> INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE
> 88TH IASC WORKING GROUP MEETING
>
> # Final Summary Record and Action Points
>
> 10-11 MARCH 2015
> HOST: FAO, ROME, QUEEN JULIANA ROOM.

OPENING

The Deputy Executive Director of FAO, Mr Dan Gustafson, welcomed participants and highlighted the relevance of the agenda, in particular counter-terrorism, and humanitarian financing which would feature high at the World Humanitarian Summit. Ms Kyung-wha Kang, Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, presented the agenda and welcomed the guest speaker, Ms Emma Bonino former Foreign Minister of Italy who delivered a vibrant keynote address highlighting that:

- The humanitarian community is facing many of the same old challenges.
- What is new is the vast range of today's challenges, the political context, and the new technologies.
- Terrorism and migration flows are two new phenomena on the humanitarian agenda that are creating problems in donor countries and changing the political landscape in Europe.
- There is an unprecedented disrespect for human rights and international humanitarian law and the notion of "Responsibility to Protect" has faded away. There is also a noticeable absence of public dialogue on the need for protection and justice.
- Humanitarians, often used as scapegoats, should push back and refuse to be blamed for the failures of others, the lack of political leadership and deadlock at the Security Council. It is not the humanitarian system that is broken but the institutions that are supposed to protect international peace and security. Focus on clarifying roles and responsibilities, and avoid finger-pointing.
- Promoting the effective use of resources is a valid exercise; however, the humanitarian community should resist determining the "cost of saving one life".
- Institutions are being bypassed and rules circumvented with the coalition of the willing taking action without even a public debate - unlike in 2003.
- The rise of new political regional powers such the Emirates or Qatar is challenging the old order.
- We need to hold governments accountable and speak up for human rights and the right to asylum.
- Humanitarian action is a value that needs to be defended until better leaders emerge and reduce the need for humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian aid, however, is not a tool to solve crises.
- The connection between humanitarian aid and development is an extremely difficult and complex issue, but one that needs to be addressed.

  WG members expressed deep appreciation for Ms. Bonino's participation and her messages, which resonated throughout the two-day meeting.

'TERRORISM' AND COUNTER-TERRORISM

The discussion was organised around three panels: one with counter-terrorism experts to get an overview of the counter-terrorism framework, a second panel to review the challenges to humanitarian action, and a third panel to look at solutions to mitigate the risk that counter-terrorism legislation and measures pose to

humanitarian action. Based on these panel discussions, it was clear that terrorism and the fight against it could severely undermine the humanitarian agenda and at times is already doing so. The Working Group was unanimous about the need to make the case for respect for humanitarian principles, access and exemptions with policy-makers at the multilateral level and national level. In the counter-terrorism context, many felt that informal dialogue and bilateral exchange are more effective than formal processes and multilateral meetings. That said, some were of the view that public advocacy would also be necessary. Many highlighted the need to put beneficiaries at the centre of the conversation and to involve them. The Group agreed for the IASC to work on a common advocacy strategy covering internal and external communications goals.

Panel 1: Overview of the counter-terrorism framework

Mr Weixiong Chen, Deputy Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate and Mr Alexander Evans, Coordinator of the Al-Qaida/Taliban Monitoring Team presented the counter-terrorism framework and engaged in a rich dialogue with the Working Group, facilitated by Ms Kyung-wha Kang, DERC. The following key points emerged from the discussion:

- **A new wave of terrorism is emerging**: Islamic State (IS) is changing the landscape with an estimated 30,000 active fighters in Iraq, Syria and Libya and a support network of Internet-savvy militants spread across some 90 countries. Boko Haram and Al Shabaab are said to have pledged allegiance to IS. Foreign fighters and 'terrorists' acting alone present a new threat to humanitarian organisations and the recipients of aid. Terrorist groups are increasingly linked to transnational crime.
- **A new wave of counter-terrorism laws and policies is underway:** the Security Council is united on this issue and is using its authority under Chapter 7 to pass increasingly tough resolutions on counter-terrorism and to request that all Member States toughen their national counter-terrorism laws and policies.
- **The counter-terrorism framework is complex and multi-layered**. Significant resources are required to understand and implement it. There is no agreed definition of terrorism or agreement on who are terrorist organizations. For instance, there are four types of lists of terrorist organizations (UN, Interpol, regional lists and national lists). The bulk of counter-terrorism is done at the country level. The UN's own counter-terrorism capacity is limited to about 100 staff.
- **The counter-terrorism framework is dynamic and rapidly changing.** States are discussing new laws and policies to implement the latest Security Council resolution on Foreign Terrorist Fighters and other measures to strengthen the existing legislations.
- **It will have an impact on the UN and its partners for years to come**. Counter-terrorism is going to be mainstreamed throughout all aspects of UN life. We can expect that various UN entities will be asked to contribute to the fight on terrorism, in particular DPKO (peacekeeping review under way), UNDP, UNHCR (screening asylum-seekers) and UNODC (technical assistance to help governments draft counter-terrorism laws). Additional UN entities should be invited to join this IASC discussion on terrorism and humanitarian action, in particular the CTITF (UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force) Office and UNCCT (UN Counter Terrorism Centre on I-ACT countries). The new counter-terrorism measures will have an impact on civil society and on various aspects of humanitarian work (funding, risk management, perception and access).
- **In relation to humanitarian diplomacy**, Mr Evans stressed that no Security Council resolutions prohibit talks with organizations of individuals designated as "terrorist'. "There is no impediment to talking to anybody but we cannot pay a ransom or use them as distributing agent. At the national level, the picture is less clear. There are only a few national legislations that prohibit contact with listed groups, and none from the major donors—as research by OCHA/NRC in 2013 indicated.   While

