

MULTI-PARTNER REVIEW OF THE ENHANCED HPC APPROACH 2022

After Action Review

What is an After-Action Review (AAR)?

An AAR is a structured discussion to draw learning from an event/process. It looks at the divergence between the planned and the actual as well as identifying what went well and what did not. The aim of an AAR is to improve future performance by reflecting on the work of a group and identifying strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. Simplicity is at the heart of the AAR, offering considerable flexibility on how it is applied. The tool is centered on bringing the relevant group together and the following themes:

- What was expected or supposed to happen?
- What actually occurred?
- What did and did not go well and why?
- What can be improved and how?

Why is the AAR an important component of the enhanced HPC?

The AAR is an important step within the HPC. It offers country teams the opportunity to discuss strengths and weaknesses in the application of the process, identify areas for attention, and collectively problem solve on methods for improving on or streamlining the process for the coming year.

The AAR also feeds into the annual review of the understanding, application and utility of the HPC guidance and templates. This review informs any potential modifications to the guidance and templates as well as capacity building and training related to the HPC.

Who should be involved in the AAR?

It is recommended the AAR be done with or through the Inter Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG), with OCHA providing or coordinating facilitation. Individual clusters and/or other bodies, such as an Information Management Working Group (IMWG) are encouraged to hold similar exercises and utilize that information to inform the ICCG AAR.

Timing

Generally, AARs, are most effective when carried out immediately after the conclusion of a project because: (a) learning and memories are fresh and (b) relevant staff are more likely to be present. To inform the 2022 HPC Multi-Partner Review and feed into updates to the templates and guidance for the 2023 cycle and beyond, information from the 2021 AAR is requested by the end of March 2022.

Organizing the AAR discussion

Consider framing the AAR discussion around the country HPC timeline. A set of guiding questions are included at the end of this document, and an example PowerPoint is available as part of the [2022 HPC Facilitation Package](#).

Format of the AAR

The time needed to conduct an AAR meeting varies, depending on the number of participants, but 2 to 3 hours is a suggested reasonable timeframe. To ensure time efficiency, it is important that participants are prepared for the discussion (for instance, this note could be shared, and request participants to complete the table in the annex).

The meeting should start with a short brief of the background of the Enhanced HPC and a short presentation of the AAR (provided in the attached slides). After the introduction, focus the meeting's discussion on the different steps of the HPC process.

It is important to reiterate that the AAR is not an evaluation of the enhanced HPC, but an opportunity to reflect on strengths and weaknesses of the approach itself and how it was applied, alongside how it might be improved upon or streamlined for the 2023 cycle. Participants should be dedicated to collectively and jointly make constructive suggestions and recommendations.

Documentation and outcomes

A notetaker to provide a summary of the discussion during the AAR is important, with OCHA (Coordination Unit) responsible for sharing the summary with participants. These notes should then be sent to NARAS (salazar@un.org) to be able to look at wider lessons across countries.

2022 Humanitarian Programme Cycle After Action Review Guiding Questions

	Answer		Why?	Suggestions?
	Challenges	Improvements		
1- How useful was the HPC Step-by-Step guidance to the HPC process?				
2- Humanitarian Needs Overviews:				
What were the most challenging aspects, and improvements compared to previous years?				
2.1- In general				
2.2- Use of JIAF indicators and severity thresholds				
2.3- Inter-sectoral analysis structured by humanitarian conditions				
2.4- Analysis of risks, vulnerabilities and coping mechanisms by diversity (gender, age, disability, etc.)				
2.5- Estimating and disaggregating the inter-sectoral number of persons in need (PiN)				
2.6- Staff analysis capacities				
2.7- Risk analysis and projection of needs				
2.8 - Community engagement				
2.9 - Clarity of the guidance and expectations				
3- Humanitarian Response Plans:				
What were the most challenging aspects, and improvements compared to previous years?				
3.1 – In general				
3.2 –Linking the HRP to the HNO when prioritizing population groups, geographic areas and factors to address in the response?				
3.3 – Inter-sectoral analysis of response options				
3.4 – Inter-sectoral strategic and specific objectives: Formulation of 'SMART' objectives and relationship to HNOs				
3.5 – Transparent costing of responses				
3.6 – Community engagement				
3.7 – Inclusion of cash and multipurpose responses				
3.8 – Clarity of the guidance and expectations				
4- Monitoring in HNO and HRP: What were the most challenging aspects of, and improvements compared to previous years?				
4.1- In general				
4.2 – Identification of situation, needs and response indicators				
4.3- Disaggregation of data by diversity (gender, age, disability, etc.)				