

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team Meeting

Date: 7 June 2017
Time: 9 am in New York and 3 pm in Geneva
Chair: Melissa Pitotti (ICVA)

Agenda

1. Read out from Sudan financing mission
2. Updates on ECOSOC HAS
3. Discussion on the future of the localization marker initiative
4. AOB

Logistics

In Geneva: Room D-610, D building, 6th floor, Palais des Nations
In New York: 13th floor conference room, DC2-1370, 2 UN Plaza, 44th Street
Via Webex: Meeting number 645 301 812; password 1234

Notes

1. Read out from Sudan financing mission

OCHA/FCS: The mission to Sudan “From Funding to Financing” was the follow up to the mission to Sudan that focused on coordination. The financing mission aimed at exploring options of revising the financing architecture to better support the new way of working.

The mission concluded that due to the specific political context in Sudan related to the upcoming lifting of sanctions, the changes should be done in two phases. Phase one should focus on the period until sanctions are lifted, while phase two should focus on financing in a more open development environment after the lifting of sanctions.

The changes in the second phase will allow many institutions to engage with Sudanese government, which will mark the major change in humanitarian/development financing.

The mission members wanted to ensure that the changes in financing do not result in reorienting humanitarian funding towards development. This point was clearly agreed upon by all consulted stakeholders.

There was a general agreement that there was a fragmented financing landscape in Sudan, which does not empower the HC to leverage the system on specific objectives.

Key funding instruments in Sudan have been clearly a result of initially joint initiatives but later evolved and started operating in a more disjointed manner. Even agencies that are part of joint programming expressed doubts that this programming is, in fact, disjointed in practice.

It was noted that the diversity of operating environment in Sudan adds another layer of fragmentation. For instance, some activities delivered by private entities complement humanitarian and development programmes but are not considered in the landscape of collective efforts.

Pooled funds have space to improve in this respect as well. While CBPF and CERF are under direct control of the HC, the other two multi-stakeholder funds operate in a more independent manner. There is a need to improve both the broad strategic governance of these funds, as well as the day-to-day coordination between fund managers.

However, while there is a need to create coordination between all financing instruments at the higher level, the specific governance of each fund should remain independent to ensure impartiality.

There is also an issue of insufficient scale, which falls below the critical mass needed for these funds to be fully effective. The Sudan Humanitarian Fund has dramatically decreased its envelope in the recent years. The other multi-donor trust funds are even smaller and are fundamentally supported by only one donor.

Despite some tension that the two missions have encountered, they paved the way towards solid consensus that the humanitarian and development systems in Sudan must move towards collective outcomes. However, it must be noted that these outcomes have not yet been articulated, which requires further work.

The mission was impressed with open recognition by several government stakeholders that they need to do better in the future.

OCHA/PAMS: The Humanitarian Development Nexus Task Team (HNDTT) is currently working on joint humanitarian/development assessments and planning. This work should be well coordinated with the work on financing for collective outcomes currently done by HFTT. We need a more holistic approach and the co-chairs of the two task teams should look into this.

Chair (ICVA): How do the findings of this mission connect to the global context? To what extent was this mission looking into the role of NGOs? And how do the findings link to localisation?

OCHA/FCS: the role of the government in the delivery of humanitarian/development assistance in Sudan is very contextual due to sanctions. It is critical that there is a solid commitment from the government for the successful delivery of humanitarian/development assistance.

There was a clear acknowledgement that there was a solid engagement of NGOs in the planning and delivery of humanitarian assistance. There are more challenges with UNDAF, which is not a process that, per se, engages civil society.

As for the localisation, the mission did not focus on it but we noted that civil society was progressively growing in Sudan in terms of capacity. It has become a fundamental partner in the delivery of assistance in Sudan.

Action Point: The co-chairs of HDNTT and HFTT to continue exploring interlinkages between planning and funding for collective outcomes.

2. Updates on ECOSOC HAS

NRC: The ECOSOC side event on humanitarian funding will take place on Thursday, 22 June. The opening will be done by Kristalina Goergieva. The event will focus on the efficiency of humanitarian system and on transformation of response.

Action Point: NRC to circulate a concept note for this side event.

OCHA/CERF (HFTT secretariat): OCHA FCS and CERF are jointly organising the ECOSOC side event “Meeting Urgent Humanitarian Needs: the UN Humanitarian Pooled Funds in the Post WHS Era”. The objective of this side event is to explore the role that humanitarian pooled funds (CERF and CBPFs) play in delivering against WHS and GB commitments. The main focus will be on the following areas: provision of un-earmarked funding; improved support to national/local responders; and greater transparency as well as wider participation.