it was clarified that contact or dialogue with groups designated as terrorist does not violate the sanctions rules, it was also said that coordination does. Therefore there is still a lot of confusion on what interaction is permissible and what constitutes a violation.

- **An enhanced dialogue between humanitarian actors and Member States is urgently needed** to limit the adverse consequences of counter-terrorism measures on principled humanitarian action. Many counter-terrorism policy-makers are unaware of these consequences. A robust advocacy strategy is needed to prevent overreach and failures of the counter-terrorism regime. For example, closing the institution "Al Barakat" in Somalia because some staffers were suspected of terrorism undermined vital remittances flow to families in Somalia and impacted the entire economy.

- **There are opportunities to make the case for humanitarian principles, access and exemptions** with policy-makers at the multilateral level: for instance at the Secretary-General's retreat in Turin, in the Secretary-General's report on the 70th anniversary of the UN or when briefing the Security Council on humanitarian emergencies (e.g. Syria). The humanitarian voice should also be heard during the open debate of the Security Council on conflict prevention. In addition, in 2016, the Security Council will take stock and assess the impact of 10 year of counter-terrorism. The humanitarian voice on the impact of the counter-terrorism regime would be useful in particular as humanitarians have access to a broader range of perspectives that can help policy-makers better understand the effects of counter-terrorism measures on various groups and activities (e.g. diaspora, local banks, disenfranchised youth, health workers, civil society, victims of smuggling, etc.).

- The latest Security Council Resolution on IS, Al-Nusra Front and other groups associated with Al-Qaeda (res. 2199 of February 2015) specifically asks the Monitoring Team to conduct an **assessment of the impact of the sanctions and other counter-terrorism measures** adopted under the resolution, and to report to the Committee within 150 days. For the first time, this provides a formal mechanism which could be used to assess the humanitarian impact of sanctions and other counter-terrorism measures. The humanitarian community needs to feed into this process as much as possible.

- **There are also opportunities for humanitarian advocacy at the regional or national level.** For instance, the Council of Europe is negotiating a counter-terrorism framework and many countries are looking at developing new domestic laws and policies on foreign terrorist fighters to implement resolution 2178. Humanitarian actors should play a role in regional and national processes leading to the adoption of laws and policies implementing resolution 2178, in order to avoid negative impacts on humanitarian operations. Resolution 2178 contains good language on human rights, IHL and refugee law which could be harnessed in humanitarian advocacy.

- **Humanitarian actors should consider engaging in a dialogue with the Financial Action Task Force** given the concerns that it has expressed around the use of the humanitarian cover to execute financial transactions. To alleviate these concerns, humanitarian organizations should also communicate more clearly what they are presently doing to comply with counter-terrorism measures, prevent aid diversion and improve due diligence.

- **Principled humanitarian action**: For humanitarian actors to be able to reach people in need, it is essential that their activities be exclusively humanitarian in nature and comply with the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence – and that they are perceived as doing so. Humanitarian organizations must be able to access conflict and disaster-affected people, regardless of their ethnic, social, political or other background and irrespective of whose control they are under. They must be more vocal about what they are doing to uphold these principles. Activities by anti-terrorism actors and organisations using a humanitarian cover for intelligence purpose (e.g DNA sampling under vaccination cover) is an issue and humanitarian actors shall strongly voice their concerns on these activities breaching all humanitarian principles.

Follow Up Action:

1. Recognizing that counter-terrorism legislation and measures will increasingly affect humanitarian engagement, continue the dialogue with counter-terrorism experts at Headquarters and explore the recommendations put forward by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate. Action by: OCHA in consultation with the Working Group by end of December 2015.

