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### Acronyms & Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACAPS</td>
<td>ACAPS Assessment Capacities Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>ALNAP Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHP</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Humanitarian Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Americas Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIC</td>
<td>Brazil, Russia, India and China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>UN Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISB</td>
<td>Communications and Information Services Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMCS</td>
<td>OCHA Civil Military Coordination Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>OCHA Coordination and Response Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>(OECD) Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>UK Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHL</td>
<td>Dalsey, Hillblom &amp; Lynn Logistics Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP</td>
<td>Disaster Response Preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EADRCC</td>
<td>NATO Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSOC</td>
<td>The Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>OCHA Emergency Preparedness Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERAT</td>
<td>ASEAN Emergency Rapid Assessment Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>OCHA Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>OCHA Emergency Services Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCPT</td>
<td>European Union Civil Protection Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>IFRC Field Assessment and Coordination Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSS</td>
<td>OCHA Field Coordination and Support Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>UN General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHA</td>
<td>Global Humanitarian Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD</td>
<td>Good Humanitarian Donorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCSS</td>
<td>OCHA Humanitarian Coordination Support Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>UN Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERR</td>
<td>DFID Humanitarian and Emergency Response Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICs</td>
<td>Humanitarian Information Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRFs</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRR</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC / WG</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRL</td>
<td>International Disaster Response Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHP</td>
<td>International Humanitarian Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSARAG</td>
<td>International Search and Rescue Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISDR</td>
<td>International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEU</td>
<td>Joint UNEP/OCHA Environment Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA</td>
<td>Multi Sectoral Initial Rapid Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSB</td>
<td>Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATF</td>
<td>IASC Needs Assessment Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OCHA  UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD  Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation
OPCW  Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
OSOCC  On-Site Operations Coordination Centre
PSD  Preliminary Scenario Definition (immediately post disaster)
RC  Resident Coordinator
RDRT  Regional Disaster Response Teams
RO  OCHA Regional Office
ROS  OCHA Regional Office Surge
SIPRI  Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
SOP  Standard Operating Procedures
SPP  Strategic Partnership for Preparedness
TCG  Tripartite Core Group
ToR  Terms of Reference
TSF  Telecoms Sans Frontières
USAR  Urban Search and Rescue
UN  United Nations
UN-CMCoord  United Nations Civil Military Coordination
UNDAC  United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination Team
UNISDR  United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
UNITAR  United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNOSAT  UNITAR’s operational satellite applications programme
Executive Summary

This 2011 UNDAC Review is the second review of the UNDAC system to be undertaken since its creation in 1993 and follows a first review carried out in 2001. It is the result of a long and highly consultative process aimed at analysing the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the UNDAC system today as well as its readiness to meet future humanitarian challenges. The Review has provided the opportunity to re-explore the position which UNDAC occupies within OCHA as the only tool to link the international humanitarian response system with the wide variety of disaster management actors not normally involved in international humanitarian coordination processes.

The findings of this 2011 Review confirm that while new initiatives and changing priorities might have distracted attention away from this long-established mechanism, the UNDAC role remains both valid and effective. The UNDAC system allows OCHA to rapidly deploy a team of trained experts with local knowledge and technical resources to assist affected governments and the international humanitarian response system with strengthened capacity in coordination, information management and assessment in sudden-onset emergencies. While the wide range of skillsets available to OCHA from amongst the 250+ active UNDAC members enables diverse and specific needs to be met, the “team” approach gives the flexibility in terms of size and composition which allows UNDAC teams to meet the requirements of any given situation.

The high regard that stakeholders have for the UNDAC concept and its core values has been a recurring theme of this review process. Documentary reviews, interviews, surveys and workshops have revealed not only the great depth of interest in and commitment to the UNDAC system, but also the high level of attachment and pride felt for what UNDAC has come to represent across its broader network. Nonetheless, UNDAC members and wider stakeholders have shown no complacency towards the UNDAC system and have engaged fully and constructively in this review process.

The nine main findings of this 2011 Review reveal that, while the UNDAC concept remains valid and bridges a critical gap between disaster management and humanitarian response coordination, it is largely the processes through which the UNDAC system is delivered which require improvement. The nine corresponding sets of recommendations seek not only to reinforce the strengths of the UNDAC concept but also to enhance its delivery, both in terms of disaster management and international humanitarian response, in support of OCHA’s mandated role in emergency response and preparedness for response.

In recent years, a vast array of new emergency response tools, partnerships and initiatives have been developed in the international humanitarian response system, which – whilst welcome – remain nonetheless “bewildering for an RC/HC”. In this environment, the UNDAC system is broadly recognised as being able to supply, upon request, a rapidly-deployable set of resources to provide significant support to both a UN RC/HC and a host government in an emergency situation. UNDAC’s role is to get coordinated response mechanisms moving in the first, critical stages of the emergency and to support the RC/HC through establishment of the whole response “platform”, including assessment coordination and pre-cluster coordination, before longer-term OCHA surge staff step in and take it forward. The UNDAC system is thus an integral part of OCHA’s response capacity; it is also the only response tool which deploys integrated teams with adaptable skillsets.
Executive Summary

Whilst it is evident that the UNDAC system has a unique role to play and enjoys a remarkable range of functional partnerships, its utility to an RC/HC and host government is still dependent upon its strategic positioning in the wider set of OCHA response mechanisms. By virtue of its long-standing reputation, broad membership and wider network, the UNDAC mechanism is seen as a key indicator in sudden on-set emergency response. A decision to deploy an UNDAC team has become a signal to stakeholders of the importance OCHA attaches to a crisis. Thus, not only does UNDAC provide OCHA with rapid response capacity, but also draws the attention of the wider humanitarian community to the emergency and response needs, including operational and funding requirements.

Despite great strides in surge capacity development, OCHA is not yet in a position to provide a truly systematic response to RC/HCs and governments in crisis situations. UNDAC needs to be better integrated into OCHA’s wider portfolio of response tools and it must be clearly defined when and where UNDAC team deployment is applicable within OCHA’s broader set of surge mechanisms. Review findings indicate that this is particularly the case when OCHA capacity is overwhelmed, where there is no pre-existing OCHA presence or when it is vital to include certain key partners in response activities. At the same time, to provide more strategic support, UNDAC teams need to be better aware of and able to advocate for other OCHA support and surge tools.

Concurrently, a significant drawback of the UNDAC system is that many actors have too little knowledge to fully utilise its services. Even when specifically requested, there can be a lack of full understanding as to what an UNDAC team can do. While there seems to be greater understanding from the disaster management side, more clarity is needed on how the international humanitarian community can better engage with OCHA’s response tools, including UNDAC. Recommendations in this Review thus address how to improve knowledge and understanding of UNDAC’s usefulness through better promotion and clarification at policy and operational levels. Key to these efforts will be the optimisation of UNDAC’s functionality with other parts of OCHA which will require acknowledging UNDAC’s relevance and its joint disaster management/humanitarian response-related methodology as well as what this actually means in terms of assessment, coordination and information management.

As regards the diversity of UNDAC membership, this is considered to be both its greatest strength and yet a shortcoming to be addressed. This Review makes recommendations regarding selection and training and seeks to introduce a set of “core competences” to sharpen skillsets and optimise team selection, not only to strengthen deployment capacity but also to better engage networks at regional and country levels.

UNDAC’s funding system has been found to be not only safe and accountable but also a great strength in enabling rapid response and flexibility. Small improvements are recommended to further enable the “Developing Countries Activities’ Account” to facilitate inclusion of competent members from developing and disaster-prone countries unable to financially sponsor UNDAC members.

With regard to UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions, the Review finds that these are considered to have considerable value in many cases, but less so in others where more strategic integration into longer-term activities is needed for more sustainable impact. Recommendations are also made regarding further development of the UNDAC system’s capacity to engage with regional mechanisms and networks.
Executive Summary

Finally, while the UNDAC system has many valuable functional partnerships with a diverse set of actors based on mission-identified requirements, the Review recommends that these relationships be further formalised to maximise benefit and predictability.

In summary, this 2011 Review finds that the way ahead requires ensuring that UNDAC is more broadly known and its role recognised as relevant for the future; that its regional outreach is intensified, while maintaining its global standards and cohesiveness; that stronger networks, refined membership procedures with more relevant skillsets and retention measures are key goals for the future. A strong focus will be needed on sustainable outcomes and building resilience in closer cooperation with other OCHA mechanisms; and the flexibility of the UNDAC system will be paramount in staying ahead of wider institutional reform and increasingly complex and challenging future disaster contexts.

This 2011 Review process has generated considerable interest and high expectations within the UNDAC network. These recommendations are provided to OCHA’s management and the UNDAC Advisory Board on how the UNDAC system may be adapted to ensure its future relevance and sustainability as a key part of OCHA’s response capacity. In addition to the recommendations, a compilation of the many ideas and suggestions captured during the various interviews and surveys will be provided for discussion and later use. Key decisions are expected to be made in ensuring that the institutional, administrative and communication environment within OCHA and IASC facilitates the further evolution of the UNDAC system and network and its adaptation to a fast-changing world. The implementation of these recommendations and decisions will further draw on the willing support and capacity of the UNDAC member countries and organizations.
1. Introduction & Purpose

The United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) team is a key component of OCHA’s rapid response mechanisms for sudden-onset disasters and is central to OCHA’s mandate: “to mobilise and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action, in partnership with national and international actors, in order to alleviate human suffering in disasters and emergencies”. UNDAC team members are drawn from governments, UN Agencies, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, regional organizations and other humanitarian partners. They are prepared for this role through intensive training in a common methodology and can be mobilised and deployed to disaster sites worldwide within 48 hours of request to support the UN and affected government with coordination of the international humanitarian response. The UNDAC training system has created a “community of practice”, a network unique within the UN, where recipient countries are often stakeholders themselves and have a technical relationship with this international mechanism before a disaster strikes.

The UNDAC team was established in 1993 and has been deployed on 213 missions worldwide. These missions have been predominantly in response to natural disasters but have also included complex emergencies and environmental and technological catastrophes. Since 2003, UNDAC teams have also been used to evaluate national readiness for emergencies through UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness (DRP) missions of which 21 have been conducted to date.

Since its founding, the UNDAC team has grown to a current worldwide total of some 250 deployable national members from over 80 countries, covering three geographical regions (Asia-Pacific, the Americas and Africa-Middle East-Europe). Thirty-four countries financially support deployment of their national UNDAC members and, of these, 12 also support participation of members from developing countries. UN humanitarian agencies are active partners with trained UNDAC members, as are the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) and the World Bank. Since 2009, UNDAC and the European Union Civil Protection Teams (EUCPT) have collaborated closely in disaster response through the use of common methodology, inclusion of associates in each other’s missions, joint deployments and training.

Relations with other regional organizations have also been developed, such as Centro de Coordinación Para la Prevención de los Desastres Naturales en América Central (CEPREDENAC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), through mission collaboration, joint exercises and training. In addition, UNDAC teams regularly participate in exercises organised by other international response organizations such as the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).

To enable UNDAC teams to perform their functions in the field, especially when establishing an On-site Operations Coordination Centre (OSOCC), a number of technical and specialised support partnerships have been developed. These range from inter-governmental networks such as the International Humanitarian Partnership (IHP), Asia-Pacific Humanitarian Partnership (APHP) and Americas Support Team (AST); to
technical NGOs such as Telecoms Sans Frontières (TSF) and MapAction; specialized UN programmes such as UNITAR’s Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNOSAT); and private sector partners, such as DHL, Microsoft and Ericsson.

The first review of UNDAC’s scope and effectiveness was conducted in 2001, recommendations from which have been addressed in the intervening decade. The proposal for a second review was first raised at the UNDAC Advisory Board in 2008, at a time when a wider review of OCHA’s emergency services, tools and mechanisms was already under discussion. This OCHA review was carried out in 2010 and recommended proceeding with a second UNDAC review. This recommendation, together with management changes within OCHA, paved the way for this 2011 review of the UNDAC system. It also provided the opportunity to assess options for potential new approaches, to build upon UNDAC’s success, ensure continuity, and at the same time adapt to meet new demands and challenges, thereby strengthening the UNDAC system for the decade to come.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this 2011 UNDAC review is to provide an analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the UNDAC system and its components, and to provide recommendations to OCHA and the UNDAC Advisory Board on how to adapt the UNDAC system to ensure its future relevance and sustainability.
2. Methodology

Review governance

The UNDAC Review Reference Group composed of seven members from the donor community (taking regional representation into account), representatives appointed by UNDAC technical partners, and by OCHA.

Review team

The UNDAC review team was composed of experts seconded by UNDAC member countries and OCHA/FCSS. The review team was led by Mr. Kjell Larsson of Sweden with the following team members: Adelheid Marschang (Germany), Francois Grunewald (France), Rolf M. Bakken (Norway), Kadir Maideen (Singapore), Neil Barry (United Kingdom), Sally Griffiths (FCSS) and Jesper Holmer-Lund (FCSS). The work of the team in the field of UNDAC administration and financing was complemented by Ib Jensen (Denmark). The review team reports to the UNDAC Steering Committee.

OCHA’s Field Coordination Support Section (FCSS) and the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB) have provided additional secretarial and logistical support. Funds from Denmark have contributed to travel costs.

The review was conducted from 1 June to 31 December 2011 and will report to the UNDAC Advisory Board in February 2012.

Scope

The full details of the scope of the review are elaborated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) (See Annex 1), with main tasks and their sequencing listed below;

- Identification of key interlocutors;
- Key interlocutor interviews with FCSS;
- Semi-structured interviews with a wide range of stakeholders, i.e. UNDAC members, focal points and governments and other UNDAC partners, either face-to-face, by telephone or through electronic questionnaires (survey);
- Desktop study of relevant documents;
- Development of review team master plan shared with UNDAC Steering Committee;
- Review team workshops in Geneva, Neuhausen, Rome, Panama City, and Revinge;
- Data analysis and preliminary findings;
- Preparation of first draft of the report and obtaining comments from UNDAC Review Reference Group;
- Preparation of second draft based on feedback received on first draft;
- Publishing of final report and handover of report to OCHA-FCSS.

Throughout these steps FCSS has ensured that UNDAC focal points and members have been kept informed and updated on progress of the review.
3. Background

As starting point for the UNDAC review, it was decided to carry out a desktop study of three core areas that would define the context for the review. The three areas were:

1. The International Humanitarian Environment
2. Changes within OCHA 2001–2011
3. UNDAC in 2011

The full studies are attached in Annexes 2 - 4 with summaries below.

3.1 The International Humanitarian Environment

Changes in the International Humanitarian System

Since the last UNDAC Review in 2001, fundamental developments have taken place in the international humanitarian system. At the same time, a series of often very large and particularly challenging humanitarian contexts have repeatedly stretched the whole humanitarian system up to, and beyond, its practical limits. In the view of Lord (Paddy) Ashdown; “We are caught in a race between the growing size of the humanitarian challenge, and our ability to cope; between humanity and catastrophe. And, at present, this is not a race we are winning.”

In simplistic terms, the formal international humanitarian system is comprised of providers (donor governments, foundations and individuals) and three pillars of implementers or delivery actors, i.e. UN agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). Both the provider and delivery sides have grown rapidly in recent years to reach funding of $15.1 billion in 2009 and over 210,000 aid worker staff across the three pillars today. By 2007, NGOs accounted for one third of total humanitarian assistance spending, with budgets of major agencies exceeding that of some nation states. Beyond the traditional actors, the “BRIC” countries and emerging Islamic donors have joined a complex group of non-DAC donors, some of which have been supporting international development programmes and systems for longer and with larger aid budgets than certain DAC donors. For UNDAC, as part of the international system, these and other growth areas such as the private sector and military-humanitarian contributions, bring an increasingly complex set of relationships with and between a range of key actors, which may be seen as being outside the formal international humanitarian system, but closely linked with it.

The 2005 Humanitarian Response Review (HRR) launched a reform process seeking to improve the effectiveness of humanitarian response through ensuring greater predictability, accountability and partnership. Within this reform process, where it has been well implemented, the cluster approach has brought some improvements in planning and coordination, although a number of concerns remain. Despite OCHA and the Inter Agency Standing Committee’s (IASC) efforts to enable a strengthened

2 GHA, (2010), Global Humanitarian Assistance Report
4 Brazil, Russia, India and China
5 The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
6 GHA, (2011). Non DAC Donors and Humanitarian Aid
humanitarian coordinator system, leadership remains one of the most important but challenging reforms to implement; “The strengthening of the Humanitarian Coordinator system is perhaps the key to making all the other components of humanitarian reform work effectively”. Meanwhile, developments in humanitarian financing and partnerships have led to financing instruments such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and country level Humanitarian Response Funds (HRFs) providing new ways of challenging resources to meet needs, although concerns remain.

Much recent progress made in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) centres around the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. States, regional and international organizations and other actors concerned are urged to implement the five priorities of the framework, which has a number of implications for UNDAC. The growing focus on the legally recognised role of national governments in preparing for and responding to disasters is positive, but it also requires greater guidance on how respect for the sovereign role of the state and the Paris Declaration commitments to ownership and alignment can be reconciled with the humanitarian principles of neutrality and independence.

In “Agenda for Change”, the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), Valerie Amos, aims to ensure that international response helps those in most need when they need it. At the IASC Principals meeting in February 2011, the ERC covered five thematic areas for helping address these priorities and a set of 10 “Key Transformative Actions” which cover many areas directly relevant to UNDAC. These include rapid dispatch of senior, experienced personnel to manage the humanitarian response, boosting human resource capacity through training and further developing rosters and closing the divide between preparedness, relief and recovery. Nonetheless, surging and maintaining a sufficient level of field capacity in large-scale responses remains challenging for the UN. Reviews frequently reflect situations of initial surge capacity being addressed; however, providing the bridge from the emergency phase to longer term staffing is still problematic.

Needs assessment also remains a key weakness within the humanitarian system, although recent progress has been made. This includes the development of new tools, joint and coordinated methodologies, including through the IASC Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF), the Assessment Capacities Project (ACAPS) and the Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA), all of which UNDAC is closely involved with. In terms of coordination, new approaches and partners have also emerged since 2001. These include the Tripartite Core Group (TCG) mechanism in Myanmar, which was seen as an innovative and effective approach utilising the network of regional organisations in the response to the 2008 Cyclone Nargis. In such contexts where there is limited previous working experience between national government and the international system, UNDAC may draw on such lessons in exploring more flexible and discrete approaches for both assessment and coordination.

There are increasing trends in the use of military forces and assets, for which OCHA remains the focal point for United Nations Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CMCoord). There can be opposition in the humanitarian community to military

---

3 UNISDR, (2005), Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 to 2015, Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters
4 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, February 2005
involvement and coordination is often problematic. In its research in this area, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) recommends that “OCHA should expand the skills and expertise of UNDAC teams to include more civil–military liaison, logistics and information experts." 

**Changing Operational Contexts**

UNDAC teams may have to respond to more complex disaster settings in the future. Not only is a wider range of disaster types to be expected, but also the emergency environment is rapidly evolving. The impact of new technologies presents situations where the reach and speed of communications outpace decision-making for activation of physical response to address needs. In a world which is more interconnected and geographically and socially mobile than ever before, affected populations will often give detailed accounts on the situation and needs through social media and mobile technologies, forming public opinion and political decision-making. Media will often report from the disaster area before international responders have mobilised.\(^{13}\)

The combination of urbanisation, environmental degradation and the apparent effects of climate change are significant factors contributing to the impact of disasters, such as the 2010 Haiti Earthquake and Pakistan floods. It is predicted that by 2015 around 375 million people will be affected by climate-related disasters every year, while other rapid-onset emergencies and the impact of conflict will affect many more.\(^{14}\) This may result in more disasters requiring international assistance in countries vulnerable to natural hazards, but who traditionally have had resources of their own to tackle disaster response.

In some contexts, such as highly-populated areas, an increased frequency of climate-related hazards added to a combination of vulnerability factors, such as environmental degradation and population growth, may result in entire regions appearing to be particularly exposed to hazard risk over the next 30 years, with some of these vulnerabilities becoming potential drivers of conflict themselves. These risks affect areas where two thirds of the world’s population live, and where some of the highest levels of food production take place. Decreasing agricultural yields and weather unpredictability will make present models of agricultural production, varieties and practices too inflexible to underwrite local and global food security in the future. The movement of parasites following their ecosystems is already occurring in some regions and will also affect yields. The health and productivity of forests will be affected and mass forest fires more likely in some areas.

An increasing risk of epidemics and pandemics reflects a combination of new forms of old infectious agents (such as influenza) and new infectious agents (such as the HIV virus or Ebola virus). This rising global health threat will exacerbate poverty as well as social and political instability in affected contexts. In some cases, an existing decline in health care delivery is already facilitating the emergence or re-emergence of infectious diseases.

Specific hazard-risks presented by technological developments are also likely to increase. This includes the risks posed by new technological facilities in poorly regulated contexts, and whole environments at risk from existing and new technological structures. Decreasing humanitarian space in which to operate reflects increasingly

---


\(^{13}\)UNF/Harvard/OCHA publication Disaster Relief 2.0 http://www.unfoundation.org/assets/pdf/disaster-relief-20-the.pdf

\(^{14}\)Humanitarian Emergency Response Review (HERR), DFID 2011
restricted and/or insecure contexts developing since 2001. Increased security investment has not necessarily improved humanitarian access. UNDAC’s role in conflict situations and unstable contexts may need further reflection and clarification in terms of UNDAC’s mandate and focus.

