraints have made it difficult for recovery actors in the Delta to guarantee that aid efforts remain as strong and effective as they were during the emergency relief phase. OCHA worked with the HCT to improve contingency planning, disaster preparedness and risk reduction efforts. OCHA also supported the development of strategic documents such as the Inter-Agency Contingency Plan and the Myanmar Action Plan of Disaster Risk Reduction.

While OCHA gradually phased-out its activities in the Delta, it retained a country office to help address country-wide issues. OCHA increased support to coordination efforts in Chin State through the deployment of a dedicated team, with regular travel to the field. As a result, a sub-office was expected to be established in Chin State in 2010. OCHA will collaborate with the local lead agency, WFP, in analyzing the humanitarian situation and getting a clearer idea of key priorities in the area.

OCHA facilitated the submission of a CERF grant in 2009 for humanitarian activities in Northern Rakhine State (NRS). In parallel, OCHA Myanmar continued to manage, in support of the HC, a Humanitarian Multi-Stakeholder Fund, which allocated funding to local and international NGOs for unmet and emergency needs in-country.

Provision of support to inter-cluster coordination was a core function at country and field level. Clusters have evolved into working groups, but remain an integral part of the Inter-Agency Contingency Plan for possible re-activation in a serious emergency. The HCT will now focus more on strategic decision-making, in particular through the formation of a smaller ‘core group’.

Challenges in implementing humanitarian reform include ensuring that the HCT retains its strategic focus. OCHA will continue promoting awareness of the cluster system and the need for its reactivation for future emergencies.

Training was provided to field coordinators, and coordination and reports associates to ensure a proper gender perspective. Field reports and assessment data updates have been presented with disaggregated age/sex data. Gender and other cross-cutting issues have also featured strongly in workshops and drafting sector response plans for the Contingency Plan and CHAP for NRS.

Nepal

**Highlights**

- Strengthened the cluster approach to increase predictable and accountable humanitarian action, especially in the aftermath of the Koshi floods, advocating appropriate hazard and risk analysis and early recovery projects.
- Advocated humanitarian issues including disaster preparedness and risk reduction through earthquake simulations, contingency planning and district disaster preparedness workshops.
- Focused international attention on food security crisis, including high death rates from diarrhea and acute malnutrition, the negative impact of climate change and the risks of an earthquake, and the continuing problems of instability.

The Nepal Country Office was in a transitional phase in 2009, preparing to scale-down to a HSU in 2010. Therefore, OCHA had a major coordinating role to play, focusing strongly on partnerships and enhancing the capacity of national structures.

OCHA raised awareness of the centrality of clusters with national and district authorities and revised contingency plans using the cluster approach. This enabled a more coherent response to epidemics, floods and landslides, to which Nepal is vulnerable. A priority for the future is to secure more Government involvement, with clusters co-chaired by Government focal points.

DRR and preparedness figured prominently in 2009. OCHA worked closely with the Government, notably the Ministry of Home Affairs, the lead ministry for emergency preparedness and response. OCHA was the lead partner in the multi-agency DDR Consortium and developed a flagship programme on emergency response. OCHA facilitated three major earthquake exercises with INSARAG and other organizations, working with Government partners, especially at the district level where 24 disaster preparedness workshops and seven contingency planning workshops were conducted. This resulted in a more effective response during the following flood season, with improved Government-led coordination mechanisms at the district level.

In the post-conflict period, OCHA’s Information Unit (IMU) provided technical capacity and support to humanitarian
partners, monitoring violations of the Basic Operating Guidelines (humanitarian principles and operational space), mapping hazards, vulnerability and risk, security incidents and trends. The IMU’s output covered political and development concerns as well as humanitarian issues.

For example, OCHA produced monthly operational space, security incident and blockade maps and provided regular analysis of key trends. Maps were produced in support of emergency response, including the 2009 floods and the Acute Watery Diarrhoea outbreak.

OCHA led the development and use of the Multi-Sectoral Initial Rapid Assessment. This involved consultation with all partners and the Government, and was endorsed by the HCT and the Government. Work continued on revising the Needs Analysis Framework (NAF), to be completed in 2010.

The HCT held monthly meetings with heads of agencies and NGO representatives. The HC Compact with the ERC has been formulated in consultation with the RC/HC. It is aligned closely with the RC/HC’s own strategic humanitarian objectives and the principle tenets of OCHA Nepal’s work plan. The Nepal ERF, aimed at channeling funds to NGOs, was formally established in June 2009, but did not receive additional funding.

Cluster leads and partners received necessary guidelines and resources to mainstream gender in CAP project design. All new projects included in the MYR 2009 and Appeal 2010 went through a gender analysis. OCHA has clearly communicated to cluster leads and partners contributing information to provide sex- and age-disaggregated data.

OCHA Nepal supported PSEA training for the UNCT and HCT.

OCHA drafted an exit strategy for Nepal that contributed to an Early Recovery Initiative (ERI) project in line with the Secretary-General’s June 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The ERI is a strategy for merging OCHA and the RCO in 2010, providing added coordination, early warning mechanisms and analytical capacity to the United Nations at central and regional levels.

As of July 2010, the OCHA Nepal Country Office will be downsized to an HSU and fully merged with the RC/HC office transitional structure. The HSU will report through OCHA ROAP. Biratnagar and Nepalgunj sub-offices will maintain a humanitarian profile, although not funded by OCHA, and will report to the Office of the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator (ORHC).

An IMU will be established in the ORHC, maintaining many of the services and capacities of the current OCHA IMU, notably the provision of materials on humanitarian, peacebuilding and development issues.

**Sri Lanka**

**Highlights**

- Coordination and advocacy for improvements to conditions in IDP camps helped ensure life-saving support for nearly 300,000 people displaced during the final stages of the conflict.
- Strengthened humanitarian coordination structures through inter-cluster mechanisms in Colombo and north Sri Lanka, which operated despite multiple constraints.
- Effective transitional support provided to early recovery and longer-term development actors in the east in early 2009, with similar frameworks for transition planned for the north in 2010.

The humanitarian context changed significantly in early 2009, with the Government staging a major offensive against the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, announcing a military victory in May. The humanitarian consequences of this fighting were felt throughout the year as the hostilities triggered a huge exodus from the combat zones to different parts of the north, including Vavuniya, Mannar, Tricomalee and Jaffna. Humanitarian assistance focused strongly on meeting IDPs’ needs, but faced numerous challenges. Insufficient land was available for camps, while IDPs faced overcrowding problems and weak health and education services.

**Needs analysis framework**

OCHA Nepal published a national NAF, based on the IASC-endorsed global template, to serve as an analytical basis for the HAP. The NAF was updated at the end of 2009 to inform the 2010 Humanitarian Transition Appeal. A revised NAF will be published in 2010.

The NAF provides information and data on various sectors of humanitarian action, as well as important background information on disaster risk, governance, and the economic and environmental contexts. The NAF focuses humanitarian action on marginalized and vulnerable communities based on systematic needs and vulnerability assessments at the local level. It also identifies areas where appropriate action is needed to focus on transferring skills and capacity to local partners and development actors to address long-term issues effectively and comprehensively.
facilities. Organizations working in the field struggled to find enough staff and resources.

Responding to changes in the situation, OCHA supported the HCT in compiling a summary of emergency priorities in Sri Lanka, highlighting the most urgent needs for IDPs and identifying projects totaling $52 million. OCHA helped elaborate a revised CHAP, which included projects to assist up to 100,000 people in support of Government plans to return the majority of IDPs to their places of origin before the end of the year.

Faced with a number of protection and access challenges, analysis and advocacy were central to OCHA’s efforts, including strengthening links between field operations, national level policies and international standards. High-level engagement and advocacy, including four visits from the ERC, maintained a focus on key humanitarian principles, particularly obligations to protect civilians under international humanitarian law.

In 2009, under the RC/HC’s leadership, OCHA supported inter-agency coordination at district and country levels through its country office in Colombo and four sub-offices in Vavuniya, Jaffna, Batticaloa and Trincomalee. The Vavuniya office was reinforced to support ongoing relief and protection needs in the north, while the offices in the east continued to monitor residual humanitarian needs and support the transition from humanitarian coordination to recovery and development structures.

OCHA facilitated contingency planning exercises, first focusing on security and displacement scenarios and then on preparations to mitigate vulnerabilities associated with the monsoon season for the displacement camps. OCHA also participated in a number of missions and led inter-agency assessments, first in the conflict areas to assess priority needs and later, as returns got underway, assessments to inform and support the return process.

OCHA continued to coordinate and support linkages between the Government and the humanitarian community. An OCHA-seconded Liaison Assistant provided direct support to the Minister of Disaster Management and Human Rights, while information capacity in the Ministry’s Disaster Management Center was strengthened through expertise, training and staffing resources to support mapping, reporting and assessments needs.

OCHA’s IMU generated a variety of products, including briefing packs, situation reports, mapping services, weekly reports, databases and contact directories. Work also continued on core OCHA tools including the 3Ws, the assessment database, meeting schedules, contacts directories and the humanitarian portal (www.hpsl.lk). As the focus on return and resettlement increased, the IMU, together with UNDP Mine Action, supported mapping the progress of planned resettlement and mine clearance. Collaboration with the Government’s Survey Department and the Urban Development Authority was also reinforced, and joint work was undertaken to review district and division level data.

Throughout 2009, OCHA supported the RC/HC in his overall coordination and advocacy role. Direct support was provided through an OCHA-funded spokesperson, who developed messages and strategies to ensure a common voice on key issues and challenges faced by conflict-affected and vulnerable people. As the cluster approach was established, OCHA worked closely with cluster leads to strengthen capacities, improve information sharing, plan and report. The clusters were crucial in supporting policy and operational decision-making, joint needs assessments, identifying gaps in assistance and funding priorities.

Strengthening UN/NGO partnerships was difficult due to evolving centralized Government decision-making policies. A stronger humanitarian response and effective transition to recovery will partly depend on maintaining an open dialogue with the Government and ensuring effective linkages and coordination structures.

In 2009, OCHA promoted the Inter-Agency Guidelines on Gender in Emergencies and Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Settings. A GenCap Advisor undertook several missions to visit IDPs in camps in the north, advised on collection and analysis of sex- and age-disaggregated information, and provided a detailed review of the CHAP planning process and advised on gendered aspects of the response. The GenCap Advisor also supported preparation of the OCHA Sri Lanka Gender Action Plan.

Operations in Sri Lanka are increasingly set to be refocused on early recovery and longer-term development initiatives. OCHA played a central role in this transition by emphasizing support for the return and reintegration of IDPs, while ensuring continued assistance to those still in camps in the north. OCHA’s Batticaloa office closed in June, with staff and assets transitioning to support the UNDP Early Recovery Coordinator’s office in the east. The Trincomalee office closed at the end of 2009, with staff reassigned to support operations in the northern districts.
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Country Offices: Latin America and the Caribbean

Colombia
Haiti
Colombia

Highlights

- Strong advocacy in partnership with the HC for the respect of humanitarian principles and engagement with the Government on access and civil-military cooperation.
- Increased international attention to and understanding of the conditions faced by Colombians exposed to conflict and natural disasters.
- Emergence as critical humanitarian information provider, producing in-depth analysis of key issues through its website and other services.

ochaonline.un.org/colombia

With continued fighting between the National Liberation Army (ELN) and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) in 2009, Colombia still faced huge humanitarian problems. Official figures indicated that 7 per cent of the population was displaced within the country. 2009 also saw several incidents of flooding and landslides. Among the worst affected regions was the Pacific Coast, where violence and disasters have had a devastating impact on communities already facing serious long-term poverty.

OCHA and its partners encountered serious difficulties in gaining access to the most vulnerable sections of the population (notably Afro-descendants and indigenous peoples), particularly in priority areas, including the Pacific Coast and the south-east, where there have been high levels of displacement. The large numbers of IDPs and their rapid, uncontrolled movement to new areas frequently overstretched local authorities’ capacity. These problems highlighted the need for a stronger humanitarian presence at field level, particularly for needs analysis. But security and logistical complications made this difficult.

Against this background and working with a limited humanitarian presence, OCHA still oversaw some important improvements in coordination in 2009. OCHA and the humanitarian community remained committed to humanitarian reform and its emphasis on greater predictability, leadership, accountability and partnership.

The overall humanitarian coordination architecture is well implanted in Colombia. The IASC CT discussed and acted on key issues during 2009, which account for its consolidation. Concerns included the impact of the government’s civil-military “territorial consolidation” strategy on civilians as well as on humanitarian workers. The IASC assessed specific cases, mainly reported by the NGOs, on how such strategy affects their work on the ground. The HC established a specific dialogue mechanism at the highest level with the Government to reaffirm humanitarian principles as well as to offer authorities practical examples on how civil-military operations take place in other countries. OCHA organized two workshops supported by OCHA-CMCS Geneva, one of them open to government and civil society actors.

