

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

WITH A FOCUS ON PROTRACTED EMERGENCIES

Summary Record and Action Points

23RD MAY 2017: 15.30 – 17.30

VENUE: PALAIS DES NATIONS, ERCC ROOM

In Geneva: FAO, [xxx](#), UNDP, IOM, OCHA, OHCHR, UNHCR, WHO, WB

On the phone: InterAction, UNICEF, ICVA, OCHA, and UNDP

Co-chairs: UNDP and WHO

Agenda Item 1: Approval of Summary Report from 7th Meeting: No comments.

Agenda Item 2: Debrief IASC Working Meeting held in Rome

Introduction (Co-chairs): At the last IASC Working Group meeting held in Rome, agenda number 6 was on the intersection between the New Way of Working and the Sustaining Peace Agenda. Bruno UNDP, on behalf of the HDN TT, helped to demystify the NWOW, noting the paradigm shift this represents for how we work. After a brief discussion, it was made clear that more time was needed for a comprehensive and in-depth discussion. The WG agreed to schedule an ad-hoc IASC WG meeting dedicated to the NWOW and the challenges at field, HQ and capital levels to provide the TT with concrete guidance on their time-bound tasks.

In preparation for this meeting, the WG requested the TT to review the background paper and increase the clarity of their request, as well as reach out to RC/HCs with the objective of clarifying gaps and required guidance. It should also be noted that these discussions were held against the backdrop of the IASC needing to reform its own working methods. Specifically, the “WG sought more agile, nimble, purpose-driven and time-bound work in support of IASC priorities by effective IASC TT and subsidiary bodies”, overseen by and accountable to the IASC. Likewise the Principals have also requested ICVA to provide a forward looking and radical rethink of the IASC based on the WG discussion.

OCHA: In the lead up to the Ad-hoc WG meeting, it will be important to understand the sorts of discussions coming out of the HC retreat currently being held in Monteux. It will be interesting to triangulate the similarities between those conversations in the retreat and the outcome of the RC/HC survey.

UNDP: The Grand Bargain recently held a pre-meeting to the upcoming June 20th Sherpas meeting in Geneva. It was raised that there was a need to clarify the linkages between the IASC’s work and the work stream 10 of the GB. A recent study by GPPI highlighted additional opportunities to limit duplication.

InterAction: At the WG, the DERC noted whether the NWOW should be a guiding question for the IASC, given the multitude of mechanisms tackling the issue and given the fact that NWOW was a major outcome of the WHS. The rationale of her question was

based on the fact that the IASC is a policy setting mechanism, whereas the NWOW does not necessarily need policy and guidance at this point.

UNHCR: point of clarification. The survey that was sent out to the RC/HC – was it also sent out to countries with an RC, and if not, would it be possible to do so? Secondly, how do the country operations who received the survey line up with the pilot countries being discussed by some agencies.

Co-chair: As is reflected in the Summary Report of the IASC WG, the mandate the TT was given was to approach field leadership in country operations with RC/HC only – about 28. However, the co-chairs have received spontaneous requests from RCs and therefore this has naturally expanded to scope of the survey in line with UNCHR point.

WHO: All previous interventions highlight the proliferation of processes and groups out there, from the IASC, to EDG, to EOSG, to Grand Bargain. All of these overlap and duplicate in many ways. **One of the roles that this TT can propose to the WG is that the TT serves as a forum where these workstreams can be consolidated. The TT can serve as a collective space.**

IOM: Agrees with WHO. In an attempt to map where all the HDN related groups are, it is clear that some coherence needs to be brought to the fore. Linked to that, the IASC TT needs to be very clear in their value added. While the TT does not have all the different constituencies [there are no development actors for example], **there is a clear role for the TT to play, in learning, mission support, and bringing in NGO voices to the discussion.**

UNDP: proposal: since the WG is going to hold an ad-hoc meeting dedicated solely to this topic would it be possible to invite some other stakeholders [non-IASC] to the meeting to bring in their perspective.

Co-chair (UNDP): this might be outside the remit of the TT, but the co-chairs will certainly relay the message to the IASC Secretariat

OCHA: While it is true that by definition the IASC does not have representation with the development structure of the UN, great strides have been made in bridging that divide at the technical level. The joint IASC HDN TT and the UN WG on Transitions [which has been succeeded by the UNDG WG on Sustaining Peace and Sustainable Development] joint plan of action, coming out of the joint workshop held in October last year is a step in the right direction.

