

## UNICEF Evaluation Management Response Template

**Evaluation Title:** Evaluation of the UNICEF L3 response to the Earthquake in Türkiye and Syria

**Region:** HQ

**Office:** Evaluation Office

**Evaluation Year:** 2025

**Person-In-Charge for Follow-up to Management Response:** Chief of Humanitarian Evidence and Learning Section

**Overall Response to the Evaluation:** UNICEF appreciates the insights of the evaluation into this L3 Emergency Response in Türkiye and Syria. Türkiye, like Ukraine, is an upper middle income country and bringing together these findings is useful. Findings for NW Syria have to some extent been overtaken by events. Issues around UNICEF's internal structure when working across UNICEF regional offices are well noted.

**Planned Use of Evaluation:** UNICEF will use this evaluation, together with other recent evaluations of L2 and L3 Emergency Responses to inform its review of the Emergency Procedures. It is particularly important in informing responses that go across UNICEF regions and that impact upper middle-income countries.

**Allowed Editor:** *Include here name/s of person/s who will edit the Management Response in the EMR Tracker*

### RECOMMENDATIONS and ACTIONS:

#### Evaluation Recommendation 1:

Effectiveness: Localization

*Develop standardized duty of care policies for implementing partners operating in an L3 emergency*

UNICEF instituted forward-leaning commitments to duty of care for staff in the Türkiye Country Office, Syria Country Office and MENARO Outpost. However, to advance further towards the localization principles outlined in the CCCs, there is further effort required, both internally and with other UN agencies, at HQ level and country levels to ensure that duty of care policies for UNICEF implementing partners are standardized in the activation of an L3 response.

#### Recommended Specific Actions

- 1.1 Develop a corporate-wide guidance document on duty of care to implementing partners in the activation of an L3.
- 1.2 Initiate discussions at Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) level (HQ level) to understand and agree to a UN-wide Duty of Care Framework.
- 1.3 Continue discussions (at country level) in Duty of Care working group and with OCHA to coalesce a minimum commitment framework for duty of care to Implementing Partners in emergencies.

#### Recommended Responsible

HQ: Division of Data Analytics Planning and Monitoring (DPAM), Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), Legal Office  
 Syria Country Office/MENARO Outpost SMT and Partnership Manager

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

UNICEF has a dedicated approach to building on the capacities of its IPs, including their security system when feasible, but is not responsible for their duty of care, as stated in the PCA template. This means, for instance, that any security information UNICEF may possess and that is externally sharable should be timely conveyed to the Implementing Partners to jointly make risk informed decisions before and during service delivery. Moreover, UNICEF can recommend IPs to align with the Saving Lives Together (SLT) framework and provide support if needed.

As a consequence, we would suggest not developing a corporate-wide guidance document on duty of care to implementing partners in the activation of an L3. We could instead propose that in the revised version of the PCA (tentatively out by end of the year), we would make reference to SLT and require IPs to perform the Duty of Care on their personnel, from prevention to management of incidents. We could also mention that UNICEF, wherever possible, will provide technical assistance to reinforce IPs capacities (e.g., training, early warning systems, etc.).

The IASC discussion could still be held on the UN-wide Duty of Care Framework, and IPs could be part of it with the objective that they put in place a system which is similar to ours.

On another note, all the above should apply to vendors too. In some COs, the biggest amount of our funding goes to vendors who are often victim of hijacking, terrorist acts, kidnapping, etc. Once again, our role would be to sensitize all the partners who work down the chain of our programmes and workplan activities in terms of accountability, but we should establish clarity on the fact that we are not responsible for their duty of care.

