

IFRC Management Response Syria Crisis Real Time Evaluation (RTE)

In accordance with the standard International Federation approach to Real Time Evaluations (RTE), the attached document is the management response to the Syria Crisis RTE, which was completed in December 2014. This document is the response to the report's recommendations as signed off by the evaluation's commissioner - the Under Secretary General for Programme Services Division (USG PSD). The management response aims to ensure effective follow-up of the recommendations and points raised in the evaluation through outlining the appropriate actions and timeframes for implementation. The management response and final RTE report are made public on the IFRC website and are shared with key stakeholders.

The management response below outlines **a short summary response to the overall content of the RTE** and then **responds to each recommendation individually**:

- Either the recommendation is fully or partially accepted and therefore the response outlines the action to be taken and the rationale for this action, plus the timeframe and person(s) responsible / accountable,
- Or the recommendation is not accepted and no action is to be taken, with the rationale provided for this position.

The template below is used to specifically respond to each of the evaluation's recommendations and the relevant people within the IFRC Secretariat management have been asked to contribute to the drafting of the management response for each relevant recommendation and to the general feedback on the RTE report. In addition, because the Syria Crisis RTE covered multiple countries / zones and a complex emergency response over three year's duration, IFRC management has taken longer over this management response than the usual month taken to respond. An additional two day meeting of key representatives from the two Zones (MENA and Europe) and the Geneva Secretariat (Disaster and Crisis Management Department) was held in Beirut in January to go through the recommendations in more detail and agree an initial management response position. This work was subsequently shared with key IFRC Secretariat managers for further management feedback and endorsement. The combination of this feedback forms the final management response document outlined below.

Follow up should be systematically monitored and reported on in a reliable, timely, and public manner. ¹

¹ **IFRC Framework for Evaluation, 2011**

Background information:

The evaluation took place between 8th September and the 30th of November, with the presentation of the final report to Secretariat management on 18 December 2014, when a final video conference presentation was made to Geneva and zones. The RTE was carried out by Team Leader (Simon Lawry-White) and Team Member (Martina Schloffer, Austrian Red Cross). The Evaluation Management Team at the Secretariat comprised: Miki Tsukamoto (PED), Christine South (DCM) and Mazin Salloom (MENA)

Background Information: This RTE was commissioned by the USG PSD to assess the impact of the IFRC's response to the Syria Crisis to inform ongoing support to the Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) and to the National Societies in the neighbouring countries of Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey and Iraq. The Syria Crisis is now approaching its fourth anniversary and the situation shows no sign of improving. It is clearly the most critical situation the world is facing currently, with grave humanitarian consequences and repercussions across the region and beyond. Figures show that over 12 million people within Syria are affected and in need of assistance, while 7.6 million of these have been internally displaced and nearly 200,000 killed. At the same time, nearly 4 million people have fled the country and are living as refugees in neighbouring countries or further afield. This RTE is therefore looking at one of the most critical situations and operations currently carried out by the IFRC.

As such, the focus of the RTE was on the opportunities and challenges presented by such a complex IFRC and Movement response over an extended time period and how IFRC support and coordination can best be provided to support the National Societies involved. The RTE was also being asked to scope out future directions and opportunities for the ongoing response. In particular, the three objectives of the RTE TOR were:

- How did the IFRC Secretariat coordinate its response internally and with Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and non-Movement actors?
- What are the challenges and opportunities of a multi-country (multi-zone) response?
- How has the IFRC dealt with a long-term, chronic crisis of this nature?

The RTE had originally been planned to take place in 2013, but had had to be postponed for operational and management reasons. A revised TOR was finally agreed in September 2014 and the RTE was able to go ahead and be completed by the end of the year. However, due to limitations on budget and availability of candidates, the team was finally smaller than initially planned and the two person team was a pushed hard to complete a review in the number of locations and contexts in the time frame available.

This RTE will be used by the IFRC secretariat in Syria, the neighbouring countries, MENA Zone, Europe Zone and Geneva to improve delivery in the Syria Crisis related operations and to help plan future strategies and actions. It will also inform all RC/RC actors contributing to the operations, to help improve RCRC Movement coordination and integration around this crisis. And finally, as with other RTEs, it will be used to inform future global emergency response operations and improve IFRC approaches and coordination in the many changing operating environments.

Summary of Management Response:

From a review of the RTE final report and the management response to the recommendations made, the main issues covered include:-

- As outlined above, the Syria Crisis is largest and most complex crisis facing the world at present and shows no sign of abating. Its impact in Syria and beyond is immense and the consequences in other countries in the region continues to grow. On that basis, the IFRC recognises the priority stressed in the RTE and the recommendations around the importance of clarifying our approach and longer-term strategy for both Syria and the neighbouring countries for the coming years. In particular, the Secretariat recognises the need to support National Societies to clarify their longer-term strategies and plans and to reinforce both the human and financial resources to achieve that support. This should not become a “forgotten crisis”.
- The RTE findings challenge the IFRC to define what it means by “crisis” and the IFRC’s role in relation to these new contexts (in terms of our Constitution, Statutes and other key policies plus practice to date). In relation to the experience of the Syria Crisis, the RTE lays down a challenge to the way the Secretariat works and outlines two separate business models currently relevant to the Syria Crisis (and other contexts) that are not mutually compatible - model A responding to the scale and scope of needs (the humanitarian imperative) and model B responding within and in support of NSs existing mandate and capacity or seeking to enhance that base. This difference of approach was particularly highlighted in the separate approaches between the Zones and Geneva Secretariat teams. The RTE challenges the IFRC Secretariat management to be clear and coherent in what its aim is and to clarify and decide how it plans to work in each context, as each approach requires different resources, capacities and messages that can be contradictory of each other. These first two points are not easily addressed through a management response to a specific RTE and require broader discussion and clear institutional positioning (globally) within the IFRC global senior management.
- The management response notes that the RTE has not really dealt with the “One Crisis” issue – how well the IFRC and the Movement had managed to work with and present the response as one coordinated response to one crisis. Instead, it has focused investment at country level (country plans etc.) and has responded according to country contexts, mandates, capacities and National Society positioning. This raises challenges to presenting a regional or “one crisis” approach or overview and there is a question as to whether this is realistic or it is more rational to maintain focus at country level, where donors are prepared to operate and invest and that regional discussions are more rhetoric and presentational.
- It is clear that the RTE has been carried out in a context of strengthening Movement coordination and cooperation and this is very much in line with the current Secretariat priorities. It is important that the management response follow up also commits to that spirit. There was a concern however, that the RTE placed a good deal of emphasis on the Movement Advisory Platform (MAP) as a base for finding solutions for coordination / cooperation, particularly around country level planning and communications. The Secretariat suggests a more balanced risk management approach noting that the MAP’s success in delivering timely and effective decisions to date has not been consistent. More needs to be done to reinforce the MAP process and to convince NSs of its tangible value if it was going to be able to deliver as recommended, including on the country plans. And if this is not the solution to a more coordinated Movement response in support of National Societies, then

