

INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE
WORKING GROUP

IASC Subsidiary Bodies
Sub-Working Group on Humanitarian Financing
Work Plan for 2012

Date circulated: 31/10/2011

I Narrative Summary

In 2012, the IASC Sub-Working Group (SWG) on Humanitarian Financing will continue work previously initiated and implement recommendations endorsed by the Working Group in November 2011. In particular, the Group will focus on the following priority areas:

- a) Enhancing links and dialogue with other humanitarian and/or development financing entities;
- b) Improving funding for preparedness;
- c) Will carry forward modalities of programme approaches for consolidated appeals and Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) allocations based on what has been achieved in 2011 with the aim of piloting the approach in 2013.
- d) Providing an effective platform for consultation on pooled funds.

The SWG on Humanitarian Financing will work in close collaboration with other IASC subsidiary bodies, such as the CAP SWG, SWG on Preparedness, CWGER and global clusters, in order to advance the work plan attached below.

II Key Expected Outcomes

- Improved links with the GHD, OECD/DAC and other entities to better draw together work related to funding for early recovery, funding for preparedness and transitional funding arrangements;
- Up to nine country studies on preparedness conducted in close collaboration with the SWG on Preparedness to:
 - Assess how preparedness funding has been delivered on the ground;
 - Weigh up the advantages and disadvantages of the different funding channels that are currently or could be used for preparedness funding;
 - Examine relationships in funding for preparedness between global, regional and country levels.

- Options identified jointly with the CAP SWG on integrating programme approaches in CAPs and CHF proposals;
- Continue to provide an effective and efficient consultation platform for the operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund and humanitarian country-based pooled funds.

III Work Plan for 2012

Objectives*	Outputs and Activities*	Indicators (with targets)*	Assigned Focal Points	Timeframe
1. Effectively engage with other entities, including GHD, OECD/DAC and others.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meet/discuss with GHD Chair with the aim of providing inputs to GHD work plan and meeting agendas. ▪ Meet with other entities to identify possibilities for collaboration. ▪ Invite representatives of other entities to attend and/or brief HFG meetings/sessions. ▪ Represent HFG at meetings/sessions of other entities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Input provided by end January 2012 ▪ Other entities met and invited to SWG meetings as needed. 	Co-chairs	Year round

* Objectives are intermediate results or changes that need to be achieved during the workplan period in order to move closer to achieving the goal. (Example: Strengthened accountability to affected beneficiaries)

* Outputs are the tangible steps, services, and products provided by the group on annual basis to achieve its objectives. (Example: IASC's role on accountability to affected populations clarified.) Activities are actions that need to be undertaken to produce the outputs. (Example: Develop policy on accountability to affected populations for the Working Group's endorsement.)

* Indicators describe how the group intends to measure progress made towards stated outputs. Targets reflect the level of progress the group strives to achieve during the reporting period. (Example IASC policy on accountability to affected populations endorsed by target date. Target date: 30 September 2012)

<p>2. Carry out Phase II of the two phase project on funding for preparedness, which involves implementation of the recommendations from the November 2010 IASC WG regarding support to the SWG preparedness 5 country pilot and action points from the IASC Principals discussion regarding preparedness funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Substantive support to the contingency planning and preparedness exercises of the five countries under the Sub Working Group on Preparedness on mapping funding and identifying avenues for improved preparedness funding, including the development of a resource funding advocacy strategy for preparedness for each of the 5 country pilots as requested by the IASC Principals. ▪ The findings and recommendations to better address the issues at the global, regional and national levels for funding for preparedness which would include validation or other of the Phase I recommendations on the architecture on preparedness funding. This would also include cost-benefit analyses of preparedness interventions for at least two of the countries chosen in Phase II. ▪ Substantive support to the GHD co-chairs on the German Initiative on preparedness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Completion of the Phase II report by June 2012 and recommendations communicated to IASC WG in July 2012 and where relevant to IASC Principals ▪ Adoption of recommendations by the GHD regarding better and predictable funding for preparedness by July 2012 ▪ Possible roll-out of recommendations regarding funding for preparedness in CAPs and pooled funding mechanisms, to be considered in 2012. 	<p>SWG Chair and CAP SWG</p>	<p>June/July 2012</p> <p>July 2012</p> <p>Second half of 2012</p>
--	---	--	------------------------------	---

<p>3. Continue to examine ways to integrate “programme-based approaches” in CAPs and CHF proposals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To achieve consensus and clarity PBA study recommendations to be presented to GCL, key GHD members, wider NGO community. ▪ DRAFT and agree on a TOR for piloting PBA for future implementation. ▪ Build consensus and agree on the definition of Project, Programme, programme approach. ▪ Finalize implementation modalities of PBA to be piloted in specific countries for a specific period and put in place monitoring mechanism to compile findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present PBA to those forums, discuss and obtain understanding for moving forward. (March'2012) ▪ Initiate possible implementation of PBA and find out practical difference between current model and proposed approach. (March'2012) ▪ Present agreed common definitions to WG for endorsement. (July'2012) ▪ Agreement on a strategy to implement PBA and present to WG by July'2012. 	<p>SWG Chair, CAP SWG, TT on Cluster Approach</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

<p>4. Provide an effective and efficient consultation platform for the operation of the Central Emergency Response Fund and humanitarian country-based pooled funds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide inputs into CERF policies, practices and reports. ▪ Discuss issues relevant to the establishment and management of new humanitarian country-based pooled funds. ▪ Review synthesis report from NRC studies on principled humanitarian action and donor behaviour and delineate possible next steps. ▪ Provide ongoing input into management response matrix of the five-year evaluation of the CERF. ▪ Provide ongoing input into management response matrix of the CHF evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Input provided as needed; ▪ Issues discussed as needed ▪ Report reviewed and next steps proposed by end Q3 2012. ▪ MRM reviewed periodically throughout year. ▪ MRM reviewed periodically throughout year. 	<p>OCHA</p>	<p>Year round</p>
--	---	--	-------------	-------------------