IASC Task Team on The Humanitarian Development Nexus (HDN TT)

with a focus on protracted emergencies

**Summary Record and Action Points**

19th December 2017: 15.30-17.30

Venue: Conf, Room d-610, PdN

**In Geneva**: WHO, IASC, UNDP, FAO, WB Group, UNICEF, IOM

**On the phone**: OHCHR, ICVA, OCHA, UNDP

**Co-chairs:** UNDP and WHO

**Agenda Item 1: Welcome and adoption of Agenda**

**Agenda Item 2: Summary Record and Action Points**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP):** With no additional comments noted during the discussion, the summary record was approved. The co-chairs noted that one pending action remained since the last meeting; OCHA sharing the initial draft of Collective Outcomes.

**Agenda Item 3: Debrief from Entebbe Workshops**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, WHO):** in Entebbe, Uganda, colleagues from across the UN, NGO, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement gathered during a peer-to-peer support workshop to share and learn from each other’s hands-on experience in advancing collaboration across humanitarian & development action. This workshop, organized by the HDN TT, brought together field colleagues from Uganda, Ethiopia, Chad, Mali, Cameroon and Sudan. The agenda featured opportunities to deep-dive on thematic elements of the humanitarian development nexus incl. analysis, planning/programming and coordination for collective outcomes. Participants also had the opportunity to present country settings where context-specific lessons, challenges, and opportunities were highlighted and discussed. The workshop included co-facilitation by TT members and presentations by EOSG providing global level policy perspectives situating these discussions within broader UN-specific reform tracks.

**Discussion: ICVA:** reported that there was general satisfaction with the outcome and unfolding of the peer-to-peer meeting. The workshop participants expressed interest in continuing discussions through the establishment of a community of practice. It is important to note that the NGO representation was low.

**FAO:** The workshop went very well. It gave an opportunity for field practitioners to voice their concerns and challenges but also to showcase their successes and best practices – which was the objective. What was clear is that while considerable effort is being made in various contexts, field colleagues continue to struggle to adapt this policy shift in practice – particularly around articulating collective outcomes- which is at the centre of the nexus.

**WFP:** Upon request from the participants of the peer-to-peer network, there was considerable interest in continuing the discussions in Entebbe. While it was clear that country experiences differed, participants found it useful to learn from others and see what tools, actions, and manoeuvres could be imported into their own operations. The community of practice will be supported by the IASC HDN TT secretariat.

**WHO:** What will be the process of getting new members into the community of practice network.

**WFP:** The criteria of inclusion will be based on whether prospective members are actually practicing and taking concrete steps to strengthen the nexus in their operations. The process will begin with a request to the co-chairs which will be channelled to the community of practice network secretariat.

**UNHCR:** it is important that we make a distinction between practitioners and interested parties – who might have something to contribute without explicitly performing day to day tasks.

**IOM:** it will be useful to have a standard set of questions regarding how, where, and to what extent they are involved in implementing the nexus. The other reality is that people change positions and locations, it will be important that the platform in whatever shape it takes has the potential to track different profiles.

**ICVA:** can propose to undertake a selection campaign within the membership of the consortium to identify non UN members that could benefit from being part of the practice network.

**IFRC:** agree with ICVA – learning form the localization/grand bargain experience, it is important that we engage with the right local actors. IFRC has produced a vetting tool that may be useful to manage the size of the group.

 **WHO:** how do you plan on making the platform dynamic and interactive?

**WFP:** In Entebbe, in collaboration with the participants we had agreed to come up with an agenda and/or list of interesting topics for 2018 related NWoW and HDN.

**ICVA:** It would be useful to map out all the events related to the nexus: March 20th annual conference of ICVA. The theme will “Navigating the Nexus: and NGO perspective”. May 31st – issue of better engagement with NGOs within the Steering Committees.

**OCHA:** Support ICVA comments. OCHA wants to note that there is a fine line between guiding the community of practice and providing field support – something that was agreed that the TT would not do. The other issue is about gaining clarity on how the outputs and learning of the Community of Practice can feed into the work of the Steering Committee.

**Co-chairs:** as reflected in the workplan approved by the working group, the TT has an activity on providing guidance and technical support to field colleagues, at the same time it is also undertaken an activity related to learning and best practice. It is within the remint of these two activities in the workplan that the Community of Practice as well as the peer-to-peer workshop was created.

