



Final Update to the Management Response Plan to the CERF Five-Year Evaluation

September 2013

This document contains the final update to the management response plan (MRP) to the CERF five-year evaluation. The CERF five-year evaluation had been mandated by the General Assembly and was carried out over an eight-month period by a team of consultants contracted through the formal UN procurement process.

Following the finalization of the evaluation's synthesis report in July 2011, the CERF secretariat developed an MRP in consultation with UN agencies, NGOs and the Controller's Office. This MRP outlined the response of the CERF secretariat to the recommendations of the evaluation. It only presented the responses from the CERF secretariat to recommendations directed at the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) and the CERF secretariat.

In addition, the MRP outlined the CERF secretariat's understanding of recommendations directed at other entities and possible ways for the CERF secretariat to support these recommendations. The MRP did not constitute a response from other entities. The implementation of the follow-up actions for the 19 recommendations contained in the MRP is tracked by the CERF secretariat.

The state of implementation of proposed follow-up actions for each recommendation is contained in the right-hand column of the table under "current status".

Closing of the CERF Five-year Evaluation MRP

The CERF secretariat has implemented all the evaluation recommendations directly under its control by third quarter of 2013. It has also launched initiatives to address broader issues from the evaluation that are linked to system-wide processes. The CERF secretariat, therefore, considers that the MRP has served its purpose. It has agreed with the CERF Advisory Group that the MRP will be closed at the fall meeting of the Advisory Group. Longer-term initiatives linked to the recommendations of the evaluation will be transferred to the CERF secretariat's regular work-plan for 2014-2015. The CERF secretariat will continue to update the CERF Advisory Group at its biannual meetings on progress and developments for longer term initiatives that relate to five-year evaluation recommendations.

OCHA's Management Response Plan (MRP) to the Five-Year Evaluation of the CERF

30 September 2013 – Final Update

Prepared by: Michael Jensen
 Cleared by: Lisa Doughten
 Tracked by: David Hartstone

Position: Head, CERF Performance and Monitoring Unit Unit/Bureau: CERF
 Position: Chief, CERF Secretariat Unit/Bureau: CERF
 Position: Humanitarian Affairs Officer, PMU Unit/Bureau: CERF

Overall comments: This MRP outlines the response of the CERF secretariat to the recommendations of the five-year evaluation of the CERF. This MRP only presents the response from the CERF secretariat to recommendations directed at the ERC and the CERF secretariat. It does not constitute a response from other entities.

TO THE EMERGENCY RELIEF COORDINATOR

Evaluation Recommendation 1: Where ERF and/or CHF pooled fund systems operate, integrate CERF planning, implementation and monitoring processes based on existing good practice examples			
Management Response: Accepted			
Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands this recommendation to refer to the potential for greater synergies and harmonization between the CERF processes at country-level, such as prioritization of humanitarian interventions, budget preparation and reporting, and those of country-based pooled funds (CBPF). Building on this possibility has been a priority for the CERF secretariat for some time and current guidelines for CERF as well as for CBPFs already contain some guidance in this respect.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
1.1. The CERF secretariat will ensure the preparation of a review of current practices and capacities in existing CBPFs to explore the potential for greater harmonization.	By end Q4 2012	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat has reviewed and provided input into the new CHF monitoring and reporting framework as well as the global CHF and ERF guidelines. Amongst other things, these recommend the use of similar structures, such as ERF/CHF review boards, for both CBPFs and the CERF. In addition, the CERF secretariat has prepared an overview paper taking stock of the main findings on CERF and ERF/CHF complementarity from a variety of reports, studies and evaluations, both externally mandated and commissioned by the CERF secretariat or OCHA. This served to inform the preparation of a guidance note on CERF-CBPF complementarity.
1.2. Based on the results of the review, the CERF Secretariat will prepare detailed guidance to OCHA country offices on harmonization of relevant aspects of CERF and CBPF procedures.	By end Q2 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat has prepared a guidance note outlining a number of recommendations to improve the harmonization between CERF and CBPFs based on the above stock-taking paper and consultations with stakeholders. The draft guidance was discussed with CBPF managers at the global OCHA Pooled Fund workshop in late April 2013. Following the workshop a detailed survey targeting all pooled fund management teams was conducted and the feedback was used to finalise the guidance. The final guidance will be disseminated during last quarter of 2013.
1.3. Following dissemination of guidance, CERF will establish appropriate procedures for tracking the degree of implementation at the field level and for	Continuous	CERF	COMPLETED: This is a continuous process. CERF will use existing processes to continuously assess the complementarity between CERF and CBPFs. The main vehicles will be the CERF RC/HC narrative reports, the Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) country