- alternative plans (Plan B) for effective coordination / cooperation need to be explored – including for the timely development of country plans.
- The IFRC Secretariat acknowledges the RTE’s reference to the IFRC’s funding challenges throughout the Syria Crisis response, especially in Jordan and Lebanon. Protracted crises pose additional challenges to the IFRC’s existing resource Mobilisation model, in sustaining longer-term funding. Noting the challenges with current funding models (emergency appeal and DOP), a review and revision of our funding instruments is planned for 2015 - 2016. In parallel, an analysis will be carried out to review the dynamics of under-disbursement and under-resourced funding cycles, which affect some regions, so as to design ways to correct course and address the associated programmatic and reputational risks, as well as the need to further develop and resource a more diverse range of fundraising capacities and experience, especially in relation to longer-term funding opportunities. The challenges of effective Movement Coordination raised in the RTE, including the competing rather than complementary bilateral and multilateral engagement models, have an inevitable impact on the IFRC’s ability to mobilise resources and need to be addressed. The RTE recommends work on a RM Strategy which may be encompassed in this work, as would steps to improve and extend coordinated representation with humanitarian partners and networks.
 - The RTE has not mentioned the secondary effects of the Syria Crisis on Europe / MENA Zone countries through wider migration (i.e. Egypt, the two DREFs for Bulgaria and Armenia), but it is clear that this is due to the challenges in the scale and scope of this evaluation.
 - This RTE also refers to some of the findings from other RTEs (see comparison with other RTE recommendations in the text on page 24). This particularly relates to clarity of roles and responsibilities, different levels and expectations of Secretariat management / teams, lines of communication and funding sustainability. The management response supports the call for a meta review of all the 8 RTE reports / recommendations and the IFRC Secretariat agrees that such a meta evaluation for the RTEs should be conducted by quarter one of 2016.
 - In line with the findings of other RTEs, this RTE also raises issues around the clarity of the roles and responsibilities of the various teams working on the Syria Crisis – including between countries and zone, between zone functions and the Syria Crisis Team, between Zones and between Zones and Geneva. Although the IFRC would stress that there has been good contact and working relationships between management and operational colleagues at all levels, it would recognise the need to clarify the lines of communication and decision making between the different levels and will work to outline this in a working document (see Recommendations number 18). This also links to issue relating to improvements in the flow of information up and down the reporting lines and improved situation and response analysis. There are also links to the last recommendations around the clarity of position around the Global Disaster Response SOPs and the OCAC system
 - There were some concerns expressed from management that the review team had not provided more fact based data and information on the positive and “at scale” contributions from the National Societies taking on strong and lead roles in their own contexts. Nor on the future opportunities and challenges for the strategic direction of the operation, as was felt to be in line with the TOR. This would have reflected more the “new generation” of NSs with the capacities, knowledge and position in their country to run major operations of this scale that should be noted. It was also felt to be a missed opportunity to build on existing learning from the operations and to adjust the operation for the changing context - including more on the existing positive work and exchanges between the two Zones in cooperation with the Geneva-based team. This was felt to have shifted the balance of the report to a “glass is half empty” position rather than building positive lessons and improvements. There was also a concern that in setting up discussions around the future models for the IFRC Secretariat the report was not able to cross

reference the decentralisation review, which has looked into this matter in some detail.

COUNTRY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS – SYRIA

Recommendation 1: Work with Syrian Arab Red Crescent (SARC) and other partners to improve programme monitoring, in particular to resolve the SARC-WFP arrangements over third party monitoring of food parcel distributions.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p>□ Partially accepted</p>	<p>This has been partially accepted as this does not relate to a particular request from SARC to the IFRC Secretariat, but to the relationship with WFP, which is at Government level and above IFRC’s ability to influence. The Secretariat will provide support to SARC regarding the relationship with WFP if requested and where possible.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where appropriate work with SARC to build monitoring capacity through support to ongoing monitoring of programme delivery and through learning by doing (e.g. the current reporting delegate is already providing support to SARC’s monitoring capacity and to their systems for tracking distributions). IFRC is also providing targeted ongoing support to build the information management (IM) capacity of NS and will continue this programmed support, which will improve SARC’s monitoring. Although this support is provided by IFRC it will benefit other actors (e.g. UN) • Linked to the recommendation below, support has been provided to SARC to set up a TOR for INGO monitoring officers for each INGO in each Governorate. This is a step towards improving both coordination and monitoring with partners • Regarding WFP, SARC maintains its own relationship with WFP at Government level. The IFRC provides support to SARC on information management which may encompass WFP and other UN related activities channelled through SARC, but is not directly engaged in supporting the relationship with WFP 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>SARC Syria Country Rep</p>

Comments: The engagement between SARC and WFP is a bilateral relationship, beyond the Secretariat’s direct engagement and influence, however, the

Secretariat is open to provide support as needed or requested by the NS				
Recommendation 2: Support the SARC in its management of coordination meetings with INGOs active in Syria to make sure that the constraints on the SARC are well understood and that INGOs perspectives are taken into account, to help make these important relationships work as well as possible.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This has been accepted as it is already being covered. Since the time of the evaluation, the Secretariat has already helped SARC to set up these coordination meetings with the INGOs in the autumn and these are now running well on their own, with 5 meetings having taken place to date, providing a good and open forum between SARC and the INGOs (<i>Ref 5.9, para 2 page 19</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As outlined under the rationale, these meetings have already been set up and are now running well. They are perceived as giving INGOs well appreciated and often unique access to SARC senior management, who are present for the meetings (as is the IFRC Country Rep). The INGOs are invited to contribute to the agenda and the debate is respectful but open to discuss difficult issues. The Secretariat commits to supporting these meetings in future. As part of this meeting, the Secretariat has already supported SARC to set up a TOR to support a monitoring officer in each of the INGOs involved, to engage them more fully in monitoring in each of the Governorates 	Ongoing	Syria Country Rep
Comments: At the time of the RTE these meetings had just started, but since that time they have been held consistently and have been strengthened in terms of their organisation and content, so this is ongoing follow up that is already committed to (see link to Recommendation 1 above).				
Recommendation 3. Work with the SARC and the ICRC to agree a robust security protocol for foreign delegates to replace the current unstructured security arrangements, including seeking advice from the Zone security adviser and Geneva security section.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This recommendation reinforces the priority of the new IFRC Country Rep (CR) to ensure that security regulations and procedures are appropriate to the current context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In agreement with SARC, the CR has commissioned an evaluation of current security documentation and procedures. A TOR for the mission was agreed with the Geneva Security Unit and the visit took place late January. This visit looked at risks for staff 	Completed by mid-2015	Syria Country Rep Security Unit

		<p>security and produced a proposal for a new set of security guidance. Zone Security is being kept informed and will advise as necessary as part of this process and this is in coordination with the ICRC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the interim, the Geneva Security Unit has validated the current document and procedures, which have been further aligned with ICRC security guidelines. Security relations with ICRC in country are working well and are seen as a good basis for this further work. 		
<p>Comments: These steps are fully in line with and endorsed by the MENA Zone</p>				
<p>Recommendation 4: Support SARC in defining its capacity development needs for improved response, for example strengthening through strategic planning, resource mobilisation or international relations and, working with ICRC, identify high quality technical support, which may mean looking beyond the RCRC network.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted</p>	<p>This recommendation is multi-faceted, and the management response has been broken down into constituent elements, some of which are fully accepted and some of which are partially accepted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The element of the recommendation linked to strategic planning will be linked to the discussions and follow up on the MAP process, covered in later recommendations. Strategic planning is currently a challenging process for SARC with all the other demands on their time (hence the partial acceptance) and therefore the next strategic planning cycle will be delayed (probably to next year). IFRC therefore continues to provide ongoing and targeted support to priority capacity building initiatives as requested by SARC (e.g. logistics, information management, resource mobilization and coordination) SARC has stressed however, that it is keen to 	<p>Mid 2015</p>	<p>Syria Country Rep MENA Zone Syria Crisis team</p>

