

**PROVISIONAL INTERNAL NOTE ON JOINT ANALYSIS BETWEEN HUMANITARIAN AND  
DEVELOPMENT ACTORS - (OCHA'S PERSPECTIVE)**

***Needs Assessment & Analysis Section, 4 April 2018***

**BACKGROUND**

The Secretary-General's report for the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) asked to 'transcend the humanitarian-development divide', including an investment in data, risk and joint analysis; and achieving a common understanding of context, needs and capacities<sup>1</sup>. At the WHS, the 'New Way of Working' was endorsed by a number of major agencies, with at its core the formulation of collective outcomes between humanitarian and development actors based on a joint analysis.

There is no generic guidance that describes what joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors consists of and how it should be done. In recent years, specific guidance was produced to conduct Post-Disaster Needs Assessment<sup>2</sup> (PDNA) and Post-Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNA) involving both humanitarian and development entities in natural disasters and conflict situations respectively. In 2017, the guidance for PCNA was replaced by guidance for Recovery and Peace-Building Assessment (RPBA).

The PDNA is a primary and/or secondary data collection exercise involving multiple stakeholders in the first few weeks or months after a sudden-onset natural disaster to inform early recovery plans. The guidelines describe how to harmonise sectoral assessments and provide detailed guidance for individual sectoral assessments that are then compiled in the PDNA report. Although it details the inclusive coordination approach that should be followed to manage the PDNA, the guidance remains heavy on the individual sectoral components as opposed to integrated inter-sectoral analysis.

In addition, despite being in principle "people-centred", both the PDNA and RPBA guidance and outputs tend to focus on the macro or meso levels (depending on the scale of the crisis) rather than the micro level. This leads to more attention being paid to needs by sector and at institutional and infrastructure levels compared to coexisting multi-sectoral needs at household and community levels.

The PDNA and RPBA guidelines stress that the pre-crisis (or baseline) situation must be considered to gauge the impact of the crisis. The PDNA guidance also encourages a prioritisation and a distinction between short- and medium-term recovery needs. The prioritisation is done at sector level and by comparison across sectors. For each sector, the consideration of short versus longer term needs, needs "severity" and vulnerable groups is encouraged. The overall prioritisation and delineation of humanitarian and development responses may be complicated in the absence of inter-sectoral analysis that clearly separates acute/transitory versus chronic needs, and describes the immediate, underlying and root factors associated.

It is important to also note that the PDNA and RPBA guidance documents go much beyond assessment and analysis and also encompass response planning and, in the case of RPBA, financing strategy. As a

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *One Humanity: Shared Responsibility – Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit*, 2016. Core Responsibility Four: Change people's lives – from delivering aid to ending - needs.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/crisis-prevention-and-recovery/pdna.html>

result, the coordination arrangements they are proposing are rather procedure-heavy with limited details on “how” to undertake joint humanitarian-development assessments and analysis.

## **PURPOSE OF THIS PROVISIONAL GUIDANCE NOTE**

An increasing number of UN Country Teams and Humanitarian Country Teams in the field as well as headquarters’ UN agencies, international Finance Institutions such as the World Bank and national governments are expressing or reasserting their interest in strengthening the linkages between humanitarian and development interventions, including under the New Way of Working. Multi-year planning of humanitarian response is already being increasingly adopted to encourage more sustainable results and, where possible, facilitate the transition between short and longer term programmes and eventually reduce the former. Few of these multi-year humanitarian plans have been based on a solid analysis that builds on past trends and brings in contextual information typically found in development analyses. Experiences with joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors are not documented, thus limiting lesson learning.

This provisional guidance note is an attempt to assist OCHA Country Offices with facilitating and supporting joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors when appropriate. Reflecting the paucity of concrete examples of practical ways to arrange for and undertake joint analysis, the guidance is admittedly still conceptual rather than grounded in proven experience, but is an attempt to suggest workable steps that can be applied and adapted to each field context.

The first part of the Note proposes an approach to identify and set up a coordination mechanism to bring humanitarian and development analysts together, taking into account the guidance that already exists for PDNAs and RPBAs. The second part of the note advises on the approach to the joint analysis itself.

