

## Summary Note - 5th Grand Bargain Meeting (28 June, 2016 – NY)

On 28 June, the 5<sup>th</sup> Grand Bargain (GB) Sherpa meeting, which was co-chaired by Sweden and ICRC, was held in New York on the margins of ECOSOC. In addition to the original Sherpa group, new donors and aid organisations<sup>1</sup> that have endorsed the “*Grand Bargain - A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need*” were invited as observers. The objectives of this 5<sup>th</sup> GB Sherpa meeting were to:

- Take stock of the GB post-World Humanitarian Summit (WHS);
- Prepare the ground for the next steps and ensure continued momentum around commitments, including follow-up options and agreement on most suitable mechanism; and
- Prepare for the September GB meeting in Germany, to be hosted by Germany and ICVA.

### Key Messages by Kristalina Georgieva

The Vice-President of the European Commission and Co-chair of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing (HLP), Kristalina Georgieva, addressed the meeting by video link. She highlighted three key points: (1) It is remarkable as to how we manage - as group - a decision-making environment, not only in terms of achievements, but also by being open to others. It is hugely important to retain this sense of an open and inclusive community and hopefully by the next meeting GB in September, we will have a bigger, even more inclusive group. (2) The need to be pragmatic and define a baseline from which we can measure both individual and collective commitments. (3) The need to demonstrate progress by September and to ensure that we measure the right things and not what is easy to measure. In this respect, it would be good to bring on board “*who do not have a horse in the race*”. Furthermore, she highlighted that the EU is embarking on a revision of its financial regulations, to make them more ‘simple’. In addition, the EU is looking at ‘digital identify’ initiatives, and in view of the migration summit that will take place in September, focus should be placed on children in protracted crises. In concluding, she reiterated that obtaining clarity on individual commitments would be critical for the GB to take off.

### Implementation of the GB – ‘*tour de table*’

The Chair invited all participants to briefly explain their priority action area on implementing the Grand Bargain, and why they felt this specific area was important. He also invited comments on any challenges organizations may have faced in implementing the Grand Bargain so far. The table below indicates what participants indicated as a priority/focus area for them.

| Priority Area            | Organization                   | Comment   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Monitoring and reporting | DFID                           | DFID: want to see behavior shifts as a result of this work.   |
| Simplified reporting     | ICVA, EC, Germany, US, Norway, | EC: modification of financial regulation and other measures aimed at simplifying reporting, multi-year funding as well as cash and support to first responders. |

<sup>1</sup> New donors and aid organisations that have endorsed the GB and were invited to the GB meeting on 28 June: Five donors, namely Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy and Luxembourg; and nine NGOs: CARE, IRC, Syria Relief, Relief International, Mercy Corps, World Vision, CRS, Global Communities and Norwegian Refugee Council.

## Summary Note - 5th Grand Bargain Meeting (28 June, 2016 – NY)

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | Estonia   |  |
| <b>Hum/dev nexus</b>                                 | WB, Turkey, WFP, UNDP, Sweden, Japan, Denmark, Norway, WVI, Estonia | <p><b>WB:</b> focused on prevention and preparedness as well as financing within the hum/dev nexus. Open to fund humanitarian actors in some situations and working to set up a global crisis response platform.</p> <p><b>WFP:</b> ongoing work with WB on linking hum/dev and cash programming through shock-responsive social protection systems.</p> <p><b>Sweden:</b> want to add peacebuilding and respecting principled hum action to get to a more holistic perspective.</p> <p><b>Norway:</b> developing a holistic strategy for fragile situations, exploring ways of incentivizing the ‘new way of working’ among UN agencies in protracted crisis. Education in crisis and emergencies a priority area.</p> <p><b>WVI:</b> policy change to allow up to 20% of development funds to be used for preparedness and response.</p> |
| <b>Needs assessment</b>                              | UNFPA, OCHA, US, UK   | <p><b>UNFPA:</b> also want to track resources flows to activities that support girls and womens’ organizations. Cash assistance, economic identity for women linked in as well.</p> <p><b>WHO:</b> joint needs assessment important.</p> <p><b>OCHA:</b> to support HCTs and HCs to transform credibility and objectivity so needs assessment acts as a catalyst for all stages of the humanitarian response.</p>  |
| <b>Harmonized partner assessments and agreements</b> | UNHCR, ICVA   | <b>UNHCR:</b> working with UNICEF/WFP on this activity, also recognize there is tough work ahead on harmonizing cost structures.   |
| <b>Strengthening local and national capacity</b>     | FAO, UNFPA, Switzerland, IFRC, Australia                            | <b>FAO:</b> working to strengthen local and national capacity in 45 countries by 2017. Have embedded the GB in the FAO global medium-term plan.  |
| <b>Transparency and accountability</b>               | UNFPA, InterAction, Bulgaria, Netherlands, SCHR, Belgium, IRC, UK   | <b>IRC:</b> implement data tools to track progress, including cost efficiency measures, and share both the data and the tools publicly.  |
| <b>Multi-year planning and funding</b>               | Luxembourg, EC, IOM, Germany, Belgium, Canada, UK                   | <p><b>Lux:</b> increase share of multi-annual commitments from current level of 49.5% to 60% by 2020.</p> <p><b>EC:</b> modification of financial regulation and other measures aimed at simplifying reporting, multi-year funding as well as cash and support to first responders.</p> <p><b>Belgium:</b> just revised multi-year funding rules to allow for 5-year commitments.</p>  |