		<p>have further support on RM/Communications and this is something that the IFRC will prioritize for follow up, with further input from both within or beyond the Movement. This has already been started with support from the IFRC Syria Team, but it is seen as useful to have further expertise, particularly around RM for development and other areas of funding (See link to Rec 20 on Syria Crisis RM Strategy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to further high quality technical support, IFRC has already planned under the current appeal, to carry out a livelihoods feasibility study to support the longer-term positioning of SARC and Movement partners, as well as develop approaches to support vulnerable Syrian households (and encourage funding). The study is being carried out with a livelihoods delegate (provided by British Red Cross), who has already been deployed according to the TOR. The final report and recommendations are expected by May 2014. 	<p>First half 2015</p> <p>Quarter 1</p>	
<p>Comments: These three action points above are linked to the specific recommendation points but are not exhaustive of the capacity building support provided by IFRC to SARC, however, they provide a good cross section of the support. The current priority for SARC is for assistance with diversifying their RM base to help support the urgently needed scale up their programme delivery, however, the development of a new multi-year strategic plan is currently on hold due to the volatile nature of the Syrian Crisis and its impact on SARC institutionally. Understandably, SARC continues to direct all available resources towards operational response priorities in order to meet the humanitarian needs of the affected population. In future, it will be important that support for communications is considered alongside that for resource mobilization, as the two are mutually compatible in terms of the capacity building of the NS and the outreach to partners and donors.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 5: The MENA Zone office, in consultation with the Europe Zone office, should issue an internal written communication to clarify the responsibilities of the respective Syria crisis team and the Syria team, and how the two coordinate, to avoid any confusion or overlap between Secretariat teams in the countries of the region.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	Linked to Recommendation 18c, this recommendation has been accepted and they will be considered as one and the same and carried out under the same terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Head of the Syria Crisis team will draft a written communication to outline the roles and responsibilities of the various teams and the inter-relation and lines of communication between the different teams and the two Zones. This will include levels, line and frequency of contact. This will be shared will all relevant internal and external stakeholders 	First quarter 2015	Syria crisis team MENA Zone Europe Zone
Comments: It was suggested that a joint meeting be held between MENA Zone and Europe Zone management to further clarify roles and responsibilities between the teams and further improve coordination around the delivery of the crisis response and this will be followed up as feasible between the two zones				
Recommendation 6: The IFRC Secretariat Secretary-General should visit Damascus in the near future to show support to the SARC and help cement Movement cooperation, as there has been no SG visit there since the start of the crisis ² . (The RTE team understands that a visit is planned.)				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This is fully accepted and has already taken place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SG visited Damascus between 21 and 23 December 2014. There is no shared visit report and this was seen as an initial visit to meet key actors and to outline areas of support. The SG committed to visiting again and on a reasonably regular basis 	December 2014	DoZ MENA OSG
Comments: Although the SG’s visit has already taken place, it is recommended that it be followed up by MENA Zone management and the Office of the SG to follow up on the commitments of the visit and ensure coherence between the SG’s visit and the RTE recommendations, to support any commitments made during the visit and to ensure these are effectively linked, where appropriate, to the necessary follow up on the RTE and its management response.				
<u>COUNTRY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS – LEBANON</u>				
Recommendation 7: Support the Lebanon RC in developing a strategy for a significant expansion of the Syria crisis response, harnessing additional PNS operational capacity alongside LRC implementation, with full LRC endorsement. The underlying principle is to continue the progressive, long-term development of the LRC response capabilities, while other National Societies mount short and medium term responses to acute needs not covered by the LRC. The Secretariat should provide additional specialist coordination and technical support over a period of months to make the scale-up possible, according to the priorities for growth identified in the Lebanon Country Plan being developed under the MAP process. Once agreed, this will require an upward revision of the Lebanon Population Movement Emergency Appeal. <i>(Shared recommendation for Jordan and Lebanon).</i>				

² Both the President and Director General of ICRC have visited Damascus.

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>This recommendation is multi-faceted, and the management response has been broken down into constituent elements, some of which are fully accepted and some of which are partially accepted. For the elements that are accepted, it must be clear that this does not accept the establishment of parallel structures, which would not be agreed by the NS. PNS will be encouraged to provide targeted support, in consent with LRC under the existing EPOA / Appeal and Country Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LRC is leading on its country plan and delivery related to the MAP process and has been moving ahead with the development of various plans, including its Strategic Plan and plans for both its Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and for its Disaster Management (DM). These have all already been drafted and the IFRC will continue to provide encouragement and technical support to LRC in these areas as requested and where it adds value. The OCAC process has already helped LRC identify areas needed for development (as has the recent IFRC supported governance & management consulting process helped define roles and responsibilities). Further support will be provided, including for contingency planning and for the country planning process supported through the MAP. 	<p>Mid-2015</p>	<p>LRC Lebanon Country Rep</p>
<p>Comments: One area linked to this recommendation that did not come under the specific actions linked to the management response, but which have wider implications for the IFRC that will need follow up under other processes, are the challenges around the appeal process and the limits of appeal type funding. It will require a wider look at the range and flexibility of the IFRC’s funding based and longer-term, multi-year funding mechanisms and processes beyond continuing with raising annual emergency appeals. The challenges of effective Movement Coordination raised in the RTE have an inevitable impact on the IFRC’s ability to mobilise resources. The management response would add that – although not mentioned in the suggested action points above – the existing IFRC appeal process itself and the relationship with bilateral funding pose additional obstacles to Movement Coordination efforts and to sustaining longer-term funding. This is especially true for long-term funding for NS capacity building, which has proven difficult to sustain under the appeal process. Though exacerbated by complex crises, these challenges are not unique to the Syria Crisis and will require a deeper review of the IFRC’s current ability to sustain multi-year funding and to secure a flexible funding base.</p>				

Recommendation 8: Take a stronger lead in PNS coordination in Lebanon, as several of the PNS have been requesting, and negotiate, in discussion with PNS and the LRC, a reduction in the number of PNS present in Lebanon, to improve efficiency in the use of resources, and reduce the coordination and hosting burden on the LRC. As a guide, the end result should be the operational presence in Lebanon ³ of not more than 6 PNS working on the Syria crisis response.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>The recommendation to have an operational presence in Lebanon of not more than 6 PNS working on the Syria crisis response, is not specifically the objective of the LRC nor of the IFRC Secretariat, but reflects the number of longer-term partners in-country at present. The LRC are open to more partners, if they are willing to commit to a similar long-term framework of support as those 6 noted above. Therefore, the Recommendation as stands has been partially accepted, as the IFRC Secretariat will support LRC in PNS coordination to reduce the burden and improve efficiency, as requested by and in agreement with the LRC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently, LRC has an existing structure for partnership support. This includes a Partnership Advisory Committee, a Movement Coordination Forum, and Sector-based Technical Committees (TORs have been finalized for these). LRC leads each sector technical/coordination group, with a supporting PNS partner as a focal point for each group. However, both LRC and the IFRC realise that there is more work needed to support the coordination of the many PNS in country and to make this manageable for the NS. IFRC will build on the actions mentioned above to ensure the development of better coordination and to better support the needs of LRC into 2015. 	On going	LRC Lebanon Country Rep
<p>Comments: Further information received from the MENA Zone Director suggested that the figure of 6 PNS is related to the number of LRC’s permanent partners in country and that the LRC SG would like to encourage other PNS to commit as long-term partners and not just to be present in country as short-term supporters, as it is wasteful of resources to set up country offices for each partner. However, it will be for LRC to lead this longer-term engagement and the Secretariat will support as agreed with the NS.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 9: Clarify responsibilities and procedures for security (for example for evacuation). If the LRC is established as having responsibility for security for PNS and Secretariat delegates, the Secretariat should make use of its international experience and standard procedures to assist the LRC in adapting its systems to include expatriate requirements.</p>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Accepted	<p>This is partially accepted, as the steps where IFRC is engaged are ongoing and scheduled to be finalised soon to clarify security modalities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat is responsible for security procedures in place, but relies on LRC for all operational coordination of security on the 	Ongoing	LRC Lebanon Country Rep

³ Some PNS will continue to have a presence in Beirut to fulfill a regional function rather than a country function.

