



INTERNAL AUDIT DIVISION

REPORT 2018/105

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

The Emergency Relief Coordinator needed to formulate a vision, mission and strategy to implement the mandate for inter-agency coordination, operationalizing the role of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee as the primary mechanism for global coordination

31 October 2018
Assignment No. AN2017/590/02

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the strategic support provided to the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) in the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms. The objective of the audit was to assess the effectiveness of strategic coordination systems in supporting the ERC to fulfil his responsibilities in delivering global humanitarian assistance under General Assembly resolution 46/182. The audit covered the period from 1 January 2016 to 31 August 2017 and included a review of the governance, organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the humanitarian programme cycle.

Under the ERC's leadership, the IASC, composed of Principals representing United Nations agencies involved in humanitarian operations, is responsible for inter-agency coordination of programming humanitarian requirements. While the IASC Principals endorsed their 2018-2019 strategic priorities and met frequently during the audit period, the ERC needed to formulate a vision, mission and strategy to implement the mandate for inter-agency coordination, operationalizing the role of IASC as the primary mechanism for global coordination.

OIOS made four recommendations. To address issues identified in the audit, the ERC, in conjunction with the Principals of the IASC and with support from Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), needed to:

- Establish a clear vision, mission and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182, clarifying the roles of the IASC as the primary mechanism and of OCHA as support;
- Update the terms of reference of the IASC to clarify the collective commitment, accountability, decision-making framework and working methods of the Principals, Working Group and Emergency Directors' Group; and
- Develop a funding mechanism for IASC core activities and establish controls to oversee the allocation and utilization of funding for IASC activities.

In addition, OCHA needed to establish a formal mechanism for governance of enterprise information technology that complies with the established Secretariat information and communications technology policies.

OCHA accepted the recommendations and has initiated action to implement them.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
I. BACKGROUND	1-2
II. AUDIT OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	2
III. AUDIT RESULTS	2-7
A. IASC governance, organizational structure, roles and responsibilities	2-5
B. Humanitarian programme cycle	5-7
IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	7
ANNEX I Status of audit recommendations	
APPENDIX I Management response	

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) conducted an audit of the strategic support provided to the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) in the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms.

2. In December 1991, the General Assembly adopted resolution 46/182 designed to strengthen the United Nations response to complex emergencies and natural disasters while improving the overall effectiveness of humanitarian operations in the field. The resolution created the position of the ERC, who would act as the principal advisor to the Secretary-General on humanitarian affairs. The ERC is responsible for: (a) overseeing all emergencies requiring United Nations humanitarian assistance, (b) managing information and advocating humanitarian issues with governments of affected countries, donors and other interested states, (c) designating humanitarian coordinators and providing them, as well as United Nations resident coordinators, with guidance and direction on humanitarian matters, and (d) leading the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), which serves as the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian affairs.

3. The IASC is composed of 10 full members (Principals) and eight Standing Invitees. The Principals represent United Nations agencies involved in humanitarian operations whereas the invitees mainly consist of the World Bank and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) consortia. Under the ERC's leadership, the IASC is responsible for inter-agency coordination of programming humanitarian requirements, which ranged from approximately \$20 billion in 2016 to \$23 billion in 2017 as of 5 June 2017¹. Of these requirements, about \$12 billion in 2016 and \$7 billion in 2017 were funded as of the same period to provide humanitarian assistance in approximately 40 countries.

4. The 2014 terms of reference of the IASC defined its objective and operational structure. The formal governance structure of the IASC include the IASC Principals, the Principals Steering Group, the Working Group, the Emergency Directors Group (EDG), and the IASC secretariat, which provides support to the IASC and its subsidiary bodies.

5. At the country level, humanitarian country teams coordinate humanitarian assistance under the leadership of humanitarian coordinators, who perform their responsibilities on behalf of the ERC.