<p>identifying good practices.</p>			<p>reviews and ongoing trainings and workshops involving CBPF practitioners.</p> <p><u>RC/HC CERF Reports:</u> A revised reporting format and guidance for the annual RC/HC CERF country reports were launched in January 2012. The format directly asks country teams to explain if and how CERF processes were harmonized with those of CBPFs where these exist. The reporting format was further refined in 2013. CERF reviews and tracks this information and follows up with country level focal points as necessary.</p> <p><u>Annual Country Reviews under the PAF:</u> The terms of reference for the independent country reviews under the CERF PAF specifically address issues related to the complementarity of CERF with other pooled funds. CERF uses the reviews to explore the level of complementarity and to identify good practices. Of the countries reviewed to date eight had a country-based pooled fund (Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Yemen, Pakistan, DRC, Colombia and Zimbabwe).</p> <p><u>Workshops/Training:</u> CERF uses regular and ad-hoc workshops and trainings involving CBPF practitioners (e.g. the annual global OCHA pooled fund manager workshop) to discuss issues around pooled fund complementarity.</p> <p>These tracking and follow-up initiatives will form part of CERF's regular work-plan activities. As such the response to the overall recommendation will be considered closed in the context of this MRP once the CERF-CBPF complementarity guidance has been disseminated to the CBPF management teams.</p>
------------------------------------	--	--	---

<p>Evaluation Recommendation 2: Provide the Humanitarian Coordinator with a formal mandate to monitor the implementation of all UN-managed pooled funds (including the CERF) by recipient agencies.</p>			
<p>Management Response: Partially accepted</p>			
<p>Narrative: The Secretary-General's Bulletin on the "Establishment and Operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund" (ST/SGB/2010/05) dated 23 April 2010 already contains a monitoring mandate for Humanitarian Coordinators. Specifically, section 5.2 states that "Resident Coordinators or Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators shall oversee the monitoring of and narrative reporting on projects funded by the Fund." In addition, the IASC handbook for RCs and HCs on Emergency Preparedness and Response states that it is the responsibility of the RC/HC to monitor implementation of pooled funds projects (CERF, CHF and ERF) throughout the duration of the response. In light of this, the CERF secretariat interprets the recommendation as highlighting the need for increased support to Humanitarian Coordinators in exercising their monitoring function. The CERF secretariat will, therefore, consider Recommendation 8 as the main recommendation in regard to issues around country level monitoring of CERF-funded activities. Any necessary follow up to recommendation 2 (this recommendation) will be considered in light of this.</p>			
<p>Key planned follow-up Action(s)</p>	<p>Time Frame</p>	<p>Responsible Unit(s)</p>	<p>Current Status</p>
<p>2.1 In case of changes to the CERF monitoring and reporting framework (recommendation 8) CERF will review whether this necessitates any strengthening of the HCs mandate to monitor the CERF at country level.</p>	<p>By end Q1 2013</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>COMPLETED: Based on the existing mandate of the Humanitarian Coordinator and building on the initiatives under the IASC Transformative Agenda the CERF secretariat will continue to work towards strengthening monitoring and learning processes for CERF at the country level with a particular view towards linking CERF to system wide monitoring processes (see recommendation 8 for details).</p>

Evaluation Recommendation 3: Develop a process for Underfunded Emergency (UFE) envelopes that promotes more effective and efficient use of CERF funds.

Management Response: Accepted

Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands this recommendation to refer to the need to reinforce a transparent and inclusive UFE country selection process that ensures that UFE funding goes to the most deserving countries. In addition, based on a reading of the evaluation report, the CERF secretariat believes that this recommendation points to the need for a better communication of UFE procedures on country selection and their outcomes. While these are well understood at the headquarters of partner agencies, this is not always the case at the field-level. Even though the CERF secretariat undertook a review of the UFE window in 2009, the secretariat will conduct additional research to identify possible alternative methodologies for selecting countries for the UFE window.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
3.1. Conduct research to identify potential alternative or improved methods to select participating countries for biannual UFE rounds, including their costs and benefits, as well as ways to ensure better understanding of UFE procedures and outcomes at field-level.	By end Q4 2012	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat recruited two humanitarian consultants to conduct a review of the UFE window. Work commenced in May 2012. After interviews with numerous stakeholders as well as review of existing practices and financial data a review report was finalized and discussed with the CERF Advisory Group in October 2012 (the full report is available on the CERF website). Overall, the review concluded that the current processes behind the UFE window are fundamentally sound. As such, the review found no need to replace or to significantly re-model them. It concluded that the UFE country selection process is based upon the best available assessments of humanitarian need and financial reporting. The consultants noted, however, a number of acknowledged challenges with the available data. The review also put forward two broad recommendations for consideration, one related to NGO involvement and one related to improving the quality of financial data.
3.2 Implement any lessons identified in the study to improve the process and adopt a communication strategy based on outcomes of the study.	By end Q2 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: CERF has taken forward the review recommendations directed at CERF.

