

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

WITH A FOCUS ON PROTRACTED EMERGENCIES

Summary Record and Action Points

7TH DECEMBER 2016: 15.30-17.30

VENUE: ENVIRONMENT HOUSE

In Geneva: UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF, FAO, IOM,

On the phone: OCHA, UNDP, IASC Secretariat, InterAction, OHCHR

Co-chairs: UNDP and WHO

Agenda Item 1: Approval of Summary Report from 5th Meeting: Summary Report Approved.

Agenda Item 2: Review of Summary Report from the Joint Workshop in New York of the IASC HDN TT and the UNDG WGT: No substantive comments on the workshop report.

Agenda Item 3: IASC TT perspectives on the Draft Plan of Action and alignment with the TT's Workplan.

Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP): Following the joint retreat in NY, the road map that was generated on the shared screen was distilled into the plan of action that was circulated before the meeting. The PoA was created by the co-chairs of both sides with inputs from WFP, UNICEF, PBSO and OCHA, following some of the feedback from participants that the road map was not action oriented enough, and clear activities needed to be generated to collectively achieve the new way of working.

OCHA: We have to aim for a plan of action that is realistic and that are bound by specific time frames. The short, medium, long term, designations are useful but more thinking needs to be done in terms of what is feasible and achievable. Some of the items would be more realistic as medium term goals. The difference between Output 1 and 2 is not clear. In line with conversations around the TTs ToR, it is important to ensure that the learning and compilation of best practices is done before any new guidance is produced. We have to clarify roles and responsibilities for what HQ support means, and what sort of elements will be supported.

CC: requested clarification on UNICEF's written comments submitted in advance, around the PoA, which mentioned that the retreat clearly pointed to need to focus on humanitarian-development nexus first, and not further complicate the matter with peace - at least at the beginning.

OCHA: it was quite the opposite. The outcomes of the workshop rather reinforced and articulated the need to gain coherence around all plans, processes, and analysis undertaken in a given scenario. For protracted conflict driven situations, the peace building/peace keeping elements cannot be ignored.

UNICEF: clarification: UNICEF's understanding of the outcomes of the workshop was that there was still a need for the hum-dev nexus to have its own time and space for more in-depth

discussion. Adding the peace dimension to that much needed conversation, complicated the discussion; this is not to say it's not a conversation worth having, but we should ensure appropriate space to build coherence across those two pillars represented by the Hum and Dev dimensions.

WFP: Echoing UNICEF: WFP has not reached the stage where the nexus discussions include a prominent peace element. We need greater clarity on what hum/dev means and then fold in peace elements as appropriate.

FAO: Agreed. The peace part of this conversation is dominated by the peace-voices at the New York level, which in some instances doesn't allow for the much needed input from other actors such as NGOs and other actors who are not in NY to diversify the discussion and make it less peace and security centric; the Global Peace Platform for example.

CC: acknowledged that a three dimensional discourse renders the conversation more complex, but it is an essential component of our work. In that sense, the co-chairs agree that greater clarity and voices should be reflected in that area, including how peacebuilding happens organically at the grass roots level as a complement to global perspectives.

FAO: pleased with the report. It is very nuanced and captured interesting tensions and findings. However, it is extremely important that the richness in the report is captured in a realistic way in the plan of action. For someone who was not present, the PoA might read as overly cumbersome; with no clear structure of differentiation between what can be done jointly, what the UNDG side can take forward, what is already underway, and what are the low-hanging fruits. The PoA should focus on few rather than many activities. There was also a strong focus on individual agencies as opposed to a broader inter-agency to-do list. The PoA can be simplified by regrouping these exhaustive activities in a way that shows what is being done and can be supported, what needs to be promoted, and what needs to be achieved. To build on the momentum of the retreat, we need to look at them in a succinct way. There is also a need to better think through the humanitarian financing aspects, which go beyond the WB initiatives.

CC: reiterate that the PoA is a distillation of the road map which was a compilation of all the activities that the participants in NY wanted to see occur. Thus, it is both a wish list and includes activities that are out there already. Seen as a checklist, what out of these activities could we, and should we take forward, as the TT, collectively with the UNWGT and as individual agencies?

OCHA: The PoA should reflect in a more concrete manner what other agencies are doing as well as the agendas of all the different initiatives out there (grand bargain, WHS follow-up). The PoA for the UNWGT and the TT on HDN should be the result of the gap-analysis of all these processes, to see where our added value is. We need a period of transition to understand how these processes are evolving. We may find that a second retreat is needed, where we need different voices from those present in NY. In this sense the PoA needs almost a 4th column that has an indication of the status of these processes.

CC: some of the gap analysis will become clearer when the UNWGT also meet to determine what can be achieved. This will in turn give us an understanding of what can be done together, where clear overlaps occur and what agencies are already planning activities individually.