2. Consider providing inputs into the Secretary-General's report on 70th anniversary of the UN as an opportunity to advocate with UN Member States to safeguard humanitarian action and principles. Action by: OCHA in consultation with the Working Group by end of August 2015.

3. Consider providing inputs on the humanitarian impact of sanctions and other counter-terrorism measures adopted under resolution 2199 (2015) on IS, Al-Nusra Front and other groups associated with Al-Qaeda, taking advantage of the new mechanism on impact assessment contained in that resolution. Action by: OCHA in consultation with the Working Group by end of May 2015.

4. Provide inputs on impact of counter-terrorist framework on humanitarian operations for the 10-year review in 2016. Action by: OCHA in consultation with the Working Group by end of December 2015.

Panel 2: Challenges to Humanitarian Action

During the second panel, facilitated by Mr Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, the Working Group discussed the key risks and challenges facing humanitarian actors in the face of terrorist attacks and counter-terrorism obligations and whether there are areas where the IASC could have a consistent approach with respect to interference and diversion by designated terrorist organizations. Three panellists provided their perspectives on the topic.

Ms Naz K. Modirzadeh, the founding Director of the Harvard Law School Program on International Law and Armed Conflict, presented the results of Harvard's research on the impact of counter-terrorism on humanitarian action. Ms Arnhild Spence Director of Partnerships, Policy Coordination and Advocacy for WFP and Ms Áine Fay, the Vice President for Programs of Concern Worldwide, shared their organizations' experience in managing the complexities of the new environment. The following is a summary of the key concerns raised during the discussion.

*   **Difficulties in discussing the practical consequences of counter-terrorism law.**

*   **Absence of collective action**: The IASC does not negotiate as a block so individual organizations pursue their own strategies. Research in 2014 found 90 different clauses on counter-terrorism in donor agreements with (and between) humanitarian organizations.

*   **Reduced access to financial services** in high-risk areas. Retails banks are closing services as a result of counter-terrorism measures. This is not only damaging for humanitarian organizations who need access to these services to finance their operations but also to economies reliant on remittances such as Somalia. Counter-terrorism policies developed by inter-governmental bodies such as the Financial Action Task Force are also having a significant impact.

*   **Tougher funding environment** as criminalization of material support to terrorist groups has had a chilling effect on donors and has made fundraising more challenging in respect to a number of countries. Restrictions on funding contributed to the famine in Somalia as donors feared that humanitarian supplies would fall under Al Shabaab's control.

- **Lack of adequate humanitarian exemptions in counter-terrorism regimes.** Most of the Security Council resolutions relating to terrorism contain no exemptions, or only very limited exemptions, for humanitarian action. Similarly, the domestic counter-terrorism legislation of most major donors contains no general exemption for humanitarian action.

- **Increased cost to humanitarian organizations as wary donors demand stronger risk management:** Humanitarian organizations need to prioritize donor relations and communications to address donor wariness and manage reputational risk. Donors want to be alerted if aid diversion has taken place before the story breaks in the media. Some donors are asking international organizations to vet their partners against national lists of designated terrorist organizations, in contradiction with their policy. A number of donors and UN agencies require that NGOs hire compliance officers, an extra cost that small NGOs cannot bear. It is important to unite and develop a common position for the humanitarian community: UN agencies, international organizations and NGOs.

- **Staff Security and Safety:** Humanitarian workers are increasingly the targets of attacks by armed groups who resort to terror to achieve their goals. This risk makes it virtually impossible for most humanitarian actors to work in areas controlled by Islamic State. Providing adequate security for staff in high-risk environments is adding to the cost of operations.

- **Risk of privatization of humanitarian assistance** as humanitarian organizations are not equipped for such onerous risk management.

- **Medical assistance construed as material support**: medical organizations cannot deliver services without violating medical ethics when the Syrian government use counter-terrorism arguments to deny medical care in areas controlled by IS because it is seen as material support to terrorists.

- **Upholding humanitarian principles:** some organizations have withdrawn from areas controlled by IS in order to resist the group's pressure to control the distribution of humanitarian supplies.

- **Uncertainty:** Humanitarians are often uncertain about what form of engagement with individuals or groups on designated terrorist lists is legal or acceptable, what the risks of a misstep might be and how to mitigate these risks.

- **Due to their different legal status,** international organizations are impacted differently by counter-terrorism policies. The toolkit should not aim at developing minimum standards for all IASC organizations, but rather identify a menu of options from which they may choose as appropriate.

    Follow up Action:

5. Explore the possibility of proposing a standardized humanitarian exemption clause in counter-terrorism legislation at the World Humanitarian Summit. Action by: WFP in consultation with the Task Team on Revitalising Principled Humanitarian Action by the end of June 2015.