Evaluation Recommendation 4: Make the CERF Advisory Group membership more representative of the humanitarian sector, including through appropriate representation of advisers with operational backgrounds in CERF recipient countries.

Management Response: Accepted

Narrative: The CERF secretariat has always placed great importance on solid humanitarian experience as well as diverse representation among Advisory Group (AG) members. While we feel that this is already the case in the current AG, the CERF secretariat will nevertheless revise the Note Verbale requesting nominations from Member States and review the selection process with a view to receiving nominations from a wider range of institutions.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
4.1 Conduct a review of the selection process for AG members.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat conducted an internal review of the process, and the ERC has endorsed the changes that were recommended to strengthen representation.
4.2 Revise Note Verbale requesting nominations for AG members from Member States.	By end Q2 2012	CERF	COMPLETED: The Note Verbale was revised by the CERF secretariat and shared with Member States in early June 2012.

Evaluation Recommendation 5: Strengthen the funding base for CERF by promoting it to existing and potential new donors as an efficient, effective and accountable humanitarian funding mechanism.

Management Response: Accepted

Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands the recommendation to refer to the need for the CERF to broaden its donor base. This recommendation is in line with the CERF's existing resource mobilization strategy, which the CERF Advisory Group endorsed in 2010 and reviewed in 2011.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
5.1 Conduct four annual Member State briefings (two in New York, two in Geneva) on the CERF.	Annually	CERF, ERPS	COMPLETED: Four Member States briefings are conducted annually.
5.2 Update the CERF's resource mobilization strategy	By end Q1 2013	CERF, ERPS	COMPLETED: The resource mobilization strategy for Member States has been reviewed and updated and was discussed with the CERF Advisory Group at its October 2012 meeting. In late 2013, CERF will use specialized expertise to develop a strategy for CERF private sector outreach in order to complement fundraising efforts from Member States.
5.3 Improve public messaging by regularly producing and distributing analytical newsletters, the CERF annual report, press releases, and updates for the CERF website.	Continuous	CERF, CISB, EPRS	COMPLETED: The new CERF website has been finalized and launched. An annual analytical information product, "Activities in 2012" has been widely shared with Member States and is posted on the CERF website.
5.4 Send annual fundraising letters with tailored messaging with follow up calls to all Member States	By end Q3 annually	CERF, ERPS	COMPLETED: Annual fundraising letters were sent in September 2012.
5.5 Conduct annual CERF High-Level conference in NY	By end Q4 annually	CERF, ERPS, CISB	COMPLETED: The CERF high-level conference (HLC) is held in December each year. In addition, CERF held its first policy side-event under ECOSOC's Humanitarian Affairs Segment in 2013.
5.6 Organize USG luncheons with targeted Member States in New York, with discussion on humanitarian financing/CERF	Continuous	CERF, ERPS	AMMENDED and COMPLETED: USG luncheons have been replaced with bilateral consultations and other meetings.

Evaluation Recommendation 6: In the screening process for submissions relating to chronic emergencies, request information on how short-term funding provided by the CERF would support longer-term vulnerability reduction programmes, which are usually government-led.

Management Response: Partially Accepted.

Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands this recommendation to refer to the need for better consideration of how emergency relief in a protracted emergency relates to longer-term early recovery, transition and vulnerability reduction programming, in particular those led by the government. Longer-term vulnerability reduction programs may not always be in place in protracted emergencies supported by CERF. Where they are, linkages with relief programming should already be detailed in the strategies informing the CAPs or similar planning frameworks. The CERF secretariat will ensure that such information is reflected in CERF applications whenever possible.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
6.1 When reviewing funding applications from protracted emergencies, the CERF secretariat will - during a trial period - request additional information on how the proposed initiatives relate to longer-term recovery and vulnerability reduction efforts where the information is not already contained in the application.	By end Q1 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: This activity is based on a number of selected case-study countries and is informed by a review of submitted CERF proposals, the annual RC/HC CERF country reports and related PAF country reviews (where relevant).
6.2 Based on an analysis of the findings from the trial period under MRP action 6.1, the CERF secretariat will decide if and how to revise the CERF application format to more systematically collect and analyse such information.	By end Q4 2013	CERF	ONGOING: The CERF application template is being revised and is scheduled to be launched by the beginning of 2014 . The revised template will include specific references to information on linkages between CERF funded activities and longer term programmes in the country. CERF will review and assess the information provided as part of the overall proposal review process. Once the revised template has been launched this recommendation will be considered closed.

