

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team Retreat Report, 21-22 January 2015

Summary

More than 45 members of the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team and invitees participated in a retreat in Geneva on 21-22 January 2015 to take stock of the Task Team's progress in 2014 and finalize the 2015 workplan with clear priorities and timelines. They agreed in principle on a revised workplan for 2015, which will be finalized in the coming weeks. During the retreat, the participants also discussed several activities in the workplan in more detail, including on challenges in accessing country-based pooled funds, donor conditions, bridging relief and development, and the future of humanitarian financing. Representatives from the Good Humanitarian Donorship briefed the Task Team on their workplan, and the World Humanitarian Summit secretariat briefed on preparations for the summit, in particular with regard to humanitarian financing. The Task Team will maintain working links with both.

Day 1 (Wednesday, 21 January 2015)

Welcome and Introduction

Isabel Gomes of World Vision, which hosted the retreat, welcomed the participants. She expressed pride in looking back on the Task Team's achievements, and encouraged participants to think further about how the humanitarian community can engage with the private sector.

Lisa Doughten, OCHA/CERF, welcomed participants on behalf of the co-chairs of the Task Team. She highlighted the broad engagement of NGOs in the Task Team: where previously the Task Team was dominated by the UN and IOM, the composition was now about half UN, half NGOs.

Nan Buzard, ICVA, welcomed participants on behalf of the co-sponsors of the Task Team. She introduced the new co-sponsor, Brian Lander, WFP, who is replacing Darlene Tymo, WFP. She congratulated the Task Team on being one of the most successful Task Teams and expressed the belief that the team will continue as long as there are humanitarian financing needs. She also stressed that donors want to do the right thing, but they are often lost: we need to find ways to support them. Mr Lander said that WFP was committed to continue co-sponsoring the Task Team.

Manisha Thomas, facilitator for the retreat, presented the agenda, including the agreed objectives and expected outcomes for this retreat (see annex). Participants noted one thing that had worked well in the Task Team in 2014 and one thing that had not. Several issues were noted more than once.

What worked well

Engagement and commitment of activity leads, activities made progress independently, and have realized important achievements

What did not work well/challenges

Engagement in the Task Team is in addition to members' regular jobs and thus available time is limited

What worked well	What did not work well/challenges
Increased external profile, others have a better understanding of the Task Team; progress updates to the Working Group and Principals meeting	Need more visibility, marketing, and external communications of Task Team successes, within and beyond the IASC (e.g., quarterly newsletter, one-pager)
The Task Team has started a number of important initiatives and is crucial for information exchange to develop common knowledge	It can be difficult for smaller organizations and southern NGOs to follow specialized discussions and participate in the Task Team. It can be difficult for new members to get up to speed on humanitarian financing issues.
The Task Team has identified a number of crucial areas of common interest	Linking to the ‘financing for development’ agenda needs to be strengthened, fragmentation of different workstreams on financing
Internal communications and secretariat support	It can be a challenge to process all the information shared via the Task Team, better prioritization would be useful; the new IASC website can help
Inter-agency collaboration between both UN agencies and NGOs, ability to work together	Monthly meetings could be more effective and better planned
Link between the Task Team and the Pooled Fund Working Group	Continued work to build links with other entities (e.g., GHD, IATI, WHS) is needed
The activity on donor conditions has realized some substantial achievements	Discussions about donor conditions and earmarking have not been as fruitful
It became increasingly clear how all the workstreams will come together	Lack of exchange of information and coordination between different activities; it can be difficult to engage in activities when one is not a co-lead or contributor
Discussions are usually substantive, and information updates are limited	Staff turnover made it difficult to work on activities
The Task Team is effective and ambitious and focuses on substantial issues	FTS is a crucial resource and more progress is needed on Objective 4 on transparency
	The Task Team should limit itself neither to ‘humanitarian’ nor to ‘financing’ issues – its work goes beyond either
	Need more information about discussions at IASC Working Group and Principals; better link between Task Team and Principals

The Task Team’s progress in 2014

Ms Pitotti gave a summary of the Task Team’s progress and achievements in 2014. Of the activities in the workplan, two have been completed, progress has been made on ten, one was cancelled, and three have not started. More detailed updates and discussions on several of the activities took place later during the retreat.

IASC HFTT 2014-2015 Work Plan

Adequate, accessible financing

- ✓ 1.1 Link to PFWG
- 1.2 ID/ tackle challenges to accessing CBPFs
- ✓ 1.3 CERF visibility
- 1.4 Align CHF/CERF reporting
- 1.5 Investigate HACT-type options
- 1.6 Review CERF best practices
- 1.7 Study Future of Financing

Reduce burdensome donor conditions

- 2.1 ID/ tackle top 5 burdens

Cross-cutting

- Link to the GHD
- World Humanitarian Summit

Reduce humanitarian/ development divide

- 3.1a Joint statement/ key messages on preparedness financing for IASC Principles
- 3.1b Implement “Dare to Prepare” recommendations
- ~~3.2 Review SRPs with resilience element~~
- 3.3 Develop advocacy plan of action emerging from OECD DAC/ CEB studies

Improve transparency

- 4.1 Explore synergy with IATI/ UNTWG
- 4.2 Improve FTS reporting
- 4.3 Create online repository of studies

Ms Doughten provided an update on follow-up to the Task Team’s advice not to adopt the Integrated Financial Accountability Framework (IFAF). The Emergency Relief Coordinator had sent a note to the Secretary-General summarizing and concurring with the Task Team’s advice, and the Chef de Cabinet responded positively on behalf of the SG, asking that the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions be informed of the UN’s decision. The assessment, reasons, and list of alternatives for IFAF that the Task Team had compiled were used in these letters.

Update on HFTT activities

A. Challenges in accessing country-based pooled funds (activity 1.2)

Ms Pitotti gave an update on this activity. From a matrix of all identified challenges, the top-ten challenges were listed.

Top 10 Challenges to Accessing CBPFs

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Limited reach | 1. One signature |
| 2. Timing | 2. Fund manager capacity/ expectations |
| 3. Lack of flexibility (backdating, audits, budget changes, etc.) | 3. Sector-focus |
| 4. Limited languages | 4. Capacity assessments too heavy |
| 5. UN agencies treated differently than NGOs | 5. Weak M&E systems |

Juan Chaves, OCHA/FCS, said that OCHA was rolling out a new policy instruction and guidelines for country-based pooled funds in 2015. These will address most of the identified challenges. The guidelines will establish one type of country-based pooled fund (CBPF), instead of the distinction between Emergency Response Funds and Common Humanitarian Funds. CBPFs will be better aligned with SRPs in terms of objectives and timelines (project implementation can be up to 12 months). An online grant management system (GMS) will support the management of CBPFs. OCHA/FCS committed to finalize and circulate the summary note in February, ensuring that identified challenges are supported by currently available evidence. In addition, OCHA will monitor the implementation of the new CBPF guidelines and update the task team on progress and/or challenges once or twice a year during the HFTT regular meetings.

During the discussion, participants discussed how progress on addressing the identified challenges could be monitored. David Matern, WFP, and others suggested that the Pooled Fund Working Group (PFWG) might be a better forum than the Task Team. Sandra Aviles, FAO, asked how the Task Team could better influence the agenda and discussions of the PFWG. Mr Chaves said that the perception of pooled funds, especially regarding the speed of disbursement was sometimes worse than the empirical evidence. Thus the identified challenges need to balance perception with data and evidence currently available. OCHA/FCS is reviewing the draft note that summarizes and explains the top ten challenges, to ensure they are objectively described.