The IASC CT’s work was based on an annual work plan that laid out priorities and goals, whose progress was reviewed during the regular meetings. This work plan included the strengthening of sub-national coordination mechanisms, a stronger emphasis on protection of civilians, international presence on the ground in areas with insufficient coverage, humanitarian financing and greater advocacy.

Under the HC’s guidance, OCHA Colombia advocated the observance of humanitarian principles and full application of the Colombian legal framework on internal displacement. With OCHA’s support, the HC engaged the Government in dialogue on a number of sensitive issues, including civil-military coordination and the protection of humanitarian space. These issues were also raised during the visit of the ERC in February.

The HC and OCHA organized a humanitarian retreat in February to discuss the implementation of humanitarian reform and outline priorities for the year. A paper was produced on impact criteria and indicators to better measure progress.

In the absence of a CAP, funding opportunities from the CERF Rapid Response Window remained crucial. A total of $5 million was also made available from the Under-Funded Emergencies Window to address protection and assistance needs along the Pacific Coast. OCHA managed an ERF under the HC’s supervision. Delegates from the thematic groups made up a review board that approved projects submitted to the fund.

OCHA Colombia is now the main in-country humanitarian information provider, ensuring an effective distribution of humanitarian products. Its online information database has more than 1,000 registered users, including the Colombian Government, universities and national NGOs.

OCHA Colombia worked with UNFPA, UNIFEM and UNHCR to promote the mainstreaming of a Gender Action Plan. The plan focused on stronger advocacy for the rights of women, girls, boys and men, including protection from gender-based violence. It also emphasized the increased use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and gender analysis in needs assessments and information products, and better internal mechanisms and capacity for gender equality programming. OCHA supported a comprehensive study of gender-based violence in Nariño department, highlighting key issues and strengthening response mechanisms at local level.
linkages between the Government and the humanitarian community, bringing parallel structures closer together, avoiding duplication and strengthening information sharing. Deficiencies in these areas had previously handicapped coordination. OCHA also looked to build a stronger presence in the country’s interior. The deployment of six focal points at regional level, representing the HC outside Port-au-Prince, was part of this move towards a more decentralized approach to coordination and preparedness.

OCHA Haiti strengthened its provision of information products, setting up a more effective information service. Crucial information and data collection was carried out by the newly recruited OCHA humanitarian affairs officers, who conducted field missions to Artibonite, Grande Anse, Nippes and other areas to evaluate humanitarian needs.

OCHA provided constant support to the 11 clusters in place in Haiti, encouraging greater inter-cluster interaction, participating in meetings and providing relevant guidance when necessary. Meeting schedules were shared with the entire humanitarian community each week. Clusters were heavily involved in decision-making processes, notably in allocating CERF grants and in contingency planning.

OCHA encouraged each cluster to designate a co-facilitator from the NGO community to ensure business continuity during the absence of the cluster lead and the full consultation of all partners. OCHA organized IASC meetings chaired by the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/HC. These monthly meetings enabled information sharing between the UNCT and NGO representatives. OCHA was also in the process of facilitating a CERF allocation for the underfunded window to overcome gaps in humanitarian response and early recovery. OCHA managed an ERRF to support NGO partners and strengthen coordination.

Gender issues were factored into disaster preparedness strategies, which took account of women’s humanitarian response needs. Data collected during field assessment missions were disaggregated by sex and age in order to facilitate and ensure a targeted response process.

A crucial early priority for OCHA was addressing the disastrous legacy of the 2008 storms and hurricanes. They killed nearly 800 people, affected more than 800,000 others and paralysed rice production. An inter-agency contingency plan was drawn up and made public in August, amid concerns about the continuing threat from hurricanes.

The plan detailed potential assistance to an estimated 150,000 families across Haiti. Inter-agency clusters were set up to handle food aid, agriculture, education, nutrition and other issues in the wake of any disaster. Large stockpiles of food were pre-positioned and all-terrain vehicles made available, with helicopters on standby. The plan allocated roles and responsibilities to individual clusters in areas such as shelter, health, education, water and sanitation, and protection. OCHA also established an operational arrangement with MINUSTAH on its role during an emergency situation, with MINUSTAH ready to support the UNCT, notably on communications and cooperation with the military. These arrangements were in the process of being fine-tuned when the earthquake struck in January 2010.

In the broader context, OCHA looked to create more rational and effective coordinating mechanisms, improving
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Performance Evaluation: Regional and Country Offices

These tables are a consolidated list of indicators for all regional and country offices reflecting progress against the OCHA Strategic Framework 2007-2009. They include a measurement of performance (output and indicator) and their corresponding achievement.

Regional Offices

### Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms and their complementarities improved among OCHA and partner agencies’ staff.

**Indicators**
- A total of 130 OCHA and partner agencies’ staff trained on CERF, Flash Appeals and CAP.
- Six briefings on the use of humanitarian financing mechanisms provided to donors and the media.

**Achieved**
- A total of 130 staff trained on CERF, Flash Appeals and CAP. Six briefings held for donors and the media.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Improved understanding and partnership on the cluster approach between humanitarian partners and Government counterparts.
- Strengthened regional coordination mechanisms, which reflect principles of humanitarian reform.
- Cluster and sector coordinators appointed for each area of response at regional and country level, each with ToR based on the IASC generic ToR for cluster or sector leads.

**Indicators**
- Five joint workshops with humanitarian partners and Government counterparts on the cluster approach.
- All cluster and sector coordinators use IASC generic ToR for cluster or sector leads.

**Achieved**
- Five workshops on the cluster approach facilitated in the region.
- All regional cluster lead agencies using IASC generic ToR.

#### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

**Outputs**
- Enhanced surge capacity in the region.
- Efficient routines for deployment in place.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of OCHA staff in the regional office trained for surge and available for deployment.
- Eighty per cent of requests for deployment of ROAP emergency capacity realized within 72 hours.

**Achieved**
- Eighty per cent of staff (19/23) trained for surge and available for deployment.
- One hundred per cent of requests for ROAP emergency capacity realized within 72 hours (or as needed).

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Improved preparedness in OCHA GFM countries.
- Advocacy for the establishment of HCTs.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of OCHA GFM countries have updated contingency plans based on revised inter-agency contingency planning guidelines.
- Four quarterly updates to the ROAP preparedness matrix over the course of the year.

**Achieved**
- Seventy per cent (9/13 countries) of countries in ROAP region have updated contingency plans: Myanmar, Nepal, Bangladesh, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Timor-Leste, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Solomon Islands, Indonesia and Cambodia.
- Initial version of preparedness matrix prepared, but since superseded by more in-depth indicators.
### 2.1 Action-Oriented Analysis of Humanitarian Trends and Emerging Policy Issues

**Output**
- Monitoring and analysis of humanitarian conditions and ongoing operations in focus countries are strengthened, giving timely advice to OCHA senior staff on a regular basis.

**Indicator**
- All ongoing medium- and large-scale emergencies in countries with no OCHA office are reported on through situation reports and briefings.

**Achieved**
- Nine out of nine medium- and large-scale emergencies in countries with no OCHA office covered by reporting and/or briefings. Focus countries: Pakistan (until mid-2009), Bangladesh, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, the Philippines, Cambodia, Bhutan, Solomon Islands. Others: Samoa, Tonga and Marshall Islands.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- OCHA Field Management Strategy and minimum level of data preparedness fully implemented.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of OCHA GFM priority countries in which HCTs have been trained on emergency information management and data preparedness.
- Sixty per cent of OCHA GFM priority countries with minimum baseline data documented.

**Achieved**
- Ninety-two per cent (12/13 countries) have had a data preparedness mission, including a Country Team briefing.
- Seventy-seven per cent (10/13 countries) with baseline data compiled and uploaded into geodatabases.

### Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms and their complementarity.

**Indicators**
- Training given to 150 partners on humanitarian financing mechanisms.
- Fifteen briefings on the use of humanitarian financing mechanisms provided to donors, the media and others.

**Achieved**
- More than 300 partners trained on CERF and Flash Appeal.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Improved understanding of the cluster approach among humanitarian partners.

**Indicator**
- At least eight joint workshops or meetings with humanitarian partners and Government counterparts on the cluster approach to take place.

**Achieved**
- More than eight events covering humanitarian reform issues were carried out. They included clusters, financial mechanisms and partnerships.

#### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

**Output**
- OCHA staff trained in surge capacity and available for deployment in emergency response.

**Indicator**
- Eighty per cent of staff in the Regional Office trained for surge and available for deployment.

**Achieved**
- Eighty-two per cent of ROLAC staff members trained in respective working areas and deployable to any emergency in the region to support administration, IM, humanitarian coordination and financial mechanisms.
## 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Improved preparedness in GFM countries.

**Indicator**
- Six GFM countries have updated Contingency Plan including DRR approaches.

**Achieved**
- Seven countries updated their Contingency Plan and incorporated DRR approaches.

## 2.1 Action-Oriented Analysis of Humanitarian Trends and Emerging Policy Issues

**Output**
- Network for information gathering and dissemination established.

**Indicator**
- Fifteen per cent of increase of documents received from partners and posted on Redhum.

**Achieved**
- Numbers of visitors to Redhum and page loads increased by more than 56 per cent compared to the same period in 2008.

## 2.5 Protection Advanced At Global, Regional And National Levels

**Output**
- Protection at the regional and national level incorporated into inter-agency preparedness plans.

**Indicators**
- Three revised inter-agency preparedness plans include protection issues.

**Achieved**
- Two regional workshops on protection held, with strong participation of regional institutions, such as CEPREDENAC, ensuring that all six Central American countries incorporated protection into their inter-agency preparedness plans.

## Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia (ROMENACA)

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Enhanced understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms and their complementarities among partners, donors and the media.

**Indicators**
- HCTs, partners, donors and media staff trained on CERF, Flash Appeals, CAP and other humanitarian financing tools.
- Quarterly briefings on the use of humanitarian financing mechanisms provided to donors, the media and others.
- One hundred per cent of humanitarian funding requests supported by evidence and assessment.

**Achieved**
- One CERF regional training implemented.
- Four quarterly briefings provided to donors, media and others.
- FTS analysis of the assistance provided by the region indicate an increasing trend of multilateral funding over bilateral funding.

### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Improved understanding of the cluster approach by humanitarian partners and Government counterparts.
- Cluster or sector coordinators appointed for each area of response in countries facing emergencies, each with a ToR based on IASC guidance.

**Indicator**
- Three capacity-building trainings and workshops organized for regional entities.

**Achieved**
- One regional training and one in-country training held.
### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

**Output**
- Emergency response provided by trained staff.

**Indicator**
- Eighty per cent of requests for deployment of ROMENACA emergency response capacity realized within 72 hours.

**Achieved**
- One hundred per cent of requests for deployment of ROMENACA emergency response capacity realized within 72 hours.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Engagement of actors in the region with international response systems.
- Preparedness and contingency plans to respond to newly emerging and deteriorating crises or emergencies.

**Indicators**
- At least two new active regional UNDAC and INSARAG memberships.

**Achieved**
- Three new regional UNDAC members, one country assumed the INSARAG Chair and two countries on the verge of joining INSARAG.

### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Strengthened public information, advocacy and information management in emergency preparedness.

**Indicators**
- Number of interviews and articles on humanitarian issues published in local and regional press.

**Achieved**
- Three broadcast interviews with the RO HoO in Arabic; 21 press releases quoted in the local press in Arabic and Russian; 12 monthly Humanitarian Updates issued; One article produced for Ministry of Emergency magazine; Three new PI products informing about OCHA mandate and activities developed in Russian.

### Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa (ROCEA)

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Improved coordination for regional preparedness strategies.

**Indicator**
- Quarterly emergency preparedness and policy outlook reports on trends and preparedness measures produced.

**Achieved**
- Three Horn of Africa crisis updates produced, one El Nino Preparedness update and one ROC – DRC refugee crisis update; Three IASC Early Warning – Early Action inputs.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Preparedness activities implemented in the priority global focus model countries in the region.

**Indicator**
- Support the updating of inter-agency Contingency Plans in 12 OCHA focus countries, in cooperation with UN partners.

**Achieved**
- Mission support given to 9 countries; Support for AU Pan African conference on Avian and Human Influenza in Addis Ababa. Remote support to Somalia and Eritrea.
### 2.1 Action-Oriented Analysis of Humanitarian Trends and Emerging Policy Issues

**Output**
- Better understanding of humanitarian policy needs and information gaps.

**Indicator**
- Quarterly analytical reports on humanitarian issues produced in partnership with field offices, regional partners and governments

**Achieved**
- Six Pastoralist Voices bulletins; two funding updates; three displaced population reports; one Horn of Africa background paper for RDT meeting.