## **PART I – WHAT DO WE MEAN BY JOINT ANALYSIS?**

Joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors implies an exercise that produces a common understanding of the situation, risks, vulnerabilities and needs from both the humanitarian and development angles. It augments the usual analysis done by humanitarian actors (e.g., a Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), a monitoring of the situation or a multi-sectoral assessment) by increasing the attention paid to underlying and root/structural factors affecting the lives and livelihoods of people, and to the evolution over time (trends) and in the future (projection). For development actors, it increases the attention paid to the micro-level (individuals, households, communities), thus complementing the meso- (sub-national) and macro-levels of analysis and the usual heavier focus of the analysis on institutions and infrastructure.

A joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors can be triggered by a specific process already envisaged, such as embarking on a multi-year planning exercise (which requires more in-depth analysis of factors, trends and projection), developing a Common Country Assessment (CCA) for a UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in crisis contexts (which requires coherence and complementarity between humanitarian and development interventions), or contributing to post-disaster or post-conflict needs assessments (which require logical links between humanitarian and development interventions in a transition mode).

A dedicated mechanism is necessary to enable the joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors. The set-up depends on the rationale for conducting the analysis, its scope, stakeholders involved, and past experiences (see Part II below).

The results of the joint analysis also depend on its purpose and what triggered it (see Part III). Results can be integrated in separate humanitarian and development reports (extracting those most relevant to each) or in a single joint report. When undertaking the joint analysis, caution should be paid to avoid simply compiling humanitarian information on the one side, and development information on the other side. The whole point of the joint humanitarian-development analysis is to combine the respective information as per an agreed-upon analysis framework.

## **PART II - COORDINATION MECHANISM FOR JOINT HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS**

OCHA will not decide on the coordination mechanism for a joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors on its own. Being a collective exercise, the identification and working modalities of a joint analysis coordination mechanism will have to be discussed and agreed with the stakeholders involved. The approach suggested here simply aims at helping in the discussions with the stakeholders.

The proposed steps below can be iterative rather than strictly sequential. They entail a proactive reach out to both humanitarian and development actors to obtain the information. However, once completed a first time, any necessary subsequent adjustments of a coordination mechanism for joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors should be lighter and easier.

Development actors are understood as the range of entities implementing long-term programmes (some being “dual-mandated” humanitarian and development) such as UN agencies (e.g. UNDP, FAO, UNICEF, UNFPA etc.), international NGOs and funds (e.g. Oxfam, Save the Children, IRC, the Gates Foundation etc.), donors, international financing institutions (e.g. World Bank, regional banks etc.) as well as national entities (e.g. ministries, national NGOs etc.).

### **1 – Map already existing coordination mechanisms where analysis is conducted by humanitarian and by development actors respectively**

Several mechanisms, platforms and processes where analysis of some sort is undertaken by either humanitarian or development actors may exist in any country and should be leveraged as much as possible. For example:

- On the humanitarian side, analysis of needs may take place by sectors under the cluster system, as well as across sectors as part of an inter-cluster coordination group. An assessment working group may have been set up to conduct cross-sectoral analysis that is then discussed in the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG).
- On the development side, the national government may have analysis and statistics units within line Ministries, as well as a central statistics office or institution. Some donors may share data and analysis in dedicated working groups or task forces for special programmes or thematics (e.g. disarmament and reintegration, resolution of land property issues, social protection etc.). Individual donors and international financing institutions may conduct yearly or project-based analyses for their country strategies and planning. The UN Country Team may have a dedicated sub-group of the Programme Management Team (PMT) in charge of preparing the Common Country Assessment (CCA) for the UN Development

Assistance Framework (UNDAF). In other countries, 'transition platforms' also exist with the participation of peace-building actors.

There may also be previous experience with establishing a multi-stakeholder coordination platform for assessment and analysis on the occasion of a previous PDNA or RPBA. This structure and experience from it should be examined before setting a coordination mechanism for joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors.

