

Background

HPC 2023 to HPC 2025: A period of landmark change for the HPC

1. **Between 2023 and 2025, the humanitarian community made the largest changes to coordinated humanitarian plans and appeals in over a decade.** After consecutive years of expansion in the scope and requirements of coordinated humanitarian plans/appeals, at a time of growing crises, extensive collective efforts—from country to global level and across the entire humanitarian system—have been exerted over the past two years to ensure humanitarian action is focused on the people and places that need it most.
2. **At the same time, the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) has been significantly lightened**, following valid and growing criticism that the process was overly burdensome, bureaucratic and time-consuming. Between HPC 2023 and HPC 2025, the process was reduced by 51 days and document length decreased by 67 per cent, increasing time available for partners and coordinators to focus on the operational response.

HPC 2023-HPC 2025



HPC 2026: We are charting a way forward during immense uncertainty and dramatic changes in our sector

3. **Following dramatic funding cuts in 2025 which have resulted in a seismic contraction of humanitarian action, the Humanitarian Programme Cycle Steering Group (HPC SG) has called for a major overhaul of the HPC ahead of 2026 to ensure it is fit for purpose in this new reality.** This includes clear calls to:
 - i. **Focus the HPC on its strategic value**, namely planning, and galvanizing resources, for principled, effective, quality, accountable, inclusive and people-centered humanitarian action.
 - ii. **Drastically lighten and reduce the HPC process**, acknowledging the dramatic reduction in humanitarian capacity available to conduct it and the critical importance of focusing remaining capacity on the delivery of humanitarian response.
 - iii. **Ensure the HPC is grounded in the priorities and preferences of crisis-affected people**, overcoming siloes and sectors to be truly accountable to the communities we serve.
4. **Furthermore, HPC SG members have stressed the critical importance of inclusivity in the HPC process (especially with respect to the role of local and national actors) and consistency in application of key concepts.** Whilst always essential (as highlighted in [HPC 2025](#)), this is particularly imperative today, as humanitarian partners navigate a dramatic decline in resources, demanding greater cohesiveness, clarity and collective action with respect to both in-country and across country prioritization.
5. **Within this context, this paper proposes a way forward for HPC 2026**, building on consultations with, and [contributions](#) from, the HPC SG, as well as discussions underway through the [Humanitarian Reset](#). The primary purpose of this proposal is to chart a path for the HPC during a time of incredible uncertainty. As such, the proposal intends to provide a 'bridge' that enables humanitarian partners to carry out a far lighter HPC that still produces critical shared understanding, focus, advocacy and action, whilst acknowledging that many elements may need to be revisited in 2026, for HPC 2027, once the broader humanitarian landscape and funding trends become clearer.

HPC 2026: Inclusivity as the Key for Collective Success

6. **Given the stakes of humanitarian planning at this juncture, it is critical that the HPC is a fully inclusive and accountable process.** As highlighted ahead of HPC 2025—but not fully accomplished, as evidenced by feedback that there continues to be a trust gap in HPC outputs—this includes two aspects:
- a. **Meaningful, continuous engagement with crisis-affected communities in all their diversities**, to ensure that the HNRP reflects people's priorities, capacities and preferences, *as well as* to ensure that affected communities are aware of how this information has been used to drive decision making and response, including to transparently communicate on what humanitarians cannot do that has been requested by communities.
 - b. **Engagement of NGOs (both INGOs and L/NGOs) throughout the process**, and especially at critical junctures, including decisions on scope-setting/defining the crisis and JIAF analysis (particularly with respect to severity), as these will be determinative of broader humanitarian planning.

HPC 2026: Critical Building Blocks

7. **The proposed critical building blocks for HPC 2026 are:**

- A. Needs Analysis
 - i. Scope of Analysis
 - ii. Severity of Need
 - iii. People in Need
- B. Response Planning
 - i. People Targeted & Prioritized
 - ii. Standardized Strategic Objectives
 - iii. Community-driven Response Activities and Modalities (plus associated 'menu')
 - iv. Responsible Transition/Ethical Exit
- C. Financial Requirements and Tracking
- D. Response Monitoring, to be analyzed against severity of needs and community preferences