### 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- Revised prototype and understanding of the multi-sectoral tool to consolidate core humanitarian information

**Indicator**
- Multi-sectoral tool piloted in three countries

**Achieved**
- Second revised prototype developed with supporting documentation; field testing in Kenya and Somalia completed.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Regional Data Preparedness strategy developed and implemented

**Indicator**
- Fourteen of 18 countries in the region have updated standard minimum datasets

**Achieved**
- Regional Data Preparedness strategy in place for countries in CEA and regularly updated for 18 countries with the minimum common operational geospatial datasets; Hazard Atlas map catalogue developed for Africa.

### Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSA)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms and their complementarities.
- More needs prioritized and coordinated CERF application.

**Indicator**
- Seventy-five per cent of CERF applications that met standard criteria.

**Achieved**
- All CERF applications were reviewed and met the CERF criteria for funding (Mozambique and Swaziland).

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Cluster or sector coordinators appointed for each area of response with well-defined ToRs.

**Indicator**
- Fifty per cent of sectors using IASC generic ToRs for cluster and sector leads in contingency planning.

**Achieved**
- All the contingency plans in SADC were reviewed and updated using IASC guidelines.
1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

Output
- Emergency surge response provided by trained staff.

Indicators
- All professional staff in the Regional Office trained for surge and available for deployment.
- Seventy-five per cent of requests for surge deployment in the region are met.

Achieved
- All four incoming professional staff trained for surge capacity.
- All requests for surge deployment were responded to (Madagascar, Mozambique, Angola, Namibia and RSA).

1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

Outputs
- Preparedness in OCHA GFM countries improved.
- Strengthened early action and early warning action and analysis of risk and hazards to human survival in southern Africa.
- Revitalized SADC disaster management team.

Indicators
- All OCHA GFM countries with updated natural disaster contingency and pandemic plans.
- Joint inter-agency RDT study on new humanitarian threats in southern Africa.
- Seventy-five per cent of GIS baseline datasets are consolidated and uploaded in the Geo-Network.
- SADC Disaster Management Team revitalized.

Achieved
- All 13 out of 14 countries in the southern Africa region have updated Contingency Plans. Remaining country, Botswana, is currently updating its Contingency Plan.
- Study on new humanitarian threats not achieved.
- 2008 SADC declaration of commitment was reviewed and the result indicated that most of the commitments made by SADC were achieved with exception to some key commitment such as staff required to implement the SADC Disaster Risk Reduction strategy, which is lagging behind.

Regional Office for West Africa (ROWA)

1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

Outputs
- Technical support to HCTs for establishing and strengthening coordination mechanisms provided, especially in countries with no OCHA presence.
- Efficient facilitation and organization of regional thematic working groups ensured.

Indicator
- Nine functioning regional working groups.
- All requests met for assistance from RCs, HCs and HCTs.

Achieved
- All requests were met.
- Eight out of nine thematic working groups are fully functioning.

1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

Output
- Procedure for deployment of ROWA emergency response and surge capacity strengthened.

Indicator
- All requests for deployment of ROWA emergency response capacity met within 72 hours.

Achieved
- ROWA responded to 100 per cent of requests for deployment of ROWA emergency response capacity.
### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**

- Inter-agency contingency plans in place for OCHA GFM focus countries.

**Indicator**

- The regional Disaster Management Strategy is finalized and implemented by December 2009.

**Achieved**

- Regional Disaster Management Strategy has been finalized and implemented.

### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**

- Increased awareness of governments, partners, the media and non-traditional humanitarian actors on the complexities of providing protection to people displaced by climate change in the sub-region.

**Indicator**

- Regional conference on climate change and protection of human rights jointly organized with OHCHR by mid-2009.

**Achieved**

- ROWA organized regional conference on climate change and protection of human rights with OHCHR in September 2009.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**

- OCHA Field Information Management Strategy fully implemented.
- Regional information network developed on issues that may lead to significant humanitarian consequences.

**Indicators**

- All OCHA information management tools implemented.
- Weekly and monthly bulletins on hydrological situation, locust invasion and food price variations shared with the regional humanitarian network.

**Achieved**

- FIDMs and OCHA website are regularly updated. The 3W database and Geo-Network not updated due to staffing limitations.
- All bulletins were shared.

---

### African Union Liaison Office (AULO)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**

- AU has improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms.

**Indicator**

- Six presentations conducted to brief relevant staff from the AU, sub-regional organizations and partners on humanitarian financing system.

**Achieved**

- Seventy-five per cent of partners, including the AU, sensitized on humanitarian financing through OCHA presentations; AU contributed through CERF to the appeal for flood victims in Burkina Faso.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**

- AU preparedness planning capacity in support of its Member States and relevant partners improved.

**Indicator**

- Six trainings, presentations and workshops on the revised inter-agency contingency planning guidelines conducted for African Union staff and partner organizations.

**Achieved**

- OCHA presentations to AU and RECs-convened training exercises included elements of disaster risk reduction approaches and preparedness in humanitarian response. The Office represented ISDR in high-level AU and Economic Commission for Africa meetings.
### 2.1 Action-Oriented Analysis of Humanitarian Trends and Emerging Policy Issues

**Output**
- Improved awareness within the AU of key humanitarian challenges, issues and trends in Africa.

**Indicator**
- Number of analytical papers, briefings and reports produced by OCHA Headquarters and offices regularly shared with the African Union Commission.

**Achieved**
- Ninety per cent of all summits of AU Heads of States have been briefed on the humanitarian situation on the continent, using mainly reports sourced from OCHA offices and Headquarters.

### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**
- Reinforced links between the AU and humanitarian organizations to help mitigate human rights and humanitarian law violations and promote POC in conflict areas.

**Indicator**
- Number of AU statements and AU peacekeeping missions’ activities highlighting POC-related issues.

**Achieved**
- AUC Chairperson has issued statements highlighting POC on the situations in Darfur, Southern Sudan and DRC among others; African Standby Force has integrated protection guidelines through the OCHA AULO into its concept development and planning processes.

### Country Offices: Africa

#### Central African Republic (CAR)

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Improved understanding of different humanitarian financing mechanisms.
- Fully functional CHF, with CAP projects financed through standard allocations and response to breaking emergencies financed by the emergency reserve.

**Indicators**
- Forty organizations trained on CHF, PBF, CERF and other aspects of humanitarian financing.
- One hundred per cent disbursement rate of donors’ contributions.

**Achieved**
- Thirty-five organizations trained on CHF, five trained on CERF; Seventy per cent of the organizations participating in CHF allocations trained on HACT process.
- All contributions from donors received. Two standards allocation carried out, with 60 projects approved. All clusters involved in the full CHF process.

### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Improved understanding of the cluster approach by humanitarian partners and Government counterparts.
- Cluster/sector coordinators appointed for each area of response, each with a ToR based on the IASC generic ToR for sector/cluster leads. Co-lead roles established.

**Indicators**
- At least one joint workshop or meeting to be held with humanitarian partners and Government counterparts on the cluster approach.
- One hundred per cent of sectors using IASC generic ToRs for sector/cluster leads and with active recognized co-lead in place.

**Achieved**
- Seven out of nine clusters have held individual workshops involving partners and Government counterparts.
- One hundred per cent of clusters have their ToR for cluster leads and NGO co-leads; HCT based on IASC principles established and endorsed by the HC.
## 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

### Outputs
- Advocacy, training and awareness raising by Protection Cluster, targeting Government and non-State armed groups.
- Awareness of scale of internal displacement problem raised in CAR and internationally.

### Indicators
- CAR IDP advocacy campaign implemented.
- Twelve protection, advocacy, training and awareness-raising activities.

### Achieved
- Support to UN SRSG for IDP rights visit to CAR in February to advocate IDP rights with Government and armed groups.
- Two training sessions in Bangui and Paoua for armed forces and non-State actors (35 participants in total).
- One cluster workshop, with Government participation, to develop new protection strategies in June 2009; support for ASG/DERC mission raising IDP rights with Government and increased international awareness of CAR crisis.

## 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

### Outputs
- OCHA Field Information Management Strategy fully implemented.
- Generic and specific information products available to facilitate humanitarian action.

### Indicators
- One hundred per cent of standardized OCHA IM tools fully implemented as per FIM Implementation Proxy Indicators (FiDMS, GeoNetwork, 3W).
- Ten information products generated and updated.

### Achieved
- All IM tools have been implemented using solutions adapted to CAR context (intranet, document sharing, development assistance database).
- Thirteen products that are produced or regularly updated, plus 20 mission reports to date.

## Chad

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

### Outputs
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms, including CAP and MYR, with full involvement of humanitarian partners. CERF grants (RR and UF) utilized for Chad if and when appropriate.

### Indicators
- Grants received for CERF rapid response and underfunded projects
- Two-day MYR workshop held, with full attendance by partners.

### Achieved
- 100 per cent of grants received for rapid response and underfunded projects.
- MYR CAP 2009 and 2010 preparation workshops held.

### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

#### Output
- Strengthened OCHA presence in Koukou.

#### Indicator
- International and national humanitarian staff deployed to sub-offices.

#### Achieved
- Sub-office established in Koukou region with major IDP presence.
### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Preparedness planning improved for East and South Chad in cooperation with aid partners and Government counterparts.
- Improved capacity of the Government and humanitarian actors to respond to natural disasters.

**Indicators**
- Number of contingency plans reviewed or drafted.
- Disaster management team in place including United Nations, RC movement, NGO and relevant ministries/local authorities.

**Achieved**
- Eighty per cent at the end of the year; revision process postponed until end of March 2010.
- Twenty per cent with preliminary steps engaged.

### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Outputs**
- Support to functional Early Recovery Cluster that is addressing transition issues in the east of Chad. Implementation of the strategic framework for sustainable returns.

**Indicator**
- Number of beneficiaries of early recovery projects and involvement of key partners.

**Achieved**
- Thirty per cent achieved: 15 actors are involved in the Early Recovery Cluster; Recovery activities not yet fully started because of the volatility of security context.

### Côte d’Ivoire (CDI)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Humanitarian financing system effectively supported and implemented.
- Humanitarian project proposals prepared and submitted through IAHCC and approved by the HC.

**Indicators**
- The CDI CAP/CHAP 2009 finalized and revised according to schedule and guidelines. Target: 100 per cent.
- Two OCHA staff members are trained on reporting in support to the CERF process.

**Achieved**
- A total of 75 per cent (CHN was only issued in February 2009).
- One staff member was trained on CERF reporting.

#### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Outputs**
- Reinforced joint coordination mechanisms with BCPR in line with the 2009-2013 UNDAF at local and national levels.
- Monitor the humanitarian and early recovery programmes.
- Strengthened humanitarian coordination mechanisms and improved dialogue between key stakeholders.

**Indicators**
- Two joint offices are operational in Korhogo and Guiglo.
- Two inter-agency coordination meetings are held each month to ensure remaining humanitarian needs are incorporated into early recovery and development programmes.

**Achieved**
- The two joint offices are operational and coordination is integrated.
- Fifteen IAHCC meetings have taken place (periodicity became monthly as of July).
### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**
- Reinforced protection and social cohesion activities through coordination, information analysis, advocacy and training tools.

**Indicators**
- Four sub-offices where protection and social cohesion working groups are established and functional.
- Percentage of protection and social cohesion issues brought to the IAHCC’s attention. Number of solutions identified and implemented.

**Achieved**
- Three regional protection sector groups are operational in Guiglo/Man, Korhogo and Bouake. Eight per cent of IAHCC meetings integrated social cohesion and protection issues on the agenda.
- Two sets of inputs were sent to the informal Protection Expert Group, which led to the Security Council’s increased protection focus for the renewal of ONUCI’s mandate; Three serious inter-community conflict situations in the West have received inter-agency intervention led by OCHA.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**
- Updated information management tools in accordance with best practices shared with all partners.
- Field information management strategies fully adapted to the transition period and progressively handed over to early recovery actors, including UNDP and supported State-run structures.

**Indicators**
- The Reporting and Information Management Working Group is revived and meets on a monthly basis (12 meetings).
- Three workshops on information collection, database and mapping of humanitarian and early recovery activities are organized for users and programme managers.
- One blog on transition activities is developed and progressively handed over to the early recovery and development actors.

**Achieved**
- Reporting and Information Management Group not revived; A concept paper on health, education and citizenship registration initiated by World Bank and supported by OCHA, with mapping of health centres, schools, tribunals and courts, along with related database.
- One workshop organized in November with 10 attendees including information and GIS managers (INS and DIPES).
- Blog was not developed.

### Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Increased use of the HAP as a tool for prioritizing CHF and CERF allocations, and strengthening of mechanisms to support financial and impact reporting, monitoring, evaluation and needs assessments.

**Indicators**
- Seventy per cent of CHF, CERF and bilaterally funded activities have been formally endorsed by clusters and are established target priorities in the HAP.
- Eighty per cent of agencies receiving CHF and CERF funding provide timely monitoring and evaluation reports to the HC and OCHA.

