

IASC Humanitarian Financing Task Team

Wednesday 10 May, 15:00 – 16:45

Development Initiatives, WFP, ICVA, CAFOD, OCHA FCS, IASC, NRC, Germany Foreign Office, German Red Cross/IFRC, CERF Secretariat, OCHA, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, WVI, UN Women, Mercy Malaysia

Presentation on Forecast-based Financing approach:

(IFRC, German Foreign Ministry, German Red Cross)

⇒ How to integrate forecast threshold into disaster response

Started in 2011 where major famine and drought in Africa where the humanitarian system took some time to respond.

⇒ Humanitarian finance is often available only when disaster strikes and suggesting it is almost guaranteed.

⇒ Anticipatory humanitarian system is needed. The approach: Forecast-based financing that would enable action based on forecast early warning rather than disaster.

German Foreign Office is working together with partners: WFP, IFRC (dialogue platform taking place in GVA and Berlin), Welthungerhilfe, and the Climate Center.

On improving the dialogue between humanitarian actors and science:

- Currently, no constant dialogue
 - Need to improve the use of extreme weather forecasts in pilot countries
 - Identification of early warning forecast thresholds and development of SOP for early action: Then, once threshold is reached, the funding is already existing and directed based on SOP.
- ⇒ Need for long term collaboration

9 high-risk pilot countries: Analysis of the different climate risk, identification of specific thresholds for main hazards; pre-defined actions (SOPs); Contingency plans early warning systems

⇒ Dialogue Platform brings together a vast range of actors

Next step: establish an international funding mechanism available for other donors to pay in and for other agencies to implement them based on threshold.

Practical aspects – What are the key aspects of the project?

1. Scenarios are designed to analyze the risk, including historical impact

- data and level of vulnerability
2. Identification of available forecasts: Selection of national and international forecast; taking into consideration the probability, intensity and lead time to the occurrence of an event
 3. Formulate early actions: such as awareness raising, strengthening houses, etc.
 4. Identification of threshold/danger levels in order for agencies to create SOPs

At a global level:

- Trying to influence at the UN Resolution level – International cooperation on humanitarian assistance in the field of natural disasters
- WHS German commitment (RT 6)

Potential fund structure:

- Hoping that Germany can convince more and more donors to invest in this “fund”/trust account
- Donors will very much rely on scientific advisory to identify whether SOPs and thresholds are reliable
- Next steps would be a meeting in Cancun, as well as the ECOSOC meeting end of June.
- ⇒ Willing to push this forward and make this more participatory

Questions, comments:

- Which donors are showing interest?
 - ⇒ So far there is only a commitment from Germany. There are some ongoing discussions with DFID and other potentially interested that have been identified are: Netherlands, Australia, and Nordic countries. The outreach will be starting now.
- What are the commissions/supporting costs that would be charged?
 - ⇒ This has not been defined yet. German Foreign Office will need support to identify those kind of things.
- On the choice of pilot countries – Is there a plan to roll it out in more political crises? (Yemen, Somalia, or South Sudan)
 - ⇒ The initial idea in 2014 was to start small, which explains the current focus. But in the long run, it may be open to more crises situations.
- Have you been talking to the IASC TT on contingency planning and early warning? They have been promoting a multi risk approach but we only see the disaster aspect of this Trust Fund for now.
 - ⇒ German Foreign Office would be happy to be introduced to the IASC TT on contingency planning and present it to their members.
- Did you consider looking at existing mechanisms before starting another Trust Fund?
 - ⇒ Yes, an analysis of all existing major funds was done beforehand to see whether this fund was a good idea.
- Have you already identified how to select partners?

- ⇒ No. For now, idea is that when governments pay for this fund, they are already collaborating with partners in this area. They should therefore be able to suggest partners to participate.
- On looking at other funds:
Depend on the number of SOPs. ATM, with two partners for sure, 1.5 million per year should be enough
- ⇒ Documents and resources will be shared to the group. Some additional questions can also be sent out directly.

