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| **OPENING** |

Calling from Zambia, UNFPA Assistant Secretary-General Kate Gilmore welcomed the participants to the 89th Working Group meeting and highlighted the need to position humanitarian issues in the UN campaign “Every Woman Every Child”.

The Chair of the WG gave an overview of global processes that will shape future international agendas in development, disaster risk management, climate change and humanitarian assistance. She thanked Working Group members for shaping the agenda of the meeting and making it relevant to the present challenges in particular the issue of migration. She suggested inviting the ERC to the next face-to-face Working Group meeting.

The Director-General of IOM Swing delivered a keynote remark focused on challenges (multiplicity of crises with no viable political processes), consequences (humanitarian system overstretched and underfunded) and coordination (stressing the great importance of the IASC and the need to foster more diverse, inclusive and accountable partnerships and strengthen collective action). He called for political leadership to address the challenges, consequences and coordination issues at stake.

He also shared his views on current migration flows (highest recorded in history), and the need to move the debate from identity to values and to stress that migration historically has been a positive force which has helped build nations and contributed to human progress. Governments need to do better addressing the fears of terrorism and job losses, embrace multiculturalism and be smarter about dealing with illegal migration and stop helping smugglers unwittingly. He also stressed the diversity and vulnerability of migrants who include pregnant women, unaccompanied minors, people trying to join their families, people looking for work, and people fleeing from violent conflict.

As champion on protection from sexual abuse and exploitation, he regretted not more progress had been achieved and shared the following concerns: no pre-departure briefings for peacekeepers, no progress on victims’ compensation and delivering justice, and no system to prevent violators from being rehired by another organization. He also regretted that PSEA had been subsumed under the AAP Task Team giving it less visibility. Finally, he stressed the need to put aside silos and institutional egos to bridge the humanitarian-development gap, hold States responsible for protection, and address the humanitarian dimension of migration.

During the discussion that followed, members raised numerous issues: First, funding challenges are putting humanitarian principles and being accountable at risk and our prioritization exercise is becoming an exclusion exercise. Second, troop contributing countries have very different rules and standards and there is a need for a better dialogue with humanitarians and development actors. Third, weak political leadership prevents decision making and solutions to ongoing crises. However, collective action by the Security Council is possible, as shown by agreements on weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. Fourth, the G20 Summit in Turkey will address the issue of forced displacement. The WB and the IMF are meant to work on a support strategy for displaced people. Fifth, there was a suggestion to issue a new Principals’ statement on PSEA to reiterate their commitment.

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Update and issue a Principals’ Statement to reiterate IASC commitment to PSEA. Action by: IOM and OHCHR by 30 November 2015.

**TAKING STOCK AND EMERGING ISSUES**

In this session facilitated by Kyung-wha Kang (Chair of the WG), Jemilah Mahmood (WHS), Hansjoerg Strohmeyer (OCHA) and Panos Moumtzis (STAIT) presented respectively the main recommendations of the WHS synthesis report, the global processes and policy developments, and the operational challenges and emerging trends from the field. This prompted a rich discussion on the following issues:

The WHS synthesis report proposes 5 action areas: dignity, safety, resilience, partnerships and finance.

