

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team Meeting

Date: 19 July 2017

Chair: Lisa Doughten (OCHA/CERF) and Melissa Pitotti (ICVA)

Agenda

1. Discussion on the review of IASC subsidiary bodies
2. Discussion on the future of the localization marker initiative
3. Briefing by NRC on multi-year funding study
4. AOB

Logistics

In Geneva: Room D-610, D building, 6th floor, Palais des Nations

In New York: 7th floor conference room, DC2-1370, 2 UN Plaza, 44th Street

Via Webex: Meeting number 315 956 102; password 12345

Notes

1. Discussion on the review of IASC subsidiary bodies

HFTT co-sponsor (WFP): The review of the Working Group subsidiary bodies started last week. It derived from the discussion in March Working Group meeting and it is part of a larger review of various IASC bodies to be considered by the Principals.

The HFTT is considered a very solid group, which is important in taking forward WHS and GB commitments. It produces specific outputs, has clear work plan and is most likely bound to continue. However, the review panel would like to see if there are any key products at the moment that should be submitted to the principals or the WG for discussion. There is also a need to have more clarity on how this group links to and supports the work of other groups, specifically HDNTT.

The criteria for the review of subsidiary bodies are:

- Delivering towards IASC priorities
- Aligned with IASC work plan
- TTs and RGs' composition fit for purpose and in line with respective expected functions
- Relevant and timely tasks and related deliverables identified
- Output achieved in a timely and consultative manner and shared with IASC WG (and IASC Principals) as relevant
- Synergies built with other Subsidiary Bodies and initiatives/mechanisms outside the IASC, as relevant
- Subsidiary body and its work is relevant to, and supports, field operations and delivery to affected people
- Subsidiary bodies effectively communicate their role and work, including through high-quality progress reports, shared with IASC WG in a timely manner
- Subsidiary Bodies' dedicated page on IASC website populated and updated as relevant

HFTT co-chair (OCHA/CERF): What is the timeline for this review?

IASC secretariat: The review should be done by the end of August, prior to the next Working Group meeting.

OCHA/PAMS: How will you ensure that the review of subsidiary bodies will be aligned with SG's review of the UN system?

HFTT co-sponsor (WFP): The broader review of the UN system, which largely focuses on development and piece aspect, should not prevent us from reviewing the subsidiary bodies. Issues like NWOW will remain in focus and this exercise should feed into the broader review of the system.

HFTT secretariat (OCHA/CERF): This review will be concluded in September, while in December the current work plan of HFTT will end. If humanitarian financing remains as IASC priority, HFTT will then work on development of the new work plan for 2018 and 2019. The two processes should inform each other as not be duplicative.

HFTT co-chair (ICVA): NGOs discussed SG's report on the repositioning of the UN development system and concluded that it is very UN centric. NGOs would appreciate more clarity on their role in this process.

The HFTT had a lot of turnover of staff working on output 3 of HFTT work plan, which is the humanitarian development nexus. We have new focal points for this output at FAO, UNDP and World Bank and plus our activities under this output are not clearly defined. Output 3 should be the key focus of the review.

2. Discussion on the future of the localization marker initiative

CAFOD: The HFTT sub-group on the localisation marker produced a report, which was shared with HFTT. It includes definitions of local and national partners and of as direct as possible funding. The group consulted with GB signatories and the process got a bit delayed. It became very clear that there was no baseline. The group decided to launch a survey to gather sufficient information base. The survey will be completed by September.

DI: The HFTT sub-group on the localisation marker could not agree with the GB signatories on the definitions of as direct as possible funding. The two groups had to agree to disagree. The survey is currently being developed by the consultant Lydia Pool and can be shared with HFTT.

IFRC (as co-convenors of the GB Localization Work stream): Based on a number of consultations, including the IASC HFTT sub-group, IFRC and Swiss government hosted work stream meetings (August 2016, February 2017), discussions held by the GHD Localisation working group (June 2017), and our own bi-lateral consultations. We circulated a paper with proposed definitions on 13 June under silence procedure lasting until 19 June. The paper recommended simplified definitions for financial tracking on local and national responders, and direct funding – and further recommended that we collect more evidence on what as direct as possible funding means, before deciding on the meaning of that term. We received many comments from GB Signatories. None have broken the silence procedure, and the comments requesting further information or clarification, or expressing a difference of opinion have related to the IASC HFTT sub-group paper, rather than the GB proposal. We have referred those questions to the co-chairs of the IASC HFTT sub-group. The revised GB definitions will be re-circulated soon and feedback will be provided to the IASC HFTT sub-group's co-chairs, we are only waiting for the internal approval procedures of one GB signatory to be complete before recirculating the agreed proposal. We do not expect any further changes.

DI: There was a duplication of work between the GB and HFTT on localisation and we ended up with two sets of definitions. This outcome is far from ideal and we need to address the process.