3.2 Changes within OCHA 2001 – 2011

“OCHA is the part of the United Nations Secretariat responsible for bringing together humanitarian actors to ensure a coherent response to emergencies. OCHA also ensures there is a framework within which each actor can contribute to the overall response effort.”

While OCHA’s mission statement has remained constant since 2001, its size, budget, roles, responsibilities and structures have grown steadily. Over the last 10 years, the budget has increased fourfold and the number of staff has increased from approximately 500 in 2001 to approximately 1,900 today. In 2011, OCHA’s budget is USD 250 million, of which USD 208 million must be raised from voluntary contributions. OCHA’s relative importance to the functioning of the humanitarian system has increased dramatically over the past decade and new departments and sections have been set up which have impacted on the UNDAC structure and FCSS, its managing section, not least the move of regional desks from Geneva to New York and the creation of the Coordination and Response Division (CRD).

The OCHA structure of today is entirely different from 2001. Headquarters and field-level growth have been complemented by establishment of five Regional Offices and four sub-regional/liaison offices which has greatly influenced the way in which UNDAC works with regions and member countries. In addition, new headquarters-level sections support Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators (RC/HC) and Humanitarian Country Teams (HCT). Growth has also taken place in the field of information management, policy and evaluations, for which two new branches were established at headquarters level. Further sections have been established to focus on OCHA’s role in early warning, preparedness, UN-CMCoord and assessment.

To ensure organizational capacity to swiftly manage increased staff needs in emergencies, a dedicated section has been created within the Emergency Services Branch (ESB) to manage surge roster mechanisms and protocols. Through these, staff from OCHA, as well as external partners, are deployed to ensure the functioning of OCHA field offices in emergency situations which has significantly strengthened the organisations internal surge capacity over the last five years. In addition to surge staff from its regional offices, OCHA is currently managing five different surge mechanisms. UNDAC, however, remains the only mechanism able to rapidly deploy comprehensive teams of specialised staff with very specific tasks, rather than individuals. While FCSS and the Surge Capacity Section work together on the basis of mutual agreements, other surge mechanisms have different administrative back up and follow different deployment procedures.

OCHA activities have also increased subsequent to the implementation of recommendations of the HRR in 2005 which required OCHA to expand its activities in the field of humanitarian financing. OCHA acts as the secretariat for the CERF, has considerable responsibilities in the area of Flash Appeals and Consolidated Appeals and is also involved with pooled funds at country level. Considerable changes have
also taken place with the establishment of global and field-level humanitarian clusters and cluster-lead organizations. The IASC Working Group is a policy-making body comprising UN, NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, private sector and civil society. Another key area of change which also closely affects UNDAC is development of the OCHA Strategic Framework which for 2010-2013\(^\text{15}\) comprises three main goals: 1) A more enabling environment for humanitarian action; 2) A more effective humanitarian coordination system; and 3) Strengthened OCHA management and administration.

Preparedness has become an important part of OCHA’s work with Member States, including regional consultations amongst humanitarian agencies to pilot inter-agency capacity assessments, followed up by capacity development plans and strategies.

Since 2004, the wording in General Assembly and Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolutions increasingly refers to the role of clusters in improving and strengthening humanitarian coordination. The role of OCHA and the UN as a whole in improving partnership and coordination with national and local authorities has also received increased focus. At the same time, a coherent OCHA response strategy for various emergency settings is still lacking. There is no policy guidance on coordination in sudden-onset emergencies, complex emergencies, or emergencies related to extreme weather conditions requiring multi-sectoral response.

### 3.3 UNDAC in 2011

#### Membership

There are currently approximately 250 active national UNDAC members globally, defined as those with valid UN contracts and documents to enable them to be deployed within 24 to 48 hours. In addition, there are a large number of OCHA, UN agency and other organizational personnel who have been UNDAC trained, however their availability and engagement with the UNDAC system varies widely from person to person and from region to region. UNDAC teams are divided into three regions (Africa-Middle East-Europe, Americas, and Asia-Pacific). Globally, approximately 28% of UNDAC members are female and 40% from developing countries.

Membership in the UNDAC system comes from over 80 countries and 20 UN Agencies and international/regional organizations. Thirty-four countries hold UNDAC Mission Accounts with OCHA/FCSS through which funds are deposited to cover deployment costs of their national UNDAC members on missions. Developing country participation in UNDAC is financed either through contributions to FCSS's Developing Countries' Activities Account or through UNDAC Mission Accounts by special agreement with some self-financing member countries.

#### Membership Issues

Following induction training, national participants are invited to become deployable UNDAC members through completion of the necessary administrative paperwork and security requirements. They are then issued with UN contracts and travel documents (UN Certificates) and thereafter can be deployed on mission. It is worth noting that, on average, FCSS staff require 4 hours to process each member’s paperwork before it is passed up through the OCHA/UN administrative chain, which requires a further 3-4

\(^{15}\) OCHA, (2010). OCHA Strategic Framework 2010 to 2013
weeks to process. UN consultancy contracts explicitly exclude medical insurance. This has led to a separate, private system of life insurance for missions (and training in the case of developing country UNDAC members) which is funded by Sweden. Repatriation insurance is covered by OCHA.

UN agency and other international organization staff members who have completed UNDAC Induction training are immediately considered to be deployable UNDAC members as no contracts are required. Their participation in UNDAC missions is arranged and funded entirely by their agency/organization. As opposed to national members, FCSS has little influence over which people are made available from UN agencies and, consequently, loses some influence over team composition.

Contracts for national UNDAC members are valid for 2 years. At the end of this period, the contracts are renewed provided the UNDAC member has made him/herself available for missions during this time, even if not selected. The current system for deactivation of UNDAC members (agreed at the UNDAC Advisory Board) is that those who have not made themselves available during a 2-year contractual period are no longer considered deployable. However, there is currently no formal system for deactivating those who, while making themselves available, have never, or rarely, been deployed. The lack of an agreed deactivation system has led to some countries having a large number of longstanding UNDAC members who may no longer fit the ideal profile. However, even if not deployable, they may remain valuable members of a wider UNDAC network and should be retained as such.

Profiles for deployment

National UNDAC members’ profiles are broadly divided between those working in disaster management at the national level and those working in international humanitarian response. This diversity of skillsets has enabled UNDAC to field some quite specialised emergency response missions, e.g. structural assessment following the Bukavu earthquake and the Zanzibar power outage.

Nevertheless, there is an apparent need for an even wider range of competencies to choose from, especially humanitarian, when selecting UNDAC members for missions. However, when selecting UNDAC members for most mission deployments, the overriding consideration is that of availability. Whilst many UNDAC members make themselves available for large, high profile disasters, such as the Haiti Earthquake, for smaller “unknown” disasters, there is often much less choice, impeding skills-based selection by FCSS.

It is estimated that, of the current active (i.e. deployable) UNDAC members worldwide, 30-50% could be considered truly active in terms of availability and deployment potential. Whilst a large pool of active members can ensure sufficient availability at any one time for deployments, it can also lead to unrealistic expectations amongst new UNDAC members eager to be selected for mission since, in an average year, only some 90-100 UNDAC members are deployed.

Evaluation

An attempt has been made at introducing an evaluation system for UNDAC members but has been difficult to implement effectively. This is partly due to time constraints but also to perceived sensitivities regarding division and assignment of tasks on mission which may not always be the team member’s actual specialization. There is a clear need to make evaluation mandatory to be able to screen out people who do not meet
the necessary competencies after initial selection, thus ensuring equality, transparency and relevant feedback to the UNDAC system. At the same time, the importance and value of flexibility in deployment needs to be acknowledged where team members may be undertaking roles for which they may not always have specialised skillsets.

**Interface UNDAC teams – OCHA response - Partners**

Over the last 6 years, in addition to UNDAC, OCHA has developed new surge mechanisms and/or partnerships which to a great extent complement each other. Regrettably, however, when not properly managed, this has led to overlap and duplication of services. There are examples of OCHA deploying parallel resources into an emergency but with no clear directive as to who is to cover which functions. Faced with ambiguous or no direction, those on the ground have been left to sort out for themselves who should do what and how.

In spite of this, most such deployments have worked well. OCHA staff and UNDAC team members have developed solutions on-site, adapted their activities and found ways to work effectively together. However, without guidance, direction and Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), the level of success is often coincidental and personality-dependent. A decisive factor for successful interaction is strong leadership. When the leadership has been strong on mission objectives and ToRs, the deployed OCHA resources have worked together as one team. In other situations, when there has not been strong leadership, OCHA/UNDAC staff has worked in parallel, resulting in lack of coordination and inefficient output.

Just as OCHA deploys staff alongside an UNDAC team, other partners, such as regional organizations, donor groups, military and NGOs, also deploy staff or teams to work on various aspects of coordination. Over recent years, there has been a proliferation in the number of organizations and/or private enterprises that either have a stake in the coordination process or bring special expertise to the table. The number of staff working in or around an OSOCC, can grow rapidly to a level that requires internal coordination for which no methodology currently exists.

However, looking at how this challenge has been met in practice, there is a clear image emerging of what has worked and what has not. Inclusiveness, integration and clear leadership are revealed as being key to establishing and running a well-functioning coordination mechanism. When UNDAC, OCHA surge staff and partners have worked together in one organizational model, such as an OSOCC, with clear, internal reporting lines and management procedures, resources have invariably been utilised optimally and each has complemented the other. On the other hand, when work has been segregated, significant problems have emerged, for example, lack of proper procedures for internal coordination or poor information sharing. Consequently, “silo” thinking, duplication of services and gaps in the coordination process have occurred with greater prevalence.

**Humanitarian Reform**

Surprisingly in the view of some, the implementation of humanitarian reform appears to have been one of the least concerns for the UNDAC team over the last 6 years, in large part due to the fact that the basis of the cluster approach is very much in line with the basic disaster management ideals which underwrite the UNDAC methodology. When on mission, UNDAC teams have supported the establishment of clusters, guided RC/HCs on humanitarian reform issues and provided initial inter-cluster coordination.
On the other hand, some studies and evaluations of the humanitarian reform indicate that many actors have too little knowledge of UNDAC to fully utilise its services in the set up and early implementation phase of the clusters. Cluster coordinators and HCTs are often unaware of the UNDAC concept and the resources an UNDAC team can offer, or how they can be used when establishing clusters in an emergency. There is clearly a need to clarify what role UNDAC should have with regards to the current humanitarian architecture and to ensure that RC/HCs, HCTs, and cluster coordinators are aware of UNDAC and its capacities.

**UNDAC’s Role in Capacity Development**

In 2009, OCHA’s Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS) commissioned a review of the UNDAC DRP missions that had been conducted to date. The review was conducted in the context of capacity development and looked at how successful the implementation status of the recommendations had been following these missions. The review pointed out that the most successful missions had been dependent on a high degree of local ownership and that the OCHA Regional Offices needed to be deeply involved in preparations, execution and follow-up to the missions. Missions without these elements had had noticeably less impact. The main conclusion was that DRP missions can be useful, even very useful in some contexts, but cannot function in isolation from other wider disaster risk reduction and capacity development work.

When studying the material from the emergency response missions selected for this report, it is clear that many UNDAC teams seize the moment when on mission to recommend disaster management measures to be taken, which would develop capacity either in governmental institutions or in-country UN entities. However, the value of experience-based written recommendations after an UNDAC emergency response mission may be lost unless they are considered with a larger, more strategic, integrated capacity development and disaster risk reduction process. To be successful and sustainable, at the very minimum, such UNDAC recommendations need to be followed up by the OCHA Regional Office and other local or regional stakeholders. There is a need to revisit the DRP review of 2009 and clarify UNDAC’s role with respect to capacity development.

**Internal Coordination**

Finally, the study found that there is an uneven and inconsistent knowledge of UNDAC methodology and tools within the global UNDAC team. This is a natural consequence of having such a large pool of members whose primary jobs and responsibilities lie outside the system. To cope with this, FCSS should be in a position to support and guide teams on missions when challenges occur. Unfortunately, FCSS staffs themselves are not always sufficiently updated on the tools and methodology to be able to adequately advise UNDAC teams on mission. This is a challenge for FCSS that, by extension, affects the quality of UNDAC teams on mission. This could be catered for by better training and selection of team leaders, but being the responsible unit for UNDAC, FCSS should also be able to be a high-quality centre of excellence with regards to UNDAC methodology, tools and guidelines. Based on mission material, this aspect of FCSS has room for improvement.

---

16 See “Review OCHA UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness Missions” Lars Peter Nissen, 2009
4. Findings and Recommendations

The findings from documentary reviews, interviews, and surveys are consistent and are grouped in the following nine findings with corresponding recommendations:

**Finding 1**

The **UNDAC concept is sound, has unique utility in serving both disaster management and international humanitarian systems, but suffers from poor knowledge and understanding of its role, including mixed perceptions of its usefulness and performance.**

Review findings indicate that the basic UNDAC concept enables OCHA to deploy a mandated UN body comprised of team members from, and directly supported by a diverse range of member countries. The direct funding mechanism allows for rapid deployment without excessive bureaucracy and there is a strong sense of ownership with all members/member countries treated as equals. UNDAC generally functions well as a rapid response mechanism that can quickly establish OCHA presence on the ground enabling an overview of a disaster situation in the early stages of a response. Once on the ground, UNDAC provides the functional interface between disaster management actors, the formal international humanitarian system and the host government. UNDAC team members deploy for genuine humanitarian reasons, from a membership which classifies its greatest strengths as being its staff, its methodology and its flexibility. UNDAC is also supported by a group of clearly valued, highly skilled technical partners.

UNDAC is not only an OCHA tool for emergency response, it is also an international network with far-reaching contacts through the wider system, linked on multiple issues through OCHA’s Virtual OSOCC online facility. However, while the broader UNDAC concept is almost unanimously seen as valid and highly regarded amongst its members, it is the system through which it is being delivered in 2011 which draws some criticism (see also Finding 2).

**Perceptions and Knowledge of UNDAC**

UNDAC’s role is clear for disaster management stakeholders but less clear in the broader humanitarian community. UNDAC’s role is also not widely known outside of its own network and has been described by many NGOs as being outside their line of sight. Furthermore, UNDAC’s role is also not well understood within OCHA, partly due to rapid expansion and staff changes, nor amongst many RC/HCs partly due to their rapid turnover and vast range of responsibilities. For some, UNDAC presents an “outdated” impression with generic terms of reference (ToRs) dating back to 2002, and a reputation for “patchy” delivery, highly dependent on the composition of its teams. An unclear role makes “marketing” UNDAC challenging and can lead to misguided expectations of teams in the field. For many stakeholders, UNDAC’s role needs clarifying and reinforcing through updated ToRs better reflecting developments in the humanitarian environment, with greater attention paid to external advocacy and a strategy developed for marketing UNDAC within OCHA itself.

**Clarifying the Cornerstones of the UNDAC Methodology**

The UNDAC methodology is based on four themes which serve as cornerstones to guide UNDAC teams, achieve mission objectives and bind together team functions on
mission. They enable a team to focus on their priorities and function effectively in ever more complex and demanding contexts. These four cornerstones (further elaborated in Annex 5) comprise:

- **Core Values.** The UNDAC methodology is based on the following core values which guide teams on mission: *Equal, Committed, Competent, Flexible, Inclusive, Operational and Supportive.*

- **Disaster Management.** The UNDAC concept bridges the gap between disaster manager and humanitarian coordination and thus provides a unique interface for disaster-affected governments, RC/HCs, HCTs and OCHA in the immediate phase following a disaster.

- **Humanitarian Principles.** UN General Assembly Resolution 46/182 adopted in December 1991 underpins OCHA’s mandate and recognises that; “humanitarian assistance must be provided in accordance with the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence of operation.” This is also fundamental for the UNDAC concept.

- **Leadership.** The UNDAC concept may support or provide leadership on operational and tactical levels but only supports leadership at the strategic level. UNDAC teams establish systems for decision-making and coordination in the immediate phase following a disaster that form the base for more complex structures.

### Measuring Success and Accountability

UNDAC’s role would be more clearly recognised and accepted if it could demonstrate more measurably what it is achieving. This would require more qualitative as well as quantitative measures of accountability. However, the rapid response nature of UNDAC deployments frequently requires revision of objectives to adjust to changing circumstances, making clear measurements difficult to identify and reporting against objectives and ToRs challenging. Nonetheless, there are ways to demonstrate delivery of tangible outputs in a crisis which should at least be aligned to the goals of OCHA’s Strategic Framework and its organisational system for setting objectives. Reporting requirements should not be onerous and should reflect the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) principles of its core donors. The mechanism for reporting should be integrated with the OCHA performance framework.

> “I see UNDAC as an instrument that strengthens your leadership task and your self-confidence. They provide concrete help, solve problems, they give you some instrument to address better the response. They are a support to you, the country and the humanitarian response architecture. They act as a bridge between the international humanitarian actors and the government. They come, they sit immediately with the counterparts, and they help us to solve the problems”

*UN Resident Coordinator quoted in ‘Research on UNDAC in Humanitarian Response Operations: The contribution to coordination & the capacity to provide operational humanitarian leadership’, Assanke Koedam, 2011*
Recommendation 1

Update the UNDAC concept and market UNDAC’s role in bridging disaster management and humanitarian coordination activities.

1.1 Update the UNDAC generic ToRs, linking them to the transformative agenda of the IASC
1.2 Demonstrate to IASC partners, Member States and the international humanitarian community that UNDAC methodology is rooted in disaster management but is largely influenced by the international humanitarian system to bring together and support coordination from both angles.
1.3 Reaffirm the four cornerstones of Core Values, Disaster Management, Humanitarian Principles and Leadership as the basis on which all UNDAC methodology is built and reflect this in an updated UNDAC handbook, training materials and guidance.
1.4 Develop a comprehensive information, marketing and awareness strategy based on updated generic ToRs within the UN system and with external partners
1.5 Adjust existing UNDAC report systems and formats to include more qualitative measures of accountability for each UNDAC mission, based on updated generic ToRs and OCHA’s Strategic Framework.
1.6 Ensure detailed sections and updates on UNDAC are incorporated in HC handbooks, contingency planning guidelines and general checklists.

Finding 2

Recognition of UNDAC’s objectives, mandate and role is unclear within OCHA at policy and operational levels

UNDAC’s role within OCHA.

While UNDAC is seen as a valuable OCHA mechanism for disaster response, its exact role and added value in the OCHA context of today needs clarifying. UNDAC is assigned a primary role under Objective 1.1 of OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2010-2013: Partnerships with a wider group of member states and regional organizations in support of humanitarian action. In this context, OCHA in 2011 states “…it is increasingly important to encourage disaster-prone countries to participate in inter-governmental response mechanisms such as the United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) system … Joining UNDAC helps disaster-prone countries to understand how to request and receive international assistance when coordinating the response to sudden-onset disasters”.

The shift in the language of UN General Assembly and ECOSOC resolutions from disaster management towards humanitarian coordination reflects changes not only in OCHA’s identity, or self-perception, but also the different approach adopted by the international humanitarian community over time, from direct hands-on management of large emergencies, to support of local mechanisms in carrying out this function. This underlines the particular added value of UNDAC as the only OCHA body which bridges the significant gap between national and bilateral disaster management actors and the formal international humanitarian response system.
Whereas disaster management involves coordination and direct management of urgent actions to respond to the entire spectrum of emergency needs, humanitarian coordination is an overarching, principled way of managing disasters through strategic planning, policy making and facilitation of cooperation and consensual decision making (see Annex 5). UNDAC provides an interface between these two approaches. However, UNDAC’s relevance is not acknowledged by all parts of OCHA as its primary rapid response tool and its only interface with disaster management actors. The increasing number of new tools and mechanisms that emerged in the wake of the Humanitarian Reform process has led to a perception within OCHA that the number of UNDAC missions and relevance have decreased over recent years.

Findings suggest that UNDAC linkages with NGOs and cluster leads could be formalised, as could existing links with parts of OCHA and specialised UN agencies. UNDAC linkages with the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement are seemingly not as strong as they were in the past, although relationships with agencies delivering bilateral aid remain strong. Political support from UNDAC member countries is important to help underpin its mandate, as is providing technical level support and maintaining funding for OCHA, FCSS and UNDAC mission accounts.

Today’s management and decision-making setup in OCHA has become very complex and compartmentalised and not optimally orientated towards fast delivery of response to sudden-onset disasters. Located within ESB, FCSS, does not have direct management lines with key departments and sections, such as the Humanitarian Coordination Support Services (HCSS), Coordination and Response Division (CRD), IASC Secretariat, Communications and Information Services Branch, CERF Secretariat, Policy Development and Services Branch. The many changes within OCHA over the past decade have led to a situation where the division of roles and responsibilities between OCHA’s Geneva and New York offices are not clearly defined. For example, CRD New York has formal links with the regions and regional desks while FCSS does not, although in reality FCSS undertakes a great deal of its work through regional offices, which has, for example, greatly improved the selection process of identifying new UNDAC members and built knowledge and awareness of UNDAC as a mechanism tool amongst member states in the regions.

UNDAC’s tested rapid disaster response facility is unlike other OCHA response mechanisms which mainly deal with reinforcement of and support to OCHA offices and support to other UN agencies. UNDAC’s role in providing disaster management and humanitarian coordination support is performed through its ability to repeatedly and rapidly deploy whole teams who can perform on the ground from day one. This makes
UNDAC a key asset among the UN agencies’ rapid response systems and should be further capitalised upon by OCHA.