6. In the Secretariat, OCHA supports the ERC through working closely with members of the IASC as well as relevant inter-governmental organizations and NGOs to coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action. The Strategic Planning, Evaluation and Guidance Section (SPEGS) promotes the accountability and transparency of inter-agency humanitarian responses by coordinating independent inter-agency evaluations as chair of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations Working Group. The Programme Support Branch (PSB) supports humanitarian actors to respond in a coordinated way to humanitarian situations and ensures a more effective and targeted delivery of assistance. The Branch provides technical support to implement a strategic, coordinated and coherent humanitarian programme cycle. The Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) is responsible for: (i) setting the longer-term policy agenda for OCHA and the humanitarian community at large, and (ii) leading OCHA's engagement and coordination of the Secretary-General's mandatory reporting to inter-governmental bodies. The Branch

¹ Source: OCHA Financial Tracking System

supports the development of common policy positions among humanitarian agencies and represents OCHA in many United Nations processes to advocate humanitarian perspectives in policy making.

7. Comments provided by OCHA are incorporated in italics.

II. AUDIT OBJECTIVE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

8. The objective of the audit was to assess the effectiveness of strategic coordination systems in supporting the ERC to fulfil his responsibilities in delivering global humanitarian assistance under General Assembly resolution 46/182.

9. This audit was included in the 2017 risk-based work plan of OIOS due to the risks that the strategic support to the ERC may not be effective in coordinating humanitarian emergency assistance through the IASC.

10. OIOS conducted this audit from July 2017 to February 2018. The audit covered the period from 1 January 2016 to 31 August 2017. Based on an activity-level risk assessment, the audit covered higher and medium risk areas in the IASC governance, organizational structure, roles and responsibilities; and humanitarian programme cycle.

11. The audit methodology included: (a) interviews of key OCHA personnel, relevant United Nations agencies, and other humanitarian actors, (b) reviews of relevant documentation, and (c) analytical reviews of operational and evaluation reports and data.

12. The audit was conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.

III. AUDIT RESULTS

A. IASC governance, organizational structure, roles and responsibilities

The ERC needed to translate the mandate for inter-agency coordination into a vision, mission and strategy

13. General Assembly resolution 46/182 tasked the ERC, under the direction of the Secretary-General, to strengthen the coordination of humanitarian emergency assistance in the United Nations. The resolution also established the IASC as part of the global inter-agency coordination architecture. Under the leadership of the ERC, the role of the IASC was reaffirmed in General Assembly resolution 48/57 as the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination.

14. Although the IASC objectives and operational structure are defined in the IASC terms of reference (TOR), there was no accompanying ERC vision and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under resolution 46/182, operationalizing the role of IASC as the primary mechanism. While OCHA strategic plans have elements of the ERC's strategic objectives on global delivery of humanitarian assistance, these were only subject to internal approvals at OCHA and did not necessarily reflect the strategic priorities of the IASC. Therefore, they were insufficient to ensure collective commitment and accountability by IASC members for the successful implementation of global inter-agency coordination.

15. The TOR was last revised in 2014 and differed with the one approved in 1998, in that it: (a) added OCHA to the list of United Nations operational agencies, presumably with the same status as the other operational agencies; and (b) included the EDG, which was established in 2013, to focus primarily on operational issues and supporting the roll-out of the Transformative Agenda. However, according to the 2017 report “Creating a better OCHA: Outcomes of the design phase of OCHA’s change process,” OCHA emphasised that it was not an independent operational agency. The TOR, therefore, needed to more accurately reflect OCHA’s role in supporting the ERC and the IASC. Additionally, while the TOR indicated that the IASC would endeavour to make all decisions by consensus, it did not require any specific quorum in meetings for the decisions to be binding.