6. Enhance the general understanding among staff in their own organization of the impact of counter-terrorism framework on humanitarian action, in particular the policies and practices on talking with groups designated as terrorist groups. Convey that current UN Security Council resolutions do not prohibit talking to designated terrorist groups and clarify what "permissible" communication entail. Action by: IASC Working Group members by the end of 2015.

Panel 3: Minimizing risk, negotiating access, and enhancing advocacy

The third panel was composed of Mr Mark Bowden, the UN Deputy Special Representative for Afghanistan, Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator in Afghanistan and representatives of the organizations that co-chair the Task Team on Revitalizing Principled Action: Ms Ingrid Macdonald, Director of Humanitarian Policy with the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Mr Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, Director of the Policy Development and Studies Branch at OCHA. Mr Brian Tisdall, ICRC moderated the discussion. The main objectives of the panel were to i) Identify good practices to reduce risk, in particular with respect to aid manipulation and diversion; ii) provide feedback elements for an IASC Principals' statement prepared by the TT on Revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action and iii) agree on key elements of an advocacy strategy.

The co-chairs of the Task Team explained the rationale for a common strategy and toolkit on counter-terrorism and shared a few concerns.

- **UN humanitarian agencies and NGOs have been criticized** for failing to address aid diversion and are expected to do more to improve due diligence and comply with counter-terrorism laws and policies. Under request of the TT, NRC is delivering guidance for humanitarian organizations to continue to deliver principled humanitarian action whilst addressing counter-terrorism measures. An Advisory Group, which includes IASC TT members, have provided feedback on the first draft and will continue to advise on the development of the tool kit.
- **The lack of a common voice has been damaging** to the humanitarian agenda. There is a perception that big agencies are not vocal and that small NGOs are bearing the brunt.
- **So far, humanitarian advocacy has largely focused on donors.** Other parts of donor governments as well as host governments should be advocacy targets as well. Humanitarian components of governments are generally on our side; it is other components of governments that are often less receptive.
- **There is an opportunity to engage in influencing the policy-making on counter-terrorism** as governments develop national legislation and policies to implement resolution 2178 on Foreign Terrorist Fighters.
- **There is a need to explain in simple terms to aid workers in general** what counter-terrorism means for humanitarian action, what is legal or illegal, where the red lines are and how to manage the key risks.
- **There is also a need for a more evidence-based approach to policy development.** Some Member States have questioned the humanitarian impact of sanctions and counter-terrorism measures as well as the effectiveness of humanitarian exemptions in mitigating any adverse impacts. More research is required in these areas.
- **Other civil society networks** could be linked to an IASC advocacy strategy on counter-terrorism.

Based on his experience as HC in Afghanistan and Somalia, Mr. Bowden shared some observations on managing the political, reputational, security and financial risks associated with counter-terrorism.

- **Political analysis:** The level of permissiveness to talk to the Taliban has increased in past months. Humanitarian dialogue with parties to the conflict should not be a free for all and must be coordinated with consistent messages. The political risks, including reduced humanitarian access and domestic political risks (i.e. constituencies and donors etc.), are fluid and it is important for humanitarian organizations to get better at sharing information and analysis.

- **Evidence-based negotiations:** In Afghanistan, under the Strategic Response Plan, the HCT has prioritised access to health and monitors this indicator as a basis for negotiation.
- The **legitimacy of humanitarian dialogue** needs to be recognised by States and there is a need for increased transparency of this dialogue. The clandestine nature of humanitarian negotiations has damaged them and created confusion with the political dialogue.
- **Stressing the independence of humanitarian action** cannot be overstated. Humanitarian negotiations must be kept separate from political dialogue and must center on the independence of humanitarian action. In addition, it is useful to focus negotiation on specific humanitarian objectives, for instance increasing access to trauma care and nutrition. Broad negotiations are confusing and hard to monitor.
- **Focusing on impartiality,** it is important to have a common understanding of the needs and to prioritise funding accordingly. In Afghanistan, the HC has a common humanitarian fund to make practical commitments and support activities linked to priority needs.
- **Security risk** can be reduced by improving human resources management. Many kidnappings are linked to staff grievances. Security can improve when managed based on data/evidence.
- **Financial risk:** The risk of aid diversion is overstated. It is alleged that the Taliban diverted US$3 million. Compared with a humanitarian budget of US$300 million, it is a minimal risk. However, risk aversion strategies by international NGOs and UN agencies have reduced partnerships with national organizations.
- **Stringent screening policies limit NGO** access to funding and undermine humanitarian strategies. Only 1 out of 1,200 NGOs in Afghanistan was eligible to receive funding from the Common Humanitarian Fund.
- **Risk Management Unit** with collective database and where humanitarian organizations share information on ways to minimise risk and build local capacity is valuable. Establishing "red lines' (i.e. lowest common denominator) is a waste of time and agencies should focus on collective action.

