

INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
58th MEETING

22-23 September 2004
UNICEF New York

Consolidated Appeals Process

Circulated: 10 September 2004

This note cites the central purpose of Consolidated Appeals, outlines three key issues which have become more prominent during the past year, and suggests a series of recommendations to be adopted by the IASC WG to address these issues.

Since 1992, the IASC has developed the Consolidated Appeals Process culminating in the 2003 'Nomenclature Paper' or 'IASC Appeal and Strategy Documents', specifying criteria for when to have what type of appeal process and associated responsibilities. In essence the CAP is an instrument to ensure coordinated planning, fundraising, and programme implementation. CAPs take place when disasters or emergencies cause acute humanitarian needs, which the host government will not address and which no single aid agency can cover. Several elements need to be in place to ensure a successful CAP. These include: a) a field driven process under the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator; b) strong collaboration within the Country Team (CT) and between it and Headquarters; and c) the field and HQ following the letter and spirit of the 'Nomenclature Paper' and associated guidelines.

Recommendation

- IASC WG continues to uphold and apply its 'Nomenclature Paper' and associated guidelines to determine when and how to issue appeals and strategy documents to address core humanitarian needs in emergencies.

In November 2003 the Secretary-General launched twenty-one Consolidated Appeals. This November he is expected to launch fifteen or sixteen. Why is this the case? Three issues stand out: 1) transition; 2) integrated 'humanitarian action and development cooperation'; and 3) governments.

Transition

In cases such as that of Sierra Leone and Tajikistan, Country Teams stated clearly in the past that the situations in these countries were of a post-conflict transitional nature and that a 'humanitarian' appeal was no longer ideal. Indeed these countries each had clear indicators that the overall context and humanitarian situation was improving, e.g. peace agreement or *en masse* return of IDPs and refugees. To support these CTs, and pending the outcome of the UNDG/ECHA Working Group on Transition Issues, its chair issued interim guidance building on the efforts of the UNDG/ECHA Working Group and discussions within the IASC on the Consolidated Appeals Process. The interim guidance resulted in these countries having a transitional appeal within the framework of the Consolidated Appeals Process launched on 18 November 2003.

Recommendation

- Agree that, for countries in transitional situations and until UNDG/ECHA Working Group on Transition Issues guidance is ready, the interim guidance on transitional appeals be

applied in order to determine whether to continue with a Consolidated Appeal or to prepare a transitional appeal. If the decision is taken to prepare a transitional appeal, the decision on which funding approach to adopt lies primarily with the CT in consultation with the host government. (This can include the framework of the Consolidated Appeals Process and its launch but for no longer than two years.)

- Support the work of UNDG and ECHA to devise a coordinated and inclusive planning, fundraising, and programming tool for the post-conflict transition.

Integrated 'Humanitarian Action and Development Cooperation'

In Liberia and Sudan, following consultations between host governments, SRSGs and DSRSGs and CTs, the decision has been taken to have one planning, fundraising, and programme implementation process, and that this should include the range of the UN's activities from humanitarian action to development cooperation. The appeal document representing this process is to have both humanitarian and development sections, and there will not be a Consolidated Appeal *per se*. (The lack of a Consolidated Appeal does not appear to be linked to the existence of an integrated mission. Indeed, in other contexts, e.g. Burundi and DRC, there are integrated missions and Consolidated Appeals planned for 2005.) Not having a Consolidated Appeal for Liberia or the Sudan could strike many observers, including donors and the media, as being inconsistent with the fact that significant humanitarian needs exist in both countries. However, to mitigate against this the overall 'humanitarian action – development cooperation' document could have a clearly marked humanitarian part, which could be pulled out of the document.

Recommendation

- ERC to consult SRSGs in Liberia and the Sudan on including both in the Secretary-General's CAP launch on 16 November.
- Assuming that the humanitarian section (and its programme's financial requirements) of the overall 'humanitarian action – development cooperation' documents is clearly visible, the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) should track contributions to the humanitarian component of the Liberia and Sudan documents.

Governments

Some Governments, such as that of Zimbabwe at the moment, have noted their unease about having a CAP in their country. Some officials have stated on the one hand their discomfort at being part of a 'humanitarian appeal' and on the other their continued wish for the country to receive the resources thereby mobilised. Such situations obviously put the CT under pressure and it is important for HQs to support CTs in such cases. There are a series of measures that can be taken.

Recommendation

- Support CTs facing difficulties with host governments *inter alia* by: a) backing HC and CT efforts to explain to host authorities that the CAP is a standard operating procedure to ensure coordinated planning, fundraising, and programming; b) making verbal or written demarche from HQ; c) sending high-level interlocutors to support CTs in their discussions with Governments; d) engaging the Secretary-General.