8. **HPC 2026 must continue gains in the Centrality of Protection¹.** This requires integrating protection principles into every phase of the HPC—from needs assessment/analysis to response planning and monitoring—ensuring that humanitarian actors protect the rights, safety, and dignity of affected people across all aspects of the response. HPC 2026 will ensure that preventing and addressing the impact of protection risks is a core collective goal. This requires Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs) to understand how these protection risks are driving or exacerbating needs and tailoring their intersectoral response to mitigate them. Working in this way enables HCTs to address needs more effectively, in a more sustainable and cost-efficient way while upholding people's basic rights.
9. **For each of these critical building blocks, the proposed (and lightest possible) methodology, as well as critical considerations, for HPC 2026 are outlined below, and updated following HPC SG feedback.**

A. Needs Analysis

10. **It is proposed that the following three key areas of focus be implemented in HPC 2026 to ensure inclusive, consistent and transparent needs analysis:**
- i. **Scope of analysis/defining the crisis:** Each country should begin HPC 2026 with a light and rapid analysis of shocks to define the crisis and geographic areas affected. Significant progress was

¹ For further reference see the Global Protection Cluster webpage on the [Centrality of Protection](#).

made between HPC 2024 and HPC 2025. However, greater consistency is needed for HPC 2026. To this end, the following four 'core' shocks should be the basis for HPC 2026, where they meet relevant emergency thresholds in the country context:

- a. **Conflict, violence, coercion and deliberate deprivation**
- b. **Natural disaster/climate-related/geological shocks**
- c. **Epidemics**
- d. **Plant and animal pests and diseases**

In addition to these four 'core' shocks, the following may be considered if required in the context:

- e. **Areas receiving and hosting a high number of displaced people**, but which (the geographic areas) are not directly affected by the shock that is driving displacement. *Note: This should only be applied where the situation warrants it (e.g. if 200 displaced people arrive in a city of 3 million this may not be considered a shock, whereas if 200 displaced people arrive in a community of 200, it would).*
- f. **Areas facing emergency thresholds of mortality and/or Severe Acute Malnutrition.** *Note: This is particularly important to guard against the possibility of critical and life-threatening needs being excluded from analysis due to any error and/or incompleteness in the shock analysis and builds on experience regarding scope-setting for HPC 2025.*
- g. **[Exceptional/extreme circumstances only] Major/sudden/acute economic shock.** *Note: This should be applied only in truly exceptional and extreme cases, to guard against the inclusion of chronic economic considerations, which are better dealt with through development action. In HPC 2025, economic criteria were only used in Venezuela and Syria.*

- ii. **Severity of Need:** Given the dramatic reduction in humanitarian resources available, it will be imperative to ensure that HPC 2026 guides collective multisectoral responses to the places where humanitarian needs and protection risks² are most severe. Given the limited resources available, it is proposed that:

- a. **Area-level intersectoral geographic severity is prioritized in needs analysis**,³ whilst ensuring that any 'pockets of need' (e.g. a camp and/or besieged area with higher severity of need vis-à-vis the surrounding administrative area) are accurately captured. *Note: if it is possible with the data available to analyze people in need by severity down to the individual, country operations are welcome to do so. However, it is anticipated that this level of detailed data will not be available in many contexts.*
- b. **JIAF Outcome indicators be prioritized for data collection**, to ensure a minimum collective evidence basis for severity analysis and, in particular, to build the evidence base regarding protection risks. These include mortality, acute malnutrition, epidemic-prone diseases, livelihood coping strategies, and violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. ⁴ Where data is not available for the outcome indicators, appropriate proxies may be used as outlined in the JIAF manual.
- c. **Inter-sectoral 'Phase 5' classifications undergo a rapid global review**, with a 'no objections' verification through the HPC SG, supported by a small group of needs assessment and analysis experts, to ensure that we are consistently applying common

² For detailed guidance on how to include protection risks in needs analysis, see JIAF 2 and the [Protection Analytical Framework](#).

³ Note: The JIAF manual requires at least two sectors in sectoral Severity 5 and two in sectoral Severity Phase 4 to classify an area as Intersectoral Severity 5. However, any areas that have at least one sector classifying it as sectoral Severity 5 are flagged for discussion by the analysis team. This means, for example, that the JIAF team could decide to raise the Intersectoral Severity to 5 if they have additional evidence that supports such a classification. See pp.42, 50 and 53 of the JIAF manual.