Ms Pitotti said that a stock-taking matrix and short summary of the identified challenges was being finalized and will be shared soon. Monika Brühlhart, UNHCR, said that implementation of the CBPF guidelines should be led by OCHA and discussed in the PFWG. Ms Aviles asked whether the identified challenges would influence OCHA's work on and management of pooled funds.

Several participants agreed that the Task Team should exercise more influence on the discussions at the PFWG, although some, including Kate Halff, SCHR, cautioned that the discussion should focus on what issues the Task Team wants to influence. To reinforce the importance of coherent policy-level engagement with the HFTT and the PFWG on CBPFs, Mr Chaves noted the positive influence that HFTT and PFWG discussions have had in the drafting of the CBPF guidelines, especially at the strategic level. For example, the guidelines explicitly aim at improving access to CBPFs to a wider scope of partners, to which end better risk management and accountability measures and standards have been developed. He reiterated OCHA/FCS will update the Task Team in about six-to-twelve months, as relevant, on progress in addressing the challenges and implemented the guidelines.

While the draft paper is circulated and the CBPF guidelines implementation take effect, Anne Street, CAFOD, said that a lot of workstreams were in a similar situation. They are in the middle of their work, thus it was premature to discuss how they could be taken forward. Tom Delrue, UNDP, said that the Task Team should focus on strategic, not operational issues. However, Ms Street, Ms Buzard, and Clémence Boutant-Willm, Handicap International, said that the challenges in accessing CBPFs, as much as they are at the operational level, were an important issue for NGOs. Ms Buzard agreed that more empirical/quantitative evidence on the identified challenges would be helpful.

Lastly, Ms Doughten said that the Task Team had often organized ad-hoc meetings to prepare for meetings of the PFWG. Ms Pitotti said the draft PFWG workplan will be finalized in March, and can be shared with the IASC HFTT in advance for feedback.

In the end, the HFTT agreed to await the final draft and, on that basis, consider which challenges should be further discussed by the HFTT at the policy level. At the same time, the HFTT advised that OCHA should maintain the HFTT and the PFWG updated on progress and challenges related to the implementation of the guidelines, and that the HFTT could input into the PFWG discussions and agenda as relevant.

Action OCHA/FCS and ICVA, as activity co-leads, to share paper on identified challenges by the end of February

B. Donor conditions (activity 2.1)

Marina Skuric Prodanovic, UNFPA, said that the activity lead and contributors had first identified basic guiding principles and definitions. Most Task Team members provided inputs on donor conditions, which were summarized in a mapping of donor conditions. As different agencies had

a different understanding of donor conditions and their importance, it was difficult to summarize inputs in the mapping. Many agencies were reluctant to name donors or to include their agency names in the mapping. In addition to the mapping, ICVA conducted a study on conditions in the agreements of UN agencies with implementing partners (to be finalized in February), InterAction a study on donor agreements (also still in draft form), and WFP a study on earmarking of funding (see below). Participants should provide ideas on how to take this activity forward.

C. Bridging relief and development (objective 3)

Sandra Aviles, FAO, said that WHO and FAO had compiled key messages on preparedness but had encountered reticence. This was part of a three-year workstream. WFP has compiled a theory of change for a new global fund on resilience and preparedness. FAO worked with the Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) office on the proposal for such a fund but some agencies opposed it. Daniel Kull, World Bank, said that humanitarian financing and the link between humanitarian and development financing was a new priority for the World Bank. The World Bank is engaged in the preparations for the World Humanitarian Summit, e.g. on risk financing. The ‘authorizing environment’, including donors, does not have an agreed position on these issues. Ms Aviles added that the Working Group had asked for research and work on financing incentives, in particular with regard to protracted crises. The IASC HFTT could refer the Working Group to a planned Danish study of incentives and disincentives. Development actors should be encouraged to step in earlier during crises both programmatically and with related funding sources.

Good Humanitarian Donorship – workplan for 2015

David Ennis, UK, Nancy Kyloh, USAID, and Sarah Költzow, Germany, participated on behalf of the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative in a session of the retreat. Ms Kyloh said that the GHD was developing its workplan for 2015, which was still being finalized (a draft was shared). Thus, it was an ideal time to discuss the workplans of both the GHD and the Task Team. The US and Canada currently co-chair the GHD, and Germany, Sweden, and the UK lead the workstream on humanitarian financing. The GHD workplan has to be kept focused and manageable. It will be focused on what donors can do to improve their contributions to humanitarian aid. The GHD workplan mirrors, to some extent, the workstreams of the World Humanitarian Summit. As the membership of the GHD is diverse, this has to be captured in the workplan.

Two areas in the draft GHD workplan in particular overlap with the work of the Task Team: ‘reporting, information, and accountability requirements’ and ‘funding modalities.’ The Task Team has identified donor conditions and GHD would like to receive more detailed information on the main donor conditions. However, donor conditions are not the main focus of the GHD workplan. Donors hope to hear about innovative funding modalities, such as, for example, the “super CERF”. Longer-term financing and transparency of aid flows are other issues on which the work of the GHD and Task Team overlaps.

Mr Ennis said that the workstream on humanitarian financing was still being planned. A lot of discussions outside of the GHD will have to be taken into account in the GHD workplan. DFID, with support from the Overseas Development Institute, will convene a high-level panel on cash programming before the World Humanitarian Summit. DFID is conducting an analytical study on the return on investment from funding preparedness activities. DFID also works on risk insurance, the private sector, 'dual purpose' issues that link humanitarian to development work, and climate financing. These areas are grouped under 'crisis financing.' Ms Költzow said that Germany was particularly interested in preparedness and bridging the humanitarian-development gap. Germany has listened to aid agencies' concerns and now provides multi-year funding and funding to pooled funds. It is important to bring together different workstreams on financing and related issues.

Ms Skuric and others thanked the GHD representatives for their presentation. Ms Skuric noted that aid agencies were increasingly moving into high-risk areas but are asked to reduce risk, which can be a contradiction. Cascading reporting requirements from different donors, and from aid agencies to their implementing partners, often mean that the 'highest common denominator' is used, i.e. extensive reporting requirements. Identifying good practices in donor conditions is important. Donor conditions are a sensitive subject and it can be difficult for agencies openly to discuss conditions with their donors. Ms Doughten suggested that the Task Team continue to engage with the GHD, for instance by organizing presentations from the GHD to the Task Team. Some of the work should also be linked with the preparations for the World Humanitarian Summit, and periodic telecons could be organized between the GHD and HFTT co-chairs. Ms Doughten asked the donors to share information about any studies or workstreams on humanitarian financing, which could be added to OCHA's inventory of humanitarian financing workstreams. Ms Aviles asked whether the Task Team should also engage development focal points in donor agencies and ministries, especially ahead of the 'financing for development' summit in Addis Ababa. Tom Delrue, UNDP, encouraged donors to reduce the gap between the humanitarian and development sides within donor agencies or governments. They should use their membership in UN agencies' executive boards to influence aid agencies. Priya Behrens-Shah, Welthungerhilfe, said that particularly in Germany's administration, there was a strict divide between humanitarian and development aid.

Mr Ennis said that requirements for managing risk originated from different parts in donor governments and administrations but there was often more flexibility than was realized. He and Ms Kyloh agreed that aid agencies sometimes put in place their own reporting and accountability requirements, which do not always originate from the donors. Ms Kyloh said that aid agencies should name the donors that impose specific conditions. The three GHD representatives agreed that donors should try to bridge the humanitarian-development gap in their own administrations. They were open to linking up further with the Task Team. Ms Kyloh agreed with the concern about risk management, said that this had also been brought up by the Emergency Directors Group, and asked for concrete examples. Ms Kyloh agreed to compiling an inventory of donor studies on humanitarian financing and related issues. Ms Költzow said that the GHD was putting together common messages for the meetings of UN agencies' executive boards.