	<p>with LRC. However, certain elements are under the control of LRC and are not for the IFRC Secretariat to agree and finalise.</p>	<p>ground, as the NS emblem is the only one well respected and therefore protected in country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PNS who have signed integration agreements with IFRC are covered by the IFRC regulations and must inform IFRC Secretariat of their movements. They will be provided with full support in security matters. Those without integration agreements are not covered by the security support. As noted above, those under existing IFRC security agreements, PNS visiting with LRC are under LRC operational security on the ground. • The current security SOPs for Lebanon do however need to be strengthened and finalized and technical back-up may be needed to complete these. The security MoU between LRC and IFRC is also in process of being finalized - a draft was shared with the LRC in February 2015 as part of the finalization of the SOPs. Once these are both completed they will be shared with PNS in country. 		<p>MENA Security Officer</p>
--	---	--	--	-------------------------------------

Comments: The discussions here will also be shared with the ICRC

COUNTRY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS – JORDAN

Recommendation 10: Support the Jordan RC in developing a strategy for a significant expansion of the Syria crisis response, harnessing additional PNS operational capacity alongside JRC implementation, with full JRC endorsement. The underlying principle is to continue the progressive, long-term development of the JRC response capabilities, while other National Societies mount short and medium term responses to acute needs not covered by the JRC. The Secretariat should provide additional specialist coordination and technical support over a period of months to make the scale-up possible, according to the priorities for growth identified in the Jordan Country Plan being developed under the MAP process. Once agreed, this will require an upward revision of the Jordan Population Movement Emergency Appeal. *(Shared recommendation for Jordan and Lebanon).*

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p>□ Partially accepted</p>	<p>This recommendation is multi-faceted, and the management response has been broken down into constituent elements, some of which are fully accepted and some of which are partially accepted. For the elements that are accepted, it must be clear that this does not accept the establishment of parallel structures, which would not be agreed by the NS. PNS will be encouraged to provide targeted support, in consent with LRC under the existing EPOA / Appeal and Country Plan. A particular focus is on strategic planning, where IFRC Secretariat has been providing long-term capacity building support to JRC throughout 2014 through the OCAC process, a Strategic Planning meeting and an OD Consultant / OD national staff. ICRC has also supported the process. With regard to the additional technical support in the recommendation, the Secretariat has the capacity to provide this if there is donor support for it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Movement Country Planning meeting is already planned and due to take place in two separate meetings in January and March 2015. It is foreseen that the Movement Country Plan should be ready by April 2015. • The IFRC supported OD consultant has now submitted a report on his recent engagement and necessary actions to be taken. This will be analysed by JRC who will follow up on the recommendations in the first quarter • The NS is currently working on their strategic plan. The process started in April 2013, with the OCAC process and was followed in June 2014 by a Strategic Planning Meeting. It is expected that in the coming months there will be the new Strategic Plan in place. 	<p>April</p> <p>March</p> <p>April</p>	<p>JRC Jordan Country Rep</p>
<p>Comments: One area linked to this recommendation that did not come under the specific actions of the management response, but which have wider implications for the IFRC under other processes, are the challenges around the appeal process and the limits of appeal type funding. It will require a wider look at the range and flexibility of the IFRC’s funding base and longer-term, multi-year funding mechanisms and processes beyond continuing with raising annual emergency appeals. Although not mentioned in the suggested action points, management notes that the existing IFRC appeal process itself and the relationship with bilateral funding can pose obstacles to securing long-term funding for protracted crises. This is especially true for long-term funding for NS capacity – building, which has proven difficult to sustain under the limits of the appeal process. These challenges are not unique to the Syria Crisis and will require a deeper review of the IFRC’s current ability to sustain multi-year, longer-term funding and to secure a flexible funding base.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 11: Work with the JRC to devise measures that will improve the confidence of partners in the JRC as a partner. A programme of measures is required to improve financial systems, and clearer and more formalised management structures and systems. Donors will likely also require stronger monitoring processes as part of any confidence building measures.</p>				

	strategy as soon as possible.	<p>IFRC Secretariat in order to agree on the main issues and clarify the different roles and responsibilities of each organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFRC Secretariat will support JRC and PNS, as far as requested and required, to develop a sustainable exit strategy 		<p>Jordan Country Rep Consortium members</p>
<p>Comments: Whilst a handover/exit strategy will be discussed and agreed between IFRC components in Q1 of 2015, more detailed handover/exit plans will only be developed once partners are confirmed and closer to the time of handover based on the operational context.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 13: Assist in the Movement’s country-level coordination meetings’ decision-making and definition of specific action points through improved preparation and management of meetings. JRC decision makers should be encouraged to attend. Attempts to bring in to these meetings those Movement partners who attend on a less regular basis have already born some fruit and should be continued.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p>	<p>There are currently regular Movement coordination meetings attended by JRC, PNS, IFRC Secretariat, and ICRC, dealing with information sharing, joint planning, dealing with thematic issues etc. The main challenge is that the level of representation from JRC at the meeting is not always able to make decisions. It is hoped that improvements in the planning, set up and attendance at the meeting will encourage greater engagement and decision- making</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFRC Secretariat will work with JRC to help re-establish the coordination mechanism between JRC, PNS, IFRC and ICRC at the appropriate decision-making level and support effective links with the operational coordination function of the NS and encourage JRC to engage. This will include work to strengthen the preparation and management of these regular meetings and support to provide the platform and inputs in order to facilitate the higher level dialogue required (e.g. negotiation of a Tripartite MOU) • Linked to this, the strengthening of Movement coordination through these meetings with ICRC and PNS will also contribute to NS OD priorities outlined in the recommendations above (e.g. supporting finance, HR development) and will support the work on the Movement Country Plan, 	<p>January – March</p>	<p>JRC Jordan Country Rep</p>

		through encouraging more coordinated support to JRC priorities and better JRC management engagement		
<p>Comments: As the recommendation includes reference to attendance at the coordination meeting, including by the JRC management representatives, the IFRC Secretariat notes that while it will encourage participants to attend it recognises that IFRC cannot ensure this</p>				
<p><u>COUNTRY LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS – TURKEY</u></p>				
<p>Recommendation 14: The TRC receives very considerable funds from the Government of Turkey but these do not allow the TRC to address the substantial unmet humanitarian needs of Syrians across Turkey. The TRC aspires to raise funds from external donors and the World Bank, just as other well-established NS do. Therefore, the Europe Zone Office, with Geneva HQ support, should consider how it can provide high quality support to the Turkish RC in the development of its resource mobilisation strategies (not just for the Emergency Appeal), to increase its understanding of funding sources and donors, as it seeks to diversify funding sources and partnerships.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p>	<p>The IFRC Secretariat recognizes and appreciates that Turkish RC is a well-recognized NS, with a good image enabling it to attract necessary resources. However, it notes that TRC is still consolidating and building national and international partnerships to develop resource mobilisation strategies to help it scale up its operations to match the humanitarian needs across the country. Turkish Red Crescent has also noted clarifications in relation to the points made in the above Recommendation (see the Comments below)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFRC Secretariat will engage in discussions with TRC to explore the NS’s interest to receive time-bound and defined capacity building support in RM and other areas, including disaster management, shelter, communications and logistics, and in relation to revising its current EA for population movement in Turkey. Once the areas of priority support and the modalities for that support have been defined and agreed between the Secretariat and TRC, the appropriate support and follow up will be sourced from within the RCRC Movement and beyond as far as is feasible. IFRC Secretariat and partners at country level, with support from the Europe Zone DMC, are currently looking into longer-term, non-emergency funding to support TRC’s activities in psycho-social support. In addition, the IFRC also supported two 	<p>Second quarter 2015</p>	<p>Europe Zone GVA RM</p>