The modality of deploying UNDAC, however, has been made more difficult as a consequence of the change in line management systems within OCHA over the past decade. In the past, OCHA Geneva was in direct contact with UN RC/HCs in disaster-affected countries to offer support including deployment of an UNDAC team. Today the request officially would have to go through several steps within the organisation before arriving at FCSS, which has led to high levels of frustration within the section.

The diagram below illustrates how a request for an UNDAC team goes from the affected government through the UN system in country, OCHA regional office and OCHA CRD in New York. Meanwhile, FCSS will most often be in direct contact with the disaster management authorities in the affected countries through its network. FCSS will very early in new sudden-onset emergencies be able to get direct information on disaster affected governments’ response and their immediate considerations about requesting international assistance. While this information is shared with operational partners through the Virtual OSOCC, there seem to be an uneven understanding with other part of OCHA for the organisation’s role in coordination of bilateral operational deployments.

The model shows that while FCSS, through its networks, often has direct links to the disaster affected government, decision-making will go through several steps before eventually leading to a formal request and actual deployment.

**UN rapid response teams**

The UNDAC mechanism is unique compared to other OCHA surge mechanisms which follow different administrative procedures and back-up when deploying people to the field for emergency response. Recent IASC discussions on rapid response mechanisms to further strengthen cluster coordination in large-scale sudden-onset emergencies have been co-chaired by OCHA/CRD. However, they have not so far involved UNDAC, one of OCHA’s key rapid response tools which can provide technical and logistical support and bring in non-cluster partners involved in sudden-onset emergency response. This is seemingly due to discussions tending to concentrate on humanitarian
coordination rather than the disaster management component of international emergency response which functions comparatively well.

**International surge capacity**

Respondents are clear that UNDAC is not intended to provide a free of charge default substitute for other surge mechanisms which are unable to provide staff in a more timely fashion. UNDAC team members might, in extremis, provide continuity in key positions for OCHA. However, this should not challenge the existing UNDAC concept by requiring it to provide longer-term OCHA surge capacity, as has been more common in the past. Nonetheless, the pool capacity and profiles of UNDAC members are not as widely known as they could be. In contrast, OCHA surge capacities are more generally known and shared via generic profiling and regular newsletters. OCHA regional office staff deploy in emergencies and tend to arrive at the same time as UNDAC teams. Therefore roles, responsibilities and core competencies of both OCHA regional staff, other surge mechanisms and UNDAC teams need to be understood and defined by OCHA, together with a better coordination approach to staff deployment within a defined response strategy.

Findings indicate that skills sets frequently lacking in UNDAC teams include reporting and humanitarian technical or advisory expertise in areas such as humanitarian financing. As a consequence of the need to launch the Flash Appeal within seven days from the onset of an emergency, the UNDAC team will inevitably be involved in informing its content, capitalizing on its ability to collect assessment data fast and in a credible way.

**Supporting needs of the RC/HC**

Despite the IASC checklist for HCs and the OCHA HC strengthening project, the range of initiatives, tools and partners has been described as “bewildering for an RC/HC” in an emergency. There is a key role for UNDAC to get coordinated response mechanisms moving in the first stages and to support the RC/HC through establishment of the whole “platform” for response, including assessment coordination and pre-cluster coordination, ready for OCHA to step in and take forward. OCHA has to be clear about where this would be applicable, mainly in situations where capacity is overwhelmed and/or there is no OCHA presence. There is a need to acknowledge that, at present, OCHA does not provide a systematic response to HCs in crisis situations. However, to be effective in this support role, UNDAC has to be more aware of, and able to advocate for, what OCHA can offer in terms of surge and additional support. UNDAC should have a role in analysing where HCT support is needed, and providing strategic and independent advice on the most appropriate type of support available, including the most appropriate surge mechanisms to replace the UNDAC team on departure.

UNDAC is in a strong position to advise and guide RC/HCs, HCTs, and cluster coordinators on these issues when on mission. However, a significant weakness of the UNDAC system is that many actors have too little knowledge of UNDAC to fully utilise its services in the implementation phase of the clusters.

Even where OCHA Regional Offices and RC/HCs are supportive of UNDAC missions and request UNDAC teams as part of their strategic disaster management plans, a lack of acceptance by the broader UN family, and poor hand-over modalities in general does impact on what UNDAC can achieve in some contexts. There is insufficient clarity on how the international humanitarian community can better engage the range of OCHA’s humanitarian services, including UNDAC.
**UNDAC’s and OCHA’s role in different emergencies**

Humanitarian response is becoming increasingly complex, with less of a distinction between natural disasters and conflict. To better meet future needs, UNDAC should be able to deploy effectively to complex emergency environments, as well as be able to carry out small-term, technical support missions, especially in contexts where large teams are not necessary or not accepted by host governments.

### Recommendation 2

**Optimise UNDAC’s functionality within OCHA.**

2.1 Implement the recommendations from this review in line with OCHA’s Strategic Framework objectives.

2.2 Work with wider OCHA to develop agreed policy on the roles of OCHA and UNDAC in different emergency types, including complex, technological and slow onset, linked to updated generic ToRs (See also Recommendation 1.1)

2.3 Identify ways in order to more effectively reinforce channels of communication between ESB sections, including FCSS, and related divisions, branches and sections such as CRD, Regional Offices and CISB, with the aim of ESB ensuring more effective support to OCHA’s objectives through deployment of UNDAC missions.

2.4 Define SoPs for the mobilisation and use of OCHA’s tools and services in case of sudden-onset emergencies, which specify the role of UNDAC field, regional and headquarters offices.

2.5 Clarify with IASC and UN agencies with rapid response mechanisms where UNDAC can add value under the five pillars of the IASC transformative agenda.

2.6 Clarify UNDAC’s role with regards to the establishment of clusters, inter-cluster coordination and interface with OCHA’s Humanitarian Coordination Support Section (HCSS) at Geneva level and clearly communicate this position to RC/HCs, HCTs and the cluster coordinators.

2.7 Promote the OSOCC concept as a key coordination platform in sudden-onset emergencies to provide support for cluster coordination, assessment, information management, UN-CMCoord, etc. through physical co-location of the key stakeholders.

2.8 Develop clear procedures and responsibilities with CRD for OCHA deployments, including leadership, reporting, handover and transition to longer-term programming.

“UNDAC provides an assurance or reassurance that we will be doing the right thing and that is maybe the most valuable form of leadership that UNDAC can provide. It ensures that we avoid making serious mistakes because they are people that provide us with more eyes and ears and valuable experience on a professional level”.

Finding 3

The UNDAC methodology is a reflection of all approaches and stakeholders in a sudden-onset emergency environment

Findings indicate that, in addition to its membership and flexibility, the UNDAC methodology is considered one of the three main strengths of an UNDAC team. The methodology is captured in the UNDAC Field Handbook, in guidelines and training materials, and combines elements of disaster management, the international humanitarian response system, functional organizational models, political awareness, and humanitarian coordination. This methodology enables UNDAC to work with diverse stakeholders in sudden-onset emergency operations, including regional organizations, the military, private sector and others.

The UNDAC methodology has also been adopted by a number of partners, including regional organisations, which places the UNDAC system in a unique position to ensure complementarity when creating links with all types of stakeholders in large-scale emergencies. The clearest examples are the EUCPT, which bases its training and approach on the UNDAC methodology and has a cooperative working relationship with UNDAC, and the ASEAN Emergency Rapid Assessment Team (ERAT).

UNDAC core activities

Coordination, Information Management and Assessment are the priority activities which underpin the UNDAC methodology, requiring systematic constant updating to keep abreast of current thinking, external developments and the role of OCHA.

Coordination

According to UNDAC mission reports from the last six years (Annex 4), humanitarian reform has positively affected the outcome of UNDAC missions across all regions. However, this is also an area where UNDAC members and key stakeholders lack clear definition of UNDAC’s role and extent of involvement in initial inter-cluster coordination. In terms of internal coordination, UNDAC, OCHA and the various technical and response partners, have worked well together in one disaster management model using, for example, OSOCCs, which have later evolved into Humanitarian Information Centres (HICs) and/or OCHA Field Offices. However, the rapid increase in staff and partners working with or around an UNDAC team in complex contexts, such as the Haiti Earthquake in 2010, requires a level of leadership and internal coordination that is currently not addressed in the UNDAC methodology.

While OCHA supports and coordinates mainly UN agencies and the cluster system, many actors are not active in clusters, including the private sector, bilateral donors, and military actors. Effective and inclusive coordination in the field has to accommodate these increasingly important players in response operations. UNDAC is the only UN mechanism that has a methodology to undertake this growing role, largely because of its disaster management orientation. At the same time, UNDAC’s role in coordinating the international humanitarian response of UN and non-UN organisations should remain and be further strengthened.
Assessment

A key question is UNDAC’s role regarding initial needs assessments and Preliminary Scenario Definitions (PSD) using secondary data. Findings indicate that UNDAC should have a key role in coordinating initial assessments and managing and appropriately disseminating the information for decision-makers. In this regard, UNDAC methodology must incorporate relevant operational guidance, including the IASC “Operational Guidance for Coordinated Assessments in Humanitarian Crises”, which assigns a key role to UNDAC in assessment coordination. UNDAC teams should be able to carry out assessments which enable PSD development to inform a Flash Appeal. This is a significant undertaking and requires guidance on how UNDAC teams should do this, as well as development of SOPs for UNDAC cooperation with assessment initiatives such as ACAPS.

Information Management

Findings show that UNDAC’s information management methodologies are in line with current humanitarian information management practices, including those of OCHA. However, as this is a constantly evolving area, UNDAC, as part of OCHA, needs to do more to stay on top of current developments and new technologies since information management is such a core component of response. In addition, information handling protocols should be developed to ensure the integrity of information and diversity of sources.

Recommendation 3

Affirm the UNDAC Methodology as a global concept for sudden on-set operations.

3.1 Continue to utilise the UNDAC methodology as the basis for establishment and maintenance of partnerships with all stakeholders

3.2 Work closely with relevant sections within OCHA, the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG), Joint UNEP-OCHA Environment Unit (JEU), national, regional and technical partners to ensure that the methodology is coherent with latest international developments and relevant for national preparedness and response measures.

3.3 Further develop the UNDAC methodology regarding inter-cluster coordination in line with recommendation 2.6.

3.4 Engage with the technical partners of IASC/NATF, including cluster lead agencies and ACAPS, to further operationalise the assessment guidance note and MIRA, to ensure UNDAC has capacity to lead or support the assessment process in sudden-onset emergencies.

3.5 Harmonise information management systems between UNDAC and OCHA Information Services Section in line with new improvements, information sources, analysis of data and utilization of new technologies.
Finding 4

UNDAC’s membership is both one of its greatest strengths and yet one of its weaknesses

UNDAC’s diverse global network of experts is regarded as both one of its greatest strengths and, at the same time, a major area of weakness. The UNDAC network of experts has developed over time and includes experts from all key stakeholders in emergency response operations. It provides a unique opportunity for personal interaction with responding organisations, including disaster-affected governments.

Concerns have been raised about UNDAC members having insufficient knowledge of UN systems, humanitarian architecture and humanitarian reform; the wrong skill sets within a team; and a lack of appropriate competencies for a functioning team. These multiple requirements indicate that a comprehensive analysis should be considered to establish more clearly where the strengths and weaknesses of UNDAC member profiles lie and to establish a set of UNDAC Core Competencies as required skills.

Funding requirements for full UNDAC member country status are perceived as restricting membership, not only from developing and vulnerable countries which may not have the financial capacity to contribute, but also from NGOs who may find the system too rigid to be able to participate. This may limit the skills and competencies available to the UNDAC system and deny access to the broad diversity of expertise which may be needed to plan for future disaster contexts.

Findings from the survey show there are too many non-deployable members listed as active members on the roster and too few OCHA staff who make themselves available for an UNDAC alert, partially due to their participation in various OCHA surge rosters. However, non-active national UNDAC members are also regarded as a potentially valuable, but relatively unused, resource of the wider UNDAC network who could provide long-distance support to deployed UNDAC teams as well as further UNDAC’s role in capacity development.

Findings indicate that the system for selecting UNDAC members for mission could be more transparent. Furthermore, a proper evaluation and appraisal system is needed for UNDAC members and team leaders which would allow FCSS to better orientate further training opportunities, promote UNDAC member development, and de-activate members when it is clear that they no longer benefit the team.

Mission Leadership

According to the survey carried out for this review, the majority of UNDAC team leaders are rated as being “capable in their role.” Most team leaders have been OCHA staff, and while there is widespread acknowledgement that it is easier for OCHA staff to be accepted by the RC/HC and HCTs, leadership experience, decision-making qualities and contextual and technical expertise are nevertheless key requirements for team leader selection. UNDAC team leaders need to build excellent relations with in-country UN counterparts and the host government and to promote clearer recognition of UNDAC in the field generally.
Recommendation 4

Review UNDAC membership, develop and introduce a set of UNDAC Core Competencies to strengthen both field deployment and the wider UNDAC network.

4.1 Update the existing UNDAC member selection criteria (see Annex 7) to better reflect requirements and develop essential “UNDAC Core Competencies” for future members and team leaders.

4.2 Introduce an effective system of evaluation and feedback to be agreed by OCHA/FCSS in consultation with the relevant UNDAC national focal point, and based on a set of UNDAC Core Competences (see also Recommendation 4.1).

4.3 Review and downsize the existing roster of UNDAC members to ensure required skill sets, core competencies and availability for active deployment.

4.4 Cease to automatically renew UNDAC contracts and redistribute new and existing membership appropriately across the network.

4.5 Focus on leadership qualities balanced with in-depth working knowledge of the humanitarian system as the primary criteria when selecting team leaders for UNDAC missions.

4.6 Work with member states and OCHA surge mechanisms on ways to ensure minimum guaranteed availability for deployments, including for UNDAC team leaders.

4.7 Encourage member states, organizations and partners to provide fully-funded future UNDAC members from NGOs, IFRC Field Assessment and Coordination Teams (FACT) and Regional Disaster Response Teams (RDRT), regional organisations and other response agencies in pursuance of Objective 1.1 of OCHA’s Strategic Framework 2010-13.

4.8 Develop approaches for “distance support” for UNDAC missions from other team members working from home or their work locations, to provide back up and analytical inputs in specific areas to deployed UNDAC teams.

4.9 Develop and maintain an “UNDAC Homepage” to communicate methodology updates, share news and report on UNDAC activities to the wider UNDAC network.

4.10 Explore ways to better maintain and actively utilise the UNDAC members who are no longer on the deployment roster, with a strong focus on networking, building resilience and relationship management.

Finding 5

UNDAC training is not sufficiently focussed on building the strengths, skills or potential of UNDAC members to best fit future challenges

While the UNDAC training system is well recognised and has been used as a model for delivery of emergency response training by other organisations, it is essential that it is constantly kept up to date to reflect best practice. The UNDAC system conducts a range of training courses and exercises each year, the most prominent of which are the UNDAC Induction Course, the UNDAC Team Leader Course, the OSOCC Course, and UNDAC Refresher Courses. In addition UNDAC members are offered places on courses provided by partners, such as ECHO, OCHA’s Civil-Military Coordination Section (CMCS) and ACAPS. The UNDAC system also educates its own trainers through the Train the Trainers course which is open to partners.
Findings reveal that UNDAC’s training approach should become more systematised, structured and targeted. Many also see a need for new training initiatives for RC/HCs, HCTs, cluster coordinators and humanitarian partners, to increase awareness of UNDAC and the capacities teams can provide in emergencies. While some changes have already been made, findings suggest that the training programme should be broader in subject matter, better tailored to the changing demands of new contexts and the humanitarian system, and aimed both at the UNDAC system itself as well as outwards towards a greater range of partners.

There is concern that there are too many UNDAC Induction Courses and that it is too easy to be accepted as a member. Originally intended to recruit new members, the aim of the Induction Courses has been widened to also include building networks, awareness and bring in new countries. The UNDAC network helps build resilience and response preparedness, provides new contacts, gives access to other networks and brings in regional and local knowledge. An engaged, informed network of UNDAC-aware key actors in disaster-prone countries and regions has great value, however this may be better achieved with other training modules than with what the Induction Course offers at present.

Feedback also indicates that UNDAC mission reports, lessons learned, and updates to methodology have not been shared or circulated as systematically as they could be. Distance learning has not been sufficiently explored and FCSS/UNDAC is falling far behind other comparable organizations in utilising the possibilities of ICT and web-based solutions. While a webpage could be developed to better share on-going developments, mission experience and store templates and guidelines for easy access, this would require dedicated resources to maintain (see also Recommendation 4.9).

Findings suggest that a new model for the UNDAC training system could be effective in accommodating both deployment and network needs, and better cater for a broad variety of skillsets. This would involve introducing a graduated approach over four identified levels, each defined by a set of required UNDAC Core Competencies, for UNDAC members to both attain and maintain (see also Recommendation 4.1). While each of the levels would have organisational importance, the associated training would target different audiences and have different strategic aims and objectives:

**Recommendation 5**

**Restructure UNDAC’s training system to strengthen UNDAC’s response, networks, resilience-building and accountability.**

5.1 Introduce a four-level training system with a set of defined UNDAC Core Competences required for each level, harmonised with other OCHA surge training initiatives.

- **UNDAC Network Level.** This level includes Core Competences required for representatives of regional partners and key stakeholders in disaster-prone countries, to understand the UNDAC concept. This will become the entry level into the UNDAC system and global network for partnership and resilience-building. This level also introduces technical support staff to the UNDAC system and international emergency environment.

- **UNDAC Operational Level.** This level is by invitation only, and should form the basis of UNDAC missions. A number of Core Competences associated with this level will be necessary to be eligible for an UNDAC contract and deployment. Courses at this level may also be used as refresher trainings.
- **UNDAC Leadership Level.** The Core Competences at this advanced level are required to be an UNDAC team leader on missions or resource person for the UNDAC system. These include training in leadership, inter-cluster coordination, assessment coordination, OCHA surge mechanisms, technical support mechanisms, aspects from the HC Handbook, and specialised courses provided by partners in areas such as technical cluster coordination.

- **UNDAC Strategic Level.** This level is aimed at creating strategic awareness of how to make best use of and support UNDAC teams for key targeted UN and external partners, including RC/HGs, cluster leads, key government representatives and leaders in the disaster management and international humanitarian systems.

**Four level UNDAC Training System**

5.2 Revise each existing UNDAC training course based on the four cornerstones of UNDAC methodology (see also Recommendation 1.3) and tailor the aims, objectives and target audience to the appropriate training level and UNDAC Core Competences.

5.3 Further integrate cross-cutting themes such as gender, environment, age and protection issues across all levels of the training programme.

5.4 Ensure that UNDAC and INSARAG training program is better harmonised.

5.5 Explore further courses offered by partners that may be opened for UNDAC members (including Cluster leads and NGOs).

5.6 Explore possibilities for utilizing distance learning as a part of the training system

**Finding 6**

**UNDAC’s funding system is financially safe, robust and a key to its success. It needs fine-tuning to improve flexibility**

The UNDAC funding system is robust and its flexibility is key to enabling rapid, predictable deployments to emergency situations. It has three components:
1. An FCSS Account administered from OCHA New York (which includes covering salaries and overhead costs);
2. Developing Countries Account (supporting training and some deployments costs); and
3. UNDAC Mission Accounts (directly supporting UNDAC member deployments).

The Mission Accounts are funded by each self-financing UNDAC member country through a pre-paid $50,000 reserve which is drawn against to cover deployment of its UNDAC members on mission. While FCSS is generally well supported, the present OCHA “zero growth” policy has prevented it from increasing its FCSS and Developing Countries Activities Account cost plans by any meaningful amount for the last seven years. FCSS has, therefore, had to rely on generous in-kind support and ad-hoc use of Mission Account funds for other agreed purposes in order to carry out its activities.

The Mission Account facility has worked well for the UNDAC system, guaranteeing up-front funding for rapid deployment with a level of flexibility that FCSS and most UNDAC member countries value highly, although it is not without its concerns at the wider OCHA level. These relate to visibility and accountability issues, as well as potential conflict with other existing donor funding agreements.

Independently evaluated as part of this review, findings indicate that the Mission Account system has a “safe” mechanism for financial accounting. It is clearly very effective in ensuring teams can be rapidly deployed and flexible enough to allow donors to extend their support to developing country UNDAC activities. Limitations, however, are the inability to retain experienced UNDAC members in the system if they can no longer be sponsored by their own governments or organisations for administrative reasons, and how UNDAC might access other sources of potential quality UNDAC members, such as NGOs, from outside of the national membership system.

**Recommendation 6**

**Fine tune the existing UNDAC funding system to increase flexibility.**

6.1 Change the current Developing Countries Activities Account into a trust fund arrangement with oversight from the UNDAC Advisory Board to better facilitate the involvement of developing countries and lift the OCHA zero growth restriction on FCSS accounts to absorb unspent balances.

6.2 Introduce a function within the Mission Account system which provides for non-sponsored UNDAC members to be recruited, trained and deployed.

6.3 Encourage countries with five or more active UNDAC members to pre-deposit larger amounts (e.g. $100,000) established as a yearly continuum in the Mission Account to reduce administrative demands for frequent top-up payments.

6.4 Develop individual, country-specific agreements for UNDAC countries’ Mission Account deposits which address issues such as different funding approaches, carry-over of funds, visibility and reporting.