IFRC (as co-convenors of the GB Localization Work stream): We had a discussion on aligning between GB and IASC processes. We have to work much closer together. We need to have clarity on processes, structures, and decision making. IFRC raised this and it was discussed (with no clear outcome) at the IASC Working Group meeting in October 2016. Moreover, there is still a lot of misunderstanding as to what we are proposing, for example in the open letter circulated by NEAR. We are proposing that OECD and FTS tracks direct funding, we believe this was misunderstood by NEAR.

HFTT co-chair (OCHA/CERF): during the recent HFTT retreat, we brought to the attention of the GB facilitation group that there is a difficulty in coordination between IASC and GB processes and a lack of clarity on the structure.

Is there any recognition in the GB facilitation group that this is an issue? Since we all recognise it, what are our next steps? How can we address the problem?

IFRC (as co-convenors of the GB Localization Work stream): The issue of the link between HFTT and GB was not discussed. But the broader coordination between the GB and IASC was discussed at the first Grand Bargain annual meeting in June. The GB Facilitation Group has been requested to ensure a structured dialogue with external processes including the IASC.

Oxfam: There is a recognition of the problem but there are no solutions yet.

NRC: Has the issue of risk transfer in the context of localisation come up?

HFTT co-sponsor (WFP): The GB commitment was that the GB work stream would develop a localisation marker together with IASC. The two groups were supposed to work together on this recommendation. It should not have been two parallel processes. And plus, it is unfortunate that this work was passed on by the HFTT to the GB work stream without first going to the Working Group and ensuring that the conclusions become the IASC product.

CAFOD: We recognised when we set up this group that we are reaching out to stakeholders beyond this group. We also invited donors and IFRC (in its capacity as co-convenor of the GB work stream).

DI: The issue of risk was not discussed in detail in the HFTT sub-group. But there was a strong appetite by local and national actors for receiving more direct funding. It would be interesting to know if it was discussed in the GB group because it includes more donors.

IFRC (as co-convenors of the GB Localization Work stream): There are two stakeholders that were involved in the HFTT sub-group on localisation, which are not traditionally part of IASC. These are donors and local actors. The IASC did a good job of including local actors, but the IFRC believes that donors did not express themselves fully in this group because they were not full-fledged members of it.

The GB facilitation group discussed the structural problems and agreed that there needs to be more structured dialogue between the GB facilitation group and IASC. On the issue of risk transfer, we hope this will be discussed in the work stream and we invite NRC and all others doing work in this area to engage and participate.

3. Briefing by NRC on multi-year funding study

NRC: The study is completed but we were unable to share it before this meeting. It will be shared with HFTT within the coming days and we will be asking for comments. The launch of the study will be done during the workshop in Geneva on 12 September.

OCHA/PAMS: This is the workshop agreed between Canada and the co-chairs of the GB work stream on multi-year funding. He hopes that the agenda for this meeting will be shared soon.

HFTT co-chair (OCHA/CERF): Does this workshop only involve IASC or also the GB signatories?

OCHA/PAMS: The workshop will be delivered by the GB co-chairs on multi-year funding. The invitees will include the GB signatories, IASC members and field colleagues.

4. AOB

HFTT co-chair (OCHA/CERF): The August meeting is usually cancelled due to holidays season. However, this year we have been debating if we should have it or not because two other HFTT meetings have already been cancelled. The HFTT secretariat will ask all members if there is an urgent issue to be discussed by the group in August. If not, the meeting will be cancelled and the next meeting will be on 20 September.

Participants

Location	Name	Agency
New York	Lisa Doughten	HFTT co-chair (OCHA/CERF)
	Mirna Loiferman	OCHA/CERF
	Johannes Fromholt	UNDP
	Annemarie Schuller	UNFPA
	Letizia Montecalvo	UNFPA
	Fernando Hesse	OCHA/FCS
	Mateusz Buczek	HFTT secretariat (OCHA/CERF)
Geneva	Melissa Pitotti	HFTT co-chair (ICVA)
	Rodrigue Vinet	FAO
	Kate McGrane	NRC
	Julie Thompson	OCHA/RMSS
	Daniela Gilotta	OCHA/FTS
	Ignacio Leon	OCHA/PAMS
	Gordana Jerger	HFTT co-sponsor (WFP)
	Agnese Spiazzi	OCHA/PAMS
	Chiara Condoleo	NRC
	Caroline Nichols	Interaction
	Tanja Schuemer	IASC secretariat
By Webex	Sara Baschetti	UNHCR
	Rachel Criswell	World Vision
	Michael Jensen	OCHA/CERF
	Victoria ?	Oxfam
	Anita Kattakuzhy	Oxfam
	Julian Srodecki	World Vision
	Arpita ?	UN Women
	Ajay Madiwale	IFRC
	Kirsten Hagon	IFRC
	Anne Street	CAFOD
	Charlotte Lattimer	DI
	Sarah Dalrymple	DI
	Lobna Hadji	World Bank
	Jordan Menkveld	IOM
	Margarie ?	Voice