InterAction: That the IASC has no development participation is a misconception. Many of the agencies sitting around the table are double hatted – we must make an effort to bring our internal counterparts to these discussions. In addition, many NGOs in the InterAction consortium are development focused and some even peacebuilding focus. **The IASC has the required diversity. InterAction could play a role in convening the constituencies to join these discussions.**

ACTION: Co-chairs to explore mechanisms to bring NGO participation (development and peacebuilding) into the TT, in collaboration with InterAction.

Agenda Item 3: Debrief on Sudan joint IASC TT-UNDG and cluster coordination inter-agency mission

Introduction (UNCHR/OCHA/UNDP): The mission was composed of three constituencies made up of the UN WG on Transitions, The IASC HDN TT and the Global Cluster Coordinators Group. Some preliminary findings are in line with some of the thinking that the TT and the WGT have begun around Typologies and context. In Sudan you have a mix of conflict, displacement, statelessness, sudden onset, slow onset and outbreaks – it was certainly a good case study. The team approached the mission in three phases 1) jointed up analysis; 2) jointed up planning and programming –linked to the definition of collective outcomes; 3) strengthening coordination and leadership. At the request of the RC/HC the team did not look into financing given another finance specific mission that was to follow shortly after the joint mission had ended.

What was interesting it that both those that the team interviewed and in some cases the team members themselves were not clear on what concretely is a collective outcome. In this regard, the TT has a role to play in bringing partners together to define what these outcomes should look like at what level, etc. The HDN TT Toolkit is a step in the right direction. A drawback of the mission was its size and its scope. The fact that two distinct missions, one of NWOW, the other on coordination was merged, made the mission slightly more complicated. All agreed that “form should follow function” in this sense, similar mission might benefit by being sequenced, starting from the NWOW mission (and definition of collective outcomes), then ensuring the coordination structure is fit to deliver on those outcomes, and then finally a review to ensure predictable and results driven financing.

There are three areas that this TT can help clarify and build on from the mission 1) the issue around coordination around collective outcomes and what is the role of the government in this; 2) once you have established your collective outcome – how do you implement it given that the collective outcome may have different vulnerable population and geographical areas; 3) the question of accountability – where is the clear framework to track and monitor results.

InterAction: The mission sounds like it came up with very interesting findings and these are the sorts of missions and field support that NGO colleagues would want to be part of if there are future missions planned- **and there should be. In addition to other missions, there are also a few missions out there since November that look at pieces of the HDN, the TT should engage in consolidating and digesting this information.**

UNDP: Aside from the planning and processes that need to be aligned to move forward the NWOW, what was the team’s sense of the mindset and attitudes of field colleagues around the NWOW?

OCHA: colleagues were welcoming of the conversation and the NWOW as long as it led to more effective and more efficient joint action. The system has become slower and heavier over time, the NWOW was therefore welcomed. The consensus was unanimously around lighter process.

WHO: From the debriefing and the conversation we are having it is clear that the mission was useful and therefore other country teams might benefit from these

sorts of mission. **This might be an activity that we can have endorsed by the WG as a core business of the TT.**

UNHCR: Agree with WHO. The inter-agency nature of the mission increases the credibility of the approach. That is the only way we can get the buy-in from decision makers and the field level. **We fully welcome this type of mission, seen by many as the first real unpacking of the operationalization of the NWOW.**

IOM: It is interesting to hear that not everyone was on the same page on collective outcomes. How did the team go about determining those proposals for collective outcomes? Were there candidates that fell short of becoming collective outcomes? **It will be interesting to reflect on that process.**

Interaction: Still on the issue of Collective Outcomes, how did the upcoming HRP factor into the process. And in the process of defining those outcomes did you find **“negative outcomes” that were being pursued collectively?**

UNICEF: requested clarification on how the Collective Outcomes incorporated existing development initiatives being led by the government of Sudan. Particular the 15 year plan to combat drought.

OCHA: Given that the CCA and the HNO were already in place. The team decided to base the definition of the Collective Outcomes on the HRP and UNDAF objectives. In situations where these two analysis processes need further refinement, it could then be argued that collective outcomes can be defined through an ad hoc joint analysis process. In Sudan, however, the pieces were already in place.