## Summary Note - 5th Grand Bargain Meeting (28 June, 2016 – NY)

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Reducing earmarking</b>                                   | <p>Luxembourg, Sweden</p> <p>US – this is a challenging area</p>   | <p><b>Lux:</b> increase share of unearmarked and softly earmarked funding from current level of 19.3% to 40% by 2020.</p>  |
| <b>Cash</b>  | <p>UNRWA, UNICEF, EC, SCHR, Germany, Belgium, Norway, WVI, IRC, MercyCorps</p>   | <p><b>UNRWA:</b> currently 50% is cash based response, and looking to increase.</p> <p><b>UNICEF:</b> collaborating with WFP/UNHCR on cash.</p> <p><b>EC:</b> committed to 20% or more by 2020 via multipurpose cash assistance.</p> <p><b>WVI:</b> committed to 50% by 2020 via multi-purpose cash transfers.</p> <p><b>IRC:</b> Go from current 6% to 25% and gather more evidence to scale cash programming.</p> <p><b>Mercy Corps:</b> by 2018 25% of all humanitarian assistance in cash programming. need to scale “digital identity” to compliment cash programming</p>   |
| <b>Channel more funding to local and national responders</b> | <p>UNICEF, Switzerland, Australia, WFP, ECHO, Netherlands, SCHR, IOM, Sweden, Belgium, Norway, CRS</p> <p>Challenging area for progress for: US, Canada, NRC</p> | <p><b>UNICEF:</b> aim to channel 30% to local and national responders by 2018 – see cash as a potential modality to drive this.</p> <p><b>Switzerland:</b> Systematic use of pooled funds, innovative tools, investment funds, insurance linked funds, etc.</p> <p><b>Australia/Norway:</b> look at our policy approach to CBPFs and how CBPFs can become even more effective instruments in supporting local response</p> <p><b>WFP:</b> In addition to supporting NGO access to CBPFs, Local response is best when local commercial sector works – will invest in supply chains to expend in local markets and local private sector support (retail, transport, etc).</p> <p><b>EC:</b> modification of financial regulation and other measured aimed at simplifying reporting, multi-year funding as well as cash and support to first responders.</p> <p><b>US/Canada:</b> will pilot funding through CBPFs to support national NGOs</p> <p><b>NRC:</b> dealing with localization properly – risk sharing, risk management, and minimizing the risk of diversion. We need to talk more about risk in the GB process.</p> <p><b>CRS:</b> Partnership, and demonstrating the impact of partnership between local and international responders to improve quality of response</p> |
| <b>Participation Revolution</b>                              | <p>ICRC, SCHR, IOM</p>   | <p><b>ICRC:</b> want to do more internally in this area to improve feedback loop with people beyond the design phase of a project.</p>   |

## Summary Note - 5th Grand Bargain Meeting (28 June, 2016 – NY)

---

### Grand Bargain Follow-up Issues

The second part of the meeting focused on: what needs to happen between now and the next GB meeting scheduled for September; how GB ‘success would look like’; GB follow-up, monitoring and reporting; as well as the issue of continued support from the Secretariat. When and how to get to roll-out of the GB at the field and to measure impact was repeatedly raised. Two distinct views came out in the conversation: a set of participants who felt their energy should focus on inculcating the necessary policy and other changes inside their own institutions, and recognizing this process would take significant time and effort. And a second set, who were already eager to go beyond making their own internal changes and felt they had bandwidth to take forward a few collective field level GB pilots. There was tension between those who wanted a clear baseline for tracking GB progress on an aggregate or individual level, and those who felt any additional heavy process would be an unwelcome or ineffective way to ensure progress.