⁴ p.46 JIAF manual

standards to identify the most severe needs. For HPC 2025, seven countries ⁵ had intersectoral Phase 5, but it was clear that different standards applied across the crises. Given that only a small number of countries are anticipated to have intersectoral Phase 5, a rapid global no objections review is feasible.

iii. **People in Need (PiN):** The PiN for each country includes all people in JIAF intersectoral severity Phase 3 and above within the scope of analysis. Ideally, this should be built—per the JIAF manual—on sectoral analysis and, wherever possible, based on multi-sectoral primary data collection. However, where updated and detailed new sectoral data might not be available, JIAF 2026 may need to rely upon secondary data reviews and expert judgment, combined with a focus on gathering fresh data in places where new shocks and/or intensified shocks have unfolded.

a. **Total PiN:** In each country, HPC 2026 will require that the HCT have an overall People in Need figure (broken down by area severity, as above). *Note: This overall PiN can be disaggregated by geographic area if the operation wishes to undertake area-based planning. It should also be disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other appropriate population groups in the context, when such disaggregation is relevant to the action it aims to inform, is feasible and commensurate with available resources, and will be used for operational purposes.*

b. **Sectoral PiN:** Clusters/sectors should still produce sectoral PiN and severity analysis, which is fundamental to the integrity and credibility of the JIAF methodology. This can, and should, include feedback from essential service providers, in addition to affected people. Should there be capacity constraints, this should be raised at an early stage to allow options/alternatives to be identified and implemented.

11. Where there is a difference between the HPC's scope and that of other key tools (e.g. the IPC) in any country context, a standardized text box will be added to the HNRP which acknowledges the differences in scope and highlights the overall figures of severe food insecurity (IPC Phase 3 or above). For example: "The HPC People in Need figure includes people in need of humanitarian assistance within the geographic scope of the crisis. The Integrated Phase Classification/Cadre Harmonise in [xxx country] covers the entirety [or xxx coverage] of the country and has found that xxx people are high levels of acute food insecurity (i.e. are in IPC Phase 3 or above)."

12. As the HPC is likely to be in less countries, and less geographic areas within countries, moving forward humanitarian partners have highlighted the critical importance of capturing the scale and magnitude of crises and needs globally. To this end, the Global Humanitarian Overview should play a key role in highlighting the totality of global needs within the narrative, to complement the headline figures. As one example, the GHO consistently cites total global acute food insecurity, regardless of cause and regardless of whether it is inside/outside of HPC scope, based on the Global Report on Food Crises, as well as total displacement figures regardless of cause and/or whether inside/outside of HPC scope.

B. Response Planning

13. Response planning has historically been one of the most time-consuming aspects of the HPC, including as it has involved both strategic and operational elements, as well as detail-oriented processes, such as project registration. However, response planning is also one of the most crucial areas where the views of crisis-affected people can shape the humanitarian response.

14. It is proposed that HPC 2026 have the following four key areas of focus for response planning, acknowledging that the HPC's primary purpose will be strategic moving forward, but also the importance of this phase for grounding the response in crisis-affected people's priorities:

i. **People Targeted & Prioritized:** Utilizing the extensive and difficult work undertaken on boundary-setting for HPC 2024/2025, it is proposed that People Targeted be based on a standardized formula for HPC 2026. This would significantly lighten the HPC planning phase, whilst remaining credible, and provide a bridge to HPC 2027, when it is hoped that a more rigorous approach can

⁵ Colombia, Haiti, Mali, Myanmar, Sudan, Ukraine and Venezuela.

be applied to determine people target.

- a. **People Targeted:** The proposed formula would be **People Targeted = 100% Intersectoral PiN Phases 4 + 5 AND max. 50% Intersectoral PiN Phase 3**. *Note: This formula⁶ is provided as a starting point and—wherever feasible within the capacity available—clusters, inter-cluster coordination groups (ICCGs) and HCTs are encouraged to undertake more in-depth response analysis to calculate people targeted, including regarding capacity and access constraints. In each country context, the ICCG and HCT should review and discuss the target calculated by the above formulas to ensure that there are no 'exclusion errors' (e.g. pockets outside target areas where response is critically required) and/or 'inclusion errors' (e.g. areas with extreme access constraints where response should be assessed for feasibility; targets that are known to well-exceed the capacity of partners in-country etc). Even where challenges are anticipated, it is recommended to target all people in Intersectoral Phases 4 and 5 (given the life-threatening nature of their needs), with all efforts exerted to find response strategies and modalities that will enable this.*
- b. **People Prioritized:** The proposed formula would be **People Prioritized = 100% Intersectoral PiN Phases 4 + 5**. *Note: Urgent Prioritization should ensure the best and most dignified response, across the 12-month cycle, taking into account seasonal/time sensitive opportunities and other contextual considerations for a cost-effective response.*