**Achieved**
- Increased use of the HAP as a tool to prioritize CHF and CERF allocations and strengthen mechanisms to support financial and impact reporting, monitoring, evaluation and needs assessments.
- All allocations made according to HAP priorities, but only 60 per cent of the organizations receiving CHF and CERF funding able to provide timely monitoring and evaluation reports to the HC and OCHA.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Cluster and inter-cluster coordination improved, particularly in areas where OCHA is not present.
- Communication and coordination links between national and provincial levels strengthened. However, for some clusters stronger leadership is still required, and the communication between the centre and provincial level needs to be reinforced.

**Indicator**
- Eight provinces with effective cluster and inter-cluster coordination.

**Achieved**
- Clusters established and inter-cluster coordination fully implemented in four provinces where OCHA has a sub-office. After proposals made to HC, humanitarian focal points were designated in four provinces where OCHA does not have a presence: Equateur, Kasai Oriental, Kasai Occidental and Maniema, enabling OCHA to reinforce monitoring of humanitarian issues, assessment of needs and coordination of the response.
### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Adequate treatment and working conditions for humanitarian organizations in accordance with national laws and international conventions.

**Indicator**
- Thirty per cent decrease in the number of administrative limitations, such as illegal taxing by local administrations that challenge access of humanitarian organizations.

**Achieved**
- A reduction of administrative limitations handicapped by continuing lack of adequate legal framework to regulate operations of non-profit organizations at provincial and national level. Relations with local government strengthened through the creation of permanent consultative frameworks such as the *cadres de concertations* to enhance regular exchange on humanitarian issues and operations, and the commission *mixte* to advance the adoption of the non-profit legal framework.

### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**
- Well-coordinated, effective and practical protection responses advocated and supported through the HC.

**Indicator**
- Eighty per cent of protection issues brought to the HC’s attention result in concrete actions.

**Achieved**
- All identified protection concerns have received OCHA attention and consequently OCHA intervened with relevant authorities (armed groups, governmental bodies) and partners.

### Eritrea

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms and their complementarity.

**Indicator**
- At least four partner staff trained on CERF and aspects of humanitarian financing, including reporting.

**Achieved**
- Three agency staff attended CERF training in Nairobi in 2009. Subsequently, more than 20 staff from various United Nations agencies were trained in Asmara before the second allocation of CERF UFE funds in 2009.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Improved understanding of the cluster approach by humanitarian partners and Government counterparts. Cluster or sector coordinators appointed for each area of response, each with ToR based on the IASC generic ToR for clusters or sector leads.

**Indicators**
- Two joint workshops or meetings with humanitarian partners and Government counterparts on the cluster approach.
- At least five clusters or sectors using IASC generic ToRs by mid-2009.

**Achieved**
- Only one workshop was held with the Health and Nutrition Working Group.
- All cluster leads are aware of the IASC generic ToR, but could not make use of them since all projects are implemented through Government structures.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Early revision of contingency plans based on the revised inter-agency planning guidelines.
- At least two trainings were held on disaster risk reduction/contingency planning.

**Indicators**
- Revision of inter-agency contingency plan is ongoing and expected to be finalized by end of July 2009.
- At least two trainings were held on disaster risk reduction/contingency planning.

**Achieved**
- Target not achieved due to lack of up-to-date data/baseline information.
- Not achieved due to absence of a Government-coordinating entity.
### 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- Improved cooperation between humanitarian partners and Government counterparts.

**Indicator**
- A joint strategy for addressing critical needs.

**Achieved**
- With the support of OCHA, the UNCT initiated a workplan/resource mobilization tool. However, it has not been shared with the Government, given its disavowal of “humanitarian” needs.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Information management strategy fully implemented.

**Indicator**
- All standardized OCHA information management tools implemented by the third quarter in 2009.

**Achieved**
- FiDMS, 3Ws, OCM and FileUpload have been implemented.

### Ethiopia

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Adequately funded and effectively functioning HRF with enhanced governance procedures.

**Indicator**
- Funding of at least $30 million secured.

**Achieved**
- Funding managed successfully: over $32 million received in 2009 in addition to the carry-over balance of $30 million from 2008. Over $39 million for 81 projects funded in 2009 (of which 71 per cent were NGOs and 29 per cent United Nations agencies).

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Strengthened coordination structures at the federal and regional level, including a more focused and strategic HCT.
- Stronger cluster support to the sectoral task forces.
- National coordination structures replicated and supported at the regional level.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of all action points emerging from the monthly HCT meetings implemented.
- All affected regions with functional coordination forums.

**Achieved**
- One hundred per cent of ad hoc emergencies were supported in 2009.
- HCT-revised ToR adopted.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Early warning indicators developed and used to prepare emergency response.
- Risk mapping and standard operating procedures developed and implemented.
- Contingency plans prepared for risk-prone areas.

**Indicators**
- Seventy-five per cent of early warning indicators used by clusters.
- Seventy-five per cent of disaster-prone areas have been mapped and contingency plans have been prepared.

**Achieved**
- Strengthened cluster support to regional early warning systems.
- Contingency plans in place for flood-prone areas of Somali and Gambella regions.
### Guinea

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing and the role of complementary organizations through the implementation and appropriate management of various humanitarian financing mechanisms.

**Indicator**
- Ninety per cent of partner staff trained on CERF and other aspects of humanitarian financing.

**Achieved**
- Seventy per cent of partner staff trained on CERF.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Cluster or sector coordination leads appointed for each area of response, each with ToR based on the IASC generic ToR for cluster or sector lead.

**Indicator**
- Seventy per cent of the sectors using IASC generic ToRs by the end of the year.

**Achieved**
- Seventy per cent of clusters using IASC generic ToRs by the end of the year.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- All preparedness activities by United Nations agencies, NGOs and the Government carried out and incorporated in humanitarian contingency plan, based on the revised inter-agency planning guidelines.

**Indicator**
- Contingency plans are developed based on sound multi-hazard risk analysis, incorporating prevention and early recovery aspects and reviewed semi-annually.

**Achieved**
- IASC and Government contingency plans developed and updated; Four disaster preparedness workshops organized in Conakry and in the field; 200 humanitarian partners trained in disaster preparedness; Working group set up to reinforce national capacities in humanitarian coordination and disaster management.

#### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**
- Advocacy strategy developed to increase awareness of humanitarian principles in accordance with OCHA’s advocacy policy instruction and guidelines.

**Indicator**
- HC endorsed country-level action plan on common messaging for 2009.

**Achieved**
- Not achieved, though Protection Cluster was strengthened at the end of the year.

### Kenya

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Opportunities for flexible humanitarian financing are available to the Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team (KHPT).

**Indicator**
- Kenya ERF is operational by mid-2009 and 80 per cent of funds raised are transformed into implemented projects.

**Achieved**
- ERF established in June 2009. In 2009, 66 per cent of funds received were disbursed.
### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- OCHA plays leading role in humanitarian response and disaster risk management.
- Coordination structures at national and sub-national levels are strengthened.

**Indicator**
- All KHPT recommendations and action points implemented in relation to coordination.

**Achieved**
- All recommendations followed up and implemented. IASC was reviewed and re-organized for greater NGO participation. Support was given to the establishment and coordination functions of the national Crisis Response Centre.

### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

**Outputs**
- Responses to humanitarian emergencies are better coordinated, with minimized sector gaps.
- Greater harmonization of humanitarian information and guidance among partners.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of humanitarian emergencies managed with KHPT support.
- Number of situation reports and analytical reports on emerging crises.

**Achieved**
- All humanitarian emergencies managed with KHPT support.
- A total of 163 maps, 34 sit reps and analytical reports produced.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Strengthened preparedness and response capacities and mechanisms within the Government and for national partners, with a focus on rapid-onset emergencies including conflicts and floods.
- Actionable inter-agency preparedness and response plans for humanitarian response and disaster management development.

**Indicators**
- At least 10 districts have disaster preparedness and response plans.
- Multi-hazard inter-agency contingency plans in place for major humanitarian hazards by mid-year.

**Achieved**
- National Disaster Response Plan in place; 10 districts have disaster preparedness and response plans; OCHA supported establishment and operation of the provincial platform on disaster risk reduction.
- Inter-agency contingency plans in place for flood response and urban violence, and under review for refugee inflows.

### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Key advocacy messages on priority thematic issues are communicated to Government decision makers, the public and the humanitarian community using all available media outlets, and through partnerships with civil society opinion leaders and other activists.

**Indicator**
- At least eight events or consultations facilitated on advocacy issues; At least two advocacy campaigns produced.

**Achieved**
- Campaigns underway on the impact of climate change on pastoralist communities and urban vulnerability; Initiatives taken to increase effective Government involvement and response in tackling chronic food insecurity.

### Niger

**1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System**

**Output**
- Humanitarian financing system effectively supported and implemented.

**Indicator**
- Percentage of CERF proposals submitted in a timely manner and in accordance with established criteria.

**Achieved**
- One hundred per cent (14 out of 14) of CERF proposals submitted and approved for $11.7 million.
## 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Strengthened clusters and cluster coordinators appointed for each area of response, each with well-defined ToR.

**Indicator**
- At least five clusters or sectors using IASC generic ToRs for cluster or sector leads.

**Achieved**
- Six clusters fully functioning and one partially operational.

## 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- National and regional risk reduction capacities promoted and supported.

**Indicators**
- Contingency plans based on sound, multi-hazard risk analysis developed, including prevention and recovery aspects and reviewed every six months.
- Emergency response plan exists for all regions.

**Achieved**
- CP developed for conflict. Subsequent multi-hazard CP under development within the IASC framework.
- Management of floods, disasters and response plans elaborated for Maradi, Tahoua, Dosso, Tillaberi and Zinder regions; Five regional teams trained on disaster preparedness and response.

## 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Outputs**
- Advocacy activities conducted through the media, leading to heightened awareness of humanitarian issues and resulting in adequate financial response.
- Advocacy activities conducted at field level to enlarge humanitarian space and access to beneficiaries.

**Indicator**
- Country-level action plan on common messaging for 2009 endorsed by HC by February 2009.

**Achieved**
- CAP 2009 launched and documents shared with the humanitarian community.

## 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Information management products, including regular bulletins, available providing critical analysis on needs or gaps.

**Indicator**
- Seventy-five per cent of surveyed humanitarian partners are satisfied with available information management tools for analysis.

**Achieved**
- No survey completed; 48 humanitarian bulletins produced and widely distributed; 15 analytical reports developed on Agadez floods; Humanitarian website established.

## Somalia

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Better understanding of complementary humanitarian financing mechanisms and their different operations leading to a well-managed and well-funded 2009 CAP.
- Increased HRF funding to local partners to assist communities not accessible by the United Nations and NGOs.

**Indicators**
- Sixty per cent of CAP funded.
- Eighty-five per cent of HRF funded projects for NGOs.

**Achieved**
- CAP was 64 per cent funded in 2009 and secured $542 million compared with $477 million in 2008.
- Ninety-two per cent of HRF-funded projects were for NGOs (48 per cent for international NGOs and 44 per cent for Somali NGOs).
## 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Regular HCT, inter-cluster and donors meetings held. Decisions made and implemented.
- Cluster system functions with field-level focal points.

**Indicators**
- Seventy-five per cent of decisions agreed by HCT implemented and followed up.
- Nine clusters with up-to-date information system and monitoring plans.

**Achieved**
- A review of HCT decisions was conducted from July to December 2009, during which 92 per cent (72 out of 78) of IASC action points were completed.
- All nine clusters have up-to-date information systems and monitoring plans.

## 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Outputs**
- Joint Operating Principles (JOP) are implemented in conjunction with an HCT advocacy strategy.
- Advocacy on protection is incorporated into OCHA materials and messaging.

**Indicators**
- HCT members implement three major components of the JOP.
- Advocacy strategy for JOP developed and implemented by end of 2009.

**Achieved**
- IASC Advisory Note on Ground Rules for Negotiation approved in April 2009, and an Inter-Agency Protocol document and Code of Conduct on PSEA were signed by the UNCT.
- JOP not approved, but IASC transferred much of content to other policy papers including the Advisory Note on Ground Rules.

## 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- Joint humanitarian inter-agency needs assessment mechanisms at field level strengthened.

**Indicator**
- Standard, integrated reporting and monitoring framework developed by June as part of the CAP to assess overall humanitarian outcomes at the sector/cluster level.

**Achieved**
- Three quarterly inter-cluster reports produced against CAP activities; Monitoring consultant recruited; HRF monitoring strategy developed and being implemented.

## 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**
- Common inter-cluster information tools developed.
- Maps provided regularly for planning purposes.

**Indicators**
- Seventy-five per cent of standardized OCHA information management tools fully implemented by end of 2009.
- Ten new inter-cluster maps developed in 2009.

