

**Independent Evaluation of UNHCR's Response to the L3 Emergency
In the Democratic Republic of Congo, December 2018 (ES/2018/19)**

UNHCR Management Response

Evaluation title:	UNHCR's Response to the L3 Emergency in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
UNHCR evaluation reference:	ES/2018/
Entity that commissioned the evaluation:	Evaluation Service
Date of Management Response:	10 May 2019

General comments on the evaluation:	<p>The armed conflict in Kasai started in August 2016, when clashes between the police and Kamuina Nsapu (KN) militiamen resulted in several deaths, including that of KN rebellion leader Jean-Pierre Mpandi. When the authorities refused to recognize Mpandi as a local traditional leader, he asked his followers to start an uprising against the Government, taking advantage of the fact that Kasai is a major stronghold of the opposition to President Kabila. From September 2016, Kasai stopped being one of the few stable regions of DRC. KN militants started expanding their violent activities in the region, destroying several villages: burning, maiming and killing thousands of civilians.</p> <p>In Tanganyika province, clashes between Twa indigenous people and Luba also displaced thousands of among the populations. The insecurity in the Kasai region (five provinces) and in the provinces of Tanganyika and South Kivu displaced almost 2,422,000 IDPs, as of the end of November 2017, of whom 1.9 million in 2017. On 20 October 2017, the UN declared an L3 emergency in the Kasai region and in the provinces of Tanganyika and South Kivu for a period of six months. Several UN agencies had already declared an internal L3 emergency but UNHCR only declared the L3 in October 2017. The operation in DRC faced challenges related to: resource mobilisation, insecurity, difficulties in gaining access to IDPs, and lack of competent staff. It should be noted that at the time of the emergency in Kasai, the DRC operation was responding to multiple simultaneous emergencies, including influxes of refugees from the Central African Republic and South Sudan.</p> <p>DRC operation welcomed the L3 evaluation mission, which was carried out shortly after the requested additional resources were made available to the operation to respond to the emergency situation. Additional staffing arrived in the operation some four months (February 2018), and about two months before the deactivation of the L3 emergency. The long lead time between the declaration and the actual date of the release of resources was detrimental to UNHCR's response. Despite the challenges, UNHCR established and maintained its position as Protection Cluster lead, as well as demonstrated its leadership for coordinating shelter interventions (and CCCM activities in Goma).</p>
--	--

	<p>The L3 evaluation mission's recommendations were welcome - some of which will be addressed by the DRC operation, while others will need the concerted support from Headquarters: the Africa Bureau, DIP, DPSM and DESS in particular. It is noteworthy that the protection-related recommendations were largely in line with those made by DIP, following a protection mission that was undertaken in February 2018 (two months before the L3 evaluation mission). Obviously, the level of implementation of the actions that were taken following the DIP mission had not yet advanced significantly by the time that the evaluation team arrived.</p> <p>UNHCR is working on a new revised policy on its engagement in IDP situations, which is expected to be finalized in the course of 2019. This policy will allow the Office to maintain leadership at a higher level and to plan for the timely availability of financial resources and competent staffing with adequate language skills. The release of the revised IDP engagement strategy will guide DRC and other IDP operations to review and re-align their business model to the global one, so that UNHCR's engagement becomes more predictable and coherent.</p>
--	--

RECOMMENDATION 1:	<p>UNHCR should develop a viable business model for IDP operations at both country and global level supported by a communication strategy targeting internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a communication strategy which will aim at sharing the DRC IDP protection/shelter strategy, IASC principles, cluster systems • comments/progress: some activities are already being undertaken to better communicate/disseminate UNHCR's added value, IDP strategy: <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve value for money by, for example, identifying alternative supply chain solutions (including more effective use of CBI), using innovations to improve efficiency and effectiveness. • Use of cash instead of CRIs. DESS could give advice on alternative supply chain solutions. • Distribution of CRIs reaching some 15% of the POCs was done in the context of the emergency response strategy; 		
Management response:	X Agree Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree		
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	Business model in DRC will be reviewed in line with the new policy on UNHCR's engagement on internal displacement to be finalized in 2019.		
Unit or function responsible:	UNHCR HQ (business model, draft business case) and DRC Operation with the support of DPSM, SET		
Top line planned actions	By whom	Comments	Expected completion date
			Progress
			Status
			Comments

