INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE
84TH WORKING GROUP MEETING

Final Summary Record and Action Points

18-19 March 2013
American Red Cross
Washington, DC

Circulated: 2013

I   Opening remarks

Opening by the American Red Cross

Ms Gail J McGovern, President and CEO of the American Red Cross (ARC), welcomed the IASC Working Group and said the ARC was honoured to host on behalf of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. She reflected on the lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, two storms that had tested the entire disaster response framework of the United States, emphasizing that preparedness, partnerships and innovative use of social media were crucial to effective disaster response. Ms McGovern referred to IASC leadership as indispensable in effective timely and compassionate relief to people in need in emergency situations, and congratulated the IASC on its Transformative Agenda (TA).

Opening Remarks by the Chair

Mr John Ging, Chair of the 84th Working Group, thanked the ARC and IFRC for their generous hospitality in such a historical and magnificent setting. He emphasized the importance of the agenda of the meeting, encouraging open and frank discussions with the objective a achieving an outcome that would truly reflect the calibre of the participants. He highlighted that dissenting views were welcome and that in terms of outcomes, it was better to have recommendations strongly endorsed by a majority with dissenting views noted rather than weaker recommendations formulated to the lowest common denominator of consensus. He noted the decision of the ERC to upgrade of the level of the Chair of the Working Group to the newly appointed OCHA ASG. [At noon, Mr Ging conveyed the Secretary-General's announcement of the appointment of Ms Kyung-wha Kang as Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator.]

Remarks by the IFRC

Mr Simon Missiri, IFRC, in his welcoming remarks highlighted that both the League of Nations and the League of Red Cross and Red Crescent societies were created at the same time, and that the ARC played a major role in this. He reflected on the extraordinary character of the ARC: with 132 years of experience, 30,000 employees, 500,000 volunteers and US$ 3.3 billion turnover.   Complementing the ARC for the excellence of its operations, he looked forward to it also continuing to make a substantive and substantial contribution to the IASC including through its generous hosting of this important meeting.

II   Transformative Agenda

Taking stock of work to date on the TA (normative, simulation exercise, field missions): Update from the TA Implementation Steering Group

Mr Andrew Wyllie, OCHA, gave an overview of the status of the TA, in terms of the normative framework, the global-level response mechanisms and field testing undertaken to date. He reminded the group that in December 2011 the IASC Principals endorsed 47 recommendations

pertaining to leadership, coordination and accountability. Since early 2012, much work has been done to translate them into the guidance, tools and procedures necessary to support their implementation in the field. While 2012 focused primarily on developing the normative work related to the TA, most of this has now been finalized through the agreed TA Protocols.

The TA Implementation Steering Group has reviewed the systems in place. The HC pool has been expanded and also includes a roster of senior coordinators for L3 emergencies. An IASC Principals simulation helped test the L3 decision making process in a sudden onset disaster. Its outcome led to the Humanitarian System-Wide Emergency Activation protocol, and to the systematic engagement of the Emergence Directors in advance of Principals' ad hoc meetings. Mr Wyllie said that the three Inter-Agency Rapid Response Mechanism (IARRM) table top exercises undertaken in 2012 had brought perspectives from different field environments. Further testing will be conducted in 2013 with a simulation exercise in June 2013 for - the system-wide L3 activation. In addition, three missions have been undertaken to field test and promote the TA (South Sudan, Chad and Myanmar). Overall, these IASC field missions have helped to identify and share best practices, pilot self-assessment and review processes with country teams and to identify operational challenges to be addressed by the HCT with support, where appropriate, from headquarters. Mr Wyllie noted that priority countries for the 2013 IASC field missions were being identified.

Roll-out to the field: Dissemination and Communication Strategy

Ms Patricia McIlreavy, InterAction, and Ms Lauren Landis, WFP, presented a Dissemination and Communication Strategy for the Transformative Agenda. This strategy and accompanying work plan outlines the steps and approach in creating broad awareness of the TA protocols, as well as training tools. The aim is to have an overall strategy for comprehensive communication, dissemination and implementation of the TA to various audiences (UN, NGO staff, and governments) with a particular focus on field operations, and to move from a Transformative Agenda to Transformative Action. They also noted the value of the Emergency Directors' mission to Syria as well as the IASC mission to Myanmar.

