

IASC TASK TEAM ON THE HUMANITARIAN DEVELOPMENT NEXUS (HDN TT)

WITH A FOCUS ON PROTRACTED EMERGENCIES

Summary Record and Action Points

17TH AUGUST 2016: 15.30-17.30

VENUE: ROOM S.212, PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

In Geneva: UNDP, WHO, OHCHR, UNICEF, FAO, IOM, ICVA/IASC HFTT, OCHA

On the phone: OCHA, WFP, InterAction, UNDP, UNHCR,

Co-chairs: UNDP and WHO

Agenda Item 1: Approval of Summary Report and Agenda: No comments were made and the report was approved as distributed. On the agenda and general meeting organization, UNICEF noted that going forward meetings should be organized in such a way that ensures the best participation, this includes sending the agenda, and background documents in a timely manner. The agenda was then adopted.

Agenda Item 2: Presentation of 3rd revised and final TT Terms of Reference:

Introduction (Co-chair, WHO): With the aim of ensuring that the TT has adequate time to tackle substantive issues, it is important that the discussions around the terms of reference of the TT be concluded rapidly. The document is now in the third round of comments, and the co-chairs strived to incorporate all comments and language provided they did not run counter to the mandate and scope tasked to the team by the Working Group.

FAO: Agreeing with the contents of the ToRs, FAO clarified the process referenced under 'work Stream and Objective' regarding building on the joint principles with the UNDG on resilience. FAO welcomed the inclusion of this workstream in the ToRs as it will provide a normative foundation for defining what is meant by collective outcomes.

UNDP: Following FAO's comments, UNDP agreed that the joint principles will form a good basis for further discussions, especially following the WHS outcomes.

UNICEF: would welcome stronger emphasis on Preparedness as UNICEF see preparedness activities as the connector between humanitarian and development processes. The normative chapeau of the HDN TT's work should be centred on ending needs in line with the SG's reports. Instead, as it stands, it reads as solely an attempt to decrease inefficiencies (which is more in line with language from the GB). Lastly, despite the name of the TT given by the Principals, our work should not neglect the HDN in sudden onset emergencies.

ICVA: Despite the two references, suggested one last hard look at the alignment between the contents of the ToRs (specifically around expected results, and deliverables) and the humanitarian principles and perhaps seeking input from ICRC in this regard. ICVA would

also welcome stronger functional linkages with the HF TT, specifically around multi-year financing and planning.

InterAction: While the ToRs are enumerate what the HDN TT wants to achieve in terms of guidance, protocols, and learning products, it does not clearly outline who will inherit these documents and most importantly who will have to implement. In addition, if the TT already has an idea of what current protocols and guidance need to be adapted or changed it should clearly state it.

Co-Chairs: In the spirit of simplicity and having a light document, it might not be necessary to include all the activities that will invariably have to be done in the build up to the ultimate goals and objectives currently set out in the ToRs. Such granularity in information might be better served as items captured under the workplan and not the ToRs.

OCHA: Noted that the term 'protocol' denotes a process that might be perceived as daunting (recalling the volume of effort and investment that went into the development and roll out of the Transformative Agenda Protocols). In addition, given the other current global processes such as the Grand Bargain, and the WHS follow up that are taking similar levels of engagement from various stakeholders in might be difficult to generate and channel the required energy towards this particular workstream on HDN. However, recognizing that the system needs some sort of modus operandi, a possible solution is perhaps to downgrade the language in the objectives to developing guidance or guidelines. OCHA sought clarity, on how area based programming relates to the HDN and the work of the TT.

FAO: This is the third meeting of its kind where the Terms of Reference have been discussed. Given the tasks extended to the team by the Working group and the need to begin normative and substantive work, FAO suggests that the ToRs are parked as is and left as fluid as possible, with the caveat that they may be reassessed following new thinking from the working group as well as the outcomes of the joint UNDG-IASC retreat, which will also greatly inform the work of the TT.

Co-Chairs: As was mentioned in the invitation, and as has been noted by FAO this is the third iteration of these ToRs. Following the call from some TT members, the process was delayed to take into account the outcomes of WHS (which was done) as well as what most expected to be revised marching orders from the Working Group (of which none were made). Given that the ToRs take into account these two major influences, the co-chairs propose that the TT moves on to discussions on work-planning and follow up on this discussion.

