

29 December 2021

Dear Ms. Steensen,

I wish to thank you for completing the MOPAN Institutional Assessment Report of OCHA, marking the end of a year-long collaboration.

I am grateful to the MOPAN Secretariat and the evaluation team for the extensive work that went into the research and the useful analysis we find in the report. I am also grateful to the Republic of Korea and the United States for co-leading the assessment, and for providing knowledge and insights on the particularities of humanitarian aid and the environment in which OCHA operates.

Having reviewed the report carefully, I am pleased that the improvements brought about by OCHA's change management process, initiated in 2017, have been documented and recognized. We had received such feedback from IASC partners and Member States, and it is encouraging to see these improvements validated in the report.

The report also confirms the progress made by OCHA in a number of areas of organizational effectiveness. We are very proud of the recognized strengths, including: (a) the strong partnerships we have built to facilitate response; (b) promoting coherence across the Humanitarian Programme Cycle; (c) our global advocacy for the inclusion of human rights and gender equality, protection, accountability to affected populations and PSEA in system-wide processes; and (d) strong pooled fund management.

OCHA manages about \$1.5 billion in contributions from Member States and the private sector every year, and we are acutely aware of our responsibility. The specific finding that, "*OCHA succeeds in striking an appropriate balance between the competing demands of speed, flexibility, transparency and accountability*", is indeed very important to us.

Ms. Suzanne Steensen  
Head of Secretariat  
Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network

OCHA is a constantly evolving organization, and we take note of the areas that still require improvements. We are of course also mindful that the changes that occurred in OCHA over the last years are unfolding within a broader context of the UN Secretary General's proposed reform agenda in terms of development, management and peace and security and that changes need to be embedded in these. Our management response to the Key Performance Indicators rated as unsatisfactory is annexed to this letter. We also intend to take the report findings into account in the preparation of our next Strategic Plan for 2023-2027, which is now getting underway.

The annex provides a summary of OCHA's management position on the issues identified by MOPAN. OCHA remains committed to effectively address weaknesses by exploring various options including through its strategic planning process and other institutional and operational strengthening processes.

We remain, as always, available to provide further information or clarity related to our continued efforts to ensure OCHA is fit to meet the growing humanitarian challenges.

Yours sincerely,



Martin Griffiths  
Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs  
and Emergency Relief Coordinator

cc: His Excellency  
Mr. Taeho Lee  
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea  
to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva

Ms. Mia Beers,  
Deputy Director  
Office of Global Policy, Partnerships, Programs and Communications,  
Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, USAID

# OCHA MANAGEMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

MOPAN 2020 Institutional Assessment Report | December 2021

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)	Synthesized Findings	Implementing measures
<b>STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT</b>		
<b>KPI 2.2 Environment (p 80)</b>	<i>Environmental sustainability and climate change not prioritized, not integrated in strategic plan, limited human and financial resources.</i>	OCHA will further integrate environmental sustainability and climate change dimensions into its operations and programme planning and implementation. The extended 2018-2022 Strategic plan notes that OCHA will continue to strengthen work on the environmental management strategy, advocacy, analysis, policy formulation and research. The new strategic plan is expected to further explore the implications of climate change and environmental impact for OCHA's work and how to further contribute to addressing them.
<b>KPI 2.4 Diversity of Humanitarian Actors (pp 83-84)</b>	<i>OCHA does not have a KPI or corporate target on diversity of humanitarian actors.</i>	While OCHA has clear corporate targets and policies on localization, there are no plans at this point to develop a KPI or corporate target on diversity of humanitarian actors. In OCHA's view, localization and diversity should not be conflated as diversity is taken to have a number of dimensions. Diversity of humanitarian actors is not under OCHA's direct control, however there is a commitment to promote coordination mechanisms and processes that are open for participation to all relevant local and international humanitarian actors. Towards the end of 2021, OCHA started to determine a baseline for localization targets across different operations which have IASC coordination structures and is also in the process of developing a "Localization Toolkit" for use by OCHA field offices.
<b>OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT</b>		
<b>KPI 3.3 Decentralised decision making (p 88)</b>	<i>Mixed record on decentralization; OCHA did not meet ambition on delegation of authority at country level regarding resource reallocation / programming</i>	<p>OCHA has made great strides in delegating some functions closer to the point of delivery. In addition to the delegations listed by MOPAN, OCHA has expanded the delegation of authority to Heads of Offices for approving memorandums of understanding for common premises and services.</p> <p>OCHA acknowledges that several years of zero real budget growth have contributed to limited capacity in some country office (CO) locations, which has hampered the organization's efforts to further decentralize delegation of authority for other functions. OCHA is looking to mitigate this challenge by the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking into new business models to spread roles in the CO (which are now performed by one person) among several colleagues.</li> </ol>