		IMPACT trainings in Turkey in 2014 and this year will support additional training in security and in Sphere TOT capacity. Other support for particular trainings or other initiatives is also included in the current appeal		
<p>Comments: Feedback from the Turkish Red Crescent would like to stress two corrections to the points made in the above Recommendation (n. 14). While TRC is working in cooperation with Turkish Government as an auxiliary to the authorities, currently TRC is not receiving any funding from the Turkish Government except for in-kind logistics support. There is also currently no funding from the World Bank for the Syrian crisis. The IFRC mission that is due to visit Turkey in March - April 2015 aims to clarify the exact expectations of TRC in the area of RM and the other above mentioned areas. IFRC recognizes the levels of work and innovation already undertaken by TRC to diversify its funding base in its own country and overseas, and will aim to provide complementary support in line with TRC needs and requirements in the longer-term. HV Division (Geneva) also suggest that RM capacity building and support should be accompanied by donor communications and marketing support. See link to Recommendation 20 covering a RM strategy for the region</p>				
<p>Recommendation 15: Consider how to revive its ‘dormant’ status agreement with the Government of Turkey to provide the IFRC with the tax and other benefits the agreement confers</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected	<p>The IFRC status agreement in Turkey remains current and valid - there has been no official information (Note Verbale) received from MFA contrary to that.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maintenance of the IFRC Status Agreement in Turkey will be acknowledged as a priority for the IFRC in all high level visits and communications with the TRC and the Government of Turkey Should operational needs require a change to the current status agreement, then this matter would first be raised between the TRC and the IFRC Secretariat. 		<p>Europe Zone Legal Dept.</p>
<p>Comments: The IFRC Secretariat has no need to address the status agreement recommendation at this point, as the current country delegate is embedded inside the NS and there is no plan to change that status. However, this may be reviewed in future if the situation changes, as it is noted that a lack of formal presence in country can affect coordination with other actors, such as the UN and opportunities for advocacy with the Government. A more formal presence might facilitate the signing of agreements and developing of partnerships to further support TRC.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 16: Explore whether the TRC might welcome a small increase in IFRC presence in Turkey, and perhaps the opening of a small delegation, if support services the TRC considers high priority are made available.</p>				
Management	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility

Response				
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected	<p>Within the context of the Syria Crisis response operation, TRC has the capacity to co-ordinate and deliver the operation at country level. IFRC Secretariat however remains open to consider alternative ways to support TRC and to discuss areas of cooperation that might be agreed TRC to support the operational response as the context and humanitarian needs evolve.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFRC Europe Zone will continue its regular contact with TRC and partner NSs and will continue to discuss the best possible services provision that the Secretariat can and should provide in this context. The IFRC Europe Zone office will also remain open to discuss with TRC the various modalities for cooperation. 		<p>Europe Zone</p>
<p>Comments: IFRC Secretariat has no need to increase its current country presence embedded inside the NS for the Syria Crisis response, but would reconsider this in relation to a request from the TRC to increase IFRC presence or would review with the NS if the operational context changes. There have been meetings in country, where an increase in cooperation and presence has been discussed, particularly in a context where other international organisations have opened offices for both operational and HD purposes. At the same time, TRC has engaged with IFRC representatives on specific technical areas, such as shelter, where shelter delegates have been in-country for projects. The current review of activities outside the camps also provides opportunities to support the NS with time bound technical expertise in areas such as psycho-social support, cash transfer, logistics, urban risk reduction and communications.</p>				
<p><u>REGIONAL LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS</u></p>				
<p><u>MOVEMENT ADVISORY PLATFORM (MAP)</u></p>				
<p>Recommendation 17 a: IFRC Secretariat (with the ICRC) should provide high-level technical support to HNS to develop 3-year movement-wide country plans, in accordance with the decisions of the ‘mini-MAP’ meeting of October 2014. These plans should be focused on responding the Syria crisis, not comprehensive NS development strategies. Given the many potential options for a ‘country plan’, the minimum expected content and basic structure should be agreed in advance with the HNS, so that a regional narrative and presentation can be added to attract donor interest.</p>				
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Decision Rationale</p>	<p>Action/s to be taken</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Responsibility</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>It is noted that there is an error in the recommendation – this was a decision of the full MAP not the “mini-MAP”, to support the country plans, but there has been slow progress on this to date. There are issues of ownership of the process, where some NSs were not represented at the meeting and only two have expressed interest in following up on</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an ambitious goal / recommendation. Although steps have been taken to follow up on and support Movement level, multi-year country plans, progress and commitment is variable across the countries involved in the crisis. Respective NSs have engaged in particular areas and LRC has agreed to lead on the Country Plans process within the MAP 	<p>Mid-2015</p>	<p>MENA Zone Europe Zone NSKD</p>

	<p>the plans (Jordan, Egypt). For this reason it is partially accepted, as IFRC Secretariat can support the process but not ensure it happens without NS buy-in. However, the IFRC Secretariat will fully support those NSs who want to move forward with this.</p>	<p>in the coming months and Jordan / Egypt have both committed to future engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFRC Secretariat has committed and will provide high level technical support from NSK Division representatives in Geneva and is working with ICRC on TOR for those NSs that want to proceed. This will be followed up at the next mini-MAP and will be re-endorsed by the full MAP when it meets. 		
<p>Comments: This point is complex and still under discussion between NSs, IFRC Secretariat and ICRC. To date, there has been limited engagement from NSs (SARC was not represented at the meeting but participated by video to present their own planning, TRC activities have to be closely coordinated with the Government’s planning (a strength for NS access and cooperation), and LRC is leading their own country planning process). On that basis there has not been progress around a common planning basis or approach and there would need to be a clear incentive for NSs to invest in this process i.e. an expectation of enhanced funding. As of March 2015, a draft guidance document on the way forward for defining and developing a country plan will be shared with the Steering Committee for consideration for implementation. This raises some questions around the ownership and effectiveness of the MAP process that may need to be addressed in the coming months and that are raised in the summary management response. There have been high expectations placed on the MAP process and it may be time to have a risk management strategy or consider a Plan B, if it is not able to deliver concrete results.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 17 b: The plans for, and progress of, the MAP process (including the Steering Group and mini-MAP) should be circulated more widely to ensure that interested stakeholders are more fully engaged.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p>	<p>This Recommendation is clearly accepted with no caveat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the circulation list for MAP and mini-MAP information (e.g. Syria TF, all Country Reps) and circulate a list of the membership of MAP of steering committee. Ensure all information is circulated to the full list in a timely manner- commitment to circulate minutes within 2 – 4 weeks of any meeting • Recommend minutes of mini-MAP steering committee are also circulated to all members of the MAP in a timely manner. 	<p>Ongoing for MAP process</p>	<p>MAP Steering Committee MAP members</p>
<p>Comments: There is a clear need to improve on the timeliness of the minutes of and follow up on the MAP and mini-MAP meetings. These have taken many weeks to circulate, to the point they become out of date</p>				