Co-chair: it is clear that a deep dive into the meat of these collective outcomes would be very interesting. Perhaps in conjunction with the publishing of the mission report, the TT can host a dedicated meeting where these issues and processes can be discussed.

WHO: welcome the idea of a deep dive conversation on Collective Outcomes; perhaps in preparation for such a meeting, it will be important for team members to capture the process to getting to those collective outcome. **This type of information will be useful to generate generic terms of reference, something that has been discussed in past meetings of the TT. Generic ToRs would provide the predictability and replicability needed to coherently implement NWOW,** similar to the process used by simulation experts.

UNDP: The issue of Collective Outcomes also highlights how Sustaining peace can fit into them. One finding of the mission was that collective outcomes don't mean common outcomes. For example, the collective outcome around social cohesion proposed in Sudan provides an entry point for peace related organizations to engage, without forcing humanitarian actors to necessarily have programmatic input. This is what meant by comparative advantage.

ACTION: Co-chairs to organize deep dive meeting on collective outcomes based on the findings of Sudan and other missions.

[Change in Agenda order] Agenda Item 3: Debrief on Workshop on NWOW in Istanbul

Introduction (OCHA/UNDP): The workshop was in line with the general consensus that the approach to NWOW should not be too driven by guidance and tools, but based on learning from the field. The workshop brought together RC/HCs, country teams, donors, and government officials. Overall the major outcomes include: i) the need for clear messaging from high level officials; ii) peer exchange will be an important part of implementation; iii) inclusivity and diversity will also be essential to NWOW specifically around NGOs, localization, and government participation.

Other key outcomes include. The need to move away from seeing humanitarian and development as a sequence or hand-over. NWOW will require that both workstreams “sometimes overlay, dovetail, or occur in parallel” – RC/HC should be empowered to make these decisions in consultation with other partners in the ground. Localization is not something we should just talk about. Private sector should become integral to operations not only on financing but also in planning in programming. Clear messaging is needed around what is new: that is, multiyear planning, collective outcomes, comparative advantage of partners, focusing on needs, vulnerability and risk reduction. There is also need to go back and unpack the relationship between humanitarian development nexus (NWOW) and sustaining peace. Are we talking about HDP or HD? Is it HDN or a triple nexus?

ICVA: There was a clear call from participants that there is a need for a soft directive/clear messaging from HQ to give regional and country level colleagues the freedom to take risks related to implementing the NWOW. From NGOs, there was a call for more inclusion in the process. There have been many regional and global policy dialogues such as in Dakar where NGOs have been invited but greater efforts should be made to include them at national level discussions.

WHO: We have to keep a close eye on the Prevention agenda. For the most part the language coming from the EOSG relates to Prevention and Sustaining Peace and it seems the linkages to the humanitarian development a being framed within that overall context. This will be something to keep in mind when we discuss how the P fits in HDPN.

Co-chair: It came to the attention of the co-chairs that there was some confusion about the framing and linkages between the workshop and the broader efforts around the new way of working. Some participants raised concerns that the outcomes might be framed as outcomes by the IASC and UNDG, rather than the findings of two individual agencies [i.e UNDP –OCHA].

Co-chair: A key message coming out of the workshop, specifically the break out session on coordination, there are so many tools and processes out there, that there is a need to create a platform to consolidate, learning and progress as well as clear and common messaging.

InterAction: An important element will be how the imperative to protect humanitarian space and principles will fit in, particularly in situations where there is conflict. As we organize new tools we need to think about typologies. The paper that was put together by the HDAG laid out a typology of contexts. We need to take that to the next level and align it with the tools that we find, as well as types of approaches in terms of types of analysis, planning tools. This would be done broadly in relation to where each context falls in relation to the typologies.

Co-chair: fully agree on that approach, as it will build on the work that the HDN TT and collaboration with the WGT have already begun in the lead up to the joint retreat in October. The analysis paper on Typologies of response scenarios is in draft form and in the Toolkit. It builds on the HDAG paper.

UNDP: One additional outcome was on coordination as it relates to collective outcomes. There was broad agreement that form should follow function and that coordination and leadership architecture should be fit for the purpose on delivering those collectively agreed outcomes.

