

Mandate Review: Effective Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance

Questions and Answers

This document provides a written response to questions Member States submitted to the Co-Chairs. Some questions have been amalgamated into general thematic questions. It also outlines changes made to the Co-Chair's preliminary analysis through consultation with Member States.

Response to other questions arising during the consultation process

General questions

1. What are the opinions of the affected countries?

Response: Member States mentioned in the Mandates were contacted by letter on the 15th of February to request their feedback on the preliminary analysis. The Co-Chairs had close consultation with these countries, and their feedback has been instrumental in improving the analysis. Where applicable, recommendations explicitly state when the affected country agrees with the analysis. Of the Red and Amber Mandates, only comments from Timor-Leste are still forthcoming and final confirmation is expected from the Democratic Republic of Congo by the meeting on Friday 4th of April.

2. What level of resources do these mandates use, and what will the financial implications of changes be?

Response: While the problem of disconnect between Mandates and output based budgeting cannot be entirely bridged – as there is no linear relationship between Mandates and resources allocated – the Controller has advised the following way to address the issue of quantifying financial implications of any changes recommended by the Mandate Review process.

The office of the Controller, in conjunction with Programme Managers, will map the effects of recommendations agreed by Member States to sub-programmes and outputs. This will determine possible financial implications of acting on recommendations for Red and Amber Mandates. These findings will then be fed back to the General Assembly in order to facilitate a final decision by Member States.

3. How are recommendations for consolidation/ strengthening being made?

Response: The recommendations document contains suggestions on how Amber mandates can be consolidated/strengthened. These recommendations fall into three categories

- a) Those where the aim is to improve mandates' structure of coordination and line of responsibility. The level of expertise needed to make precise recommendations on how to improve the structure of implementation suggests that this exercise would be best conducted by the secretariat. We therefore recommend that the Secretary-General report back to Member States before the end of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly with specific proposals in this regard.
- b) Those which aim to consolidate reports. This is based on feedback the co-chairs received from Member States and implementing entities.
- c) Those which aim to follow up on insufficient implementation of mandates. Among the Amber mandates there are those which reflect ongoing need, but there is a gap, or declining, implementation. The recommendation for these mandates is that Member States reiterate the importance of implementing these mandates.

Questions related to Amber mandates

1. ID 8083/ID 18202/18203: Emergency international assistance for Peace, normalcy and reconstruction of war-stricken Afghanistan:

- a) What is the relationship between the mandates under this resolution and similar mandates from the annual Resolution "the situation in Afghanistan"? In its latest version, the Resolution Situation in Afghanistan contains mandates relating to humanitarian assistance
- b) ID 18202: Why is only UNHCR mentioned under "Implementing agencies" when the comment mentions the need for better definition of responsibilities?

Response:

- a) The annual resolution "the situation in Afghanistan" covers elements of humanitarian assistance which complement the 'Emergency international assistance for Peace, normalcy and reconstruction of war-stricken Afghanistan'. However, implementing entities have drawn the Co-Chair's attention to a lack of clarity of division of responsibility and accountability in the implementation of these Mandates. It is recommended that these be clarified.
- b) Mandate ID 18202: contrary to information from the Mandate Registry, UNHCR is not the sole implementing entity on this Mandate. While UNHCR plays an important role in the implementation of this mandate, evidence suggests that the mandate would be better implemented if the roles of UNAMA and UNHCR were clarified.

Questions relating to Green Mandates

1. Why are some mandates which requests reports to be delivered by a specific date – which has now passed – not classified as 'completed' or 'red'? For example: ID 15841/ID18108: Safety and Security (due at the 55 and 60 GA respectively)

Response: In general, reports which request delivery by a certain date were classified as Grey. In some circumstances, the Mandate Registry indicates that a particular mandate is

‘recurrent’. The definition of a ‘recurrent’ Mandate, according to the registry, is that it is “*calls for recurrent action (e.g. reporting back to the General Assembly annually, biannually, every three months, etc) or on a continuous basis (e.g. tracking or supporting a peace process of a situation but with no end date stated). Recurring mandates may not appear again in future resolutions although they remain ongoing.*”

The Co-Chairs classified these mandates as Red if they no longer reflect need, and were not being delivered. However, if our records show that they are recurrent *and* have been renewed annually, and so reflect current need and continue to be implemented, they have been classified as Green.

Questions arising from Mandate Registry issues

1. Shouldn't we only be looking at Humanitarian Aid mandates in this cluster? E.g. ID 4202/4203: Mozambique: The specific mandates here should be moved to the development cluster. We have difficulties to see any humanitarian component. Similarly, ID 18197: Emergency international assistance for Peace, normalcy and reconstruction of war-stricken Afghanistan

Response: the Co-Chairs acknowledge that some of the mandates included in this cluster appear to have a more development focus than humanitarian aid. However, it was felt that it is important to work from the Mandate Registry as it is, in order to make the review as systematic as possible. However, these irregularities in the Registry have been noted, and the Co-Chairs suggest that the Mandate Registry be updated.