UNHCR: requested additional time to review the ToRs. Also inquired as to whether a monthly frequency was necessary.

ACTION: TT members to provide final comments by **Wednesday 24th by COB.** Feedback to be sent to co-chairs.

ACTION: Meeting frequency was agreed to be kept at monthly, and perhaps more frequent as deemed necessary.

Agenda Item 3: Work Plan Discussion on Workplan of the TT

Introduction (Co-Chairs): Recalling the comments received on the ToRs and building on the conversations during the previous two Task Team meetings, the co-chairs opened up the floor to source for preliminary ideas on how the team can take the objectives set out in the ToRs forward. The co-chairs informed the group that work had already begun on a draft 0 of the workplan based on the initial indications from agencies who shows some willingness to lead a small team to draft documents and products, but needed to be fleshed out through further conversation.

FAO: Noting that it would be difficult to comment on a workplan without a concrete document with which to contribute to and/or amend, it is important that the workplan offer some granularity on what the objectives in the ToRs mean concretely. That is, the objectives need to be linked to concrete outputs, and each output have clear activities under them- these will have to be properly sequenced. In particular, the TT still needs to define what some key terms are. Work will therefore need to be done around generating a common normative narrative/understanding.

Co-chairs: Co-chairs propose to take FAO's suggestions on-board and propose an amended 0 draft of the workplan that will be circulated to the Team and can be discussed during a dedicated agenda item at the next meeting.

OCHA: In line with the comments from FAO, it is important that the workplan address the policy issues at hand which until now remain blurry. Currently, there are ongoing programmatic issues that are occurring without a policy umbrella (OCHA roll out of multi-year planning tools, for example). Echoing InterAction, the policy issues and products that the TT will develop, will need to substantial take into account field ownership, while being aware that field colleagues are tired of protocols and extra process.

UNICEF: Agrees with FAO – in addition developing a common narrative will be essential. This will aid in understanding where the commonalities in processes such as risk, planning, and programming are, and how we can build on them. Looking at the agenda, UNICEF is concerned that the emphasis is on 'TA protocols for protracted crises'—It is important to look at the current response protocols with the view of tweaking or adding, but we should not be aiming to produce another set of protocols.

InterAction: Agreed on not opening up the TA protocols and called for the team to move forward on its normative work. Suggest that the co-chairs interact heavily with other IASC and UNDG subsidiary bodies to see where there are some linkages.

Co-chairs: Responding to InterAction and recalling the informal meeting held in New York with the co-chairs of the Working group on Transition, efforts have already begun to link

up with the co-chairs. To this end, co-chairs reiterated their call for volunteers to join the planning committee for the joint retreat.

Responding to UNICEF and Interaction, if after proper and sequenced reflection on the common narrative and common understanding with the UNDG of the gaps in response in protracted crises, and TT members still feel strongly that no additional nor adapted protocols are required, a rationale will have to be provided to the Working Group who tasked the team.

ACTION: Co-chairs to develop draft workplan and circulate for comment and discussion during the next TT meeting and invite agencies to sign up to lead a small group on various activities.

ACTION: Interested TT members to express willingness to join planning group for the joint IASC HDN TT/ UNDG WGT retreat (current membership includes, UNDP, WHO, OCHA, FAO, PBSO, SG UNOCC).

Agenda Item 4: Discussion on Typology and criteria

Introduction (WHO): Acknowledging the need to begin developing a stronger and clear analytical foundation for moving the TT's work forward in defining the humanitarian development nexus, WHO presented preliminary analysis of each of TA protocols based on five suggested criteria with the view of teasing out some of the relevant elements of the current inter-agency response protocols and how they may be useful in protracted emergencies. The five proposed criteria of the HDN were a) Collective Outcomes; b) Joint Planning and Analysis; c) progressively ending needs; d) government and local engagement; e) protracted response.

Overall, the preliminary analysis showed a) the current response protocols hold considerable references, language, and guidance on humanitarian work and how it relates to the nexus, albeit will need to be fleshed out in a more concrete and systematic manner; b) new response protocols were found to have greater emphasis on these criteria in an explicit manner; c) whereas older documents contained this information albeit mostly in footnotes, addendums or annexes.