Action GHD co-chairs to share inventory of donor studies on humanitarian financing

Task Team to share donor conditions, including donor names, with GHD

Donor conditions: WFP analysis of earmarked funding

David Matern, WFP, shared the results of an overview of earmarking of WFP funding. In 2014, WFP received an unprecedented US\$ 5.5 billion in funding. The analysis which focused on 2013 data, sought to find out how the money was allocated. It found that:

- only 9% of WFP's contributions were fully flexible
- 81% were directed funds, of which 27% were in-kind contributions with associated cash and 64% were cash contributions
- Furthermore, 89% of the directed cash contributions came with further constraints (tied either to type of activity/commodity/purchasing constraints/or geography, e.g. a specific region within a country operation). Most of the restrictions were combined restrictions, e.g. commodity/geography/purchase.

See the presentation, shared separately, for further details.

Next step: WFP is currently preparing an analysis of specific donors and developing an action plan specific to each case. Part of the analysis will include a study of how some earmarking may be self-imposed. Mr Matern asked the Task Team whether there was interest in the WFP report, the donor analysis and action plan that WFP is preparing? Would other organizations be interested in carrying out a similar analysis? If yes, the analyses could be compared and be the empirical basis for joint talking points or even a joint action plan for reducing donor conditions.

Several participants provided comments and asked questions:

- There is a need to untangle further what the earmarking means and how it impacts aid. (So far WFP only has anecdotal evidence of situations where this causes problems.) The Task Team could give concrete examples of how this impedes efficiency and increases transaction costs.
- Conversely, it would be useful to present the results in a positive way, by showing what kind of implementation un-earmarked funds allow.
- Conduct a study of why donors have reduced un-earmarked money. What has driven that trend? Part of the answer is increasing pressure on donors to show results.
- Should we commission a study that covers all UN agencies? What other studies could we draw on (e.g., OECD/DAC peer reviews)?
- Would organisations that were previously hesitant to name donors be willing, after today, to name them?


Other comments included the following:

- From the perspective of some NGOs, 11% of unrestricted funding seems rather good. How do donor conditions affect NGOs and the UN system differently?
- Earmarked money rarely covers the full cost of a programme. There is a problem because earmarked funds only cover subsets of a programme such as a specific activity.

The future of humanitarian financing (activity 1.7)

Ms Street introduced the session by saying that this activity was bringing together several of the workstreams of the Task Team. She introduced Lydia Poole, the consultant who had compiled the draft report on the consultations under this workstream. Germany and FAO provided funding; CAFOD, FAO, and World Vision led the activity; ICVA provided support to organizing regional consultations; and several people had volunteered to participate in the activity's steering group which will meet on 23 January.

Ms Poole gave an update on the workstream and presented a report that summarizes the outcomes from four regional organizations in London, Amman, Bangkok, and Dakar.

 <p>FUTURE HUMANITARIAN FINANCING</p> <p>Future Humanitarian Financing (FHF) is an initiative to bring fresh thinking and expertise from beyond the humanitarian sector to address the growing problem of how we meet the financial costs of responding to humanitarian crises.</p> <p>T: @FutureHF W: futurehumanitarianfinancing.org</p> <p>©CAFOD/Mo</p>	<p>About FHF</p> <p>Convened on behalf of the IASC task team on humanitarian financing and led by a steering group comprising CAFOD, the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and World Vision and funded by the Government of Germany and FAO.</p> <p>The purpose of the FHF initiative is to discuss the potential of new and emerging approaches to financing and investigate how these might support both a more open and adaptive humanitarian endeavour as well as new business models fit to meet the changing nature and scope of humanitarian crises.</p> <p>Dialogue events were held in London and key centres of regional humanitarian coordination including Amman, Dakar and Bangkok, with a final synthesis to be held in Geneva in January 2015.</p>
<p>Shared vision of the future</p> <p><i>Financing, coordination and response will be increasingly nationalised, regionalised and localised.</i></p> <p><i>Greater diversity will re-shape the constitution and norms within 'the system'.</i></p> <p><i>Crisis-affected individuals will receive a 'bundle' of financial and material assistance through a variety of channels.</i></p> <p><i>Elsewhere, international actors will continue to provide classic principled humanitarian assistance in contested settings.</i></p> <p><i>Modes of assistance will be modernised and make greater use of more efficient processes, technology, products and services.</i></p> <p><i>Influenced by new global norms, treaties, and financing tools, governments and private sector actors will invest in mitigating the risks of climate change and building resilience to disasters, offsetting some of the rising costs of responding to climate-related disasters.</i></p>	<p>Challenges 1: Demand outstripping supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapidly expanding funding gap. • Few alternative and additional sources of financing; those 'new' sources that exist will challenge traditional humanitarian actors and modes of response. <p>Challenges 2: A system out of step with reality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The international humanitarian system is increasingly perceived to be exclusive and out of touch. • Funding is heavily concentrated among a limited number of actors. <p>Challenges 3: A dysfunctional and inefficient financing architecture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilising funds on the basis of voluntary appeals drives large-scale avoidable inefficiency. • Funding is often not sufficiently timely to arrest deteriorating situations. • The system struggles to cope with periods of peak demand. • Funding has become excessively fragmented and transaction chains convoluted and inefficient. • Humanitarians have taken on responsibilities which they cannot hope to meet. • There is no shared long-term strategic vision to guide how humanitarians should work with others to achieve more sustainable locally and nationally-led and financed crisis-response.

<p><i>Transformative change</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-focussing humanitarian action on what is 'mission critical' • Embracing and enabling diversity / becoming 'open and adaptive' • Committing to subsidiarity: localising aid • Building a more outward-looking and progressive humanitarian enterprise: solutions tend to come from outside <p><i>"View new actors (as a whole) (global rising actors, crowd-sourcing etc) as an opportunity rather than competition and improve coordination amongst them."</i></p> <p><i>"Be clear on what only humanitarians can do and why. Assume this is very small selection of activities. What's 'mission critical'?"</i> FHF dialogue London</p>	<p>Remodelling and incremental changes</p> <p><i>"We need to focus as much as the need to make better use of funds that we have as generating new funds."</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anticipation and analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moving away from reactive funding approaches • Quantifying and communicating requirements (needs assessments and appeals) • Tracking and monitoring funding 2. Upgrading the architecture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting donor resources effectively • Bridging liquidity gaps • Making provision for peak demand 3. Increasing efficiency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing recurrent costs • Reducing transaction costs • Improving business practices • Streamlining reporting <p><i>"There needs to be a shift to a system that finances action based on early warnings - whether of potential conflict or health emergencies or droughts, heavy rain or hurricanes. New insurance products (index-linked) and index-trigger based social protection are options here too."</i></p>
--	--

With regard to slide 3, the claim that the gap between humanitarian requirements and funding is widening was contested during the consultations, especially by donors who questioned whether the analysis presented in humanitarian appeals was accurate.

Julian Srodecki, World Vision, invited questions and comments from the participants. Faisal Yousaf, WHO, asked about the level of participation in the regional consultations. Ms Poole answered that many different organizations had participated, including local NGOs, international aid agencies, regional organizations, local governments, and donors. It was difficult to get many representatives from local NGOs to participate. Those that did attend said their organizations relied mostly on local funding from various sources, including corporations, rather than international humanitarian funding. Ms Skuric said that while appeals for voluntary funding had been identified as inefficient, if no appeals were issued, some of the money may remain untapped. Ms Poole said that much of humanitarian requirements were recurrent and could therefore be separated from humanitarian appeals. Ms Aviles invited the Task Team to comment on the draft report, which will be shared soon, as it will become an IASC product. Ms Buzard cautioned that (at least some of) the findings and recommendations from the report should translate into concrete outcomes. She said that the discussion should take into account wider issues, for instance technological innovations or (lack of) investment in infrastructure. Mr Delrue said that the distinction between humanitarian and development actors was artificial for many organizations that work in both areas. This should be taken into account when discussing the future of humanitarian financing.