		<p>b. Liaising with the UN Department of Operational Support (DOS) to provide administrative and financial capacity.</p> <p>Finally, the 2022 budget foresees a \$16 million growth for COs, for the first time in five years. This growth will contribute to addressing human resource capacity challenges and optimize the Delegation of Authority expansion.</p> <p>Regarding CERF, the link made in the MOPAN report between the allocation processes and wider OCHA decentralization issues, such as delegation of authority for certain administrative functions, is not immediately clear. With respect to the strategic direction of CERF, the ERC, as the manager of the Fund, is responsible for setting the strategic direction of the Fund informed by consultations with key stakeholders, including the CERF Advisory Group. CERF allocations remain driven by country-level priorities and funding requests from RC/HCs. However, in line with the provisions of the UN Secretary-Generals' Bulletin on CERF, it is the ERC's prerogative to make allocation decisions centrally.</p>
<b>KPI 3.4 Performance-based human resources (p 90)</b>	<i>Staff performance management system does not address excessive work pressure or poor performance</i>	As a Department of the UN Secretariat, OCHA does not have its own staff performance management systems. OCHA will continue to support the rollout of the UN Secretariat's new agile performance management approach and policy, which were designed to address feedback about weaknesses in the former performance management system. One-on-one performance management coaching will be made available to managers facing underperformance challenges within their teams.
<b>KPI 4.3 Results based budgeting (p 94)</b>	<i>Results based budgeting not applied; lack of alignment of financial resources to strategic objectives, lack of tracking costs from activity to results</i>	In line with the UN Secretariat's approach OCHA will implement UN Secretariat Results-Based-Management tools as they are rolled out and align this with the planning cycle to the extent possible.
<b>RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT</b>		
<b>KPI 5.3 Capacity analysis (p 106)</b>	<i>Lack of capacity analysis of national partners' capacity outside of pooled funds; no capacity building strategies developed.</i>	The report notes this indicator is relevant in the areas of building disaster preparedness and response capacity of national partners. OCHA conducts trainings and assists partners in the pursuit of coordinated humanitarian action including preparedness. However, OCHA's mandate does not include a call to build broader institutional capacity.
<b>KPI 5.4 Risk management (pp 107-108)</b>	<i>Gaps in risk management and mitigations; corporate risk register is not maintained, does not include analysis of and mitigation for political risks.</i>	OCHA's corporate risk register was updated in 2019. An update of the risk register is next scheduled for 2022, in line with the Secretariat system wide guidance on Enterprise Risk Management which OCHA is required to implement. This also involves the use of standard risk register templates and OCHA will be updating the 2019 register to align with the Secretariat system wide risk register template.



		humanitarian response to COVID, which takes precedence. This evaluation will explore the extent to which humanitarian actors worked successfully across the nexus in a global multifaceted crisis. The Joint Steering Committee co-chaired by OCHA and UNDP will undertake a light review of the support already provided to priority countries to identify measures required for enhanced demand driven support and addressing systemic challenges to addressing drivers of crises.
<b>KPI 6.3 Demonstrated commitment to furthering development partnerships for countries (p 118)</b>	<i>OCHA's internal structures and incentives are not always sufficiently supportive of collaboration / co-operation with country systems</i>	While there is room for improvement, OCHA engages with governments at various levels. Beyond advocacy, areas of collaboration/cooperation are preparedness, training, CMCoord and the HPC including needs assessments. The new operating model was largely focused on how OCHA can improve internal mechanisms.
<b>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT</b>		
<b>KPI 7.1 RBM applied (pp 128-129)</b>	<i>Lack of systematic approach to results-based management</i>	OCHA acknowledges the gap in the implementation of RBM. However, as part of the Secretariat, OCHA plans to roll out RBM tools based on the guidance and timelines proposed across the Secretariat. Every effort will be made to align this with the next planning cycle.
<b>KPI 7.3 Evidence-based targets (pp 131-132)</b>	<i>Gaps in KPIs pathways and intermediate results.</i>	OCHA will continue to work to strengthen KPIs at various levels, particularly as the development of the new strategic plan is underway. This may not necessarily be measured by individual indicators, but a combination of several indicators including qualitative ones.
<b>KPI 7.4 Effective monitoring systems (pp 133)</b>	<i>Gaps in corporate monitoring; insufficient resources allocated.</i>	OCHA will continue to strengthen monitoring by allocating resources as they become available. In 2021 and 2022, more resources were allocated to field operations where enhanced monitoring is required. OCHA monitors performance of its field office operations in line with strategic result areas outlined in the strategic plan, for example, strengthening information management and communication systems for resource allocation and use. This is partly done through annual work plan reporting and regular updates by heads of field offices to HQ management to ensure that the organisation is still on course to achieve planned results and outputs. The monitoring covers various operational issues that include resource allocation and timely utilization, coordinated planning for HRPs and HRP funding status, progress on implementation of Duty of Care by different offices in addition to other field operations.
<b>KPI 7.5 Performance data applied (p 135)</b>	<i>Planning documents are not based on performance data.</i>	OCHA does apply performance analysis to its operational planning. For example, OCHA determines which field operations need to be scaled up or down, based on the situation and performance analysis of its operations and that of partners. This also applies to determination of coordination structures to be established or to handover coordination responsibilities to government, a decision which is informed