* **Dignity** of people must be at the heart of humanitarian action. It is linked to the IASC priority of accountability to affected people. Feedback from the OPR missions also reveals that generally there are insufficient and insufficiently effective mechanisms in the field to take account, hold account and give account. HC of Iraq asked for best practices or practical advice in the application of AAP and PSEA guidelines.
* The synthesis report speaks of **safety** of people as one of the five key areas where action is needed. People want safety, dignity and hope, freedom from fear and want as well as respect of the law. There is a strong call for protection of civilians and accountability under international law, as well as investment by donors in protection. STAIT noted that more needs to be done to implement the IASC statement on the centrality of protection in the field.
* Islamic financing mobilizes additional **humanitarian financing**. Some cautioned that this would redirect money that is already used for charitable purposes. Zakat standards will be launched at the WHS. Other suggestions are to reduce transaction costs (e.g. ‘cut the middle man’) and greater discipline in delineating humanitarian and development funding.
* **Ownership and Governance of the humanitarian enterprise** is a recurring theme: there is a broad call emerging from the WHS consultations for localization of aid: “local when possible, international when necessary”. There is also a call for the IASC to become more inclusive, to decentralize decision-making power and embrace local capacity. The private sector wants to know how to engage. STAIT also commented that more democracy and inclusiveness is required at the field level as well as simplification of our planning processes. The WHS consultations have found that the limited trust in the UN is of concern.
* **A New Deal for migrants and refugees** was introduced at the regional consultations for the Middle East and North Africa. It was proposed to fundamentally change how refugees and host populations can be supported with predictable and sustainable source of support using a development and social protection model and fostering greater self-reliance. It would also involve more equitable arrangements for resettlement in third countries.
* While UN members of the IASC are in favour of aligning the work with the **Sustainable Development Goals**, NGOs cautioned that such alignment would present risks, in particular in complex political emergencies. Multi-year programming seems more adapted to protracted emergencies. In November, the UN Chief Executives Board will discuss how development and humanitarian analysis, planning, programming and financing streams can be brought closer together in a way to promote coherence and comparative advantage. Three ASGs (UNDP, OCHA and UNHCR) are consulting the relevant UN Executives on this issue. There is a proposition for the CEB to contribute to WHS through a joint statement.
* There has been an unprecedented number of reviews and reform initiatives over the past 2 years sometimes labelled as **Global Processes**: Sendai, SDGs, peace operations panel, peacekeeping review, Human Rights Up Front, review of 1325 resolution on women and peace, WHS, etc. Proposals and findings from these reviews are quite similar or interrelated. One common theme is financing. Peacebuilding review calls for USD100 million in assessed contributions. Humanitarians call for increase in funding. SDG will cost additional 3.5 billion per year. All of these funds come from similar pots. Peacebuilding is looking into the option of pooled funds building on CERF example.
* OCHA was requested to regularly update the paper on global processes circulated before the meeting and highlight **opportunities** for IASC organizations as well as **risks**. For instance, associating local actors too closely to the UN mechanism could reduce the scope of their action and put them at risk. Overall there was recognition throughout the meeting that the SDGs (no one left behind) represent an overarching framework for development, humanitarian and peacebuilding actors. It is also a framework that can foster more integrated approaches, in particular between humanitarian and development actors (although some doubted that the SDG framework would apply in failed states and complex emergencies). Indicators to measure progress implementing the SDGs are under
* development and would present opportunities to influence how success will be measured.
* STAIT field visits show the weakness of HCT collective **leadership** despite the TA’s emphasis. Agencies’ mandates are still more important than collective results. A mindset shift is urgently needed to be able to move forward. In many HCTs, the double hatting of representing clusters and agencies is problematic.
* **Coordination** improved, notably on deploying the clusters and efforts must be continued to adapt them to local needs and capacity. However, there is a call for stronger frontline operational capacity.
* There were queries regarding the future mandate of the **STAIT** team. STAIT is likely to continue its work with an increased focus on learning and communication, overseen by the EDGs.

**Follow-up Action:**

* + - 1. Update the WG and/or the Principles as relevant on global processes, highlighting opportunities and risks for the IASC to better inform IASC discussions and decision making. Action by: OCHA, before each IASC Principals and WG meeting as necessary.

**REVITALIZING PRINCIPLED HUMANITARIAN ACTION**

In this session facilitated by Sikander Khan (UNICEF), Aurélien Buffler presented the draft advocacy strategy on counter-terrorism (COTER), Ingrid MacDonald (NRC) updated on the COTER toolkit and Patricia McIlreavy the integration review.