These roles will be explored in the context of four countries currently facing famine - Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen - where some \$240 million in coordinated allocations from CERF and CBPFs have recently enabled quick humanitarian action.

Country-level examples will be used to demonstrate how the funds work in synergy as mutually reinforcing tools.

The side event will be delivered as the panel discussion followed by questions and answers. The panel will be chaired by the ERC and will include DSRSG for South Sudan and representatives of Germany, WFP and civil society.

3. Discussion on the future of the localization marker initiative

IFRC: We are currently negotiating the finalisation of definitions of localisation. As the co-leads of the localisation work stream of the GB, we are trying to find a way forward to reconcile the views of GHD donors and the HFTT sub-working group on localisation.

OCHA/CERF (HFTT secretariat): In trying to find the common ground between HFTT sub-working group on localisation and GHD, to what extent do you take under consideration the views of other GB signatories?

IFRC: Other signatories of the GB have not been consulted on the definitions yet.

4. AOB

OCHA/FCS: FCS briefed on the upcoming CBPF NGO Dialogue Platform and Pooled Fund Working Group (PFWG) meetings, which will take place in Geneva on 12 and 13 June respectively.

At the CBPF NGO Dialogue Platform, other than NGOs having an opportunity to discuss good practices and challenges, NRC will present the latest study on pooled funds and will highlight the CAR fund as a case study. OCHA will also present the latest mapping exercise conducted to explore capacity building opportunities for implementing partners and the work on the localization marker conducted by the HFTT sub-group on localisation.

At the PFWG, Qatar will be introduced as the new co-chair replacing Ireland. Topics to be discussed among others include the DRC Humanitarian Fund's efforts to respond to increasing needs in the context of a protracted crisis; exploring capacity building opportunities for implementing partners; and the role of OCHA pooled funds response in addressing the famine emergencies.

World Vision International: We are preparing a single agency report on predictable, flexible, multi-year funding in humanitarian emergencies, which is based on recent experiences in Somalia, South Sudan, the El Nino response in Southern Africa and Syria. The report is a series of short illustrations/case studies demonstrating how different combinations of such funding contributed to more responsive programming, efficiency and comparative advantages.

The work is being done by Humanitarian Outcomes and is meant to compliment the IASC paper Lydia Poole is currently working on with the sub-committee on MYF. The draft will be circulated for HFTT comment in two weeks. World Vision International looks forward to receiving input from HFTT members.

OCHA/CERF (HFTT secretariat): The CERF results report is the first ever comprehensive compilation of results of CERF funding covering the full year of allocations. It is based on 66 RC/HC reports received in 2016 and covering the results of over 450 projects funded by CERF in 2015. The report includes summaries of the numbers of people who received CERF-funded assistance at the global, regional and allocation levels. The report also provides an overview of CERF's strategic added value to humanitarian operations at the country level as reported by RC/HCs.

The global picture of CERF results is complemented in the regional sections by summaries of results of every single allocation made by CERF in 2015 with specific focus on assistance provided to people in need.

The report is the major step forward in CERF's accountability and reporting on its performance. It is the culmination of several years of our work on improving the reporting framework of the CERF and developing our Grant Management System.

OCHA/CERF (HFTT secretariat): The new ASG/DERC is interested in effective and streamlined IASC structures. In this connection, she has proposed a review of the relevance and mandates of IASC Subsidiary Bodies.

The review will be as light as possible and will involve the IASC secretariat, sponsors for the relevant IASC priorities and possibly IASC focal points. A concept note on the process will be shared with focal points shortly. The IASC secretariat will work on this review with co-chairs if and as required. The review should be completed by mid-July.

Participants

Location	Name	Agency
New York	Rachel Criswell	World Vision
	Mirna Loiferman	OCHA/CERF
	Sanjana Quazi	UNICEF
	Andrea De Domenico	OCHA/FCS
	Fernando Hesse	OCHA/FCS
	Mateusz Buczek (HFTT secretariat)	OCHA/CERF
Geneva	Melissa Pitotti (Chair)	ICVA
	Laura Calvio	OCHA/FTS
	Agnese Spiazzi	OCHA/PAMS
	Ignacio Leon	OCHA/PAMS
	Chiara Condoleo	NRC
	Victoria Stodart	IFRC
By Webex	Sara Baschetti	UNHCR
	Rudina Turhani	ICRC
	Cat Langdon	DI
	Christelle Loupforest	UNMAS
	Maryline Py	UNFPA
	Nicolas Brat	UNHCR
	Daniel Kull	World Bank
	Lobna Hadji	World Bank
	Johannes Fromholt	UNDP
Angela Hinrichs	FAO	