Read out from South Sudan financing mission

The mission included 10 participants

Because of the coordination complication, the mission only looked at the financing aspect of the New Way of Working
Invitation by the HC/RC

Observations:

- Large amount of financing options, pooled funds, etc but no one has a clear picture
- ⇒ Mapping of the financing possibilities & how we can move from having the funding for projects quite disparate and not well coordinated to a clear sequencing and links between the various projects through financing.
- Discussion about how to better work together:
 - Consolidate the development and peace building sides
 - Have the humanitarian pooled funds to speak more closely
 - Identify humanitarian funding programmes and how to ensure there are some preparedness elements that would allow to move into the development side.
- Brainstorm on how to coordinate:
 - Humanitarian financing “platform” where a mapping could be done on what is available.
 - Have the basic services provided by the government, and then get more development funding in. (Quite Sudan specific)
 - Decision making forum would include new actors (such as private sector actors and governments)

⇒ The report will be available this week.

Questions and comments:

- Will the report be shared widely?
- ⇒ Yes, it will be shared with anyone interested. looking at feedback as much as possible. This would feed into Istanbul event
To let the HFTT know where the comments and feedback should go to (Rachel?)

Updates on the status of HFTT activities by each activity lead:

Local actors engagement / PCA: [OCHA FCS & Mercy Malaysia]

- Not much has happened
- A ToR has been developed with ICVA. The idea would be to hire a consultant after June.
- A conversation is still pending with Mercy Malaysia on whether and how to organize a meeting in Kuala Lumpur to talk about delivery.
- ⇒ Things will move forward based on the upcoming opportunities in May and June.

Questions: N/A

Mapping of pooled funds: [NRC]

- The study on pooled funds was presented at the last TT meeting.
- The research will be further discussed at the OCHA-NGO platform meeting in June
- Also, some MS have expressed some interests to the PFWG. This opportunity will be explored.

Questions: N/A

Localisation marker: [CAFOD]

- The localisation marker WG finalized the two tasks identified last July.
- Briefing paper developed by Charlotte from Development Initiatives looks at 3 definitions:
 - What is a national actor?
 - What is included? What are we trying to measure?
 - Definition of “as directly as possible”
- Broad consultation through a survey – 400 responses were received.
- ⇒ We don't recommend the elaboration of a specific marker to track funding to local and national actors. Rather, we propose to support the improvements of FTS as the existing mechanism that could provide this analysis and information. Yet, not everybody reports to that, and changes will come through in due course.
- The WG is now looking at producing an interim report to suggest a baseline on what is going to local and national actors from the Grand Bargain signatories. Indeed, existing baseline of information and data is not really reliable because most donors are not yet able to say how much funding has been directly or indirectly given to local actors. Much of the reporting is happening on a spontaneous basis. An interim report would contribute to know the current situation.
- One more meeting is plan to further disseminate these 2 pieces of work.

- Even though a marker may not be the right tool, developing a policy marker is still something that could be considered. More needs to be done in order to contribute to changing behaviors, and this work goes beyond the HFTT and requires a broader engagement of IASC members, GB signatories, etc. If this work is carried forward it is not something the sub-group would intent to carry alone.
- Also, ECHO & IFRC are organizing a consultation in June (5-7) where endorsement of the definitions paper led by Charlotte is expected.
- ⇒ There is the feeling that the required tasks have completed. Yet, there still a need to disseminate and follow up on the decisions that will be made.

Questions & Reactions:

- Looking at the %, are there any lessons that were learned from the gender marker?
- ⇒ Yes, the report does look into lessons learned form other markers, especially the gender marker. As a policy marker, it gives a tremendous amount of help in raising awareness. Yet, the marker was based on secondary data, which questions the statistical reliability of the gender marker.
- ⇒ On the policy marker:
 - Co-conveners of this initiative pushed the conversation a lot to see whether there was appetite to develop this policy marker now. A range of options are summarized in the report.
 - Everyone seems to recognize the importance of localization but no one willing to work on behavioral change. Is there an actual appetite for more systematic behavioral change for the achievement of localisation?
 - If policy and financing are separate, that may help avoid generating incentives for further funding.
- ⇒ This conversation is parked for the next HFTT retreat. Co-chairs and co-conveners should meet to discuss in the meantime.