TO THE CERF SECRETARIAT

Evaluation Recommendation 7: Develop Prioritisation Process Guidance for HCs and Cluster Coordinators.			
Management Response: Accepted.			
Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands the recommendation to refer to the need for additional guidance materials on how to select emergency interventions at the country-level to submit as parts of applications for funding from the CERF RR and UFE windows. The CERF secretariat considers it important that any prioritization guidance developed for the CERF takes into account guidance for other humanitarian planning and financing instruments, such as the Flash Appeals, CAPs and CBPFs. The CERF secretariat will gather and review lessons learned on prioritization from recipient countries of CERF funding, review existing guidance materials and prepare new guidelines reflecting best practices. Prioritization guidance will build on the CERF life-saving criteria which will continue to define eligibility. The CERF secretariat will also attempt to include a section on prioritization in the training of Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs) and cluster (and sector) coordinators. In addition, the CERF secretariat will establish a Community of Practice (CoP) on humanitarian financing to allow for the exchange of good practices on prioritization exercises as well as other humanitarian financing processes.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
7.1 Gather lessons–learned from the field on CERF prioritization and review existing prioritization guidance of other humanitarian planning and financing instruments.	By end Q1 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat systematically extracts possible good practices from submitted CERF proposals, from annual CERF country reports by RC/HCs and from PAF country reviews and other relevant studies. These serve as case studies and help inform guidance development. CERF prioritization guidance is also informed by the work undertaken under the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC) (linked to the IASC Transformative Agenda).
7.2 Develop draft CERF prioritization guidance. 7.3 Circulate for review, revise as per comments and	By end Q4 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: A prioritization guidance package is being revised and finalised in fourth quarter to ensure that it reflects relevant elements of the new guidance on humanitarian

disseminate final guidance.			needs overview (HNO) and prioritisation (part of the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC) guidance package that will be launched in Sep 2013).
7.4 Ensure inclusion of prioritization among contents of HC and cluster coordinator training.	By end Q3 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: Prioritisation is part of the guidance tool-kit for the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC) and as such would also be included in HPC trainings and workshops.
7.5 Establish a humanitarian financing Community of Practice (CoP).	By end Q4 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: By working closely with OCHA's Funding Coordination Section (FCS) and building on existing OCHA CoPs, a technical platform and modality has been selected and a limited target group of practitioners has been invited to participate in two CoP pilots. One CoP for CHF fund management teams was launched in March 2013 and a second CoP for CERF UFE focal points was launched for the second UFE round in 2013. Based on the lessons learned following a pilot period it will be decided if and how to proceed with an expansion of the CoP to a wider group of practitioners.

Evaluation Recommendation 8: Strengthen CERF monitoring and learning systems at country level to improve CERF impact.

Management Response: Partially accepted.

Narrative: The CERF secretariat fully agrees with the need for accountability, and for monitoring and learning systems that help to maximize the impact of the CERF. The CERF secretariat fully endorses the sub-recommendations contained in the bullet-points, that is, the proposal to hold an inter-agency workshop at country-level as part of the annual narrative reporting exercise and the inclusion of CERF issues in inter-agency real-time evaluation. Although these are not under the direct control of the CERF secretariat, the CERF secretariat will advocate for them with RC/HCs and HCTs. With regard to in-country monitoring, the CERF secretariat will review existing CERF monitoring and learning systems and look for ways to strengthen linkages with CBPFs, CAPs and other relevant systems and frameworks.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
8.1 Review and if necessary revise the guidance and template for the CERF annual RC/HC country report with the aim of encouraging interactive and inclusive processes that facilitate learning. This may include a lessons-learning workshop as part of the annual reporting exercise.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat has revised the template, guidance and process of the narrative reports on the use of CERF funds by RC/HCs. The revisions have taken place in three phases. The 2011 reports (due on 15 March 2012) were submitted in a revised and improved format. Based on the lessons learned in 2012 the reporting format and guidance were further adjusted for the 2012 reporting cycle with reports due by 15 March 2013. By August 2013 a more significant overhaul of the RC/HC process was introduced in that the reporting schedule was changed from a fixed annual reporting date (15 March) to a rolling reporting schedule that follows the cycle of the CERF grants. With this new reporting schedule RC/HCs and recipient agencies will report on a rolling basis three months after implementation of their CERF projects has been concluded. This approach will yield a lighter reporting process and it will ensure that reports are prepared immediately after project implementation and thus while information is still readily available and with a greater chance of key staff involved in the CERF process and the implementation of the projects still present. It will also allow the CERF secretariat to undertake a more thorough and constructive review of reports and improve its ability to undertake valuable analysis. The new expanded guidelines and reporting template stress the importance of conducting interactive and inclusive consultations at country level as part of the preparation of the report. The CERF secretariat has further promoted this approach through targeted outreach to reporting focal points at country level.