## **2- Review the terms of reference and/or scope of the various mechanisms to coordinate analysis by humanitarian and development actors respectively**

The coordination mechanisms identified in step 1 may be inactive, or they may have a very specific focus (e.g. geographic, thematic, temporal) or on the contrary may be very broad in scope. Those seemingly inactive can be removed from the next steps although lessons should be sought from the reasons for inactivity and how they have performed before.

The review of ToRs and scope of existing analysis coordination mechanisms or platforms will enable identification of potential overlaps and complementarities, and inform the dedicated humanitarian-development analysis coordination mechanism that may eventually be set up.

## **3- Map the actors engaged in humanitarian and development analysis respectively**

The above review of active/functioning analysis mechanisms and processes can also be used to list the actors engaged in each of them. Note that the same actor may participate in different mechanisms and processes yet with different staff who may not be closely linked among themselves. For example:

- Dual-mandated agencies may have humanitarian staff engaged in humanitarian analysis on the one side under the sector/cluster system, and separate experts engaged in development analysis for specific topics or programmes, without systematic exchanges between the two.
- Similarly, there may be a government team analysing disasters (e.g. as part of a national Disaster Management institution) and different and disconnected government teams dealing with development data and information
- Donors also often have distinct humanitarian and development offices or institutions with distinct procedures and limited inter-linkages.

Actors mapping will allow the determination of which entities participate in which type of analysis, and inform the composition of the dedicated humanitarian-development analysis coordination mechanism that may be set up.

## **4 – Identify an appropriate coordination mechanism for joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors**

Based on the previous steps (screening of existing coordination mechanisms for analysis by humanitarian and by development actors, terms of reference/scope of these mechanisms, and humanitarian and development actors involved), it should be possible to decide if an existing platform can be used with some adjustment of membership and scope, or if another mechanism should be set up. While efforts should be made to use existing mechanisms rather than add a new one, it is likely

that the diversity of actors and the specific objectives of the joint humanitarian-development analysis (see Part II below) will make it difficult to just use an existing coordination platform.

Existing guidelines for PDNAs, RPBAAs and to some extent CCAs/UNDAFs can be used for the set-up of the coordination mechanism for joint humanitarian-development analysis. As mentioned in steps 1 and 2 above, if these exercises or other multi-sectoral assessment and analysis (including – but not limited to - Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Common Country Assessments) have already been undertaken in the past in the context, their experience should be capitalised on. This includes available (in-country) lessons learned on membership (who should participate, at which level), chairmanship, main topics on the agenda, meeting location, language and frequency, and decision-making rules. This is all the more important as coordination guidelines for PDNAs and RPBAAs tend to be procedure-heavy and there may be lighter ways to proceed.

Note that the coordination mechanism that should be established for joint analysis at this stage is at the strategic level, rather than technical level. The aim of this mechanism is to enable discussions between humanitarian and development analysts to (i) define the objectives of the joint analysis, its scope, broad roles and responsibilities, and timeframe, (ii) orient the work and take decisions when adjustments are needed, and (iii) approve the final joint humanitarian-development analysis for transmission to decision-makers. Strategic coordination among humanitarian and development actors for analysis can take the form of a joint analysis ‘reference group’ or a ‘task force’ for example. The stakeholders involved may wish to combine analysis and planning at the strategic level under the same platform or group, rather than having two distinct coordination mechanisms for analysis and for planning. The review of previous experience should help with this decision.

In turn, this joint analysis reference group (or equivalent) will most likely decide to designate a group of individuals with technical expertise to further develop and implement the joint analysis. This joint humanitarian-development technical group will agree on analysis methods, indicators and outputs, and deliver the actual analysis under the guidance of the strategic level reference group.

**Box 1 – Example of analysis coordination mechanism established for joint humanitarian-development analysis in Pakistan**

A Vulnerability Analysis Working Group co-chaired by OCHA, UNDP and the World Bank was set up to oversee the implementation of a comprehensive joint vulnerability and socio-economic needs analysis for FATA. A single document combining humanitarian and development analysis will be produced.

In parallel, an integrated Resident Coordinator Office-OCHA Information Management Unit was set up to strengthen joint analysis by facilitating the dissemination of information and analysis on humanitarian, development and peace issues through a single system. This process also aimed to avoid duplication of effort and identify and address gaps in the collective understanding that may be addressed collaboratively.