6.5 Further explore the possibility for a permanent solution to the provision of insurance of national UNDAC members which is currently covered by ad-hoc arrangements.
Finding 7

**UNDAC DRP Missions have value but are not sufficiently systematised within OCHA’s wider Disaster Risk Reduction Policy and initiatives**

The recent OCHA Policy Instruction on Preparedness serves as a guiding principle to address ESB’s engagement in OCHA’s preparedness activities. OCHA has been increasingly dealing with disaster preparedness since assignment of responsibility to OCHA under Chapter V of the Hyogo Framework (strengthening preparedness for response). Within this portfolio, UNDAC has undertaken DRP missions, broadly recognised to have value (see Annex 4). The UNDAC system has access to members with governmental preparedness expertise who can provide much-needed inputs and can fill a specific gap otherwise not covered by OCHA or other actors, namely the analysis of national response capacity and structure and the provision of detailed context-specific advice.

It is felt, however, that DRP missions should be more strategically implemented and guided by clear agreement on better harmonisation of responsibilities of the various OCHA and UN preparedness initiatives also underway in many contexts. UNDAC DRP missions were reviewed in 2009 (see also Section 3.3), with one of the conclusions being that successful missions depend on national ownership and a high degree of regional involvement in both planning and follow-up of the mission. This requires close cooperation between UNDAC, OCHA/EPS and OCHA Regional Offices, to ensure a unified approach and enable follow up of recommendations to build preparedness and resilience over the longer term. FCSS/UNDAC need to ensure the right profile and skills are provided and the differences between mainstreamed Disaster Risk Reduction, Capacity-Development and Emergency Response Preparedness have to be clearly maintained.

**Recommendation 7**

**Systematise UNDAC’s DRP capacity within OCHA’s wider Disaster Risk Reduction policies and initiatives.**

7.1 Request OCHA to clarify the internal division of labour with respect to preparedness activities and DRP missions.
7.2 Provide UNDAC DRP missions on request of OCHA Regional Offices and OCHA/EPS, as constituent parts of wider Disaster Risk Reduction initiatives including those of the Global Focus Model.
7.3 Develop generic UNDAC DRP Terms of Reference and specific UNDAC DRP methodology, incorporating International Disaster Response Law (IDRL) initiatives.
7.4 Engage more closely with OCHA on longer-term hazard-risk scenarios examined in Section 3.1 to better scope and prepare for the types and scale of emergencies which may be predicted in the near future.
7.5 Use national UNDAC members to strengthen the link between OCHA preparedness activities and national governments, drawing on relationships, trust and networks for preparedness and response.
Finding 8

**UNDAC is not maximising the potential opportunities of regional relationships and networks**

There has been an increasing demand for more regional involvement in both training and in UNDAC missions. Regional participation is valuable for contextual and cultural understanding, links with affected governments and networking. The UNDAC methodology, nonetheless, is a combination of several systems for coordination and disaster management, the essence of which needs to be kept global. A flexible system is, therefore, needed to appropriately apply the global UNDAC methodology to the regional contexts relative to training and on missions.

**Regional relationships**

As national and regional response capacities get stronger, the challenge for OCHA is to ensure that international assistance and support for disaster response is still understood and accepted. This is where the unconventional nature of UNDAC as a network is a key comparative advantage. UNDAC members in national and regional institutions can become essential entry points for deployment of large-scale relief operations as well as for longer-term preparedness initiatives.

Although regions differ greatly in terms of capacity to prepare for and respond to disasters, the importance of local ownership is always critical. The capacity to network within the regions in cooperation with regional organisations and regional offices of international organisations gives UNDAC considerable added value. UNDAC’s methodology needs to remain global, but OCHA Regional Offices could help UNDAC refine its methodology with greater cultural and contextual adaptation to maximise its potential and impact. This work and these relationships with partners need to start long before a crisis develops, building on shared training and exercises, shared values and competences and on personal relationships. There are, however, some financial issues in “getting local” to build resilience, capacities and relationships. While an existing mechanism is in place for donors to contribute funding to encourage the engagement of developing countries in the UNDAC system, it is restricted in its expenditure by the existing OCHA zero growth policy (see also Recommendation 6.1).

**Recommendation 8**

**Develop UNDAC’s capacity to further engage in and support regional mechanisms and networks.**

8.1 Maintain centralised UNDAC system management and training methodology to enable global reach, but increasingly work with regional capacity and networks in close cooperation with respective OCHA Regional Offices.

8.2 Request each OCHA Regional Office to nominate an UNDAC Point of Contact who can ensure that regional aspects and influence is included in training and on missions, but who is also given time to stay updated on UNDAC methodology and initiatives.

17 In this respect, UNDAC resembles IFRC as it links to a wide network, i.e., the national civil protection entity, as compared with national Red Cross/Crescent societies.
8.3 Draw on increased focus on networking through UNDAC membership to develop a dual UNDAC approach based on agreed modalities, comprising (a) complementary or joint deployment between UNDAC and regional institutions, and (b) a mechanism to promote “UNDAC-friendly environments”.

8.4 Strengthen the capacities of UNDAC regional team members using UNDAC Core Competencies (see also Recommendation 4.1) for rapid deployment from the regions. OCHA Regional Offices should proactively support this development.

8.5 Further develop use of the Developing Countries Activities Account mechanism to enable UNDAC member countries to support increased involvement of developing countries in the UNDAC network as well as collaborative arrangements with other national or regional institutions.

Finding 9

UNDAC has valuable partnerships which need reinforcing and diversifying

UNDAC maintains a number of operational partnerships with technical organizations, governmental agencies, NGOs and the private sector which provide specialised support services to the UNDAC team, as well as to OCHA and the wider humanitarian community.

Logistical support modules, such as ICT services, base camps, office and vehicle support, are provided by bilateral consortia such as IHP, APHP and AST; emergency mapping and telecommunications provided by technical NGOs such as MapAction and Telecoms sans Frontières (TSF), deployed alongside with UNDAC teams; UNOSAT provides satellite imagery and geographic information for the humanitarian community; and private sector partners DHL provide airport handling and logistics services to the affected country and international responders.18 ACAPS and the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have also become natural partners of UNDAC when on mission.

A close relationship has been established between EUCPT and UNDAC, with experts frequently deploying as part of each other’s missions providing additional technical expertise including in areas such as environmental assessment.

The UNDAC partnerships have traditionally been built based on experience from field operations and the partnerships have developed through shared principles, mutual aims, complementary functions and common methodology.

Equipment Support through Partnership

UNDAC receives its mission equipment support through the IHP, APHP and AST. This system has worked well and continues to add value to UNDAC missions. Consequently the IHP in particular, with their larger operational capacity, has increasingly supported other parts of OCHA outside of UNDAC missions. While IHP is very much adapted to how UNDAC operates, it is not equally well adapted to how OCHA functions, including in areas such as electronic hardware and software which is not always compatible. To be able to support OCHA as effectively as they support UNDAC missions, it is has been suggested that IHP and other support partners need to better familiarized with OCHA’s internal ICT standards.

18 See also http://www.unocha.org/what-we-do/coordination-tools/undac/partners
Technical partnerships

Many of UNDAC’s technical partnerships present potential options that have not yet been fully explored, including with the private sector, on how service delivery can be further complemented. There remain many areas for clarification with partners, including roles and responsibilities, modes of deployment, security management, accountability, reporting lines and cooperation within an OSOCC. In addition to response, preparedness between UNDAC and its partners is seen as crucial.

Findings of this review indicate that UNDAC could use new mechanisms to develop formal partnerships and nurture better understanding with other organisations frequently present in field. This is seen as critical to creating a more enabling response and coordination environment. Closer partnerships present challenges, such as requirements to match UNDAC rules and standards. These range from issues such as security procedures, financial allowances and insurance through to capacity for rapid deployment. Very few agencies can match these requirements, although there are clearly potential opportunities to build collaborative agreements, for example, with the international Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement. This would help rebuild a previously fruitful collaboration between UNDAC and FACT teams which, although successful for some years, has since become more distant due to being based on personal networks rather than institutionalised. The fundamental principles of the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement must be respected, but they also comprise one of the four cornerstones (see also Finding 1) of the UNDAC methodology, guiding the basis for potential cooperation. Special consideration should be paid to sensitive situations where natural disasters take place in conflict zones or when UNDAC finds itself involved in complex emergencies.

OCHA/UNDAC and NGO relationships.

Findings indicate that there is limited knowledge of UNDAC amongst most NGOs (see also Finding 1). NGOs often have very little interaction with UNDAC in the field which may be related to not having access to membership of the UNDAC system. Communication between NGOs and UNDAC is by and large sub-optimal.

Recommendation 9

Increase the range of UNDAC’s partnerships and improve modalities of existing networks.

9.1 Identify strategic partners together with OCHA and agree on types of potential partnerships needed in the future and where to utilise them in the existing disaster management and humanitarian system.

9.2 Develop improved standardised agreements with partners, based on their needs, which clarify their role and better define the framework of partnerships and mutual support.

9.3 Develop SOPs for managing security of partners, including for unstable or insecure contexts.

9.4 Engage and facilitate IHP liaison with OCHA regarding its operations, and ensure that hardware and software used for missions are compatible.

9.5 Pay special attention to developing partnerships with other UN agencies and cluster leads to facilitate UNDAC support to the cluster system and to the establishment of area-based coordination mechanisms.
9.6 Use UNDAC expertise beyond emergency deployments, for example, in small, technical cooperation teams e.g., in environmental emergencies utilising the environmental expert rooster managed by the JEU, and/or as technical expert resources on request of other partners, and define clear roles and modalities for deployment.

9.7 Build stronger relationships between UNDAC and the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, at strategic levels and through training exchanges on tactical and operational levels.

9.8 Increase engagement of partners in UNDAC training activities to improve joint preparedness in all fields, including logistics, telecommunications and mapping.

9.9 Enhance dialogue between OCHA/UNDAC and NGOs on both disaster management and humanitarian coordination, and explore ways of bringing NGOs into the UNDAC system (See also Recommendation 4.7).
5. Conclusion

The last decade has repeatedly demonstrated that when faced with difficult challenges, the international disaster management and humanitarian system has been able to acknowledge weaknesses and to creatively attempt to improve itself. Yet, the challenges ahead remain enormous. They include adaptation to climate change, preparing for and responding to large-scale urban disasters, food and price crises, complex emergencies, technological and bio-sanitary disasters, to name just a few. UNDAC will play a role at the forefront of many of these new challenges and its rapidly deployed teams will be amongst the first to face the immediate consequences of what these events mean to humanity.

Preparing for UNDAC in 2020.

UNDAC members demonstrate an astonishing level of individual pride and attachment to the system, but are at the same time keen to see a continuous development of the system and strengthen their own skills to be better prepared for future emergencies. The UNDAC’s Core Values, which were somewhat implicit, have been detailed and made explicit in this review. They contribute to the fact that becoming an UNDAC member often results in personal experience which brings long-lasting commitment to the system and a wish to remain in the UNDAC network, even if personal circumstances regarding deployment may change.

UNDAC teams have continued to demonstrate their valuable role in disaster management and humanitarian coordination, with a capacity to adjust flexibly to difficult, complex and often dangerous environments. From the original USAR coordination and INSARAG methodology, UNDAC has developed into a more complex strategic, tactical and operational tool. But faced with hazards of a higher frequency, greater scale and with more profound impacts in a much more complex humanitarian environment, UNDAC also needs to do more. This requires reflection on the nine findings and nine recommendations of this UNDAC review 2011, and agreeing a full implementation plan which explores the new avenues, responsibilities, networks and partnerships recommended. It also requires commitment and high level support in the UN to more strongly underwrite UNDAC’s role through policy, leadership and improved operational functioning beyond today’s bewildering complexity and constraints.

The review team is without any hesitation in affirming there is a critical gap for UNDAC to fill, in and between the disaster management and humanitarian systems. Criticism of the past has been open and lessons have been identified, but these are somewhat secondary to the questions surrounding much greater challenges ahead. This review has been very timely. UNDAC has value, but it must move forward, and that requires OCHA’s commitment, understanding and practical support. The nine recommendations of this review span four strategic areas which will be crucial in the development of an UNDAC fit for 2020, that will be capable of meeting an even more challenging set of circumstances and contexts than it has faced to date:

A) Ensuring that UNDAC is better known, recognised and remains relevant in the future. (Recommendations 1 and 2)

As there is clearly no other organization undertaking its role, greater challenges will make it more and more essential for UNDAC to perform its mission-critical duties in disaster management and humanitarian coordination. Internal institutional and inter-agency stumbling blocks should have no place compromising this work and sincere efforts to remove them must be on the agenda at the highest level in the international humanitarian system, and in particular in OCHA.
B) Increasing UNDAC’s active role in regional settings while keeping global coherence and cohesiveness. (Recommendations 7 and 8)

Reinforced global lead and authority combined with regional knowledge, strengths and capacities will become more critical than in the past. The incidences of simultaneous or multiple large-scale disasters are increasing, placing huge potential obligations on UNDAC, in addition to the 80% of its present missions which support a regional-level response. Counting on a combination of local and regional strengths with international competences will remain vital both for better preparedness and better response. UNDAC’s disaster preparedness role is valid and will be all the stronger when integral to wider OCHA policy and long-term regional initiatives.

C) Strengthening membership, networks and resilience. (Recommendations 4, 5, and 8)

The basis of UNDAC is unique. Being both a sub-system bridging the international disaster management and humanitarian architecture, as well as a network of hundreds of active and non-active UNDAC members, creates remarkable potential. UNDAC can count not only on institutional mechanisms, but on inter-relationships between its members who can be in many different positions in the international system or in the affected countries or regions themselves. The potential of the UNDAC system and UNDAC network to respond and to build resilience should be grown and nurtured by a specific communications strategy, a creative multi-layered membership and training strategy, and robust support from donors, partners and regional organizations. UNDAC has strong core values which need protecting from politicization of aid and attempts to weaken humanitarian principles and norms.

D) Keeping agile. (Recommendations 2, 3, 6 and 9)

With the contextual and systemic challenges to come, UNDAC will need to be even more agile, rapidly reacting to crises and keeping abreast of changes in many areas. These include information and communications technology, societal changes such as community interconnections, roles of diaspora and civil society organizations in the first hours after a disaster, as well as growing demands for accountability and reporting. New relationships, arrangements and partnerships await, and more than ever, UNDAC will need to be light on its feet, drawing more on its diverse membership and relationships as a flexible multi-faceted resource for preparedness, resilience and response. This will not be possible, however, if UNDAC is mistakenly relegated to a secondary role and neither cemented as OCHA’s first response mechanism in sudden-on-set emergencies nor politically and functionally supported by OCHA, the UN system and governments. It is of vital importance that OCHA improves its own internal deployment procedures by making UNDAC-trained OCHA staff available for UNDAC missions, providing the necessary expertise needed for the increasing complexity of today’s disaster environment.

This 2011 Review process has generated considerable interest and high expectations within the UNDAC network. The report has been submitted to the UNDAC Steering Committee and to the highest level in OCHA. Key decisions are expected to be made in ensuring that the institutional, administrative and communication environment within OCHA and IASC facilitates the evolution of the UNDAC system/network and its adaptation to a fast-changing world. The implementation of these recommendations and decisions will further draw on the willing support and capacity of the UNDAC member states.
Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Background

The UNDAC team is central to OCHA’s rapid response to sudden-onset disasters and is at the heart of OCHA’s mandate to mobilize and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors in order to alleviate human suffering in disasters and emergencies. UNDAC team members from governments, UN Agencies, the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement, regional organizations and other humanitarian partners, are prepared for this role through intensive training in a common methodology and can be mobilized and deployed to disaster sites worldwide within 24 hours of a request to coordinate humanitarian functions.

The UNDAC team was established in 1993 and, as at 1 January 2011, has been deployed to 208 disasters (Annex I). These missions have been predominantly in response to natural disasters but have also included complex emergencies and environmental/technological catastrophes. Since 2003, UNDAC teams have also been used to evaluate national readiness for emergencies through UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness missions of which 20 have been conducted to date.

Since its founding, the UNDAC team has grown to a current worldwide total of approximately 250 active national members from over 70 countries, covering three geographical regions (Asia-Pacific, the Americas and Africa-Middle East-Europe). There are currently 32 countries financially supporting deployment of their national UNDAC members; 12 countries underwrite the participation of members from countries which cannot afford to support their own nationals. Some 7 UN agencies are active partners with trained UNDAC members, as are IFRC, ISDR, ECHO and the World Bank. Since 2009, UNDAC and the EU-Civil Protection Mechanism (EU-CPT) have collaborated closely in disaster response through the use of common methodology, inclusion of associates in each other’s missions, joint deployments and training. Relations with other regional organizations such as CEPREDENAC, ASEAN and ECOWAS have also been developed through mission collaboration, joint exercises and training. In addition, UNDAC teams regularly participate in exercises organized by other international organizations such as NATO/EADRCC and OPCW.

To enable UNDAC teams to perform their functions in the field, especially when establishing an On-site Operations Coordination Centre, or OSOCC, a number of technical and specialized support partnerships have been developed. These range from inter-governmental networks such as the International Humanitarian Partnership, Asia-Pacific Humanitarian Partnership and Americas Support Team; technical NGOs such as Telecoms Sans Frontières and MapAction; specialized UN programmes such as UNOSAT; and private sector organizations which are members of the UN Compact programme - DHL, Ericsson and Microsoft (See Annex III).
The first review of the UNDAC scope and effectiveness was conducted in 2001. Recommendations from that review were addressed in the intervening decade. The idea of a 2nd review was raised at the UNDAC Advisory Board in 2008. At that time, a wider review of OCHA's emergency services, tools and mechanisms was already under discussion and subsequently carried out in 2010, one of the recommendations of which was to proceed with an UNDAC review. This recommendation, coupled with management changes within OCHA/ESB/FCSS, paves the way for a further review of the UNDAC system and the opportunity to assess options for potential new approaches, to build upon UNDAC’s success, ensure continuity, and at the same time adapt to meet new demands and challenges, thereby, strengthening the UNDAC system for the next decade.

**Expected Outcome**

The expected outcome is an analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of the UNDAC system and its components and provision of recommendations to OCHA and the UNDAC Advisory Board on how to adapt the UNDAC system to ensure its future relevance and sustainability.

**Scope of Work**

The review should address but not be limited to:

**UNDAC Concept:**

1. An assessment of the relevance/utility of the UNDAC concept within the changed humanitarian architecture and in the sudden on-set emergency environment

2. Analyse trends and changes within the humanitarian setting to provide recommendation on future roles and responsibilities of the UNDAC system.

3. An assessment of the level of awareness of the UNDAC system and its role in international disaster response coordination, to include OCHA Headquarters, Regional and Country Offices, UN Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators and UN Country/Disaster Management Teams, Global Cluster Leads, Governments, regional organisations, international NGOs, and other international humanitarian response partners

**UNDAC Team Composition:**

4. A review of the composition of the UNDAC team with respect to professional and practical skills, gender, geographical and cultural composition vis-à-vis rapid response to a variety of global emergencies and options for future enhancement

5. A review of the criteria and procedures for selecting new UNDAC members & team leaders

6. A review of the contractual and administrative procedures governing UNDAC membership

7. A review of the practices and effectiveness of the current system for evaluating UNDAC members’ and team leaders’ performance whilst on mission
8. A review of the current criteria and procedures for determining UNDAC deployment status and retention as UNDAC members

Training

9. An assessment of the efficacy of the existing UNDAC training programme including awareness courses, induction training, refresher, team leader, internal and external specialized training

10. Discuss the relevance of external training programmes and how these could be better aligned with the existing UNDAC training concept

Deployment procedures

11. A review of procedures for requesting an UNDAC team

12. A review of the roles of OCHA regional Offices, CRD and OCHA Gva in “promoting” the utilisation of UNDAC system

13. A review of decision-making protocols for deployments

14. A review of the criteria’s for selection of team leader (OCHA vs National UNDAC member, profile of candidate, etc.)

15. A review of alert and team selection procedures

16. A review of communication and reporting while on mission

17. A review of End of Mission debriefing and reporting procedures

18. A review of the existing practice for hand-over and transition process

19. A review of methods and extent of assimilation of lessons learned

Equipment

20. An assessment of the effectiveness of the technical support (equipment, services and personnel) provided to UNDAC through equipment support partners (the IHP, APHP and AST), technical support providers (MapAction, TSF, UNOSAT, ACAPS) and private sector partners (DHL, Ericsson)

Methodology

21. Review of the current UNDAC methodology with respect to its relevance and the extent to which it meets the established UNDAC Terms of reference. The review team should focus on the following aspects:

   A. Coordination (including USAR Coordination and Inter-cluster coordination support)
   B. Assessment (including the ongoing activities within the Needs Assessment Framework)
C. Information Management (including interaction with other IM initiatives)
D. Humanitarian financing (expectations and defining the role of the UNDAC team)
E. Civil Military Cooperation (Should this be core to the team or provide support for)
F. Environmental assessment (expertise within team or support for outside experts)
G. Exit and handover
H. Debriefing and capturing the mission experience
I. Preparedness for response

22. A pre-deployment analysis of UNDAC teams to ascertain the range of skills the
team comprises (in the areas of strategic and operational coordination including
assessment and information management)

Cooperation, lateral relationships and partnerships
23. A review of the modalities, perception of utility and tangible outcomes of cooperation
between the UNDAC system and its stakeholders

A. Within OCHA (New York, Geneva, Regional and Country Offices)
B. Requesting governments (prior, during and post emergencies)
C. Requesting Resident Coordinators/Humanitarian Country Teams
D. OCHA field offices (When such is in place)
E. UNDAC member countries & participating countries
F. Other first responder mechanisms such as FACT, CPT, ERAT
G. Secondment of technical experts during emergencies
H. UN agencies, INGOs and clusters
I. Technical support partners, including IHP, MapAction, TSF, ACAPS
J. INSARAG
K. Regional organizations e.g. ASEAN, EU, ECOWAS, CEPREDENAC

Financing
24. A review of the funding arrangements for the UNDAC system and OCHA/FCSS as a
means to ensuring stable and transparent financial support.