Follow up Action

7. Prepare a paper listing key issues and opportunities to guide the collective IASC advocacy on counter-terrorism based on the Working Group discussion. Action by: co-chairs of the Task Team on Revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action with support from the IASC Secretariat by 30 April.

8. Circulate a draft statement and key messages, along with options on the advocacy mediums to the Working Group for comments. IASC TT on revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action by 15 April.

9. Circulate the revised statement and key messages along with options on the advocacy mediums to Principals for consideration. Action by: Chair of the WG by 30 April.

10. Provide comments on the draft toolkit to NRC. Action by: Advisory Group[1] by end of April.

Data Revolution: Opportunities and Challenges

Mr Arafat Jamal, UNHCR, described the ubiquity of data and options that are presently available from traditional data collected in needs assessments and registration to new data such as cash withdrawals or satellite data. He described the use of data in decision-making and accountability and noted opportunities to

---

[1] Toolkit advisory group members are from the following organisations/networks:
Mercy Corps, IRC, UNICEF, ICRC, WFP, InterAction, NRC, Oxfam GB, European Inter-Agency Security Forum, CARE, OCHA, Catholic Relief Services, and Action Contre la Faim.

ensure more coverage of excluded groups, to cope with new geographies, and connecting the humanitarian and development worlds. He highlighted the main features of the UN roadmap to leverage the data revolution for sustainable development presented in the report "A World that counts- Mobilizing the Data Revolution for Sustainable Development" released in November 2014, and noted initiatives in the High-Level Committee on Programme and other forums with which the IASC could usefully link. The use of data will be crucial to achieve the sustainable goals. He invited WG members to reflect on how this may link with humanitarian priorities.

Mr Mark Dalton, OCHA, presented an overview of the digital evolution's opportunities and threats from a humanitarian and coordination perspective and of OCHA information strategy and initiatives.

- **Digital technology and data has transformed many industries and has the potential of transforming the humanitarian landscape.** OCHA will focus on this in the long term. WHS is expected to introduce innovative new solutions.
- **OCHA's immediate priority** is improved situational awareness for better decision-making. OCHA is investing in and delivering five core information services to humanitarian partners that will improve access to information and data. These are: INFORM (humanitarian risk analysis index), KoBo (Digital data collection for needs assessments), FTS upgrade, Humanitarian Data Exchange (data repository and data exchange language for improved standards and interoperability) and the Humanitarian Hub which will integrate existing web platforms for easier access and sharing.
- OCHA is focused on improving **situational awareness to support a more fact-based view of crises as well as data-driven decision-making**. Advances in technology and data bring opportunity, however many challenges to overcome the data gap (given the nature of humanitarian crises, some data is simply not available), reluctance to share data, data skills and analysis gap, fear of unknown consequences of sharing data, and a need for data standards that support interoperable analysis.
- **Important to inform and communicate on various processes and initiatives regarding data within the IASC organizations.**
- OCHA sees responsible data as an urgent priority that the sector needs to engage on immediately. OCHA is developing a data policy and consulting experts on data legality, privacy, security and technical issues.
- **Crucial element for OCHA is to focus on what data partners need as a collective to make decisions and deliver assistance effectively.**
- **Future success** in data management will depend on interoperability and networks that establish the right policies, standards and governance, close the data deficit and build capacity to use this information effectively to inform humanitarian decision-making.
- **The SG has laid out a road map for the UN, further exploration needs to be done with non-UN entities.**
- OCHA is holding a **data conference in June** to discuss the data/information needed; how information is shared, how data can be used to inform decision-making. Outcomes of the data conference will feed into the World Humanitarian Summit.
- The IASC can support the sector's engagement with data by endorsing and promoting initiatives around data and standards.

    Main challenges raised by IASC organizations:

- Linking data analysis and collective decision-making. Decision-makers often make decisions without having the right data in hand.
- Protect what has worked so far in the area of information management and reduce duplication.
- Optimize technology at our disposal (mobile phones are underutilized).
- Capacity challenge faced by governments and partners that are excluded from digital revolution.
- Lack of Sex and Age disaggregated data.
- Need for a common approach.
- Inter-operability and data protection differ between organizations making it difficult to share data.

WG members acknowledged the critical importance of these issues, and invited further briefings on related initiatives by member organizations without the need at this point to develop a common framework so as not to hamper the spontaneity and creativity of the field.