* **COTER** was featured in the General Assembly and Summit on Sustainable Development and has become an even more critical issue for many Member States. Following the decisions made by the WG in March and the Principals in May, the Task team on Revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action implemented a few initiatives to communicate the points agreed in Rome. On its behalf, OCHA organized a side event at ECOSOC and provided inputs to the Sanctions Committee. The DERC will brief the Security Council Committee on COTER in December.
* The draft statement prepared for the Principals was used as a reference point in several advocacy efforts. The COTER advocacy strategy is targeting governments, UN agencies and NGOs to minimize the risk of COTER legislations and measures slowing down humanitarian response. The TT had been challenged by capacity shortage and insufficient recording of evidence on the impact on humanitarian operations.
* On financing: the TT was working with the TT on Humanitarian Financing to look at issues of security networks, remittances and cash programming and the role of banks.
* National level advocacy has been conducted in: Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Several states have created legislative exemptions. Harvard University is preparing a study on the impact of legislations following the adoption of the Security Council resolution on foreign fighters.
* NRC briefed on the COTER toolkit which should be finalized in November. It addresses issue of due diligence and risk management required by donors as well as restrictions on access to funding for local NGOs. WG agreed to discuss the toolkit and dissemination in an Ad Hoc.
* OCHA and NRC proposed to draft an op-ed for Principals willing to speak out jointly on this issue. Public advocacy on this issue was stressed as the public has yet to clearly hear the humanitarian concerns. Local NGOs are particularly affected by COTER measures and independently do not have the international reach to effectively advocate on this complex issue.
* Many members welcomed the COTER strategy and agreed to support it. One person found it too general and unclear. There was also a suggestion to better link with other work related to COTER, in particular initiatives related to the peacekeeping and peacebuilding reviews. One participant pointed out that the toolkit should be conscious of safeguarding protection activities.
* InterAction presented the key findings of the **integration review** completed by the TT at the request of the Principals. Like similar reviews, they found that the integration policy is poorly known and insufficiently or rarely implemented. HCTs do not demonstrate the leadership or do not have the influence required to prevent the politicization of humanitarian action. Humanitarian action in some complex emergencies has become dependent on the military for access. The review concluded that poor information sharing, lack of analytical clarity and multiplicity of coordination mechanisms undermine principled action.
* The review recommends implementation of the integration policy, which if implemented appropriately, would carve out humanitarian exemptions and protect humanitarian space. The review is complimented by other studies, for example a recent ACF report on the structurally integrated mission in Somalia. The review found that the IASC should not agree to triple-hatting (SRSG/RC/HC) unless a prior assessment has been carried out.
* One participant recommended that humanitarians should have dedicated logistical assets to facilitate reaching remote areas independent of peacekeeping assets which in complex political emergencies is deemed politically inappropriate and dangerous. Another raised the point that the interviewees were essentially humanitarians, which had an influence on the findings and recommendations of the review.
* There were differences of opinion on the issue of integration and the way forward. The majority of WG members echoed the call for greater implementation of the policy on integration. Better communication and understanding of the IAP throughout the system must be ensured, and the integrity of the process should be respected, for example during Strategic Assessment Missions. Several called for more effective dialogue with DPKO on this issue in particular in view of the peacekeeping review. The integration review will be submitted to the principals along with the management response once finalized.
* The Chair observed that both the centrality of protection statement and the IAP were not sufficiently known in the field pointing to the need for better communication and distribution of policy guidelines but also greater guidance on how to apply policy guidance at field level.

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Circulate a draft joint op-ed on counter-terrorism that other Principals would be invited to join. Action by: OCHA & NRC by 30 November 2015.
2. Inform the IASC secretariat on what action agencies are taking forward in line with the counter-terrorism strategy. Action by WG members by 9 November 2015.
3. Convene an ad hoc Working Group meeting to discuss the COTER toolkit and advocacy strategy. Action by: Chair of the WG with IASC Secretariat in mid-November 2015.
4. Submit the integration review to the Principals including a management response plan. Action by Co-chairs of the PHA TT: NRC and OCHA by 20 November.
5. Suggest that the IASC Principals communicate to their staff the need to ensure the full implementation of the UN Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) Policy. Action by: Chair of the WG by 30 November 2015.

**PROTECTION**

The objective of the session on protection was (1) to decide on how to take the Independent Whole-of-System Review of Protection in the Context of Humanitarian Action (WoS Protection Review) forward; and (2) to provide the Global Protection Cluster Task Team on Implementing the IASC Protection Priority (GPC TTPP) with guidance on the development of the IASC Protection Policy.