1.1	Review the national IDP strategy in line with the HCT protection strategy	DRC Office; PI Nairobi & HQs	Regular reporting: based on results will be a feature; and articulating the needs of POCs;	Mid-2019	In progress	Each province already has an IDP strategy and Kasai has an operational plan.
	Issue shelter cluster strategies	DRC Office	Regular reporting: based on results will continue to be a feature; articulating the needs of POCs;	15 April 2019	In progress	In existence since end 2018
	Provide CBI whenever feasible	DRC Office	In 2018 there has already been a 261% increase in the cash transferred to populations of concern – reaching 40% - 50% of coverage (depending on the locality) compared to 2017. Of the total cash assistance delivered in 2018, 69% targeted IDPs, through multipurpose cash grants, conditional cash for shelter reconstruction and cash for protection.	Ongoing	Ongoing	A ‘Cash for protection’ pilot project is currently being implemented in Kasai. UNHCR DRC is planning to increase its CBI intervention and will use it more and more for promoting protection and self-reliance of POCs. UNHCR is using CBI in areas of return (NRC project funded by UNHCR)
	Issue a revised policy on UNHCR’s engagement in situations of internal displacement (IDP policy)	DIP	UNHCR to issue a new IDP policy developed following consultations with stakeholders. This policy will set the organizational framework for engagement in IDP contexts and can be adapted to context specific factors.	In 2019	In progress	

	Develop a communication strategy on IDP response	DRC Office in consultation with PI (HQ)	With the strengthening of the IMO capacity (four additional staff) at the end of 2018, public information documents improved in quantity and quality. PI has increased the number of stories and PI products on the IDP response/situation.	April 2019	In progress	Many of the components of the strategy are already being implemented
RECOMMENDATION 2:		<p>Strengthen monitoring systems so as to better inform UNHCR interventions and more clearly demonstrate outcomes at a community level.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review systems of organisations, including implementing partners, that measure protection outcomes. • Facilitate outcome monitoring learning process with partners. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise UNHCR DRC monitoring and reporting systems based on learning and a Theory of Change (link with R6). • Consider piloting a write-shop approach to capture outcomes in a participatory format. 				
Management response:		X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):		<p>A lot of progress has been achieved in improving monitoring systems throughout the country and in the IDP response in particular. Staff conducts regular field visits to meet beneficiaries and collect feedback, which is more systematically incorporating into the programming. IMOs, who now have a more significant presence on the ground, supported the development of indicators that allow to better monitor the impact of programmes.</p> <p>RBM reporting (designed by the IMOs for implementation by field teams) is being used for improved reporting. While most of the recommendations are linked to the new RBM structures, which are being developed, this is in line with current organizational efforts to strengthen monitoring, reporting, and move towards a more results-based management system that is built around outcomes. Steps are being taken to identify & constantly improve on the scope and processes of UNHCR’s measurement that can be applicable to a diverse set of contexts and situations across the displacement cycle. ‘</p>				

Unit or function responsible:		DRC Operation and HQs (DPSM)				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
2.1	Monitoring of partners' activities is in progress with Log Alto ¹ .	DRC Programme	Results based management system.	End 2019: Log Alto is to be fully operational	In progress	Staff were trained on Log Alto Roll out is in progress Meanwhile, multi-functional teams are monitoring the partners. Field monitoring visits are mandatory and are being undertaken.
	IMOs to support the development of more elaborated indicators that allow better monitoring of impact.	DRC Programme	Strengthening of IMO capacity has enabled the programme staff to better monitor the impact of projects	By March 2019	Completed	
	Programme and Protection staff to regularly conduct field visits and focus group discussions with beneficiaries.	DRC Programme	Feeding of key findings into programming has been strengthened.	Ongoing	Ongoing	
	Define a global approach to outcomes/monitoring. The organization-wide approach to monitoring will be developed as part of the revision of UNHCR's IDP engagement policy.	DPSM (UNHCR)	This will lead to better budgeting based on harmonized use of indicators; reduced number of objectives, measurable outcomes.	End of 2019	In progress	Dedicated protection coordinators in place in the area of operation; & more dedicated IMOs for IDP operations.
RECOMMENDATION 3:		Ensure that UNHCR DRC's partner retention decision-making processes reflects relevant global guidance, notably in assessing partner performance and the likely impact on UNHCR's response for PoCs if a partner is not continued.				

¹ Log Alto is a monitoring software developed by the Division of Programme Support and Management (DPSM) to allow the consolidated and regular storage and analysis of data related to the activities implemented by partners. As such, it allows real-time review of progress against targets allowing making adjustments as required. DRC has volunteered to be a pilot for Log Alto.