ii. **Standardized Strategic Objectives (SOs):** Each year, every country goes through a process of developing SOs for their HNRP, often requiring workshops and wordsmithing. However, in reality, globally there are around 3-4 SOs that are in common use, with little variation from country to country. It is therefore proposed that HPC 2026 use standardized SOs, to avoid unnecessary labour in-country, and to leverage over a decade of experience in developing SOs⁷, as follows, with the ability to adapt to context as and where needed:

- a. **SO1 – Saving Lives & Alleviating Suffering:** Reduce crisis-related morbidity and mortality through principled, rapid, quality, inclusive, safe, dignified and accountable life-saving assistance.
- b. **SO2 – Protecting Safety and Rights:** Protect the safety, dignity, and rights of crisis-affected people, in line with international law and standards.
- c. **SO3 – Sustaining Lives and Livelihoods:** Enable equitable and sustained access to essential services and livelihoods to preserve dignity and promote resilience and self-reliance for crisis-affected people.

NOTE: In each country context, the ICCG and HCT should review the standardized Strategic Objectives and propose any red line adjustments that are required to adequately reflect the response in the country.

iii. **Community-driven Response Activities & Modalities:** To date, response planning has been primarily driven by clusters at national-level, resulting in perceptions that it is too top-heavy, centralized and sector-driven, as opposed to being formulated around the preferences and priorities of crisis-affected people. While there has been growing engagement of communities in the HPC—between HPC 2023 and HPC 2025, the percentage of countries where people were consulted during response planning increased from 68% to 85%—this has not gone far enough. HPC 2026 must mark a turning point and to that end, it is proposed that:

⁶ This formula is proposed based on analysis of HPC 2025 data, which demonstrates that over half of the countries with HNRPs had People Targeted within a 25% range of the proposed formula, including major crises such as Sudan. The main outliers in this formula in 2025 are countries with low comparative severity (Chad and Niger), which have a higher proportional target due to the absence of large numbers of people in intersectoral severity 4/5, as well as two significant crises (Myanmar and Yemen) where People Targeted is significantly lower for specific reasons, including due to operational capacity and/or access constraints.

⁷ The wording proposed is primarily based on analysis of Strategic Objectives contained in the 2025 HNRPs.

- a. **HPC 2026 should contribute to whole-of-system efforts to ensure accountability to affected people (AAP), including as part of the Humanitarian Reset.** AAP is a [commitment](#) by humanitarians to use power responsibly: to take account of, give account to, and be held to account by the people they seek to assist, with community engagement/consultation being one component of this endeavour.
- b. **Response activities and modalities should be based explicitly on the expressed preferences and priorities of crisis-affected people,** including through transparent and consultative dialogue that allows communities to participate in decisions—including regarding how best to use scarce resources—and to challenge them.⁸ While this is already detailed in existing guidance, structural barriers and constraints have impacted progress. Moving forward, how this is done will depend on context (including capacity, accessibility, etc). *However, at a minimum, this means:*
 1. **Identifying and defining people's priorities and preferences** by consulting with people in all their diversities at all stages of the HPC. *Note: This does not require community consultations to be held specifically for the HNRP but rather a commitment by humanitarian actors to utilize all available community consultations/engagement to feed into the HPC. Should resources be available to carry out dedicated consultations as part of the HPC, this is welcome, but with the reminder that consultation/engagement is only one element of Accountability to Affected People (AAP) and the HPC should further the entirety of AAP; AND*
 2. **Choosing ways to meet targeted people's needs that align with their preferences and priorities,** e.g. borehole vs water trucking and kitchen garden vs food assistance, to give just two age-old examples; AND
 3. **Delivering through the modalities that people most prefer, and which address their priorities and preferences most holistically and flexibly** e.g. if people express a preference for cash assistance instead of in-kind assistance, the response should honour this insofar as it is feasible; AND
 4. **Where we are unable to deliver in the way or through the modalities that people prefer and prioritize, explaining why and what we are doing about it,** i.e. through sustained community engagement and communication we explain what (if any) constraints we are facing that prevent us from delivering based on preferences and priorities (e.g. authorities' constraints on use of cash, etc). This will also focus the response throughout the year, based on community feedback.