They recommended that a feedback loop be developed and implemented to help revise and improve the communications tools as well as the protocols. It was proposed that periodic trainings or exercises that can validate the use of the protocols to determine if any changes or adjustments are recommended. The presenters noted that in order to assure shifts from dissemination to implementation and institutionalization, the TA approach must be integrated into the working methods of individual IASC organizations. Senior leadership, the ERC, donors and Executive Boards all remain key to keeping the momentum towards institutionalizing changes. The presenters suggested developing benchmarks for tracking the impact of the TA in improved humanitarian response.

Discussion

The participants congratulated the presenters for the progress made in finalizing the remaining normative work, and consolidating an -implementation strategy. The Implementation Steering Group's draft was seen to be comprehensive in terms of: awareness/dissemination, validation and systematic review, implementation and application, and institutionalization of the TA in agencies and in the system. One participant said that that the language in the empowered leadership paper should be amended to recognize the leadership role of national governments in several contexts. Another participant felt that the language was too UN-centric and that NGOs did not recognize themselves in the protocols; it was also acknowledged that more needed to be done to get the NGOs engaged. Some noted that a core element was missing: a definition of an L3 and non-L3 emergency. Participants asked to clarify when and by whom the Protocols would be revised and a proposal was made to have annual revisions by the WG. The country-level missions were seen to be key in the TA implementation. To this effect, further clarity on different kinds of missions was requested and the need for establishing criteria for such missions as well as establishing a priority list of mission countries was highlighted. One speaker suggested three types of missions: priority TA missions; missions to address team dynamics; and 'anticipatory' missions. Participants also spoke of the need to critically review the

composition of the missions, ensuring continued ownership and keeping the missions light and fit for purpose. Taking the TA forward would only be successful if time was taken to embed this in the 'DNA' of the humanitarian community. The proposals to this effect included for example, having mentors and a repository of information and practice. The issue of dedicated capacity to monitor and support the implementation of the TA was discussed at length, with various proposals involving secondments, possibly to OCHA, to the IASC Secretariat or to a UNDG-type body. Further discussions were required on the management of pooled funds, monitoring of the TA, and working with non-traditional actors. On leadership, it was noted that IASC members were not necessarily putting forward their best leaders for the HC pool. One speaker suggested including a TA objective in HC compacts. Another said that donors must also be held accountable for programming in support of the collective action (joint needs analysis and prioritisation, joint strategic response planning), as well as to better share risk and streamline their reporting requirements. Mention was also made of the need for an evaluation or real time review.

The Chair noted donor expectations of the TA, and field fatigue with humanitarian reform generally, both issues needing to be addressed effectively. He reminded participants of the original intent of the TA to streamline, simplify and speed up the way we work together to transform the efficiency and effectiveness of the humanitarian response to the benefit of those in need. He emphasised the indispensability of getting the right calibre of leadership in place, and of being able to demonstrate in a self-evident way the impact of the TA.

The Working Group:

1. Agrees that the TA Implementation Steering Group will finalize the 'strategy for the dissemination, implementation and institutionalization of the TA' and handover to the Emergency Directors. ***Action by: WFP and InterAction in collaboration with the Implementation Steering Group, by mid-April.***

2. Recommends a light review of the language of the protocols to:
   - Make it sensitive to the role of national governments
   - Clarify what is meant by strategic statements vs. strategic response plans
   - Make the TA language less UN-centric and more inclusive of NGOs
   - Identify applicability of the protocols to both L3 and non-L3, sudden and slow-onset contexts. ***Action by: Emergency Directors.***

3. Recommends light country-level missions to support, monitor and mentor the TA implementation in the field, preferably at the request of HCs/HCTs. It further recommends that Emergency Directors establish clear criteria and typologies (support or anticipatory) for such missions as well as a priority list of countries. The composition of missions should involve 2-3 IASC organizations, while reflecting the IASC membership. ***Action by: Emergency Directors***

4. The Working Group recommends establishing a dedicated capacity, within OCHA with inter-agency secondments, subject to available resources, to serve as a repository for TA knowledge and to support maintenance of relevant tools as well as their institutionalization. ***Action by: OCHA to provide proposal to Emergency Directors***