	<p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update partnership selection processes to ensure that they are fully aligned with UNHCR’s global guidelines and principles of partnership. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply the revised procedures during partner selection processes and, given that these are revised, gather feedback from stakeholders, including UNHCR staff, and partners about the timeliness, quality and accountability of the selection process - to make adjustments where needed. 					
Management response:	X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree Disagree					
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	The evaluation mission narrowed in on the performance of one particular protection partner, which was not retained in 2018. It must be emphasised, however, that the non-continuation of the partner’s services in 2018 was fully in keeping with UNHCR’s global guidelines and principles of partnership (namely IPMC’ Guidance Note No.1). The decision of the Representative was in full consultation with RBA and the Implementing Partnership Management Service at HQs - a decision, which was taken in a bid to mitigate risks related to accountability and oversight shortfalls but above-all - to maintain the integrity of the IDP programme in DRC.					
Unit or function responsible:	DRC Operation and Regional Bureau					
Top line planned actions	By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress		
				Status	Comments	
3.2	Review the current DRC partner retention process to reflect the likely impact on refugees/IDPs of the non-continuation of a partnership (to also glean the impact from PoCs themselves).	DRC Office - Multi-functional teams	follow-up missions on UNHCR & its partners’ activities are ongoing;	The SOPs were revised as well as the IPMC meeting minutes – by 30 March 2019	Implementation in progress	Assessing the impact of non-continuation of a partner is new – UNHCR is strengthening its accountability; Impact on PoCs: (revised SOPs) (done). Validation of partners’ working plans (finalized). Reinforcement of operations and coordination capacity (finalized). Revision of IPMC SOPs (done)

Assess partner performance	DRC Office - Multi-functional teams (Field Offices)	follow-up missions to take place in the field/participatory assessments, surveys, conduct interviews of PoCs. Evaluation missions on protection needs and responses.	Ongoing	In progress	Development and implementation of monitoring tools by IMO, in conjunction with Protection & Programme teams.
Gather feedback from UNHCR staff and partners about the timeliness, quality and accountability of selection processes and adjust where needed (feedback).	IPMC meetings	Meetings with UNHCR staff and partner staff.	Ongoing.		30 October 2019 (ongoing)
RECOMMENDATION 4:	<p>In consultation with partners, develop an action plan to fulfil IASC accountability commitments to PoCs.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that complaints' boxes are well in place, are known and that PoCs are aware for their purpose • Constantly sensitize all stake holders - share relevant lessons learned, and reporting tools with UNHCR and implementing partner staff using an interactive approach; • Review relevant guidelines, Standard Operating Procedures, etc. stressing all aspects of accountability towards affected persons (AAP), through a lens to identify improvements that may be needed; • Facilitate discussions and/or workshops to agree, both internally and with partners, on changes or different ways of working which would improve AAP to fulfil relevant commitments; • Ensure that the design of the AGD participatory assessments fulfil UNHCR's commitment to meaningfully engage women, men, girls, and boys, & other groups - to mobilise & use their capacities. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate relevant AAP elements into capacity building, strategies and guidelines. 				
Management response:	X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):					

Unit or function responsible:		DRC Office with the support of DIP's Community Based Protection team and PSEA Unit				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
4.1	Improve existing PSEA procedures/activities.	UNHCR DRC Operation and HCT, clusters, partners	UNHCR shared lessons and practices with partners in the framework of the Protection Cluster, the Shelter Working Group and other fora.	Throughout 2019	Nomination and training of PSEA focal points in all areas of operation done in 2018; - ongoing -	Strengthened follow-up of complaints management/mechanisms/committees (SOPs and Complaints Mechanisms / PSEA) are in place in AORs, but they need to be constantly updated.
	Ensure that complaints' boxes are well in place, are known and that PoCs are aware for their purpose.	UNHCR DRC Operation and Partners.	To be undertaken.	ASAP.		Strengthened follow-up of complaints management/mechanisms/committees (SOPs and Complaints Mechanisms / PSEA) are in place in AORs, but they need to be constantly updated
	Organise fora with PoCs, host communities, local leaders to discuss solutions.	UNHCR DRC Operation and HCT, clusters, partners	AGD participatory assessments are taken into account women, men, girls, and boys to mobilise capacities.	Throughout 2019	Two big meetings were already organized: in Goma and in Kalemie – (end 2018) – participation of local leaders, IDPs, host communities	Participation of the PoCs in the next annual planning workshop is envisaged (mid 2019).
	Undertake surveys that will also target IDPs themselves – for indicative assessments of the Protection Cluster's activities & other interventions.	DRC Operation and partners	Improve AAP: to fulfil relevant commitments and incorporate relevant AAP elements into	Throughout 2019	A forum for IDP women will be organized in September 2019	(mid 2019).