Governance
25. A review of the governance structure (Advisory Board) as a means for providing
orientation and guidance to the UNDAC system and fostering ownership of the
UNDAC member countries
Methodology

Review governance
Establishment of an UNDAC Reference Group composed of three – four members from the donor community, (taking regional representation into account), representatives appointed by UNDAC technical partners and by OCHA.

Review team
The UNDAC review will be conducted by a core UNDAC review team of 3-4 persons chaired by a senior representative appointed by the UNDAC Advisory Board as Team leader, and supported by 1-2 external consultants. The team could be supplemented with representatives from UNDAC member country governments, experienced UNDAC member(s) not least to facilitate the “long distance peer review arrangements”. OCHA/FCSS will provide secretarial and logistical support.

The review team reports to the Reference Group.

Briefing and scope:
A. Identification of key interlocutors;
B. Key Interlocutor Interviews with FCSS ; semi-structured interviews, either face-to-face or by telephone
C. Documentary research: a comprehensive document review
D. Development of review team master plan, to be shared with Review steering group
E. Data analysis and preliminary findings;
F. Preparation of first draft of the report, and obtaining comments from Review Committee
G. Preparation of second draft based on feedback on the first draft
H. Cross reference with reviews involving UNDAC deployments
I. Final report.

FCSS should ensure that UNDAC focal points and members and are kept informed on the process.

Time Frame
May/June 2011 First meeting of the UNDAC review team
By 1 July 2011 Work plan of the UNDAC review team presented to FCSS and the UNDAC Review Reference Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 1 September 2011</td>
<td>First report outline is presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 30 October 2011</td>
<td>Final draft of the report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>Final draft is discussed by Reference Group and OCHA management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 30 November 2011</td>
<td>Review team receives final comments from Reference Group and OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 31 December 2011</td>
<td>Report is finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>Report is presented and discussed at the UNDAC Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output**

1. A short and concise UNDAC Review Report of 15 to 20 pages (with annexes as required), with vetted recommendations and suggestions for implementation.

2. OCHA/FCSS to develop an implementation plan, highlighting the expected outcome and financial implications.
## Matrix of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDAC Concept</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the relevance/utility of the UNDAC concept within the changed humanitarian architecture and in the sudden onset emergency environment</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse trends and changes within the humanitarian setting to provide recommendation on future roles and responsibilities of the UNDAC system</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the level of awareness of the UNDAC system and its role in international disaster response coordination, to include OCHA Headquarters, Regional and Country Offices, UN Resident/Humanitarian Coordinators and UN Country/Disaster Management Teams, Global Cluster Leads, Governments, regional organisations, international NGOs, and other international humanitarian response partners</td>
<td>1.2, 1.4, 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDAC Team Composition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the composition of the UNDAC team with respect to professional and practical skills, gender, geographical and cultural composition vis-à-vis rapid response to a variety of global emergencies and options for future enhancement</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the criteria and procedures for selecting new UNDAC members &amp; team leaders</td>
<td>4.1, 4.5, 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the contractual and administrative procedures governing UNDAC membership</td>
<td>4.3, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the practices and effectiveness of the current system for evaluating UNDAC members’ and team leaders’ performance whilst on mission</td>
<td>1.5, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the current criteria and procedures for determining UNDAC deployment status and retention as UNDAC members</td>
<td>4.1, 4.4, 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the efficacy of the existing UNDAC training programme including awareness courses, induction training, refresher, team leader, internal and external specialized training</td>
<td>5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the relevance of external training programmes and how these could be better aligned with the existing UNDAC training concept</td>
<td>5.5, 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deployment procedures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of procedures for requesting an UNDAC team</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the roles of OCHA Regional Offices, CRD &amp; OCHA Geneva in “promoting” utilisation of UNDAC</td>
<td>2.3, 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of decision-making protocols for deployments</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the criteria for selection of team leader (OCHA vs National UNDAC member, profile of candidate, etc.)</td>
<td>4.1, 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of alert and team selection procedures</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of communication and reporting while on mission</td>
<td>2.4, 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of End of Mission debriefing and reporting procedures</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of the existing practice for hand-over and transition process</td>
<td>2.4, 2.6, 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review of methods and extent of assimilation of lessons learned</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the effectiveness of the technical support (equipment, services and personnel) provided to UNDAC through equipment support partners (the IHP, APHP and AST), technical support providers (MapAction, TSF, UNOSAT, ACAPS) and private sector partners (DHL, Ericsson)</td>
<td>9.2, 9.3, 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Review of the current UNDAC methodology with respect to its relevance and the extent to which it meets the established UNDAC Terms of reference. The review team should focus on the following aspects:  
  1. Coordination (including USAR Coordination and Inter-cluster coordination support)  
  2. Assessment (including the on-going activities within the Needs Assessment Framework)  
  3. Information Management (including interaction with other IM initiatives)  
  4. Humanitarian financing (expectations and defining the role of the UNDAC team)  
  5. Civil Military Cooperation (Should this be core to the team or provide support for)  
  6. Environmental assessment (expertise within team or support for outside experts) | 1.3, 1.5, 2.7, 2.8, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.1, 4.9, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scope of Work</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Exit and handover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Debriefing and capturing the mission experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Preparedness for response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pre-deployment analysis of UNDAC teams to ascertain the range of skills the team comprises (in the areas of strategic and operational coordination including assessment and information management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cooperation, lateral relationships and partnerships</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A review of the modalities, perception of utility and tangible outcomes of cooperation between the UNDAC system and its stakeholders:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Within OCHA (New York, Geneva, Regional and Country Offices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Requesting governments (prior, during and post emergencies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Requesting Resident Coordinators/Humanitarian Country Teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OCHA field offices (When such is in place)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UNDAC member countries &amp; participating countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other first responder mechanisms such as FACT, CPT, ERAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Secondment of technical experts during emergencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UN agencies, INGOs and clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Technical support partners, including IHP,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1

2.3, 2.4, 2.8, 4.6, 4.7, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 9.1, 9.2, 9.5, 9.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MapAction, TSF, ACAPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>INSARAG</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Regional organizations e.g. ASEAN, EU, ECOWAS, CEPREDENAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financing**

A review of the funding arrangements for the UNDAC system and OCHA/FCSS as a means to ensuring stable and transparent financial support.

6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5

**Governance**

A review of the governance structure (Advisory Board) as a means for providing orientation and guidance to the UNDAC system and fostering ownership of the UNDAC member countries

1.1
Annex 2

The International Humanitarian Environment

Changes in the International Humanitarian System

Since the last UNDAC Review in 2001, fundamental developments have taken place in the international humanitarian system. At the same time, a series of often very large and particularly challenging humanitarian contexts have repeated stretched the whole humanitarian system up to, and beyond, its practical limits. “We are caught in a race between the growing size of the humanitarian challenge, and our ability to cope; between humanity and catastrophe. And, at present, this is not a race we are winning.”¹ The section below outlines the headline issues which have developed since 2001;

Redefining the International Humanitarian System

The formal international humanitarian system is comprised of providers (donor governments, foundations and individuals) and three “pillars” of implementers or delivery actors (UN agencies and IOM, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs). The delivery side has grown rapidly at some 6% each year, to reach over 210,000 aid worker staff across the three “pillars” today.² Provider-side overall humanitarian funding for the international humanitarian system has increased faster than the rate of official development assistance (ODA) over recent years, reaching $15.1 billion in 2009.³ By 2007, NGOs accounted for one third of total humanitarian assistance spending, with their public contributions being more than three times the total expenditure of the CERF and country level funds combined. The composition of the ‘non-DAC donors’ has changed significantly too. This group is complex and diverse. It includes previous recipients of aid, countries which respond to disasters domestically or have large refugee populations, as well as countries that have been contributing to and supporting international development programmes and systems for a number of decades, and some of which have been doing so for longer and with larger aid budgets than certain DAC donors.⁴ These developments bring an increasingly complex set of relationships with and between a number of key actors, which may be seen as outside the formal international humanitarian system, but are closely linked with it.

Humanitarian Reform

The humanitarian reform process launched in 2005 seeks to improve the effectiveness of humanitarian response through ensuring greater predictability, accountability and partnership. Within this, when well implemented, the Cluster Approach has brought improvements in planning and coordination, facilitated shared human and financial resources, rationalised tools and standards, and enabled better mapping of “who’s doing what where”, lesson learning, the sharing of new technologies and training. But concerns include clusters leading to “stove piping” of needs and activities into sectors, not addressing

³ GHA, (2010), Global Humanitarian Assistance Report
⁴ GHA, (2011). Non DAC Donors and Humanitarian Aid
the “real need” to move towards humanitarian – not just UN – country teams, the time consuming nature of clusters, the challenge of getting cross cutting issues addressed and the lack of engagement of local aid agencies. Problems seemingly arise when clusters are applied as a blueprint, unmindful of context and existing state capacities.

Since 2005, several studies have stressed the importance of a **Strengthened Humanitarian Coordinator System:** “The strengthening of the Humanitarian Coordinator system is perhaps the key to making all the other components of humanitarian reform work effectively.” But in practice, ALNAP pointed to there being “little evidence” of stronger HCs in practice though, and leadership as being the most challenging humanitarian reform to implement. OCHA’s efforts to tackle this problem include through more systematic candidate inductions, training and skills development.” The IASC has worked on making response more predictable too, through for instance, developing the “Checklist for RCs and HCs on Emergency Preparedness and Response in 2010.” This emphasises the responsibility to support the Government, abide by International humanitarian and human rights law and humanitarian principles, and be guided by the principles of partnership.

Developments in **Humanitarian Financing and Partnerships** have led to financing instruments such as the CERF and country level Humanitarian Response Funds (HRFs) becoming commonplace facilities. They transfer considerable resources to meet emergency needs, and spikes in chronic situations using an “underfunded window” in the case of the CERF. However, there remain repeated NGO concerns with the effectiveness and efficiency of UN agencies in managing and disbursing pooled funds to NGO partners. The donor role in terms of partnership and coordination also still presents an unfortunate tendency to “go it alone”, especially for those with significant field presence, according to a study on donor coordination in 2009. But new and diverse partnerships are also evolving elsewhere, for example, the agreement between Brazil and Spain to jointly implement and oversee both humanitarian and development aid programmes in selected developing countries.

**Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 and other DRR considerations**

Considerable progress made in Disaster Risk Reduction centres around the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015. Its five priorities comprise (1) Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation. (2) Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning. (3) Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels. (4) Reduce the underlying risk factors. (5) Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels. In their approach to disaster risk reduction, States, regional and international organizations and other actors concerned are urged to take into consideration...
the key activities listed under each of these five priorities and should implement them, as appropriate, to their own circumstances and capacities. In this regard, the Hyogo framework for action had a number of implications for UNDAC, some of which may need re-clarifying as a result of subsequent developments in humanitarian reform which started at around the same time.

Needs Assessment
ALNAP notes that while needs assessment remains a key weakness within the humanitarian system, recent evidence points to progress in both quality and quantity of assessments, and in the development of new tools and methodologies to improve their usefulness. These recent initiatives include the joint and coordinated approaches to needs assessment being developed by ACAPS in cooperation with the IASC, and on-going developments in the UN Multi-cluster Initial Rapid Assessment Initiative (MIRA). This area remains work in progress, and while assessment methodologies abound in the humanitarian sector, what may concern UNDAC more is establishing a common approach rather than a common methodology. Assessment must be rapid, comprehensive in terms of assistance and protection, be accessible for the concerned authorities and the HC and an agreed basis on which an overall operational plan can be agreed.

Other Coordination Approaches and Partners
New initiatives emerging since 2001 include the Tripartite Core Group (TCG) mechanism in Myanmar, which was seen as innovative and effective in response to the 2008 Cyclone Nargis. The TCG brought together the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Myanmar Government and the UN. There is also a growing importance of NGO consortia approaches such as the Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies (CBHA) and greater collaboration between agencies through initiatives such as the Emergency Capacity Building Project at a global level and the country level approaches such as the Protracted Relief Programme in Zimbabwe. Since 2003 considerable progress has also been made in developing the relationship between UNDAC and the European Union Monitoring and Information Centre (EUMIC) helping to build synergy and complementarity between the two facilities in times of disaster response.

ERC’s Agenda for Change and IASC
ERC Valerie Amos has set out her agenda for change to ensure international response helps those in most need when they need it. “The ERC’s top priorities for the short to medium term are: significantly strengthening delivery on the ground (coordination and leadership, accountability, humanitarian country teams, inter-cluster coordination); building a global consensus for OCHAs work along with advocacy on the application of humanitarian principles; and improving human resources management including recruitment issues, the balance between the field and headquarters; and rigorously monitoring and measuring effectiveness and performance.” At the IASC Principals meeting in February 2011 the ERC covered five thematic areas for helping address these priorities. These areas comprised; the

---

16 OCHA’s response to the United Kingdom’s Multilateral Aid Review. OCHA 2011
Evolving Context for Humanitarian Action, Leadership and Coordination, Enhancing National Capacities for Preparedness and Early Recovery, Enhancing Humanitarian Accountability, Advocacy and Communications. A set of 10 “Key Transformative Actions”17 were agreed which cover many areas directly relevant to UNDAC, including rapid dispatch of senior, experienced personnel to manage the humanitarian response, boosting human resource capacity through training and further developing rosters and closing the “divide” between preparedness, relief and recovery.

The Role of National Governments in International Emergency Response

The role of states in disaster response is clearly recognised both in law and in key statements of principle. According to UN Resolution 46/182 of 1991, the affected state has “the primary role in the initiation, organisation, coordination, and implementation of humanitarian assistance within its territory”.18 In recent years there has been a growing focus on this role of national governments in preparing for and responding to disasters. In part this is due to the increasing wealth of some developing countries which achieve Middle Income Country (MIC) status, a growing willingness and ability to respond to disasters themselves and the emergence of states as donors in their own right. However, this positive set of developments also requires greater guidance on how respect for the sovereign role of the state and the Paris Declaration commitments to ownership and alignment can be reconciled with the humanitarian principles of neutrality and independence. International relief efforts are frequently criticised for ignoring, side-lining or actively undermining local capacities.

Surging and Maintaining Humanitarian Capacity

Closely linked to harmonising local and international capacities is the challenge of surging and maintaining a sufficient level of field capacity in large scale responses. Reviews reflect situations of initial surge capacity being addressed, but maintaining that capacity after this first crucial stage being problematic. In its 2007 Review19, People in Aid (PIA) concluded that “….surge capacity represents an entire system of policies and procedures; it is as much about an organisation’s philosophical approach as it is about any single instrument, such as a roster or register.” PIA defines 10 critical lessons, or enabling factors, required to develop surge capacity, many of which UNDAC has worked on developing over the last decade.

Accountability, Transparency and Impact

This area concerns “upward” accountability to donors and host governments as well as “downward” accountability to beneficiaries. The Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) developed the HAP standard in 2007 (updated in 2010) and started a process of certification for its member organisations.20 Other accountability initiatives include the development by the ECB Project of a “Good Enough Guide”21 to help develop accountability to beneficiaries and includes simple tools and communications materials. The Conflict Sensitivity Consortium goes further in using accountability and communications practices to...
ensure conflict sensitive approaches (CSA)\(^{22}\) which do more than just “Do No Harm” to maximise the benefits and sustainability of humanitarian interventions. However, the IASC notes that “Given the importance attached to accountability in the rhetoric of humanitarian reform, it is curious that, beyond the provider of last resort, greater attention has not been given to the accountability architecture of the HC (or RC/HC) and HCT. Leadership cannot function in an accountability vacuum. This is one of the more significant challenges to the system of UN humanitarian leaders\(^{23}\).

The Role and Coordination of Military Humanitarian Contributions

The 1992 "Oslo Guidelines" provide a voluntary framework for military engagement in humanitarian operations, which was updated in 2006. This reflected increasing trends in the deployment of military forces and assets over previous years, for which OCHA remains the focal point for United Nations Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination (UN-CMCoord). Over recent years there has been growing opposition in the humanitarian community to the deployment of military humanitarian capacities, particularly those of foreign forces, and coordination is often problematic. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) notes indicates that while information management seems to be best and most appropriately carried out by OCHA, at the same time OCHA’s MCDA register “...has not been effectively used in the last decade\(^{24}\).” SIPRI makes a series of recommendations, including one specifically concerning UNDAC in the area of assessment; “OCHA should expand the skills and expertise of UNDAC teams to include more civil–military liaison, logistics and information experts.”

Other Initiatives and Areas of Development

A number of other initiatives underway include; information and communications developments such as those being developed by INFOASAIID/CDAC. In the relationships with clusters in mainstreaming information management and strategic communications, this work will have a direct link to UNDAC responsibilities in the future. The steadily evolving Sphere Project has recently published the 2011 edition of the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, with more cross cutting themes and the stronger emphasis on protection principles. It will be necessary for UNDAC’s focus and training to keep pace with this on-going work and to pre-empt future developments which are likely to include increasing emphasis on areas such as CSA and communications and information management in response.

Changing Operational Contexts

The combination of urbanisation, environmental degradation and the apparent effects of climate change are significant factors contributing to impact of disasters, such as the 2010 Haiti Earthquake and Pakistan floods. It is predicted that by 2015 around 375 million people will be affected by climate related disasters every year, while other ‘rapid onset' emergencies

\(^{22}\) Learning Review of Conflict Sensitivity in Emergencies, CARE/CAFOD on behalf of the Conflict Sensitivity Forum, July 2011

\(^{23}\) The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, (2010), Fit for the Future, Strengthening the Leadership Pillar of Humanitarian Reform.

\(^{24}\) Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, (2008), The Effectiveness of Foreign Military Assets in Natural Disaster Response.
and the impact of conflict will affect many more\textsuperscript{25}. In addition to increased frequency, \textit{combinations of vulnerability factors} result in some regions appearing to be particularly exposed to hazard-risk over the next 30 years. Associated population movement could become so serious in high risk areas that it could lead to political or military confrontation\textsuperscript{26}. Densely populated and vulnerable delta areas are of particular concern due to a combination of rising sea levels, more frequent violent climatic events, and increased flood events from upstream territories. Professor Norman Myers of the University of Oxford estimates that; “…\textit{when global warming takes hold there could be as many as 200 million people displaced by 2050}”\textsuperscript{27}. \textit{These risks} affect the areas where two thirds of the world’s population lives, and where some of the highest levels of food production take place. Decreasing agricultural yields and weather unpredictability will make present models of agricultural production, varieties and practices too inflexible to underwrite local and global food security in the future. The movement of parasites following their ecosystems is already occurring in some regions and will also affect yields. The health and productivity of forests will be affected and mass forest fires more likely in some areas.

\textbf{An Increasing risk of epidemics and Pandemics reflects} a combination of new forms of old infectious agents (such as influenza), and new infectious agents (such as the HIV virus, or Ebola virus) in a world which is more interconnected and geographically and socially mobile than ever before. Intensive poultry or livestock rearing in close proximity to humans creates conditions in which hybrid and new viruses can develop, such as swine flu (H1N1) or avian flu (H5N1, SARS). The rapidly expanding and often uncontrolled use of antibiotics of recent years causes increased resistance of bacteria to treatments which were highly effective 50 years ago. While epidemics directly affect humans, there are further indirect impacts which surround the broader issues of health/sanitary problems and human security issues, including biological insecurity between states, global and regional food insecurity and environmental insecurity especially regarding the emergence of new “mega-cities” in developing countries.

“\textit{New and re-emerging infectious diseases (including TB; malaria, cholera) will pose a rising global health threat and will exacerbate social and political instability in countries and regions affected. The persistent infectious disease burden is likely to aggravate or even provoke economic decay and social fragmentation of societies. Infectious diseases are a leading cause of death already. Alone or in combination, war and natural disasters, economic collapse and human complacency are causing a decline or break down in health care delivery in affected countries or regions and facilitating the emergence or re-emergence of infectious diseases. In developed countries, past inroads against infectious diseases led to a relaxation of preventive measures such as surveillance and vaccination. Inadequate infection control practices in hospitals will remain a major source of disease transmission in developing and developed countries alike. Climate change will contribute further to an increase of communicable diseases on a larger scale. Malnutrition, poor sanitation and poor water quality in developing countries also will continue to add to the disease burden that is overwhelming health care infrastructure and thus response capacity in many countries.}

\textsuperscript{25} Humanitarian Emergency Response Review (HERR), DFID 2011
\textsuperscript{26} Groupe URD, (2010), Mapping of Future Unintentional Future Risks
\textsuperscript{27} Myer et al, (1995).
Response to such problems is always multi-sectoral and any response mechanism has to be ready to address health issues in a multi sectoral and coordinated way."

The impact of new technologies presents situations where the reach and speed of communications outpace the often necessarily slower time, physical response to address needs, but where the specific hazard-risks presented by technological developments are also likely to increase. This includes the risks intrinsic in new technological facilities in poorly regulated contexts, and whole environments at risk from existing and new technological structures. Decreasing humanitarian space in which to operate reflects increasingly restricted and/or insecure contexts developing since 2001. Increased security investment has not necessarily improved humanitarian access, and in some contexts, may have even restricted it further. Political circumstances can restrict humanitarian access where strong state control is unwilling to allow unfettered humanitarian access, especially for international actors to respond on the ground.