16. To assess the effective coordination of system-wide global emergency humanitarian assistance, OIOS reviewed: (a) the minutes of meetings of the IASC Principals and its Working Group; (b) results of internal IASC reviews undertaken in 2003 and 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the “2003 report” and the “2014 report” respectively); (c) IASC role in developing policies and operational guidance; and (d) feedback from programme managers representing member agencies and NGOs. OIOS observed that:

- a. Minutes of the IASC meetings: IASC Principals held six meetings during the audit period; however, attendance was low. Also, from the minutes there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate whether key decisions had been made by consensus or by “convergence of the majority,” which is permissible under specific conditions.
- b. The results of the 2003 and 2014 IASC reviews: The 2003 and 2014 reports, overall, determined that the IASC was viewed by stakeholders as relevant and necessary. However, they concluded that there was insufficient commitment to collective leadership and accountability both at the level of the ERC and of the Principals. They also noted that the IASC could have been more effective in its working methods. Evidence obtained during this audit, as well as interviews with OCHA programme managers, representatives of participating agencies and NGOs indicated that the observations in the commissioned reviews were still relevant.
- c. Important policies and initiatives with inter-agency impact were not always initiated and endorsed at the IASC: PSB and PDSB in OCHA regularly conducted policy studies and developed policies and guidelines affecting inter-agency humanitarian response. However, these were not always channelled and advocated through the formal IASC mechanisms. Also, many initiatives and commitments of the humanitarian community were also not coordinated or implemented through the IASC. For example, the World Humanitarian Summit was not planned or conducted under the auspices of the IASC. The actionable policies and practices to operationalize these commitments were supported by structures outside the IASC. Additionally, several other informal fora existed outside the IASC to discuss issues of policy or guidelines. The Global Cluster Coordination Group, for example, engaged in significant policy discussions on cash programming, but it had no formal reporting line to the IASC.

17. To address some of the above, the IASC Principals, at their retreat in April 2017, authorised the Deputy ERC to convene and chair a joint meeting of the IASC Working Group and EDG by October 2017 as a pilot, with lessons learned intended as a basis for consideration by the Principals in restructuring of the IASC. At the IASC Principals meeting held on 31 May 2018, the Deputy ERC presented the proposed IASC strategic priorities for 2018-2019 comprising: humanitarian financing; inclusion and accountability; collective advocacy; humanitarian-development collaboration; and operational response. They represent the basis for planning IASC activities, and to ensure ‘form follows function’. The Principals, based on the recommendations made by the Working Group, agreed to:

- a. Rationalize IASC structures below the Principals, recognising the need to maintain the operational support as provided by the EDG and to consider the viability of merging the Deputies Forum and the Working Group. Accordingly, an options paper on the configurations for the IASC structures beneath the Principals would be put forward for decision by the Principals later in November 2018;
- b. Review coordination structures that enables the system to move forward effectively; and
- c. Actively incorporate collective insight from IASC partners for faster, more collaborative and dynamic solutions facilitated by the IASC secretariat.

18. While the 31 May 2018 meeting of the IASC Principals endorsed the 2018-2019 strategic priorities and agreed on steps to structure the IASC beneath its Principals, it is still important for the ERC to formulate his vision, mission and strategy to implement his inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182 in rationalizing these structures. The IASC TOR also need to have clearer rules of engagement, including establishing a quorum for IASC Principals' decisions to be binding. This will enable the ERC to further strengthen systemwide coordination of humanitarian emergency response and better prepare the humanitarian system for more effective coordination with the other United Nations pillars of development, peace and security and human rights in alignment with the Secretary-General's reform agenda.

(1) The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and with support from OCHA, establish a clear vision, mission and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182, clarifying the roles of the Committee as the primary mechanism and of OCHA as support.

OCHA accepted recommendation 1 and stated that the IASC had been undergoing a renewal under the leadership of the current ERC since September 2017. The ERC had consulted with the Principals to put forth a renewed approach and new structures underneath the Principals to ensure that IASC is able to deliver on its mandate in line with the vision and priorities of the IASC Principals. Consultations were also underway to ensure better relevance of the IASC through stronger engagement with critical actors in humanitarian action. Recommendation 1 remains open pending finalization and implementation of the structures and working methods in line with vision and priorities of the IASC.

(2) The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals and with support from OCHA, update the terms of reference of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to clarify the collective commitment, accountability, decision-making framework and working methods of the Principals, Working Group and Emergency Directors' Group.