Recommendation 17c: The MAP process should conclude Movement wide country plans by March 2015 and a regional chapeau by June 2015 that brings all the plans together into a cogent whole, with resources specified for regional coordination and communications activities required.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected	<p>While the process is ongoing regarding country plans in one or two of the NSs, there has not been the commitment to follow up on this across the board and therefore it will be impossible to meet this recommendation within this timeframe. Both this objective and timeframe will have to be revisited at the next mini-MAP meeting to decide how best to proceed and the recommendation reviewed at that point to decide if it is partially achievable by country or achieved in another manner / timeframe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted in Recommendation 18a) there is commitment from LRC, JRC and ERC to carry out country plan processes. It is therefore important to focus support and limited resources on those NSs willing to move forward at a country level. IFRC Secretariat will therefore focus first on individual country planning processes, on a case by case or demand basis, possibly using LRC as the pilot, before discussing regional options. As per Recommendation 17a, the questions raised will be addressed at the next mini-MAP meeting, rendering the timings in the Recommendation unachievable 	Mid-2015	Country Offices NSKD
<p>Comments: As already mentioned under Recommendation 17 a), there is a concern in this management report that the RTE has put a lot of emphasis on the MAP process, but this is not linked to the evidence of the effectiveness or delivery of the MAP to date. There is a need to review the effectiveness of the MAP and to look at options to improve it or to move to a Plan B. It may be more realistic to focus on country planning on a case-by-case basis according to the context, constraints and engagement in each country and to do so over a longer timeframe. This can be linked to the current ongoing work with a team of consultants and NSs to build a bottom up MENA Strategy that is led by MENA NSs</p>				
<p><u>MEASURES TO IMPROVE INTERNAL COORDINATION, COMMUNICATION, AND SUPPORT ACROSS THE SYRIA CRISIS RESPONSE</u></p>				
<p>Recommendation 18a: The Secretariat should improve its internal communication and coordination for the Syria crisis by, for example, convening on a biweekly working level operational progress teleconference/meeting at regional level for the Syria crisis, including Europe and MENA zones, HQ, and country delegations, possibly chaired by the Head of Syria Crisis Operation based in Beirut.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>This recommendation is agreed to in principle but with amendments to the realism of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IFRC will establish regular working contact between zones and country teams on 	Monthly ongoing	Syria Crisis team

	timeframe and content	a more formal basis, but emphasises that it will be more realistic to achieve this every 1 - 2 months, becoming more frequent only in phases of acute crisis. We recommend that engagement from Zone and country level colleagues includes Communications/HD counterparts		
Comments:				
Recommendation 18b: To improve regular information flow with the PNS and Geneva Secretariat, the Secretariat should convene a teleconference, perhaps every 6 weeks, for each country, again at senior working level, with the individual HNS. (Demand will probably be highest for Syria itself).				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	It is unrealistic to hold such a wide reaching conference every 6 weeks, but agreed to hold a conference for the different country contexts on a regular basis, according to developing events and the NS engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SARC management, key PNSs and the Syria country team have started meeting monthly in Beirut to discuss and solve programme and operational issues. The first meeting took place in February – with positive feedback received from both SARC and PNSs – and a second meeting is scheduled for mid-March. Information on these meetings will be shared more widely. • In Lebanon, this will be discussed with LRC and PNS representatives to decide on their own process and frequency of their meetings • Likewise in Jordan, the Country Rep will discuss with the PNS representatives and come up with own process and frequency of their own meetings • This is seen as a challenge in Turkey, where there are fewer partners and TRC is more discreet about sharing information and coordinating with partners 	Ongoing	Country Offices

Comments:				
Recommendation 18c: The MENA Zone office, with the Europe Zone office, should issue a written communication on the respective roles and responsibilities of the Syria team and Syria crisis team, to clarify how they relate to each other.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This recommendation is fully accepted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IFRC Syria Crisis Team will draft a written communication to outline the roles and responsibilities of the various teams and the inter-relation between the two Zones. This would include the levels, lines and frequency of contact and should clarify who needs to be contacted or kept informed of different areas and levels of information 	March	Syria Crisis Team
Comments: This communication will be fully shared with the management of both Zones and Geneva before it is finalized and circulated				
Recommendation 18d: The Secretariat in Geneva should appoint one designated focal point for the Syria crisis, dedicated to the task of linking the operations coordination to the regional coordination level, with a widely advertised email and phone number.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Under review	This Recommendation is under review. It should be linked to the ongoing work around the decentralization report and its follow up and the pending decision around the Global Disaster Response SOPs (GDRSOPs) for response operations, including L3 equivalent disasters, where a global level coordination role is important (see also response to 18c).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any follow up action would be contingent upon clarification for a mandated role for Geneva Secretariat under the current decentralised structure (depending on the follow up to the decentralisation review next steps and approval of the GDRSOPs) and on the allocation of resources to support it. The further experience during the Ebola crisis and the establishment of an Ebola cell in Geneva may inform possible options in the future. This would obviously be linked to the resources available. 	Ongoing	USG PSD and GSMT
Comments: Over and above the points made under the rationale / actions section, the IFRC Secretariat would also need clarification on the added value this focal point would provide in relation to the Syria Crisis Team (which currently provides links between operations and regional coordination). It is however				

accepted that that the Geneva Secretariat can provide added value in the areas of specific technical and support services for the Syria Crisis.				
Recommendation 18e: The Directors of Zone concerned should call for additional technical support from Geneva HQ, especially, but not limited to, those areas where the zone office has no technical specialist. Geneva HQ should, in turn, propose to zone and country offices, through the designated HQ focal point, where technical support could usefully be provided.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	This recommendation has only been partially accepted as the IFRC is not clear on the real point of the recommendation. It appears to be linked to other recommendations around clarity of roles and responsibilities and the more in-depth planning process, which are accepted under Recommendation 18 e) . However, the need to request and supply high level, technical support where necessary is agreed in principle and hence the recommendation has been partially accepted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical support this will be negotiated between Zones and Geneva management as required, particularly when not available in the zones. The ability to provide said support will be contingent upon resources available. If there is a difference of opinion around the need for or options for providing that support, it will be taken to the next level of management for a decision 	Ongoing	MENA Zone Europe Zone PSD Tech Depts.
Comments:				
Recommendation 18f: By end April 2015, the two Directors of Zone should send a short progress report on the implementation of recommendations 18a-18e to the Secretary-General for his review.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected	Standard management reports should integrate adequate progress reports on these matters and additional layers of reporting should not be needed. This should be confirmed by the SG and his requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review with the SG if and when additional progress reports are needed, or if specific issues or events demand an update 	Second quarter	GSMT
Comments:				
<u>MENA ZONE STRATEGIC PLANNING EXERCISE</u>				
Recommendation 19a: The development of a 3-5 year DM development strategy for the countries of the Zone.				

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This has been fully accepted and has already been initiated through the deployment of a consultancy team over the past month or more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently a consultant team is working on a 5-year strategy for the MENA Zone, based on a bottom-up consultative approach, with NSs driving the agenda and findings. The first draft of the strategy is due in March 2015 	March – June	MENA Zone Management
Comments: This goes beyond the NSs involved in the Syria Crisis and covers a strategy for all NSs in the Zone				
Recommendation 19b: Developing greater clarity on the nature of the leadership the HNS and PNS expect from the Secretariat zone and country offices.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	This has been accepted as it will be in part covered by the work on the MENA Strategy outlined under Recommendation 19 a). The Secretariat also recognises that to develop greater clarity on leadership roles, further management discussions and a dialogue process with Movement stakeholders must be undertaken.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MENA Zone will ensure that the discussions with NSs to develop the 5-year strategy, will also seek to inform or develop clear recommendations to improve clarity in leadership based on the expectations between NSs and the Secretariat. 	Mid 2015	MENA Zone Management GSMT
Comments: Further to this recommendation (and referring to the issues raised in section 5.1 of the RTE report), the GSMT shall discuss the interpretation of the Secretariat leadership role and challenges to the business model outlined in the RTE – that is between model A (working with functions required to mount an at scale response to humanitarian needs) versus model B (working with the functions required for a response based on HNS capacity).				
Recommendation 19c: How to maintain sufficient human resources to support the Syria crisis operation, while at the same time providing the rest of the Zone with the support it requires.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	While the Secretariat recognises the validity of the point around addressing the human	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat will continue to recruit according to HR requirements and will 	Mid 2015	GSMT