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person  | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken | Supporting documents |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| Incorporate reference to Duty of Care for Implementing Partners in the Programme Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with CSO partners. This PCA would be applicable to all CSOs. | DAPM               | Angela Bettiol, Chief Safeguarding Unit<br>Rodolphe Ghoussoub, Chief OIC, Programme Implementation Unit | December 2025            | Not Started  | NA            | NA                   |
| Develop best practice/tools for CSOs regarding Duty of Care   | DAPM               | Angela Bettiol, Chief Safeguarding Unit<br>Rodolphe Ghoussoub, Chief OIC, Programme                     | December 2025            | Not Started  | NA            | NA                   |

|  |  |                        |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | Implementation<br>Unit |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|

**Evaluation Recommendation 2:**

Effectiveness: Human Resources and Surge

*Review ERT, Humanitarian Surge Deployment roster and Regional Response Roster and Standby Partnerships considering the changing typology of emergencies and increased digitalization needs*

There is strong evidence pointing to UNICEF’s strategic learning and adapting lessons in HR/surge from other L3 emergencies. However, the evaluation identified the need to revisit Humanitarian Surge Deployment Roster and Regional Response Roster to maximize the use of Standby partners and ensure that relevant skills for current and future emergencies are readily available, especially in information management. There is a need to remain vigilant so that capacity of Country Offices in emergency-prone regions are not decreased by L3 surge requests.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

2.1 Review recent L3 evaluations and mission reports for identification of skills gaps/delays in required surge personnel and update rosters accordingly to ensure roles such as information management specialists are well-resourced.

2.2 Revisit Standby Partner rosters to ensure that skills and regional expertise for emergency prone regions are well-resourced.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: Division of Human Resources (DHR), Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS)

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree:) Partially agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons: Indicators on delays not clear**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person       | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| ERT Review  | DPC                | Boris Zinsou<br>Lissassi | End 2025                 | Underway   | A review of ERT mechanism was conducted. Conversations are ongoing with Senior leadership to review and prioritize recommendations for implementation. |                      |
| Global humanitarian surge roster review including skills assessment for Emergency functions | DPC                | Lubna Saikaly            | End 2025                 | Underway   | As one of the recommendations of Humanitarian meeting held in 2024, DPC is working on  |                      |

|                                      |                      |                                 |          |          |   |  |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|---|--|
|                                      |                      |                                 |          |          | consolidation of regional and Global roster. We believe the outcome will strengthen the Roster system to accelerate the identification of internal capacity for deployment. |  |
| MENA Regional Response Roster review | MENARO / P&C and REA | Esereda Musisi<br>Segolene Adam | End 2025 | Underway | A review of gaps has been initiated.  |  |

**Evaluation Recommendation 3:**

Effectiveness: Resource Mobilization

*Continue to advocate among donors for more flexible funding, notably in severely sanctions-affected countries such as Syria, and for a larger proportion multi-year funding allocated to L3 responses*

Stringent donor conditionalities, as well as the short lifespan of donor grants received for the L3 response, entail significant cost to UNICEF and to donors. They divert resources away from programme priorities, and adversely impact the quality and pace of programme execution.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

3.1 Reflect UN positioning on overcompliance in UNICEF positioning and communications with donors.<sup>67</sup> Determine the nature, cost and operational impact of overcompliance on UNICEF operations, and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures in its enterprise risk management plan.

3.2 Engage in an evidence-based advocacy drive aimed at donors, documenting the high costs and administrative burden of short-term grants in L3 responses and their successor programmes, and developing value-for-money arguments in support of more flexible and longer funding cycles. Consider introducing time-sheeting to document the high cost of grant management.

3.3 In advocating for longer-term grants, enrol the support of donors who have already adopted long-term/multi-year funding in their practices (e.g., FCDO, SIDA), to help highlight the benefits of this approach.

3.4 Amend the HAC format to include an annex listing HAC interventions that would benefit from multi-year funding. Use this annex as a basis for the development of a funding framework, for use in engaging with donors and securing multi-year commitments for recovery, resilience, sustainability and other longer-term programme goals deriving from HAC appeals.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: Public Partnerships Division (PPD), Private Fundraising and Partnerships (PFP), Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), Division of Global Communication and Advocacy (DGCA), Syria Country Office, Türkiye Country Office

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

Difficult/burdensome donor conditions are unfortunately not limited to the Syria context. PPD has supported the Syria CO on advocacy with donors around these conditions and will continue to do so. However, because these conditions are often driven by political motivations, they can be difficult to counteract even with sustained advocacy. Given the external fundraising environment at the moment, including global funding cuts announced by some key donors to UNICEF's Syria response, it may be particularly difficult to gain traction on these issues at the current time.

