

## **Update to the Management Response Plan to the CERF Five-Year Evaluation**

*CERF secretariat  
April 2012*

This document contains the first 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 to at the 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 up actions for each recommendation is contained in the right-hand column of the table under "current status". This also outlines revised implementation time frame for any activities that were rescheduled in order to ensure better alignment with other work streams, such as those contained under the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Transformative Agenda.

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

Date: 23 April 2012 (First Tracking Update)

Prepared by: Michael Jensen  
 Cleared by: Steve O'Malley  
 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 to at the ERC and the CERF secretariat. It does not constitute a response from other entities.

### TO THE EMERGENCY RELIEF COORDINATOR

<b>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</b>			
<b>Management Response:</b> Accepted.			
<b>Narrative:</b> 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 those on 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 Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
1.1. The CERF will ensure the preparation of a review of current practices and capacities in existing CBPFs to explore the potential for greater harmonization.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	ONGOING: 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.
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 2012	CERF	The new CERF rapid response guidelines that was published in September 2011 contains a section named "Complementarity with other Humanitarian Pooled Funds" which provides guidance on how to use country-level systems and structures for CBPFs to support the preparation and prioritization of CERF proposals.
1.3. Following dissemination of guidance, CERF will establish appropriate procedures for tracking the degree of implementation at the field level and for identifying good practices.	By end Q2 2012	CERF	A revised reporting format and guidance for the annual HC CERF country reports were launched in January 2012 and were used by country teams for the 2011 reports. The new format directly asks country teams to explain if and how CERF processes were harmonized with those of CBPFs where these exist.  The revised terms of reference for the 2012 independent country reviews under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) specifically addresses issues related to the complementarity of CERF with other pooled funds.

			The annual HC reports for 2011 and the PAF country reviews of 2012 will allow CERF to gauge the current level of harmonization between CERF and CBPFs. PAFs country reviews include the following countries with CBPFs: Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, and Yemen.
--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**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.**

**Management Response:** Partially accepted.

**Narrative:** The Secretary-General’s Bulletin on the “Establishment and Operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund” (ST/SGB/2010/05) of 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 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.

Key planned follow Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
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.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	See recommendation 8.

**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 the 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 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 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 Q1 2012	CERF	ONGOING: The CERF secretariat is in the process of contracting independent humanitarian consultants to conduct a review of the UFE window. The process is expected to be completed by the third quarter of 2012.
3.2 Implement any lessons identified in the study to improve the process and adopt a communication strategy based on outcomes of study.	By end Q3 2012	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 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	ONGOING: 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	The Note Verbale will be revised by the CERF secretariat and shared with Member States in early June.

**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 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	ONGOING: The first Member State briefings for 2012 in New York and Geneva are scheduled for May 2012.
5.2 Update the CERF's resource mobilization strategy	By end Q1 2012	CERF, ERPS	The resource mobilization strategy is being reviewed and updated.
5.3 Improve public messaging by regularly producing and distributing analytical newsletters, the CERF annual report, press releases, and updates for the CERF website.	Ongoing	CERF, CISB, EPRS	The new CERF website is being finalized. An analytical information product "Activities in 2011" 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	This will be done by the end of Q3 2012.
5.5 Conduct annual CERF High-Level conference in NY	By end Q4 annually	CERF, ERPS, CISB	The 2011 CERF high-level conference was held in December 2011.
5.6 Organize USG luncheons with targeted Member States in New York, with discussion on humanitarian financing/CERF	Ongoing	CERF, ERPS	ERPS has organized one luncheon for the Gulf Cooperation Council. Further lunches for other partners will be organized with Member States closer to the CERF's annual pledging conference,

--	--	--	--

**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 programs, 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 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 Q4 2011	CERF	POSTPONED: This activity will be based on a number of selected case-study countries and will be linked to a review of the annual HC CERF country reports. Due to the timing of the HC CERF reports the deliverable 6.1 has been moved to Q2 of 2012. 6.2 will follow based on the findings in 6.1.
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 analyze such information.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	