**Achieved**
- Eighty per cent of standardized OCHA information management tools fully implemented, including new summarized 3W product by cluster and region.
- Eleven new inter-cluster maps developed in 2009, plus an additional 69 general maps; OCHA Somalia website recorded a major increase of hits on maps in 2009.
### Sudan

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- CHF allocations undertaken in timely and strategic manner towards priority humanitarian activities.

**Indicator**
- The allocation process undertaken in accordance with policies, strategies and timelines, and agreed by the HCT.

**Achieved**
- Three standard allocation rounds and 11 proposals approved under the rapid response mechanism were completed in 2009, resulting in $110 million in allocations.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Well-functioning HCT and Inter-agency Management Group for Darfur (IAMG).
- Government, beneficiaries, humanitarian community, donors, United Nations agencies and UNAMID engaged with each other through formal committees, forums and bilateral relations.

**Indicator**
- Weekly meetings of the HCT in Khartoum and IAMG meetings in Darfur, in which strategic decisions are taken.

**Achieved**
- HCT was streamlined to senior-level participation and met on a weekly basis; IAMGs in Darfur transitioned to area HCTs, meeting on a weekly basis. Minutes produced and disseminated; policy recommendations are produced as required.

#### 1.3 Strengthened OCHA Emergency Response Capacity

**Output**
- A supported RCO to ensure immediate and coordinated humanitarian response to emergencies.

**Indicators**
- Fifty per cent of all emergencies responded to within five days.

**Achieved**
- Over fifty per cent of all emergencies responded to within five days through OCHA-led assessments and coordinated response.

#### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Outputs**
- Public relations products on humanitarian principles and issues including civil-military relations are produced, focusing on the consolidation of March 2007 Joint Communiqué and unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance in Darfur.
- Public events organized by OCHA on behalf of the HC and the HCT.

**Indicators**
- Weekly and monthly public relations products produced.
- Public events organized on a quarterly basis for the HC and HCT.

**Achieved**
- Monthly and quarterly updates produced on humanitarian issues.
- Regular civil-military information sessions held as part of UNMIS induction; Regular monthly Humanitarian Forum held; Exposure to national audience was limited, with intensified outreach efforts required.

#### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Information management practices, systems and tools are utilized to produce and disseminate standard products to the humanitarian community to aid coordination and decision-making.

**Indicator**
- IM products and tools are readily available to the humanitarian community.

**Achieved**
- Core map sets updated and new information products produced in line with OCHA standards; More than 40 maps produced and/or updated.
## Uganda

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- ERF established to fund activities related to immediate emergency response incorporating best practices.

**Indicator**
- A fund of $1 million established and ready for disbursement in first quarter of 2009.

**Achieved**
- ERF established, with 30 per cent funding realized. ERF Board and related processes in final stage of development.

### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Improved understanding of the cluster approach by humanitarian partners and Government counterparts, specific to the current transition environment.

**Indicator**
- At least one joint workshop or meeting in each sub-region conducted with humanitarian partners and Government counterparts on the cluster approach before end of the second quarter of 2009.

**Achieved**
- OCHA held meetings at sub-regional and national level collectively and with key cluster leads individually on transitioning humanitarian clusters into Government-led coordination mechanisms. Challenges identified and analysed and fed into revisions of Adaptation of Clusters policy and established improved strategy.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Strengthened sub-office capacity for disaster preparedness.

**Indicator**
- All OCHA sub-offices have performed an annual updating of contingency plans based on the IASC inter-agency contingency planning guidelines.

**Achieved**
- Disaster Preparedness Officer hired to coach and assist sub-offices with inter-agency contingency planning efforts that address district government-agreed hazards. While incomplete to date, outreach to the wider humanitarian community is ensuring better buy-in and relevance to resourced plans.

### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Output**
- Comprehensive workplans for transitioning from humanitarian assistance to recovery in place.

**Indicator**
- All sub-office and country-level workplans in place and reviewed with recovery or development actors for visibility.

**Achieved**
- Progressively reduced presence from three to one office in the Acholi sub-region in response to diminished humanitarian role and increased emphasis on recovery and development; Inter-agency cluster coordination meeting now co-chaired by OCHA and the RCO.

## Zimbabwe

### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Humanitarian finance monitoring and reporting system established.

**Indicators**
- Reporting on financing of humanitarian activities in Zimbabwe shared with humanitarian partners on quarterly basis.
- Humanitarian financing in the country linked to FTS, securing contributions from 70 per cent of key stakeholders.

**Achieved**
- Donors reporting to FTS, but limited reporting from NGOs despite awareness-raising sessions organized by OCHA during 2009.
- About one third of the humanitarian funding reported goes to projects outside the CAP.
1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

Output

- Effective and accountable cluster system achieved.

Indicator

- All eight clusters/sectors and the ICF actively supported by an OCHA focal point.

Achieved

- There are designated focal points for each of the eight clusters/sectors.

1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

Output

- Effective support in building overall national readiness, early warning and disaster response capacity.

Indicator

- Two inter-agency and rapid needs assessments conducted.

Achieved

- One joint United Nations/Government assessment on IDPs conducted; Three needs assessments with partners and Government conducted.

2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

Output

- Effective joint advocacy platform established by IASC Country Team and made operational.

Indicator

- Key, timely messages developed to support humanitarian access and response.

Achieved

- Seven key messages developed on protection, humanitarian access, food security and cholera response.

Country Offices: Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia

Iraq

1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

Output

- CAP, CERF and ERF resources adequately mobilized and transparently, efficiently and effectively utilized in humanitarian response.

Indicators

- Joint 2009 CAP prepared.
- All ERF projects processed within 21 days of receipt.

Achieved

- CAP for 2009 launched at the end of 2008 and MYR published in June 2009; Pillar 1 of CAP (inside Iraq) funded at 45 per cent of the MYR revised total requirements as of December 2009.
- Average time for processing ERF applications down to 22 days from average of 50 days in June 2008; One training workshop for more than 100 Iraqi NGOs on ERF project formulation and management, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting held.
### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Humanitarian coordination between HCT and Government strengthened and/or streamlined across Iraq with representation of all partners (donors, Iraqi authorities, United Nations agencies, NGOs and the Red Crescent and Red Cross Movement).
- Key regional NGOs programming in Iraq mapped.

**Indicators**
- Eighty per cent of sectors using IASC generic ToRs for sector lead.
- At least 25 per cent of Iraqi NGOs involved in strategic planning, response, coordination and needs assessment.
- Eighteen Iraq field coordination cells established and functioning (one in every governorate).
- NGO capacity gap analysis undertaken and training planned.

**Achieved**
- One hundred per cent of sectors followed principles of generic ToRs for cluster leads.
- Iraqi NGOs constitute 60 per cent of protection sub-SOT, 75 per cent of wat-san sub-SOT and 40 per cent of humanitarian working groups operational in Basra, Thi-Qar, Muthana and Maysan.
- Thirty-five Iraq field coordinators and information management officers have been recruited in all 18 governorates of Iraq (two per governorate except Basra).
- Mapping of 50 per cent of key Iraqi NGOs (over 200) was undertaken by the NGO Coordination Committee in Iraq in late 2009, in consultation with OCHA.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Partners’ capacity to plan for and respond to disasters strengthened. Updated contingency plans in place.

**Indicators**
- Number of workshops and follow-up programmes.
- Contingency plans in place and being maintained/updated.

**Achieved**
- One high-level disaster risk reduction workshop held with Iraqi Government ministers and officials in December 2009.

### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Coordinated and effective advocacy on humanitarian principles and issues of concern. Increased awareness of humanitarian principles, resulting in an increase in humanitarian access.

**Indicators**
- HC endorsed country-level action plan on common messaging for 2009.
- Iraqi media or institutions increased their coverage of violations of humanitarian principles and human rights law.

**Achieved**
- OCHA continued to co-chair the Inter-Agency Advocacy Working Group during 2009; OCHA involved in joint advocacy and public information campaigns, highlighting humanitarian principles and issues of concern, including activities to mark World Refugee Day on 20 June 2009 and the inaugural World Humanitarian Day on 19 August 2009.
- Local and international media continued to report on the humanitarian and protection situation across Iraq, including impact of displacement and insecurity on women, children and minorities.

### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Output**
- Access monitoring mechanism developed and informing advocacy and programming.

**Indicators**
- HC briefed regularly on status of protection response and access issues.
- OCHA participation in Protection Sector Outcome Team (POT) to ensure strategic priorities are met, key protection concerns identified and appropriate response implemented.

**Achieved**
- Regular OCHA briefings to HC on protection and humanitarian concerns, including those relating to residents of Camp Ashraf and other minorities and vulnerable groups.
- Continuing OCHA participation in POT; IAU collaboration with Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism Steering Committee to develop more secure and decentralized child rights violations database; Humanitarian access issues regularly featured in IAU information products.
### occupied Palestinian territory (oPt)

#### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Output**
- Ensuring compatibility and complementarity between the Palestinian authorities’ planning mechanisms and the United Nations mid-term recovery plans.

**Indicator**
- Each strategic objective within the CAP 2009 includes an early recovery element.

**Achieved**
- CAP strategic objectives include early recovery elements.

#### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Strengthened voice of the HCT in oPt.

**Indicator**
- Establishment of the Advocacy Working Group under the auspices of the HCT.

**Achieved**
- The Advocacy Working Group has been established and meets regularly.

#### 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- Ensure the needs at the Palestinian grassroots level match the priorities of the humanitarian community and the national authorities.

**Indicator**
- OCHA to spearhead the roll-out of clusters, ensuring a ‘bottom-up’ approach to needs assessment and taking the lead in key areas such as protection.

**Achieved**
- Clusters rolled out and operating; OCHA supports OHCHR in the Protection Cluster, and chairs and coordinates the sub-working group – the Displacement Working Group.

#### 2.4 Protection Advanced at Global, Regional and National Levels

**Outputs**
- A strategic approach to protection and access issues reflecting policy aims of the IASC.
- Active participation in child protection sector groups.

**Indicators**
- Creation of a Protection and Access Unit within OCHA dedicated to monitoring, analysing, reporting and addressing access issues.
- Number of protection-related reports drafted.

**Achieved**
- Development of a more strategic and coordinated approach to protection and access.
- Support to HC and HCT in better anticipating and more effectively negotiating with the relevant authorities on impediments to delivering humanitarian relief.

### Pakistan

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Well-funded and functioning ERF mechanism.
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms including CERF and Flash Appeals.

**Indicator**
- ERF established by June 2009.

**Achieved**
- PHRP 2009 funded by 79 per cent.
1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Strengthened support to the HC.

**Indicator**
- OCHA comprehensive support to the HC office.

**Achieved**
- OCHA re-established a fully functioning OCHA office in Islamabad, a sub-office in Peshawar and an antennae office in Buner, Swat district, and assisted with establishing the HCT; Oversaw deployment of inter-agency team to review existing cluster mechanism in Pakistan and provide recommendations on ways to further strengthen the system.

2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Awareness of key humanitarian advocacy issues (including humanitarian space, guiding principles on IDPs and protection of civilians) raised in close cooperation with partners.

**Indicator**
- Key humanitarian messages updated monthly and shared with IASC partners.

**Achieved**
- Advocacy issues, including protection, discussed and raised by the HC and OCHA with Government counterparts.

2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Targeted information products made available to humanitarian community and other actors.

**Indicator**
- Number of weekly situation reports and appropriate information material in various formats produced.

**Achieved**
- Weekly sit reps on humanitarian response produced, which were used in the national and international media; 19 OCHA Pakistan sit reps distributed between June and October 2009; six humanitarian updates since 19 October 2009; 95 maps produced; 12 media interviews/reports since Interim Report was submitted.

Country Offices: Asia and the Pacific

Indonesia

1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Output**
- Maximized use of CERF and ERF available funds to meet underfunded or sudden-onset emergencies or post-conflict needs.

**Indicators**
- At least one monitoring and evaluation visit to each project location.
- ERF funded at a minimum level of $1 million.
- A minimum of three local NGOs implementing ERF-funded projects.

**Achieved**
- Monitoring and evaluation visits conducted for 18 projects.
- Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency contributed $1.877 million to ERF in 2009.
- Three local NGOs and nine INGOS received 94 per cent of ERF for 21 projects in eight provinces.
### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Cluster or sector coordinators appointed for each area of response, each with ToR based on IASC generic ToR for sector or cluster leads.

**Indicators**
- All sectors using IASC generic ToRs for sector or cluster leads.

**Achieved**
- Three clusters activated in response to West Java earthquake, and early recovery network for West Sumatra earthquake response; All clusters use the IASC generic ToR.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Strengthened disaster preparedness capacity of Government agencies and continued support of the development of contingency plans with local government counterparts, including training of trainers, and rapid assessment and coordinating training.

**Indicators**
- Contingency Plans in 10 districts and provinces developed and updated.
- Four trainings of trainers on DRR and disaster preparedness.
- At least one Indonesia rapid assessment and coordination training conducted for Government officials.

