GHDI Work Plan 2014-2016: CAN-US Co-Chairs

Key Goals	
1.	**Humanitarian Aid Effectiveness Enhanced: Establishing best practices in Donorship at a system level** • Informed by inputs received from implementing partners, GHDI will seek to identify and agree upon a set of good practice regarding: funding, reporting standards, needs assessment and institutional assessments. • GHD will initiate a dialogue with other major donors to humanitarian action about how they ensure principled Donorship, including CERF, UN Agencies, and State donors outside the GHDI.
2.	**People in Need Better Served: Incentivizing an enabling environment for effective field action** • GHD will seek to improve donor coordination at the onset of a crisis. • GHD will strike the appropriate balance between support for the global coordination platforms, including safety and security, and delivery at field level.
3.	**Humanitarian Solidarity Strengthened: Interface between GHDI, humanitarian principles, and the WHS** • Provide a link between humanitarian donorship and the WHS's priority themes with a view to establishing common messages as required. • Engender new donor partnerships and improve dissemination of key GHD messages to broader humanitarian community.
4.	**Adapting GHDI to evolving humanitarian landscape** • GHDI membership and tools

Activity	Work-stream membership
1.0 Humanitarian Aid Effectiveness Enhanced: Establishing best practices in Donorship at a system level	

1.1 **Reporting, Information and Accountability Requirements:** Identify common core areas of reporting and clarify donor priorities and requirements to identify possibilities for convergence around best practices. Issues to be considered include:
• Contractual agreements: Identifying good practice and model clauses
   o Incorporation of accountability to affected populations and other priority cross-cutting issues (gender equality, environmental sustainability, use of innovative programming tools (cash, vouchers)).
   o Risk-sharing and flexibility.
   o Informal reporting (expected but not required)
• Cascading requirements:
   o Understanding how GHD member requirements of multilateral agencies flow through to impose additional control mechanisms on NGO partners
   o Initiate a dialogue with UN agencies and the CERF on their principles for partnership to understand and encourage principled donorship to implementing partners
   o Incorporate discussion on requirements for pooled funding mechanisms
	Co-lead: CAN, ECHO

...	• Reporting:
	    o Use and quality of annual reports from UN and Red Cross for core funding
	    o Other required donor reports, both on program results and financial accountability for core, project and program funding
	• Evidence-based decision-making: Information, Needs Assessments and Analysis.
	    o Explore further the actual and potential uses of Risk Information for Agencies, Donors and others.
	    o Informal exchange of relevant institutional assessment/monitoring information
	    o Clarify understanding of current use of needs assessment information by donors, including the Humanitarian Needs Overview as part of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle
	    o Information-share on donor-support to needs assessment capacities, methodologies and tools.	

1.2	**Funding Modalities:** Funding to UN and other partners (NGOs, RC/RC, local governments) - modalities, conditionalities, timeliness and operational impact. • Build a shared analysis of the current range of humanitarian financing instruments and test whether they are fit for purpose; • Identify good practice with regard to multi-year finance; • Provide a platform for discussion of humanitarian financing issues with other relevant initiatives, including the UN panel, WHS and the IASC working groups on improving the linkages between relief and development finance • Update of *Review of Humanitarian Financing Mechanisms* (April 2008) with annex on donor modalities • Annual review with OCHA on status of funding for crises.	**Co-lead:** UK, Germany, Sweden
**2.0 People in Need Better Served: Incentivizing an enabling environment for effective field action**	
2.1	**Managing Risk & Crisis Coordination** • Explore potential for simple information exchange at onset of crisis via Twitter or other internal tool • Needs assessment usage for decision-making and alignment with SRPs	**Lead:** US

…	• Risk sharing – information exchange with partners on risk tolerance among donors
	   o Current practice, best practice, need for an ongoing discussion platform with partners
	• Safety and security:
	   o Establish set of agreed data for safety and security reporting.
	   o Consider most effective funding channel for supporting effective security/safety management.
	   o Best practice on donor expectations/requirements and advocacy on safety and security
	• Civil-military coordination: beyond the Oslo Guidelines, is there a need to update thinking on the use of military assets in humanitarian response?	

3.0 Humanitarian Solidarity Strengthened: Interface between GHDI, humanitarian principles, and the WHS		
3.1	**Aligning positions for WHS and aid effectiveness** • Develop and position GHD messaging on humanitarian aid effectiveness, innovation, and other WHS thematic pillars, as appropriate o Identify opportunities to communicate to WHS working groups • Review and consider recommendations from WHS regional consultations regarding GHD • As appropriate, engage with other relevant stakeholders regarding WHS preparatory work	**Lead:** Switzerland
3.2	**Outreach and Engagement** • Host side events on GHD (ECOSOC, Affected States, Private Sector, SHARE/Non-GHD Members) • GHD SHARE • Coordination with non-GHD countries on humanitarian aid effectiveness / principled action / GHD principles • Identify opportunities to encourage collective and individual re-affirmation of the GHD principles	**Co-lead:** Canada, US, Mexico
4.0 Adapting GHDI to evolving humanitarian landscape		
4.1	**Membership and Communication** • Manage GHDI Website and Twitter account • Manage GHDI policy tools	**Co-lead:** CAN, US

	• Establish key messages on centrality of GHD principles for donor decision-making	
4.2	**Internal Tools on GHD engagement** • Annual review of donor practice / Indicators work / Survey • Information exchange on DAC Peer Reviews	**Co-lead:** Belgium, Czech Republic

Management of Work Plan/Work-Streams
- Frame the requirements for leading each work stream to feed into the identified goals, in coordination with work stream chairs
- Each work-stream should include a problem statement based on existing evidence and field reviews:
  o Year One: Map current practice, identify and define best practices
  o Year Two: Consultation and deliberation on each best practice for plenary
- IASC may join meetings on a case-by-case basis as determined by co-chairs
- First Meeting: Include a panel discussion with representatives from the UN , Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement and NGO community on how donors are actually doing in respecting the GHD principles
- E-mail and Communication: Update plenary distribution list - Two Geneva, one capital – cosmetic updates to landing page of website pending further discussion, and logistical use of twitter only (meeting schedule) pending further discussion.
- Meetings for GHD
  o Two to three plenary meetings per year
  o Work-Stream meetings are ongoing, with management by work stream chair following consultation with co-chairs
  o Co-chairs to participate in work stream meetings (either Canada or US)