## 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 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 Q4 2011	CERF	<p>ONGOING: CERF prioritization guidance will be informed by the work undertaken under the IASC Transformative Agenda during the first half of 2012.</p> <p>The CERF secretariat has developed a draft concept note outlining the necessary steps and stakeholders that would have to be involved in the preparation of the prioritization guidance. This envisages a document review, consultations, a possible survey of CERF focal points, the identification of case studies and good practices as well as the possible establishments of an informal OCHA-internal prioritization working group.</p> <p>The CERF secretariat systematically extracts possible good practices from submitted CERF proposals and from annual CERF country reports by HCs. These will serve as case studies and will help inform guidance development.</p> <p>Preparation of a humanitarian financing Community of Practice (CoP) is underway and a pilot will be launched early in the second quarter of 2012. The CoP will be initially for OCHA staff only.</p>
7.2 Develop draft CERF prioritization guidance.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	
7.3 Circulate for review, revise as per comments and disseminate final guidance.	By end Q1 2012	CERF	
7.4 Ensure inclusion of prioritization among contents of HC and cluster coordinator training.	By end Q2 2012	CERF	
7.5 Establish a humanitarian financing Community of Practice (CoP).	By end Q1 2012	CERF	

### **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 interagency 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 Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
8.1 Review and if necessary revise the guidance and	By end Q4 2011	CERF	ONGOING: 8.1. The CERF secretariat has revised the template for the annual narrative

<p>template for the CERF annual 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.</p> <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>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>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 2011</p> <p>By end Q1 2012</p> <p>By end Q1 2012</p>	<p>CERF</p> <p>CERF</p> <p>CERF</p>	<p>reports on the use of CERF funds by RC/HCs as well as the accompanying guidelines. The 2011 reports (due on 15 March 2012) were submitted in the revised format.</p> <p>ONGOING: 8.2. Draft AAR guidance has been developed. During the second quarter of 2012 these will be shared and discussed with selected CERF stakeholders.</p> <p>ONGOING: 8.3 &amp; 8.4. This work will be closely aligned with related initiatives under the IASC Transformative Agenda. 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. Following the finalization of the framework a series of scoping missions will map the current monitoring practices of CHFs and develop a roll-out plan for each fund. The CERF secretariat will during second quarter of 2012 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. Monitoring systems for OCHA-managed pooled funds was the main agenda item at the annual OCHA pooled fund management workshop in April 2012.</p> <p>The revised terms of reference for the 2012 independent country reviews under the CERF Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF) specifically include research questions related to monitoring and evaluation of CERF funded activities.</p> <p>The CERF secretariat anticipates contracting a consultant to conduct an independent review of the PAF. The process is expected to start in the third quarter of 2012 and conclude before the end of the fourth.</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 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	ONGOING: The CERF discussed the study on partnership arrangements with partner agencies. There was, however, limited support on the side of agencies for this initiative. Instead, the CERF secretariat is working 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 RC/HC reports. Initial results will be reviewed by the CERF Advisory Group in May 2012.
--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**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 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.	Immediately/ ongoing	CERF	ONGOING: 10.1. 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 2011	CERF	10.2. The review of the CERF application template is planned to take place during second quarter of 2012 following the conclusion of the review process for the 2011 annual HC CERF country reports. The CERF application template and the format of the CERF country reports are closely linked. A combined review of the application template and the new reporting template is deemed to be the most effective approach. The application template was most recently revised in August 2011.
10.3 Revise communication strategy around the Underfunded Emergency process (see recommendation 3)	By end Q3 2012	CERF	10.3. This will be linked 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 back end 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 has been established by the Controller, which will be looking at the whole issue of cost recovery in the UN secretariat including the PSC. Under PSC, one of the issues that the group will be looking at is the use of the PSC income (including the current 60:40 split). OCHA will participate in this group and the meetings are scheduled to start in September 2011

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 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 Q3 2011	CERF	POSTPONED: 11.1. Due to staff changes in the UN Office of the Controller, discussions regarding use of the PSC to reinforce the HC's and OCHA's monitoring capacity at country level have been deferred and will begin mid-May 2012
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	11.2. This is pending the conclusion of the work outlined under recommendation 8.