PPD is working to improve the decision-making architecture and guidance to all country offices regarding the management of donor conditions.

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person | Expected completion date       | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents                            |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| PPD to issue and update guidance on donor conditions to all offices   | PPD                | Mandy Gunton       | Initial guidance in March 2025 | Completed  | Guidance on Public Sector Donor Conditions issued 21 February 2025   | <a href="#">Guidance on Donor Conditions</a>    |
| PPD to establish escalation and decision-making mechanism around consideration of accepting donor conditions.   | PPD                | Mandy Gunton       | March 2025                     | Completed  | Policy on Resource Mobilization, which details escalation and decision-making around accepting conditions, issued February 2025. | <a href="#">Policy on Resource Mobilization</a> |
| As part of the process to review and revise the HAC guidance and platform for the 2026 appeals, EMOPS will consider how to amend the format to better highlight interventions that would benefit from multi-year funding. | EMOPS DO           | Jonas Berntsson    | Q4 2026                        | Not started  |  |   |

**Evaluation Recommendation 4:**

Effectiveness: Division on Funds and accounting for flexible/non-flexible funds

*Develop a clear, corporate-wide definition of flexible/non-flexible funding by building upon the Grand Bargain's definition of flexible and quality funding indicators, which classify funding as unearmarked, softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked*

UNICEF lacks a well-defined global understanding as to what constitutes flexible and non-flexible funding. Owing to the likelihood of increased multi-regional emergencies in the future, there is also an identified need to think more deeply on corporate mechanisms and procedures to divide emergency funding between regions.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

4.1 Develop a corporate-wide definition as to what precisely is defined as flexible and non-flexible funding in line with the Grand Bargain's definitions.

4.2 Based on a clearer definition, revisit financial accounting systems in public and private partnership units to streamline accounting for these funds.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: Public Partnerships Division (PPD), Private Fundraising and Partnerships (PFP), Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), Division of Financial and Administrative Management (DFAM)

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office                | Responsible Person | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents |
|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| Proposal on humanitarian funding earmarking through adapting the Grand Bargain definitions of flexible funding  | PPD<br>With support from EMOPS DO | Guillaume Sauval   | Q1 2025                  | Completed  | PDD consulted with PFP and put together a proposal of funding categories, and shared with DFAM |                      |
| Decision on defining UNICEF's various earmarking categories & determine what categories and sub-categories should be added in UNISON at grant creation date?? | DFAM                              | Nino Tevzadze      | Q2 2025                  | Underway   |  |                      |

**Evaluation Recommendation 5:**

Effectiveness: Division on Funds and accounting for flexible/non-flexible funds

*Develop and institutionalize a SoP for funding allocation in multi-regional L3 responses*

**Recommended Specific Actions**

5.1 Develop a standardized SoP for the criteria and process of dividing multi-regional L3 funding (ensuring the inclusion of the Regional Directors at all stages of the discussions).

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: PPD, PFP, EMOPS, DFAM, Regional Offices (Partnerships Advisor in coordination with Regional Office Emergency Advisor)

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree):**
**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person                        | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| Align multi-regional L3 responses allocation with the GHTF allocation SOP developed by EMOPS  | EMOPS/PPD          | EMOPS DO /<br>Guillaume Sauval            |                          | Underway   |  |                      |
| MENARO SOP on allocation of funds for Syria refugee HAC is standardized for other multi-country, cross-regional responses' allocations. | MENARO             | Segolene Adam<br>Joana Perez<br>Martorell |                          | Completed  | MENARO already uses a standardised procedure in consultation with ECARO for allocation of funds for Syria refugee HAC. |                      |

**Evaluation Recommendation 6:**

Effectiveness: Alignment of data on emergency results reporting

*Improve alignment of data on results reporting in SitReps, dashboards and RAM*

The evaluation found at country-level that figures for the WoS results (i.e., reach against set targets) did not always align between different datasets as presented in SitReps, dashboards and RAM reports. This has made determining actual results very challenging. This issue has also been identified in other L3 evaluations and as such, has been raised to a corporate-level recommendation.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

6.1 Conduct review of good practices from 5-10 UNICEF Country Offices that have made progress in utilizing data to identify good examples of how the issue of misalignment has been addressed at the country level and what the effects of those solutions have been.

