

HNRP Annotated Template – Revisions following HPC SG Feedback

Summary of HPC Steering Group members’ feedback (for details, see Annex)

HPC Steering Group members submitted feedback on the HNRP template, ranging from points of emphasis on key steps in the HPC (e.g. scope-setting for needs analysis) to specific suggestions on wording within the template (e.g. to ensure acknowledgment of the full diversity of the communities whom humanitarians serve). OCHA has reviewed all of the feedback and made a number of adjustments to the template accordingly. The below table consolidates the primary substantive feedback from HPC SG members and associated adjustments/feedback from OCHA. With respect to more detailed requests, these have been reflected throughout the template wherever possible, with two parameters: 1) the integrity of key elements of the HNRP template were maintained (e.g. the Foreword, Crisis Overview and Response Strategy are segments that are intended to be clear, concise and compelling; where more detailed technical suggestions were provided on these pages, OCHA endeavoured to accommodate them in other parts of the template); 2) repetition was avoided, as was providing examples that were overly specific.

Issue	Issues Highlighted by HPC members	Template Adjustments/Feedback
Template/HNRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The template is generally endorsed and appreciated for its streamlined approach. 	
HPC Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HPC should be focused on evidence-based needs analysis and boundary-setting. “Capping” of figures should be avoided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reference has been added at the beginning of the HNRP template regarding the purpose of the HPC and the importance of this being an evidence-based process, whilst highlighting the role of the HPC in promoting robust discussions and informing difficult decisions.
Needs Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope Setting: There are concerns about the potential for scope-setting to exclude vulnerable people from the HNRP needs analysis, especially in protracted crises. Humanitarian Principles: Multiple stakeholders emphasize that needs assessments should be grounded in humanitarian principles like humanity and impartiality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scope Setting: The concept of scope-setting has been part of IASC-endorsed guidance since 2016. However, it has been applied differently in different contexts, including in HPC 2024. The objective for HPC 2025 is to promote a more consistent approach. Detailed guidance on analyzing context, shocks and impacts to inform needs analysis scope-setting is contained within the JIAF and

		<p>Humanitarian Profile guidance (see Annex 2), which are linked to from the HNRP template. The HNRP template highlights the importance of comprehensive context/shock/impact analysis, especially in protracted crises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanitarian Principles: A reference has been added at the beginning of the HNRP template to highlight the importance of the entire HPC being grounded in the humanitarian principles. As all UN resolutions¹ related to the principles refer to them within the context of the provision of humanitarian assistance in emergencies/disasters, setting a scope of needs analysis based on context/shock/impact is fully consistent with the humanitarian principles.
<p>Response Planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequences of boundary-setting: There were multiple requests to make clear, within the HNRP, the consequences of boundary-setting (i.e. who will no longer be targeted for assistance and the consequences for them). • Context-specificity: Decisions on boundary setting and prioritization should be made consultatively at the country level, with flexibility to address context-specific needs. • People-centered planning: The voices of affected people should be included in this process to ensure that their capacities and preferences are accurately represented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequences of boundary-setting: A new sub-section has been added (moving content that was earlier placed under the Humanitarian-Development Collaboration section) to highlight the consequences of boundary-setting; key advocacy messages can be highlighted here. • Context-specificity: The HNRP template provides three key parameters for boundary-setting discussions—the “reality check”; determining who and where the HNRP will target; and identifying which activities the HNRP will include—each of which can be adapted to the context.

¹ **Latest GA resolution:** Reaffirming the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence in the provision of humanitarian assistance, and reaffirming also the need for **all actors engaged in the provision of humanitarian assistance in situations of complex emergencies and natural disasters** to promote and fully respect these principles

