

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team

Co-chairs: Lisa Doughten (OCHA/CERF), Melissa Pitotti (ICVA)
19 October 2016

MEETING AGENDA

1. Briefing by MPTF on the Global Concession Facility Fund and the Global Crisis Response Platform
2. Discussion on a definition and parameters for the localization marker
3. Briefing by FCS and ICVA on the second phase of the Field-focused Study to Review the Partner Capacity Assessment Process
4. AOB
 - GHD-HFTT collaboration on a reporting workshop to be held in November
 - Humanitarian Week and Global Humanitarian Policy Forum in December
 - CERF Advisory Group – Session with IASC

MEETING NOTES

1. Briefing by MPTF on the Global Concession Facility Fund and the Global Crisis Response Platform

MPTF: The Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office is the UN centre of expertise on pooled financing mechanisms. It supports development, effectiveness and UN coordination through the efficient, accountable and transparent design and administration of innovative pooled financing mechanisms as well as provision of advisory services for fund operations.

The MPTF Office is the UN's focal point for discussion with the World Bank on pooled financing instruments (MDTFs) and on coordinated UN – WB financing architectures in fragile and conflict-affected situations. Housed within UNDP, the MPTF Office is firewalled from all UN implementing entities, UNDP included. The MPTF Office's current portfolio is over \$8.5 billion in total and includes over 100 pooled financing mechanisms (country-level and global MDTFs, Joint Programmes (JPs) and National Funds), established for humanitarian, transition, development and climate change activities.

Every context requires a mix of right financing instruments for effective response. Important quote from the UN, WB and OECD mapping of financing instruments for protracted crisis, fragility and sustaining peace: "Financial solutions will often involve a range of instruments tailored to the specific context. This will require determining the right mix of finance and partnerships for specific global challenges and different regional and country contexts, and designing financing strategies and architectures that combine and sequence the relevant financing instruments."

There need to be good interlinkages between the various financing instruments. The right mix of financing instruments for delivering collective outcomes include:

- International grant funding for humanitarian action (ODA)
- International grant funding for peace consolidation and development (ODA/non-ODA)
- International concessional and non-concessional loans
- Risk based financing instruments (e.g. insurance)
- Domestic private sector and civil society resources
- Domestic resources from national and local governments (e.g. tax revenue)

The key objective of this mix is the delivery of collective outcomes, which include:

- Consolidating peace
- Essential services and solutions
- Strengthened institutions

The Global Crisis Response Platform (GCRP) is the World Bank's platform for crises situations. GCRP acknowledges that addressing complex challenges requires an integrated approach which:

- Spans the various phases of crisis risk management- prevention and preparedness, response, and recovery and reconstruction
- Recognizes the need for multi-sectoral interventions
- Crowds in private sector resources and capacity by building incentives
- Bridges the gap between humanitarian and development assistance
- Acknowledges that, together with the poorest countries, support to middle-income countries (MICs) must be bolstered when they provide "global public goods" or contribute to fighting "global public bads".

GCRP recognizes that, while predicting the nature and extent of future crises is difficult, it is critical to invest in efforts to prepare local actors and the international community, to enable them to adapt quickly and respond effectively.

GCRP encompasses, and builds on, existing WBG crisis-related funding mechanisms, financing instruments, and financial and knowledge-based products, along with a number of ongoing and proposed initiatives designed to fill gaps in the architecture. It will provide scaled up, systematic and better coordinated support for managing and mitigating current and future crises, across the spectrum of risks and vulnerabilities facing the WBG clients.

GCRP will allow the WBG to strengthen synergies across various units working on risk mitigation and crisis management. It will also make sure that relevant knowledge and experience is shared across WBG and its clients.

The GCRP includes preparedness and prevention, response, and recovery and reconstruction in economic crises, natural disasters, conflicts and public health emergencies.

One of the instruments within the GCRP is The Global Concessional Financing Facility (CFF), which provides concessional financing to help address refugee crises in middle-income countries. This facility was launched in full partnership between UN, WB and Islamic Development Bank to bridge the gap between humanitarian and development assistance in refugee agenda. The initial focus of this facility was to help Jordan and Lebanon address the impact of Syrian refugees. The approved

funding included \$380mn in projects only three months after launch. Expanded from MENA CFF to Global CFF at Leaders' Summit to ensure coordinated international response to refugee crises. It seeks to raise \$1bn in grants for Jordan/Lebanon and \$500mn for global window to leverage some \$6 billion in concessional financing over five years for MIC refugee hosts.