*Source: OCHA Country Office, Pakistan, September 2017*

**Box 2 – Example of analysis platform for humanitarian and development analysis in Yemen**

A humanitarian-development-peace ‘platform’ was set up to bring together data from humanitarian and development actors and contribute to a common understanding of risks, needs, gaps and opportunities for joint analysis, operations and advocacy. The platform consists of a strategic and technical level. The strategic level consists of the RC/HC, Office of the Special Envoy, EU and Islamic Development Bank to inform the strategic direction, supported by a technical team of representatives from the UN, World Bank, IsDB and EU

across the humanitarian-development-peace nexus responsible for joint and shared data collection and analysis.

Source: OCHA Coordination and Response Division, September 2017

### **PART III - APPROACH FOR JOINT HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS**

This Note does not provide technical guidance on data collection and analysis *per se* since humanitarian and development assessment and analysis methods are essentially the same. Instead, the emphasis is put on an approach that enables the combination of humanitarian and development data and information, and the production of analytical outputs that inform subsequent decision-making on interventions by the respective actors. While there is a logic to the steps listed below (especially with the first), they can be treated iteratively rather than strictly sequentially.

#### **1 – Jointly agree on the objectives of the joint humanitarian-development analysis**

This step is potentially the most critical and should be led by the strategic level joint analysis reference group (or equivalent) mentioned in Part II. Humanitarian and development actors are likely to have different expectations from assessment and analysis. For example:

- Humanitarian actors typically expect analysis that describes priority needs (survival, essential livelihood and self-sustenance capacity), disaggregated by population groups and vulnerability criteria (e.g. according to age, sex, displacement status, ethnicity, marginalisation etc.), and by the lowest possible geographical level. These results are the most suitable to inform options for humanitarian assistance based on life-saving and capacities for minimum self-sustenance, targeted to the neediest.
- Development actors often demand analysis that describes trends, investment opportunities and the capacities of institutions and infrastructure to enable these, and also identifies risks. The desired geographic level of disaggregation is generally higher (e.g. provincial or central).

These varying expectations affect the scope, breadth and depth of the analysis, influencing: how far in time (backward and forward) the analysis should go, which geographic areas should be covered, which population groups should be distinguished, which specific thematics or cross-sectoral issue should be included etc. Agreement between humanitarian and development actors is essential to avoid frustrations and effectively meet the needs of decision-makers.

Once this step is completed, the role of the strategic level group is essentially to monitor the progress of implementation of the analysis by the technical group, and to advise when adjustments are necessary. The subsequent steps are undertaken by the technical group, guided by the agreed-upon objectives.

#### **2- Develop a joint humanitarian-development analysis framework**

The analysis objectives are used to develop the analysis framework which lists which data (qualitative and quantitative) are needed, including indicators and how these will be disaggregated and combined to enable interpretation of the situation, vulnerabilities, needs, risks and priorities. Potential or known sources of information are indicated.

The below points are worth considering:

- A **common 'unit of analysis'** is indispensable for the combination of humanitarian and development data and information. This unit of analysis can be population groups (e.g. children under 5 years of age, pastoralists, casual workers, persons with disability, refugees etc.), geographic areas (e.g. a province, community, camp, city, urban neighbourhood etc.), sectors (e.g. agriculture, education, health etc.) and/or institutions (e.g. markets, rule of law etc.).

As existing humanitarian and development data and information are likely to use different units of analysis, it may be necessary to “re-process” or to extract available results according to the units of analysis of interest. For example, some reports may describe the situation by sector while referring to specific population groups and geographic areas for this sector. This sectoral information can thus be extracted by population groups and by geographic areas and combined with pieces of information referring to the same groups and areas from other sectors (see example of analysis output matrix below).