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People-centered planning: The template has been adjusted to emphasize the need for response planning to be driven by people’s capacities and preferences in several places.
Centrality of Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on CoP: The Centrality of Protection should be emphasized more consistently throughout the HNRP template, ensuring protection risks are clearly articulated and shoring-up Centrality of Protection in response planning aspects. There is a call for better integration of protection concerns, including GBV mitigation and its linkages to PSEA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HNRP template has been adjusted in several places based on the specific suggestions provided by the Protection Cluster, in order to enhance the Centrality of Protection at both the needs analysis and response planning phases.
Humanitarian-Development Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development suspensions/reductions: HPC SG members highlighted the importance of noting where development action is suspended or reduced and including advocacy messages around this (i.e. calling for resumption etc). • Collaboration: HPC SG members noted that HDC should be two-way and not just about humanitarian “asks”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development suspensions/reductions: Text has been added encouraging specific reference to any development suspensions/reductions and advocacy on the same under the HDC section. • HDC: Text re the consequences of boundary-setting has been moved to a different part of the template, and this section is now focused on two-way engagement and associated advocacy.
Inclusive HPC Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a call for earlier and more regular engagement with stakeholders, including the GCCG, to ensure effective participation and support for country cluster colleagues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst not reflected in the HNRP template per se, the critical importance of an inclusive HPC process is being reiterated at every possible opportunity and OCHA is open to feedback on what more can be done, whilst acknowledging the challenges faced by teams on the ground as they try and run a light and short HPC whilst ensuring optimal inclusivity.

Annex 1. Specific HPC SG Member Feedback (consolidated/condensed for brevity)

Entity	Form	Key Comments
GCCG	Email + comments in Annotated Template	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanitarian Principles: While acknowledging the inclusion of humanitarian principles in the document, the GCCG emphasizes that needs must be determined based on these principles to avoid excluding acutely vulnerable populations, such as SAM children and those in IPC phase 4, especially those affected by protracted crises. • Scope of Analysis and Shocks: The GCCG advocates for a comprehensive needs assessment across the entire country, which includes identifying needs, severity, and drivers. They propose that shocks should inform the response plan rather than restrict the scope of analysis, ensuring that even areas not affected by shocks are considered. • Centrality of Protection and Protection Risks: The importance of consistently and robustly presenting the Centrality of Protection and protection risks is highlighted. They stress that these issues should be clearly articulated, as they are core drivers of humanitarian crises. The GCCG suggests involving the Protection Cluster in refining the narrative and proposes a learning webinar for OCHA teams. They also emphasize the consideration of GBV mitigation. • Boundary Setting Methodology and Decision Making: The GCCG recommends that boundary setting and prioritization decisions be made consultatively at the country level, avoiding globally imposed rules. They stress the importance of including the voices of affected people in these decisions. • GCCG Engagement: The GCCG highlights the need for early engagement in the process to contribute effectively and support country cluster colleagues. They propose having two set touch points in the year to review lessons learned and discuss new HPC guidance. • Humanitarian-Development Collaboration: The GCCG emphasize that engaging with development partners should be a two-way process, as clusters are already striving to participate in development processes.
ICVA	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Comments: The template was difficult to evaluate without additional supporting materials, and the limited timeframe. Members are keen to review the Step-by-Step guidance, emphasizing its importance in understanding the HNRP template. • Scope-Setting and Analysis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is concern about how scope-setting from 2023 has been implemented.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is crucial to consider all needs within the scope-setting, and the current guidance might allow for inconsistent application across different contexts. ○ The relationship between humanitarian and development caseloads should be clarified, noting that both can assist the same populations. ● Inclusion and Representation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The feedback stresses the importance of including diverse humanitarian partners and affected communities in the needs analysis process. ○ The template should explicitly include marginalized groups, such as women, children, LGBTQI+ individuals, IDPs, and refugees. ● Non-negotiables: Certain elements, like Centrality of Protection and focus on AAP, PSEA, gender, age, and disability, should be mandatory and not optional. ● Consequences of boundary-setting: The HNRP should clearly outline the impact of boundary-setting decisions and include affected people's perspectives in prioritization. ● Humanitarian-Development Collaboration: The template should detail the implications for humanitarian response if development actors do not deliver on their responsibilities. It should also address situations with limited development cooperation and the effects of boundary-setting in these contexts.
REACH / IMPACT	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Overall Support: IMPACT endorses the HNRP template and appreciates the streamlined and targeted approach of the HPC process. ● Scope-setting: There is a concern about potentially excluding vulnerable populations if the definitions of scope are applied too narrowly in the JIAF manual. Inconsistent application of scope definitions across crises could lead to misallocation of global resources. The lack of detailed guidance leaves gaps in ensuring consistent scope-setting, which the current JIAF manual does not adequately address. Despite these concerns, IMPACT agrees to proceed with the current plan, emphasizing the importance of monitoring and reflecting on the scope-setting process for future improvements.
FAO	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scope-setting: The team appreciates the effort to include feedback from the previous Steering Group meeting and acknowledges the importance of taking an expansive definition of "shock" in protracted crises. This prevents oversimplification of the situation by focusing only on recent or rapid onset events. There is a need for a clear process in the executive summary to define the scope of needs, which should be based on