The Value Proposition of the Global Concessional Financing Facility is:

- Bridges the gap between humanitarian and development assistance
- Enhances coordination between the United Nations and multilateral development banks through an open platform
- Strengthens the resilience of countries impacted by refugee crises by assisting both host communities and refugees
- Leverages innovative financing modalities to scale up development support at more advantageous terms
- Supports programs and policy reforms in areas such as education, health, and job creation to create sustainable development outcomes

Additional documents will be shared electronically after the meeting.

FAO: Can you provide some information on the assessment of financing flows? And why did World Bank not think about financing prevention? There is a big push for scaling up prevention activities and more and more of a gap in this area.

ICVA: NGOs are trying to understand these developments. Will this platform focus on funding to Governments? Or are UN agencies and NGOs also included? Do you have any ideas on how to reach broader humanitarian community with messages on this platform?

World Vision: When will these mechanisms be truly up and running?

UNICEF: Can you clarify the governance structure of this platform. How will it be coordinated with the UN?

MPTF: On the question of assessment, if you do an assessment of the situation, as you plan, you need to take the issue of financing under consideration.

As for understanding these new developments by NGOs, you are not alone and all actors across the system including MPTF are trying to understand the changes that are coming. The complexity of financing is increasing rapidly. There is far more actors and for more instruments. This is why MPTF invested in new capacity and mapping exercises.

The global crisis response platform is already up and running and allocated its first money. As for coordination, we included one actor on humanitarian side and one on development side in the governance structure. It is UNHCR on the humanitarian side and the actor on the development side is still to be selected.

[2. Discussion on a definition and parameters for the localization marker](#)

CAFOD: Two meetings of the group working on the development of the localisation marker have taken place so far. We grappled with number of issues related to the scope of the localisation

marker. The membership in this group is important. We invited two Grand Bargain signatories, who are focusing on the localisation, Canada and Australia. We also collaborated with ECHO, which presented experiences to date with resilience marker.

We need to understand some of the potential pitfalls and experiences with regards to other markers. We have taken them on board and reflected on them. For the next meeting, FCS developed a paper on road map, planned consultations, definitions and criteria. We will need more guidance on how wide this marker should be.

OCHA-FCS: The group working on the localisation marker realised that it is very important to come up with the working definition of localisation. The definition will be key for the development of the marker and for building common understanding of related issues.

The consultation phase of this work is very important to ensure that different perspectives are considered. We had a discussion in the group on not limiting our thinking to tracking the money. We should still be able to apply critical thinking on what localisation means. It should not only be about throwing more money on local actors because they will likely not be ready to absorb it. Capacity building and engagement of local actors in joint planning are central in the discussion on localisation.

There is a consensus that this marker should be simple. It should be clear, applicable and easy to adopt. The temptation to put too much into the marker should be resisted as it might render the tool ineffective.

The HFTT is encouraged to provide comments on the papers that were shared by the next meeting. These papers are not in any way definitive and we welcome contributions.

IFRC: We have right stakeholders in the group. Can someone clarify the endorsement process of the outcomes of the work on the localisation marker?

World Vision: It is not clear on how IASC and GB processes come together. We should expand the consultation process on the development of the localisation marker, so the two processes can interlink.

UNMAS encouraged to enclose the chair of the gender group in the development of the marker. UNMAS would also like to be consulted on the process and definitions.

OCHA-FTS highlighted that it does not have the classification of national and international NGOs and would like to develop it. FTS is interested in the definitions that will come out of this group.

UNICEF: how are you involving local participants? Linkages with GB work streams on localisation are key for this marker.

FAO: It is important and necessary to think about interlinkages between these processes but the Sherpa group expressively did not want to merge the Grand Bargain with IASC processes.

OCHA-FCS: suggested that organising the HFTT retreat soon would be useful. It could allow for mapping all different streams of work and define who needs to coordinate with who. It is important to bring operational and technical voices to the table.

3. Briefing by FCS and ICVA on the second phase of the Field-focused Study to Review the Partner Capacity Assessment Process

It was agreed to move this agenda point to the next meeting due to time constraints.