5. The Working Group recommends establishing benchmarks and a light tracking/monitoring mechanism to measure the impact of the field implementation. ***Action by: Emergency Directors***

III Application of the TA in slow onset emergencies

Mr Ted Chaiban, UNICEF, and Mr Rick Brennan, WHO, presented on the application of the Transformative Agenda in slow onset as well as complex emergencies. This session aimed at preparing the Principals Steering Group discussion on 27 March. They noted that the first L3 activation was in a very difficult setting, Syria. Some of the key early measures were not rolled

out, including MIRA, CERF and Strategic -Statement. Overall, a flexible application of L3 protocols was needed.

The L3 HC roster needed to be strengthened by increasing geographical, gender and linguistic diversity. It was proposed that candidates to L3 roster be encouraged to pass the RC assessment thereby qualifying them to hold both HC and RC functions. On the process for appointing a Senior/Emergency HC, the need for aligning the protocols for the designation of the RC in L3 settings with those for the selection of the HC was noted. In case there is delay identifying appropriate leadership, then support from Emergency Directors was seen as key to ensure that other components of the TA protocols continue to move forward.

They noted that the L3 protocols should not be interpreted as being sequential, i.e. dependent upon the designation of a senior emergency coordinator; coordination mechanisms could be strengthened, an HCT convened, and a strategic statement produced in situations where interim leadership decisions are delayed. These actions could be supported by the Emergency Directors, regional offices, and other structures to strengthen in-country operations. On the IARRM, the HCT had to review staffing needs. On the relationship between strategic statement and strategic response plan, it was noted that there was agreement to develop a 2-3 page strategic statement to give top-level direction on initial priorities for the humanitarian response within 72 hours of the L3 declaration. Subsequently, the HCT would develop a strategic response plan that is more detailed and sets out the targets, indicators and accountabilities of agencies and clusters for meeting the objectives contained therein. Revision of CAP or other appeal document as appropriate would then follow. As for the criticality of missions versus the criticality of threats, it was noted that a special security protocol was currently being developed with UNDSS. The presenters noted the need for agreeing on triggers that may signal the need to activate different TA procedures in slow onset emergencies. The actual decision to declare an L3 emergency continues to reside with the Principals.

Discussion

Participants had differing views on whether to make the RC assessment a condition to join the L3 HC pool, noting the original intent of the L3 HC roster was for a deployment of up to 3 months. On activating the TA provisions, the participants raised the need for support teams in the field. Some cautioned against making the activation too -static, as it is very context specific. The strategic statement was seen as a way of explaining the rationale for L3 designation and for setting the strategic direction for the response. The strategic statement was seen as key for advocacy, to galvanize and focus the whole community. On the criticality of missions versus criticality of threats, the participants suggested to devise means to assess situations more flexibly and to determine if providing assistance helps to improve staff security. Several participants noted that in Syria the strategic statement should have been ready on the day of L3 declaration. It was also noted that while triggers and signals were all there, it still took six months for the L3 declaration. To this effect, it was noted that the IASC EW/EA group should be playing a key role. Furthermore, it was noted that the Emergency Directors' Terms of Reference include their role in advising the Principals on the activation of the L3 response.

The Working Group:

6. Recommends that OCHA, together with UNICEF and WHO redraft the paper for consideration by the TA Principals Steering Group taking into consideration the views expressed by the Working Group members. ***Action by: UNICEF, WHO, OCHA and other IASC organizations that wish to contribute by 27 March***.

IV Rebooting the IASC Working Group

The Chair opened this session reflecting on what he characterized as the many legitimate frustrations expressed by Working Group members for some considerable time. He embraced the responsibility of the Chair to generate a constructive and positive dynamic worthy of the calibre of the participants. He thanked the Secretariat for the background documents prepared for this agenda item and reflected that in spite of the many discussions over the years on the role and composition of the Group, the original Terms of Reference remained valid as it was the only one endorsed by the Principals. He highlighted the opportunity of the meeting to open a new chapter for this body and he encouraged participants to be candid and bring all contentious issues to the table. He also emphasized the need in framing recommendations, to position the Working Group as a body of influence and that to effectively do so, it had to better align itself with the expectations of the Principals forum. Finally he stressed the need for a substantive, empowered IASC Secretariat, which through its composition and modus operandi enjoyed the confidence of the membership as impartially representative of their collective views and interests.