* In opening the session on protection, the Chair of the Working Group and GPC Coordinator Louise Aubin summarized the progress made by the GPC TTPP: After the endorsement of the Statement on the Centrality of Protection by the IASC Principals, the GPC TTPP commissioned a study to review the performance of the humanitarian system in achieving protection outcomes with a view to identifying measures to ensure the centrality of protection in humanitarian action.
* The GPC Coordinator highlighted that effective protection programming required the support of a multiplicity of actors in a multi-sectoral response, including common strategic outcomes as part of the HCT response. The humanitarian landscape is becoming increasingly diverse. The review recommends strengthening the engagement of the “Global South”. A more operational definition or explanation of protection might help make protection more accessible to different actors and reflect protection needs in varying contexts. The review also makes recommendations on leadership and capacity related to protection.
* Since the WoS launch the GPC TTPP held extensive discussions on it. The complexity of the report and the timeframe were constraints and there was not yet consensus on the TT formulated considerations for the WG, including suggestions on who could take certain recommendations forward. The GPC Coordinator indicated that the GPC is taking stock of the review, linking it to other studies and the new GPC 2016-2019 Strategic Framework as well as the 2016 workplan will include activities for the implementation of recommendations.
* The Working Group thanked the GPC and its TTPP for their work and expressed its readiness to take ownership of the follow-up to the WoS Protection Review. The WG requested the GPC TTPP to finalize and submit through the GPC Coordinator the “considerations” and the “summary of proposed actions” to the WG, and where there was no consensus, that this be clearly noted and that information of where there remained diverging views be reflected. As it was perceived as useful to have the WG address system-wide issues, it was decided that the WG should take on the discussions on substantive issues and that a subset of the WG members would review the documents and make recommendations to the Working Group. The GPC could be asked for expert advice if needed.
* Moving forward, better links would need to be made to the Human Rights Up Front (HRUF) initiative and the way to feed into the dignity/safety recommendations of the WHS needed to be defined. It was noted that the WoS Protection Review had not sufficiently considered monitoring and reporting mechanisms which may have implications on funding.
* A system to monitor the implementation of the review was deemed useful to increase accountability.
* Further discussion around leadership and on how to make protection be understood in more concrete terms but also in terms of its complexity are needed. Clarifications of the link between the GPC and its areas of responsibility and a better focus on child protection issues would be useful. Members expressed caution regarding the creation of new structures, noting that a lot of work was still needed to fully mainstream protection: “we need to build a protection DNA”.
* Regarding the IASC Protection Policy, WG members agreed that it should be as operational, practical and action oriented as possible, possibly resembling a toolkit, building on a mapping of existing documents such as the GPC Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons (2010) and the IASC Policy Paper on the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons (1999).
* The GPC Coordinator highlighted the Review’s recommendation to develop an explanatory note to further the practical understanding of protection. Several projects are underway that could feed into this, including a paper explaining what protection means in relation to accountability to affected populations (AAP) and the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), requested by the EDG, as well as a communications package to explain protection to operational actors being developed by the GPC.
* The GPC Coordinator indicated that ProCap has proposed dedicating resources to help develop the Protection Policy or alternatively an agency like UNHCR or another resource could be identified and asked the WG for guidance on the time frame. Some members expressed concerns about both ProCap or an Agency drafting the policy. The final decision was that the GPC Coordinator will consult the GPC TTPP and advise the WG on how and who should draft the Protection Policy. Asked about the timeframe, the WG suggested that the Policy should be drafted within three months.

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Submit the “considerations” and “summary of proposed actions” to the WG (ensuring to reflect the many views among the GPC TTPP members). Action by GPC Coordinator by 12 November 2015.
2. Establish a small group to review the GPC submission (previous action point). Action by: Chair of the WG upon receipt of the above by 12 November 2015.
3. Propose follow up for discussion by the WG, including a system to monitor implementation of the review. Action by: Subset of WG by 12 December 2015.
4. Advise on process, penholder and timeline [including a mapping of existing policy and guidance] for drafting the protection policy for endorsement by the IASC WG by March 2016. Action by: GPC Coordinator and GPC TTPP by 12 November 2015.
5. Draft action-oriented protection policy. Action as identified by GPC Coordinator and GPC TTPP in Action Point 4 above by 22 February 2016.

**OPERATIONAL GAPS: MIGRANTS AND THE HUMANITARIAN SYSTEM**

The objective of this session was to discuss ways of addressing operational gaps in relation to the needs of migrants in crises. It was facilitated by Clare Dalton (ICRC) with a presentation by Vincent Houver (IOM). The Chair prefaced the discussion by giving a brief account of the Principals’ discussion in Nairobi in May 2015 and the request for IOM to lead the effort to address policy gaps.