4. AOB

4.1 GHD-HFTT collaboration on a reporting workshop to be held in November

ICVA reported that Germany, co-convenors of the Grand Bargain simplifying/harmonizing reporting work stream, will be co-hosting a workshop to be held in Geneva during the second half of November. The workshop will serve two purposes:

- 1) To get participants up-to-speed on relevant studies on reporting, including a recent GPPI study which proposes a reporting template, and
- 2) To propose a path forward for a consultative process towards simplifying and harmonizing reporting.

The workshop will be a joint effort by the GHD and HFTT to design the agenda, so HFTT volunteers who want to help should contact Melissa Pitotti (melissa.pitotti@icvanetwork.org). The workshop on reporting will be the first of many, and will likely include donor, UN and NGO participants, who attended the April 2016 workshop on development of the Grand Bargain commitment language related to reporting.

4.2 Humanitarian Week and Global Humanitarian Policy Forum in December

OCHA-PDSB: Several important humanitarian events will take place in December including GHO launch, 25th anniversary of resolution 46/182, Global Humanitarian Policy Forum, CERF High-Level Conference and Pooled Funds Working Group.

The GHO launch is planned for 5 December in Geneva. It is a public event and it will focus this year on “proving a negative”, i.e. exploring the effects of humanitarian funding gaps.

The 25th anniversary of resolution 46/182 will take place in the week of 5 December and will focus on consolidating the gains from WHS.

The Global Humanitarian Policy Forum will take place on 12-13 December and will focus on the follow up on WHS commitments and on localisation and collective outcomes.

CERF High-Level Conference will take place on 13 December in New York and will focus on refugee and IDP movements. It will be opened for the last time by the current SG.

Pooled Funds Working Group will take place on 15 December in New York.

4.3 CERF Advisory Group – Session with IASC

Co-chair (OCHA-CERF): The CERF AG will take place next week. We are welcoming 8 new members. There will be a session with IASC for which HFTT members are invited. It will take place on Friday, 28 October from 9 to 10.45 am. Participants are also invited for the reception in the evening of 27 December.

NRC brought to the attention of the HFTT members the letter from Steven O'Brien on increasing CBPFs to cover 15% of HRP requirements and suggested a broader discussion on it.

OCHA-FCS offered organising a briefing and a discussion on the subject.

Co-chair (OCHA-CERF) suggested that this can be discussed in the next HFTT meeting in November.

UNICEF: will there be a discussion on the timeliness of CERF sub-grants in the AG?

Co-chair (OCHA-CERF): The discussion on the timeliness of CERF sub-grants with the AG takes place only once a year during the spring meeting. This is when new data on the timeliness of sub-grants is available.

One of the main issues for the upcoming AG meeting is the expansion of CERF to \$1 billion a year. We will also be focusing on the innovative financing, risk insurance scheme, resource mobilisation, advocacy and communication.

PARTICIPANTS

Location	Name	Agency
New York	Lisa Doughten (Co-chair)	OCHA/CERF
	Henriette Keijzers	MPTF
	Michael Jensen	OCHA/CERF
	Juan Chaves	OCHA/FCS
	Sanjana Quazi	UNICEF
	Chris ?	?
	Olga Aleshina	MPTF
	Johannes Fromholt	UNDP
	Romano Lasker	OCHA/PDSB
	Andrew Billo	UNFPA
Geneva	Christelle Loupforest	UNMAS
	Sara Baschetti	UNHCR
	Julie Thompson	OCHA/RMSS
	Laura Calvio	OCHA/FTS
	Kate McGrane	NRC
	Daniela L. Gilotta	OCHA/FTS
	?	WFP
	Mateusz Buczek (HFTT secretariat)	OCHA/CERF
By phone	Melissa Pitotti (Co-chair)	ICVA
	Charlotte Lattimer	DI
	Anne Street	CAFOD
	Maya ?	Oxfam
	Anida ?	Oxfam
	Sandra Aviles	FAO
	Johannes ?	World Bank
	?	World Bank
	Benard Muinde	IASC secretariat
	Ajay Madiwale	IFRC
	Elena Garagorri-Atristain	ICRC
	Bahar Zorofi	WFP
	Julian Srodecki	World Vision
	Rachel Criswell	World Vision