<p>accepted</p>	<p>resourcing challenges and maintaining sufficient people to support the crisis response, the phrasing of this Recommendation is in the form of a question and does not make it a clear recommendation that can be specifically answered. It has therefore been partially accepted.</p>	<p>consider using emergency funding or reserves to reinforce Zone / Country level management structures in the event of a major disaster or crisis responses.</p>		<p>Human Resources</p>
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>Recommendation 19d: Engagement of Geneva HQ on how to address the general under-resourcing of the Zone Office compared with the current and possible future scale of crises in the zone.</p>				
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Decision Rationale</p>	<p>Action/s to be taken</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Responsibility</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accept</p>	<p>The Secretariat sees the validity of the point around the resourcing of the MENA Zone Office specifically and the different levels of the Secretariat at times of disaster or crisis more generally, and therefore accepts the Recommendation. Different options for addressing resource constraints need to be discussed / agreed at senior management level as they have implications for the wider IFRC Secretariat structure, the business model and decentralization.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat recognizes the need to look into other funding models for adequately resourcing Zone Offices to support longer-term crises and agrees to table this discussion with GSMT within 2015. A review of how IFRC Secretariat funding could better match the needs of today's crises is planned for 2015. As part of this, management will explore the options to expand funding beyond the current tools (primarily Emergency Appeals) towards other mechanisms for seeking and managing multi-year humanitarian and development funding. 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>GSMT RM DCM</p>
<p>Comments: This recommendation relates to the earlier discussion around moving beyond the limits of emergency appeal funding in a longer-term or chronic crisis. The challenges presented by the existing appeal process are not unique to the Syria Crisis and will require a deeper review of the IFRC's current ability to sustain multi-year, longer-term funding and to secure a flexible funding base. This also links to ongoing discussions on the IFRC Secretariat business model and decentralization. It is also noted that timely and adequate investments must be made in terms of the Zones' RM capacity which must be reinforced with qualified and trained personnel. Currently, re-deployment from Geneva is used in times of crisis, but this is not appropriate or sustainable for longer-term crises.</p>				
<p><u>REGIONAL LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS (cont.)</u></p>				

<p>Recommendation 20: The IFRC, led by the Secretariat, should develop a regional resource mobilisation strategy for the medium term. To gain longer-term financial support to maintain RCRC activities for Syrians and affected local communities in neighbouring countries, the IFRC will need to adopt a resilience approach and seek out development funding sources, not just traditional humanitarian donors. To be successful in this approach, it will require high quality, detailed proposals covering a 2-3 year time frame.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>This Recommendation has been partially accepted. The Secretariat recognises the constraints in humanitarian funding and the need for diversification of funding approaches for such a long-term crisis. However, it is also concerned that the impact of a mid to longer-term regional resource mobilization (RM) strategy would be limited by the challenge of engaging a more diversified and development oriented funding base to sustain the work being done by the NSs over the longer-term, at a time when donors are still operating within a humanitarian crisis rather than opening up more longer-term funding options. It was also felt that country specific funding approaches are more likely to yield results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The action under this Recommendation links to the MAP follow up, as NSs are expecting to see increased funding coming from that process. Therefore the IFRC Secretariat will encourage the MAP process to support work to support funding opportunities as part of multiple year country plans. 	<p>Mid 2015</p>	<p>GSMT MENA Zone Europe Zone HVD/RM</p>
<p>Comments: In responding to this Recommendation, the Secretariat recognises that its RM efforts for the Syria Crisis response are currently not organised around development planning/funding and that it will need to engage other approaches, skills/capacities to successfully access longer-term funding. The Secretariat Global Senior Management Team will be engaged to discuss and identify key areas and approaches that IFRC wants to prioritize and to agree on how the Secretariat can develop the skill base to support this across the different teams and put into place a more robust system for securing longer-term development funding through diversified funding streams.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 21: Alongside the regional resource mobilisation strategy, each country in the region should develop, with technical support, a mobilisation plan to raise resources in-country, via embassies, local donor representation, UN agencies and the private sector.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>This recommendation has been accepted, noting that, in line with the response above,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current RM strategic approach of the IFRC Secretariat includes steps to improve 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Country Offices</p>

	<p>fora in a uniform way and is more realistic to prioritise engagement based on the context, the needs and the usefulness of the individual forum or network.</p>	<p>prioritising attendance, ensuring the appropriate briefing and clarifying decision-making authority for those representing the IFRC.</p>	<p>Mid 2015</p>	
<p>Comments: GSMT decisions regarding the overarching vision for positioning the organisation and the priorities for investment of resources to engage in inter-agency networks / meetings, will be developed in consultation with the IFRC membership. Engagement strategies will be disseminated to the membership, alongside the related resource implications.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 23: The Secretariat should build on current good practices regarding the presentation IFRC-wide planning and reporting, as observed from Lebanon, Turkey and the MENA Zone office, by working with PNS to; 1) reflect bilateral plans and contributions in the EPOA and the Emergency Appeal, in both the narrative and budget columns designed for the purpose, and 2) listing bilateral contributions in the Donor Response document. The combination of 1) and 2) will provide a better overview of the IFRC-wide contribution to the Syria Crisis response. (This recommendation could also have global application).</p>				
<p>Management Response</p>	<p>Decision Rationale</p>	<p>Action/s to be taken</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Responsibility</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Accepted</p>	<p>The IFRC fully accepts this recommendation and agrees it should be standard in any appeal or planning / programming document, to reflect the actions of IFRC partners in country. In MENA Zone this continues to be taken forward by the 4Ws process and the Federation Wide Planning and Reporting work, where the ambition is make it Movement-wide.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IFRC will continue to use and improve the 4Ws as base to respond to wider IFRC (and Movement) reporting, particularly on the narrative level and will use it to maintain information management products set up in relation to the Syria Crisis response. • In relation to Federation Wide Planning and Reporting, there are challenges to pull together the divergent approaches and indicators into a coherent and complete report. This will be referred to the MAP process to help resolve - to invest in the resources and processes to set up and sustain Federation, or rather Movement-wide, reporting and to invest in improving data 	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>MENA / Europe Zone PMER GVA PED Finance</p>

		gathering, analysis and monitoring.		
<p>Comments: There is a need to follow up with Finance and GSMT to ensure the financial and planning systems investigate the necessary changes to make the appeal and reporting systems more open to demonstrating the Federation-wide contributions.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 24: To help ensure that all Secretariat and ICRC staff in the region understand the intention to increase cooperation between the organisations, it is proposed that the ICRC Director-General and the IFRC Secretary-General send internal communications to their staff in the region, spelling out their intent for closer cooperation between the organisations, and highlighting particular areas where cooperation is to be strengthened.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>The Secretariat supports the principle of this recommendation. In addition to a message from senior management, more would should be done to ensure greater common understanding amongst regional and country teams of the roles and mandates of each organisation, particularly in relation to the support to and expectations of the NS membership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IFRC SG and the ICRC DG have agreed and disseminated a generic global message relating to the Strengthening Movement Coordination and Cooperation (SMCC) process in February 2015. • A specific message supporting stronger Movement cooperation will be prepared in the context of the next MAP meeting and disseminated broadly. • Movement country teams have been encouraged to meet more often, and with key decision makers present, to Promote understanding and respect for the different roles of the Movement components and how they may work effectively together. 	Ongoing	<p>OSG Movement country teams</p>
<p>Comments: This recommendation links to engagement underway between the IFRC Secretary General and the ICRC Director General (e.g. offsite in 9 January 2015) and other high level discussions between both organisations through the SMCC process which focusses on improving coordination and communications around major disasters, conflicts and crises. Critical to improved Movement coordination and cooperation is an understanding of, and respect for, the capacities and roles of the NS in the affected country and of NS providing assistance.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 25: Working with Secretariat HQ, the Zone offices should invite PNS (traditional and non-traditional) to provide or fund senior technical support for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Movement wide country plans, in line with the on-going MAP process b. A Syria region resource mobilization strategy, and country strategies c. A Humanitarian Diplomacy Strategy, building on the work already done in devising the Movement Communications Strategy. 				

Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>This recommendation is accepted, as the IFRC encourages PNS engagement in country planning, RM and HD support to the NSs involved in this crisis. However, it should be noted that the point on the HD Strategy is less clear, as this was not mentioned elsewhere in the report or other recommendations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As agreed under the recommendations above on the planning and RM processes, the Secretariat will encourage PNS to support, with both human resources and funding, the MAP Movement-wide Country Plans and country (or regional) RM strategies (points a) and b) in the Recommendation). The Secretariat is considering adopting a Standing Conference Call at the outset of a crisis, to invite supportive NSs to engage, with support from Secretariat HQ and Zone staff, on providing pools of human resources with competencies in RM and HD to help coordinate RM and HD strategies 	Ongoing	<p>MENA Zone Europe Zone HVD / Comms</p>
<p>Comments: Whilst the Secretariat strongly supports engagement from PNS in support of planning, RM and HD objectives, it would stress that this should be in support of the needs expressed by the NSs and teams on the ground and not according to the PNS's own objectives. The effective implementation of a Movement communications strategy would require dedicated resources and engagement from all Movement components. While work on this Strategy progressed in 2014 for the Syria Crisis, Zone management require further support for effective Movement communications.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 26: The Secretariat should convene the HNS at operational level, to share practical lessons (as proposed by SARC). The Secretariat should first test the interest level of the NS concerned.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>The Secretariat is supportive of this process in general, but recognises that it may be best served through mechanisms other than a meeting (bearing in mind SARC's restrictions on leaving Syria and time and resource constraints). Practical lessons for the neighbouring countries are often quite different to those of SARC and it may be more relevant to have a meeting between the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer the proposal for an operational lessons learnt process to the next mini-MAP or MAP meeting, to confirm the level of interest among the NSs. Upon confirmation of interest, the MENA Zone may follow up with a lessons learned exercise which could also provide an opportunity to consider other pending issues, such as longer-term recovery 	Mid-2015	<p>Syria Country Rep MENA Zone</p>

	neighbouring countries to share their experiences.	<p>planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat will also look into options to capture lessons from SARC's experience to share with a wider audience. 	Ongoing	
Comments:				
<u>GLOBAL/GENERAL LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS</u>				
Recommendations 27: The Secretariat should complete and publish the Global Disaster Response Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), with a modification for how the decision is made on the location and organisation of the Secretariat leadership of the response to a major crisis. It is proposed that the standard procedure should be for the Secretary-General to make the decision based on the advice of senior management from the zone(s) concerned and HQ, with a written instruction, valid for a set duration.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	The GDRSOPs have been drafted and put procedures in place to address the issues of roles and responsibilities in disaster response in the decentralised structure for different levels of response. However, this Recommendation has been partially accepted as these SOPs have not been agreed by the GSMT and are also pending further discussions around the Decentralization Review findings and other key strategic decisions. It is accepted that it may be appropriate for the SG (in contact with his management team and the ICRC) to issue specific written instructions on the management procedures for a specific response.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat will revise and re-circulate the GDRSOPs to Secretariat stakeholders, for further information and feedback. They will then be re-submitted to the GSMT for a decision. In discussing the GDRSOPs the GSMT will decide on the need for a more directive process for the SG to issue written instructions on the management procedures for a specific response context. 	Mid 2015	GSMT PSD / DCM Dept.
Comments: It was noted in the discussions that the IFRC's GDRSOPs should be relevant to the RCRC approaches and language and not necessarily follow UN terminology or categorization - i.e. . not focus solely on Level 3 responses.				
Recommendation 28: The Secretariat should consider how to revise its incentive systems for its managers of offices and delegations to measure and reward performance against clearly defined tasks and products, in line with the SOPs, rather than using resources raised for the Secretariat as a key performance				

indicator.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	<p>This recommendation is not clear in its specific references to an “incentive system” for managers. The response focusses on the current practice of setting KPIs around volume of business rather than quality of performance or delivery coverage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat agrees to review the use of appeal coverage rates as a KPI to measure performance, as it is not linked to delivery of services to vulnerable people and is potentially counterproductive to the good delivery of those important services. The Secretariat will seek to use a series of KPIs that relate more to the quality and delivery of services. The Secretariat will further develop its accountability systems for managers of offices and delegations. 	Ongoing	<p>GSMT HR Dept. PED</p>
<p>Comments: It is noted that the use of Emergency Appeal coverage rates as a KPI for Secretariat managers may create an incentive to limit the scope of appeals to reflect available funding rather than the scale of humanitarian need and the capacity of the IFRC to respond. The approach of using Emergency Appeal coverage rates as a KPI for Secretariat managers is not consistent with the Principles and Rules for RCRC Humanitarian Assistance.</p>				
<p>Recommendation 29: The IFRC should ensure a more predictable response to major emergencies by 1) analysing disaster and crisis risks in the countries most at risk of crisis or disaster (say the top 20⁴), 2) map the likely response capacity of the National Societies in those countries, based on the NS own self-assessment, 3) create a dialogue and plan for how an emergency response would be scaled up, building on any OCAC and CAS results available, in consultation with the HNS and Movement partners active in the country.</p>				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	<p>This is agreed and is fully in line with the Principles and Rules for RCRC Humanitarian Assistance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contingency planning and preparedness activities will be expanded and include the most disaster and crisis prone countries and include Movement and non-Movement partners, in line with current Contingency Planning Guidelines. The Secretariat is currently exploring the 	Ongoing	<p>Zones OD Dept. DCM Dept.</p>

		feasibility of enhanced information management system for local to global risk monitoring and analysis.		
Comments:				
Recommendation 30: The Organisational Capacity and Certification (OCAC) process should be amended to include NS capacity for disaster management within its scope.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Partially accepted	The OCAC self assessment process focussed on NS capacities overall and not specifically on NS capacity to implement disaster management programmes. However, as disaster management is often a core mandate of NS the results of the OCAC process should be relevant to assessing some elements of the NS DM capacity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IFRC Secretariat will consider amendments to the OCAC self assessment methodology and indicators on the basis of lessons learnt. As DM is a core mandate for most NS, further indicators for assessing NS capacity in DM will be considered. 	Ongoing	OD Dept.
Comments: NS disaster management capacity are assessed through the “Well Prepared NS” process and this shouldn’t overlap with the purpose and remit of the OCAC process.				
Recommendation 31: The IFRC Secretariat should work to improve the quality of its own, and NS, response planning and preparedness, in particular, needs assessment, vulnerability analysis, and gap analysis, including assessment of non-RCRC actors, and beneficiary consultation, as part of a general standards improvement initiative, which is amongst the new Secretary-General’s priorities.				
Management Response	Decision Rationale	Action/s to be taken	Timeframe	Responsibility
<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted	The IFRC secretariat agrees on the need to continue its work to seek to improve standards in the areas outlined and will address this as far as resources and capacities allow.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiatives to improve needs assessment, vulnerability / gap analysis etc. are within the priorities of the Secretariat global DM team as part of current business. The Secretariat will seek to raise and target more resources into this area of work. Earlier feedback on Recommendation 22 in relation to monitoring and analysing data around disaster prone countries will be further 	Ongoing	DCM Dept. Zone DMCs Communications

		<p>supported through participation with other organisations (e.g. ACAPs). There will be a greater focus from the Secretariat in Geneva on supporting Zones to ensure the quality of the data assessment and analysis during major disasters or crises</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat is committed to build upon learning and innovation in beneficiary communication. A global coordination position on beneficiary communications and accountability to affected populations was agreed at the 2013 general Assembly and is being recruited. 		
<p>Comments: There is a clear link here to Recommendation 22 around the need to prioritize the monitoring and analysis of disaster risk information and there will be efforts to join up the response to the two recommendations in the practical follow up taken. The Secretary General has recognised the priority of to strengthening support to NS for improved standards and quality in response planning and preparedness.</p>				