<p>8.2 Finalise guidelines for CERF After Action Reviews (AAR) at country level under the leadership of the RC/HC as defined in the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF), and disseminate guidelines to CERF focal points in recipient countries with an aim of encouraging greater learning.</p>	<p>By end Q2 2013</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>COMPLETED: CERF AAR guidance and templates were developed in 2012. To strengthen the field perspective the CERF secretariat discussed the AAR guidance and suggested template with the OCHA regional office for Southern Africa and with in-country actors in Lesotho during a mission in late September 2012. These consultations helped refine the guidance and the AAR template in advance of the planned field testing that would inform a more systematic roll out. The field testing and roll out was put on hold due to the decision to introduce a new staggered RC/HC reporting process (see above under point 8.2). Under the new reporting process an inclusive AAR is recommended to be conducted immediately after completion of CERF projects and it will serve as the first step in preparing the narrative report on the use of CERF funds. The RC/HC report shall be finalised and submitted to CERF no later than three months after completion of CERF activities.</p>
<p>8.3 Conduct a review of current monitoring practices of CBPFs and identify options for linking them with monitoring of CERF-funded interventions.</p>	<p>By end Q2 2013</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>ONGOING: 8.3 & 8.4. This is closely aligned with related initiatives under the IASC Transformative Agenda in particular the work by the Programme Cycle Steering Group on developing a monitoring framework for humanitarian response. In addition, the CERF secretariat has been involved in the development of the new monitoring framework for Common Humanitarian Funds (CHF) that was finalized during first quarter of 2012.</p>
<p>8.4 Based on findings from the five-year evaluation, from country reviews under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) and the review under MRP action 8.3, the CERF Secretariat will review country level CERF monitoring and learning systems and assess whether a revision of the PAF is necessary.</p>	<p>By end Q4 2013</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>Following the finalization of the framework a series of scoping missions mapped the current monitoring practices of CHF and developed a roll-out plan for each fund. The CERF secretariat will determine how to link CERF monitoring to CHF monitoring processes in CHF countries. It will also assess whether elements of the CHF monitoring framework could potentially be adopted for CERF usage in non-CHF countries. CERF will follow the roll-out of CHF monitoring systems and will discuss CERF linkages with the OCHA Funding Coordination Section (FCS) and pooled fund managers. The final guidance on complementarity between CERF and country-based pooled funds (CBPF) references possible inclusion of CERF activities under CBPF monitoring frameworks.</p> <p>COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat has contracted a consultant to conduct an independent review of the PAF. The process started first quarter 2013 and is expected to conclude before the end of the third quarter of 2013.</p> <p>In the context of the MRP this recommendation will be considered closed. Continuing initiatives to strengthen CERF monitoring and learning systems and implementation of recommendations of the PAF review will be integrated into the CERF secretariat's regular work-plan. The CERF Advisory Group will be briefed on developments at its biannual meetings.</p>

Evaluation Recommendation 9: Commission, within one year, a study of the partnership arrangements of the different UN agencies with NGO implementing partners to capture good practice and propose a system for streamlining partnerships with known partners in new emergencies.

Management Response: Partially Accepted

Narrative: The CERF secretariat recognizes the important role that NGOs play in the implementation of CERF-funded projects as well as significant differences in sub-granting arrangements between agencies. However, the issue is broader than the CERF and any comprehensive review of different sub-granting procedures and identification of best practices will require

significant support and involvement by agencies. The CERF secretariat will introduce this topic in the regular meetings of the IASC Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing which is the primary forum for IASC discussions of CERF related issues.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
9.1 Launch discussion in IASC Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing to obtain agency feedback on proposed review of sub-granting procedures.	By end Q3 2011	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF discussed the study on partnership arrangements with partner agencies. There was, however, limited support for this initiative given that a number of agencies have already taken steps to improve their partnership arrangements with implementing partners. Instead, the CERF secretariat worked with agencies on a bilateral basis to secure more qualitative information on sub-granting procedures and how CERF funds fit into their broader implementation arrangements to complement the quantitative information on the timeliness of sub-grants that is collected in the annual HC reports. Initial results of this research were reviewed by the CERF Advisory Group in May 2012. CERF continues to work closely with agencies on these issues and uses information and findings from PAF country reviews and future annual HC reports to inform consultations. CERF will continue to synthesize findings and discuss these with the CERF Advisory Group.

Evaluation Recommendation 10: Better document and disseminate the reasoning behind allocation decisions at all coordination levels in order to improve the transparency and thoroughness of the process.