Mr Joel Charny, InterAction, shared his reflections on the current state of the Working Group, and referred to the 2011 report, 'Effective functioning and management of the IASC Working Group.' He felt that there was a general malaise around the Working Group, discouraged and frustrated due to what it perceived as a lack of respect for the group, the work produced and unproductive process. He emphasized the need to focus honestly and constructively on the problems. On the substantive agenda, he noted the lack of an overall IASC agenda and said it was impossible to address the proliferation of subsidiary bodies without a clearer sense of priorities. On the management of the Working Group and associated bodies, he noted two major problems: lack of transparency; and the role performed by the Secretariat in terms of following action points and subsidiary bodies.

He made seven recommendations: 1. Focus on a narrower agenda; 2. Define annual agenda and set number of meetings based on agenda; 3. Reaffirm the July 2011 agreements on meeting dynamics and facilitation (proactive, objective facilitation; use outside facilitators in necessary); 4. Agree on and clarify process for developing meeting agendas; 5. Reduce number of Subsidiary Bodies based on relevance to the agreed agenda and the degree of activity of the group; consider a simplified structure of task teams and reference groups; 6. For Subsidiary Bodies that remain, designate Working Group focal/contact point responsible for the Subsidiary Body in a meaningful way to the Working Group; 7. IASC Secretariat to act as 'guiding intelligence', working on behalf of all IASC members.

Discussion

The participants noted that this was a timely discussion as addressing prevailing reputational issues and crisis of relevance was required. Issues that required clarification included the relationship between the IASC Working Group and the Emergency Directors, as well as the role of OCHA and the IASC Secretariat. Serious concerns were raised about a shift of humanitarian leadership by OCHA from Geneva to New York, including the future Chair of the Working Group. Participants welcomed the Chair's confirmation that the new Working Group Chair will spend considerable amount of her time in Geneva.

While the TA was seen to be a key item for continuing focus of the WG, other issues of relevance to the field were flagged: these included access and issues arising from the Sri Lanka report, such as protection, diversity and partnerships, integration arising from the recent security council decision on Somalia, Access issues in Syria and Sudan and many others. A number of participants noted the lack of consultation and transparency in setting the agenda and formulation of the minutes and action points. In this regard, need for more facilitated and accountable dialogue by the Secretariat was emphasized. Concern was voiced on decisions regarding the number and duration of meetings and the lack of transparency and accountability for recent decision on this. Several participants expressed their support for and confidence in the IASC Secretariat, which they viewed should be working in the interests of all members, and requested that the Secretariat be further empowered. Moving forward, the role of the IASC Secretariat is expected to be substantive, rather than administrative: the IASC Secretariat should

be empowered to make judgements, make proposals and take decisions on agendas, background papers and meeting conclusions according to the interests of its full IASC constituency.
On meeting management, proposals included: having more advance notice on the meetings; using external facilitators; background papers to be written more widely by the IASC organizations instead of OCHA; using alternative methods for meetings (such as tele-/videoconferences); and transparency on the meeting outcomes but reserving the right for some discussions to remain confidential. There was a request for more clarity on how issues can be brought on the Working Group's attention. Renaming the IASC Working Group to reflect its policy function was discussed but without conclusion. An IASC Working Group retreat was also suggested and left open as an option.

The Working Group endorsed the simplified structure of task teams and reference groups and expressed the need to allow the current subsidiary bodies sufficient time to finalize their tasks (transition period).

In light of the policy focus of the IASC Working Group, the Chair facilitated a brainstorming on the policy issues in need of –the Working Group's attention. The policy issues brought forward were based on the issues discussed in the 83rd Working Group meeting and included: access, sovereignty, protection, integration, politicization, accountability to affected populations, diversity, urban challenges, nexus between humanitarian and development, resilience, MDG 2015, resource mobilization, transformative agenda, risk management, refugees, innovation and new technologies. Suggestions were made on 'packaging' the issues to facilitate efficient discussion.

Several participants envisioned that greater clarity and coherence was required between the terms of references of the EDs and IASC Working Group; and in the procedures for selecting items for IASC Principals meetings.