UNICEF + FAO: the PoA is symptomatic of how much divergences has occurred over the last five years in our respective pillars, to the point where potential synergies are not clear anymore. The retreat, in this sense, was the opportunity to meet once again to take stock of this divergence. The UNWGT's perspective is mainly focused on the integration issue. The nexus they contend with is made up of peace, political, and development actors, but not necessarily about how humanitarian action need to be complemented by actions that reduce need, which is the nature of the nexus the humanitarians are contending with together with development actors now. This is in part, due to the fact that peace was brought in late in WHS. We should build on the momentum from WHS, especially on the series of discussions planned in the coming months (Denmark, Dakar, etc).

OCHA: Individually, agencies will be developing their own workplans and how HDN will be integrated in their respective processes. OCHA for example are advancing in the Dakar meeting with the aim to replicate some of the discussions from the retreat and what this may mean for the field. The PoA should be structured in a way that shows the priorities for immediate action in the coming 12 months, and an assessment of workstreams that would need attention down the line.

WHO + FAO + OCHA: discussed 3 concrete steps that the HDN TT can follow 1) pull together the typologies, analysis of planning and analysis tools, and a mapping of the timelines into one package that can inform country visits and give all agencies a common framework as we go about our individual and collective work; 2) there was considerable support from the participants of the workshop to undertake learning missions and other forms of collectively undertaken support to countries; 3) and echoing FAO, we need to work with the Task Team on financing getting our thinking straight around financing issues, including the World Bank but also other forms of humanitarian financing that can be leveraged for this work.

CC: These are some of the activities that are already marked in the PoA. In that case, the approach to the PoA should be one where agencies go through the activities and pick items and activities that they think needs to be prioritised over the next 12 months. Would also be worth approaching the Dakar and Denmark meetings collectively.

FAO: The approach to peace in the PoA needs to be more balanced. It's worth reiterating, that there seems to be a predominance of the peace-element that is very abstract and high level, we should reflect on the WB/UNDP/DPKO study on conflict preventions, for example. The sort of granularity we need for the implementation of the HDPN should be at the same level and it should be reflective of the greater peace building community.

UNICEF: Agree. Linked to FAO's intervention, we may need to explore how to revitalize the discussions around the New Deal. In terms of philosophy of approach the follow up to the new deal, is perhaps the approach we should be aiming for.

CC: this sentiment was also echoed by the civil society actors who noted that the way peace was featured in the retreat, did not necessarily reflect how peace is framed on the ground. It needs to be more field based.

UNICEF + WHO + UNDP: There are also the more grassroots initiatives that both humanitarian and development actors perform with primary and secondary objectives towards peace keeping and peace building (engaging with communities in terms of prevention, reconciliation, safety

nets, and protection work). The humanitarian potential to sustaining peace should be better reflected rather than limiting it to resolution and Security Council work. **CC:** decision point: The co-chairs will aim to convey these discussions to the UNWGT and co-chairs request agencies drill down the PoA and highlight some priorities and low-hanging fruit. This will facilitate what we begin working on immediately, ahead of the meetings in Denmark, and other meetings.

OCHA: the co-chairs might explore formal/official participation or representation in the UN WGT (and perhaps vice versa) to ensure that these sorts of conversations are systematically fed back to the WGT.

FAO: requested clarification and further details around the meeting in Denmark referred to by UNICEF and OCHA. To which the **CCs**, mentioned that they have not received final concept notes nor invitation to the event. It seems to be organized under the rubric of the grand bargain

UNDP: In addition, we should be looking at priority activities from programmatic entry points. An added value of the TT can be to also look at those individual agency programmes that are aiming at the new way of working, and learn from them and share them as appropriate. This can also feed into some of the actions in the PoA around inter-agency support missions.

CCs: Following a clarification of how these planning documents (plan of action, work plan) would feed into broader work being done in the IASC, the co-chairs took the opportunity to summarize the outcomes of the Principals sessions on the new way or working, where Mary Robinson, the SG's special envoy on El Nino and Climate change presented the Blue Print for Action. The Blueprint and accompanying draft inter-agency SOPs were well received by the Principals and it was a good discussion, with the Chair noting that the blueprint should be held as an example of how the new way of working can be operationalized in concrete terms. The Envoy herself, following an intervention from OHCHR about fragile states (which we know make up 80% of the caseload), noted that the SOPs predominantly apply to contexts and countries in which governments are willing, are stable, and capacitated to some degree. The WB representative also noted that there was a remarkable absence of risk informed argumentation in the proposals they receive at country level.

UNDP: To this end, the work done by the RG of Risk Early Warning and Preparedness on the SOPs fits very well under some but not all of the typologies and address important work in particular in cyclical and climate related disasters but should perhaps not be thought as the all-encompassing comprehensive blueprint suited for all operational settings in which we need to advance the new way of working, on the contrary as much of the contexts can be far more politicized with protracted conflict footprints. By extension however, the work on SOPs gives us a good foundation and direction, in terms of developing similar procedures for other more 'constrained' scenarios.

FAO: [Also present at the principals meeting]. Agreed with the summary of the co-chairs, and comments of UNDP, and noted that the blueprint and SOPs should be seen as an important contribution and component and not the totality of the new way of working. The work in the blueprint does not capture the breath of the task at hand.

OCHA: also coming out of the Principals meeting, was the need to limit the number of new processes. Secondly, we need to keep in mind that we are facing an odd global environment were we have new perspectives that have more representation in major donor governments.