7. Should we be looking at mandates where Member States are implementing entities? E.g. ID21818: Angola. Mandate refers to a Member State as implementing entities. We don't think that mandates that refer to obligations of Member States should be reflected, the review should focus on mandates given to UN bodies/secretariat rather than obligations of MS. Delete it from register?

Response: While the Co-Chairs acknowledge this issue, it was felt that it was important to work from the Mandate Registry as it is, in order to make the review as systematic as possible. However, these irregularities in the Registry have been noted, and, an update of the registry could be recommended.

Changes made to Preliminary Analysis following consultation with Member States

Following the consultation process with Member States and further interaction with the secretariat, we have decided to make the following changes in categorization from the preliminary analysis. These changes are emphasized in italics in the updated analysis document, available at the following web address:

<http://www.un.org/ga/president/62/issues/Mandatereview.shtml>

1) Reclassification from Red to Green.

- These nine mandates stem from resolution 46/182. These mandates were thought to have been superseded by resolution 60/124 and the establishment of the CERF. However, resolution 60/124 actually complements the foundational humanitarian emergency mandates contained in resolution 46/182, and cannot be understood without them. In fact, relevant provisions in 46/182 continue to be the basis for later CERF related mandates. These mandates are therefore Green.

2) Reclassification from Amber to Red.

- The reporting requirement of Mandate 22603 (resolution: '58/118) on the 'Participation of volunteers, White Helmets, in the activities of the United Nations in the field of humanitarian relief, rehabilitation and technical cooperation for development' was fulfilled in the 61st session (A/61/313). This mandate has now been superseded by resolution 61/220, which decided that the report on this issue is to be incorporated in the report "strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations" in the 64th Session.
- Mandate 18896, on the 'Special assistance for the economic recovery and reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of the Congo', (resolution '57/146) and Mandates 15905, 15910 (resolution '52/169[A]) moved from Amber to Red because further information has shown that this has been updated through the Consolidated Appeals Process.
- 'Special assistance for the economic recovery and reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of the Congo', Mandates: 15537 (resolution '54/96[B]), 3703 (resolution '55/166), 18884 and 18885 (resolution '57/146). Further consultation has highlighted that while aspects of the situation remain relevant, the UN now operates in the country under the auspices of MONUC.

3) Reclassification from Amber to Green.

- Following consultation with Somalia, it has been found that Mandate 18405, 'Assistance for humanitarian relief and the economic and social rehabilitation of Somalia' (resolution: '56/106) which "Calls upon the international community to provide continuing and increased assistance in response to the United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance for Somalia" is a declaration, and should be classified Green.
- As of the 64th session reporting on White Helmets will be incorporated into a coordinated report on Humanitarian Assistance (see number 2 above).
- However, Mandate 15712 (resolution: '54/98) and Mandate 17949 (resolution: '56/102) on the 'Participation of volunteers, White Helmets, in activities of the United Nations in the field of humanitarian relief, rehabilitation and technical cooperation for development', are policy mandates which continue to reflect need and are being implemented. They should therefore be classified as Green.
- Mandate 18394 on the 'Assistance for humanitarian relief, rehabilitation and development for East Timor' (resolution '56/104) has been moved because

paragraph 4 continues to reflect needs and is implemented. It had originally been categorized as Amber because of paragraph 2, which refers to the Transitional Authority. Further consultation has highlighted that the mandate is nonetheless relevant.

- Mandate 22604 on “Special emergency economic assistance for the recovery and the development of the Comoros’ (resolution '58/120), was moved from Amber to Green because the Mandate has only been partially fulfilled and the need for this mandate still remains.
- 18740, 'International cooperation and coordination for the human and ecological rehabilitation and economic development of the Semipalatinsk region of Kazakhstan, (resolution '57/101). Further consultation has highlighted that this mandate is still relevant, and that implementation is ongoing.

4) Reclassification from Amber to Grey

- Mandate 15713 (resolution '54/98) on the “Participation of volunteers, White Helmets, in activities of the United Nations in the field of humanitarian relief, rehabilitation and technical cooperation for development” refers to a reporting requirement, which has been completed. This mandate is non-recurrent, and therefore should be classified as Grey.

5) Reclassification from Red to Grey

- The reporting requirement of Mandate 6707 (resolution '53/1[O]) on Emergency Assistance to the Sudan, has been completed (A/54/295) and the mandate is non-recurrent.

6) Reclassification from Green to Amber

- Mandate 3905 on Safety and security of humanitarian personnel and protection of United Nations personnel (resolution: '55/175). Further consultation has shown that this mandate predates the creation of DSS and DFS and some coordination difficulties persist.

7) Reclassification from Green to Red

- 22679 and 22676, 'Special assistance for the economic recovery and reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, (resolution: 52/169), and, 3705, (resolution: '55/166). Further consultation shows that these mandates have been updated through the Consolidated Appeals process.