- **Factors associated with needs** must be identified as these will be at the core of the subsequent response analysis between humanitarian and development actors. Typically, humanitarian responses will focus on addressing survival and basic self-sustenance needs and the factors immediately associated to these, while development responses may address the underlying and root factors. While the joint analysis should not go into recommendations for responses, the analysis outputs should clarify the nature of the factors associated with needs. Factors which contribute to various needs simultaneously should also be identified as they will be of particular interest for subsequent response analysis (cross-sectoral interventions).
- Assuming that the main goal of the joint analysis is to inform subsequent identification of synergies and complementarity between humanitarian and development responses to meet and, as much as possible, reduce people’s needs, it follows that **a major output of the analysis is an understanding of the combination of short and longer term needs that specific population groups in specific geographic areas/locations are facing, together with the associated factors**. This means that the results of the analysis should go beyond a mere compilation of disconnected sectors or thematic analyses. It should enable the identification of the comprehensive needs of population groups and geographic areas/locations. This, in turn, calls for people-centred inter-sectoral analysis.
- Trends analysis, both reflecting past evolution and anticipated changes, is important. It will inform subsequent decisions on layering and sequencing of humanitarian and development responses. It requires an identification of risks (linked to predictable shocks and stresses) and an agreement among humanitarian and development actors on their likelihood and impact on needs. Existing contingency plans may be used for this purpose.

The analysis framework reflects the above points by listing the expected analysis outputs, including the desired units of analysis, identification of types of factors associated with needs, combination of needs for given population groups and areas, risks and projected needs.

An example of an analysis result is shown in the matrix below (see Notes at the bottom).

Population group (Examples)	Location	Urgent needs (survival and essential self-sustenance capacity)	Factors associated with urgent needs	Medium- and long-term needs (livelihood protection and improvement)	Factors associated with medium- and long-term needs
E.g. Living in areas directly affected by conflict	Areas A, B...	Protection against armed groups indiscriminate attacks  Access to health care, education and livelihood means  Etc.	Armed groups' objective to occupy specific areas ( <i>immediate</i> )  Insecurity along routes to access health services and schools ( <i>immediate</i> )  Departure of personnel ( <i>immediate</i> )  Disrespect of International Humanitarian Law ( <i>structural</i> ) Etc.	Diversification of livelihoods e.g. to minimise movement and diversify income sources  Communication means e.g. to strengthen social networks  Disarmament of armed groups Etc.	Scarcity of land ( <i>structural</i> ) Unemployment ( <i>underlying</i> ) Adverse business investment environment ( <i>structural</i> ) Entrenched political positions ( <i>structural</i> ) Etc.
Farmers relying on small-scale agriculture in rural areas not affected by conflict					
Displaced in urban areas not affected by conflict					
Etc.					

**Notes:**

- Population groups can be defined according to any characteristics relevant to the context, e.g. displacement status, type of livelihood, location etc. However, the *categories should not be overlapping*. In that sense, large groups are likely to be identified, with sub-groups distinguished in the subsequent columns according to specific needs they present (e.g. within the displaced in urban areas, distinguish children below 5 years of age, those who are unemployed, those lacking social connections etc.).



- It is also possible to start the analysis at geographic level (column 2) and to identify in a second stage in which population groups present needs within the specific areas.
- The analysis can also start by sector or thematic area (i.e. examining health, education, poverty, climate change, rule of law etc.) and in a second stage identify which population groups present needs in relation to these different sectors or thematic areas, and where these groups are located.
- The nature of the needs (urgent versus medium/long term) is essentially defined by the observed or anticipated consequences on people's lives and livelihoods. The understanding of what is a threat to lives, to self-sustenance capacity, and to the maintenance or improvement of livelihoods must be discussed and agreed upon between the humanitarian and development analysts.
- The factors associated with needs include the type of, and degree of exposure to shocks and stresses (contextual factors); vulnerabilities to these shocks and stresses; and capacities to respond (e.g. functioning of institutions and services, social networks, mobility, assets etc.). These factors can be identified at individual, group, community or area level. Needs and risks are the result of the combination of shocks/stresses, vulnerabilities and capacities.
- Factors must be disaggregated according to their linkage with the needs (direct-immediate/indirect-underlying), recurrence and persistence (acute/chronic or structural-root). This will help at the stage of response analysis to discuss response options and division of labour between humanitarian and development actors.
- Once the matrix (or equivalent result) is completed, it is useful for the subsequent stage of response analysis to summarise:
  - **Which population groups present which combination of needs;**
  - **Where these groups are located;**
  - **Which factors appear to be associated with different needs at the same time** (and thus offer an opportunity to address multiple needs at once).