**Achieved**
- Three CPs at district level developed, one at provincial level was updated.
- One training of training of trainers on school-based disaster preparedness programmes were held.
- Technical support provided on development of Contingency Plan training curriculum and modules.

### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Output**
- Reinforced capacities of Government institutions responding to disasters or emergencies through trainings on humanitarian reform, GHP, IHL, civil-military coordination and gender mainstreaming in humanitarian situations.

**Indicators**
- At least one workshop per semester conducted on specific humanitarian issues targeting the Indonesian context and advocating humanitarian reform, IHL and GHP.
- At least 40 Government staff (Indonesia Rapid Response Team for Assessment and Coordination) trained in responding to emergencies.

**Achieved**
- In July, a workshop was conducted on the application of the International Disaster Response Law to facilitate the National Policy on International Humanitarian Assistance in Indonesia; Two workshops conducted in November and December for the Government to develop guidelines on the international community’s role in emergency response.
- Thirty-six Government and non-Government staff participated in IRAC training in October.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Reinforced information management and analysis of capacities of Government institutions to respond to disasters or emergencies.

**Indicator**
- Seventy per cent of OCHA’s standardized information management tools implemented and utilized for analysis.
- Eighty per cent of OCHA staff time devoted to support information management.

**Achieved**
- Seventy per cent of OCHA’s standardized information management tools implemented; OCHA tools (3W, ReliefWeb, sit reps) are being implemented and introduced to Government; OCHA conducted two trainings on GIS and data management procedures.
**Myanmar**

### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- OCHA support to the HC office enhanced.
- A smoothly functioning cluster system in line with the principles on humanitarian reform.
- Cooperation with the Government strengthened through increased consultation.
- Stronger United Nations/NGO coordination.

**Indicators**
- Dedicated capacity for strategic engagement on humanitarian issues/challenges with partners at HCT and inter-cluster level.
- Cooperation with ASEAN through the TCG, periodic review and disaster risk reduction.

**Achieved**
- Regular meetings of sectoral and thematic working groups, as well as HCT, with OCHA providing secretariat support to the HCT.
- Full cooperation with ASEAN achieved at field and country level through the TCG, as evidenced in the smooth transfer of four OCHA hubs to the RCC in the Delta.

### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Refined inter-agency contingency planning process.
- Enhanced dialogue with Government on disaster management at national and sub-national level, including close collaboration with UNDP.
- Greater cluster and sector coordination in each area of response with IASC-based ToR for cluster and sector leads.

**Indicators**
- Over 30 organizations participating in CP and disaster risk reduction preparation.
- Disaster risk reduction and preparedness data and workplans readied and in place by first quarter of 2009.

**Achieved**
- Thirty-two organizations participated in CP workshop and over 60 organizations adopted CP in August 2009.
- Support provided to the DRR working group; DRR data made available; Government’s Standing Orders on disaster preparedness and response translated and a Myanmar Action Plan on DRR developed.

### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Outputs**
- The roles of OCHA, UNDP and the United Nations Office of the RC and HC with regards to transitions are clarified at central and field level.
- Improved linkages between humanitarian and recovery programmes.

**Indicators**
- Early Recovery Framework and PoNREPP process implemented.
- Agreement reached on timeline for gradual transfer of coordination responsibilities to UNDP and partners in cyclone-affected areas for six coordination hubs by end of January 2009.

**Achieved**
- PoNREPP architecture implemented, including establishment of RCC-TCG and the RCC overseeing the early recovery process. Handover to RCC/UNDP successfully completed in December 2009, following extensions of support in response to strong calls by the humanitarian community in-country.

### 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- Humanitarian needs jointly assessed, closely monitored, prioritized and reflected in appeals and response plans.

**Indicator**
- Periodic monitoring of humanitarian needs, including follow-ups to the Village Tract Assessment pillar of the Post-Nargis Joint Assessment process.

**Achieved**
- Three periodic reviews conducted and two social impact monitoring assessments; Needs assessments are reflected in the upcoming CHAP for NRS.
### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**
- OCHA’s continued support to MIMU in terms of staffing and technical issues.
- Targeted information products provided to key stakeholders and strengthened information management capacities.

**Indicators**
- Functional MIMU in place and able to meet the information needs of the humanitarian community, including OCHA.
- Updated 3W, integrated monitoring matrix, maps and other standard products.

**Achieved**
- MIMU operating effectively.
- Products updated regularly and made available to agencies, including on the MIMU website.

### Nepal

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Clusters strengthened with ToRs, inclusive membership of other humanitarian actors and links to newly established governmental counterparts.
- Humanitarian coordination structures and mechanisms streamlined and mapped to development coordination forums.

**Indicators**
- All clusters with ToRs.
- At least three cluster strategies mapped to UNDAF theme group strategies.

**Achieved**
- All clusters using IASC standard ToRs.
- Nutrition, health and education clusters linked to development strategies.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Outputs**
- Improved disaster preparedness and response capacity enhanced.
- Virtual EOC for major disaster scenarios (earthquake, floods and conflict).

**Indicators**
- IASC earthquake contingency plan tested by June 2009.
- Regional earthquake response search-and-rescue (INSARAG) exercise held by June 2009.
- All eight border posts receive training on expedited customs agreement.

**Achieved**
- Earthquake plan tested three times with inter-agency simulations.
- INSARAG exercise held in April 2009.
- Eight trainings held on expedited customs agreement, including seven border posts and the international airport.

#### 1.5 A Strategy Contributing to Seamless Transition and Early Recovery

**Output**
- OCHA exit strategy enabling a seamless transition.

**Indicator**
- Exit strategy developed by June 2009.

**Achieved**
- Concept note for a joint RC/HC office was developed and articulated in an OCHA exit strategy in early 2009. Senior management endorsed the strategy in July 2009.
### 2.3 A Common Approach to Needs Assessments and Impact Evaluation

**Output**
- A common approach to needs assessments and impact evaluation.

**Indicators**
- All clusters using standard assessment formats.

**Achieved**
- Needs Analysis Framework updated to inform planning of 2010 CAP.
- Cluster leads and Government of Nepal endorsed common Multi-cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) format; Training of MIRA roster conducted; MIRA used in flood assessments.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**
- Context mapping products and monitoring tools setting humanitarian trends and identifying emergency policy issues.
- Specific reports on humanitarian trends and policy issues.

**Indicators**
- Monthly maps on security, access, strikes and blockades.
- At least three sets of thematic maps and reports on humanitarian trends and policy issues.

**Achieved**
- Twelve sets (monthly) of maps produced for security, access, strikes and blockages.
- Thematic mapping on disaster-prone districts; access to basic services; analysis supporting the constitutional debate on federalism.

### Sri Lanka

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Well-funded humanitarian appeal addressing priority needs in the north of Sri Lanka.
- Appropriate use of CERF funding to address urgent and underfunded needs.

**Indicators**
- Quarterly updates on CHAP project implementation.
- CHAP funded at 70 per cent or more.
- All CERF requests funded (for underfunded and rapid response windows).

**Achieved**
- Regular updates provided to Government counterparts on CHAP project implementation and in the CHAP MYR and 2010 documents.
- CHAP for Sri Lanka 70 per cent funded as of the end of 2009.
- All CERF requests funded (for under-funded and rapid response windows).

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Strengthened humanitarian response planning.

**Indicators**
- Quarterly update of humanitarian contingency plan.
- Disaster preparedness data compiled by the end of 2009.

**Achieved**
- Humanitarian contingency plans updated on a regular basis at field level, with special focus on flood contingency planning in the north from September to November.
- Work continued with the Sri Lanka Disaster Management Centre on risk profile for the country.
### 2.2 More Strategic Advocacy of Humanitarian Principles and Issues

**Outputs**
- Decision-making on humanitarian and protection priorities are supported by IHL, Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and Protection of Civilians.
- Guiding Principles on Humanitarian and Development Assistance in Sri Lanka promoted and implementation monitored.

**Indicators**
- Quarterly reports on humanitarian access developed by OCHA and shared with partners.
- A joint advocacy strategy developed, which anticipates risk and articulates key messages.

**Achieved**
- Quarterly reports on humanitarian access developed by OCHA and shared with partners.
- Media monitoring to anticipate communication challenges; Protection of civilian training and workplan developed.

### 2.5 Strenthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Outputs**
- OCHA information products and services support information sharing and coordination.
- Information management tools support cluster roll-out and integration of cross-cutting issues to inform and improve humanitarian response.
- Timely, appropriate information products in support of preparedness and response activities.

**Indicator**
- Monthly updates of website products supporting the Government’s geo-spatial data management and updates.

**Achieved**
- Regular updates of information management products including situation reports, factsheets, maps and humanitarian website; Humanitarian portal (www.hpsl.lk) received an average of 16,000 hits per month, with over 10,000 documents downloaded on a monthly basis; Support on risk profiling and geo-spatial data management provided to the Government through OCHA-seconded staff at the DMC.

### Country Offices: Latin America and the Caribbean

**Colombia**

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Output**
- Increased participation of local actors (United Nations and non-United Nations) in national and local coordination mechanisms linked to HCT.
- Fully functioning coordination mechanisms in priority areas.

**Indicators**
- Three new IASC local coordination mechanisms established.
- Three joint sectoral plans or strategies formulated and implemented targeting vulnerable groups and regions.

**Achieved**
- Two out of three new local IASC coordination mechanisms created in Arauca and Putumayo.
- One strategic plan for the Pacific littoral, one gender inter-agency plan, nine areas with local inter-sectoral plans.

#### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Revised and updated contingency plans (disasters and complex emergency at local and national level).

**Indicator**
- Revision of contingency plan according to revised inter-agency guidelines.

**Achieved**
- The inter-agency contingency plan was updated and tested during an inter-agency simulation exercise.
### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- Engendered programming improved.

**Indicator**
- Differentiated data (gender, age-based, indigenous and Afro-Colombians) available on the website.

**Achieved**
- Information products (10 out of 20) elaborated by OCHA Colombia comply with a gender perspective.

---

### Haiti

#### 1.1 A Predictable and Needs-Based Humanitarian Financing System

**Outputs**
- Well-funded and functioning emergency relief fund mechanism.
- Improved understanding of humanitarian financing mechanisms including CERF.

**Indicators**
- Quarterly updates on the response, recovery and reconstruction mechanism.
- Twenty-five partner staff trained in CERF.

**Achieved**
- Nine projects funded from the ERRF in 2009.
- CERF allocated $5 million from the underfunded emergencies window for humanitarian action in Haiti.

#### 1.2 Improved Coordination Structures at Country, Regional and International Levels

**Outputs**
- Support to the DSRSG/HC.
- Strengthened HCT with continued participation of NGO partners.
- Functioning clusters in line with the principles of the humanitarian reform.

**Indicators**
- All decisions taken by the IASC are implemented by HCT and clusters meet regularly with adequate participation from non-United Nations partners.
- HCT and clusters meet regularly with adequate participation from non-United Nations partners.

**Achieved**
- Monitoring of humanitarian situation and reporting to DSRSG/HC.
- Inter-cluster meetings organized every two weeks to facilitate cross-cutting operational coordination.
### 1.4 Greater Incorporation of Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches and Strengthened Preparedness in Humanitarian Response

**Output**
- Contingency Plan updated.

**Indicators**
- Bi-annual update of Contingency Plan.
- Disaster preparedness data compiled.

**Achieved**
- Guided planning process around Contingency Plan developed in advance of 2009 hurricane season, with participation of Government, United Nations agencies and NGOs.
- Information provided by National Civil Protection Unit on zones most at risk of natural disasters shared with humanitarian partners.

### 2.5 Strengthened Information Management Based on Common Standards and Best Practices

**Output**
- OCHA’s information products and services support information sharing and coordination. Information management tools (GIS, website, 3W) support sector-based coordination and integration of cross-cutting issues.

