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1. Humanitarian Response Planning (HRP)

The HRP draws on the results of the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) process to define the humanitarian response to the assessed needs of the affected population.

Starting from the response analysis, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) will conduct a planning workshop to determine the overall Strategic Objectives (SO) of the response, and define the parameters, boundaries and assumptions of the response.

Using the SOs, the relevant clusters that would contribute to each SOs agree on how to collaborate and ensure an integrated approach upon each SO. Formal or informal agreement on areas of overlap with other clusters will be important to identify and agree on respective roles & responsibilities e.g. will Education or WASH cover WASH in Schools; will Shelter or WASH cover WASH facilities in Shelters; etc. (refer to the inter-cluster matrices in the support pack). Having defined how to work together, the Clusters then develop cluster response plans, logframes and priorities to contribute to the overall country strategy / SOs.

The WASH Cluster Coordinator develops the WASH HRP in collaboration with a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG), and may draw from an existing Strategic Operating Framework (SOF), or use the HRP process to develop a more detailed SOF. The WASH Information Management Officer (IMO) will be involved in the identification of needs, partner capacity and WASH Cluster caseload information for the Strategy, in addition to helping identify the appropriate (i.e. measureable) indicators, but will not necessarily be involved in developing the technical aspects of the WASH HRP.

The Cluster Coordination Unit will also organise a transparent project validation process, for which clear selection criteria will need to be elaborated, ideally in conjunction with the SAG. It is critical that these are considered and communicated to cluster partners. Some key tips in this regard include:

* Easy identification of duplications or gaps requires the use of the Enhanced Geographic Fields (EGFs) as detailed in folder ‘3. For Partners’
* Use of ‘indirect costs’ as a selection criteria will require agreement on the definition of ‘indirect costs’
* Agreement with other key clusters as to how to manage joint reviews / multi-sectoral projects – e.g. WASH in Schools – within the overall HRP timeline.

While the SRP and WASH SOF are being finalised, the WASH IMO should, in tandem and in consultation with the coordinator, be developing the WASH response monitoring system, starting with the main monitoring tool (also known as the 4Ws). The system is critical to the coordination of a response. The system will track the progress of the Cluster against the targets that have been agreed (defined from information on the needs, capacity and caseload exercises).

1. Key Guidance

This process is described in detail in the SRP Guidance 2015 in the resource pack, alongside the current HRP template, examples of country / cluster logframes, and various explicative notes.

More information can be found: <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space/page/strategic-response-planning>

1. Tools & Resources

The GWC has developed various tools and resources over the years to support the Strategic Planning Process (all found in the resource pack):

* Strategic Operating Framework
	+ A guide on how to develop a SOF – overlapping and complementary to many key elements of the HRP (e.g. standards; data flows; priority activities; best practice outputs from TWGs). The iterative document provides orientation to any incoming WASH actor, and can be drawn on in the development of any HRP.
* Inter-Cluster Matrices
	+ Inter-Cluster Matrices of Roles & Accountabilities: global-level agreements on the respective roles and accountabilities of Clusters in areas of potential overlap. As a general rule, this seeks to ensure that other Clusters take responsibility for the WASH aspects within their institutions (e.g. health centers; schools; etc.), while WASH is responsible outside the institutions, and can provide technical support, standards, etc.
		- These documents are intended to be adapted in-country, and will be important to define amongst Clusters around specific SOs, prior to the development of cluster / multi-cluster response plans.
* IM Toolkit: Capacities & Caseload
	+ Guidance Notes on conducting capacity assessments and determining cluster caseloads. It is important to note that the IMO is NOT fully responsible for this task, which must be informed by WASH contextual *knowledge*.
* Environment and Gender Markers
	+ In most countries one or both of these markers may be used. Resources provide an overview of what they are, and some basic guidance to provide partners to facilitate their consideration during project elaboration.
* Example from the field
	+ One excel providing an overview of the HRP process provided to partners including: project selection criteria; timelines; and WASH framework detailing priority areas and indicative activities
	+ One excel providing an overview of the project validation process by the coordination unit, including: identification of potential duplications or gaps; analysis by funding, coverage, objective and priority.