		<p>comprehensive country-wide assessments. This ensures all vulnerable populations are considered, not just those affected by recent events. If certain geographic areas or population groups are excluded from the scope, it must be transparently justified based on inter-sectoral analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Engagement/Use of Testimonials: While integrating people's testimonials is encouraged, it is essential to ensure they are representative and not anecdotal. A clear methodology should be established for community consultations. • Boundary-Setting and Prioritization: Prioritization should focus on the needs of affected people and the humanitarian outcomes, not just the type of activities. The rationale behind response strategies must be clearly provided, including the risks of excluding certain populations or areas. • Humanitarian-Development Collaboration: While the effort to align the HNRP with other planning frameworks is noted, there is concern that planning documents alone may not be sufficient. It's critical that current and adaptive programs address urgent needs to prevent deterioration.
IOM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Disaggregation: Change "Status breakdown" to "breakdown per population group" • Humanitarian Principles: IOM wishes to stress and reiterate that the overall approach needs to be firmly based on humanitarian principles. • Consolidation: IOM supports the suggestion to use the upcoming cycle for consolidation and focus on the implementation of JIAF 2.0 and boundary setting.
WFP	Email, Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope-Setting and Humanitarian Principles: WFP stresses that needs should be determined based on humanitarian principles, particularly humanity and impartiality; it is crucial to count every person in need (regardless of the driver of the need/shock), as this is a fundamental humanitarian principle and part of Accountability to Affected People. WFP calls for a comprehensive assessment across the entire country to gain a realistic and up-to-date understanding of the population's needs. The analysis should cover both sectoral and inter-sectoral aspects to identify the nature, severity, and drivers of these needs. WFP understand that scope setting is a well-established concept but wonder whether its interpretation has been consistent across the board. WFP proposes that shock identification remains part of the analysis, while ensuring the scope of it (PiN and severity) is comprehensive – in alignment with field practices to date. WFP reiterates the need for a strong focus on individuals in IPC3+ in the needs section of the HNRP. • Definition of Humanitarian Need: WFP recognizes the evolving humanitarian landscape and are eager to engage in more detailed dialogue on what constitutes a humanitarian need. The increasing complexity,

		<p>enhanced Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), Nexus, and localization approaches, including those developed through the Emergency Relief Coordinator's flagship initiatives, present valuable opportunities for us to review and refine our thinking and strategies in future years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary-Setting & Prioritization: WFP strongly agrees that HNRPs need to present realistic targets and financial asks, considering the operational capacity of humanitarian actors, complementarity with development and non-HNRP actors, and funding trends and levels. HCTs should have intentional discussions around boundary setting and prioritization to focus on the most life-threatening needs and leverage the comparative advantages of different actors.
UNHCR	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for WFP's Comments: UNHCR supports WFP's emphasis on realistic targets and financial asks in Humanitarian Needs and Response Plans (HNRPs), considering operational capacity, development actors' complementarity, and funding trends. • Scope-Setting and Humanitarian Principles: Needs should be determined based on humanitarian principles, with comprehensive assessments informing boundary setting and prioritization. Consistency in scope setting and shock identification across all areas is essential. Accurate presentation of needs in Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) is crucial. All needs should be counted, and a clear distinction should be made between identified needs and response targets, acknowledging that needs may remain unmet. • Incorporating Lessons Learned: Boundary setting was introduced last year, and it is important to see how lessons learned from earlier this year are informing the process for 2025. This includes how elements of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), localization, and the Nexus approach are being incorporated.