**Indicators**
- Monthly update of website.
- Updated 3W and quarterly production of maps.

**Achieved**
- Emergency monitoring of 2009 hurricane season and shared daily meteorological bulletins and alerts with humanitarian partners; Humanitarian information provided through weekly bulletin dissemination and website updates, including cluster activities.
- Revised 3W database launched; Quality and quantity of map production boosted by recruitment of national GIS Officer.
## Annex II:
Breakdown of OCHA Budget, Expenditure and Donor Contributions

### TABLE 5: OCHA Budget in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Mid-year</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Budget Activities</strong></td>
<td>12,292,600</td>
<td>13,472,800</td>
<td>13,472,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-budgetary activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEADQUARTERS ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>6,737,692</td>
<td>6,289,964</td>
<td>6,289,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive &amp; Administrative Offices</td>
<td>26,072,017</td>
<td>22,932,793</td>
<td>22,952,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Response Division</td>
<td>5,497,328</td>
<td>5,190,020</td>
<td>5,190,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Branch</td>
<td>12,915,145</td>
<td>11,324,396</td>
<td>11,325,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations &amp; Support Mobilization Branch</td>
<td>7,016,134</td>
<td>6,290,373</td>
<td>6,290,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Support</td>
<td>8,328,213</td>
<td>7,693,264</td>
<td>7,693,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development &amp; Studies Branch</td>
<td>10,674,217</td>
<td>9,440,924</td>
<td>9,440,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Information Services Branch</td>
<td>20,238,441</td>
<td>17,011,947</td>
<td>16,985,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Headquarters Activities</strong></td>
<td>97,509,210</td>
<td>86,353,881</td>
<td>86,318,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIELD ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Regional Information Networks</td>
<td>11,004,246</td>
<td>10,022,905</td>
<td>10,022,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>11,004,246</td>
<td>10,022,905</td>
<td>10,022,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>4,168,710</td>
<td>3,665,402</td>
<td>3,665,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia</td>
<td>5,354,160</td>
<td>5,030,992</td>
<td>5,030,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa</td>
<td>3,030,155</td>
<td>3,170,888</td>
<td>3,170,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>27,766,356</td>
<td>25,392,529</td>
<td>25,392,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>2,499,910</td>
<td>2,246,147</td>
<td>2,246,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>4,996,912</td>
<td>4,326,932</td>
<td>4,326,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>3,891,797</td>
<td>3,225,959</td>
<td>3,225,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>13,319,270</td>
<td>12,706,513</td>
<td>12,706,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>503,902</td>
<td>478,411</td>
<td>478,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5,843,438</td>
<td>3,107,095</td>
<td>3,107,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>955,944</td>
<td>853,945</td>
<td>853,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2,480,383</td>
<td>2,431,783</td>
<td>2,431,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2,658,554</td>
<td>2,052,209</td>
<td>2,052,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5,863,933</td>
<td>5,485,250</td>
<td>5,485,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>17,679,641</td>
<td>16,677,197</td>
<td>16,677,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3,285,945</td>
<td>2,965,307</td>
<td>2,965,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2,406,116</td>
<td>3,305,083</td>
<td>3,305,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>64,189,745</td>
<td>59,924,831</td>
<td>59,924,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE EAST, NORTH AFRICA AND CENTRAL ASIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,218,842</td>
<td>9,218,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>314,080</td>
<td>276,480</td>
<td>276,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>5,482,062</td>
<td>4,857,531</td>
<td>4,857,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td>6,304,912</td>
<td>7,276,653</td>
<td>7,276,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,082,072</td>
<td>4,381,289</td>
<td>4,381,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>336,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>12,869,046</td>
<td>25,734,315</td>
<td>26,071,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA AND THE PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1,230,334</td>
<td>1,145,551</td>
<td>1,460,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2,104,838</td>
<td>2,682,671</td>
<td>2,682,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1,914,509</td>
<td>1,854,795</td>
<td>1,854,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3,256,019</td>
<td>3,146,902</td>
<td>3,146,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>336,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>8,505,700</td>
<td>8,828,919</td>
<td>9,683,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3,919,896</td>
<td>3,833,287</td>
<td>3,833,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1,246,465</td>
<td>1,141,664</td>
<td>1,141,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>5,166,361</td>
<td>4,974,951</td>
<td>4,974,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Field Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,579,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Field Activities</strong></td>
<td>129,815,534</td>
<td>135,155,930</td>
<td>137,926,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Extra-budgetary activities</strong></td>
<td>227,324,744</td>
<td>231,509,811</td>
<td>224,244,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OCHA Budget (Regular and Extrabudgetary Activities) (US$)</strong></td>
<td>239,617,344</td>
<td>234,982,611</td>
<td>237,717,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 6: Expenditure in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Final Budget</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Expenditure Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Budget Activities</strong></td>
<td>13,472,800</td>
<td>13,671,749</td>
<td>101.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra-budgetary activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEADQUARTERS ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
<td>6,289,964</td>
<td>5,065,973</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive &amp; Administrative Offices</td>
<td>22,952,877</td>
<td>22,392,238</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Response Division</td>
<td>5,140,020</td>
<td>5,081,286</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Branch</td>
<td>11,325,979</td>
<td>10,093,453</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations &amp; Support Mobilization Branch</td>
<td>6,200,373</td>
<td>6,164,918</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Support</td>
<td>7,693,265</td>
<td>6,520,567</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development &amp; Studies Branch</td>
<td>9,440,924</td>
<td>7,987,693</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Information Services Branch</td>
<td>16,985,386</td>
<td>13,170,782</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Headquarters Activities</strong></td>
<td>86,318,788</td>
<td>76,436,910</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIELD ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Regional Information Networks</strong></td>
<td>10,022,906</td>
<td>10,435,224</td>
<td>104.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Offices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>5,226,872</td>
<td>3,579,171</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>3,665,402</td>
<td>2,364,662</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia</td>
<td>5,030,992</td>
<td>4,648,138</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Central and Eastern Africa</td>
<td>3,170,888</td>
<td>2,978,573</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for Southern Africa</td>
<td>3,252,565</td>
<td>2,403,626</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office for West Africa</td>
<td>5,945,810</td>
<td>4,082,126</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>25,392,529</td>
<td>20,056,296</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>2,246,147</td>
<td>1,885,110</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>4,326,932</td>
<td>4,059,011</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>3,225,959</td>
<td>3,546,978</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>12,706,513</td>
<td>12,617,989</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>478,411</td>
<td>414,448</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3,170,995</td>
<td>3,086,246</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>853,945</td>
<td>762,125</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2,431,783</td>
<td>2,433,806</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2,052,209</td>
<td>1,974,830</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5,485,250</td>
<td>4,993,989</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>16,677,197</td>
<td>13,717,697</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2,965,307</td>
<td>2,577,936</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>3,805,083</td>
<td>2,842,175</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>59,924,831</td>
<td>54,913,340</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE EAST, NORTH AFRICA AND CENTRAL ASIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>9,218,842</td>
<td>6,232,058</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>276,480</td>
<td>224,271</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4,857,531</td>
<td>3,663,081</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td>7,276,653</td>
<td>5,276,423</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4,381,289</td>
<td>3,197,584</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>336,867</td>
<td>91,176</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>26,071,182</td>
<td>18,460,322</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA AND THE PACIFIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1,460,791</td>
<td>1,190,097</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>2,682,671</td>
<td>2,002,730</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1,854,795</td>
<td>1,720,035</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>3,146,902</td>
<td>2,196,581</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>338,660</td>
<td>212,839</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>9,683,819</td>
<td>7,322,282</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>3,833,287</td>
<td>3,511,403</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1,141,664</td>
<td>955,964</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>4,974,951</td>
<td>4,467,367</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Field Activities</strong></td>
<td>1,579,493</td>
<td>1,579,493</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Field Activities</strong></td>
<td>137,926,191</td>
<td>117,458,595</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Extra-budgetary activities</strong></td>
<td>224,244,799</td>
<td>193,895,505</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OCHA Budget (Regular and Extrabudgetary Activities) (US$)</strong></td>
<td>237,717,779</td>
<td>207,567,254</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7: Voluntary Contributions — Breakdown of donor earmarking (US$)

**OCHA Activities**  | **Office** | **Sweden** | **United Kingdom** | **United States** | **European Commission** | **Norway** | **Netherlands** | **Canada** |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
**Unearmarked Contributions Total** | 10,712,880 | 12,831,156 | 3,000,000 | 2,015,478 | 7,006,432 | 3,941,146 | 807,037 |
**Headquarter Activities**  | 261,120 | 330,776 | 1,230,000 | 7,006,432 | 3,941,146 | 807,037 |
**IRIN**  | 99,400 | 161,407 |

**Regional Offices**  | **Office** | **Sweden** | **United Kingdom** | **United States** | **European Commission** | **Norway** | **Netherlands** | **Canada** |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
**Regional Office - Latin America & Caribbean (Panama)**  | 261,120 | 161,407 |
**Regional Office - Latin America & Caribbean (Panama)**  | 99,400 | 161,407 |
**Regional Office - Latin America & Caribbean (Panama) Sub-total**  | 261,120 | 161,407 |
**Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (Bangkok)**  | 83,000 | 162,766 | 205,385 |
**Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (Bangkok) Sub-total**  | 83,000 | 162,766 | 205,385 |
**Regional Office for Southern Africa**  | 807,037 |
**Regional Office for Southern Africa**  | 285,820 | 500,000 |
**Regional Office for Southern Africa Sub-total**  | 285,820 | 500,000 |
**Regional Office Central & East Africa (Nairobi)**  | 212,171 |
**Regional Office Central & East Africa (Nairobi)**  | 197,694 | 212,171 |
**Regional Office Central & East Africa (Nairobi) Sub-total**  | 197,694 | 212,171 |
**Regional Office for West Africa**  | 85,800 | 57,875 |
**Regional Office for West Africa**  | 85,800 | 310,390 | 242,111 |
**Regional Office for West Africa Sub-total**  | 85,800 | 310,390 | 242,111 |
**Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia**  | 600,000 |
**Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia**  | 735,294 | 669,841 |
**Regional Office for Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia Sub-total**  | 735,294 | 669,841 |
**Regional Office-SRO for Central Asia**  | 200,000 |
**Regional Office-SRO for Central Asia**  | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
**Regional Office-SRO for Central Asia Sub-total**  | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |

**Africa**  | **Central Africa Republic** | 264,845 | 604,961 |
**Chad**  | 705,000 | 562,588 | 735,000 | 242,111 |
**Côte d’Ivoire**  | 141,000 |
**Democratic Republic of the Congo**  | 3,426,594 | 669,841 |
**Eritrea**  | 100,569 |
**Ethiopia**  | 719,650 | 800,000 |
**Guinea**  | 186,593 |
**Kenya**  | 562,315 |
**Somalia**  | 705,000 | 872,955 | 294,474 |
**Sudan**  | 1,128,000 | 3,426,594 | 807,037 |
**Uganda**  | 705,000 | 632,022 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
**Zimbabwe**  | 282,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
**Africa Total**  | 5,652,965 | 7,163,498 | 2,332,059 | 2,905,586 |

**Middle East, Northern & Central Asia**  | **Iraq** | 2,298,851 | 310,390 | 242,111 |
**Afghanistan**  | 1,410,000 | 1,247,191 | 774,330 |
**Pakistan**  | 705,000 | 381,395 | 180,783 |
**Lebanon**  | 175,237 |
**occupied Palestinian territory**  | 1,732,578 | 777,980 |
**Yemen**  | 35,765 | 173,160 |
**Middle East, Northern & Central Asia Total**  | 3,419,765 | 2,333,858 | 735,294 | 422,894 |

**Asia**  | **Indonesia** | 400,000 | 198,308 |
**Myanmar**  | 198,308 | 198,134 |
**Nepal**  | 200,000 | 162,498 |
**Philippines**  | 290,276 | 348,984 | 93,458 |
**Sri Lanka**  | 125,209 | 310,390 | 162,498 |
**Asia Total**  | 654,216 | 672,878 | 147,200 | 474,090 |
**Latin America and the Caribbean**  | **Colombia** | 197,724 |
**Haiti**  | 359,825 | 639,206 | 200,000 |
**Latin America and the Caribbean Total**  | 359,825 | 639,206 | 200,000 | 197,724 |
**OCHA Activities Total**  | 22,382,211 | 19,548,414 | 17,752,596 | 7,308,499 | 6,647,560 |

Totals include Paid and Pledges
UK contribution includes the $1.8M meant for 2008 but paid in 2009 part of the second tranche of 2008
Excludes corrections of Luxembourg contributions
Total includes the transfer from the Italian Prepositioned Fund
### ANNEX II: BREAKDOWN OF OCHA BUDGET, EXPENDITURE AND DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

#### OCHA ANNUAL REPORT 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>expenditure</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5,725,433</td>
<td>6,000,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3,246,000</td>
<td>3,665,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1,450,362</td>
<td>4,896,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1,210,800</td>
<td>3,747,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3,487,070</td>
<td>3,447,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,331,163</td>
<td>3,330,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,406,470</td>
<td>3,021,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1,740,177</td>
<td>2,804,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,037,933</td>
<td>2,532,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1,278,772</td>
<td>2,491,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>924,394</td>
<td>2,487,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>938,727</td>
<td>1,278,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td>12,304,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Donors</td>
<td>6,702,623</td>
<td>4,489,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>156,785,029</td>
<td>124,972,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex III: Specially Designated Contributions and Other Trust Funds

A. Specially Designated Contributions

Specially Designated Contributions (SDCs) are for projects implemented by third parties and are earmarked donor contributions specifically for that purpose. These activities are not included in the OCHA Annual Plan and Budget. Income towards them is counted in neither the OCHA total donor income, nor in its donor ranking tables. SDCs consist of UNDAC Mission Accounts, Natural Disaster Activities (emergency cash grants), Relief Stock Items, Emergency Response Funds and Third Party Grants (ProCap, GenCap, Juba Initiative Project and other grants).