			capacity-building, strategies and guidelines.			
	Undertake participatory assessments.	DRC Operation and partners	Participatory assessments validation workshops are taking place	Throughout 2019	These are done every trimester to better inform programme budgeting & address needs more efficiently.	(ongoing, especially for new waves of displacement).
	Sensitize partners and UN agencies on the importance of AAP and the centrality of protection.	DRC Operation		ongoing	Done for first trimester with regard to AGD. More emphasis will be placed on lessons & sensitization to define & re-inforce AAP at HCT & Clusters.	Meetings regularly held with 1) ICR: Inter- Comité Regional 2) CLIO: Comité local inter organizations and 3) CRIO: Comité regional inter organizations (new humanitarian architecture in DRC). Training of the partners on AAP - ongoing. Monthly coordination meeting are held by UNHCR with partners.
	RECOMMENDATION 5:	<p>Work with OCHA and other key partners to revise IASC data management and reporting systems to more accurately reflect protection mainstreaming while providing appropriate incentives.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out a mapping of protection mainstreaming (existing and key gaps), which should be integrated into follow up on R3 and R6; • Draft a joint concept paper with OCHA based on lessons learned from DRC and other relevant contexts that considers incentives for non-protection agencies to share good quality data. 				

	Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pilot systems for collecting and reporting on protection mainstreaming. 					
Management response:	X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree					
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	<p>OCHA is particularly keen for UNHCR to join hands in incorporating the centrality of protection in operations and interventions, including for IDPs. OCHA's feedback includes their interest for UNHCR to show the protection trends so that they can map the impact of effective coordination & working in close collaboration. Thus, OCHA routinely asks each cluster/sector to report on protection mainstreaming and UNHCR in particular, to demonstrate protection mainstreaming in its activities.</p> <p>The Global Protection Cluster already has a section of its website devoted to protection mainstreaming, including a protection mainstreaming toolkit developed by OCHA and the International Rescue Committee, based on a mapping of protection mainstreaming. In addition, the Global protection Cluster (GPC) devotes considerable attention to promoting the centrality of protection in humanitarian action, including through stock-taking of the implementation of the IASC Protection Policy and annual reviews of actions to ensure the centrality of protection, including protection mainstreaming.</p> <p>The GPC is part of the Global Clusters Coordination Group and actively participates in its information management initiatives and the Geneva-based Information Management Working Group. Neither the GPC nor UNHCR can change, in the short term, the priorities adopted by the IASC, OCHA or the Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) in 2019, which are now set. The GPC and UNHCR can try to influence the work-plan of OCHA and the GCCG in 2020 to include revising its data management and reporting systems, bearing in mind this is a major task that will have to be undertaken by another office and not UNHCR (nor the GPC).</p>					
Unit or function responsible:	DRC Operation and GPC					
Top line planned actions	By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress		
				Status	Comments	
5.1	Mapping of protection mainstreaming across clusters	UNHCR, OCHA, UNFPA, UNOPS and HCT at DRC level.	Mid-2019	ongoing		
	Draft a joint concept paper that considers incentives for non-protection agencies to share good quality data	UNHCR and OCHA at DRC level.	End of 2019.	Only preliminary discussions have been carried out with OCHA.	IMO units in UNHCR and OCHA will advise on tools to be proposed to non-protection agencies.	