OCHA accepted recommendation 2 and stated that the IASC secretariat had embarked on a review of the IASC and its structures underneath the Principals. This entailed robust consultations with IASC members to ensure buy-in and ownership of the new structures and working methods to enhance accountability and efficiencies. Recommendation 2 remains open pending finalization and implementation of the structures and working methods of the IASC.

The funding of IASC operations needed to be more transparent

19. A transparent funding mechanism is necessary for the IASC to effectively implement the ERC's vision, mission and strategic plan. Complete financial information on the full scope of the activities of the IASC is also necessary to accurately measure the cost effectiveness of activities undertaken by the IASC.

20. The IASC TOR did not cover the funding mechanism to support IASC activities. It also did not require periodic reporting to the IASC Principals on the use of resources. While the funding of the IASC secretariat and other OCHA support, consisting mainly of extrabudgetary resources, was included in the OCHA programme budget, the sources of funding of other activities of IASC carried out by its subsidiary bodies such as the Task Teams, Reference Groups, and Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team (STAIT)/Peer-to-Peer were not reflected under an IASC or any other identifiable cost centre. For example, the Task Teams and the Reference Groups relied on voluntary funding from sponsoring organizations or donors. STAIT/Peer-to-Peer activities were funded under a project for which the project staff undertook their own resource mobilization. Furthermore, there were no consolidated budgeting and financial reporting processes for the overall IASC activities informing the ERC about the funding sustainability and effectiveness in the use of resources.

21. As a result, the Principals did not have any visibility of the financial needs and overall financial condition of the IASC. This rendered the funding mechanism ad hoc and risked its sustainability. Consequently, the core activities of IASC may not have adequate resources to support them. During the IASC meeting on 31 May 2018, the Deputy ERC briefed the Principals on the recommendations of the Deputies for strengthening the IASC secretariat through secondments from IASC members.

(3) The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and with support from OCHA: (i) develop a funding mechanism for IASC core activities; and (ii) establish controls to oversee the allocation and utilization of funding for IASC activities.

OCHA accepted recommendation 3 and stated that participating IASC organizations were encouraged to second staff to the Secretariat, and OCHA would explore the feasibility of developing a funding mechanism for IASC core activities. Recommendation 3 remains open pending development of a funding mechanism for IASC core activities.

B. Humanitarian programme cycle

The humanitarian programme cycle was being reviewed to ensure that it realizes its intended value

22. In 2013, the IASC introduced the humanitarian programme cycle (HPC) to replace the Consolidated Appeals Process in the context of the Transformative Agenda. General Assembly resolution 71/127 called upon United Nations organizations to support the improvement of the HPC, in consultation with affected states, to strengthen the coordination of humanitarian action to meet the needs of people affected by humanitarian emergencies.

23. The HPC had significantly contributed to a more systematic planning and implementation of humanitarian assistance and improved oversight and better coordination. However, its application in some contexts may have led to more attention being given to processes rather than the efficiency and effectiveness of assistance endangering the gains that had been made by refocusing on humanitarian response, identification of funding requirements, establishment of a framework for humanitarian action and

monitoring procedures. To address these risks, there was a need to undertake a global evaluation of the HPC approach as inter-agency evaluations were more focused on individual emergency responses.

24. OCHA indicated that work was currently ongoing to gain lessons learned for improving the HPC; therefore, no recommendation is made on this issue.

OCHA needed to strengthen governance over information technology

25. General Assembly resolution 71/127 stressed the importance of accurate and reliable information to ensure better assessment of needs to improve preparedness and humanitarian response.