Programme support charges levied from expenditure for SDC projects are spent, inter alia, on the administrative costs of managing these projects. In most cases, programme support charges are levied at 3 percent on SDCs.

- UNDAC Mission Accounts: Member States deposit funding with OCHA, which is used to deploy their nationals on UNDAC missions. Thirty Member States currently hold UNDAC Mission Accounts with OCHA.

- Natural Disaster Activities: These are funds held in pre-positioned reserve accounts by eight donors and drawn on to provide emergency cash grants to United Nations agencies and NGOs in natural disasters. OCHA manages the grants and releases them at the RC’s request in order to provide immediate support for relief operations responding to natural, environmental and technological disaster situations. An individual project account is created per disaster to enable the issuance of financial authorizations, maintenance of grant balances and preparation of Statements of Accounts for each natural disaster project. Unspent funds are returned to the Pre-Positioned Funds account.

- The ProCap and GenCap Rosters: This is flow-through funding for ProCap and GenCap, covering the management and deployment of senior protection officers and senior gender advisers by the Norwegian Refugee Council. (ProCap and GenCap Secretariat costs appear in the OCHA budget since they are not flow-through costs.)

- The Juba Initiative Project (JIP): JIP was established in 2006 to support the Peace Secretariat and Cessation of Hostilities Monitoring Team of the Juba Peace Talks. JIP was set up to channel donor support to the peace process that formally ended on 31 May 2008. Activity against the project in 2009 was related to the cancellation of two pledges by donors, previously recorded as income to OCHA in 2008. The project is now closed.

In 2009, the greater portion of SDCs was made to the ERFs ($84 million or 94 per cent). The funding that key contributing donors allocated to ERFs remained roughly constant in donor currency, although a strengthening dollar reduced the US dollar income to ERFs in 2009, as compared

### TABLE 8: OCHA Specially Designated Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDAC Mission Accounts</th>
<th>Natural Disaster Activities</th>
<th>Relief Stock Items</th>
<th>Emergency Response Funds (ERFS)</th>
<th>PROCAP and GENCAP Rosters</th>
<th>Juba Initiative Project</th>
<th>Other Specially Designated Contributions</th>
<th>Total Specially Designated Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance — 1 January 2009</td>
<td>1,409,224</td>
<td>9,098,469</td>
<td>5,283,770</td>
<td>80,910,662</td>
<td>1,399,572</td>
<td>979,495</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99,081,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Donor Contributions</td>
<td>414,945</td>
<td>703,235</td>
<td>212,008</td>
<td>83,905,293</td>
<td>3,513,553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>163,841</td>
<td>88,912,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Funds 2009</td>
<td>1,824,169</td>
<td>9,801,704</td>
<td>5,495,778</td>
<td>164,815,955</td>
<td>4,913,125</td>
<td>979,495</td>
<td>163,841</td>
<td>187,994,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Programme Support Charges</td>
<td>(58,710)</td>
<td>(6,950)</td>
<td>(162,685)</td>
<td>(1,703,449)</td>
<td>(100,505)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,076)</td>
<td>(2,035,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditure</td>
<td>(451,620)</td>
<td>(206,864)</td>
<td>(3,044,512)</td>
<td>(56,837,852)</td>
<td>(3,335,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(31,350)</td>
<td>(63,907,198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Available Funds before other income, adjustments, transfers, refunds and ISDR costs</td>
<td>1,313,839</td>
<td>9,587,890</td>
<td>2,288,581</td>
<td>106,274,654</td>
<td>1,478,075</td>
<td>979,495</td>
<td>128,415</td>
<td>122,050,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income, adjustments, transfers and refunds</td>
<td>(1,015)</td>
<td>(7,571,457)</td>
<td>794,549</td>
<td>2,104,209</td>
<td>251,659</td>
<td>(891,540)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,315,595)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes unpaid pledges of US$16,620,866.
with 2008. OCHA opened five new ERFs in 2009: Afghanistan, Colombia, Kenya, Nepal and Uganda. This brought the total number of ERFs in 2009 to 16. Of the $84 million contributed to ERFs in 2009, about half went to the HRF in Ethiopia. This amount is similar to the distribution in 2008. No funds were received for the Haiti and Nepal ERFs in 2009. The CAR, DRC and Sudan ERFs were funded by the in-country Common Humanitarian Funds. The funds managed through these ERFs do not pass through OCHA’s accounts. Funding to the oPt ERF tripled from 2008, in large part responding to the Gaza crisis of late 2008/early 2009. Funding for the Indonesia ERF also tripled from 2008 in response to the 2009 earthquake. A total of $16.8 million of the total contributed to the ERFs in 2009 was pledged but not yet disbursed as at the closing of accounts.

The Afghanistan Emergency Trust Fund was established in June 1988 by the Secretary-General to support humanitarian activities in Afghanistan. In its later life, the fund supported the Office of the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan and through two memoranda of understanding. The first provided grants to NGOs working to address rehabilitation needs, while the second supported humanitarian and economic development activities.

In 2009, expenditure for the Afghanistan Emergency Trust Fund amounted to $1.5 million. The 31 December 2009 closing balance was $1.1 million. Activities are projected to cease in 2010, with the fund closing within the 2010-2011 biennium.

The Tsunami Trust Fund was established following the tsunami of 26 December 2004. The fund financed activities undertaken in the course of coordinating humanitarian action in relation to the earthquake and tsunami, including the provision of relief to victims as well as longer-term infrastructure development. During its closing stages, remaining funds were used to support UNDP’s development activities. The fund is projected for closure in 2010.

In 2009, expenditure for the Tsunami Trust Fund amounted to $421,115. Its closing balance at 31 December 2009 was $3.4 million.

### TABLE 9: Specially Designated Contributions by Donor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>US$</th>
<th>Totals includes Paid and Pledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td>Includes $1 million of funds transferred from the Italian Preposition Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2,694,508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,487,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>23,933,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>13,393,164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>84,915,394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>24,765,036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>22,426,469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14,676,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8,737,864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>89,922,976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10: Emergency Response Funds: Contributions by Donor and Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4,854,369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2,033,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,010,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>15,441,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>993,484</td>
<td>2,232,764</td>
<td>621,012</td>
<td>871,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,812,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,506,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,506,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3,450,250</td>
<td>431,790</td>
<td>6,476,850</td>
<td>2,986,650</td>
<td>1,721,530</td>
<td>1,573,677</td>
<td>3,072,520</td>
<td>4,220,715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,933,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>699,301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,487,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>11,377,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,306,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total (US$)</td>
<td>3,450,250</td>
<td>1,425,274</td>
<td>45,631,277</td>
<td>2,986,650</td>
<td>621,012</td>
<td>2,592,709</td>
<td>3,066,214</td>
<td>7,551,377</td>
<td>13,393,164</td>
<td>313,972</td>
<td>3,883,495</td>
<td>84,915,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals includes Paid and Pledged
Includes $1 million of funds transferred from the Italian Preposition Fund
### B. Other Trust Funds

**TABLE 11: Afghanistan Emergency Trust Fund - AXB**  
Statement of Income and Expenditure 2009 (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Total (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance</td>
<td>2,427,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers, Refunds, Savings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds Available</td>
<td>167,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>2,595,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>1,447,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance (US$)</strong></td>
<td>1,148,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closing balance consisting of:**
- Outstanding Advances and Commitments against MOU II with UNAMA: 932
- Other Outstanding Advances: 116,007
- Balance of Funds for liquidation of liabilities during closure: 1,031,617

**Closing balance (US$)**: 1,148,556

**Expenditure breakdown (US$):**
- Staff Costs: 371,099
- Travel: 50,160
- Operating Expenses: 810,062
- Supplies, Materials, Furniture and Equipment: 195,354
- Programme Support Costs: 20,405
- **Total Expenditure (US$)**: 1,447,080

**TABLE 12: Tsunami Trust Fund**  
Statement of Income and Expenditure 2009 (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Total (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance</td>
<td>3,457,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers, Refunds, Savings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds Available</td>
<td>357,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>3,814,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>421,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Balance</strong></td>
<td>3,393,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes outstanding allocations provided to UN agencies for execution of projects.
# Annex IV: Other Contributions

## TABLE 13: Associate Experts Programme (JPOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headquarters New York</th>
<th>Headquarters Geneva</th>
<th>Offices in the Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo, occupied Palestinian territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excluding Associate Experts for the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR).
### Annex V: Definitions and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADRRN</td>
<td>Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Associates Surge Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>African Union Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AULO</td>
<td>African Union Liaison Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPR</td>
<td>Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADRI</td>
<td>Capacity for Disaster Reduction Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Central and East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPREDENAC</td>
<td>Coordination Center for Natural Disaster Prevention in Central America</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>Common Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILSS</td>
<td>Inter-State Committee Against Drought in the Sahel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISB</td>
<td>Communications and Information Services Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DERC</td>
<td>Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHC</td>
<td>Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC</td>
<td>Disaster Management Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Designated Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPKO</td>
<td>Department of Peacekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMFSS</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Donor Relations Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSRSG/HC</td>
<td>Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASBRIG</td>
<td>Eastern African Stand-by Force for the Eastern Africa Sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCT</td>
<td>Ethiopia Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHRP</td>
<td>Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>National Liberation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF</td>
<td>Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERI</td>
<td>Early Recovery Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARC</td>
<td>Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATA</td>
<td>Federally Administered Tribal Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDMS</td>
<td>Field Document Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTS</td>
<td>Financial Tracking Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenCap</td>
<td>Gender Standby Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFM</td>
<td>Global Focus Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP</td>
<td>Global Humanitarian Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAG</td>
<td>Humanitarian Advocacy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoO</td>
<td>Head of Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRF</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSU</td>
<td>Humanitarian Support Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAHCC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Humanitarian Coordination Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMG</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Management Group for Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA-RTes</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Real Time Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC SWG</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee Sub-Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAU</td>
<td>Information and Analysis Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICGLR</td>
<td>International Conference on the Great Lakes Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICN</td>
<td>In-Country Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRL</td>
<td>International Disaster Response Laws, Rules and Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFCs</td>
<td>Iraq Field Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHL</td>
<td>International Humanitarian Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMOs</td>
<td>Information Management Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMU</td>
<td>Information Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARAG</td>
<td>International Search and Rescue Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIN</td>
<td>Integrated Regional Information Networks</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>JHIE</td>
<td>Joint Humanitarian Impact Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOP</td>
<td>Joint Operating Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHPT</td>
<td>Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>League of Arab States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMU</td>
<td>Myanmar Information Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINURCAT</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSTAH</td>
<td>United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA</td>
<td>Multi-cluster Initial Rapid Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUC</td>
<td>United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYR</td>
<td>Mid-Year Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAF</td>
<td>Needs Analysis Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPAs</td>
<td>National Adaptation Programs of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSOs</td>
<td>National Cluster Support Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>Northern Rakhine State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>North West Frontier Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSG</td>
<td>OCHA Donor Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHRM</td>
<td>United Nations Office of Human Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONUCI</td>
<td>United Nations Operation in Côte d’Ivoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORHC</td>
<td>Office of the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Palestinian Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>Performance and Accountability Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEV</td>
<td>Post-Elections Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHRP</td>
<td>Pakistan Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHT</td>
<td>Pacific Humanitarian Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC</td>
<td>Pandemic Influenza Contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Protection of Civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>Protection Sector Outcome Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEA</td>
<td>Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Regional Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC</td>
<td>Recovery Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC/HCs</td>
<td>Resident Coordinators/Humanitarian Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO</td>
<td>Resident Coordinator’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>Rapid Deployment Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>Regional Directors Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redhum</td>
<td>Regional Humanitarian Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDLAC</td>
<td>Risk, Emergency and Disaster Task Force for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESO</td>
<td>Roaming Emergency Surge Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHPT</td>
<td>Regional Humanitarian Partnership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAP</td>
<td>Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLAC</td>
<td>Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMENACA</td>
<td>Regional Office for the Middle East, North Africa and Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWA</td>
<td>Regional Office for West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAARC</td>
<td>South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBPP</td>
<td>Stand-by Partnership Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCs</td>
<td>Specially Designated Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>Senior Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOT</td>
<td>Sector Outcome Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>Sub-Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STFs</td>
<td>Sectoral Task Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCG</td>
<td>Tripartite Core Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG-DRR</td>
<td>Technical Working Group on Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-CMCoord</td>
<td>United Nations Civil Military Coordination</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>UNDOCO</td>
<td>United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECOSOC</td>
<td>United Nations Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNETT</td>
<td>United Nations Emergency Technical Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM</td>
<td>United Nations Development Fund for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>Under-Secretary-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3W</td>
<td>Who Does What Where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>United Nations World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGT</td>
<td>Working Group on Transition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>