UNDAC’s role in conflict situations and unstable contexts such as the 2011 deployment to Ivory Coast need further reflection and clarification in terms of UNDAC's mandate. While UNDAC teams may still have a relevant role, the relationship with the concerned authorities may necessarily be a different one than in the case of a natural disaster, and the nature of needs be far more protection-orientated. More specific operational modus operandi are needed in such contexts and greater attention focussed on the sensitivities of information management, as well as protection, access and security issues.

The challenge facing UNDAC in such significantly changing operational contexts is that its operational modus operandi needs to constantly evolve to meet emerging threats and specific hazard-risks. A more Research and Development-orientated approach involving interested countries may need higher priority in UNDAC. This would enable a more prominent role in exploring future challenges and developing response scenario, to avoid it becoming largely reactive to situations which could have been more clearly predicted and prepared for.

The UNDAC Setting
As well as the systemic and contextual changes of the last decade, the setting of UNDAC itself has also changed since the last review. Key areas of change include the development of The OCHA Strategic Framework 2010-2013. This comprises three main goals: 1) A more enabling environment for humanitarian action 2) A more effective humanitarian coordination system and 3) Strengthened OCHA management and administration. OCHA’s strategy and adaptive management framework to deliver these goals was subject to a mid-year review entitled “OCHA in 2011”, which covered several areas of challenge and progress which directly concern UNDAC. These include undertaking the 2011 UNDAC Review, using regional partnership meetings to seek greater engagement with Member States on humanitarian issues in their region and encouraging disaster-prone countries to participate in inter-governmental response mechanisms such as the United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) system and the International Search and Rescue Advisory Group (INSARAG). This work builds on a series of steps taken since the IASC

28 OCHA, (2010), OCHA Strategic Framework 2010-2013
approved UNDAC Terms of reference (2003) and the technical partnerships which UNDAC has built up with a wide range of organisations since 2001, including IHP, Map Action, EU MIC, EU CP mechanism (now merged with DG ECHO), local CP capacities, IFRC and ISDR.

A Review of OCHA emergency services, tools and mechanisms was undertaken in 2010\textsuperscript{29}. In response to the findings of the review and its 15 recommendations, the ERC at the time, Sir John Holmes, listed a set of areas for the OCHA Donor Support Group (OSDG)\textsuperscript{30} in which the recommendations would be immediately taken up. The ERC also emphasised that an OCHA Policy Instruction on Preparedness was under review. This would be used as a guiding principle to address ESB’s engagement in OCHA’s preparedness activities.

As this work continues, the setting of UNDAC will change within the wider developments in OCHA and ESB. But more specifically, “Recommendation 4: Immediate response” directly addressed UNDASC and INSARAG: Acknowledging that; “The UNDAC mechanism has proved highly useful and successful over its almost twenty years of existence.....” the review felt that “It is timely for it to be revamped not only to adapt to today’s humanitarian environment and reality, but also to be equipped to anticipate and adapt to new and emerging realities in the future.” It was recommended that OCHA undertake an in depth review of UNDAC that “.....should include both a review of the A-assessment and the C-coordination of its title, in the context of the current humanitarian architecture, but also of the response preparedness functions that UNDAC has been engaged in more recently.” Eleven points were provided for possible inclusion in the Terms of Reference for the Review.

\textsuperscript{29} Humanitarian and Development Network, (2010), Review of OCHA’s Emergency Services Tools and Mechanisms
\textsuperscript{30} UN Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Sir John Holmes, (2010), message to OSDG
Annex 3

OCHA 2001-11

In 2001, it was recognized that OCHA needed to be able to respond rapidly and efficiently at the outset of new emergencies through timely deployment of staff to prepare the way for agency partners, as had been the case in Kosovo and in East Timor. Since its establishment in 1998, OCHA staff had been increasing in numbers and in June 2000 the organization launched a review of its internal structures, procedures, leadership and funding requirements in order to manage its growth and further improve its ability to support the humanitarian work of the UN agencies and other partners.

At that time, humanitarian issues related to complex emergencies were covered by a desk structure in New York (in proximity to the Security Council) and those relating to operational response to natural disasters were covered by a desk structure in Geneva (in proximity to humanitarian response organizations and donors), integrated with the response tools and services. The 2000 Review recommendations were presented during the first-ever OCHA Senior Management Retreat which marked not only the beginning of a process of structural change, but also agreement on OCHA’s Mission Statement which is still used today:

**OCHA Mission Statement:**
The mission of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs is to mobilize and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors in order to:

1. Alleviate humanitarian suffering
2. Advocate for the right of people in need
3. Promote preparedness and prevention
4. Facilitate sustainable solutions

The 2000 OCHA Review recommended combining the natural disaster and complex emergency functions into a single desk structure that applied to both New York and Geneva, with New York focusing on the political side and Geneva on operational and administrative field support.

OCHA’s response tools and services were brought together in the newly-established Emergency Services Branch in Geneva, including FCSS and the UNDAC system. Whilst the organization was recognized to have sufficient capacity to respond to sudden on-set natural disasters, it found itself struggling to effectively meet new staffing requirements in complex emergencies. It was therefore decided to develop an initial surge capacity mechanism in Geneva which formed the basis for further surge initiatives and led to increases in the numbers of staff dedicated to administrative and personnel support in the field. Field expansion in turn led to requests from OCHA to donors to finance 35 new headquarters posts that could support the field in these areas.
Information management has become increasingly important for OCHA in recent years as a result of new technologies available to the aid community, following on from locally-developed joint initiatives to improve information sharing in Kosovo, Eritrea and Sierra Leone. The concept of Humanitarian Information Centres, formalized in 2004, and the decision to establish Information Management Units in each of OCHA’s country offices began the process of moving away from generic OCHA staff positions as Humanitarian Affairs Officers into more specialized roles, such as Information Management Officer and Geographic Information Officer.

Similarly, new policy areas have given rise to new units, such as the Geneva-based Internal Displacement (IDP) Unit as part of OCHA’s Policy Development Branch, as well as specialist policy advisors deployed to crises to provide specific advice and technical support to senior staff, for example, as part of the GenCap and ProCap initiatives, also both based in Geneva.

The recommendations from the 2000 OCHA Review were tested in the response to the Darfur Crisis and the Indian Ocean Tsunami in 2004, followed in 2005 by the Pakistan earthquake and the food crisis in Niger. These emergencies, as well as UN internal reform under the then-Secretary-General Kofi Annan, fuelled the movement for Humanitarian Reform spearheaded by former Emergency Relief Coordinator, Jan Egeland, which effectively consolidated OCHA’s position at the centre of humanitarian coordination.

The Humanitarian Reform process led to further expansion and specialization for OCHA staff, not least in humanitarian financing including management of the CERF and other funding tools for humanitarian emergencies. Similarly, the cluster approach gave rise, initially, to specialist Cluster Coordinators (and in some country offices, Inter-Cluster Coordinators) and the establishment of a dedicated unit located in Geneva to provide technical support in humanitarian coordination strengthening and leadership. Likewise, public information, reporting and needs assessment have also developed into similar specialist units and functions.

In 2005, it was decided to realign geographical desk functions into one consolidated Coordination & Response Division based in New York. This refocused the efforts of the OCHA desk officer from inter-departmental and inter-governmental processes globally to the 20-plus OCHA country office operations, thereby intensifying the country focus but leaving critical “watch” countries unsupported.

This gap was filled by establishment and strengthening of 5 OCHA Regional Offices, allowing OCHA local-level access to governments, regional organizations and regional coordination mechanisms (including the UN’s Regional Director Teams). It also gave OCHA direct interaction with Resident Coordinators on issues such as preparedness, contingency planning and ultimately response, considerably broadening OCHA’s outreach and partnership base and placing OCHA Humanitarian Affairs Officers and specialist staff directly in the region to increase surge capacity.
The growth of Regional Offices, Sub-Regional Offices, Country Offices and Sub-Offices heralded a move to rationalize OCHA’s field presence and ensure parity in resource allocation globally. From 2007, funding rationalization ensured OCHA’s growth was in line with appropriate strategic direction, laid out in an OCHA strategic priorities document which also aimed to strengthen OCHA as an organization through a better internal policy and guidance framework and appropriate training and career development for staff.

A whole-of-office approach to staffing management became a priority in 2008 with the establishment of a field roster, strengthening of the Surge Capacity Section in Geneva and development of an Emergency Response Roster, thereby making great steps in improving OCHA’s response capacity.

As part of this corporate strengthening phase, the Directors of OCHA Geneva and the Coordination & Response Division worked jointly to develop systems and practices to enhance OCHA’s internal coordination practices in emergency response. Most notably, the concept of “Corporate Response” was established, declared in Myanmar in 2008, Haiti in 2010 and lately in the Horn of Africa crisis, requiring a whole organization, coordinated response. Disasters of this scale outweigh the combined response capacity of the Regional Office and the Emergency Response Roster and often require a significant scaling-up of the OCHA operation in country as well as certain Headquarters units. Declaration of a Corporate Response puts all OCHA units on standby to be called for action, with Director-level leadership of the coordination process, at least through to the Revised Flash Appeal stage.

This has led to three important internal coordination structures: the Operations Task Force of OCHA tools and services in Geneva; a policy level forum of senior OCHA managers in New York; and a strategic level forum of OCHA Directors convened by the ERC to address complex issues and engage with the Secretary-General and Agency Principals through various inter-agency fora.

Concurrently, OCHA has developed an Emergency Response Coordination Centre and dedicated standby fund of US$4 million based in Geneva for the procurement and deployment of staff for large-scale emergencies or multiple, simultaneous crises.

Furthermore, OCHA’s role in preparedness has been re-established, having been transferred to UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention & Recovery (BCPR) along with the successful UN Disaster Management Training Programme (UNDMT) when OCHA was created in 1998. The Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters accorded responsibility for strengthened disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels (Priority 5) to OCHA which led, in 2007, to the establishment of the OCHA Early Warning & Contingency Planning Section (EWCPS) and the Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS), which have now merged into one section (EPS) in the Emergency Services Branch in OCHA Geneva.

In addition, OCHA has taken on the role of host to inter-agency activities which inevitably influence the organization’s own priorities and capabilities. As an example, the Pandemic Influenza Coordination Unit (PIC) was created in Geneva in 2006 to mitigate the impact of a potential influenza pandemic and develop greater readiness of the UN system, national governments and the humanitarian community. PIC staffs, including seven regionally-based...
personnel, were seconded from UN agencies and donors. Its activities ceased at the end of 2010 with no formal transfer of functions nor institutional knowledge.

At the end of 2006, the Surge Capacity (and Contingency Planning) Section was transferred from New York to join the Emergency Services Branch in Geneva with OCHA’s other emergency response tools, but with contingency planning functions remaining in New York. The new Surge Capacity Section (SCS) took on additional surge responsibilities including management of the Standby Partnerships Programme and Emergency Response Roster. Today, SCS works closely with OCHA’s GenCap and ProCap specialized surge mechanisms and with the Coordination & Response Division to ensure OCHA’s surge requirements are met. In 2011, SCS has focused on training and development of operational self-reliance of surge staff and it is generally recognized that this has been successful in meeting both the quality and quantity of surge requirements. However, work remains to ensure complementarity and appropriate sequencing of OCHA surge and emergency response tools as well as consistency with new approaches to inter-agency surge capacity as identified in the IASC transformative agenda.

The Strategic Planning Unit (SPU) was formed in 2006 to identify priorities, manage resources, analyse results and generally support the work planning and reporting cycle associated with OCHA’s first formalized strategic framework, implemented from 2007 to 2009. Procedures were mainstreamed during this period and aligned with other strategic processes, including development of Humanitarian Action Plans at field level and the UN’s own biennial planning cycle. In developing the second strategic framework, wide consultations were held with OCHA staff at Headquarters and in the field including through regional workshops. The proposals put forward were informed by OCHA’s work on global challenges in 2008. With the support of OCHA’s Senior Management Team, a steering group was set up to drive coordinated planning processes in each of OCHA’s work units with the aim of achieving greater ownership of the final product.

Latest developments include the concept of Management Task Teams (MTT) for each objective in the Strategic Framework, led by a member of the Senior Management Team and responsible for aligning relevant parts of OCHA to that objective. This promotes better cross-unit dialogue and facilitates increased understanding of common objectives.

Since the arrival of Valerie Amos as Emergency Relief Coordinator in September 2010, the strategic focus has been on how to ensure that the humanitarian system is kept fit for purpose. Humanitarian response operations, especially in sudden-onset, large-scale emergencies, have repeatedly revealed a lack of leadership and of timeliness in ensuring adequate levels of leadership. This is currently being addressed through the IASC Principles forum through an initiative to deploy experienced senior humanitarian coordinators to facilitate overall response coordination and further strengthen the cluster coordination mechanism as well as accountability through clarification of roles and responsibilities of Humanitarian Coordinators, the Humanitarian Country Team, Cluster Coordinators and OCHA.

To support these expanded responsibilities of the past decade, the OCHA budget and staffing have grown significantly, both at Headquarters and at the field level through the establishment of additional country and regional offices.
OCHA Funding and Staffing 2005 and 2010:

Table: OCHA’s budget and staffing in 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>50,124,446</td>
<td>60,427,572</td>
<td>110,551,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: OCHA’s budget and staffing in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>108,720,016</td>
<td>144,216,572</td>
<td>252,936,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>637</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues affecting the functioning of FCSS and the deployment of UNDAC

A key area of change which has and will affect UNDAC includes development of the *OCHA Strategic Framework 2010-2013*[^31^], comprised of three main goals:

1. A more enabling environment for humanitarian action;
2. A more effective humanitarian coordination system; and
3. Strengthened OCHA management and administration.

OCHA’s strategy and adaptive management framework to deliver these goals was subject to a mid-year review entitled *OCHA in 2011* covering several areas which concern UNDAC including this 2011 Review; namely, the use of regional partnership meetings to seek greater engagement with Member States on humanitarian issues in their regions; and encouraging disaster-prone countries to participate in inter-governmental response mechanisms such as UNDAC and INSARAG. How these activities are to be operationalized is not yet clear; however, the desire to use UNDAC and INSARAG as vehicles to engage in partnerships is sometimes in conflict with the further enhancement of both mechanisms.

A *Review of OCHA’s Emergency Services, Tools and Mechanisms* was undertaken in 2010[^32^] which resulted in 15 recommendations, including *Recommendation 4: “Immediate response”* directly addressing UNDAC and INSARAG. Whilst acknowledging that “the UNDAC mechanism has proved highly useful and successful over its almost twenty years of existence”, the review felt “it is timely for it to be revamped not only to adapt to today’s humanitarian environment and reality, but also to be equipped to anticipate and adapt to new and emerging realities in the future.” It was recommended that OCHA undertake an in-depth review of UNDAC that “should include both a review of the A-assessment and the C-coordination of its title, in the context of the current humanitarian architecture, but also of the response preparedness functions that UNDAC has been engaged in more recently”. The then-ERC, Sir John Holmes, in a message to the OCHA Donor Support Group (OSDG),[^33^] set out the areas in which recommendations would immediately be implemented. However, a clear, overarching framework for ESB tools and services has yet to be elaborated and

[^31^]: OCHA, (2010), OCHA Strategic Framework 2010 to 2013
[^33^]: UN Under Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, John Holmes, (2010), message to OSDG
weakened links with geographical desks and Regional Offices have left OCHA’s tools and services in a state of limbo.

Since 2001, OCHA has established a number of internal and technical surge mechanisms with varying levels of success. Initial steps to create an internal emergency surge roster of OCHA staff was discontinued after some time, mainly due to a lack of buy-in from staff and, more especially, managers who were reluctant to release staff. With the establishment of the Surge Capacity Section (SCS) in ESB, the Emergency Response Roster (ERR) was revitalized and is now in its tenth rotation and some 114 OCHA staff were deployed in the period 2010 -11. The OCHA surge rosters today not only comprise general OCHA staff, but increasingly encompass specialized staff in areas such as Civil-Military Coordination, information management, gender and protection, while other specialized sections in OCHA still have their own surge and deployment mechanisms. It is noteworthy that all such mechanisms are deployed upon request from the field and SCS has invested significant resources in introducing and “selling” these new mechanisms.

At present, there is no real clarity within OCHA as to how the UNDAC system and the OCHA ERR interact and which mechanisms should be used when. Experience has shown that, while UNDAC can provide the most effective rapid response in putting a team on the ground in sudden-onset emergencies, other humanitarian activities are better covered by OCHA surge. The OCHA Gantt chart for the Haiti earthquake in 2010 illustrates how Regional Office staff, UNDAC, ERR staff and standby partners were all deployed in the field at the same time. While the mechanisms for deployment of different technical capacities now are in place, nonetheless the questions still remain as to how best coordinate the entire range of specialized surge to ensure complementarity of the systems.

The current process of further strengthening the role of CRD has seen increased focus on OCHA Regional Office staff as first wave surge response in new emergencies within their geographical coverage. This will compound the challenges identified above in determining the most appropriate mechanism(s) to use and managing parallel surge deployments.

There is currently no centralized training programme within OCHA on emergency response, but rather a series of separate courses offered by various specialised sections. The FIRST training organized by SCS for staff on the ERR endeavours to provide condensed basic training for OCHA staff who may be deployed to sudden-onset emergencies to perform specific OCHA-related activities. The UNDAC Induction Course is the only training of its kind within OCHA which focuses on natural disaster response and has always been very popular with OCHA staff, often drawing applications from in excess of 70 staff for a maximum of 4-5

---

34 The Gantt chart developed by OCHA SCS provides a quick overview of all OCHA surge deployments during an emergency.
35 Field Response Surge Training
available places. This naturally leads to disappointment from those who are not selected and a perception of preferential treatment towards those who are.

One of the key roles of the UNDAC system lies in training of regional and national disaster managers and foster the bridge building between the National Emergency response systems and the approach of International Humanitarian Response organisations. This will naturally influence the profile of team UNDAC members; who should be proficient in: humanitarian coordination, humanitarian emergency response architecture, inter-cluster coordination, needs assessment methodology (MIRA), assessment coordination, humanitarian financing, disaster managers methodology, information management, reporting, media management. The training should further comprise specialised technical competence as required (e.g. safety and security, technological, environmental, GiS, e.g.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mission with Flash Appeal</th>
<th>Total number of Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDAC mission with Flash Appeal or other humanitarian appeal (since the HRR)**

UNDAC training has produced a “community of practice” which is unique in the UN system as it includes a broad diversity of disaster managers expert in many different aspects of operational emergency response, at the national, regional and international levels, from both developed and developing countries, from within and outside of the UN and established international humanitarian response system. When UNDAC members meet in emergency operations, including those from the affected country and region, they share the same “culture” and team spirit, and use the same methodology and “operational language” which is an invaluable asset. Regrettably, OCHA surge and other response mechanisms are unable to take benefit from this relationship and remain more attuned to the international humanitarian response system rather than coordination with local actors. OCHA branches and sections tend to be somewhat compartmentalized and do not necessarily formally relate to each other, which can be further compounded by the fact that surge staff are generally deployed on an individual, rather than a team basis, with specific functions which may not be harmonized or interrelated.

The review team found that OCHA yet has to define its own response strategy and methodology, which tools are used when and what functions are needed under which circumstances. The current ad hoc division of responsibilities does not facilitate effective disaster management and coordination nor does it capitalize on the advantages inherent in the UNDAC system. The OCHA’s branches and sections are compartmentalized and do not necessarily formally relate to each other, other than by personal contacts. Various mechanisms that deal with support to roll out of individuals or teams are not harmonized or do not related systematically to each other – organogram structure and OCHA functions need to become more coherent. The UNDAC systems ability and capacity to deploy and operationalize in the field within 24 hours complex and specialized field teams is unparalleled.
in the UN system; it constitutes an essential element for successful disaster response and this vehicle could to a much large degree be utilised by specialised OCHA entities to facilitate rapid deployment of experts.

Whilst OCHA has recognized the value of the UNDAC and INSARAG networks in building relationships with a number of Member States, non-traditional donors and regional organizations, it is not effectively capitalizing on the advantages inherent in the UNDAC system in disaster management and coordination. Due to UNDAC’s close relationship with the INSARAG network and in particular UN General Assembly 57/150\(^\text{36}\), there is a perception within OCHA that UNDAC is only a mechanism for operational coordination of international urban search and rescue teams in earthquake and collapsed structure emergencies, and that it is staffed primarily by “USAR guys”. It is required for FCSS to get clarity with regards to UNDAC’s role and how the organisation as such best can capture on the capacity of the UNDAC system. This process is being complicated by the fact, that the roles and responsibilities of OCHA Geneva vs OCHA NY in sudden on-set emergencies are still to be clarified and operationalized in view of effective disaster management and coordination and fulfilling coherently disaster management functions, the repartition of roles appears to be ad hoc and leave it as an open question if the OCHA structure coherent with the current task?

Current discussions in the IASC on strengthening the international humanitarian response system, performance and leadership, have not included UNDAC as one of OCHA’s key rapid response tools. OCHA would do well to ensure its place in these discussions to ensure stakeholders may take benefit of the capacity, network and goodwill inherent in the UNDAC system.