Ms Doughten briefed on the proposed High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing. As the Secretary-General is still confirming the members of the panel, its timeline has been delayed slightly from the anticipated January start. The terms of reference will be circulated soon. The panel will consider existing work and research on humanitarian financing, including that of the HFTT, and compile a 'meta-analysis.' Interim results may be presented to the 'financing for development' meeting in Addis Ababa. Tensai Asfaw, OCHA/DRS, said that the panel would take up many of the same issues identified by the 'future of humanitarian financing' workstream and tie together different workstreams and discussions on humanitarian, development, recovery, and climate financing.

Action Activity leads to share draft report with Task Team for comments

World Humanitarian Summit

Rob Smith (WSH Secretariat) gave an update on how humanitarian financing issues are being discussed during the preparations and consultations ahead of the WHS. The consultations are focused around four themes, and humanitarian financing touches on all four. The key issues from the consultations that are relevant to financing are:

1. There has been an emphasis on the localisation of humanitarian response. For humanitarian financing, this means: How to get funding more rapidly and effectively into the hands of local actors? How can we capitalize on encouraging trends such as pooled funds?
2. The funding gap invites a fresh look at additional and new sources of funding.
3. A key issue is the humanitarian-development divide, and what this means for financing. How can we use development funding more proactively in humanitarian or peri-humanitarian situations, particularly in protracted situations, which is the largest drain on humanitarian funding. How can we commit to multiyear funding (either by amending humanitarian funding rules to allow this, or by repurposing development funds)?
4. Need to adapt the funding architecture to be more flexible to respond to novel situations (e.g. Ebola outbreak).

WHS has conducted only a limited set of research on finance; the main workstream is on the localisation of funding. There are also workstreams on risk financing and insurance principles led by the World Bank (under theme II 'Reducing Vulnerability and Managing Risk') and another on financing solutions in protracted situations (also under theme II). But much more needs to be done, and the WHS Secretariat is eager to work with the Task Team. The WHS secretariat will begin to post the work they have been doing online, and invite feedback and ideas. Proposals for the Budapest consultations in early February are also welcome.

Day 2 (Thursday, 22 January 2014)

Summary of day 1

Ms Thomas presented the revised agenda for day 2 of the retreat (see annex) and gave a summary of the discussions on day 1. Overall, participants appreciated the work of the Task Team. They also noted some challenges: external communications, exchange of information between the different workstreams, organization of meetings and participation via Skype, diversification of membership to include local and southern NGOs, engagement with other entities, e.g., GHD, WHS, and IATI. Ms Thomas summarized the discussions on country-based pooled funds, donor conditions, bridging the humanitarian-development gap, engagement with the GHD, the future of humanitarian financing, and engagement with the WHS secretariat in particular on donor conditions and local financing.

Ms Doughten gave updates on the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, the review of the CERF, and capacity assessments of implementing partners:

The panel will be announced in a message from the ERC to the IASC and ODSG in the coming days. The terms of reference of the panel include: how to mobilize more predictable funding in the longer term, more cost-effective use of resources by using risk management and preparedness, better coherence between humanitarian and development work. The panel will help to align new thinking on humanitarian financing with political efforts and will look at a time horizon of twenty years. It should begin its work in mid-February and work for six months. Angela Hinrichs, FAO, asked about the panel's membership – it still needs to be confirmed. Ms Aviles said that the panel could help to get political commitment for improving humanitarian financing. The 'future of humanitarian financing' workstream should feed into the work of the panel. Mr Matern agreed that the terms of reference of the panel and the problem statement of the 'future' workstream were very similar. He asked about the working methods of the panel. Ms Doughten said that the panel would rely on existing research and the Task Team should provide a short, e.g., two-page, summary of its work to the panel. The plan is for the panel to have three meetings. Clare Dalton, ICRC, said that the Task Team should react to the message to the IASC to ensure that its inputs are taken into account.

Action Task Team to compile two-page summary as input to the panel by March 2015

Considering the widening gap between humanitarian funding and requirements, the advocacy by the High Commissioner for Refugees, and the large number of Level 3 crises, the CERF secretariat decided to commission two studies: a 'technical' study to review the option of using assessed contributions for the CERF and a 'strategic' study to assess the feasibility of and rationale for a possible higher funding target. The two studies will be finalized by the end of January or early February and will be discussed in greater detail in one of the next Task Team meetings.

Action Continue discussion on 'super CERF' in February or March Task Team meetings

OCHA's Director of Corporate Programs would like the Task Team to look into capacity assessments of implementing partners. The Task Team already has some activities in this regard: a study of 'HACT-like' assessments and the work on donor conditions. The discussion on capacity assessments should not be limited to the humanitarian sphere but include development organizations. Kate Halff, SCHR, and Ms Aviles asked whether this issue was really linked to the Task Team's work on donor conditions. Ms Halff said that the Core Humanitarian Standard should be taken into account in any capacity assessments. It was agreed to continue the discussion in more detail in future meetings.

Brainstorm on the Proposed Work for the Humanitarian Financing Task Team 2014-2015

Ms Thomas introduced the next session: group work to brainstorm on any revisions to the workplan for 2015 and defining what success in 2015 would look like. Participants reconfirmed the four objectives of the Task Team; these will be kept without changes. Ms Aviles said that the Task Team should consider

working more on innovative humanitarian financing. The results of the group work were presented to the plenary.

Group 1 (Rachel Criswell, World Vision, reporting): The group affirms that the focus of our work needs to be packaging the lessons learned from the ‘future of humanitarian financing’ work to meaningfully influence external audiences. The group therefore chooses to prioritize Objectives 1 & 2 with specific action focused on (1) Bringing key messages from our 2014 work to high-level donors (e.g. through the High-Level Panel and GHD); (2) make meaningful and concrete change to constraints in the field around conditions (e.g. transaction costs, risk management) and localization of aid (“localization” needs to be defined by the whole group so that concrete action plans can come from it).

Group 2 had two suggestions: (1) to focus on private sector engagement (under objective 1) and (2) to revitalize objective 4 on transparency.

On private sector engagement: Isabel Gomes, World Vision, suggested forming a platform for sharing best practices on engaging with the private sector. Two approaches were discussed: taking the task on within the Task Team and reviewing it in 6 months or so; or taking it on outside the group with interested parties. The group questioned whether tackling the topic within the Task Team would require taking out another topic or task. World Vision noted that if the task were taken on by the Task team, World Vision would then be able to assign someone on to work on this and thereby reduce the need to cut out another task or activity. World Vision will share a 1-pager on what such a private-sector engagement platform could look like.

On objective 4 on transparency, Lisa Walmsley, OCHA/FTS, called on the Task Team to look at activity 4.2 (“convene technical sub-group and agree on concrete steps to improve IASC reporting to FTS”). Objective 4 is about transparency but it is also about maintaining an evidence base. We have very basic questions that still need answers (the timeliness of aid, whether it is proportionate to need, etc.). These require good data, and good data requires transparency. Ms Walmsley also noted that she can identify resources to make activity 4.3 happen (online repository).

Group 3 set as its goals 1) to influence and impact the HLP by developing key messages and a clear plan to act; 2) to see the HHTT develop into something more influential and become embedded in the wider system, as a key interlocutor on financing issues. Concretely this would mean engaging with the GHD (invite donors to explain their policy changes; cultivate donors to spread messages on our behalf); feeding key messages into the WHS study on the localisation of aid; inviting ISDR to brief on post-Sendai implications for humanitarian financing; advocate at the WEF (read-out from ERC); 3) On Donor Conditionalities: find champions who can advocate for what we want (e.g. the Germans). The group also suggested as a goal mainstreaming humanitarian financing.