<p>RECOMMENDATION 6:</p>	<p>UNHCR DRC should develop a service-oriented approach to protection monitoring to ensure data is used effectively to improve the quality and timeliness of assistance and advocacy to the benefit of PoCs.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In conjunction & the support of relevant HQ units, conduct a survey of agencies targeted for protection mainstreaming to determine their needs for information and technical support. • Develop a Theory of Change in consultation with key partners illustrating how protection monitoring will add value for PoCs in their communities through influencing different categories of partners and other stakeholders, including local authorities and the national Government; • Draft a corresponding results framework to measure progress, including protection outcomes, and a media communication strategy for internal and external stakeholders, including clarifying what is shared with MONUSCO; and • Develop protocols to strengthen accountability amongst partners and peers by clarifying roles and responsibilities for collecting, analysing, communicating and acting upon protection monitoring data. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot joint protection mainstreaming activities with agencies working in other clusters/sectors (food security, RRMP) to support protection mainstreaming, increase coverage and use of protection data and address the perception amongst communities where UNHCR cannot meet all their needs.
<p>Management response:</p>	<p>X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree</p>
<p>Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):</p>	<p>The Operation agrees with the first part of the recommendation on the protection monitoring system which needs to be reviewed. It is to be noted that the operation faces major challenges with the large geographical area to be covered, with limited infrastructure, logistical challenges, and relatively limited financial and human resources.</p> <p>UNHCR DRC has started reviewing its protection monitoring system since 2017 (before the declaration of the L3) and is developing a new tool, the SAR (“systeme d’analyse et de reponse”), to ensure that protection monitoring data are effectively used to inform the planning, budgeting and the delivery of an adequate response as well as appropriate messages for advocacy. However, without additional resources and competent francophone staff, it continues to be difficult to review the PMS in a meaningful way.</p> <p>The recommendation is using the terms of ‘protection monitoring’ interchangeably with “monitoring of protection response”. Protection monitoring systems do not come with theories of change and results’ frameworks. The essential purpose of PM is to generate information about trends in the protection environment which is then effectively used to ‘the benefit of PoCs’. The recommendation formulates immediate and medium-term priorities</p>

		<p>around issues in a way that suggests that PM generates information about the impact and contributions of activities. The trends identified in PM should never be automatically attributed to our actions, or seen as indicators of our activities or contributions. The extent to which UNHCR and its partners are not thanked, or blame for the trends is an empirical question that is to be determined in each instance, during the joint analysis.</p> <p>Activities suggested under recommendation 5 are relevant for recommendation 6 as well.</p>				
Unit or function responsible:		DRC Operation with the support of FICSS				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
6.1	Review of the former protection monitoring system and develop a new system – roll out of Analysis and Response System (SAR)	UNHCR, DIP and partners	Not much progress was made in 2017 and early 2018 due to absence of the Snr. IMO who was deployed on an emergency mission to support another Operation facing critical challenges.	End 2018: SAR developed Mid 2019: Launch of the SAR and roll out	In progress	<p>Review of the former protection monitoring system started in earnest in 2018 – when the Snr. IMO returned to the operation. Development of SAR aiming at improving data collection, data analysis, and follow up of actions taken with partners (Analysis and Response System):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online tool • Collect data electronically - using tablets and kobo toolbox (not paper); • Protection analysis • Referrals and follow up systems (will show where there are achievements/actions taken – theory of change); • available to all • Assess the existing response capacity

						(community based, local infrastructure).
Issue new SOPs.	UNHCR and partners.	UNHCR and partners will develop SOPs aiming at defining roles and responsibilities with regard to protection monitoring. SAR will be open to other partners who will be able to contribute; With the referral system and the follow up on actions taken, the SAR will be service/result oriented.	Mid-June 2019: completion of SOPs.	In progress	By end 2019	
Establish a protection monitoring working group.	UNHCR and partners	UNHCR will work on capacity building of members of the Protection Monitoring Working Group and on the harmonization of methodologies and collection tools. Together with partners, it will also finalise the protection information exchange protocol	March 2019	In progress	November 2019.	

RECOMMENDATION 7:		Prioritise community-based approaches to strengthen protection for PoCs.				
		<p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the community-based protection strategy² at the same time as developing the Business Model, a Theory of Change and monitoring systems (linked with R1, R4 and R5). • Pilot revised approaches, with built-in reflection / events to learn and refine systems. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanded roll out of revised community-based protection systems, supported by increased mainstreamed approaches (linked with R5). 				
Management response:		X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):						
Unit or function responsible:		DRC Operation with the support of the DIP Community Based Protection team, the CCCM and Shelter WG, DPSM, and the global protection cluster				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
7.1	Review the community-based protection network structure	DRC operation, DIP, DPSM and Protection, Cluster/shelter working group/CCCM working group	Community-based protection was integrated in the protection monitoring - thanks to the creation, training and support of community protection structures in Kasai and North Kivu. In Tanganyika, community-based protection was integrated in the protection monitoring through the creation of tools, training	Mid 2019	In progress for community protection relays (done)	<p>The community protection relays have been put in place, in every zone in Kasai and in some areas in North Kivu.</p> <p>The community protection networks (“réseaux communautaires de protection” RECOPRO) and the local peace committees (“comités villageois et locaux de paix”, CVP and CLP) were</p>