While there was general agreement that the GB Sherpas are a group of volunteers, all ready to work as peers, committed to change as outlined in the 51 commitments across the ten GB work-streams, the group had very different perspectives on the way forward. The discussion ranged between proposals for establishing ‘work-plans’ pertaining to the ten GB work-streams in preparation for the next GB meeting in September – a process that was considered by some as rather ‘heavy’ and ‘not realistic’ given the timeline -; proposals that suggested to look at what ‘GB success’ would look like, possibly determining five to six outcomes that could be tabled at the next GB; and proposals that were considered to be ‘lighter’, including reviewing progress by individual entities and other groups and agree on the way forward at the September meeting on this basis.

In regard to the GB monitoring and follow-up, reference was made to the guiding principles outlined in the World Bank/Sweden co-led options’ note compiled in early May, as well as the ‘thought-paper’ on the GB monitoring mechanism, circulated by the USA prior to the meeting. While there seemed to be consensus that the group would need to keep the momentum and strike a balance between being ‘practical’ and being ‘ambitious’, very different perspectives on the way forward prevailed. On the more practical side, recognizing that secretarial support would still be needed, in the interim, the OCHA staff assigned to the HLP Secretariat will continue to work on GB issues and assist Germany and ICVA in the preparations for the September meeting.

### Wrap-up and Next Steps

Against this backdrop, consensus was reached on the way forward leading to the GB meeting in September as follows: Germany and ICVA would host the next GB meeting, to be held on 6 September 2016 in Bonn, Germany; in preparation for said meeting, the co-hosts would work on an ‘options’ paper’ for the September discussion, which would include the following elements: tracking of individual commitments; defining which of those commitments would need to be addressed collectively and determine the status of progress; GB monitoring options; space/dialogue/forum needed for future GB deliberations; GB inclusiveness; and timelines on the way forward. In this regard, Germany/ICVA will reach out to the GB Sherpas and co-champions of the 10 work-streams in order to solicit their respective inputs. Said ‘options’ paper’ would then be shared with all GB Sherpas in due advance of the September 6, 2016 meeting in Bonn/Germany.

# Summary Note - 5th Grand Bargain Meeting (28 June, 2016 – NY)

## Annex I - Agenda – Fifth Grand Bargain Sherpa Meeting

Tuesday, 28 June 2016

*UN Secretariat Main Building, 1st Avenue, New York - Room 2726&2727 (27<sup>th</sup> floor)*

**Chaired by Sweden & International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)**

### **Objectives:**

- **To take stock of the Grand Bargain post-World Humanitarian Summit (WHS);**
- **To prepare the ground for the next steps and ensure continued momentum around commitments, including follow-up options and agreement on most suitable mechanism**
- **To prepare for the September meeting (to be hosted by Germany in Berlin)**

**15:00-15:15 (15 min) Coffee/Tea**

**15:15-15:30 (15 min) Opening**

*Chair to: (1) outline objectives and expectations of the day; (2) set the tone for the way forward in order to ensure that the Grand Bargain delivers on its collective and individual commitments.*

**15:30-15:45 (15 min) Key Messages by Kristalina Georgieva (Video link)**

**15:45-16:45 (60 min) Implementation of Grand Bargain Commitments**

*Sherpas to share individual agency/donor plans to implement the Grand Bargain commitments.*

**16:45-18:30 (105 min) Grand Bargain Follow-up Issues**

*Sherpas to examine the Grand Bargain follow-up issues (and potentially others that have come to light during the discussion on taking stock).*

*By the end of this session, the Sherpa group will have discussed the following issues with a view of reaching an agreement on the way forward (leading up to decisions to be taken in the September meeting):*

- *A robust implementation and roll-out plan of the Grand Bargain commitments;*
- *The most suitable Grand Bargain follow-up mechanism for monitoring (c.f. options mapped out in the discussion paper of 2 May 2016 prepared by the World Bank/Sweden-led working group);*
- *A shared understanding of the issues and solutions pertaining to roles, responsibilities and staffing of a future temporary or ad hoc ‘Grand Bargain Secretariat’; and*
- *How to ensure inclusiveness in regard to the ‘Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need’.*

**18:30-19:00 (30 min) Wrap-up of the day and next steps**

*Sherpas to agree on action points and timelines in regard to the follow-up issues, including the topics to be tabled at the September meeting, setting the date for this meeting and handing over the chairmanship.*