NOTE: *It is acknowledged that there may be significant capacity constraints given the dramatic decline in humanitarian resources. Good practices regarding AAP in the HPC will be shared across country operations to support implementation in HPC 2026 in the lightest possible manner, recognizing that capacity will vary country-by country and that, wherever possible, efforts in the HPC should build upon pre-existing work and tools for AAP (e.g. complaints and feedback mechanisms etc).*
- c. **To enable response monitoring, a globally usable 'menu of activities and indicators' will be shared with all country operations,** so that they can select activities from the menu, rather than having to articulate new definitions and terminologies across each response. This menu is based on a comprehensive review of many years of the HPC and contains a diverse and wide-ranging set of activities and indicators that reflect the full array of response options across a multitude of crises. It will be consulted globally with the Global Cluster Coordinators Group (GCCG) and will also be reviewed by UNHCR

⁸ Important resources on navigating challenging ethical decisions—which will likely become more common due to the dramatic reduction in humanitarian resources available—are available including based on the [COVID-19 response](#) (WHO, Global Health Cluster (2020) *Ethics: Key questions to ask when facing dilemmas during COVID-19 response in humanitarian settings*. Developed with the Protection Cluster, Sphere, and partners and on [Humanitarian Ethical and Principled Decision-Making](#) (Humanitarian Outcomes (2022) *No Easy Choice: A humanitarian's guide to ethical and principled decision-making.*)

and IOM to consider possible interoperability with refugee and migrant operations. It will be possible to add activities to this menu, but the menu both expedites and lightens the process of developing a log frame for the response *and* ensures response monitoring will be feasible by avoiding different wording for the same/similar activities and indicators. Indicators should be disaggregated by sex, age, disability and other appropriate population groups in the context, when such disaggregation is relevant to the action it aims to inform, is feasible and commensurate with available resources, and will be used for operational purposes.⁹

- d. **Each agreed response activity will then be linked to one Strategic Objective**, to enable response monitoring, with the ability for each country operation to choose whether they would then like to group data by cluster/sector, by area, or both, depending on coordination capacity and architecture.

- iv. **Responsible transition/ethical exit:** Since its establishment, the HPC has been seen by many as a continuous cycle. Moving forward, it is vital that the conditions/criteria for humanitarian exit be clearly stated in the HPC, promoting transition from the outset of every response, and making clear any challenges that need to be overcome for a transition to occur. The HPC should—in a light and context-appropriate manner—promote responsible transitions that prioritize the well-being of crisis-affected people and minimize potential harm, including through transparent communication with affected communities. As the HPC tightens in focus, it will be critical to ensure robust collaboration with development actors, especially with respect to people who may no longer be targeted for humanitarian assistance and to ensure a strong focus on recovery wherever it is feasible and appropriate.

C. Financial Requirements & Tracking

- 15. **Determining the financial requirements of a coordinated plan/appeal has frequently been time-consuming for both partners and clusters.** This has included the development of increasingly detailed and complex project templates to be filled by partners, as well as in-depth vetting and review of projects by cluster coordinators. In settings where activity-based costing has been utilized, this has also taken extensive time and effort, given the need for detailed calculations regarding standard costs.
- 16. **Given that HPC 2026 will be carried out with significantly less capacity than any previous year, it is proposed that we leverage the extensive costing data that we have gathered over the past decade.** Costing should be calculated both for the response to all people targeted, and for the subset of people prioritized. To this end, two options are proposed:
 - i. **Use activity-based costing, where data is already available and/or can be readily developed,** with a specific approach taken for common services, based on lessons learnt;
 - ii. **Use a basic formula, namely $\text{Financial Requirements} = \text{People Targeted in 2026} \times \text{total \$ costed per person 2025}$,** where it is not possible to do activity-based costing with the capacity available.
- 17. **To lighten the process, costing should be based on data already available.** However, should a country operation face a major change in the cost of operations between 2025 and 2026 (e.g. due to a spike in inflation and/or changes in market dynamics, decreased accessibility requiring increased air operations etc), the HCT may agree to adjust the cost per person. This should only be the case in exceptional cases and should be clearly and transparently justified.
- 18. **Reporting to the Financial Tracking Service should be bolstered both in terms of timeliness and accuracy** by ensuring recipients of humanitarian funding submit relevant information through centralized or decentralized focal points (as agreed with FTS) through the [FTS Reporting Template](#) as soon as money is received. Donors should equally be encouraged to make financial reporting a requirement.

