Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) Guidelines

Annual Headquarter Report on the use of CERF Funding

INTRODUCTION

CERF’s overarching legislative framework – General Assembly Resolution 60/124, the Secretary-General’s Bulletin on the “Establishment and Operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund” (ST/SGB/2010/05 of 23 April 2010) and the Umbrella Letter of Understanding – call for organizations receiving CERF resources to submit an Annual Headquarter (HQ) Report on the overall strategic impact of CERF funding upon the Eligible Organization’s global emergency programmes.

The Annual HQ Reports are the agencies’ reporting tool for informing the Emergency Response Coordinator (ERC) about the overall strategic impact of CERF funding upon each organization’s global emergency programmes. They should describe how CERF programme results fulfil the mandate of the fund to facilitate the timely implementation of time critical, life-saving activities in new emergencies or strengthen the core of underfunded emergencies. The reports feed into the annual Secretary-General Report on CERF that is shared with the General Assembly. The reports should be prepared by the recipient agencies’ HQs with input from the agencies’ field offices as needed.

The 2013 independent review of the CERF Performance Accountability Framework (PAF) recommended continued improvement of CERF HQ reports and increased two-way feedback and information sharing on agency performance capability. With these recommendations, CERF has as per January 2014 amended the Annual HQ Report template and guidelines.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION OF ANNUAL HQ REPORTS

These guidelines are structured according to the tailored agency template that will be shared with each agency upon launch of the reporting process. Deadline for submitting the report is towards the end of the first quarter of the year. CERF will communicate the exact deadline in January of each year together with the tailored template. The template contains the following three sections:
I. Funding Overview

II. Programme Highlights

III. Fund Use and Management

It is suggested that the report does not exceed 6 pages (font type Arial size 10). Please delete the boxes with guiding comments in the template before you submit the report.

Section I - Funding Overview (It is suggested that Section I does not exceed 2 pages)

Section I should provide a narrative overview of the total CERF funding received by the agency in the past year. In this section it is suggested that the following is included:

- Analyses of the total annual CERF funding received by the agency by window (Rapid Response (RR)/Under-Funded (UFE)) based on the pre-populated table provided by the CERF secretariat.
- Description of CERF’s overall annual ranking as a donor to the agency [insert in table].
- Reflection on trends in received CERF funding compared to previous years, for example by sector, geography, emergency type and volume. If relevant, please highlight significant changes in funding trends, outline possible reasons for this and related consequences.

Section II - Programme Highlights (It is suggested that Section III not exceeds 2 pages)

Section II should provide an analysis of the overall strategic impact of CERF funds on the agency’s global emergency programmes. Agencies are encouraged to reference studies or evaluations where applicable and to use concrete examples were available.

It is suggested that the section includes analyses of how CERF allocations have fulfilled the mandate of the fund to facilitate timely implementation of time critical, life-saving activities in sudden onset emergencies (or rapid deteriorations thereof) and/or strengthen core elements of the overall humanitarian response in under-funded emergencies. The section could also include analyses of CERF’s role in funding humanitarian response activities in the past year compared to other funding sources. It is also suggested that the section includes analyses of whether CERF has contributed to the agency’s strategic goals.

It is also suggested that the section includes analyses of situations where CERF funding improved the humanitarian response and helped stabilize/improve the emergency situation (health, nutrition, etc.) at the country or regional level. The section could also include analyses of whether CERF allocations have helped improve resource mobilization from other sources and whether CERF has contributed to improve coordination amongst the humanitarian communities.

In contrast to the information provided at the country level by Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators (RC/HCs) in the RC/HC Reports that focuses on the overall UN humanitarian response to specific emergencies,¹ the information in this section should focus on the specific agency program results analysed from a global perspective.

Section III - Fund Use and Management (It is suggested that Section III not exceeds 2 pages)

It is suggested that Section III describes any lessons learned, key challenges or good practises experienced when accessing funding from the CERF, including management and decision-making processes. Please be specific in describing the strengths and weaknesses observed in terms of the CERF secretariat’s Fund administration. Recommendations regarding the use of the Fund, its criteria, proposal,

¹ RC/HC Reports are available on: http://www.unocha.org/cerf/reportsevaluations/residenthumanitarian-coordinators-reportsrchc-reports-2013
allocation, implementation, evaluation and reporting requirements are also welcome. Please use concrete examples, if possible.

It is also suggested that section III references potential agency challenges and/or initiatives at a global level that could impact overall CERF performance. This could include findings from evaluations and independent assessments of relevance to the CERF partnership. Please highlight initiatives or challenges related to monitoring, evaluation and accountability systems that may be of relevance to CERF accountability.

Finally, it is suggested that the section describes achievements and challenges regarding partnership arrangements for implementation of CERF projects, including relevant initiatives undertaken at field or headquarter levels to improve engagement of implementing partners in CERF prioritisation processes and to ensure fast disbursements of funds to implementing partners.