Group 4 made three suggestions:

1. Focus on highlighting recommendations to feed into the HLP
2. One of the biggest challenges in the Ebola crisis has been the tracking of resources and contributions. The Ebola crisis is an interesting example because it brings together in an

- unprecedented way emergency and development financing, with no common reporting: emergency and development funds are tracked by different agencies and different tools. The group suggests that the Task Team lay this out as a problem statement and show that there is a need to come up with a real-time tracking system for all kinds of funds.
3. The team could look into how to move forward on the localisation of aid, by commissioning a study for example.

Group 5 made the following suggestions:

1. Objective 1. How do we define 'adequate'? Is there place in the workplan to link to the Core Humanitarian Standard, and advocate that it be used in humanitarian financing?
2. Look into how well SRPs reflect needs on the ground (Objective 1)
3. Objective 1.3 is unclear: visibility (promote CERF) but also about how we promote better performance: need to highlight bad practices and learn from them.
4. How will the 'future of humanitarian financing' study influence the Task Team's workplan?
5. The work on donor conditions requires more NGO perspectives (Objective 2)
6. We need more inputs from the field and make sure that what we are discussing is grounded in field realities. There is a sense of disconnect.
7. Need to make sure that our work is not duplicating work done elsewhere.

Other points raised in the discussion:

- Ms Criswell said the Task Team's focus should shift towards prioritizing advocacy. She asked whether we have the right people to take that kind of work forward. Perhaps we might consult on this with the communication and advocacy members of our agencies.
- Darla Silva, UNICEF, asked that the Task Team put together a list of all relevant studies. A request was made for a calendar of upcoming events.

Action Task Team to compile list the different studies undertaken by the Task Team and timelines for each

IASC secretariat to compile calendar of events and share it with the Task Team

Tasks, activities, and deliverables in 2015

Ms Walmsley provided an update on Objective 4. It was agreed that activity 4.3 (online repository on humanitarian financing studies) was a task that could be relatively quickly achieved, using the new IASC website which will be available during the first quarter of 2015. Thus, the activity could be completed during the second quarter.

There was discussion on whether to drop activity 4.1 (synergies with the International Aid Transparency Initiative, IATI). Some felt it was an activity that was undertaken by individual agencies, others that the Task Team should engage with IATI to promote transparency of funding data. It was agreed to invite the

IATI secretariat to give a presentation to the Task Team during the second quarter, and that Ms Walmsley would participate in IATI meetings and update the Task Team.

Ms Pitotti presented a list of studies undertaken as part of the Task Team activities.

IASC HFTT Products

Activity 1.2 Challenges to Accessing Country-Based Pooled Funds

- OCHA-ICVA led CBPF stocktaking matrix/summary (to share in February)

Activity 1.5 Options Partner Capacity Assessments

- ICVA-commissioned mapping (including HACT)/ recommendations (April)

Activity 1.6 CERF Best Practices

- ✓ UNICEF-InterAction led CERF best practices document (November 2014)

Activity 1.7 Future of Financing

- CAFOD-FAO-WV led Future Humanitarian Financing Outcome Document (March)

Activity 2.1 Donor Conditions

- ✓ UNFPA-WFP-led matrix (January)
- ✓ WFP analysis PowerPoint (January)
- ICVA-commissioned review of UN-NGO partnership agreements (February)
- InterAction review of bilateral donor agreements (February)

Activity 3.1 Humanitarian/ Development Divide

- ✓ IASC/ODI Dare to Prepare Study (2013)

Participants and updated the existing activities under Objective 1 (see annex for revised workplan).

Ms Skuric and Mr Matern presented options for taking Objective 2 forward. As a first step, best practices and success stories will be identified. Second, the group will develop messages and strategies for donor engagement. For this, a deeper analysis is needed to unpack the conditions of key donors, which will be conducted by the activity group.

Ms Aviles gave an update on Objective 3. The FAO and World Bank have presented a 7-page document to the IASC Working Group. The humanitarian-development divide will also be discussed by the High-Level Panel, is part of the GHD workplan, and Denmark has commissioned a study on incentives in humanitarian financing and the aid architecture. The steering committee includes Denmark, FAO, and the World Bank. An informal group with DFID, the UN University, FAO, the WHS secretariat, and OECD/DAC discussed a 'new deal' of financing solutions to bridge the humanitarian-development divide. Separately, a think piece on the future of humanitarian financing was compiled.

Action FAO to share terms of reference of the study on incentives and think piece on humanitarian financing

Participants discussed in three groups: (1) suggested new activities under Objective 1, (2) Objective 2, and (3) Objective 3.

Ms Doughten presented the discussion on Objective 1. Suggested new activities were:

- engagement with the private sector. This will be taken up by an informal group outside the task team, in link with an OCHA group on private sector engagement.
- study on localizing aid. At one of the next meetings of the Task Team, the ‘future of humanitarian financing’ study will be discussed in detail and it will be agreed whether the Task Team should focus some of its activities for 2015 on any recommendations of the study.
- Core Humanitarian Standard. This will be included under Activity 1.5 on partner capacity assessments.
- Do SRPs address needs and requirements? This was dropped.
- Good and bad practices in CERF visibility and partnerships. This was discussed in the CERF Advisory Group on the basis of the paper on best practices in accelerating CERF project implementation (activity 1.6), and will continue as part of the CERF secretariat’s work.

Ms Criswell briefed on the discussion on Objective 2. Activity 2.1 now includes five action points:

- Finalize the various studies under this activity (by WFP, ICVA, and InterAction)
- Identify best practices and success stories on changing donor conditions
- Identify the top 10 donors, plus some important emergent donors, for further analysis and conduct deeper analysis of conditions imposed by these donors
- Summarize the findings from the different parts of the analysis in a short document
- Draft advocacy plan and key messages

Ms Aviles briefed on the discussion on Objective 3. The objective leads will focus on two of the original three activities: (1) dissemination of preparedness messages before or during the Sendai World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, and (2) advocating for a funding mechanism for preparedness. The preparedness messages have already been completed and the implementation of the recommendations from the ODI/IASC study, ‘Dare to Prepare,’ have been taken forward by developing a theory of change to develop a preparedness funding mechanism. The draft messages will be shared with the Task Team. A small working group, with FAO, WHO, OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, and IFRC, will discuss these issues next week.

The IASC Working Group has asked the Task Team to investigate incentives and disincentives in bridging the gap between humanitarian and development communities. Since Denmark has already commissioned a study on this, FAO and the World Bank have asked Denmark to include IASC members in the steering group for this study, and are waiting for a response. FAO and the World Bank are already part of the steering group.

Germany and the UK have approached FAO and the World Bank to look into financing solutions in protracted crises. Invitations should also be extended to an NGO and a UN humanitarian organization, to participate in discussions on financing solutions for comprehensive typologies.

Action FAO to send update to the Task Team following next week’s meeting of the small working group

FAO to revise the workplan with regard to Objective 3

Working methods

A. Advocacy

Ms Thomas said that possible external actors that the Task Team should engage include GHD, WHS, the High-Level Panel, OECD/DAC, and the World Economic Forum. Ms Aviles suggested a dedicated meeting to discuss this, possibly on the basis of the ‘future of humanitarian financing’ report.

Based on the study and a visioning paper, key messages will be drafted. Advocacy messages on other workstreams will be formulated later, and may be discussed at a regular or special meeting or a mid-year retreat of the Task Team. Ms Criswell suggested that communications specialists be involved in these discussions. Ms Silva said that key messages have to be tailored to specific audiences. Ms Thomas said that the most important audiences for the first half of 2015 were the High-Level Panel and the GHD, because of their timelines. Ms Boutant-Willm suggested the WHS process, in particular the Budapest consultations in early February.