* Building on the keynote address of Mr. Swing, Vincent Houver gave examples of recent crises in Libya, CAR, South Sudan, Yemen and Saudi Arabia, where the humanitarian response to migrants’ needs was incoherent, ad hoc or inadequate. IOM is now working with UNHCR on a comprehensive regional response plan where specific needs of migrants are factored into the response. The Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) did not capture the migrants dimension and the humanitarian response plans are not systematic. In the past, some plans looked at migrants’ needs; others did not and the migration dimension was only referred to as populations of concern in the introduction. The CERF is difficult to access for migration issues. While migrants do not always need humanitarian assistance, the humanitarian planning process is the place where their needs could be integrated and IOM is asking for consensus that HCTs need to factor in migrants’ needs of humanitarian assistance by integrating them into the HRP; not necessarily in a separate chapter, but by mainstreaming them throughout the plan.
* There was broad support for IOM’s proposal with a number of important considerations and suggestions to IOM going forward: respect field-based prioritization of where the greatest needs are; full recognition that there are legal and illegal migrants and that often the latter are more vulnerable, but at the same time more difficult to access; call for greater linkage between humanitarian and development actors to ensure that migrants, in particular children, have continuous access to social services even during transit. Resident Coordinators are asked to take a closer look at access to social services for migrants in their country of responsibility. There was also a call for disaggregated data (age and gender) and for special attention to migrants who, as foreigners, are often more vulnerable than citizens. Finally, the role of the host community and local governments must be factored in the assistance provided to migrants who are often moving to urban areas and may compete with other vulnerable groups for resources, livelihoods and services.
* The WG Chair observed that many governments are not implementing the *Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers*. She committed OCHA to look into the planning and financing guidance with the perspective of vulnerable migrants and asked IOM to follow up with interested organizations as appropriate. IOM would like to report back at the next Working Group meeting. Finally, the EDG would be updated on this topic before their discussion on migration in the Mediterranean and Balkans as part of their horizon scanning discussion on 26 October.

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Assess potential incorporation of vulnerabilities of migrants in humanitarian planning guidance, and of IOM as recipient of CERF. Action by: OCHA-PSB and OCHA/IASC secretariat by 30 November 2015.
2. Follow-up to discussions on migration through bilateral discussions and/or convening another meeting with relevant organizations, as appropriate. Action by: IOM before the next Principals meeting (by 30 November 2015).
3. Convey to EDG the WG discussions and action points. Action by: IASC secretariat by 23 October 2015.

**MIGRANTS IN COUNTRIES IN CRISIS (MICIC)**

Monique Frison from the MICIC secretariat (IOM) shared information on the Migrants in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) initiative, in a session facilitated by Ugochi Daniels from UNFPA. Monique encouraged IASC members to contribute to the policy development process. She recalled the 2011 Libya crisis, during which 800,000 migrant workers and their families had found themselves in the midst of conflict. While this was not the first example, its scale raised awareness of the needs of migrants for protection and evacuation. The 2011 Japan tsunami showed that this phenomenon does not just occur in conflict situations or developing countries and that ways need to be found for States, the private sector and other actors to better support migrants in crises.

* Migrants require special attention as they often have pre-existing vulnerabilities; are often unwilling or unable to leave the country in crisis and/or they may be unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin due to lack of relevant documents and other factors. Because of their status they may also be unable to access humanitarian assistance which is usually addressed to nationals for the affected country. They are often subjected to discrimination, targeted attacks or exploitation and may encounter local and language barriers, and be lacking the social networks that nationals may rely on in times of crisis.
* The objectives of the MICIC initiative are to save lives, protect rights and dignity of migrants, and to address longer term impacts of crises for migrants, their families, and their home and host communities through a better preparation, more effective response and better recovery. The outcome of the initiative will be a set of non-binding principles, guidelines and effective practices that are applicable in conflict and natural disasters during the preparedness, emergency response and post-crisis recovery phases irrespective of the longevity of the crises.
* The consultation process is government-led and chaired by the US and the Philippines. Through informal sharing of information and practices, the process identifies and examines the issues and evidence base, as well as the roles and responsibilities of actors including the origin, transit and host states, international organizations, regional actors, the private sector, civil society, migrants and the diaspora. Among the eleven consultations, the Civil Society Consultation on 28 and 29 January 2016 and the International Organization Consultation on 16 and 17 March 2016 should be of particular interest to the IASC. The WG was invited to participate in these consultations or contribute via the MICIC online portal.
* The common themes and learnings from the four consultations held so far include a need to better locate migrants; the fact that if migrants are protected pre-crisis, they are also less vulnerable during the crisis. During a crisis, as the primary necessity is to save lives, migrant may require evacuation assistance. Post-crisis, recovery is crucial and experience shows that returns to the country of origin can be very difficult for long-term migrants.
* Several WG members expressed interest in collaborating in the process, which needs to be principled and pragmatic as the process is government-led. Questions addressed the relationship of the MICIC with other ongoing processes and existing tools, such as the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement. Participants wondered how compliance by parties in conflict with the non-binding guidelines would be ensured, and whether there would be mechanisms to monitor and ensure accountability. The relationship between migrants and the host communities was pointed out as a particular challenge.
* Principles being developed would include a section on existing conventions and other hard law. To ensure they are as practical and usable as possible, the remaining six months of consultations will allow to adapt and engage with other processes and to align to and ensure complementarity with existing frameworks. The MICIC secretariat looks to the WG for input and advice on the issue of services and referrals.