Multiyear funding: [FAO, NRC]

- Both studies have been completed and shared. The first draft is currently under revision. Findings are expected to be shared on 16 May (SIDA conference?) and to be presented to the GHD group later on.

Donor conditions: [ICVA]

- Specific piece was largely covered back in November.
- Currently working on planning the pilots for harmonized donor reporting
- ⇒ Decisions on locations (Myanmar, Iraq and Somalis (and potentially a fourth one)) and the content of the template.
- State of pilots:
 - Good buy-in from NGO partners and UN agencies are quite

- motivated to join in.
 - The big focus now is to ensure donor governments engage in the pilots. ICVA working through NGO partners in this regard.
 - At the local level in Myanmar, there is a strong interest in participating in the pilot. It will be pushed further once governments have agreed to engage.
- GB co-conveners meeting will be key in the steps towards finalization of pilots.

Questions & Reactions:

- Positive feedback from Myanmar: who is it coming from?
 - ⇒ There is a strong interest from NNGOs, as well as NRC, WFP, other INGO partners. There were also some initial conversations with OCHA.
- Which donors have committed already to the pilot?
 - ⇒ In terms of agencies: WFP, UNFPA, FAO.
 - ⇒ In terms of donors: Germany, Norway, Sweden. Now working closely with DFID, ECHO, US and looking into Canada, Australia, Switzerland, Japan. Mapping with available resources is being done in order to see overlap among NGOs, donors, and funding amounts. This would help better target donors.
- What is the timeline we are working on?
 - ⇒ Ideally, we should have a very clear picture on the 17th May for GB co-conveners meeting.
 - ⇒ By the end of June, engaging at country-level will start.
- NRC is working on donor conditionality project on cost classification. A draft will be made available by mid-June.

Humanitarian-Development Nexus: [FAO, UNDP, WB]

- Engagement with the IASC TT continues.
 - So far, we are continuously working with support agencies on collecting evidence and best practices from the field.
 - Meeting in Copenhagen in March: Clear outcome document, which also relates to the financing aspect of the HDN.
 - In Turkey, there will also be a panel. It should be more on technical level and more concrete than what has been discussed in Copenhagen, with examples from the field and discussion with HC/RCS
- ⇒ Documents on Copenhagen and Istanbul will be shared with the TT members.

Transparency: [FTS and DI]

- Key messages on FTS and IATI were produced, as well as guidelines on the use of IATI to report to FTS (almost completed)
- Ongoing work on it this year:
 - Starting with some bilateral discussions: The GB has implications to the reporting. It is therefore important to touch base with major

- reporters and see the major challenges
 - After bilateral discussions, the conversation will be reconvened at the HFTT sub-WG.
- The background note is almost done:
 - Can we genuinely say it is an HFTT product even though not many feedbacks from HFTT members?
- ⇒ The background note will be shared one more time for comments and feedback before finalization.

Overall, it was very useful to have updates. This procedure will be repeated once every quarter.

AOB

- Next week CERF Secretariat will be in GVA for 3 events:
 - CERF Advisory Group
 - Meeting with NGOs on access to CERF
 - 17 May Member States briefing on CERF
- ⇒ The agenda for next week Advisory Group CERF meeting will be shared again, along with a list of who are members of the CERF Advisory Group.
- UN Women is keen to become active member of the HFTT based on two levels:
 - UN Women's mandate and areas of interest GB's UN Women's commitment
 - Co-chair of the IASC Gender Reference Group. It could contribute to further linkages between the different Task Teams.