 **UNHCR:** where does the Statement of Intent stand?

**Co-chairs**: as agreed in the last TT meeting the SoI has been submitted to the WG. The comments and caveats that were highlighted were annexed to the SoI for further information to the WG. However, no changes were made to the Statement itself beyond the co-chairs’ amendments following the WG consultations on matters in which consensus was reached.

**WHO**: the steering committee meeting happened over two months ago. Do any other agencies have a sense of what was discussed and agreed, as there has been no read out from the meeting.

**UNDP**: does not have any information on what was discussed, but going forward in 2018 will endeavour to share the read-outs.

**Agenda Item 4: Key Messages on HDN**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP):** This activity stems from the joint plan of action held by the IASC HDN TT and the UNDG Results Group SD/SP (carrying the portfolio of the former WG on Transitions). This document was initially drafted by the co-chairs’ group and supported by their respective secretariats and has been refined through an earlier consultations as well as through two rounds of commenting in the IASC HDN TT. The main substance of these messages has also been triangulated with field practitioners working on advancing coherent cross-pillar collaboration. These Key Messages are drafted with the view of promoting a risk-tolerant culture and establishing a common language and vision. That is, once endorsed by senior leadership and disseminated widely, the Key Messages will send a clear and collective message that field colleagues can, and should, innovate to find new solutions to traditional siloes and bottlenecks. They also provide the broad parameters, scope, and requirements of what is needed to more coherently meet and reduce needs and vulnerabilities while addressing root causes. As such, they have been pitched at a global level and kept succinct so that they can be adapted as appropriate to context.

**Discussion: UNHCR:** expressed reservations that agency and corporate endorsed positions will be difficult to have by the requested deadline.

**OCHA:** while OCHA understands that this process has being going on for a while there remains a fundamental issue to which the solution is not readily available: The issue as it stands is that the key messages conflate the New Way of Working with the Humanitarian Development Nexus – linked with the Sustaining Peace. OCHA might have to be opposed to the key messages.

**ICVA:** understand that the humanitarian principles are a given, but it should be made more explicit in these discussion. The Key messages are a bit weak in the area of how this links with the prevention agenda and sustaining peace resolutions.

**OHCHR:** replying to OCHA; having read the minutes of the Steering Committee – the issue of the peace element is very much in the current thinking of that forum: So much so that PBSO is included in the forum and they want to include DPA – this might point to the fact that the Principals themselves have moved away from the restrictive definition in old SG reports (over a year ago), and have adopted a more recent SG formulation of humanitarian, development and peace being three sides of the same triangle.

**IOM:** did this distinction come out in Entebbe – while these discussions are happening in the NY/GVA level it is always important to have a reality check in terms of whether these discussions resonate with actors on the ground putting this in practice.

**Co-**chairs: the conclusion there was that whether you like it or not these three dimensions blur together. To OHCHR’s point – it is very clear that the parameters have evolved. That said, we do still require additional language to ring fence the humanitarian principles. Peace in/peace out is a semantic discussion.

**UNHCR:** proposal for the Key messages to reflect current language contained in the most recent report of the SG on sustaining peace which might help on what is essentially a semantics issue. In this report, agreed language is as follows: “pursuing Collective Outcomes across the humanitarian development nexus *and its link to peace”*.

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION**: working-level input for the key messages to be sent by Friday |

**Agenda Item 4: Progress Report [long and short form]**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, WHO):** As TTs go, the HDN TT has produced a substantial number of products and events that we can all be proud of. The two progress reports that were shared ahead of the meeting with the view of highlighting these achievements. Two documents were shared for comments: the first is a short progress report developed as part of yearly routine IASC subsidiary body reporting and covers activities performed and/or undertaken by the TT in 2017. The second on the other hand is a longer, more detailed version of the progress report dating back to the inception of the TT. This document was requested by the WG following the Ad Hoc meeting on the Task Team.

**Discussion: UNHCR:** The development of Snapshots can be considered one of the more tangible products that the TT produced last year. The only reservation UNHCR has going forward with this project is that the snapshots aim to incorporate an interagency perspective, that goes beyond what the peers in the network provide. In terms of field support, the Mali model was the right way to get field request down to the technical capacity that resides in the TT.

**IOM:** The TT should explore means by which the TT can provide feedback to the requests. In the Mali example the timelines went beyond what IOM is prepared to provide, it would be useful to know as requests come how flexible the request is- whether handoff can be built in for example (three agencies over three months).