In closing this agenda item, the Chair thanked participants for the frank and constructive exchange and in particular assured the group that the criticisms directed to OCHA and the expectations for change would be brought to the attention of the ERC and the incoming Chair and that he was confident of a positive response.

The Working Group:

7. Recommended the Working Group refocus its attention to the strategic policy agenda impacting on operational effectiveness in delivery of humanitarian assistance. This should be forward looking drawing on experience from current operations and the imperative to expand the base of those committed to principled humanitarian action. Three indicative categories were suggested:

    Challenges to values and principles: Access (Sudan, Syria), sovereignty (G77, Pakistan, Sudan, Syria) protection (Sri Lanka, Syria)[1], integration (Somalia, Mali, DRC), politicization (Syria, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Sudan), accountability to affected people (Sahel, Philippines)

    Working with others: Partnership/Diversity, urban challenges, humanitarian/development, resilience, MDG 2015, resource mobilization

    Working better: Transformative agenda, risk management, refugees, innovation, new technologies.

    Action: IASC Secretariat to develop in consultation with Working Group Members a proposal of priority policy issues for consideration by the Principals, by 22 April.

---

[1] Following a decision of the IASC Principals in December 2012, the Principals will already be holding a first discussion on protection – 'Protection of human rights in complex humanitarian emergencies: Discussion about the implications of the Report of the Secretary-General's Internal Review Panel in United Nations Action in Sri Lanka' – at their upcoming meeting on 8 May 2013.

The Working Group clarified and refocused the following aspects of its own functioning and modus operandi:

8. Role: Develop recommendations for the IASC Principals on the strategic policy agenda impacting on operational effectiveness in delivery of humanitarian assistance. This should draw on experience from current operations and the imperative to expand the base of those committed to principled humanitarian action

    Title: [More discussion needed, suggestions included, Working Group, Policy Directors Group, Policy and Practice Group]

    Chair: Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator

    Composition: Substantive experts empowered for decision-making

    Terms of Reference: need to change to reflect new composition and focus

    Agenda development:

    -   Managed by the Secretariat on behalf of the Members through the Chair

    -   Developed through a transparent process (early and interactive consultations)

    -   Clear designation of responsibilities and timelines on papers

    Action: New TORs to be drafted by the IASC Secretariat, based on the WG discussions and in consultation with WG members, for presentation to Principals by May 2013.

The Working Group decided the following actions regarding meeting management:

9. Co-facilitation by different members of individual sessions is optimal

    External facilitation: as appropriate

    Frequency of meetings: more flexibility needed, driven and responsive to agenda, meeting options other than in person should also be considered as appropriate e.g. videoconferences

    Minutes and Action Points (AP):

    -   Clarity in summing up essential to create common understanding of meeting conclusions

    -   Action points should be accompanied with clear designation of responsibility and timeline for action and identification the resources required to implement.

    -   Better mechanism to reflect suggested amendments and disagreements in finalisation of minutes (with option of attaching a statement explaining objection)

    -   More transparency and interaction in finalization of minutes

    -   Option for confidential records upon request

    Action: IASC Secretariat to ensure that these measures are included in new TORs and applied during meetings

The Working Group agreed on a new approach to Subsidiary Bodies as follows:

10. Replace current Subsidiary Bodies with Task Team model with time-bound tasks issued by Working Group:

    -   Task Teams accountable to the Working Group.

    -   Develop a transparent process for interested parties to get issues on the Working Group Agenda

The Working Group reaffirmed and agreed that the IASC Secretariat must:

11. Be both empowered and substantive; serve the interests of all IASC members impartially and professionally; and report to the Group through the Chair.

V   Humanitarian Principles – Preparation for the IASC Principals Discussion

Mr Brian Tisdall, ICRC and Ms Ingrid McDonald, NRC facilitated an exchange between IASC organizations on their understanding and practice of Humanitarian Principles. Mr Tisdall explained the rationale for the debate to have been the need for frank dialogue, which provided an opportunity for a reality-based discussion. Ms Macdonald noted that there was a multiplicity of principles projects under way, including by the British Red Cross, humanitarian forums, SCHR, NRC, IFRC and ICRC.

