

**Global project for Crisis response
PAC Meeting Minutes
27 October 2015**

Participants

The following Bureaus were represented in the PAC:

- CRU: Bruno Lemarquis (Co-chair);
- BPPS : Stan Nkwain (Co-chair) ;
- RBAP: Mohammad Younus;
- RBEC: Sarah Poole;
- RBAS: Celine Moyroud;
- RBLAC: Ugo Blanco;
- BERA: Laurel Patterson;
- BMS: Notonegoro, Hannes Finkenbrink and Amat O Kebbeh
- ExO: Dominik Brinkmann.

The following Bureaux submitted written comments and recommendations ahead of the PAC: BPPS, RBA and BERA.

Project Background

This global project is put in place to enable CRU to implement some of the activities agreed at the corporate level in the Integrated Work Plan (IWP). Plannable results and activities are captured in the project's results and resources framework. The project will facilitate cross-bureau partnerships and enable CRU's role of effectively supporting the organization's crisis response mechanisms, facilitating crisis coordination, ensuring rapid response and preparedness, and enabling UNDP to constructively interface with crisis response and humanitarian actors.

The six outputs of the global project are in line with most of CRU main deliverables and cover mechanisms to bring together central and regional bureaus, regional hubs, and country offices to strengthen information and analysis for early warning, to quickly deliver support for crisis response and coordination, to effectively apply Fast Track Policies and Procedures, to deploy SURGE experts and to apply Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Immediate Crisis Response.

This global project enables implementation of, and strengthens the key principles and elements of UNDP's corporate crisis response strategy in order to ensure that the Organization's crisis response capacity is fit for purpose. The global project complements the CRU Management Project that covers CRU Staff salaries and other operational costs.

Review and Appraisal Process

The global project for Crisis Response is very specific and extensive discussions have taken place among BMS, CRU, ExO and BPPS on the format, implementation modalities, review and appraisal process. Most of the strategic substance in the global project has been endorsed within other corporate mechanisms such the Executive Group which agreed on the Corporate Accountability Framework, including crisis response.

At a meeting with BMS and BPPS on 25 September, it was agreed that a PAC co-chaired by BPPS and CRU would be organized. . A subsequent meeting was organized with BPPS on 28 September to discuss comments received from various parts of BPPS. BPPS comments have therefore all been addressed in the global project prior to the PAC meeting.

On 19 October 2015, the CRU Deputy Director sent out an invitation for the PAC to all UNDP Deputy Directors requesting comments on the document. Two sets of comments, one from RBA and one from BERA were received ahead of the PAC.

The PAC was convened on 27 October 2015. All comments received (prior to the PAC and during the PAC) are reflected in Annex 1, together with the responses.

Conclusion and Decision

The PAC endorses the project for approval.

Cleared by:



Bruno Lemarquis
Deputy Director, CRU

Date



Stan Nkwain
Deputy Director, BPPS

13/11/15

Date

ANNEX I: MATRIX OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comment from:	No	Comment	Response
RBA (written)	1	What is the exact amount to be approved in the framework of the present global project? Is it 14,292,611 USD as mentioned next or 18,208,000 USD as mentioned on the cover page as 'Unfunded budget'?	This question was discussed during the PAC. The exact amount for the Project is USD 49,708,000. The allocated resources (USD 30,000,000) is a conservative projection based on CRU initial allocation for 2015. Depending on the allocation received by CRU and mobilized resources, the amounts on each line (allocated and unfunded) will vary.
RBA (written)	2	Based on the RRF, it seems that almost all funds will go into deployments, and nothing into the programming/ early recovery packages. It is mentioned in the annex 2, and RBA highlighted several times the importance of having some available cash for programmes in addition to having only people. Even though the funding windows plus management is not declared yet, someone needs to be responsible for this funding as well as for the emergency response funds, equally missing from the Prodoc.	The global project does not include the funding and processes dedicated to support the Country Office activities such as TRAC 1.1.3 (2) or other TRAC allocations for programmatic needs. The allocation modalities for these funds are currently set by the POPF. Discussions are still ongoing at corporate level on the channeling of emergency funds and this aspect should be partly addressed by the new trust fund architecture (Crisis Response and Recovery window) and the upcoming SOPs for Crisis Response. This is explained in the Part 2 of the Prodoc.
RBA (written)	3	Overall, there are certain elements in this prodoc that do not seem to align with the corporate role as designed for CRU. One would imagine that the corporate accountability framework leads and even if this prodoc states differently, that this does not change the role of CRU	The Prodoc should be aligned with CRU's workplan that was approved at corporate level. The project board will meet on a yearly basis to adapt the workplan and ensure that it is consistent with the corporate accountability framework