² This strategy is likely to feature strengthening of CBOs, conflict-sensitive analysis, participatory needs assessments (including identification of vulnerable individuals), participatory beneficiary selection criteria and community feedback systems.

			and support of community protection networks, and local peace committees.			implemented in all areas of operation in Tanganyika (Moba, Nyunzu, Manono, Kalemie, Kabalo...) Ongoing revisions will be necessary.
	Develop a community based strategy	DRC operation, DIP and Protection, Cluster/shelter working group/CCCM working group	The development of the protection/Shelter/CCCM strategy based on the community-based approach will be done nationally and shared with the field offices - to be adapted to their respective operational contexts.	Mid 2019	In progress Community protection relays (done)	End 2019
RECOMMENDATION 8:		<p>UNHCR DRC should improve cost effectiveness, including through more effective use of remote management and monitoring approaches.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop options based on lessons learned from DRC and other remote management contexts.³ • Describe and cost different operating options for remote management and monitoring, giving due emphasis to community-based approaches and protection mainstreaming (links with R4 and R6). <p>Medium-term priorities: within 12 months</p>				

³ Unlike some other contexts where remote management has been used, such as Syria and Somalia, UNHCR has more physical access to PoCs. The main constraints have often not been security-related but more related to the cost of establishing a UNHCR presence and physical access due to logistics and poor infrastructure. DRC is thus a more conducive environment for remote management than contexts where UNHCR has virtually no access. See, for example, Mercy Corps (2015) Remote Management Annotated Bibliography and UNHCR (2014b) Remote Management in High-Risk Operations: Good practice and Lessons Learned.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft and implement a transition strategy to roll out the most viable model(s). • Ensure management and oversight closer to the point of delivery of services to PoCs; 				
Management response:		X Agree □ Partially agree □ Disagree				
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):						
Unit or function responsible:		DRC Operation with the support of DPSM				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
8.1	Review remote management and risk management	DRC Management, Programme and Project Control Unit, in consultation with HQ/DPSM.	The Deputy Representative (Protection) was re-assigned in Q1 2019, to Lubumbashi to ensure accountability, oversight and more harmonised implementation of UNHCR's engagement with IDPs (Kasai & in Tanganyika). Remote management should not be at the detriment of AAP and anti-fraud mitigation measures.	1 st Quarter 2019	In progress	Goma has started a pilot in this respect, allowing communities to collect and share information with UNHCR in locations where UNHCR and protection monitors are not present. CBI and other services are provided to IDPs and communities; by end 2019.
	Regular teleconferences with the management and the key members of the multi-functional teams (MFTs) allowed for the follow-up of the L3 activities.	DRC Operation		Ongoing	Ongoing	
	Promote cash activities in areas where the local market is viable and competitive.	DRC Operation	Promotion of cash has already been prioritized and coverage reached	Ongoing	Ongoing	

			40% - 50% (depending on the locality) compared to 2017.			
	Keep stockpiles of NFIs ready, in line with updated contingency plans	DRC Operation	Anticipate the development of distribution plans of CRIs before the arrival of IDPs and collect data on IDPs and host communities to include vulnerable members of both of them - according to clear socio economic criteria.	Ongoing	Ongoing	

RECOMMENDATION 9:	<p>Improve emergency preparedness for IDP emergencies.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for a more proactive approach to inter-agency emergency preparedness, including agreed protocols for early warning triggers. • Facilitate development of preparedness plans within the protection cluster and GRT linked to overall contingency plans to strengthen preparedness and optimise use of limited resources. <p>Medium-term priorities: within the next 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the inter-agency efforts, develop a plan to improve UNHCR DRC's readiness to respond to potential emergencies, both at the national and provincial levels, including basic operational readiness actions, to enable a response in a timely and coordinated manner (linked with R1, R9). <p>Take actions based on the plan to improve UNHCR DRC's readiness and monitor progress.</p>
Management response:	x Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	The recommendation in regard to advocacy for a more proactive approach to inter-agency emergency preparedness are accepted, it being recognized that such advocacy and actions need to happen at all levels, and most importantly as part of the UNCT/HCT at country level. UNHCR, through its Division of Emergency, Supply and Security (DESS) is represented in the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness (ERP) and Early Warning Early Action (EWEA) work streams both of which fall under the Operations working group of the