### 3- Review existing data and information

As for every analysis, a desk review of available humanitarian and development data, information and analyses are required to make the best possible use of what is already known, and decide which, whether and how gaps should be filled.

If a comprehensive analysis has been undertaken, such as a Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), a recent Common Country Assessment (CCA) or up-to-date country strategy documents by donors or international financing institutions, these documents can provide a useful source and baseline. As mentioned however, available results may have to be extracted against the agreed-upon units of analysis and to describe the associated factors in a structured way (e.g. immediate, underlying and structural).

It must also be remembered that the joint analysis should not be a simple compilation of humanitarian information on the one side, and development information on the other side. The whole point of the joint humanitarian-development analysis is to compare and contrast the respective information as per the agreed analysis plan.

#### **4- Fill in information gaps**

An analysis of any kind must be planned in advance to produce results on time for the decisions or next steps it is supposed to inform. A joint analysis between humanitarian and development actors makes proper planning and clear timeline essential given the range of stakeholders involved and the diversity of their expectations. The joint analysis results may be needed for a time-bound exercise such as to enrich an HNO or a CCA, or to inform a multi-year response plan, or a post-disaster or post-conflict recovery plan.

The timeline for finalizing the joint analysis will determine if it is practicable to fill in information gaps with primary data collection. In some cases, a multi-sectoral assessment designed and conducted jointly between humanitarian and development actors may be feasible, but the complexity of agreeing on objectives, sampling frame, scope, data collection tools and resources should not be underestimated. It may be more feasible to conduct separate assessments (e.g. for some sectors or thematics or specific population groups and locations) in a harmonised way (e.g. using compatible sampling frames, similar definitions of terms and indicators, interoperable datasets etc.) to enable combination of the results at the analysis stage.

When timeline for the finalization of the joint humanitarian-development analysis does not allow for primary data collection to fill gaps, a plan for monitoring and/or complementary assessments should be recommended to the strategic reference group and included in subsequent response plans and budgets.

#### **5- Agree on the results of the joint humanitarian-development analysis**

The technical humanitarian-development analysis group is responsible for producing the analysis results. In many cases, a single analysis report that consolidates the analysis from both the humanitarian and development angles, guided by the original analysis objectives and outputs, will be the most useful. It will allow the extraction of relevant results to feed into other analysis products such as an HNO or a CCA, or broader documents such recovery plans. The communication modalities and audience should be carefully thought through to account for potential sensitivities in the results, e.g. with Government counterparts.

As mentioned, it is important to avoid presenting distinct humanitarian and development analyses that remain disjointed. The analysis outputs should enable understanding:

- Which needs must be met urgently, for whom and where, and in theory require short-term interventions; these are needs with stakes for the survival and basic livelihood self-sustenance capacity of people;
- Which needs are less urgent but important and require medium and longer term interventions to address them; these are needs that are essential to address for the eventual reduction of humanitarian needs;
- What are the factors associated with these various needs, including which ones should be addressed urgently and which ones need to be addressed on the medium or longer term, starting as soon as possible, to reduce humanitarian needs, risks and vulnerabilities, and prevent or mitigate the re-occurrence of needs.

The analysis should refrain from recommending interventions, and roles and responsibilities of humanitarian and development actors at this stage. These discussions should take place as part of the subsequent response analysis. This will help prevent the analysis from becoming inadvertently biased or influenced by programming or financing expectations. Instead, indications of the way forward should be offered.

While previous experiences, such as for PDNAs or RPBA, should be considered, it may be advisable to identify one lead writer who integrates the results of the joint analysis according to the desired units of analysis and outputs. This can strengthen the coherence of the analysis, compared to a compilation of inputs from separate analysts who may have looked at distinct aspects e.g. from the humanitarian angle versus development angle, or from specific sectors.

DRAFT-INTERNAL USE ONLY