Management Response: Accepted

Narrative: The CERF secretariat recognizes that the rationale for allocation decisions at field and headquarters level may be unevenly communicated in the official CERF allocation documents, and to address this issue a number of initiatives have already been initiated by CERF in 2011. The CERF secretariat will continue its ongoing work on improving transparency, communication and information dissemination using the findings from this evaluation.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
10.1 Ensure that information from all levels of the decisions making process has been adequately included and presented in CERF submissions.	Continuous	CERF	COMPLETED: This is being done through the proposal review process.
10.2 Review the improvement brought about by the introduction in 2011 of a new, more detailed CERF application template and assess whether additional changes to the format are necessary.	By end Q4 2013	CERF	ONGOING: The CERF application template is being revised and will be launched January 2014. Improvements have been introduced to enhance the quality of information.
10.3 Revise communication strategy around the Underfunded Emergency process (see recommendation 3)	By end Q1 2013	CERF	COMPLETED: This is linked to the follow-up to the review of the CERF UFE window (see recommendation 3).

TO THE UN CONTROLLER – CERF secretariat response

Evaluation Recommendation 11: Allocate a percentage of CERF funds from the 3 per cent UN Secretariat management fees to reinforce the HC and OCHA's monitoring capacity at country level.

Management Response: Pending.

Narrative: The standard PSC level of 13 per cent normally charged on UN trust funds has been reduced from 13 per cent to 10 per cent for CERF (of which 7 per cent is passed to the CERF implementing partners). The 3 per cent retained by the UN secretariat is split operationally 40/60 between the substantive office and central administrative services, as per established UN Secretariat-wide practice which is applied across all UN departments and offices. The portion of the programme support funds used for central administrative services is used for costs incurred for backend administrative and other support functions by the UN secretariat such as recruitment and servicing of staff and consultants, procurement and contracting, budget preparation and control, financial operations, accounting, reporting, auditing etc. However, regardless of the above, the Controller has agreed on an exceptional basis for CERF, that the portion of PSC for management of the Fund could go above the current practice if the increase in requirements is based on well-justified, operational needs with all requests being considered on a case-by-case basis.

A Working Group on Cost Recovery was established by the Controller to look at the whole issue of cost recovery in the UN Secretariat including the PSC. Under PSC, one of the issues that the group would be looking at was the use of the PSC income (including the current 60:40 split). OCHA participated in this group and the report produced by the group was finalised in March 2012.

A discussion around the need for financing of additional CERF monitoring capacity will depend on changes to the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) and, therefore, depend on the outcomes of follow-up actions to recommendation 8. Additional discussions on the course of action proposed by the evaluators would therefore be required before the CERF Secretariat could respond in detail. In addition, while the recommendation makes reference to the country-level, not all countries receiving CERF funds have OCHA offices and some countries only receive occasional CERF grants of small amounts which would not justify a country level monitoring mechanism. It should also be noted that CERF grants are by design not a regular funding source for an emergency, but rather constitute ad-hoc allocations responding to specific emerging needs. Therefore, any percentage levied on CERF allocations would have to be standardized in a way to ensure that countries with the most CERF funds/projects also receive enough resources to monitor those projects.

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
11.1 The CERF secretariat will launch discussions with the Controller's office on the administrative aspects of this recommendation.	By end Q1 2013	CERF	ONGOING: Consultations with the UN controller are ongoing. The ERC met with the controller on 8 April 2013 to discuss issues around PSC. During the meeting the ERC highlighted concerns surrounding the use of the PSC, such as the split between OCHA and the wider Secretariat and transparency around the use of funds allocated to the UN Secretariat. The Controller, in turn, highlighted that any policy change would have wider implications. It was agreed that the Controller would provide additional information to the CERF Advisory Group on the current PSC policy and the usage of CERF PSC. Subsequently the deputy UN Controller briefed the Advisory Group at its meeting in May 2013 and the Controller will meet with the Advisory Group during the November 2013 meeting to further discuss usage of the PSC.
11.2 In case of changes to the CERF monitoring and reporting framework (under recommendation 8) CERF will review whether this necessitates a strengthening of the monitoring capacity at country level.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	ONGOING: (See recommendation 8 for details). CERF will continue to engage with inter-agency processes and with recipient agencies to utilise existing or evolving monitoring systems and processes at country level to improve information on results achieved with CERF funds. CERF will also continue to improve the inclusiveness and quality of the narrative reporting processes at country level. Finally, the independent country reviews conducted under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework are important tools for verifying the added value of CERF at country level. CERF will continue to develop the strategic use of these country reviews.