	<p>IASC structure. UNHCR is also a member of the Emergency Directors’ group (EDG) and participates in its’ regular calls.</p> <p>As part of the EDG and the IASC working groups, DRC was identified as risk of very high concern in two bi-annual reports to which DESS contributed – namely in the report covering the period June 2017-November 2017 in regard to the Kasai crisis and later on in the report covering the period May 2018 – October 2018 in regard to the elections. In the first report relevant to the Kasai crisis, OCHA facilitated consultations with the HCT in its capacity, resulting in the DSRSG/RC/HC commitment to address the imbalance in response capacities in the east as opposed to new areas of displacement (including Kasai) by better spreading staff and resources across vulnerable areas. This was officially reported to the EDG. UNHCR supported the ERP rollout, which was not conducted because of reticence by the HCT in DRC.</p> <p>UNHCR will continue to undertake advocacy for more automaticity between the early warning and preparedness in the inter-agency fora, including through its participation in the ongoing revision of the ERP approach. It stands ready to support the Operation in DRC with technical support as per the needs identified by the country and endorsed by the Regional Bureau. In 2019, a UNHCR specific guidance note (complementary to the ERP) will be produced to support operations to ensure an adequate level of internal preparedness to take on leadership responsibilities and operational response in IDP crises. The work on the guidance note will start only after the launch of the new Policy on IDP engagement, to ensure the guidance supports the policy in all its elements.</p>				
Unit or function responsible:	DRC Operation, DIP, and DESS				
Top line planned actions	By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
				Status	Comments

9.1	DESS to undertake a high level joint mission to DRC	DESS and DRC operation		Mid 2019	In progress	By mid-year 2019
	DESS to align its Emergency and Preparedness Policy in order to align it with the IASC Scale Up Protocol, including the Activation protocol for IDP emergencies.	DESS	<p>The depletion of resources and logistical constraints/procedures causes teams to be deployed too late when an emergency is declared. Decide quickly if there is need to deploy coordination staff/create DRC emergency internal roster.</p> <p>Inventory of warehouses to deliver quickly in case of emergency</p> <p>Support DRC with technical support as clearly identified by the country and endorsed by the Bureau.</p>	10 April 2019: DRC emergency response (criteria and strategy)		Reflection started at DRC level but it will need commitment from HQs DESS to deploy quickly CRIs or other needs (e.g. vehicles) when there is an emergency. Emergency preparedness contingency plan developed.

	Advocate for a more proactive approach to inter-agency emergency preparedness, including agreed protocols for early warning triggers	DRC Operation	Undertake advocacy for more automaticity between the early warning and preparedness in the interagency fora. Mainstream protection within inter agency questionnaires Produce a UNHCR specific guidance note (complementary to the ERP)	2019		
--	--	---------------	--	------	--	--

RECOMMENDATION 10:	<p>Accelerate the development of guidance and tools required for IDP contexts.</p> <p>Immediate priorities: within the next 6 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on experience of IDP operations from DRC and other countries, draft an inventory of guidance and tools required. • Prioritise guidance and tools that specifically support the Business Model for IDPs (R1) <p>Medium-term priorities: within 12 months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft and field test guidance and tools. • Develop and or revise training modules for UNHCR and partner staff on working in IDP contexts.⁴
Management response:	X Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	This recommendation is pertinent and DIP is working on the issuance of the revised IDP policy, which is scheduled in the second quarter of 2020, which will then trigger an update on internal guidance. Some policies and guidance, such as that for AGD, already apply and do not need to be tailored to IDP situations. Others, such as the minimum preparedness actions in emergencies with internal displacement, are being updated but require more time and investment.

⁴ Similar to modules UNHCR has developed for Refugee Status Determination, Resettlement, or Statelessness.