**Recommended Responsible**  
 HQ: DPAM, EMOPS

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned  | Responsible Office | Responsible Person                | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken | Supporting documents |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| Consultations with 5-7 Country Offices will be conducted to explore the root causes of misalignment in different systems | DAPM               | Joseph Barnes<br>Zainab Al-Azzawi | 31 Dec 2025              | Not started  |               |                      |

**Evaluation Recommendation 7:**

Effectiveness: Supply and Purchasing

*In light of lessons learned in the Syria-Türkiye Earthquake Response, develop a fuller and more actionable definition of the no-regret principle, for application in preparedness and contingency planning.*

The notion of ‘no-regret.’ as currently understood at UNICEF, encourages a higher risk appetite but does not provide a clear operative basis for managing risk, or for establishing accountability frameworks that are more supportive of higher-risk decision making in preparedness and emergencies.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

7.1 Develop further programme-level guidance on the application of the no-regret approach, including on key parameters to be considered (e.g. Cost of no-regret investments vs. likelihood of adverse event being prepared for). This guidance should be supported by specific examples drawn from operations.

7.2 Clarify those aspects of due diligence and minimal standards that are not waived by the no-regret principle.

7.3 Identify viable and context-appropriate alternatives to pre-positioning and other measures taken on a no-regret basis (e.g., LTAs, low-value procurement, direct procurement) and assess their comparative strengths and limitations.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS), Supply Division (SD), DFAM

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned  | Responsible Office | Responsible Person | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken   | Supporting documents  |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Updated version of the Emergency procedures  | EMOPS, DO          | Lana Wreikat       | Q1 2026                  | Not started  | Desk review of the lessons learned from the 3 years of roll-out of the ‘no-regrets’ approach, wide range consultation with key informants | <a href="#">2024-12-18 Concept Note - Emergency Related Procedures final.docx</a> |
| SD and RO will continue to reinforce multi-pronged supply response of prepositioned supplies and streamlined procurement processes using | SD                 | Emma Maspero       | Q1 2026                  | Not started  |   |   |

|  |                         |                    |         |         |  |  |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| LTAs, low value procurement, repeat ordering etc         |                         |                    |         |         |  |  |
| Development of organization-wide risk appetite statement | OED, Chief Risk Officer | Jacob Van Der Blij | Q1 2026 | Started | Initial high level risk appetite statement developed, to be refined and complemented with an operational guide for practical application in country. |  |

**Evaluation Recommendation 8:**

Effectiveness: Emergency Procedures

*Address clarity gaps in those aspects of the Emergency Procedures that relate to simplified review and approval processes, notably in view of enabling quicker procurement and processing of multi-sectoral projects.*

The Emergency Procedures remain little known by UNICEF staff in Syria and Türkiye, especially in terms of their application in the area of procurement and the review of multi-sectoral projects.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

8.1 As part of the ongoing review of the Emergency Procedures (EPs), draw on lessons learned at country level in the L3 response (Syria, Türkiye) to improve and streamline the practical application of the EPs, with special emphasis on the following lines of action:

8.2 Clarify accountabilities and decision-making processes to ensure the more rapid development and review of projects, notably when they are multi-sectoral in nature.