26. The HPC Information Services Unit in PSB is responsible for development and maintenance of information services and tools to support coordination of the HPC needs assessment, needs analysis, response planning, and response monitoring, including financial tracking. During the audit period, the Unit was in the process of implementing the “HPC.tools” project that involved changes to the technology supporting the HPC information ecosystem related to: (a) new tools to transform needs assessment and analysis, (b) replacement of the Online Project System, (c) introduction of a response planning and monitoring tool, and (d) ongoing integration and redevelopment of the Financial Tracking System

27. Some of the needs assessment and analysis tools were being developed by external partners, and the rest of the tools by OCHA. Initially, a vendor was engaged to provide the software development service, but this was discontinued after the vendor was deemed not cost-effective. Currently the tools are being developed by contracted programmers under the supervision of PSB following the Agile approach. While the Agile approach allows for flexibility to develop and pilot applications before scaling them up and adding features, it does present risks, especially in an environment of very diverse stakeholders in the humanitarian community. The risks include: failure to identify alternate solutions that may be more cost efficient and a better business fit; potential scope creep resulting in additional costs being incurred; inadequate testing resulting in poor software quality; insufficient systems documentation that could hamper future maintenance; and unclear responsibilities for ensuring cost management and project success.

28. While there was no evidence that these risks had impacted the current HPC information services projects managed by OCHA, there was no formal process for continuous monitoring of project risks. In addition, no business case was completed for the project. The critical success factors for the project had also not been clearly identified, benchmarked and monitored during project implementation. An effective OCHA governance structure over information technology projects was therefore needed to minimize the related risks.

29. At the time of the audit, OCHA did not have an information technology governance structure, but was in the middle of a major reorganization that could result in centralization of all sections whose core responsibilities are related to information technology. The new structure needs to consider an appropriate information technology governance mechanism that would be responsible to ensure that: (a) information technology project prioritization is aligned with OCHA’s strategic and business objectives; (b) OCHA priority projects are adequately resourced to ensure completion on time, on budget and within scope; and (c) related risks are monitored on an ongoing basis. Potential cost overruns, failure to meet user needs, inadequate systems documentation and low buy-in from users could result if effective governance over enterprise information technology is not established.

<p>(4) OCHA should establish a formal mechanism for governance of enterprise information technology that complies with the established Secretariat information and communications technology policies.</p>

OCHA accepted recommendation 4 and stated that it had been following established Secretariat information and communications technology (ICT) policies for the governance of enterprise information technology and was an active member of the ICT Architecture Review Board. Further to the completion of OCHA's change management process and establishment of overall corporate governance, OCHA will be establishing a formal process for the ongoing review and governance of ICT, digital, data and information management initiatives and projects managed by OCHA. Recommendation 4 remains open pending establishment of a formal process for the ongoing review and governance of ICT projects managed by OCHA.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

30. OIOS wishes to express its appreciation to the management and staff of OCHA for the assistance and cooperation extended to the auditors during this assignment.

(Signed) Eleanor T. Burns
Director, Internal Audit Division
Office of Internal Oversight Services

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ² / Important ³	C/ O ⁴	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁵
1	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and with support from OCHA, establish a clear vision, mission and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182, clarifying the roles of the Committee as the primary mechanism and of OCHA as support.	Important	O	Submission of evidence on the establishment of a clear vision, mission and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182, clarifying the roles of the Committee as the primary mechanism and of OCHA as support.	31 March 2019
2	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals and with support from OCHA, update the terms of reference of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to clarify the collective commitment, accountability, decision-making framework and working methods of the Principals, Working Group and Emergency Directors' Group.	Important	O	Submission of evidence on the updated terms of reference of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to clarify the collective commitment, accountability, decision-making framework and working methods of the Principals, Working Group and Emergency Directors' Group.	31 March 2019
3	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and with support from OCHA: (i) develop a funding mechanism for IASC core activities; and (ii) establish controls to oversee the allocation and utilization of funding for IASC activities.	Important	O	Submission of evidence on the: (i) development of a funding mechanism for IASC core activities; and (ii) establishment of controls to oversee the allocation and utilization of funding for IASC activities.	30 September 2019
4	OCHA should establish a formal mechanism for governance of enterprise information technology that complies with the established Secretariat	Important	O	Submission of evidence on the establishment of a formal mechanism for governance of enterprise information technology that complies	30 September 2021

² Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

³ Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

⁴ C = closed, O = open

⁵ Date provided by OCHA in response to recommendations

STATUS OF AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ² / Important ³	C/ O ⁴	Actions needed to close recommendation	Implementation date ⁵
	information and communications technology policies.			with the established Secretariat information and communications technology policies.	

