

Accelerated Transitions

Key takeaways from NRC internal discussions

The IASC Principals have confirmed that the IASC/interagency coordination system will undergo accelerated transitions in Cameroon, Colombia, Eritrea, Iraq, Libya, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Zimbabwe. Three other countries (Ukraine, Mozambique, and Chad) remain on a list of potential deactivations, with a decision expected in June.

NRC organized internal discussions with affected Country Offices and Regional Offices to enable them to exchange with one another, share reactions and reflections for the future, and jointly brainstorm next steps. The following is a summary of the main ideas and proposals from those discussions, focused first on countries when an accelerated transition is already confirmed, then turning to the three that are still pending, followed by next steps from the global level.

Top lines from/for countries where accelerated transitions are confirmed:

- **Many countries may need some type of operational coordination that is inclusive of NGOs following the deactivation of IASC structures** – where humanitarian needs remain, and at least some humanitarian response is already funded to continue.
 - This will likely look different from country to country.
 - Replicating the existing in-country coordination system and structures is neither the objective of the deactivations nor the ideal outcome. A good starting point is to understand what the needs for coordination will be for actors continuing to deliver humanitarian response.
 - Future humanitarian coordination can benefit from linking to any relevant structures in the development coordination sphere – noting that these have different formats between sectors and issues within and between countries. Relevant development actors will therefore need to be engaged in discussions, when that becomes appropriate.
 - Future coordination does not need to be UN-led – we have seen some successful examples of NGO coordination, including via NGO forums (e.g. North-West Nigeria).
 - In contexts where coordination leadership will be transferred to authorities, suggestion to consider having a NORCAP-style secondment response to build up government capacity.
 - Some protection risks and hard-to-reach areas may require special consideration in transition planning, including in how coordination is continued and who leads this (e.g. international or civil society actors).¹
 - Looking at how some functions could be combined with refugee coordination structures could be an option in some contexts to avoid duplication.
- **Across the board, there will need to continue to be a way to monitor new and deteriorating needs, and flag any severe needs which arise.**

¹ Note that NRC and the Global Protection Cluster recently published a practice note on promoting continuity of protection in humanitarian coordination transitions, available [here](#).

- This could potentially be outsourced to a third party, as has been done in some countries in Latin America.
- Data collection, analysis, and information management capacities will need to be considered.
- **Some countries may wish to maintain a collective strategic planning and fundraising tool, especially where reduction in visibility and donor engagement in a crisis is a concern.**
 - There is not currently a standard model for this (beyond Flash Appeals), so we would need to consider what this could look like.
 - NRC sits in the global Humanitarian Program Cycle Steering Group so can feed in suggestions from COs if it is helpful to have a standard approach – we had previously considered the idea of a Protracted Crisis Response Plan, for example.
- **We will need to rethink funding channels to meet residual needs.**
 - This will include how to ensure access to funding for local and national NGOs if OCHA-led pooled funds disappear from deactivated countries.
 - More broadly, NRC and others will have to explore non-humanitarian sources of funding to enable continued responses to needs, including for solutions.

Top lines from/for countries where accelerated transitions will be considered:

- **Countries that have been propositional and provided a strong rationale for their proposal (e.g. Colombia) have been the most successful in setting out the terms of their transition.**
 - The HC/HCT in Colombia proposed very clear timelines, vision and plan for transition, and justification for staffing needs, and their requests have been more readily accepted as a result.
- While the last round of EDG discussions did not use an explicit set of criteria for their decisions (though NRC had prepared a set of suggested criteria [here](#)), **we can anticipate which factors will and will not resonate in the future EDG discussions and decisions:**
 - Factors that **increase** the likelihood of being recommended for accelerated transition:
 - Countries without areas classified as severity 4/5 need or with only small pockets of severity 4/5.
 - Countries with governments that are willing OR have stronger economies (and therefore resources) to respond.
 - Countries where there is strong pushback against OCHA, the Clusters, or existing UN coordination structures.
 - Factors that **decrease** the likelihood of accelerated transition:
 - Countries with sanctions regimes, areas under the control of *de facto* authorities or non-state armed groups, or other contextual factors that make it difficult for the government or development actors to assume responsibility to meet humanitarian needs or coordinate response.
 - Factors that **do not seem to affect** the likelihood of accelerated transition:

- Being a neglected or protracted crisis – OCHA does not believe that this is justification for maintenance of the IASC coordination architecture if there are not severe needs.

Requests for global support/next steps:

- Support to think through what should come after the accelerated transition would be helpful.
 - Recognizing that there is unlikely to be a one-size-fits-all answer to what comes next – to some degree, this will have to be a country-by-country conversation.
 - There is already some guidance – [IASC transition guidance](#), [NRC/GPC Protection in Transitions Guidance](#).
- **NRC's Policy and Advocacy Section will:**
 - Share some suggested HCT discussion questions, with the aim of helping HCTs to start thinking through the approaches that will best suit their contexts (e.g. on residual coordination, collective planning/fundraising, funding modalities).
 - Share some considerations or principles from NRC's perspective, building off the suggested HCT discussion questions.
 - Share some lessons learned from past transitions and examples of models that have been used in other contexts.