<b>Evaluation Recommendation 12: The CERF loan fund should be reduced to US\$30 million and the balance transferred to the grant window.</b>			
<b>Management Response:</b> Accepted.			
<b>Narrative:</b> 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.			
<b>Key planned follow Action(s)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Responsible Unit(s)</b>	<b>Current Status</b>
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 were 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 2012	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. However, a detailed examination is still required on a case-by-case basis. Not every country context will be suitable for a CBPF.

Key planned follow 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 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 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>ONGOING: The revised terms of reference for the 2012 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>The CERF secretariat is currently organizing the 2012 round of PAF country-level reviews. These will focus on the Horn of Africa (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia), Ivorian refugees (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Liberia) and one additional country to be decided. In countries with a pooled fund (Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia and Yemen), consultants will be asked to examine their interaction and complementarity with the CERF.</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 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 Q1 2012	CERF	ONGOING: 15.1. The IASC generic ToR for cluster/sector leads at the country level do not currently include concrete language on the responsibilities of cluster leads in the allocation of funding from pooled funds (i.e. CERF or country based pooled funds). The frameworks (ToRs and guidance documents) for the individual funds, however, 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. Nevertheless, a clear reference to pooled funds responsibilities in the generic ToR for cluster leads may be advantageous. The CERF secretariat will explore this in consultation with relevant stakeholders as set out in the MRP action. The CERF secretariat will link this MRP action to the work under the IASC Transformative Agenda. The discussions linked to the Transformative Agenda have included aspects of the role of cluster leads in major emergencies. It is not clear whether this in itself will lead to any changes to the generic ToRs for cluster leads, but the CERF secretariat will follow the discussions and use this as basis for implementing the action.
15.2 Through work under the OCHA Strategic Framework objective 2.4 and the IASC Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing explore options for closer integration of monitoring frameworks at the country level.	By end Q2 2012	CERF	ONGOING: 15.2. This action will be linked to the work around implementation of a standardized monitoring framework for Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs) and ERFs. The monitoring framework for CHFs is being discussed in the IASC SWG on Humanitarian Financing. 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.

<b>Evaluation Recommendation 16: Disseminate and promote good practice examples.</b>			
<b>Management Response:</b> Accepted.			
<b>Narrative:</b> The CERF secretariat supports the recommendation and will work with partners in identifying and disseminating good practice examples.			
<b>Key planned follow Action(s)</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Responsible Unit(s)</b>	<b>Current Status</b>
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.	By end Q4 2011	CERF	ONGOING: 16.1 & 16.2. The CERF secretariat systematically identifies good practices from submitted CERF proposals and from annual CERF country reports by HCs. These will serve as case studies, be communicated to partners and will help inform guidance development. The CERF secretariat is identifying good practice examples, from the 2011 HC CERF country reports as part of the review process. It is expected that by early May a number of possible good practices will have been selected and prepared for dissemination.
16.2 Identified good practices will inform CERF guidance development.	Ongoing.	CERF	

**TO UN AGENCIES AND IOM – CERF SECRETARIAT RESPONSE**

**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.**

**Management Response:** Partially accepted.

**Narrative:** The CERF secretariat found FAO's evaluation of its use of CERF funds to have been a very useful exercise and would support to the best of its ability any recipients of CERF funding who decided to conduct a similar study.

Key planned follow Action(s)	Time Frame	Responsible Unit(s)	Current Status
17.1 Support agencies who conduct an evaluation of their use of CERF funds.	Ongoing	CERF	ONGOING: The CERF secretariat has been in contact with a number of agencies regarding the possibility of conducting evaluations of their use of CERF funds. To date, IOM and WFP have expressed an interest in conducting such an evaluation in 2012. In addition, the CERF secretariat is liaising 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.

**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 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 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	ONGOING: A concept note has been developed and shared with partner agencies. The concept note will be discussed with relevant agencies during the early half of 2012 to gauge if there is any interest in and need for this possible mechanism on the part of agencies. Based on these preliminary consultations it will by second quarter of 2012 be decided whether a more in-depth discussion with relevant stakeholders is warranted.
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	