

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
55th MEETING**

12-13 November 2003

**IFRC Headquarters, Geneva
Auditorium (Basement)**

IASC TF on Sub-Working Group on the CAP: Background Note

Circulated: 10 November 2003

Key Priorities in 2003

Please see the attached table. There were no changes in planning and much was achieved.

Achievements in 2003

The IASC WG endorsed a policy on **IASC Appeal and Strategy Documents**. This policy is a significant step forward in defining criteria and mechanisms for initiating and ending a CAP. It clarifies the names and formats of humanitarian appeals, and should aid decision-making about why, when and how to produce IASC appeal and strategy documents. In June, the paper was sent jointly by the IASC and UNDG to all Resident Coordinators and Humanitarian Coordinators.

Interim guidance for transition, elaborated with UNDG/ECHA, was issued for select countries for 2004 appeals, pending completion of the UNDG/ECHA WG on Transition recommendations. The interim guidance asked country teams to define specific understanding of terminology such as relief, transition and recovery. In addition, the strategy should link to longer-term strategies, such as the UNDAF or PRSP as well as large IFI/regional bank programmes. For example, the transition appeal for Sudan programs link to achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Members continued to implement the recommendations of the **IASC Plan of Action for Strengthening the CAP** endorsed in 2002.

UNICEF and WHO commissioned work *to develop standardised guidelines for Joint Assessments to strengthen the programming aspects of the CAP*. **An assessment matrix for the CAP** includes the elaboration of a framework for the collection, analysis and presentation of data; a compilation of existing guidelines and other relevant material; and the formulation of recommendations towards the development of consolidated guidelines. A workshop is scheduled for 1 and 2 December to review findings and the way forward.

The IFRC has taken the lead in reviewing whether and how humanitarian needs in countries not covered by a CAP are being addressed, and in proposing recommendations on appropriate strategies. The IFRC reviewed existing humanitarian needs and field level coordination in selected countries not currently covered by a CAP and considered the use of a Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP) and associated tools where humanitarian needs are significant. This work complements that done on needs assessments (see paragraph above), inter alia in that needs assessment tools will be piloted in one non-CAP country.

The IASC CAP SWG collaborated with important **donor-led initiatives for strengthening the CAP**, including the Montreux Donor Retreat, the Humanitarian Financing Work Programme, the Stockholm International Meeting on Good Humanitarian Donorship and the follow-up and implementation of recommendations emanating from these fora.

In addition, the IASC CAP SWG supported field teams to elaborate CAP documents, including Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAPs), Mid-Year Reviews, and Consolidated Appeals. Some twenty inter-agency CAP trainers **facilitated thirteen CAP field workshops** for some 450 government, donors, UN, Red Cross Movement, and NGO representatives with the aim of strengthening coordination and strategic planning and programming to meet the humanitarian consequences of crises. Countries where workshops were held included: Burundi, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC (Goma and Kinshasa), Great Lakes, Indonesia, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tajikistan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. Finally, collaboration on development of public information materials and organising launches was extensive.

Regarding financial reporting, much work took place to ensure that financial tracking is more timely and consistent in terms of issues reported on. Progress was made on reporting the use of unearmarked funds, although work remains in this area. FTS addressed the Good Humanitarian Donorship Implementation Group on definitions of humanitarian assistance for tracking purposes.

Priorities for 2004

While progress was made under the headings of the 2003 work plan, the goals remain the same. Much work remains, in particular on the Humanitarian Financing Studies (supporting the pilot studies on Burundi and DRC), Needs Assessments, and ensuring that the CAP becomes a truly inter-agency coordination and strategic planning and programming tool. Further, the extent to which the CAP is used as an advocacy tool is to be addressed. The CAP SWG is to improve the extent to which the FTS is accurate and comprehensive, and linked with the DAC.

Specific priorities are to include:

- * Pursue the option of IASC members seconding staff to the CAP Section;
- * Lead consultations with donors on funding tendencies, in particular when contributions are made and the extent to which they are balanced in terms of geography;
- * Review and make improvements in Consolidated Appeal documents, in particular the ways in which assessments, monitoring, and evaluation are highlighted in them;
- * Enhance guidelines on Consolidated Appeals, e.g. by developing parameters for the inclusion of projects in Consolidated Appeals, and work to ensure their application; and
- * Enhance policies on “transition” within the Consolidated Appeals Process.
- * Ensure that Country Teams receive information and training needed to implement IASC-endorsed policies and guidelines.