

INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE
AD HOC WORKING GROUP MEETING ON
HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE REVIEW FOLLOW-UP

**Outstanding Recommendations from the
Humanitarian Response Review (HRR)**

24 January 2006
Palais des Nations, Room H.3
Geneva

Circulated 16 January 2006

I Recommendations for IASC

ix.	The IASC should take the lead in establishing the clear understanding that capacity according to a consistent and predictable standard. A reporting mechanism should be developed by the IASC Working Group with special attention being paid to the NGO community.
xvi.	The IASC and country teams should accelerate the establishment of the IASC at the country level, to be named the Field Humanitarian Team (FHT). (Action: IASC - immediately)
xviii.	The IASC should establish a joint consultative UN/NGOs/ICRC/IFRC forum at the level of Directors of Emergencies, which should meet at least every quarter or as the need arises, with a rotating chair, to take common orientations on urgent humanitarian issues, using as a basis for discussion the “Early Warning Mechanism” being developed by the IASC. (Action: IASC before end 2005)
xxiii.	IASC should increase coherence in the appeal mechanisms, especially where networks exist. The CAP process should be the tool, with the IASC taking a stronger leadership and establishing by end 2005 a plan of action to speed up the process. (Action: organizations/IASC)
xxiv.	Organizations should develop stronger advocacy for forgotten or neglected needs, through a shared “communication” strategy, established through the IASC, addressed in particular to public opinions and media in the current and potential donor countries. Donors’ policy should be challenged on the basis of sound needs assessments. (Action: All/IASC)
xxv.	Humanitarian organizations should review their financial systems, with a view to use available funds in a way that anticipates donor disbursements and prevents loss of funds.
xxvii.	Humanitarian organizations should agree to use a common funding appeal system managed by the Humanitarian Coordinator, when as members of a Field Humanitarian Team, they have contributed to establish a Common Action Plan for the initial phase (12 weeks) of a new emergency.

II Recommendations for ERC/OCHA

x.	OCHA should promote the expansion of surge capacities through the progressive establishment of pre-identified modules at national or regional level, building, inter alia, on new initiatives such as the European Union mechanisms and the French Proposal to establish a standing International Humanitarian Force (Action: ERC/OCHA to engage in discussions in order to agree on modalities for cooperation and implementation – immediately)
xvii.	The ERC should review the composition, functions and decision-making process of the IASC based on the following elements: i) memberships to be based on substantive involvement in humanitarian operations; ii) major leadership to be ensured in monitoring and promoting the reform process through cross-fertilization amongst organizations; iii) organizations to agree on an appropriate system of empowerment of the IASC in making its decisions binding for the members in pre-identified situations (Action: ERC with IASC for proposals before end 2005)
xxii.	OCHA should assess the coordination capacities of the HC offices in the field, in preparedness, planning, needs assessment and resource mobilization and to draw up a timebound plan of action for equipping them with the necessary tools and mechanisms. (Action: OCHA with IASC)

III Recommendations for donors

xxviii.	Donors should make substantial progress in addressing the acknowledged imbalance in support to different emergencies (forgotten or neglected needs) (Action: All - through inter alia the GHDI – immediately with clear objectives fixed for 2006 budgetary exercise)
xxix.	Donors should actively support humanitarian organizations efforts in enlarging the donor base (institutional or private), while preserving respect for the established humanitarian law, principles and practices.
xxx.	Donors should introduce only progressively and after appropriate preparation, new funding mechanisms, such as country pooled funding, to prevent negative effects on the financial capacities of humanitarian organizations. (Action: concerned donors)
xxxi.	Donors should review disbursement procedures in order to reduce the time span between pledging and disbursement to a maximum of six weeks. (Action: All)
xxxii.	In the framework of the GHDI, donors should rapidly agree on the possible simplified reporting approaches (annual reporting of organizations or common format) and establish the common format by end 2005. (Action: donors in the GHDI - for decision before end 2005 and implementation in 2006)
xxxiii.	Donors should consider an increase of the present level of funding for humanitarian assistance in the framework of the debate on the MDG. (This should be a priority for the GHDI)
xxxiv.	A larger group of donors, including the private sector, should engage in support of preparedness or rapid reaction- through establishing financial mechanisms covering these types of activities at the levels of organizations and, complementary, at central level, such as a revised CERF. Donors should consider devoting at least 5 to 10 per cent of their annual funding to preparedness activities of the organizations.
xxxv.	Donors should agree on the revision of the CERF in order to increase its size (between 350-500 M \$), to enlarge its scope (support to start up and preparedness activities), to modify its modalities (a large grant element) and the role of the ERC in managing it.

xxxvi.	Donors should engage to channel funding, in the initial (12 weeks) phase of a new emergency, through the common appeal which will support the Field Humanitarian Team' Plan of Action and will be managed by the Humanitarian Coordinator.
--------	--

Prepared by: OCHA – January 2006