Action Activity leads (1.7) to share draft report on the ‘future of humanitarian financing’ for feedback by the Task Team

Activity leads to formulate key messages based on their work, as relevant.

B. External communication

The Task Team will make an effort better to communicate its achievements to external partners via the IASC newsletter.

C. More efficient meetings

The number of updates and information sharing in meetings should be limited to the information that cannot be shared in writing in advance. Agendas should be annotated, and the summary for each agenda item, as well as its relevance for the Task Team’s workplan, should be provided by the presenters. The number of agenda items for each meeting should be limited, as should the time allocated for presentations to leave enough time for discussions. Time should be strictly kept during meetings. Ms Thomas suggested splitting the agenda for each meeting into core business, which is related to the workplan, and other business. For those calling in by phone, presentation slides must be shared before a meeting so that people on the phone can

follow the presentation. People who speak should introduce themselves. Meetings should start at 9am New York time so that members based in Asia can participate.

Action Task Team secretariat to follow up on above suggestions to see which are feasible

D. Diversifying membership

Ms Criswell volunteered as a focal point for diversifying membership, including: encouraging local and southern NGOs to participate, ensuring that agenda items that are relevant for local and southern NGOs are put at the beginning of the agenda. Additional partners could be invited for specific meetings.

E. Links with the PFWG

Ms Thomas summarized three ways in which the Task Team could exert greater influence on the PFWG: commenting on the PFWG's workplan, ad-hoc Task Team meetings before a PFWG meeting (as they have been held in 2014), and proposing agenda items for PFWG meetings.

F. Links with the GHD

GHD representatives will be invited to specific meetings, or portions of meetings, as relevant.

G. Co-chairs

Both co-chairs will be on maternity leave for part of 2015. ICVA has recruited an interim replacement for Ms Pitotti who is available to co-chair the Task Team. OCHA will recruit an interim replacement for Ms Doughten but it was suggested that a Task Team member takes on the role of co-chair in the interim rather than the interim Chief of CERF. This will be further discussed during the 18 February IASC HFTT meeting.

Conclusion and next steps

A draft version of the revised workplan will be shared with the Task Team for comments, and the final version will be sent to the IASC Working Group for approval.

The co-chairs thanked Ms Thomas for facilitating the retreat.

Action Share draft revised workplan with the Task Team for review and comments

Once finalized, share the workplan with the IASC Working Group (via the IASC secretariat) for approval on a no-objection basis

Annex

Humanitarian Financing Task Team (HFTT)

Work Plan

January 2014-December 2015

Date updated: 2 February 2015 (Draft for comments)

Color-coding: green = achieved, blue = ongoing, red = not started (text highlighted in yellow still needs to be reformulated)

Objective 1: Adequate humanitarian financing, which is context appropriate, is accessible to operational organisations on the ground					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
Pooled Funds					
1. [Completed] Formalise links between the HFTT and the Pooled Fund Working Group (PFWG) and ensure the HFTT prepares collectively in advance of PFWG meetings	Lead: co-chairs, OCHA/FCS	End Feb 2014	High	PFWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed PFWG agenda is discussed at HFTT New PFWG TORs include membership of HFTT co-chairs
2. Conduct a stock-taking exercise to identify challenges to access country-based pooled funds and identification of which challenges can be tackled by the HFTT	Lead: OCHA/FCS and ICVA Contributors: FAO, Start Network, World Vision, OCHA/CERF,	Q 2, 2015	High	Principled Humanitarian Action TT Work stream C (COTER), Objective 1 (coordination and operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Matrix and summary drafted Next action:

Objective 1: Adequate humanitarian financing, which is context appropriate, is accessible to operational organisations on the ground					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
	IOM			improvements), Task 1: COTER tool kit and guidance; Task 3: COTER info note for IASC members; Task 4: IASC Principals' statement Work stream C (COTER), Objective 2 (outreach and advocacy), Task 1: workshop on US HAFA bill; Task 3: engagement with HFTT	refine and share with HFTT for feedback
3. [Completed] Improve the visibility of CERF's contribution to humanitarian response	Lead: OCHA/CERF Contributors: ICVA, CAFOD, NRC	Q3, 2014	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed • New CERF logo; improved website; press releases and infographics published, human interest stories
4. Explore options for aligning pooled fund (CBPF and CERF) reporting in SRP countries: a. Respective pooled fund secretariats to identify commonalities and differences in reporting requirements and, if applicable, identify possible opportunities for streamlining reporting in the context of SRPs.	4a) Lead: OCHA/CERF, OCHA/FCS Contributors: IOM	Q2, 2015	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, on track • Draft document developed • CERF and CBPF project templates aligned

Objective 1: Adequate humanitarian financing, which is context appropriate, is accessible to operational organisations on the ground

Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
b. If required, IASC agencies via HFTT to develop common messaging to donors reinforcing proposed changes (dependent on outcome of activity 4a.)	4b) Lead: OCHA Contributors: SCHR, WFP, UNMAS, UNFPA, IOM, OCHA/FCS	Q3, 2015			
Partnerships					
5. Map existing methodologies to NGO partner capacity assessments (including the HACT approach) and produce actionable recommendations for harmonization.	Leads: ICVA and OCHA/FCS Contributors: FAO, START, UNFPA, UNICEF, Welthungerhilfe, World Vision Steering Group: TBD	Q3, 2015	High	Principled Humanitarian Action TT Work stream D (Risk Management), Objective 1 (strengthened risk management), Task 1: compendium of risk management structures; Task 2: review of joint RM structures; Task 3: link to HFTT and others Link to OCHA's forthcoming work with development organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Consultancy advertised for proposals due 22 January 15 • Next action: develop Steering Group TORs and hire consultant • Separately, FCS has developed 'operational modalities' for CBPFs, based on agencies' risk rating
6. [Completed] Review good practices in UN-NGO partnership agreements with regard to CERF sub-grants	Lead: UNICEF and InterAction Contributors: NRC, World Vision, WHO, UNHCR, Handicap	Q3, 2014	High		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed • Paper presented to CERF Advisory Group in Nov

Objective 1: Adequate humanitarian financing, which is context appropriate, is accessible to operational organisations on the ground					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
	International, OCHA/CERF, OCHA/FCS				2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual agencies taking action according to lessons learned
Future Funding					
7. a. Commission a scoping study on future funding possibilities for humanitarian action b. Discuss the findings of the study and agree on any possible next steps, including how to use findings as inputs to the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, e.g. by compiling an advocacy document	Leads: CAFOD, FAO, World Vision	Q1 2015 (complete study) Q1, 2015 (meeting to discuss draft report) Q3 2015 (advocacy document for HLP)	High	Principled Humanitarian Action TT Work stream C (COTER), Objective 2 (outreach and advocacy), Task 1: workshop on US HAFA bill; Task 3: engagement with HFTT Preparedness and Resilience TT Objective 1 (guidance and tools), Activity 4: model for IASC response capability Objective 3 (engagement and advocacy), Activity 2: preparedness and resilience messages for post-2015 agenda AAP/PSEA TT Objective 2 (advocacy with donors), Activity 2: 1-pager on PSEA good practices for donors, Activity 3: get	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Funding secured TORs developed Lead researcher identified Report drafted Steering committee to be formed Regional dialogues held in London, Bangkok, Amman, Dakar, and Geneva

Objective 1: Adequate humanitarian financing, which is context appropriate, is accessible to operational organisations on the ground

Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
				AAP/PSEA on GHD agenda Objective 4 (WHS), Activity 1: AAP on WHS agenda; Activity 2: GA resolution on AAP	

Objective 2: Re-negotiate donor requirements on conditions that contribute to reducing the burden					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
<p>1. a. Compile list of top 10 donors and key emerging donors (based on responses received during the mapping exercise)</p> <p>b. Refine and adapt matrix from mapping exercise in 2014 workstream and based on inputs from HFTT members complete the matrix for each donor (with no attribution to humanitarian agencies, except for category UNO/NGO), including categories such as severity, size of donor, scope for improvement</p> <p>c. Conduct separate mapping exercise/summary stemming from ICVA/Interaction studies for conditions imposed by UN agencies (without attributions)</p> <p>d. Review OECD/DAC peer reviews for any relevant learnings (WFP). Review list to add any key NGO donors (Handicap Int'l and WV)</p>	<p>Lead: UNFPA, WFP Contributors: UNHCR, FAO, ICVA, InterAction, World Vision, UNICEF, Handicap International, IOM, OCHA/FCS, WHO</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p>Feb 2015</p> <p>Feb 2015</p> <p>Mar 2015</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Principled Humanitarian Action TT Work stream C (COTER), Objective 1 (coordination and operational improvements), Task 1: COTER tool kit and guidance; Task 3: COTER info note for IASC members; Task 4: IASC Principals' statement Work stream C (COTER), Objective 2 (outreach and advocacy), Task 1: workshop on US HAFA bill; Task 3: engagement with HFTT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing • Inputs from aid agencies collected • Analysis of top five donor conditions underway

Objective 3: Contribute to aid effectiveness by reducing the humanitarian/development divide					
Overall Lead for Objective 3: FAO and UNDP; link: Preparedness and Resilience Task Team					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
<p>1. a. Review and compile key messages on preparedness financing emerging from IASC/ODI 'Dare to Prepare' study for IASC Principals <u>Output:</u> Preparedness messages disseminated before or during Sendai (World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction)</p> <p>1. b. Implement the recommendations in the report 'Dare to Prepare', identifying possible synergies with ongoing studies and processes such as:</p> <p>a) Funding at the Sharp End by Lydia Poole/CAFOD</p> <p>b) Saving Lives Today and Tomorrow: Managing Risks OCHA Policy Study</p> <p>c) Disaster Response Dialogue – Study on humanitarian financing to disaster-affected governments ICVA, SDC, OCHA, IFRC</p> <p><u>Outputs:</u> Recommendations (which were endorsed at the IASC WG) of the Dare to Prepare report implemented <u>Theory of change for preparedness fund compiled</u></p>	<p>Lead: FAO and WHO Contributors: UNDP, UNICEF, the World Bank, CAFOD</p>	Q2, 2015	High	<p>Key messages drafted, comments compiled. Revised draft to be circulated for distribution by WHO ASG Dr. Aylward to the Principals</p> <p>Initial discussions with OCHA FCS and UNDP MPTF office regarding inclusion of preparedness financing in country based pooled funds and the establishment of a fund, respectively.</p> <p>TT members to participate in closed workshop hosted by OCHA for Launch of Saving Lives to identify possible synergies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, on track • IASC/ODI study launched • Study used for World Humanitarian Summit • Key messages drafted and follow-up actions prepared • Initial discussions about global preparedness fund
2. Develop and implement advocacy plan of action to disseminate key messages to	Lead: FAO, UNDP, Contributors: WHO,	Q3, 2014?	Medium	Principled Humanitarian Action TT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not started, waiting for

Objective 3: Contribute to aid effectiveness by reducing the humanitarian/development divide					
Overall Lead for Objective 3: FAO and UNDP; link: Preparedness and Resilience Task Team					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
<p>humanitarian and development donors emerging from the following external processes (the advocacy plan of action may include joint missions, social media, conferences, identification of champions, UNDG, etc.):</p> <p>a) Engage with risk and resilience study of OECD DAC (contact point: Rachel Scott, OECD-DAC)</p> <p>b) Participate in the Chief Executive Board (CEB) study on joint humanitarian-development agendas, which uses resilience as the entry point (contact point: Laetitia Arnault, CEB Secretariat)</p> <p>Output: Development of an Advocacy Plan of Action, with identifiable milestones and its implementation</p>	<p>UNFPA (sub-activity b), CAFOD (sub-activity a), InterAction (sub-activity a), World Bank</p>			<p>Work stream D (Risk Management), Objective 1 (strengthened risk management), Task 1: compendium of risk management structures; Task 2: review of joint RM structures; Task 3: link to HFTT and others</p> <p>Preparedness and Resilience TT</p> <p>Objective 1 (guidance and tools), Task 1: guidance on IASC ERP approach; Task 3: Index for Risk Management Objective 3 (engagement and advocacy on preparedness and resilience), both tasks</p>	<p>inputs from Task Team on Preparedness and Resilience</p>
<p>3. Modality (mechanism) of dedicated source on preparedness financing to be determined</p>	<p>FAO, WHO, OCHA, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, IFRC</p>	<p>Q2, 2015</p>			<p>•</p>

Cross-cutting Objective 4: Improve transparency through strengthening empirical knowledge base on funding flows (in and out)					
Activities	Focal Points	Timeframe	Priority	Complementarity	Status
<p>1. Explore synergies between the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), and the IASC</p>	<p>Lead: OCHA/FTS Contributors: FAO, UNDP</p>	<p>Q2, 2015 (IATI presentation)</p>	<p>Medium</p>		<p>• Ongoing</p>

Humanitarian Financing Task Team		and feedback from IATI meeting)			
2. Convene technical sub-group and agree on three concrete steps to improve IASC reporting to FTS, including possible adaptations required by changes in the Humanitarian Programme Cycle and advocacy	Lead: OCHA/FTS, IOM Contributors: UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF	Q4, 2015	High	GHD HPC Working Group (?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not started
3. Create online inter-agency repository on humanitarian financing studies and analyses	OCHA/FTS and IASC secretariat to discuss possibilities	Q2, 2015	Medium	Preparedness and Resilience TT Objective 1 (guidance and tools), Task 2: IASC Early Warning/Early Action reports; Task 3: Index for Risk Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not started

Cross-Cutting across the Work Plan:

- Determine which issues to take to donors/GHD counterparts as a follow up to the invitation to link with the GHD, particularly on GHD's Humanitarian Financing Work Stream. Lead: co-chairs.
- World Humanitarian Summit
High Level Panel

Modalities/Standing Items of the Task Team Monthly Meetings:

- **Schedule:**
 - Third Wednesday of every month (starting in February 2014)
 - Usual time 9:00 NY/15:00 Geneva
- **Focus of Meetings:**
 - 1) Work Plan Progress** – based on activities on-going at the time of the meeting
 - 2) Updates/Links with Other Groups/Processes** – regular updates for feedback and engagement when necessary/appropriate
 - 3) Information Sharing/Upcoming Research and Analysis (*Everyone in HFTT to share/engage*)**
 - Regular, proactive engagement and discussion of ongoing and upcoming research and analysis (*Everyone on monthly calls*)
 - Where possible, to avoid the monthly meetings becoming too focused on information sharing, relevant information is to be shared, in writing, at *least 3 days in advance* of meetings (*co-chairs responsible to remind HFTT well in advance of meetings*)