ACTION: Co-chairs to explore how best to take the typologies paper to the next level following InterAction comments

Agenda Item 4: Preparations for Ad-hoc Working Group

Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP): The date for the ad-hoc has not been announced yet. It was tentatively scheduled to be held on the margins of ECOSOC Humanitarian Affairs Segment (HAS), around June 19. But it now seems that it might be pushed further back to the first or fourth week of July. That said, during the WG the ad hoc was tentatively scheduled for the end of May, which urged the TT co-chairs to send out the RC/HC Survey quickly. The 'ask' from the WG was clear: the TT should clarify to the WG what it wants the WG to endorse.

In preparation for the Ad hoc meeting, the co-chairs will analyse the responses from the RC/HC Survey. While answers continue to trickle in a few trends are already visible from the responses the co-chairs have received (over 50% of the those who received the survey): 1) while most are familiar with the term, there is a varied understanding of what the core elements entail; 2) the parameters of the NWOW is not clear in relation to Sustaining Peace; 3) implementation is unequal and uneven; 4) resounding request for support – while the type of support required varies.

In terms of other preparations for the ad hoc: the co-chairs will pull together various products and papers produced for previous meetings and discussions. These include; the analysis paper on the intersection between NWOW and Sustaining Peace; the summary record of the bilateral conversations the co-chairs had with TT members; and a revised version of the decision and discussion point. This version will keep the general content of its previous iteration focusing on clear decisions the WG must make on 1) linkages with other processes such as the Grand Bargain; 2) clear messaging on the peace element (Sustaining Peace); 3) the scope of the normative work and to what purpose; 4) the parameters of potential field support.

UNHCR: It was mentioned in Istanbul that there might be a high-level side meeting on the margins of ECOSOC and the General Assembly. Obviously depending on which one occurs first UNHCR would want to see some connectedness among these various processes, with key messages being coherent and reflective of collective work being done in the TT.

UNDP: we must be careful not to get caught up in process. We must learn from the other process-heavy reforms that the humanitarian community has already come out of, such as the Transformative Agenda

InterAction: Agree with UNDP. The TT should perhaps take a proactive approach in setting the date given the critical milestones that have just been discussed. In terms of properly sequencing discussions around the NWOW when would the best time for the ad hoc WG to happen? Can the co-chairs push for a specific date? If in the end there is no meeting on the margins of ECOSOC we would still welcome an informal face-to-face meeting.

Co-Chairs: Take note of the request for the co-chairs to be more propositional around the date, while at the same time reiterating that the meeting largely rests on the agenda of the DERC.

IOM: On advocacy, IOM does not see the value added of the TT in this area. IOM rather sees the value of the TT in connecting to the field, learning, providing the sort of support seen in Sudan, and also elucidating some of the sticking points that need nuance and clarity, in line with the proposed deep dive on Collective Outcomes, drawing from the IASC's humanitarian expertise. On the positioning vis-a-vis Sustaining Peace, we should not get bogged down on semantics- we should look at the programmatic entry points.

UNICEF: the TT should focus on the tools and processes in the humanitarian system and look at where the bottle necks are that prevent them from being conversant with the need to reduce risks and vulnerabilities. The TT should also position itself as the reference point to other fora, such as the Grand Bargain and the Principals.

OCHA: There are no concrete plans for an ECOSOC side event just yet, beyond the wish from the Turkish officials at Istanbul to see some form of Member States briefing on the New Way of Working. The current plan is to review with Germany what the structure of ECOSOC HAS looks like and see where something along these lines could be.

ACTION: Co-chairs to update the content of the Tool Kit

ACTION: Co-chairs to revise workplan

ACTION: Co-chairs to produce analysis piece on the Survey results.

ACTION: Co-chairs to update the Key messages and common narrative, and explore with the IASC Secretariat whether the WG can pre-endorse the key messages ahead of the Ad-hoc

AOB:

UNDP: Based on the WGT workplan, which is in line with the joint action plan between the HDN TT and the WGT, UNDP and OCHA offered to take up one of the activities in the plan around data collection. To this end, UNDP and OCHA are working on a light methodology and questionnaire to systematize the collection of data around the NWOW. **AS the co-chairs revise the workplan ahead of the Ad hoc meeting, UNDP proposes that this activity, as a legacy of the joint plan of action, be considered an activity under the HDN TT workplan.**

ACTION: UNDP and OCHA to share methodology for comments to the TT.