**UNDP:** on the issues of capacities, UNDP has been discussing internally on how to bolster a roster of deployable capacities for country office as and when requested on the NWOW and on general issues around HDN – this will be worked on actively in 2018. Going forward it will be useful for the TT to decide on what constitutes deployable capacity and what sort of profile you are looking for. In addition, some of the standby rosters of NGOs are gearing up for having an HDN advisors. There is a wider resource out there that goes beyond agency capacities.

On the key messages – on the OCHA point on the nexus – we agree that it is difficult to talk about the nexus without talking about peace. How we apply the nexus should depend on the context.

**WFP:** The issue of profiles also came up in Entebbe. The peers acknowledge, looking around the room, that the profiles of those considered HDN advisors in RCO/HCT came from very different background and varied profiles. Discussions are still preliminary, but the peers explored potential generating generic terms of reference for an HDN advisor.

**Agenda Item 5: Grand Bargain Update**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP):** Since the last TT meeting there have been a few Grand Bargain related meetings that have generated some degree of confusion, particular vis a vis the relationship between GB WS 10 and the HDN TT. Since then, the co-chairs have received queries from TT members requesting clarification. To that end, UNDP was invited to present the latest developments in the grand bargain workstream and more generally in the grand bargain facilitation group meeting and what that might entail for the HDN TT.

**Discussion: UNDP:** UNDP and Denmark co-convene the grand bargain workstream 10 on the humanitarian development nexus. Since July there has been quite some turbulence around the purpose and scope of the workstream. To begin, it is important to note that WS 10 was never meant to be a tangible workstream. It was acknowledge that it would be different in nature than the other workstreams. Through those discussions a few recommendations were made, one of which was to have various WS go directly to the HDN TT given the overlap in mandate and workstreams. Given some misgivings from other actors, a decision was made to take a step back and reassess its role, in the meantime the Grand Bargain remains unchanged.

**WFP:** there are some similarities with how the localization workstream worked in parallel with the IASC HFTT. The TT will do well to learn about how best to create complementarity learning from them. What also remains to be clarified is the internal dynamic between WS10 in relation to the other 9 workstreams

**IFRC:** The key lessons from the localization/HF TT collaboration were agreeing on the outset on approval and endorsement procedures.

**IOM:** The TT should look beyond workstream 10; there are other grand bargain workstreams that will benefit from a strong linkage with the HDN TT, specifically localization and participation revolution.

**UNDP:** UNDP would argue that it touches on almost all of them. Multi-year financing, needs assessment etc

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION**: UNDP and IFRC to meet and discuss proposed modality for HDN TT relationship with GB WS 10 and debrief TT at next meeting. |

**Agenda Item 6: Next Steps**

**Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP):** This discussion centres around the forward-looking portion of the progress report which outlines potential activities that the TT should priorities for 2018.

**OCHA:** As was announced in previous meetings, after offering to hold the pen on a collective paper on COs, OCHA has produced a first draft which is still being internally tweaked based on the outcomes of the Entebbe workshops and the missions that have taken place since then. What remains to be discussed is the relationship between OCHA’s work and the TT, there has been no progress.

**UNDP:** UNDP has some resources to support a broader discussion on the COs. UNDP is aware of the draft paper OCHA has developed, and a separate bilateral has been held with them. There was general agreement that there is a need to widen participation and input into that process (including UN and non-UN partners). This process is still in the early stages.

**WHO:** this bilateral process between UNDP and OCHA is timely given that WHO has also set aside some resources to engage a consultant to work on collective outcomes as a contribution to the IASC HDN TT workplan. This work involved a desk review of major documents discussing collective outcomes as well as work on trying to articulate a wireframe of how COs might look like. It will focus on three sectors.

 **Discussion:**

 **Co-chairs:** Any other agency specific activities that might fit into the Workplan?

**UNDP:** Plans are currently underway to convene similar multi-stakeholder workshops as was held in Entebbe: one focusing on western Africa; and the other in the Middle East or Asia. Dates have not be confirmed first – they will be very similar to the Entebbe format.

**UNHCR:** Propose that the TT explore and potentially convene a workshop on joint analysis. It was by far the one of the key points of convergence among peers. Collaboration could be explored with OCHA/ECHO co-conveners of the needs assessment workstream through their HDN sub-workstream. This work could also include work that DOCO, and the IM working group is working on.

|  |
| --- |
| **ACTION**: UNDP and IFRC to meet and discuss proposed modality for HDN TT relationship with GB WS 10 and debrief TT at next meeting.**ACTION**: UNDP to provide update on concrete dates as and when they become available on the next multi-stakeholder meeting. |