		In 2019, DESS is planning to work on and produce a UNHCR specific preparedness package for IDP emergencies (complementary to the ERP) to support operations to ensure an adequate level of internal preparedness to take on leadership responsibilities and operational response in IDP crises. The work on the guidance note will start only after the launch of the revised IDP policy to ensure the guidance note supports the policy in all its elements relevant to emergency preparedness.			
Unit or function responsible:		DIP and DPSM			
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress
					Status Comments
10.1	Issuance of the revised IDP policy	DIP and DPSM/DESS	The lack of identical/harmonized standards and methods lead to agencies and partners giving responses in a dispersed manner.	In 2019	
	Issuance of preparedness package for IDP emergencies	DESS		2020	

RECOMMENDATION 11:	<p>UNHCR should clarify accountability for decision-making during L.3 emergencies to help ensure that the resources are allocated consistent with a corporate emergency. Key steps could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a comparative study of systems of peer agencies, such as WFP and UNICEF, who have developed protocols based on lessons learned will be useful references. • Review the Policy on Emergency Preparedness and Response for contexts prone to IDP crisis. Activation protocols should consider both the humanitarian imperative and the capacity of the field office with the aim of enabling early action to address situations of internal displacement. • Ensure that UNHCR is prepared to declare an internal L3 emergency in IDP crises when it is justified by the humanitarian needs.
Management response:	Agree <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially agree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree
Reasons (if partially agree or disagree):	DESS does not agree that the accountability for decision-making during L3 emergencies are unclear. The accountability for decision-making during L.3 emergencies are already clear. The Emergency Policy on Emergency Preparedness and Response, which applies to both refugee and IDP emergencies (including IASC wide L3 emergencies), has already defined the accountabilities of the High Commissioner and the SET members,

the Bureau Director, the Country Representative and the Division Director. In particular, it mentions the following:

- The concerned Bureau Director is accountable to provide strategic direction, reporting and updates to the SET, managing resources and coordinating Headquarters support.
- The Representative is accountable for timely emergency preparedness and response.
- All Division Directors (including DESS) are responsible to ensure extension of functional and technical support, guidance and expertise. More specifically for DESS, it is responsible for deployment of experienced emergency staff and all emergency rosters; analysis of security trends and provision of security advice; the release of Core Relief Items (CRIs), Non-Food Items (NFIs) and vehicles; provision of procurement support and advice; pipeline and warehouse support; the establishment (as required) of regional and local frame agreements; maintenance of global and regional stockpiles.

Based on the above accountabilities, the resource allocation falls under the Bureau Director's management responsibility and its implementation under the Representative. The Division Directors' role (including) DESS is only to provide support, guidance and expertise.

However, for Recommendation Bullet Point 1, DESS agrees to conduct a comparative study. DESS will suggest to include it as an action point in the next IASC work plan meeting. In this way, DESS can receive the required data from other agencies about their emergency protocols, which will enable us to conduct the comparative review. If the IASC Results Group will agree to include this subject in their work plan, the study can be finished by end of 2019. If not, DESS may need to approach each relevant agency bilaterally to ask for data, which may take more time.

For Recommendation Bullet Points 2 and 3, DESS is of the view that the Activation protocol for IDP situations is already included in the Emergency Policy and follows the same criteria and procedures of refugee emergencies (definition of emergency, country operation together with Bureau to make recommendation to declare an emergency). In general, the delay/ inaction to declare IDP emergencies is a result of weak implementation of the policy and not the policy itself. This could be caused by lack of knowledge of the policy by country operations. In some instances, the delay is on the decision-making. For instance, UNHCR is following the decision to declare IDP emergency in line with IASC's decision to declare a system-wide emergency.

However, the automatic mobilization of human, financial and material resources only applies to L2 and L3 refugee emergencies. If this should expand to IDP emergencies as well, the next possibility is to adjust the Policy through a minor amendment or in 2021, when it is due for overall review. Despite this provision in the Policy, in practice is that, whenever there is an IASC system-wide emergency declaration, the High Commissioner has already committed the Organization's resources in support for the response and that country operations, when

		appropriate, have also benefited from consequences that were supposed to be applied automatically only for L2 or L3 refugee emergencies, e.g., use of fast track procedures for recruiting staff.				
Unit or function responsible:		DESS				
Top line planned actions		By whom	Comments	Expected completion date	Progress	
					Status	Comments
11.1	Comparative Study	DESS/HQs	DESS will suggest to include the comparative study as an action point in the next IASC work plan meeting or to approach each relevant agency bilaterally to ask for data, which may take more time.	End of 2019 or 2020		
	Activation protocol for IDP emergency and UNHCR preparedness to declare emergency for IDP	DESS	If the provision of the Emergency Policy on automatic mobilization of resources should expand to IDP emergencies, DESS will need to work towards amending the Policy.	If minor amendment is needed, in 2019. If amendment requires a major revision, in 2021.		

UNHCR HQs / Geneva / 10 May 2019