Mr Tisdall asked what principles united us, and suggested that the IASC could rally around humanity and impartiality. He noted that the key challenges included deficit of political commitment to support principled approach; increased sensitivity to principled humanitarian action in 'global south' and fragmentation of armed groups. Ms Macdonald recalled tension between national sovereignty and the humanitarian imperative, as has been the case in Syria and Sudan. On the options available, the presenters noted that unauthorized cross-border humanitarian operations in territory not controlled by the state could lead to losing access to all civilians in territory controlled by the government/state. Ms Macdonald emphasized that different definitions and interpretations of what the principles mean when put into action can generate confusion and misunderstanding with beneficiaries and interlocutors. Furthermore, this can result in different strategic and operational decisions. The challenge is to harness the complementarity presented by different approaches. The presenters also pointed out the fact that while the fundamental principles were designed for the battleground, 90 per cent of humanitarian response was outside these areas. The presenters noted challenges rising from 'One UN' and integrated approach and controversy when dealing with non-traditional actors. The possible conclusions included reflecting on how the IASC concretely translates principles into action in today's world and that a principled approach is more critical than ever.

Discussion

Participants felt the discussion provided a sound basis for recommendations to the IASC Principals and preparation for the May IASC Principals meeting. IASC agencies were all structured differently and each agency applies the principles differently. Principles and their applications were noted to be more complex than they might seem, as illustrated by the UN Sri Lanka report. Several issues were seen to have further impact on the principals, including funding and access. While only 10 per cent of humanitarian response was in conflict zones, it was noted that the principles were also relevant and needed for natural disaster response. Principled action was seen to be more critical than ever, as illustrated in Syria.

The Chair noted that the objective of this agenda item was to sensitize the IASC Working Group members on the work underway in preparation of the Principals discussion in May. He thanked IFRC and NRC for their thought provoking presentation.

VI Lessons learned from Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, and their applicability to the IASC

Mr Trevor Riggen, ARC, provided an update on their response to Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, including in terms of leadership and coordination, and gave insights into how the US deals with preparedness, social capital, adaptation/resilience and social media.

Lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina focused on four areas: infrastructure, volunteers, diversity and partnerships, with each one of these areas facing different challenges. For example, infrastructure systems were not able to scale up sufficiently and as an immediate action to this the ARC had to increase capacity to serve upwards of 1 million families over a ten

day period. On diversity, the challenge was the inability to effectively address needs of diverse communities and thus, the ARC recruited and trained approximately 130 Community Relations Liaisons. On partnerships, the ARC developed national partnerships with faith-based, civic groups and business communities. The Post Katrina American Red Cross has over 71,000 trained disaster workers and relief supplies to support 500,000 people.

In response to Hurricane Sandy, the American Red Cross provided more than 112,000 health and mental health contacts, distributed more than 7 million relief items and mobilized more than 17,000 disaster responders. Through an impressive public awareness campaign, the ARC encouraged residents to prepare and directed them to lifesaving resources. On social and new media, Mr Riggen noted that this had allowed the ARC to track requests and needs from across the impacted area in real time, and to identify greatest areas of need quickly. He mentioned the community perspective to be of major importance. Other issues addressed included meeting very high expectations from citizens of an affluent nation, responding in real-time to queries, cross border collaboration, and the practice and culture of learning from experience through 're-engineering' service delivery by attacking the root causes of bottlenecks.

Discussion

The participants were impressed by the ARC response and their ability to identify lessons amidst the response. It was noted that monitoring social media for humanitarian response can be a time-consuming undertaking and a question was raised on the human capacity needed. While only two full time staff are employed, ARC also has many volunteers to work on this. Similarly, ARC's anti-fraud measures were of interest and ARC explained that their monitoring and whistle-blower systems had proven to be effective. The participants felt that in addition to lessons learned from response, a lot could be learned from ARC's partnerships, for example with the corporate world. On organisational learning, which was complimented by a number of participants, Mr Riggen observed that you "may not always be able to change an organizational culture, but you can certainly create a new one".

VII   Any Other Business

The IASC Secretariat and WFP were congratulated for the launch of an IASC document 'app' which was made available for this Working Group meeting to make background document review easier.

<div align="right">Prepared by the IASC Secretariat, March 2013</div>