RBA (written)	4	RBx are leading HQ inter-agency coordination, however it would be good to establish a mechanism through which CRU is regularly kept abreast of the discussions and information (e.g. minutes, notes from DPA to SG etc.) are shared so that CRU is appraised of certain situations prior to crisis.	This aspect should be addressed in the SOPs and other Business Processes with the Regional Bureaus.
BERA (written)	5	BERA/CG suggests to assign a CRU communication focal point (or even create a communication position in CRU/allocate resources to communication) given the importance of preparing/training crisis responders in strategic communication to prevent reputational issues and ensure high visibility of UNDP in crisis. This focal point could collaborate with BERA on other communication related activities outlined in this project plan and enhance advocacy for crisis response in general as well as internal communication flows.	This comment relates to business processes between CRU and BERA that are not covered by the global project. The point is well taken and further discussions will be held on this aspect under the framework of the SOPs.
BERA (written)	6	BERA/CG suggests the recruitment of additional SURGE Communication Advisors to the roster to increase UNDP's communication capacity in crisis	The global project does not enter in this level of detail. Currently, 16 communication SURGE advisors have been cleared by CRU and BERA and four will be trained in 2015.
BERA (PAC)	7	A partnership section should be added to the global project for Crisis response document to lay out a strategy to mobilize the additional resources needed to implement all activities. It will be particularly important to diversify the funding base either through the thematic windows or bilaterally from donors given the funding gap and that the amount of TRAC funding available for this project is still not absolutely certain.	A Partnership for Crisis response section has been added in the Project Document and CRU will work with BERA on a full-fledged Resource Mobilization Strategy for Crisis Response within the framework of the new Trust Fund architecture.
RBAS (PAC)	8	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding for the ERAs and the ERCCs should be more predictable for some selected countries with high needs. 2. It is unclear how the global project complements other tools available for CRU. 3. The document should be used as an internal tool only for work planning and not for external resource mobilization. 4. It is necessary to consider how UNDP can sustain engagement 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The activity is covered by output 1 and 6 (activity 6.4) already. CRU will work closely with RBx to ensure forward planning and identify countries where long term ER coordination capacity is required. CRU will also prioritize resource mobilization for ER coordination

		beyond SURGE, and be a leader in early recovery. In the case of RBAS, for example, there have been challenges in sustaining UNDP's engagement beyond SURGE.	<p>requirements.</p> <p>2. A paragraph has been added in the strategy to clarify the complementarity between CRU management project and the global project for Crisis Response.</p> <p>3. The global project is only intended to be used for internal purposes. CRU will work with BERA on a separate resource mobilization strategy (see above).</p> <p>4. Agreed that the challenge is with sustained coordination of early recovery efforts beyond SURGE and that there needs to be more predictable deployment for post-SURGE coordination.</p>
RBAP (PAC)	9	<p>1. Need for a resources mobilization strategy to mitigate the financial risk identified in the risk log</p> <p>2. The indicators should be qualitative and not only quantitative</p> <p>3. The global positioning of UNDP in Crisis Response within the humanitarian and development community should be addressed in the Project Document</p>	<p>1. A resource mobilization strategy will be prepared with BERA (see above)</p> <p>2. A few indicators have been revised to ensure that the quality of the delivery is also assessed.</p> <p>3. The global positioning is addressed in Output 5 and in the new Partnership for Crisis Response section.</p>
RBEC (PAC)	10	Emphasis should be placed on strengthening internal capacities within UNDP to send immediately deployable experts to undertake PCNA/PDNAS and other assessments such as the MIRA.	An activity result has been added in Output 2 dedicated to PCNA/PDNA
RBLAC (PAC)	11	<p>Two sets of comments:</p> <p>1. Better language is needed for slow onset crisis;</p>	1. CRU's role and responsibilities are for

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Need to strengthen UNDP position with the humanitarian actors; 3. Role of CRU in imminent crisis; 4. Better support for drills at the CO level; 5. Revision of the TRAC 1.1.3 criteria; 6. What is the link between the global project for Crisis Response and the CPR trust fund; 7. Does CRU have funding available to support the implementation of ET recommendations. 	<p>“crisis spikes”, when the capacity of COs is not commensurate with the scale and complexity of the crisis. CRU has also a role in building UNDP’s capacity for crisis response.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A Positioning in Crisis section has been added to the Project document; 3. CRU’s role in the case of imminent crisis is to ensure that the CO has capacity to respond to the crisis. Programmatic preparedness is with BPPS. Ensuring that UNDP is ready corporately to face imminent threats when they arise will be addressed in the SOPs; 4. CO preparedness to respond to crisis will be rolled out starting 2016 as per Output 3; 5. Trac 1.1.3 category 2 is not within the scope of the global project; 6. The CPR TIF is currently being revised and discussions are ongoing on the funding architecture; 7. Decisions of a financial nature are usually discussed outside of the ET. The ET usually specifies the sources of funds, and this is reflected in the minutes. In its role as ET secretariat, CRU can play a facilitation role with other parts of UNDP to ensure that activities get funded.
BMS (PAC)	12	CRU needs operational capacity to implement the global project. CRU operational capacity is currently

			being assessed and recommendations will be made to potentially use BMS Operational structure.
--	--	--	---