The UNDAC Handbook, methodology and standard operational procedures are generally acknowledged as standard practice within the field of international emergency response and have been adopted by many other organizations. However, the current Handbook dates from 2006 and needs to be updated to incorporate latest changes in the humanitarian system, including a clear approach on how to address cross-cutting issues in emergency response coordination, for which OCHA plays a vital role. Better consistency is also needed in addressing environmental impact in emergencies and how to better utilize the capacity of environmental and technical experts within the UNDAC system.

Appropriate methodology also needs to be developed for UNDAC disaster response preparedness missions, covering political as well as technical preparedness, including how to further strengthen the role and capacity of the requesting government in implementing the agreed recommendations. They must be part of a structured, long-term process with other relevant partners, and priority countries identified with OCHA Regional Offices and the Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS).

There is a further need to review the current selection criteria for new UNDAC members and to adjust the team profile to better reflect current skills and knowledge requirements to effectively interact with the various humanitarian actors and existing coordination

\(^{36}\) UN General Assembly Resolution 57/150 of 27 February 2003 on Strengthening the Effectiveness and Coordination of International Urban Search and Rescue Assistance
mechanisms in sudden-onset emergencies. Additionally, the internal UNDAC information management platform and UNDAC mission software needs to be upgraded.

Currently, the trend is moving towards strengthening of regional capacities which must be embraced by both OCHA and UNDAC. In this regard, the primary role of the UNDAC system should be to develop the capacity of regional disaster response teams, to ensure that these networks will be made-up of competent national first responders with knowledge of the international humanitarian system, who can work together using common methodology and interface effectively with UNDAC in sudden-onset emergencies to bridge the gap between the international and regional response. The UNDAC system has already achieved remarkable progress in this field and these activities should be further developed in close cooperation with the OCHA Regional Offices.

Finally, FCSS staffing should reflect a combination of profiles which support and facilitate the integration of disaster response methodology with humanitarian coordination to ensure the bridge between the two systems. FCSS should be supported in marketing the UNDAC brand inside of OCHA as well as to outside partners, through appropriate networks, fora, awareness-raising and information sharing activities.
Annex 4

UNDAC in 2011

Introduction
This annex is a background study that was conducted as a part of the UNDAC review and is looking into the question; what has UNDAC become in 2011? The study was conducted through July 2011 and the findings presented for further discussion during the review team’s meeting in Neuhausen 10 – 11 August.

Methodology
A desktop study of mission reports from selected missions covering the period 2005-11 has been conducted. The main question about what UNDAC has become in 2011 have been examined from six angles by asking, more specifically, what has been done on missions, how was it done, and why was it done this way? Furthermore were the missions analysed for lessons identified and gaps/problems encountered.

This has been supplemented with semi structured interviews with some of the members from these missions and FCSS staff. Furthermore, current training material, including SWOTs from the team leader courses, the UNDAC DRP study of 2009, and summaries from advisory board meetings has also been studied. Due to time constraints, very few interviews have been conducted at this stage and the findings would undoubtedly have been enhanced if more UNDAC members had been interviewed.

UNDAC Benchmark Missions 2005 – 2011
During this period, 67 UNDAC missions have been carried out.37 38 of these (56.8 %) have been selected for closer study as background material for this report (see list at end of study). The selected missions span all regions, and stem from the small mission with a very specific, almost narrow ToR, to the large, multi-member missions with global response from numerous actors.

Findings
When going through the documentation from the selected missions there is one feature of the UNDAC concept that comes across strongly. Namely that one of the UNDAC team’s foremost strengths is a methodology that can be adapted to suit any given emergency situation. It is flexible, adjustable, and dynamic in the sense that it evolves with the various challenges an UNDAC team faces on mission. Even when missions develops in a direction that was not anticipated from the onset, the UNDAC team still finds a gap it can fill and a role to play that adds value to the response.

We also see, however, that the challenges faced on mission have been solved in a variety of ways that is not captured in training materials or the UNDAC Field Handbook. When on

37 15 DRP missions conducted in the same period are not included in this number
mission, the teams have faced challenges, raised questions and come up with ad-hoc solutions that needs to be further discussed.

**Interface UNDAC teams – OCHA response**

The generic ToR of 2002, states clearly that UNDAC is a part of OCHA. It is a rapid response tool that in sudden onset emergencies may be used to establish a coordination mechanism for international response on the request of a government or an RC/HC. An UNDAC team works under the same mandate as OCHA and will in many situations be the first OCHA’s presence in the field. A presence that later may develop into a longer term OCHA commitment dependent on the scale and needs of the disaster. As a simple metaphor it may be said that UNDAC is OCHA’s first response and “fire corps.”

Over the last 6 years we see that OCHA has developed new mechanisms and/or partnerships that, to a great extent, fulfil an UNDAC-team, but when not properly managed rather leads to an overlap and a duplication of services when on mission. There are examples of OCHA deploying various staff into an emergency, alongside an UNDAC team, apparently without an idea of how they should divide the tasks between them or who should do what when. Direction that is given have been ambiguous and it’s more the rule than the exception that it is left up to the staff on the ground to sort out the “whats” and the “hows.”

In spite of this, it has worked on most occasions. OCHA staff and UNDAC team members have developed solutions on site, adjusted the PoA and found ways to solve the tasks. However, without guidance, direction and standard operating procedures the level of success is often coincidental and personality dependent. A decisive factor for successful interaction seems to be strong and clear leadership of the UNDAC team. When the team leader has been clear on mission objectives and ToRs, the UNDAC team and deployed OCHA staff has fulfilled each other and worked together as one team. In other situations OCHA staff has worked in parallel of the UNDAC team resulting in a lack of internal coordination and an inefficient output.

To avoid this, there is a need to develop guidance for when OCHA and UNDAC deploy alongside each other. OCHA response need to be more integrated and coordinated with the UNDAC mission. Questions of leadership, integration and task orientation need to be clarified from the onset and not solved locally through ad-hoc solutions in every emergency. This guidance also needs to include interaction with in-country OCHA offices and clarify reporting lines. Subsequently there is a need to include this in UNDAC trainings.

**Integration of Partners**

Just as OCHA deploys staff alongside an UNDAC team, other partners also deploy teams or staff who work on various aspects of coordination. Over the last years we’ve seen an increase in the number of organizations and/or private enterprises that either has a stake in the coordination process or brings special expertise to the table. We see regional organizations that are deploying coordination teams with the same size and resources as an UNDAC team, e.g., ASEAN and EU CPT. Partners with expertise within environment, ICT, information management, assessment or logistics deploys alongside the UNDAC mission in larger and larger numbers. The mission objectives of these partners may either be to support the UNDAC team or to perform a specific task related to the coordination process. We also see a tendency for regional organizations to take a stronger grip on coordination of disasters
happening within their own region.\textsuperscript{38} The number of staff working with or around UNDAC grows rapidly and procedures for this needs to be reflected in the methodology.

As an example it can be mentioned that during the Haiti earthquake in 2010, the UNDAC team consisted of 17 members from the onset of the crisis. A huge team by all standards, but counting partners and support staff, the number rose to 46 within 72 hours. Furthermore, 10 days into the earthquake the number of staff working inside the OSOCC peaked at 94. Such a huge number of staff requires a level of internal coordination that is not even remotely covered in the UNDAC methodology and without proper guidance or standard operating procedures ad-hoc solutions have been invented.

If we look at these solutions, however, there is a clear image emerging of what has worked and what has not. Just as with OCHA staff deploying alongside UNDAC, full inclusiveness, integration and clear leadership seems to be key issues for a establishing and running a well-functioning coordination mechanism. When UNDAC, OCHA and all partners have worked together in one organizational model, e.g., an OSOCC, with clear, internal reporting lines and management procedures the resources have been utilized optimally and the partners have fulfilled each other. On the other hand, when UNDAC, OCHA and various partners has worked segregated, without any proper procedures for internal coordination and information sharing, silo thinking, duplication of services and gaps in the coordination process has occurred with greater prevalence.

**UNDAC’s Role in Capacity Development**

In 2009 the Emergency Preparedness Section (EPS) of OCHA commissioned a review of the UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness (DRP) missions that had been conducted to date,\textsuperscript{39} the objective of which had been very different from standard UNDAC response missions. The review was conducted in the context of capacity development and looked at how successful the implementation status of the recommendations following these missions had been. The review pointed out that the most successful missions had been dependent on a high degree of local ownership and that the OCHA Regional Offices needed to be deeply involved in preparations, execution and follow-up of the missions. Missions without these elements had had noticeably less impact. The main conclusion was that DRP missions can be useful, but cannot function in isolation.

Staying within the recognized framework of capacity development, the report recommends how UNDAC and FCSS should be involved in future DRP missions. It points out that FCSS would have a considerably smaller role in comparison with EPS and the Regional Offices, and that OCHA should clarify the division of labour with respect to DRP missions. EPS are recommended to take the lead through most of the stages in a capacity development process, but there is a need to define FCSS’s role and the interface between the two sections with regards to DRP missions.

When studying the material from the emergency response missions selected for this report, it is clear that many UNDAC teams seize the moment when on mission to recommend disaster

\textsuperscript{38} Both in Asia/Pacific (ASEAN) and Europe (EU Civil Protection Mechanism) strong regional agreements have been made, regulating use of regional coordination teams within the region

\textsuperscript{39} See “Review OCHA UNDAC Disaster Response Preparedness Missions” Lars Peter Nissen, 2009
management measures to be taken that may capacitate either governmental institutions or in-country UN entities. It is recommendable that they do and it is a practice that to a certain degree should continue. When viewed from a capacity development standpoint, however, written recommendations after an UNDAC emergency response mission may only be a drop in the water if they don’t play a role in a larger process. An UNDAC team may have unique qualifications and capacities to advice local disaster management institutions on preparedness measures that can be taken, but without proper follow-up, recommendations after a mission may never get further. To be successful such recommendations need to be followed up by the Regional Office and, possibly, also involve EPS. The recommendations could be the starting point of a DRP mission were UNDAC can participate and support. We see that this has come further in the Americas and in the Asia/Pacific region, than in Africa/Europe. Both ROLAC and ROAP are deeply involved in regional preparedness activities and actively use UNDAC as a tool for capacity development.

Giving recommendations on disaster management during emergency missions, however, seems to be a much more developed approach in Latin America than in other regions. The mission reports from Latin America often focus on DRP issues, and noticeably more than reports from other regions. Some reports from Latin America have hardly anything on UNDAC functioning or the emergency itself, but numerous pages with various issues focusing on DRP.

If we look at the UNDAC Handbook, various training material, and summaries from UNDAC Advisory Board meetings it says that UNDAC should participate in preparedness activities, i.e., DRP missions, but there is very little guidance to how this should be done and to what extent UNDAC should be involved. This lack of guidance may be the reason why approaches and methodologies have evolved differently in different regions. There is a need to revisit the DRP review of 2009 and clarify UNDAC’s role with respect to capacity development. This should help define a DRP-framework for how UNDAC should operate. Following such a clarification there is a need to develop the UNDAC methodology accordingly.

**Internal Coordination**

When reading various debrief forms, teams often complain about certain tools or parts of methodology that they do not have and would have eased their challenges had they been available. For example, do teams consistently complain that they do not have pre-printed business cards, or that certain forms or templates do not exist and has to be created in-country. These are small challenges, but nevertheless add stress to the mission and feel unnecessary to deal with. The sad part of it is that many of the tools required by the teams have been developed but the teams are unaware of their existence.

That there is an uneven and inconsistent knowledge base within the global UNDAC team is a natural consequence of having such a large number of members[^1] and that they often are UNDAC members in addition to other, more pressing responsibilities. Some members are highly qualified, but do not deploy as often since they have to prioritize their own job and move UNDAC further down on the list. Consequently, one cannot expect that each and every

[^1]: Approximately 250 as of July 2011
UNDAC member knows every word in the UNDAC Field Handbook or are updated on the latest tools developed for UNDAC missions.

To cope with this, FCSS should be in a position to support and guide teams on missions when challenges occur and if there is a methodology or tool developed to meet it. Unfortunately, FCSS staff doesn’t always know about these tools or are fully updated on the methodology either and are, thus, unable to guide the teams on all UNDAC issues. For example were templates for UNDAC business cards developed as a part of the UNDAC mission software in January 2007, but very few FCSS staff are aware of their existence and cannot give this information to the teams when asked.

This example is of course a minor problem, but points to an unfortunate and unnecessary situation that may be symptomatic for a lack of internal coordination within FCSS. This is a challenge for FCSS that, by extension, affects the quality of UNDAC teams on mission. Being the responsible unit for UNDAC they should also be able to be a high-quality centre of excellence with regards to UNDAC methodology, tools and guidelines. Based on mission material this aspect of FCSS has room for improvement.

**Humanitarian Reform**

The largest change in humanitarian assistance over the last 6 years is without doubt the humanitarian reform of 2005. The UNDAC team landed in the middle of the implementation of it during the Pakistan earthquake in 2005 and had to hit the ground running. At the same time as various agencies and organizations had to figure out their new role as cluster lead/coordinator, the UNDAC team had to both learn what it was all about and guide/coach the organizations on the ground.

Surprisingly enough the implementation of the cluster approach appears to have been the least of the worries for the UNDAC team over the course of the last 6 years. In some cases it appears as if the reform has affected the outcome of the UNDAC missions positively and mission reports from all regions tells similar stories. When on mission UNDAC teams have supported the establishment of the clusters, guided RC/HCs on humanitarian reform issues, and provided inter cluster coordination. Based on the missions studied for this report the problems encountered have been mostly outside the teams’ influence and UNDAC in itself have been on top of the challenges. The humanitarian reform is only partly covered in the UNDAC Field Handbook, but has been extensively covered in trainings since the implementation. Extensive mission experiences including work with cluster coordination have added quality to the trainings.

On the other hand, other studies and evaluations of the humanitarian reform indicate that many actors doesn’t know enough about UNDAC to fully utilize their services in an implementation phase of the clusters. Cluster coordinators and HCTs are often unaware of the UNDAC concept and, consequently, don’t know what resources and UNDAC team have or how they can be used when establishing clusters in an emergency.

Humanitarian reform seems like an area where the UNDAC team feels on top of the game and ahead of many other organizations and in-country partners. Regardless of the merit of
this, the UNDAC team is without doubt in a unique position to advice and guide HCs, HCTs, and cluster coordinators on humanitarian reform issues when on mission. Apparently there is a discrepancy in perception between how the UNDAC team sees themselves with regards to the clusters and how they are perceived by others. This needs to be examined so that misunderstandings and misconceptions are cleared away and UNDAC’s role clarified.

Benchmark Missions 2005 – 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Americas</th>
<th>Africa/Europe</th>
<th>Asia/Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>Libya, Migrant Crisis&lt;br&gt;Cote d’Ivoire, humanitarian crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Haiti, hurricane Tomas&lt;br&gt;Haiti, earthquake</td>
<td>Benin, floods&lt;br&gt;Albania, floods</td>
<td>Pakistan, floods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin, floods&lt;br&gt;Namibia, floods</td>
<td>Samoa, earthquake/ tsunami&lt;br&gt;Philippines, typhoon Ketsana&lt;br&gt;China, typhoon Morakot&lt;br&gt;Taiwan, typhoon Morakot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Panama, floods&lt;br&gt;Honduras, floods&lt;br&gt;Haiti, hurricane Hanna&lt;br&gt;Bolivia, floods</td>
<td>Zanzibar, power outage&lt;br&gt;Albania, ammunition depot explosion</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea, sea swell&lt;br&gt;Nepal, floods&lt;br&gt;Myanmar, tropical cyclone Nargis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Dominican Republic, tropical storm Noel&lt;br&gt;Jamaica, hurricane Dean&lt;br&gt;Peru, earthquake&lt;br&gt;Uruguay, floods&lt;br&gt;Bolivia, floods</td>
<td>Ghana floods</td>
<td>Solomon islands, tsunami&lt;br&gt;Indonesia, Yogyakarta earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Suriname, floods&lt;br&gt;Guatemala, mudslides</td>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire, toxic waste dumping</td>
<td>Philippines, landslide&lt;br&gt;Pakistan, earthquake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>USA, hurricane Katrina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia, tsunami&lt;br&gt;Sri Lanka, tsunami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Cornerstones: Foundation of the UNDAC Methodology

The UNDAC methodology is by many considered to be the system’s strongest feature. It can be adapted to suit any given emergency situation, being flexible, adjustable, and dynamic in the sense that it evolves with the various challenges an UNDAC team faces on mission. Even when missions develops in a direction that was not anticipated from the onset, the UNDAC team usually finds a gap it can fill and a role to play that adds value to the response.

The UNDAC methodology is captured in the UNDAC Field Handbook and in various guidelines and training materials. Originally it grew out of a need to have a system for disaster coordination that spanned across both standard disaster management systems and international humanitarian coordination. Consequently the UNDAC methodology took a bit of everything and became a system at the interface of other systems. It combines elements of disaster management, functional organizational models, political manoeuvring and humanitarian coordination. Today the UNDAC methodology has become a unique system off, and for, all systems.

As with any other “construction”, the foundation has to rest on something solid and firm that holds the rest of the structure together. Most houses have four corners and in original masonry the position of the four cornerstones were absolutely essential for the rest of the building. They determined how the rest of the house would be, how firm, and how large. The better the groundwork was done, the better and more solid the end-result would be. The UNDAC methodology also has such a foundation in the form of four cornerstones. Four concepts that is essential for the individual members, the team and how an UNDAC mission approaches the mission objectives.

“The expression cornerstone means something that is essential, indispensable, or basic. It is derived from the first stone set in the construction of a masonry foundation and is important since all other stones will be set in reference to this stone, thus determining the position of the entire structure.”

Derived from Wikipedia and Dictionary.com
Core Values

The individual UNDAC staff are considered among the main strengths of the UNDAC team. They come from a vast diversity of professional backgrounds, contexts and cultures, but with skills and competences that are important for the UNDAC team. At the centre of the UNDAC methodology lie certain core values that UNDAC members are dedicated to and approach a mission with.

These core values are, naturally enough, inherent in the members before they become UNDAC members, but during the induction course the core values are, subtly, but nevertheless, rigorously included in all the topics. Remarkably enough, the core values have never been written down. Neither have they been presented in any guidelines, handbooks, or training materials. They are just there, like a strong undercurrent that everyone is aware of, that shape the team-spirit when on mission, but few can pinpoint where they originated or stem from.

As a result of certain key-interviews, a list of the UNDAC core values was compiled stating that UNDAC members are:

- **Equal** – UNDAC members leave their egos and status at home. In a team, all members are equal and home positions are inconsequential.
- **Commited** – UNDAC members are committed to solve the mission objective, to contribute to a common goal, and put individual and personal agendas or needs aside.
- **Competent** – UNDAC members are experts within their fields, but also able to apply their expertise internationally in a variety of contexts and disaster situations. They are committed to maintain their skills and expertise, to be prepared, and to stay current on relevant issues.
- **Flexible** – UNDAC members are flexible and adaptable. UNDAC teams adjust mission objectives to situational needs and aim to stay on top of the developments at all times.
- **Inclusive** – UNDAC members are inclusive. UNDAC teams strive to involve and integrate partners and other stakeholders in the coordination mechanism, aiming to create one whole where the output is larger than the sum of its parts.
- **Operational** – UNDAC members apply an operational focus. UNDAC teams will base decisions/recommendations on operational needs and not political considerations.
- **Supportive** – UNDAC members support each other and in-country counterparts. When on mission UNDAC teams will endeavour to find a role within an existing structure and support, coach and guide without establishing non-sustainable systems.

The core values have evolved over the years and have become essential to the UNDAC methodology. Even if they so far have been unwritten, rules of thumbs, the time is ripe to list and affirm them. Disaster situations have become more complex, the number of actors and
partners has grown, and UNDAC members come from more diverse backgrounds than before. The core values are part of what glues an UNDAC team together and in a time of ever more demanding disaster situations, political concerns and overwhelming flows of information, it is important to be conscious of the essentials.

**Disaster Management**

Since its inception in 1993 UNDAC has grown to be a successful tool for OCHA in sudden onset emergencies requiring international assistance. It is OCHA’s “rapid response force” that may support and/or establish basic coordination services and run them for a short period of time. But an UNDAC team is not only OCHA as they also bring in more capacities than what we ordinarily associate with coordination of humanitarian assistance.

Historically UNDAC team members came from typical civil protection agencies, e.g., firefighters, etc., but over the years the UNDAC team has been enhanced with members from a vast variety of backgrounds. The core element of being operational, however, both in mindset and in practice, has been kept in trainings, exercises and, above all, on missions. Many disasters creates a void in the immediate aftermath were “everything” needs to be created, or re-created, from scratch. Simple, tangible structures for coordination, emergency organizational models and basic services need to be established before more complex structures can evolve. The principle of a house never being stronger than the foundation it rests on is also valid for a coordination structure and UNDAC has shown that it has solid competencies in building foundations.

It has been stated that by doing this groundwork UNDAC provides an interface between disaster management and humanitarian coordination and that it is the only entity within OCHA and the humanitarian architecture that has this ability. To understand what this involves we first need to look at what distinguishes disaster management from humanitarian coordination.

Disaster Management, also often referred to as Emergency Management, has been defined as; “the organization and management of resources and responsibilities for addressing all aspects of emergencies, in particular preparedness, response and initial recovery steps”.1 The term is further elaborated by saying that “[a] crisis or emergency is a threatening condition that requires urgent action. [Disaster] management involves plans and institutional arrangements to engage and guide the efforts of government, non-government, voluntary and private agencies in comprehensive and coordinated ways to respond to the entire spectrum of emergency needs”.2

In summary disaster management involves coordination of urgent actions to respond to the entire spectrum of emergency needs. This is the task UNDAC originally was created for and still retain the capability of doing.