Evaluation Recommendation 12: The CERF loan fund should be reduced to US\$30 million and the balance transferred to the grant window.			
Management Response: Accepted			
Narrative: The CERF Secretariat agrees with the usefulness of a reduction in the size of the loan element. This is in line with the results of a study that the CERF Secretariat had conducted ahead of the April 2011 CERF Advisory Group meeting. Consultations will be undertaken on the exact size of the reduction as well as the use of the funds thus set free. This discussion will be informed by actions under recommendation 19.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
12.1 Develop policy proposal on reform of the loan element for presentation to AG at November 2011 meeting.	By end Q3 2011	CERF	COMPLETED: Based on a policy proposal by the CERF secretariat and this recommendation by the five-year evaluation, the CERF Advisory Group recommended a reduction in the size of the loan element to \$30 million at its October 2011 meeting. Following approval by the General Assembly, \$46.4 million was transferred from the loan element to the grant element in January 2012.
12.2 Conduct research and consultations on legislative steps, including possible General Assembly (GA) authorization, necessary for reform of loan element.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	
12.3 Provide input into draft GA resolution for reform of loan window at request of Member States.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	

TO THE DONORS – CERF secretariat Response

Evaluation Recommendation 13: In at-risk countries where there are no alternate UN pooled fund mechanisms apart from CERF, donors should support the establishment of an ERF or other type of pooled funding that is directly accessible by NGOs.			
Management Response: Partially accepted.			
Narrative: The establishment of a CBPF often makes an important contribution to the local humanitarian architecture. A detailed examination, however, is still required on a case-by-case basis according to the criteria set out in the ERF and CHF guidelines. Not every country context will be suitable for a CBPF.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
None	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable.

Evaluation Recommendation 14: Ensure that future evaluations look collectively at CERF and other UN-pooled fund mechanisms.			
Management Response: Accepted.			
Narrative: The CERF secretariat will seek to include the interaction of the CERF with CBPFs in future evaluations. In addition, the CERF secretariat will continue to include the issue in the country-level reviews under the PAF where a CBPF is present.			

Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
14.1 Country-level reviews under the PAF for countries with CBPFs will take into account the interaction between the CBPFs and the CERF.	Ongoing through PAF reviews.	CERF	<p>COMPLETED: The revised terms of reference for the independent country reviews under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) specifically include research questions related to the complementarity of CERF with other pooled funds.</p> <p>To date CERF PAF reviews in Kenya, Somalia, Ethiopia, Yemen, Pakistan, DRC, Colombia and Zimbabwe have examined complementarity between CERF and the country-based pooled funds in those countries as per the standard TORs.</p>

TO CLUSTER LEAD AGENCIES – CERF secretariat response

Evaluation Recommendation 15: Integrate performance measurement of UN-managed pooled funds into cluster performance systems.			
Management Response: Partially accepted.			
Narrative: The evaluators have clarified that the meaning of this recommendation is twofold, firstly to ensure that the terms of reference of cluster leads clearly outline pooled fund related responsibilities and, secondly, to integrate performance measurement of CERF (and CBPF) funded activities into broader cluster and sector monitoring and reporting frameworks. For the first part of the recommendation CERF agrees that the terms of reference for cluster leads should provide clarity of the full range of responsibilities of cluster lead agencies and cluster coordinators, including those related to pooled fund processes. With respect to the second part of the recommendation, the CERF secretariat agrees that CERF-funded activities can benefit from being assessed as part of the broader humanitarian response and utilizing existing cluster or sector monitoring and performance systems, while still ensuring that mandatory reporting requirements for CERF grants are met. A better integrated monitoring approach of pooled funds and CAPs is a priority under OCHA's four year (2010-2013) Strategic Framework (SF), and it is specifically addressed through a strategic objective dedicated to ensuring a more systematic coordination of the common humanitarian programme cycle (objective 2.4). The CERF secretariat will address this recommendation through the ongoing work under SF Objective 2.4, and will link it closely to the MRP actions under recommendation 8 (see above).			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
15.1 Liaise with relevant IASC entities to ensure that the terms of reference of cluster leads adequately reflects pooled fund related responsibilities.	By end Q3 2012	CERF	<p>COMPLETED: 15.1. The IASC Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at the Country level (from August 2012) includes cluster support to the HC in prioritizing and making funding decisions related to pooled funds as a core responsibility of the cluster (albeit this is not described in great detail in the document). In addition, the frameworks (ToRs and guidance documents) for the individual funds establish the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders in the pooled fund processes, including cluster leads and cluster members. The frameworks for the various pooled funds therefore constitute the common agreements for participating organisations and other stakeholders, and as such these define a common understanding of the roles and responsibilities of relevant entities.</p> <p>It should however be noted that at policy level the role and responsibility of clusters in monitoring the implementation of pooled fund activities is still unresolved. This issue is currently being discussed in the broader context of clusters' role in monitoring the overall humanitarian response.</p>
15.2 Through work under the OCHA Strategic Framework	By end Q4 2013	CERF	ONGOING: 15.2. (See also recommendation 8) This action will be linked to the work