What is missing from all these discussions is how we present our success, our results; whether it may be on El Nino or in Costing. Lastly, we must not forget the changes that will occur at the Principals level over the near future, the aim is to focus on the ground beyond the administrative and bureaucratic components that may change over time.

CCs: Agree that results at field level is the priority and what is needed and the most. Summarizing the discussion, the TT should aim for a small number of scenarios, 2-4 countries, where we can mount inter-agency support missions and capture the results on implementing the new way of working. This simple approach around three-four countries and common terms of reference for joint support mission could be presented to the UN/WB partnership who in discussions have expressed interest for the same and indicated that they may have resources for enabling support such as these.

UNICEF: In addition to our own missions, we should also aim to maximise other upcoming missions. How does the TT aim to get organised around these aspects in a systematic manner? There is some work done by the CIC as the Secretariat for the HDAG group in NY, who are documenting some of these activities.

CCs: The support from the HDAG is welcome, but hover over the technical level. The HDAG has been presented as an informal group that would invariably require the support of the IASC and its mandated task teams. **OCHA** concurred, by saying that in addition, these various groups also happen sometimes above the technical level.

WHO: all agencies present are also not represented in the HDAG and it becomes a bit difficult to follow what it is and how it adds and complements the work of the UNWGT and the TT and other initiatives. While we do these missions concurrently, it doesn't preclude agencies to leverage those opportunities to further their own agency specific processes. The protracted emergency framework at WHO; the roll of the country road maps at WFP; the MYP at OCHA; UNDP risk informed programming, etc.

UNDP +OCHA + FAO + UNICEF: We should also look at our relationship with the WBG for more than financing. The TT can serve as a brain trust, or support mechanism to making sure that the proposals submitted to the WB that are funding the new way of working reflect the elements that we are all discussing such as better risk informed planning, and context analysis, common understanding of what risk means, given that they are just now opening up their frameworks and facilities to these new operational contexts.

ACTION: co-chairs to re-circulate comments from OCHA, FAO, and UNICEF on the plan of Action to the Group

ACTION: agencies to go through PoA from the HDN TT perspective and highlight a handful of activities that need to be done in the next 12 months. The activities that gain consensus for prioritization will form the basis of the HDN TT workplan in addition to the items already present in it.

ACTION: co-chairs to feedback IASC perspective on the PoA specifically as it relates to ongoing activities within Agencies, upcoming events related to HDN, and the need to further refine and clarify the Peace elements of the new way of working.

ACTION: co-chairs to explore how to best systematically represent the collective voice and perspective of the HDN TT into the WGT.

ACTION: co-chairs to circulate info on the initiatives of the HDAG/CIC

ACTION: co-chairs to convey the discussions of the TT related to the ENSO SOPs and the Blueprint for Action, putting them in context of the typologies and the bigger picture that the new way of working entails

Agenda Item 4: Tour de Table on lead agencies

A brief discussion was also held around the progress made by lead agencies on the Workplan. Further discussions will be held in bilateral meetings between the co-chairs and individual agencies to move workstreams ahead, in addition to mapping agency workstreams related to HDN.

- 1.1 **Lead Ignacio/Romano:** OCHA: *what we have so far are tips to develop multi- year planning, but still requires further internal conversation in-house*
- 1.2 **Lead Jahal UNDP:** *the Early Recover Cluster is working on furthering the work on the typologies presenting in the retreat and is working on adapting them with some additional language that was put on hold before WHS. They will work closely with WHO and IOM as the document develops*
- 1.3 **Lead HDN TT Co-chairs:** *completed: but further retreats may be proposed.*
- 1.4 **Lead HD TT Co-chairs:** *living document, updated with conversation from the workshop and additional input from agencies since then. WHO in preliminary discussions with OCHA to overlay the mapping with financial perspectives.*
- 2.1 **Lead OCHA/ Co-chairs:** *OCHA is planning a workshop in Dakar which will have elements of learning from field practitioners, this workshop can feed into this workstream. And can be combined with 2.2 over the next year. As well as the pilots that TT is working on; May need to be changed to something more ad hoc.*

A brief conversation was held on the objective and composition of the HDAG, who clearly have overlapping workstreams. In the spirit of gaining coherence and limiting duplication the HDN TT might be well served to connect with this group. In addition, the voices of NGOs who are instrumental to the implementation of the new way of working will need to be represented somehow.

- 2.3 **Lead OCHA:** *work is ongoing. A complete matrix of pilots and countries of opportunities was developed based on the round table discussion held in NYC. OCHA inserted some additional changes to the matrix a few weeks ago.*
- 3.1 **Lead FAO:** *was aimed as a quick win – this workstream is still underway and will integrate the work done ahead of the workshop*

3.2 **Lead WHO:** *will merge the work on typologies, the mapping of analysis and planning tools and an analysis of timelines to develop a common tip sheet to guide inter-agency and individual field missions.*

Output 4: *As discussed these workstreams will be put on hold until learning is developed.*

ACTION: OCHA to facilitate invitation to Dakar workshop and connect co-chairs with organizers to explore synergies.