D. Response Monitoring & Analysis

- 19. **In recent years, collective attention has focused primarily (and importantly) on increasing the credibility**

⁹ <https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/world/statement-humanitarian-programme-cycle-steering-group-limitations-mandatory-population-data-disaggregation-endorsed-24-april-2024>

of humanitarian needs analysis. However, this has meant that response monitoring has received limited attention and resources. Given the depth, breadth and magnitude of funding cuts, it is vital that we focus our energy and effort in 2026 on understanding whether our collective response is focused on the most severe needs and in accordance with crisis-affected peoples' expressed priorities and preferences. It is acknowledged that collective monitoring capacity will be reduced and should focus on priority tasks.

20. For HPC 2026, response monitoring will aim to accomplish two main objectives:

- i. **Knowing who is doing what, where, to inform operational coordination:** At a time of drastically reduced resources and seismic changes in the humanitarian system, this basic objective is more pertinent than ever, as tracking partners' presence and response will be essential to ensuring a common understanding of where response is being undertaken and what activities are being implemented, by who. It will be critical that this data can be grouped in different ways, depending on the coordination architecture and approach in the country context (e.g. area-based, clusters activated, etc). This will be enabled by the new tool under development by OCHA, in consultation with global clusters and partners, which will be shared with the HPC SG.
- ii. **Analyzing response and presence against the severity of needs and crisis-affected peoples' stated preferences and priorities, and acting on the results:**
 - a. **Response vs severity:** Throughout the year, monitoring data should be analyzed against the severity of needs to understand whether the response is reaching those whose lives are most at risk. This analysis should be discussed by the ICCG, and area-based coordination group(s) as appropriate, to inform regular (ideally, monthly) discussions within the HCT. Where there is significant under-response in areas of greatest need (especially when there is intersectoral Phase 5), the HCT should discuss response strategies and approaches to course correct.
 - b. **Response vs people's priorities and preferences, within the resources available:** Throughout the year, monitoring data should be analyzed against the expressed priorities and preferences of crisis-affected people to identify whether humanitarian partners are delivering in alignment with these. Ongoing community feedback on the response and adjustments that should be made should also be incorporated. This analysis should be discussed by the ICCG, and area-based coordination group(s) as appropriate, to inform regular (ideally, monthly) discussions within the HCT. If, for example, communities have stated a preference to receive assistance in cash, but most of the response is still in-kind, humanitarian partners should discuss why this is and whether it is possible to course correct. If it is *not* possible to rectify the situation, the HCT should commit to communicating with communities on why the response is not aligned with their expressed priorities, preferences and feedback.

HPC 2026: Resource Mobilization

21. As humanitarians prepare for HPC 2026, intensive donor engagement is needed to galvanize the resources required to stand in solidarity with people in crisis around the world in the year ahead. As evidenced by this paper, humanitarians will exert all feasible efforts to collectively and credibly assess and analyze needs, focus humanitarian responses on the people who need them most, and monitor our collective response against people's preferences and the severity of needs. *However, without urgent action to mobilize funding, humanitarians will be unable to meet even the most critical needs, jeopardizing people's lives and undermining the trust we have built with the communities we serve.*

NOTE: This document focuses on building collective clarity regarding the way forward for HPC 2026, given that it is about to kick-off. Other HPC-related issues that are being (or will be) discussed as part of the Humanitarian Reset—including operational needs assessments/analysis, operational planning and area-based approaches to both of these issues—will be brought to the HPC Steering Group at a later stage. There are also ongoing discussions—including with respect to humanitarian coordination—that will impact on HPC 2026, which are not yet reflected here (e.g. how clusters are configured) but will be factored into the HPC at a later date.

HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME CYCLE