<p>objective 2.4 and the IASC Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing explore options for closer integration of monitoring frameworks at the country level.</p>			<p>around implementation of a standardized monitoring framework for Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs) and ERFs. The monitoring framework for CHFs was finalized during the first quarter of 2012. Following the finalization of the framework, a series of scoping missions mapped the current monitoring practices of CHFs and developed a roll-out plan for each fund. When rolled out, the CERF secretariat will explore if and how this framework could potentially be used to support monitoring of CERF-funded activities in countries with a CHF. The CERF secretariat will also link up with discussions under the IASC Transformative Agenda around broader emergency wide monitoring systems for humanitarian response, in particular for monitoring of CAPs and Flash Appeals.</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>Evaluation Recommendation 16: Disseminate and promote good practice examples.</p>			
<p>Management Response: Accepted.</p>			
<p>Narrative: The CERF secretariat supports the recommendation and will work with partners in identifying and disseminating good practice examples.</p>			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
<p>16.1 Establish a “good practice” repository and promote it to the field and headquarters staff involved in CERF processes. The CERF Secretariat will highlight such practices in the CERF newsletter and website.</p>	<p>By end Q4 2012</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>COMPLETED: 16.1 & 16.2. The CERF secretariat has put in place an internal system for systematically identifying good practice examples for inclusion in the repository. The good practice repository is used to inform CERF trainings and guidance development and good practice examples.</p>
<p>16.2 Identified good practices will inform CERF guidance development.</p>	<p>Continuous</p>	<p>CERF</p>	

TO UN AGENCIES AND IOM – CERF Secretariat Response

<p>Evaluation Recommendation 17: Conduct an evaluation of their use of CERF funds within 18 months to determine what internal factors, including partnership policies and practices, influence the effectiveness of CERF projects.</p>			
<p>Management Response: Partially accepted</p>			
<p>Narrative: The CERF secretariat found FAO’s evaluation of its use of CERF funds to have been a very useful exercise and will support to the best of its ability any recipients of CERF funding who decides to conduct a similar study.</p>			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
<p>17.1 Support agencies who conduct an evaluation of their use of CERF funds.</p>	<p>Continuous</p>	<p>CERF</p>	<p>COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat contacted agencies regarding the possibility of conducting evaluations of their use of CERF funds. To date, IOM has agreed to conduct such an evaluation in 2012 and the review was concluded in 2013. WFP will make CERF a component of a broader review of its use of pooled funds scheduled for 2013-2014. UNHCR is also considering launching a CERF-related review. In addition, the CERF</p>

			secretariat liaised with agencies regarding the possible inclusion of standard CERF-specific questions for evaluations of selected projects or programmes implemented with the help of CERF funds. FAO included a number of such standard CERF questions in a project evaluation in Sri Lanka on a trial basis. The final evaluation report became available in October 2012.
--	--	--	---

Evaluation Recommendation 18: Ensure the development and implementation of emergency procedures for disbursing funds to implementing partners.			
Management Response: Partially accepted.			
Narrative: The CERF secretariat recognizes the importance of rapid onward disbursement of funds to NGO implementing partners by UN agencies and would support to the best of its abilities agency efforts aimed at increasing the speed of such transfers. However, this recommendation is related to agencies internal systems and its scope is broader than the CERF. Should a study of the partnership arrangements of the different UN agencies with NGO implementing partners be undertaken (as proposed under recommendation 9), such a study would help to clarify current emergency procedures for disbursement of funds to implementing partners and identify potential gaps.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
None	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable.

Evaluation Recommendation 19: UN agencies that do not use internal advance mechanisms in conjunction with CERF funding should establish interactivity and complementarities between these and the CERF, in order to speed up the start-up of projects.			
Management Response: Partially accepted.			
Narrative: The CERF secretariat understands this recommendation to suggest the establishment by agencies of internal advance mechanisms where not already present, to bridge the gap between the approval of a project proposal by the ERC and the arrival of funds at the field level. The CERF secretariat supports this recommendation and will examine the possibility of using the CERF's loan element to assist in the establishment of advance mechanisms by agencies which do not have sufficient resources of their own to do so.			
Key planned follow-up Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
19.1. Finalize concept note on potential use of the CERF loan element to support establishment of agency-specific internal advance mechanisms where not already present.	By end Q3 2011	CERF	COMPLETED: The CERF secretariat developed the concept note mentioned and shared it with partner agencies. It was discussed with relevant agencies in 2012 to gauge whether there was any interest in and need for such a mechanism on the part of agencies. Based on the outcome of consultations there appears to be limited interest in exploring this modality further. The CERF secretariat, therefore, does not consider the use of the loan element to establish such facilities viable at present.
19.2 Discuss concept note in the IASC Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	
19.3 Support establishment of internal advance mechanisms using the CERF's loan element as necessary.	By end Q2 2012	CERF	