8.3 Update the training material used across UNICEF to familiarize staff with the Emergency Procedures, addressing clarity gaps in the application of simplified procedures and the no-regrets principle.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: EMOPS, DFAM, in collaboration with ROs and COs

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree):Partially Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office             | Responsible Person | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken   | Supporting documents  |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| Updated version of the Emergency procedures including accountability frameworks, and institutional awareness raising and learning | EMOPS, DO with support from SD | Lana Wreikat       | Q1 2026                  | Not started  | Desk review of the lessons learned from the 3 years of roll-out of the 'no-regrets' approach, wide range consultation with key informants | <a href="#">2024-12-18 Concept Note - Emergency Related Procedures_final.docx</a> |

**Evaluation Recommendation 9:**

Effectiveness: Emergency Procedures

*Support Senior Management in encouraging a higher risk appetite among country office staff involved in L3 scale up decisions, and the application of the Emergency Procedures.*

Risk aversion among staff is causing some of them to continue to apply a highly stringent approach to compliance, despite the Emergency Procedures, even when this results in unnecessarily slow programme delivery.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

9.1 Produce training material and guidance for use by Country Office senior management in creating a supportive environment for greater risk tolerance among staff. This material should provide specific, programme-level directions on how to address staff concerns surrounding risk-taking, and how to balance it with process compliance and accountability.

9.2 Introduce optional UNICEF-wide indicators for use by Country Offices to measure their attainment of key success criteria in the rollout of EPs (e.g., on time needed for HD reviews).

9.3 Where appropriate, deploy risk officers to support fast-tracked L3 decision making at operations level.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: EMOPS, ROs, in collaboration with COs

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned  | Responsible Office      | Responsible Person | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents  |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| Updated version of the Emergency procedures              | EMOPS DO                | Lana Wreikat       | Q1 2026                  | Not started  | Desk review of the lessons learned from the 3 years of roll-out, wide range consultation with key informants       | <a href="#">2024-12-18 Concept Note - Emergency Related Procedures final.docx</a> |
| Development of organization-wide risk appetite statement | OED, Chief Risk Officer | Jacob Van Der Blij | Q1 2026                  | Started  | Initial high level risk appetite statement developed, to be refined and complemented with an operational guide for |   |

|  |  |  |  |  |                                   |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
|  |  |  |  |  | practical application in country. |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|

**Evaluation Recommendation10:**

Coordination: HQ, Regional Offices, Country Offices and MENARO Outpost

*Improve strategic planning for Regional Office support in emergency preparedness and response for Country Office and MENARO Outpost.*

In terms of coordination, the earthquake did provide opportunities to reflect, learn and implement stronger support and coordination mechanisms between the Regional Office and Country Office/MENARO Outpost. Further planned support should be drawn on from the regional offices throughout the earthquake recovery period to enhance emergency preparedness and response for future emergencies.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

10.1 MENARO Outpost (and WoS based in Amman), in close consultation with ECARO and Türkiye Country Office, develop a strategic plan of Regional Office support to be provided in 2025 to enhance emergency preparedness and response in Syria.

**Recommended Responsible**

MENARO, in close consultation with ECARO and Türkiye Country Office

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Partially Agree.**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:** Following the change of situation in Syria early December 2024, a transition out of the Whole of Syria mechanism and Gaziantep outpost was initiated to bring all operations within Syria. The transition plan will be completed by mid-2025. MENARO supports the transition plan which involves a focus on revised strategic emergency preparedness and response for Syria, including WoS and Gaziantep outpost staff.

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person                    | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken   | Supporting documents          |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| Revise Emergency preparedness and response plans to reflect the transition from WoS into Syria. | MENARO             | Segolene Adam<br>Maddalena Bertolotti | July 2025                | Underway   | MENARO supported Syria CO and WoS team to revise their Emergency preparedness and response plans for Syria in light of the changes of circumstances. A Transition plan for the programme and the office has been developed and is under implementation. Syria CPD revision will be aligned with the Interagency | These are internal documents. |

|  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  |  |  | process of a Syria Transition Plan (under Special Circumstances). |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

**Evaluation Recommendation 11:**

Coordination: HQ, Regional Offices, Country Offices and MENARO Outpost

*Generate better understanding of emergency response and preparedness in atypical UNICEF operating environments, most notably in upper-middle to higher income countries.*