OCHA: While overall the methodology is useful, what remains unclear are the definitions of collective outcomes and what these mean in practical terms. Similarly, when we talk of joint planning and analysis, it is important to remember that we are talking about essentially two different legal documents (UNDAF, HRP). Against that backdrop, what does joined mean? Would also wish to see joint monitoring/or accountability as an important criteria. The methodology provides a very useful way of visually and systematically analysing the protocols and would be interesting to see this applied on the development side as well.

FAO: Building on the work that FAO, WFP, UNICEF, and UNDP undertook in Somalia in collaboration with the HC, it might be useful to include "Investment" as a criteria. In this

sense, investment comprised of activities and programming that did not fall under immediate life-saving activities. For all other activities, applying this lens -- “programming as an investment into the community (irrigation schemes, etc)” -- was deemed to be useful as it reinforced the notion of long-lasting interventions that last.

ICVA: On the criteria related to engaging with the government/local authorities, how much of the references in the various protocols contextualized their guidance in conflict setting? This issue resonates very strongly with the Sherpas of the Grand Bargain, who are aiming to develop and define an ecosystem of diverse actors. Where this idea meets challenges is when the actors, are perhaps unwilling or incapable of acting.

WHO: These five criteria are a helpful starting point for conversation and a joint narrative. In this sense, the first hurdle will be to understand what these terms and criteria mean. Equally important will be how these apply in different contexts. To this end, while the TT develops these criteria of HDN, it should concurrently reflect on the Typology of response scenarios (building on the HDAG Paper) which might have an effect on to which extent these criteria can – and should -- be applied (keeping in mind humanitarian principles and human rights). And thirdly, the task will be to understand how these criteria can be applied differently within one country, in different pockets of context, which will link with the TT’s discussions on area-based programming.

ACTION: Co-chairs invite interested members of the TT to contact WHO to move ahead on fleshing out a common normative understanding of HDN which will include; a) fleshing out and refining the HDN criteria and developing a Typology of response scenario, keeping in mind area based programming.

ACTION: Co-chairs will relay the current work and thinking on criteria to the UNDG WGT with the aim of applying a similar analysis on development processes and protocols (in line with OCHA and FAO comments)

Agenda Item 5: Preparation for joint retreat

Introduction (Co-Chairs, WHO): In preparation for the joint retreat, there was an initial informal meeting in NY (in June) between the co-chairs. Since then, an initial circulation has been sent to source for interested agencies who would wish to be part of the planning committee for the joint retreat. A follow-up teleconference to have preliminary discussions will be held during the week of 23rd of August. The floor was opened for members to either express interest in joining the group, or raise issues that they deem important to carry forward into the retreat.

WHO: It will be important that when both groups meet, a substantive conversation can be had on common understanding. This will not preclude, but instead will build on the HDN TT’s current discussion on criteria, etc., as a contribution to that larger narrative. Secondly, WHO would welcome the extension of an invitation to the Sherpas of the

elements related to the HDN under the Grand Bargain. This will aid in achieving coherence across the processes and limit duplication.

FAO: Has volunteered to be part of the planning committee. FAO sees it useful to have a conversation about Analysis, Planning and Programming, perhaps to gain an initial sense (through mappings and other background documents that will need to have been prepared) where concrete changes and recommendations can be generated. On the Grand Bargain, the work of the HDN TT is on the horizon of the GB Sherpas. We have to go into the retreat thinking of it is a beginning.

OCHA: As part of the preparatory work ahead of the retreat it will be useful to have a mapping of the key objectives and the issues on the agendas of these task teams. Perhaps the IASC Secretariat can help with gaining that visibility over 3 – 6 months.

UNDP: An important discussion to have at the retreat will be reconciling the proliferation of pilots being generated from the numerous processes (GB, MAPS support, Principals, etc.) that are happening. This should result in a common framework for operationalizing the HDN.

OHCHR: We should not forget to bring in the work under the High Level Panel on Peacebuilding and PBSO. To which UNDP clarified that PBSO is indeed the co-chair of the UNDG Working Group on Transition.

FAO: Adding to the suggested list of background documents, the principles of resilience currently being revised to reflect recent thinking (now to be called the principles of advancing collective outcomes) could be useful in draft form.

ACTION: Members to confirm availabilities for the joint retreat – tentatively planned for the mid to end of October.

ACTION: Next meeting will be held in the week of 17th September.