		by performance analysis of partners and government. Similarly, resource allocation to partners coordinated by OCHA considers performance of the recipient partners.
<b>KPI 8.1 Independent evaluation function (pp 135-138)</b>	<i>Lack of independent evaluation function, managerially or financially; lack of resources for evaluation.</i>	OCHA has taken some steps to address the matter in line with the SG's August 2021 Administrative Instruction (ST/AI) on Evaluation in the Secretariat, as well as UN Evaluation norms and standards, and it has increased its evaluation budget by 12 percent in 2022. This is 0.45 percent of its total programme costs, near the minimum 0.5 requirement set out in the ST/AI guidance. Additionally, it is updating its internal evaluation policy to be in line with the new ST/AI and expects this to be promulgated in the first quarter of 2022.
<b>KPI 8.2 Evaluation coverage (pp 138-139)</b>	<i>Evaluation plan for the 2018-21 period has not been funded or executed.</i>	In line with the new ST/AI, OCHA is required to undertake one self-evaluation of each of its sub programmes every six years. OCHA will fulfil this commitment in line with its new 2023-2026 Strategic Framework.
<b>KPI 8.4 Evidence-based design (pp 140-141)</b>	<i>No formal system for integrating lessons-learned into new interventions.</i>	OCHA will continue to work on strengthening lessons learned in its planning and implementation. For example, lessons learned from planning and responding to COVID-19 have been factored in for 2022 preparedness and response planning at country and regional levels. This approach will continue with other emergencies.
<b>KPI 8.5 Poor performance tracked (pp 141-142)</b>	<i>Lack of system to identify poorly performing interventions</i>	OCHA acknowledges the need to strengthen tracking of underperforming interventions and will continue to develop systems and tools through its planning and reporting for tracking and addressing underperformance. The Umoja Extension 2 Integrated Planning, Management and reporting Solutions being implemented by all Secretariat entities has monitoring components that should enable OCHA to track and strengthen performance.
<b>RESULTS</b>		
<b>KPI 10: Relevance to partners (pp 149-151)</b>	<i>Mixed performance on "leave no one behind" principle</i>	<p>MOPAN recognizes that OCHA has been successful in ensuring that the priorities of affected people, including sub-groups and marginalized groups, are identified and captured in assessments and planning. Humanitarian interventions by definition are focused exclusively on the most vulnerable. To give one example, in most cases over 75% of affected people reached with humanitarian assistance are women and children. Further, respective progress made is documented through the annual assessment of all HNOs and HRPs.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that as a coordinating, as opposed to programmatic entity OCHA does not control or have authority over the way humanitarian partners target or distribute assistance in specific instances. OCHA continues to advocate for the prioritization of the most vulnerable through multi-sectoral needs analysis, the strategic planning process, the Humanitarian Country Teams and inter-clusters coordination.</p>

	<i>CERF not always tailored to support most vulnerable groups</i>	<p>CERF allocations are prioritized directly on the ground by recipient agencies under the leadership of the RC/HCs. Given the overall resource scarcity, CERF funds alone will never be able to ensure complete coverage. Therefore, UNCT/HCTs prioritize CERF funds for interventions in areas deemed to have the greatest added value in complementarity with funds from other sources, such as CBPFs and bilateral contributions. In recent years, CERF and CBPFs have also emphasized the importance of four priority underfunded areas in their interactions with country-level stakeholders requesting them to give due consideration to support for women and girls, people with disabilities, education, and other aspects of protection. This is in support of a 2019 initiative by the then ERC. A recent review of CERF support to these areas, which was also made available to MOPAN authors, found that the initiative had increased funding to these areas. This has been followed up by CERF with targeted allocations, for example to address GBV in 2020 and programs benefitting people with disabilities in 2021.</p>
<b>KPI 12: Sustainability of results (pp 60, 152)</b>	<i>Limited progress on encouraging partners towards more sustainable approaches</i>	<p>While OCHA concurs that the nexus approach often remains ad-hoc at the system level and under-resourced at country level, the operationalization of the nexus approach is not the main responsibility of OCHA, but predominately the responsibility of RC/HCs and of Governments which are tasked to lead on sharing of analysis, articulating collective outcomes and HDP priorities and ensuring that joined up programming is carried out within the respective plans (HRP, UNSDCF) towards those priorities.</p> <p>The recent IASC mapping of 16 countries that have implemented the nexus approach (which was carried out by OCHA) has clearly shown that OCHA has been extremely supportive of those processes where the RC/HC and the Government are leading on the nexus approach</p> <p>The finding should better reflect how much the humanitarian system has driven the operationalization of the nexus since the World Humanitarian Summit and the Agenda 2030 with the overall aim to reduce need, risk, and vulnerability. The same level of engagement by development actors to work on underlying drivers of need is needed and it is slowly strengthening through the UN Development System repositioning.</p>