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Contribute to MICIC by participating in consultations (Civil Society Consultation 28-29 January 2016 and International Organization Consultation 16-17 March 2016), reaching out to the MICIC Secretariat or submitting practices on website. Action by: IASC organizations by 31 March 2015.

**IASC PROIRITIES, WORKING MODALITIES AND DRAFT WORKING GROUP WORKPLAN 2016-2017**

The overall objective of this WG meeting was to identify future priorities and sharpen working modalities. To lay the groundwork for this discussion, the Chief of the IASC secretariat presented the achievements of the IASC including its various subsidiary bodies over the past two years, reminded of the current IASC priorities, and outlined emerging potential future ones identifying outstanding issues and future challenges. She also summarized recommendations on future priorities and strengthened work modalities stemming from preparatory meetings.

* Key achievements include the implementation of the *Transformative Agenda*; *the Review on the Impact of Integration on Humanitarian Action*; the *IASC Principals Statement on the Centrality of Protection*, the *WoS Protection Review* and further efforts to mainstream and operationalize protection, issuing of the *Common Framework for Preparedness*, significant progress made including advocacy efforts on counter-terrorism, and strengthening the operationalisation of AAP. Feeding into the work of the High-Level Panel on Financing, significant inter-agency work had been undertaken on humanitarian financing. The implementation of the *IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings* and the implementation of the *IASC Policy Statement on Gender Equality in Humanitarian Action* have been reviewed; a new version of the *Gender-based Violence Guidelines* was launched and the *Second Action Plan for Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas* was endorsed. IASC members have proactively taken part in the WHS consultation process and had submitted many standalone contributions.
* The WG would have to decide how to take forward the recommendations made in the various reviews. The WG would also issue guidance to IASC subsidiary bodies, given that current work plans would- in principle- come to an end in December 2015. In preparation, subsidiary bodies had submitted progress reports and recommendations for potential future work; all had expressed a desire to continue their work at least until the WHS in May 2016.
* The Chief of the secretariat stressed that improvements are needed in WG work modalities to ensure better linkages with the field. IASC policies and guidance should be simplified and rolled-out in a more efficient manner. The WG could focus on supporting and monitoring the implementation of existing IASC policies and guidance, at the same time proactively applying lessons from operational evaluations. In doing this, local NGOs and affected people should be involved to make policy work more effective.
* In addition to the current five 2014-2015 IASC priorities (preparedness and resilience, protection, financing, AAP and PSEA, and revitalizing principled humanitarian action) WG members have repeatedly called for a focus on new partnerships and localizing response and strengthening operational effectiveness. These priorities reflect recommendations from the WHS consultations and other global processes. Discussions in preparation of the WG meeting had identified the desire and need to ensure stronger agency ownership of IASC commitments and greater leadership by the Principals and WG in inter-agency processes, prerequisites for effective inter-agency work
* In subsequent discussions, WG members expressed a strong desire to seize the initiative proactively recommending to Principals a forward looking workplan for 2016 and amending working modalities to strengthen impact and operational relevance. They suggested that it was the responsibility of the IASC and the WG to learn from and prioritize recommendations emerging from global processes such as the WHS and mindful of the SDGs, with a clear focus on supporting field operations. One organisation suggested instead of developing a work plan now, the ground should be set for developing one mid next year following the WHS in Istanbul. WG members concluded to review the SDG (what does it mean for the various actors and our specific role) with the potential to align IASC work streams as relevant.
* Many participants stressed that the IASC had developed significant valuable policy guidance but that more work was required to ensure broad implementation and monitor impact. Several expressed that they and their partners perceived a significant value added and global authority of the IASC; suggesting collective strength can and should be applied towards collective action. Participants agreed that the 2016 IASC workplan should be flexible to adapt to future developments including recommendations emerging from ongoing global processes. WG members expressed gratitude for the commitment and achievements of Task Teams and Reference Groups.