FUTURE OF HUMANITARIAN FINANCING

Mr Brian Lander, WFP, facilitated this session and stressed that the Working Group had an opportunity to discuss what could be recommended to the High-Level Panel established by the UN Secretary-General to explore ways to address the humanitarian funding gap.   Ms Sandra Aviles, FAO presented the main findings of the report on the "Future of Humanitarian Financing" (FHF) prepared by CAFOD, World Vision and FAO under the work plan of the IASC Task Team on Humanitarian Financing.   She highlighted three key challenges: a demand for humanitarian funding that exceeds the supply due to the limited number of donors, a financial architecture that creates huge inefficiencies, and a system that is not effectively connected to other aid flows, for instance remittances or development aid.   The report proposes ways to address these challenges: a new division of labour, improved cost-effectiveness of programming, referring to other actors when appropriate, increase development investments, embrace the diversity of financing actors, commit to subsidiarity and prioritise national-led response. The Good Humanitarian Donorship has received the report with great interest.

The Working Group endorsed the report and agreed to submit it to the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Funding with a cover note from the Chair of the WG to be circulated to the WG for comments. The following issues were raised by participants:

- 2015 is a critical year to push key recommendations through the Financing for Development Conference, the Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding Reviews and the World Humanitarian Summit.
- Multi-year funding to address protracted humanitarian emergencies: Funding is problematic in many protracted emergencies where a 15-20 year horizon is needed to establish a standard of stability. In these countries, the humanitarian actors must seek funding for multi-year planning and work with development, climate, and peace-building actors. This approach must be underpinned by common or complementary theories of change between humanitarian and development actors.
- Linking humanitarian and development funding: the IASC Task Team on Financing must work closely with the UN Working Group on Transition and include NGOs and IOM in the conversation to ensure that linking humanitarian and development funding mechanisms within the UN does not limit or exclude non-UN entities from accessing funds.

- Localizing the response means easier access to funding for local NGOs and investments in capacity-building of local actors.
- Funding Food Security: The Committee on World Food Security is negotiating a Framework for Action for Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Crises and will discuss funding in May.
- **Learning from insurance and private sector models** that use forecasting models is an important recommendation for the IASC, particularly to enhance prevention, early warning, and early response, which are generally less expensive than response.
- **The humanitarian system is not broken but needs to connect with others better:** The IASC must challenge the narrative that the system is broken. The system is addressing the needs of millions of people. However, it needs to connect with other players more effectively to divide the work. It must also convey to its partners the scope, expected outcomes and exit strategies of humanitarian action.
- **Efficiency of financing should not come at the expense of quality**: Do more with less will mean reaching less people or may undermine codes of conduct and standards. However, have an honest conversation about bringing down the costs and sharing the risks between donors, the UN and NGOs. In particular the IASC needs to learn from pooled funding.
- **Donor funding going to L3 emergencies**: L3 designation is directing most funding to five countries while other crises are underfunded.
- **Counter-Terrorism** has impact on humanitarian financing channeled by humanitarian organizations or privately (e.g. remittances).

Follow up Action:

11. Prepare a cover note for the Chair of the WG to introduce the FHF findings to the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Funding. The cover note will be circulated to the WG for comments by mid-April.
Action by: Sandra Aviles in consultation with the FHF Steering Group by end of March.

12. Circulate the FHF Executive Summary to IASC Principals. Action by: IASC Secretariat by 3 April.

13. Propose a dialogue for interested WG members with the High-Level Panel. Action by: Chair by end of May.

14. UN agencies and NGOs should review terms of implementing agreements to lessen transactional costs and explore how to increase the nimbleness of UN funding. Action by: InterAction and UN funding agencies, in consultation with the TT on Humanitarian Financing, end of 2015.

WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT

Ms Kate Halff facilitated this session and invited participants to make recommendations to the IASC Principals' for collective engagement in the Summit. The discussion on the WHS highlighted that, while the IASC has been contributing to the WHS thematic discussions via the IASC Task Teams and Reference Groups, much of the input has not been seen as coming from the IASC. The IASC is perceived as being absent from the discussions. While IASC member organizations felt initially that they should try to feed into the process independently, many members are now seeing the added value of a more united approach. A few IASC member organizations expressed their frustration in not gaining appropriate access to the WHS process and asked what criteria were used to select participants in regional consultations. IASC members felt that often

those at the table in the WHS discussions were not those at the centre of humanitarian action and therefore a distorted view of the international humanitarian system is being given. If the IASC wants to have a significant impact in the process it needs to speak up now in a united voice and ensure that it has a say in the reports leading up to the summit. Other points raised were:

- **Lack of clarity on functions of the WHS Secretariat:** facilitation vs. agenda-setting.
- **Strong concern that some key core issues are not being given enough visibility in the WHS.** Need for the IASC as a collective to feed into the process with a stronger voice and influence the outcomes of the Summit. The Chair suggested a Principals' meeting with the Secretary-General if required.
- **Overall willingness to have a common IASC voice.** There is still time to influence, yet limited.
- **Highlight key trends and concerns:** conflicts, protracted emergencies, forgotten disasters/IDPs, counter-terrorism, violence and violations of IHL.
- Convey that the IASC is the humanitarian coordination system and is, and has been, adaptable: There are concerns that the WHS consultations perpetuate myths that the system is 'broken". The IASC can actually provide evidence on how the system is responding and adapting to the new generation of crises. IASC systems are overstretched, not broken. Propose a session on L3s at the WHS.
- **Propose some key changes:** Build relationships with other systems, humanitarian financing, humanitarian principles, centrality of protection. Seek to obtain commitments from governments for instance to reduce numbers of IDPs or to reduce the long-term proliferation of conflicts.
- **Who will be the voice of the IASC at the WHS:** The ERC or other IASC Principals?
- **The IASC represents three voices:** Communities affected by crises, systems and institutions.
- **Finalise and officially launch the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) guidance** to avoid the perception of the IASC being "broken".

Follow up Action:

15. Seek clarity on the criteria for invitation to WHS consultations and on what the outcome document will look like. Request the WHS Secretariat to allocate space and time for the IASC Principals' input into the content of the WHS synthesis reports (draft and final), the Secretary-General's Report and the WHS outcome report itself. Action by: IASC Secretariat by the end of April 2015.

16. Share analysis of IASC Task Teams and Reference Groups' interaction with WHS and identify areas where further engagement is required by them. Action by: IASC Secretariat by the end of April 2015.

17. Draft key collective IASC messages to be shared with the WG, ERC and Principals, building on the six core messages circulated before the meeting. Action by: IASC WG members with support from the IASC secretariat by end of April 2015.

PHILIPPINES EVALUATION MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

The Chief of the Secretariat briefed the WG on the Philippines Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE). The IASC Transformative Agenda introduced IAHE as the final component of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. IAHEs are mandatory for all L3 emergencies and this evaluation is the first IAHE to be finalized. Two other IAHE are underway one for South Sudan and one for the CAR. The IASC secretariat as an independent entity from OCHA's evaluation unit, was put in charge of collecting feedback from all agencies to the recommendations as proposed by the evaluation and consolidate them in a Management Response Plan.

Accountability for the implementation of local level recommendations lies with the HC/HCT while accountability for global level recommendations lies with the IASC. The following points were highlighted:

Overall, the Philippines IAHE found that the emergency response was adequate, timely, and effectively met needs, and that the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) components were applied rigorously, on time and with high quality. There was room for improvement in, among other areas, supporting recovery, joining up international and local response efforts and strengthening the timing, nature and inclusiveness of HPC tools, especially monitoring. It also identified a number of successful innovations and areas for further study.

- Areas where the inter-agency evaluation found room for improvement that are relevant to all responses (global-level recommendations) include:
  1. Learn about the relevant and more scaled up use of cash transfer programmes, which promoted more coordinated approaches in Philippines;
  2. Build livelihoods capacities in the international response system;
  3. Ensure that in disaster-prone middle income countries, the international system works with governments to prepare for potential disasters;
  4. Employing more tailored approaches to support recovery and guidance on transition;
  5. Place a higher priority on anticipating and resolving property rights and land issues;
  6. Consider that HPC guidance better differentiates between the planning and reporting processes of protracted emergencies vs sudden onset large scale disasters;
  7. Redesign assessment processes, so that needs assessments are conducted collectively and on a cluster basis, with a clear view to informing operational planning;
  8. Consider that the next generation of L3 guidance better reflect respective authorities and responsibilities of IASC members, Emergency Directors, the Humanitarian Coordinator and national and sub-national managers in an L3 emergency.

- The HC/HCT has developed an action plan to implement recommendations at the country level, and the HC will report to the ERC on the implementation of these recommendations. A management response plan is being developed by the IASC Secretariat in consultation with the WG for global recommendations. It will be shared with the Principals for final endorsement.
- Several members expressed interest in learning on cash transfers and suggested to ask the Cash Learning Initiative to follow up on this recommendation.
- Several recommendations include an adaptation of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle: InterAction asked an update on the release of the HPC revised guidance, voicing the concern of many other organizations in the room and called for urgent action. IASC colleagues were unlikely to make any further changes to the HPC until the version of the guidance revised in 2014 was released.