If we look at the term Humanitarian Coordination it is a lot more loosely defined. “[Humanitarian] coordination is the systematic utilization of policy instruments to deliver humanitarian assistance in a cohesive and effective manner. Such instruments include (1)"

---

1 United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) terminology list, 2009. See also http://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology#letter-d
2 Ibid
strategic planning; (2) gathering data and managing information; (3) mobilizing resources and assuring accountability; (4) orchestrating a functional division of labour in the field; (5) negotiation and maintaining a serviceable framework with host political authorities; and (6) providing leadership. Sensibly and sensitively employed, such instruments inject an element of discipline without unduly constraining action”.3

This definition is almost 20 years old and disputed, in particular by NGO communities, as it is said to be more a description of a strategic, top-down, UN centric model rather than a definition.4 Some attempts have been made since then to re-define humanitarian coordination, but this definition has, nevertheless, endured. Even the Humanitarian Response Review of 2005 did not define humanitarian coordination more tightly.5 IASC has rather gone on to describe the change in context and listed guiding principles for humanitarian coordination. In the IASC “Handbook for RCs and HCs on Emergency Preparedness and Response”6 of 2011, we find that RC/HCs should be guided by the following principles when discharging their duties; Support to the Government, Humanitarian Principles, Principles for Partnerships, International Humanitarian and Human Rights Laws. From the IASC “Humanitarian Coordination Competencies,” we can further read that humanitarian coordination includes “Formulating Strategies, Applying Humanitarian Principles and Norms, Fostering Humanitarian Teamwork, Negotiation and Advocacy”7 There is, however, nothing that clearly defines what is meant by humanitarian coordination. What we can derive, however, is that humanitarian coordination is an overarching, principled way of managing disasters through strategic planning, policy making and facilitation of cooperation and consensual decision making.

The model above shows how disaster management overlaps with humanitarian coordination.

---

5 Ibid
6 See also http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/pageloader.aspx?page=content-subsi-common-default&sb=77
7 Ibid
Facilitation of coordination is, naturally enough, also central in the UNDAC methodology. UNDAC is a part of OCHA, works under OCHA’s mandate, and is a tool that either enhances in-country OCHA capacity or provides OCHA services and takes on OCHA’s typical facilitating role with regards to humanitarian coordination. But UNDAC may do more than that by also filling a distinct niche at tactical and operational levels where concrete actions need to be taken and rapid decisions made to save lives in the immediate chaotic aftermath following a disaster. UNDAC endeavours to link in with all responders, not only traditional humanitarian, but also with operational levels of the affected government, bilateral responders, military, private sector, etc., to create a forum for coordination, to establish basic services, and to provide leadership when needed.

This feature of the UNDAC concept distinguishes it from the humanitarian face of OCHA as they bring something more to the table. An UNDAC team provides basic disaster management services and, through that, may fill a gap for affected governments, HCTs and OCHA. The fact that the UNDAC methodology is disaster management rooted is reflected throughout the methodology, but has so far not been defined as the cornerstone it actually is.

**Humanitarian Principles**

The humanitarian principles remain as fundamental to the UNDAC system as it does to OCHA. When the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 46/182 in December 1991, forming OCHA and the position of the Emergency Relief Coordinator, one of the essential guiding principles was that “humanitarian action must be provided with principles of humanity, neutrality and impartiality”\(^8\) In later years, the fourth principle, i.e., independence, has been adopted acknowledging that humanitarian assistance must remain free and self-governing.

The humanitarian principles are vital for most humanitarian actors. Over the last decade, however, the world has experienced a proliferation and diversification of actors, some of which may have different motives for engaging in humanitarian assistance and, consequently, attach different interpretations to the humanitarian principles.

---

| **Humanity:** Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health and ensure respect for human beings. |
| **Impartiality:** Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinctions on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinions. |
| **Neutrality:** Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of political, racial, religious or ideological nature. |
| **Independence:** Humanitarian action must be autonomous from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian |

\(^8\) See also [http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/46/a46r182.htm](http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/46/a46r182.htm)
thus include organisations from very different cultural and professional backgrounds and with differing levels of expertise and experience in humanitarian affairs."\(^9\)

UNDAC, being in the ground in the immediate aftermath of a disaster, will need to ensure that their coordination activities are conducted in a way that adheres to the humanitarian principles. It is equally important that this is also communicated to technical partners, support staff and other actors working with UNDAC.

**Leadership**

Over several years leadership in itself has not been an issue that has been explored to a great extent in the humanitarian world. It has been an aspect that has been mentioned, but not analysed and put into perspective by bringing the framework of international humanitarian assistance into the equation. There is no doubt that leadership and management in international humanitarian assistance has its very unique challenges and that a blueprint of traditional organizational models and procedures cannot be utilized fully. Providing leadership in a multi-organizational, international environment, where both individuals and organizations, come from a variety of backgrounds with regards to contexts and managerial procedures requires an equally unique form of leadership. The question of applying leadership has almost been treated with caution or shied away from.

Lately however, this has been a growing field and we see more and more studies and reports talking about the need for better coordination and stronger leadership in humanitarian operations. There are still, however, many outstanding issues. One example is the leadership expected from an HC position considered by many to be next to impossible to execute due to the position’s lack of formal authority and accountability. Furthermore how the various leadership-positions in the humanitarian architecture should approach leadership is still not substantiated. It is very much an unploughed field where it is left up to the individuals to interpret what leadership in international humanitarian assistance really entails. We find ourselves in the slightly awkward situation were “everyone” calls for more leadership and better coordination, but still the discussion hasn’t moved on from principles to tangible solutions that can be applied in disaster situations. For example the IASC Handbook for RCs and HCs on Emergency Preparedness and Response states that the HC should “chair the HCT [, and that] the HCT operates according to the Principles of Partnership: equality, transparency, result-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity”\(^10\)” There is, however, nothing on how to apply leadership of this strategic and crucial forum for overall coordination of a disaster\(^11\).

Another issue that creates confusion within the humanitarian environment is what level of decision-making the various entities, tools and forums belong to. This is many times caused by different terminologies in different organizational and cultural backgrounds. For example, there is a distinct difference between European and North-American terminology where the term *tactical* in large parts of Europe means the same as *operational* in North-America and

---

\(^9\) See “Humanitarian Coordination in Changing World”, published by OCHA and The Global Public Policy Institute, 2011

\(^10\) See also http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/pageloader.aspx?page=content-subsidi-common-default&sb=77

\(^11\) See also “Leadership in Action; Leading effectively in humanitarian operations,” ALNAP 2011
vice versa. Just to add to the conundrum other regions, language groups and organizational backgrounds have their own twist to how one perceives levels of decision-making.

This is not an issue that can be globally solved, but UNDAC should be clear on its own terminology and acknowledge that there are different perceptions. For UNDAC’s purpose it is suggested to use the following model to describe the various levels of leadership in humanitarian operations and UNDAC’s role with regards to them.

UNDAC teams have many times either provided or supported leadership on tactical and operational levels in emergencies. UNDAC teams do not provide strategic leadership, but have on some occasions provided strategic advice to governments, RC/HCs or HCTs. UNDAC as a concept belongs to a tactical and operational level with regards to leadership. This is both historically and traditionally affirmed from the first years when UNDAC grew out of INSARAG, through the later years’ OSOCC- establishments in large scale emergencies.
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Some general UNDAC statistics
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UNDAC Selection Criteria (current)

Introduction
UNDAC aims to facilitate the international response to sudden-onset disasters and man-made emergencies by the immediate collection, collation and dissemination of information obtained through assessment of damage and humanitarian needs, and by the initiation of mechanisms for the coordination of international relief operations.

The Field Coordination Support Section (FCSS) of the Emergency Services Branch of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), in close cooperation with national emergency relief services, identifies suitably qualified and experienced persons for the UNDAC team, primarily from participating national Governments and international humanitarian agencies/organizations.

Emergency Management Profile
Ideally, prospective candidates should possess the following profile:

1. Experience in international emergency management, including information management, rapid assessment techniques and operational coordination in an emergency situation, preferably in coordination of humanitarian response;
2. Familiarity with management of operational support functions, including telecommunications, logistics and security;
3. Strong teambuilding skills and cultural awareness, for working in a multi-disciplinary, multinational team, with ability to assume authority as and when needed;
4. Highly flexible, with an ability to respond effectively to rapidly-changing situations with minimum guidance and support;
5. Language skills: working knowledge of English essential; knowledge of additional languages desirable.

Other Requirements
1. Ideally aged between 30 and 50, in good health and physically fit;
2. Nomination of qualified female candidates is encouraged;
3. Able to cope with extreme hardship living/working conditions in a disaster area and be psychologically prepared to witness extreme human suffering at close quarters;
4. Knowledge of MS Windows and MS Office and familiar with operation of VHF radios and telecommunications equipment;
5. Basic first aid training and good coping mechanisms/stress management techniques;
6. Possess a valid driving licence;

7. Available for three to four weeks at 12 hours' notice for deployment anywhere in the world in response to a sudden-onset disaster at least once a year for the next three years. Written endorsement of this availability should be provided by the national UNDAC Focal Point.
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List of Interviews

Mr. John Adlam, Director, Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department Operations Team, DFID

Mr. Mohamed Al-Ansari, Head of UAE USAR Team Section and UNDAC Focal Point UAE

Ms. Dr. Dana van Alphen, Regional advisor for the PAHO emergency response team

Mr. Alexey Avedeev, Chief, International Cooperation Department, EMERCOM

Mr. Einar Bjørgo, Deputy Chief UNOSAT

Mr. Richard Blewitt, CEO HelpAge International (member of the Humanitarian Coordinator Pool)

Ms. Muireann Brennan, Center for Disease Control, Atlanta

Ms. Ines Brill, Capacity Development Practice Leader, UNDP Panama

Ms. Kim Bulduc, UN Resident Coordinator Panama

Mr. Per Byman, Manager Humanitarian Unit, SIDA

Ms. Sandrine Chopin, Deputy Director, Handicap International, Paris

Mr. Hans Das, Head of Civil Protection Unit, European Commission - DG ECHO

Mr. Simon Eccleshall, Head, Disaster Services Department, IFRC

Mr. Helena Fraser, Chief OCHA Donor Relations Section

Mr. Ivo Freijsen, Chief OCHA Surge Capacity Section

Mr. Tony Frisch, Ambassador, Head of Humanitarian Aid Department, Swiss Humanitarian Aid

Mr. Gabriel Fuks, Ambassador, UNDAC Focal point, Argentina

Mr. Jose Maria Garcia, OCHA Administrative Office

Mr. John Ging, Director, OCHA Coordination Response Division

Mr. Gerard Gomez, Head of OCHA Regional Office Latin Americas and Caribbean

Mr. Patrick Gordon, Deputy Chief OCHA Information Technology Section

Ms. Caroline Grandjean, Deputy Director of the French Centre de Crise, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs and UNDAC Focal Point
Mr. Derek Hardy, Emergency Coordinator, Center for Disease Control, Atlanta

Ms. Loretta Hieber-Girardet, Chief OCHA Assessment and Classification of Emergencies Policy Development and Studies Branch-Geneva

Ms. Belinda Holsworth, OCHA Humanitarian Coordination Support Section

Mr. David Horobin, Head of the Crisis Management Unit, ICRC, Geneva

Ms. Adelina Kamal, Head of Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance Division of the ASEAN Secretariat

Mr. Bujar Kapllani, former Director, General Directorate for Emergencies, Ministry of Local Government and Decentralisation, Albania

Mr. Arjun Katoch, former Chief, OCHA Field Coordination Support Section

Mr. Iain Logan, Global Emergency Group, IFRC Operational Coordinator, member of the Humanitarian Coordinator Pool

Mr. Sean Lowry, Director of Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies

Ms. Jemilah Mahmood, Senior Researcher, Humanitarian Futures Programme, Kings College, London (former Head of Mercy Malaysia, former Response Director UNFPA, member of the Humanitarian Coordinator Pool)

Mr. Mario Lito Malanca, Emergency and Post Conflict Advisor, IOM

Mr. Ricardo Mena, Head, UN-ISDR Office for the Americas

Mr. Ross Mountain, Director DARA

Mr. Flemming Nielsen, Deputy Head of International Division of DEMA and Chair of IHP

Mr. Vicente Raimundo Nunez-Flores, Director, ECHO Office for the Caribbean

Mr. Dewey Perks, USAID UNDAC and INSARAG Focal Point

Mr. Thomas Peter, OCHA Emergency Response Coordination Centre

Mr. Robert Piper, UN Resident Coordinator, Nepal

Mr. Mark Prasopa Plaizier, OiC IASC Secretariat

Mr. Gerhard Putman-Cramer, Former Chief OCHA Emergency Services Branch

Ms. Marie Sophie Reck, OCHA Consolidated Appeals Program Section

Mr. Dr. Matthias Schmale, Under Secretary General, IFRC

Ms. Joe De Serrano, DFID Operations Team Response Officer and UK UNDAC/INSARAG Focal Point

Ms. Katarina Toll, OiC OCHA Emergency Preparedness Section
Mr. Achim Troester, Special Coordinator German Foreign Office, UNDAC focal point for Germany

Mr. Stephen Webster, Senior consultant for UNDAC training programs

Mr. Chris Weeks, Director of Humanitarian Affairs for DHL

Mr. Walter Wintzer, Director CEPREDENAC

Mr. Nigel Woof, Director MapAction

Mr. Andrew Wyllie, Chief OCHA Civil Military Coordination Section

And many others, including UNDAC members worldwide and staff of FCSS
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Results of online Survey and key Trends

General information on UNDAC members in the Survey
Since the last UNDAC Review in 2001, the international system of humanitarian aid has changed profoundly. Not only did the humanitarian architecture progress with reforms and developments (e.g. the humanitarian reform of 2005 with the introduction of the cluster system), but also the scope and impact of disasters has widened due to climate change and circumstances of political complex emergencies. These changes have led to an increase of diversity of disaster management tools and also to new actors engaged in humanitarian operations on site in emergencies. The UNDAC Review of 2011 will analyze the role and position of UNDAC within these new developments and it will hopefully provide some answers on how to adapt and modify the system and the methodology of UNDAC in order to continue to be one of the most effective UN tools in international disaster response mechanisms.

This documents aims to identify key trends of the survey that was conducted to get the views and ideas from UNDAC members. The survey, which was conducted online, using Survey Monkey, with the questionnaire available in English and Spanish, was sent to all active UNDAC members globally. Some 166 UNDAC members did participate in the on-line survey and the general trends in the feed-back are captured in this document.
Concept/System & Funding

Although the UNDAC concept is clearly understood by its members and the current alert and mobilization procedures are rated from good to excellent by 75% (91% by Spanish members) of the responders, 65% of all members (68% of the Spanish speaking members), there is a general desire for a more transparent procedure with regards to the selection process when composing an UNDAC team. The Spanish speaking members indicate the desire for the SMS alerts and the Virtual OSOCC alerts to be available with Spanish translation. 96% of the responders indicated that they were satisfied with the support from FCSS and with the current arrangements of financing, communication, information sharing, reporting and general mission support.

Objectives/mandate & role within OCHA

According to survey response, the UNDAC members indicated that the key role of UNDAC missions are assessment and coordination, followed by inter-cluster coordination, support to OCHA and the HCT. Being asked to indicate the main five activities that an UNDAC team should be able to facilitate, the replies were: information sharing, information management, needs assessment, coordination of incoming assistance and liaison as well as chairing of coordination meetings. The Spanish speaking members clearly pointed out inter-cluster coordination as a main role of UNDAC. To the question, which external circumstances have hampered the mission in achieving the agreed ToR, the majority of answers indicated: lack of acceptance/support by RC/HC and national authorities.
More than 80% of the participating UNDAC members felt that the presence of an UNDAC team on the ground was contributing to ensure accountability. Quote from the Survey: “To improve the level of accountability the role of UNDAC needs to be more visible and understood by all actors involved. Also UNDAC should work more closely with host governments and national authorities, it should make use of standardized systems to avoid gaps, inform donors more on results and impacts and coordinate the transition with LEMA more visible.”

Some 47% of the responders stated that UNDAC teams in the field are currently unable to embrace all players operating in emergencies. Interestingly, there are significant regional differences in this perception. The stakeholders, who according to the UNDAC members aren’t currently well integrated into the existing coordination mechanisms, are national NGOs, private actors and local authorities.

To enhance the leadership role of UNDAC in rapid response missions, the UNDAC members did ask for better training (including leadership development), more awareness building and an increase of local members and government participation. The UNDAC members furthermore requested a more precise definition of the role of
OCHA and UNDAC in the “new humanitarian architecture” and clearer layout of the expected activities and responsibilities.

Did you feel, that you were a well integrated part of the OCHA`s response coordination?

- NO 25 %
- YES 75 %

In order to cooperate effectively with national governments, the role of UNDAC needs to be more clearly communicated and the mistrust/issues of politics must be put aside. The time factor and language barrier should also be taken into account. To clarify the role of UNDAC, to overcome mistrust and work better with other UN agencies, it is important to strengthen the leadership role of UNDAC.

Methodology and Training

The quality of the UNDAC members, the methodology, the support system (technical partners) and the agility of the system were perceived as the main strengths of the UNDAC system. The main weaknesses identified by the members were:

1. Too many inactive members (not enough deployment opportunities)
2. UNDAC is not well known by other humanitarian actors, stake holders, RCs…
3. Lack of predictability of the capacity of the respective UNDAC teams (not having the right team members, with sufficient experience and the required skills)
4. The selection process (identification of new members and composition of teams)

Further weaknesses in terms of field support indicated in the survey are: the collaboration between OCHA staff and national UNDAC members as to their roles, inconsistent support of mission equipment (IT), lack or at times hostile engagement from RC’s/HCT-members and the complicated UN administrative system.

The three main operational partners on ground that are included in the UNDAC methodology are NGOs, the Red Cross and other UN agencies. However, members state that the areas of Civil Military Coordination and Inter Cluster Coordination should
be better addressed in the methodology and training program. Although 85% of the responders (94% of Spanish speaking members) feel well prepared for UNDAC missions, the survey showed that the members feel that they could improve their skills in the field of need assessment, coordination, OSOCC management and Civil Military Coordination.

The survey shows that the team leader of UNDAC missions primarily were OCHA staff or an experienced national UNDAC member. 75% of the replies indicated that the team leader has the sufficient skills, training and experience to provide the required leadership for the team, but many also indicated that one of the major weaknesses in the current UNDAC system is the dependence of good team leaders. The team leader is perceived as the key criteria if the team “makes it or breaks it”

The survey showed that there is a need for a better standardization of the hand over procedures and more time to prepare the handover. Some members even went so far to suggest the establishment of dedicated “handover team members” (team members responsible for the hand over process). 46% of team members indicated that they had handed over their end of mission report to the RC/HC and 40% to their UNDAC TL.

The UNDAC team members in general feels well prepared for deployments and there was a very high mission readiness amongst the participants in the Survey. While the UNDAC members generally feels well in the field of assessment, Civil Military Coordination, OSOCC Management and Information Management, the members expressed that they felt less prepared in fields of Humanitarian financing, UN report System and Inter-cluster coordination.
Post Mission

The debriefing was mostly directed towards FCSS and UNDAC colleagues. However, members state that a standard handover procedure/modified process, more engagement with OCHA and above all the involvement of agencies and national authorities would be of value. Only 57% of the participants in the survey felt that they had been proper debriefed after missions. There should further be drawn attention to the crucial fact that 76% of members rate the current personal evaluation system as not known or sufficiently transparent.

The survey shows that lessons learnt from missions are best captured at refresher trainings and through debriefing of the entire team. Members require more transparency about the lessons learnt from missions. They should be documented and distributed, put on the VOSOCC, shared at conferences and training courses and be incorporated into the methodology of UNDAC.

A majority of the participants in the survey indicated that the current approach of UNDAC refresher courses conducted every 2 years is insufficient to address changes and keep members fit for missions. Most members keep themselves informed of changes in the system via the FCSS newsletter, the VOSOCC, external training courses, Reliefweb, UNDAC refresher courses and internal information exchange amongst other UNDAC members. Almost all members indicated that they keep themselves informed about new disaster management approaches and tools via their work, self-study, internet and personal contacts apart from making use of the VOSOCC and courses. The majority of UNDAC members keep in touch with other members from their Induction course and past missions.

Membership and Partnerships

Concerning the core profiles of an UNDAC team more than half of the responders (60%), are of the opinion that there are still gaps and additional skills often are required during missions. The three main components that should be added according to individuals were Civil Military Coordination, Security and technical expertise concerning LEMA and OSOCC.

Although 65% of the responders agree that the criteria and procedures for selection of new UNDAC members are relevant and effective and 81% rate the criteria and procedures for their retention as UNDAC member as transparent and good, but that there are too many people trained, who are not being deployed. Furthermore, in order to facilitate deployment, contractual issues (UN certificates) and payment procedures should be aligned. An issue of dissatisfaction for many UNDAC members was the current system of evaluation.
which clearly needs to be enforced and modified as 70 % of responders are not at all familiar or satisfied with the current system of evaluation. 82 % of the members indicated that the outcome of evaluation is not clear and transparent or that they have not received any evaluation at all.

The technical support in terms of equipment provided by support partners is ranked quite high, with more than 80 % of responders rate it as available, effective, sufficient, up to date and functioning (as support partners are able to fix problems).