Annex 2. Pre-existing Guidance on Scope of Needs Analysis

2016 - [Humanitarian Profile Support guidance](#)

- 2. **People Affected includes all those whose lives have been impacted as a direct result of the crisis.** This figure is often the first available after a sudden onset emergency and often defines the scope or boundary of a needs assessment. It does not, however, necessarily equate to the number of people in need of humanitarian aid; it should not be confused or used interchangeably with the category People in Need. Characteristics of the category People Affected must include: • being in close geographical proximity to a crisis; • physically or emotionally impacted, including exposed to a human rights violation/protection incident; • experiencing personal loss or loss of capital and assets as a direct result of the crisis (family member, house/roof, livestock or any other asset); • being faced with an immediate threat from a crisis.
- **When a crisis becomes protracted and its effects deepen and spread, the definition of Population Affected may need modification, to include population geographically distant from the centre of the initial shock and not having been physically/emotionally impacted but experiencing secondary effects of a disaster/crisis.** These could manifest as economic implications, such as price increases and commodity shortages, or the consequences of damaged infrastructure, such as water supply or electricity. Estimates of the Population Affected are among the very first information requirements at the onset of a crisis. Numbers of population affected are derived from the total population of the affected area, as they are a sub-set of that category. Identifying affected populations is always linked to identifying affected geographical areas, whether an area population has been displaced from or to, or an area that has been specifically hit by a flood, or cut off from all access to food.
- 3. **People in Need are a sub-set of the Population Affected** and are defined as those members: • whose physical security, basic rights, dignity, living conditions or livelihoods are threatened or have been disrupted, AND • whose current level of access to basic services, goods and social protection is inadequate to reestablish normal living conditions with their accustomed means in a timely manner without additional assistance. This category is further broken down into sub-categories or by sector/cluster to provide additional detail about the intensity, severity or type of need (e.g., need of urgent life-saving assistance, food insecure population, people in need of shelter). The definition of People in Need will need to be monitored and adjusted over time. At the onset or continuation of a shock, needs are more likely to be centred on sustaining lives; the more protracted the crisis, the more needs will be centred on re-establishing and sustaining normal living and livelihood conditions.

2021 - [JIAF 1.1. manual](#)

- The JIAF Framework is built around five main pillars, each of which contains different sub-pillars to help organise information, visualize relationships, and bring a consistent structure to the analysis (see Figure 1, page 5).

- The first three pillars – context, event/shock, and impact – allow response actors to define the scope of the crisis, i.e., to identify all affected geographic areas and estimate the total number of people who have been affected by it, disaggregated by key demographic characteristics.
- The fourth pillar regarding Humanitarian Conditions allows response actors to then classify the severity of humanitarian needs within the affected areas and populations and estimate the number of people in need within each severity level.

2023 - [JIAF 2.0](#) technical manual

- Module 1 (Contributing factors and scope Objectives and Outputs) is where analysts initially meet to identify common parameters and scope of analyses. Module 1 is done jointly with members representing the clusters and areas of responsibilities, as well as relevant sectoral coordination mechanisms that may be activated at country level, sector-leading agencies, OCHA, NGOs, and other relevant partners and civil society during multi-partner working sessions.

Module 1 has three objectives:

- To identify key contextual information that directly relates to the humanitarian situation. This information includes background on key underlying structural conditions, as well as information on humanitarian trends, that help understand people's vulnerabilities to shocks.
- To identify major shocks and their impacts on the humanitarian situation. By pinpointing the relevant information about the shocks, such as location and intensity, analysts can better understand and map out the crisis. Assessing the impact of shocks on systems (e.g. infrastructure, movement restrictions, etc.), and on vulnerable population groups is crucial to define the scope of analysis and establish a shared understanding of the situation.
- To determine the scope of the JIAF analysis to be conducted and relevant implications for data collection. This includes defining the geographic scope of analysis, the administrative level and any specific population groups to be analyzed.

[...]

- Workspace (1B: Shocks and Impacts) is used to identify and document major shocks that have caused disruptions leading to humanitarian needs. It allows analysts to identify the shocks affecting the country, estimate the population affected and assess their likely impact on systems and populations. Box 5 outlines the content of Workspace 1B.
- Workspace 1C (Scope of Analysis) provides analysts with the space to record agreements on the unit of analysis, based on context, shocks, and impacts, and determine the implications for data gathering and analysis. Box 6 describes the content of Workspace 1C.