**Guidance to Subsidiary Bodies:**

The WG expressed deep appreciation for the efforts of the TTs, and requested them to complete pending tasks as per the 2014-2015 workplans, preferably by 31 December 2015, latest by 31 March 2016. Their mandate would then either end at this time, or be extended, possibly under a revised framework or with amended tasks. There was recognition that some TTs which would not be extended might form a community of practice, building on current results and workstreams.

**Emerging priorities:**

WG members suggested future key priorities, all of which resonated with emerging recommendations from global processes in particular the WHS but also ongoing IASC work streams. They recommended a stronger focus on issues of immediate field operational relevance or in support of strengthening operational capacity and effectiveness (focusing on protracted crises and conflict), reaching out to other stakeholders and a commitment to investing in partnerships and local response capacity. Suggestions included:

* Operational response capacity of humanitarian agencies.
* Protection and safety, including displacement, migration
* Principled Humanitarian Action, including COTER.
* Humanitarian financing
* Preparedness and resilience (including urban challenges, localizing response, climate change, pandemics and the humanitarian development nexus – in line with on-going discussions in the context of WHS.
* PSEA and AAP.
* Localization/Complementarity/Inclusiveness.

**Working modalities:**

Representatives overwhelmingly called for a strengthening of working modalities with a focus on **immediate operational relevance** and greater direct engagement with and **outreach to field based partners** and broader stakeholder communities. Through greater dialogue with field based mechanisms the objective would be to gain a better understanding of operational needs, allowing IASC and WG to adapt their policy guidance focus. WG members also suggested a greater dialogue with donors. Further they recommended:

* Call for the WG to become ‘more nimble’, ensuring quicker decision making and greater flexibility, with the objective of ensuring immediate operational relevance and showing greater sense of urgency. Call for greater collective ownership and leadership. Greater flexibility in IASC structures, e.g. not every issue requires a Task Team.
* Reaching out to and sharing information with other relevant actors including development, peacekeeping and peacebuilding actors (e.g. Working Group on Transition) and members states.
* Stronger two way relationship with Principals (reflecting Principals’ interests while also advising Principals on WG work streams). WG members requested greater clarity on Principals’ vision for the IASC WG.
* Ensure learning from and action on ongoing reviews, including WHS, SDGs, PO/PK reviews, OPRs and IAHEs.
* Some called for committing to stronger advocacyon key issues influencing the wider humanitarian community.
* Several expressed a desire to focus policy guidance on addressing systemic operational challenges and to strengthen advising key decision makers on developments and future threats including on key operational issues (in particular on protracted crises).
* A call to limit the WG scope to strengthen relevant output.
* Members suggested working on key issues in smaller groups, then bringing it to the collective, with the objective of more timely action.
* Several WG representatives questioned the division of tasks between the EDG and the WG. Some suggested that the EDG focused mostly on ad hoc current crises, whereas the WG addressed systemic operational issues (while others disagreed). A few suggested that EDG and WG discussions should show greater connectivity. One representative queried whether the IASC 2014 review was up for discussion.
* Several raised that recommendations towards strengthening working methods had been expressed repeatedly before but had not yet been implemented. Representatives concluded that they were committed to seizing the opportunity strengthening WG effectiveness and impact.

On the basis of these decisions and recommendations, the WG requested the facilitator of the discussion (Kate Halff of SCHR) to work with the IASC secretariatto prepare a draft workplan for the IASC WG for 2016 to be shared electronically for feedback and to be discussed in an Ad Hoc WG meeting.

**The Chair closed the meeting summarizing main action points. She thanked WG members and subsidiary bodies for their commitment, UNFPA for hosting the meeting and the IASC secretariat for successful meeting preparation.**

**Follow-up Action:**

1. Complete pending tasks as per the 2014-2015 Task Team workplans. Action by: Task Teams, preferably 31 December 2015, latest 31 March 2016.
2. Prepare draft workplan for the IASC WG for 2016 to be shared electronically for feedback. Action by IASC Secretariat with SCHR by 6 November 2015.
3. Ad Hoc WG in November to agree on workplan, priorities and working modalities and recommendations for the Principals. Action by: Chair of the WG with IASC secretariat mid-November.
4. Invite the ERC to the next IASC WG meeting. Action by: Chair of the WG.

*Prepared by the IASC secretariat (9 November 2015)*