Participants and Invitees

Name	Agency
Tensai Asfaw	OCHA/DRS
Sandra Aviles	FAO
Priya Behrens-Shah	Welthungerhilfe
Clémence Boutant-Willm	Handicap International
Monika Brühlhart	UNHCR
Nan Buzard	ICVA (co-sponsor)
Hélène Castel	WHO
Juan Chaves	OCHA/FCS
Rachel Criswell	WVI
Clare Dalton	ICRC
Tom Delrue	UNDP
Lisa Doughten	OCHA/CERF (co-chair)
Elena Garagorri	ICRC
Astrid van Genderen-Stort	IASC secretariat
Isabel Gomes	WVI
Kate Halff	SCHR
Angela Hinrichs	FAO
Caroline Hotham	START
Michael Jensen	OCHA/CERF
Daniel Kull	World Bank
Brian Lander	WFP (co-sponsor)
Gustavo Laurie	UNMAS
Katja Laurila	IASC secretariat
David Matern	WFP
Jordan Menkveld	IOM
Zu Mian	Mercy Malaysia
Alberto Pasini	NRC
Melissa Pitotti	ICVA (co-chair)
Marina Skuric Prodanovic	UNFPA
Nicolas Rost	OCHA/CERF (secretariat)
Louisa Shea	ICVA
Darla Silva	UNICEF
Guillaume Simonian	WHO
Julian Srodecki	WVI
Anne Street	CAFOD
Manisha Thomas	facilitator
Lisa Walmsley	OCHA/FTS
Marie-Louise Wandel	UNICEF
Faisal Yousaf	WHO
Invitees	
David Ennis	UK (GHD)

Name	Agency
Charles-Antoine Hofmann (by phone)	WHS secretariat
Natasha Kindergan (by phone)	WHS secretariat
Sarah Költzow	Germany (GHD)
Nancy Kylah	USAID (GHD co-chair)
Lydia Poole	consultant
Rob Smith	WHS secretariat

Agenda (revised)

Retreat on the IASC Task Team on Humanitarian Financing

Rhin and Aare rooms, Environment House, MIE II, 7-9 Chemin de Balexert, Geneva, Switzerland

21-22 January 2015

Objective for the retreat

Take stock of the Task Team's progress in 2014 and finalize the 2015 workplan with clear priorities and timelines.

Day 1, Wednesday, 21 January 2014 (Stocktaking)

Time	Topic	Responsible
8:30-9:00	Arrival and coffee/tea	
9:00-9:30	Welcome and introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome by World Vision International • Welcome by the co-chairs of the Humanitarian Financing Task Team • Welcome by the co-sponsors of the Humanitarian Financing Task Team • Introductions of participants. Participants list one thing that worked and one thing that did not work • Review of agenda, objectives, and expected outputs of the retreat: The basic goal is to revise our workplan for 2015. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review and adjust the Task Team's workplan and prioritize activities to be addressed in 2015, in line with the IASC priority on humanitarian financing ○ Agree on links with other entities, to achieve the workplan and identify links with GHD workplan ○ Discuss in greater detail some activities from our workplan 	Isabel Gomes (World Vision International), Lisa Doughten and Melissa Pitotti (co-chairs of the IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team), Nan Buzard (co-sponsor of the IASC humanitarian financing priority), Manisha Thomas (facilitator)
9:30-10:00	The Task Team's progress in 2014 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize progress in 2014 against the Task Team's workplan and reactions from the Working Group and IASC Principals Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions will provide a basis for the revision of the Task Team's workplan for 2015 Expected outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the achievements of the Task Team in 2014 and the work that remains to be done • Identify gaps in the workplan that could be filled with additional activities for 2015 	Lisa Doughten, Melissa Pitotti, Manisha Thomas
10:00-11:05	Group work: HFTT activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each activity, the activity leads present a short introduction (5 minutes each). Then the retreat participants split into three groups, and each group will visit each of the three stations listed below, rotating from one to the next. Each session is 25 minutes long. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Juan Chaves and Melissa Pitotti 2. Marina Skuric and David Matern 3. Sandra Aviles and Tom Delrue

Time	Topic	Responsible
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges in accessing country-based pooled funds (activity 1.2) Donor conditions (activity 2.1) Bridging relief and development (objective 3) 	
11:05-11:35	Coffee/tea break	
11:35-12:00	Group work: HFTT activities (continued)	
12:00-12:30	Report-backs in plenary	Manisha Thomas
12:30-13:15	Lunch	
13:15-14:15	<p>Good Humanitarian Donorship – workplan for 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefing on the 2015 priorities of the Good Humanitarian Donorship initiative Discussion with GHD representatives on priorities in humanitarian financing <p>Expected outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas identified where the priorities of donors and the Task Team overlap, to feed into the revision of the 2015 workplan Issues identified to explore further on which the Task Team can work closely together with donors 	Nancy Kyloh (USAID and GHD co-chair) and other GHD representatives
14:15-15:00	<p>Donor conditions: WFP analysis of earmarked funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide an update on an analysis of the amount of funding from WFP's top ten donors that is earmarked <p>Expected outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding of how earmarking affects humanitarian organizations and how it is linked to other donor conditions 	David Matern
15:00-16:00	<p>The future of humanitarian financing (activity 1.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide an update to the HFTT on the findings and ideas from the 'future of humanitarian financing' research process. Provide a brief update on the High-Level Panel on the future of humanitarian financing (Lisa Doughten) <p>Expected Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task Team members have a shared knowledge and understanding of the work of Activity 1.7 to date Initial feedback is gathered from the Task Team Task Team members share their comments and proposals for taking the research ideas forward (this will also feed into sessions during the retreat on the High-Level Panel and the WHS) 	Sandra Aviles, Julian Srodecki, and Anne Street (activity co-leads), Lydia Poole (researcher), Lisa Doughten
16:00-16:30	Coffee/tea break	
16:30-17:30	<p>World Humanitarian Summit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on how humanitarian financing issues are discussed during the preparations and consultations ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit <p>Expected outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on how the Task Team can continue to work with the WHS secretariat to ensure that humanitarian financing issues are discussed ahead of the summit 	Rob Smith (WHS secretariat, tbc)

Day 2, Thursday, 22 January 2014 (Planning)

Time	Topic	Responsible
8:30-9:00	Arrival and coffee/tea	
9:00-10:00	Summary of day 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a summary of the discussions on day 1 of the retreat Provide further updates on the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing Provide an update on any outstanding issues, e.g. the review of the CERF Reaffirm the objectives of the Task Team for 2015 	Manisha Thomas
10:00-10:45	Brainstorm on the proposed work for the Humanitarian Financing Task Team 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given yesterday's discussions, what could we do in 2015? What would success look like? What would success in 2015 look like, in the big picture? Expected outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ideas for humanitarian financing activities that the Task Team should consider to add to its workplan 	Manisha Thomas
10:45-11:15	Coffee/tea break	
11:15-12:30	Revision of the workplan and prioritization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss whether the activities in the workplan need to be adjusted Review progress and discuss possible changes under objectives 1 and 2 Expected outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on the activities in the Task Team's workplan for 2015 Agreement on the prioritization of activities Initial designation of organizations leading and/or contributing to activities 	Manisha Thomas Objective 1: Lisa Doughten, Melissa Pitotti Objective 2: Marina Skuric
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-15:30	Revision of the workplan and prioritization (continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review progress and discuss possible changes under objectives 3 and 4 Discuss the inclusion of any cross-cutting issues in the workplan Expected outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreement on the activities in the Task Team's workplan for 2015 Agreement on the prioritization of activities Initial designation of organizations leading and/or contributing to activities 	Manisha Thomas Objective 3: Sandra Aviles, Tom Delrue Objective 4: Lisa Walmsley
15:30-16:00	Coffee/tea break	
16:00-17:00	Working methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the working methods of the Task Team, including its meetings, links with the PFWG and GHD, communications, diversification of membership 	Lisa Doughten, Melissa Pitotti, Manisha Thomas
17:00-17:30	Summary and conclusion	Lisa Doughten and Melissa Pitotti