APPENDIX I

Management Response

United Nations  Nations Unies
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM MEMORANDUM INTERIEUR

TO: Ms. Muriette Lawrence-Hume, Chief
A: New York Audit Service,
Internal Audit Division, OIOS

DATE: 25 October 2018

THROUGH:

S/C DE:

REFERENCE:

FROM: Mark Lowcock, ~~Under-Secretary-General~~ *Alay* for
DE: Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief
Coordinator

SUBJECT: **Draft report on an audit of strategic support to the global**
OBJET: **humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms**
(Assignment No. AN2017/590/02)

In reference to your memorandum dated 25 September 2018, I am enclosing herewith OCHA's response to the draft report and the recommendations issued.

Copy to: Ms. Annie Tanmizi, Executive Officer a.i., OCHA

Management Response

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
1	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and with support from OCHA, establish a clear vision, mission and strategy to implement the global inter-agency coordination mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/182, clarifying the roles of the Committee as the primary mechanism and of OCHA as support.	Important	Yes	OCHA	First quarter of 2019	Under leadership of a new USG/ERC (since September 2017), the IASC is undergoing a renewal. The ERC has undertaken consultations to put forth a renewed approach to ensure the ability of the IASC to deliver on its mandate. In addition to endorsing the IASC Strategic Priorities (2018-2019), the IASC secretariat has been tasked to develop a detailed workplan to ensure the implementation of these priorities. In addition, a review of the structures underneath the Principals are underway to ensure that the IASC is able to deliver on the vision and priorities of the IASC Principals. Consultations are also underway to ensure better relevance of the IASC through stronger engagement with critical actors in humanitarian action.
2	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals and with support from OCHA, update the terms of reference of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee to clarify the collective commitment, accountability, decision-	Important	Yes	OCHA	First quarter of 2019	The IASC secretariat has embarked on a process for the review of the IASC and its structures underneath the Principals. This entails robust consultations with IASC Members to ensure buy-in and ownership of the

¹ Critical recommendations address critical and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided with regard to the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

² Important recommendations address important (but not critical or pervasive) deficiencies in governance, risk management or control processes, such that reasonable assurance may be at risk regarding the achievement of control and/or business objectives under review.

Management Response

Audit of strategic support to the global humanitarian inter-agency coordination mechanisms

Rec. no.	Recommendation	Critical ¹ / Important ²	Accepted? (Yes/No)	Title of responsible individual	Implementation date	Client comments
	making framework and working methods of the Principals, Working Group and Emergency Directors' Group.					new structures and working methods to enhance accountability and efficiencies.
3	The Emergency Relief Coordinator should, in conjunction with the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and with support from OCHA: (i) develop a funding mechanism for IASC core activities; and (ii) establish controls to oversee the allocation and utilization of funding for IASC activities.	Important	Yes	OCHA	Third quarter of 2019	Organizations are encouraged to second staff to the Secretariat and OCHA will explore the feasibility of developing a funding mechanism for IASC core activities.
4	OCHA should establish a formal mechanism for governance of enterprise information technology that complies with the established Secretariat information and communications technology policies.	Important	Yes	OCHA	Third quarter of 2021	OCHA has been following established Secretariat ICT policies for the governance of enterprise information technology and has been an active member of the ICT Architecture Review Board and related fora. Further to the completion of OCHA's change management process and establishment of overall corporate governance, OCHA is establishing a formal process for the ongoing review and governance of ICT, digital, data and IM initiatives and projects managed by OCHA. This review process will be in line with ICT policies but will also look at strategic value and cost/benefit to the organization, with recommendations made to the new OCHA operations committee, headed by the USG.