The typology of emergencies is evolving with climate change and regional conflicts. The earthquake response in Turkey demonstrated some challenges for UNICEF in terms of how to engage with a strong national government and provide appropriate surge resources for a well-capacitated Country Office. This highlights a need to have a more nuanced and evidence-based understanding of emergency preparedness and response in those types of contexts.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

911.1 Conduct meta-analysis from internal and external reviews on emergency response in upper-middle- and higher-income countries to generate lessons learned and best practice from these engagements.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: EMOPS, Evaluation Office

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken  | Supporting documents |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| As part of the development of the 2026-29 Strategic Plan, and contributing to the Business Models Initiative, EMOPS will contribute to institutional consideration of UNICEF Country Office typologies and ways of working. | EMOPS, HELS        | Anthea Moore       | Q3 2025                  | Underway   | Inclusion of risk and fragility considerations together with country income levels in the 2026-29 strategic plan differentiation and Business Models initiatives |                      |
| Inclusion of Country Office typologies in the revision of the Emergency Preparedness Procedures that include country income level   | EMOPS, RAPS        | Pete Manfield      | Q4, 2025                 | Underway   | Consultation underway on typology model including country income levels, risk exposure and other considerations.   |                      |



**Evaluation Recommendation 12 (from [Syria Report](#)):**

Coordination: HQ and MENARO

*Revisit the regional and global surge rosters and adjust to ensure IM specialists (at all levels) are well represented, facilitating a quicker drawdown of these skills in an L3 emergency*

As UNICEF globally pursues the strategic agenda of digital transformation, the demand for IM skills and resources has grown. In the Outpost, two challenges were identified during the L3 response in this area. The first was receiving timely and well-suited surge to provide IM support. The evaluation found that IM specialists are often needed for longer durations than an eight-week deployment circumscribed in the Emergency Response Team deployments, and country offices would prefer surge staff who have regional knowledge.

**Recommended Specific Actions**

12.1. Review current regional surge rosters to ensure there are an adequate number of people with IM skills (at all levels) on roster lists. It is recommended that regional experience be prioritized through the planned use of standby partners and linking professional development plans of national staff in the MENA region with stretch assignments.

**Recommended Responsible**

HQ: DPC, EMOPS, and MENARO

**Management Response: (Agree, Partially Agree, Disagree): Agree**

**If recommendation is rejected or partially accepted, report reasons:**

| Actions planned   | Responsible Office | Responsible Person                           | Expected completion date | Implementation stage:<br>Not started<br>Underway<br>Completed<br>Cancelled | Actions taken   | Supporting documents |
|---|--------------------|--|--------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| UNICEF IM functions to be skills mapped and standard ToRs developed                       | DPC and DAPM       | Joseph Barnes                                | Q4 2025                  | Not started  |   |                      |
| Establishment of IM community   | DAPM and EMOPS     | Joseph Barnes and Anthea Moore               | Q4 2025                  | Underway   | Community survey and basic community infrastructure established in 2024 |                      |
| Review surge deployments of IM capacity (cluster and UNICEF) by DPC, EMOPS, DAPM and MENA | DPC, EMOPS, DAPM   | Lilian Reyes, Joseph Barnes and Boris Zinsou | Q4 2025                  | Not started  |   |                      |
| ERT Review (linked to Recommendation 2)   | DPC                | Boris Zinsou Lissassi                        | End 2025                 | Underway   | A review of ERT mechanism was conducted. Conversations                  | ERT Review           |

|  |     |               |          |          |   |   |
|--|-----|---------------|----------|----------|---|---|
|  |     |               |          |          | are ongoing with Senior leadership to review and prioritize recommendations for implementation.   |   |
| Global humanitarian surge roster review including skills assessment for Emergency functions (linked to Recommendation 2) | DPC | Lubna Saikaly | End 2025 | Underway | As one of the recommendations of Humanitarian meeting held in 2024, DPC is working on consolidation of regional and Global roster. We believe the outcome will strengthen the Roster system to accelerate the identification of internal capacity for deployment. | Global humanitarian surge roster review including skills assessment for Emergency functions |