Follow-up Action:

19. Request OCHA/UNHCR to provide an update on status of the HPC guidance. Action by: Chair of WG by end of March.

20. Provide feedback on IAHE recommendations to the IASC secretariat. Action by: IASC Working Group members by the end of March.

21. Develop Management Response Plan. Action by: IASC Secretariat by 15 April.

22. Submit Management Response Plan to the IASC Principals. Action by: Chair of the WG by end of April.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS, SUMMARY AND CLOSING

ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment

- OCHA gave a short update to the IASC Working Group on the current preparations and expectations for the ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment (17-19 June 2015, Geneva). The agreed theme of the Segment, which has been the focus over the last two years and leading to the World Humanitarian Summit, will be: "the future of humanitarian affairs: towards greater inclusiveness, coordination, interoperability and effectiveness".
- The IASC Secretariat is working on organizing a side event on IASC activities, with the input from IASC organisations, plus panel members representing the IASC community. Member States have requested to be informed of IASC undertakings in recent resolutions.

  #### Follow-up action:

23. Develop a proposal for an ECOSOC side event enabling IASC panellists to present the work of the IASC to Member States. Action by: IASC Secretariat by end of May.

Update on Independent Whole-of-System Review of Protection in Humanitarian Crises

Ms Louise Aubin from UNHCR (in her capacity as Global Protection Cluster Coordinator) briefed the WG on the progress of the Whole of System Protection Review. The inception phase completed, the consultants have undertaken a desk review, interviews, group discussions and an extensive survey; an analytical report has been shared. Three missions are being undertaken to South Sudan, Myanmar and Syria during which a variety of actors will be met (Government, Civil Society, communities, humanitarian actors, etc.) In addition, an informal reference group outside the IASC framework has been established to provide peer review and feedback on the review.

The final report providing the consultants' recommendations is due by the end of April. A first draft will be circulated for comments and a workshop will be organized in April to discuss the report and comments with the members of the Task Team (responsible for facilitating implementation of the IASC Protection Priority).

Discussions are also ongoing regarding the launch of the report and the development of a protection policy for the IASC.   The WG highlighted the clear need for this report to feed into the WHS and other processes. Several Principals have requested to discuss the findings of the Protection Review in May.

Review of the 2008 IASC Policy Statement on Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action

In 2008 the IASC approved its *Policy Statement on Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action*, setting out the IASC's commitment to achieving gender equality and ensuring that the human rights of women, girls, boys and men are equally promoted and protected in humanitarian action.

As a co-chair of the IASC *Reference Group on Gender in Humanitarian Action*, UN Women commissioned – on behalf of the IASC - a consultant to conduct a review of the *Policy Statement.*   The reference group has asked to brief the WG on the review findings in an ad hoc meeting.

Follow-up Action:

24. Schedule an ad hoc meeting to discuss the gender review and the Management Response to the Philippines evaluation. Action by: IASC secretariat and IASC Reference Group on Gender by end of March.

Saving Lives Together (SLT) ongoing and new initiatives

The revision of the SLT Framework is currently being finalised. This revision is the result of extensive consultations at HQ and field level between UNDSS, OCHA, and the main NGO consortia, it also includes inputs from a review of UN - NGO collaboration on security and SLT which was completed by the NGO community in 2014.

The revision of the SLT framework aims to achieve a clearer, more realistic and focused approach compared to the current version, with emphasis on coordination structures and information sharing as key aspects. The revised framework will further formalise the SLT Oversight Committee and establish feedback and reporting mechanisms. It is intended to detail specific arrangements and procedures in a guidance package. Completion of the revised SLT Framework and accompanying Guidelines are anticipated to be finalised and disseminated to the IASC by mid-2015.

As a new SLT initiative for 2015, UNDSS is providing two slots for NGO security managers at all Security Certification Programmes for UNDSS professional security officers (34 slots in 2015). This initiative aims at increasing mutual understanding of policies and procedures, and provides an opportunity to foster cooperation and networking.

UNDSS HQ continues to provide daily reports to HQs focal points in SLT partner organisations, as well as regular updates of a phone book with contact details UNDSS international field personnel. In addition, UNDSS and OCHA are supporting initiatives at the field level to foster UN-NGO security collaboration, including through the deployment of dedicated security personnel, e.g. a humanitarian security team in Juba/South Sudan since January 2013 (funded by CERF).

OCHA will update its research on "to Stay and Deliver" in 2015. OCHA has volunteered to co-chair the UN Steering Group on programme criticality.

Follow-up Action:

25. Share "Saving Lives Together" with the Working Group when the framework is finalized. Action by: OCHA by July 2015.

Prepared by the IASC secretariat (2 April 2015)