

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

WITH A FOCUS ON PROTRACTED EMERGENCIES

Summary Record and Action Points

1ST MARCH 2017: 15.30 – 17.30

VENUE: PALAIS DES NATIONS,

In Geneva: IASC Secretariat, UNDP, OHCHR, WB, ICRC, OCHA, IOM, WFP, WHO, UNHCR, OCHA

On the phone: FAO, ICVA, UNICEF, UNDP, OCHA,

Co-chairs: UNDP and WHO

Agenda Item 1: Approval of Summary Report from 5th Meeting: No comments.

Agenda Item 2: Debrief on Bilateral Discussions:

Introduction (Co-chairs, WHO): The first meeting of the year of this task team has come relatively late (in March) given the holiday period. In addition, at the request of the TT, the co-chairs used the months of January and February to conduct a series of bilateral conversations with the members of the TT to get a more nuanced sense of each agencies' vision for the TT. The main outcomes of the meeting included: establishing a common understanding of the NWOW, and the NWOW vis a vis sustaining peace; the TT should focus more on implementation than discussions; systematic learning coming out of inter-agency and agency-specific missions. More details can be found in the summary report which was shared ahead of the meeting.

OCHA: around the first conclusion (create a common understanding around the New Way of Working and how sustaining peace fits into it), there is a lot that remains to be done to help people understand what NWOW is. The first priority should be to understand the NWOW and as a "non-actionable" aside work on understanding how Sustaining peace fits in.

UNDP: There has been a lack of coherence in the NWOW agenda. There is a need to clarify and agree on whether the nexus includes peace actors. Is it HD or HDP?

OCHA: QCPR resolution paragraph 24 makes a useful distinction in this regard. The paragraphs outline that the humanitarian-development nexus is distinct and separate from the development-peace nexus.

UNICEF: Agree that the separation is a sensible approach. It is important that we get HDN right, but it is also important that we clarify how the IASC will contribute to the sustaining peace and conflict prevention agenda.

IOM: conceptually these are easy distinctions to make. But in some sense they are also arbitrary. Looking at the ToRs for Sudan we quickly realize that in context such as these the distinction will dissolve. Operationally there is no missing it.

FAO: agree with UNICEF and IOM. There is a need to explore all three dimensions, as they will come to a head in discussions about addressing root causes, economic revitalization through support to livelihoods, and conflict sensitivity.

OCHA: from a context point of view the three agendas are present and cannot be ignored. The point is that the contribution of the IASC to this agenda has to be done in a practical way. The current political climate in main donor countries requires that we show success early and systematically.

UNDP: Part of output 7 in the joint IASC- UN WGT plan of action is on developing a shared narrative. This is where these clarification need to be clearly expressed. The confusion around this item will remain until all agencies clear the joint messages and joint narrative.

OHCHR: concurring with FAO, OHCHR focuses on root causes. It will be important to clearly define the conflict sensitivity; conflict prevention, human rights, and protection aspects of the HDN. We cannot leave that out, thinking that it will be done by other stakeholders.

UNICEF: [clarification of previous point] we should not be making artificial distinction, the point about separating HD from P is about method in terms of how we proceed. We need to articulately how humanitarian and development actors contribute to sustaining peace and conflict prevention – and the rights based approach is fundamental to that. However, when we work out the modalities of implementing NWOW on the field there is an imperative to come out with clarity on how we will deliver this on the ground.

Agenda Item 3: Progress Report o the IASC Working Group Draft:

Introduction (Co-chairs, UNDP): This agenda item links to the preliminary outcomes of the bilateral meetings. A draft progress report was circulated to TT members. It will also be submitted to the IASC working group. As part of the request to update the WG on the TT's progress, the TT was also asked to provide questions and areas for guidance from the working group. Especially in the context of the new DERC, this is an opportunity for the TT to make its case clearly , show the progress made so far, and get clear guidance from the WG.

OCHA: in as much as we update the WG group with this progress report we should come prepared to ask the WG on specific asks. When this group was established the movement at SG and HQ level had not occurred. We need to update ourselves (and our purpose) in line with the new high level vision. Because the TT is a subsidiary body we need the WG to clarify what they see the added value of the TT vis a vis the Principals.

OCHA: the dynamics in NY are sprawling in nature. The quick pivot of the SG towards prevention has led to a reassessment of many workstreams and architectures of the UN DG and beyond. Between that, the change in personnel at the highest levels, and the introduction of the World Bank as a major player in this sphere, the TT has to be very proactive in understanding what its value added can be.

UNHCR: There is a risk that this becomes a circular discussion where we ask the Working Group questions and they reflect does questions back to us for guidance. In terms of the shared narrative or some sort of draft document that can be shared as a background document. Secondly, how does this work mesh with the newly established IASC-UNDG steering group on HDN for the famine countries.

IASC Secretariat: the topic of the humanitarian development nexus and the new way of working is one that has picked up a lot of momentum. We are all struggling with how to keep up with the many different forums that have taken this work on and what their value is in

driving implementation at field level. In this sense, this TT conversation around a shared narrative, and the conversation around how HDN fits with the sustaining peace agenda is a timely one, as the WG (as a policy and guidance setting mechanism) begins to think about how its internal workings are designed.

Co-chair UNDP: a core drafting committee was set up to begin work on the shared narrative. We had a few difficulties in getting it down to a few pages which the co-chairs will now send around for comments. What has been expressed in this group and in the working group on transitions is the urgency that we need to get this text out.

OCHA: one comment on the progress report – Where the report outlines its focus for 2017: In addition to the emphasis on field implementation (which is important), this Task Team should also emphasize the whole body of work around guidance – reviewing policy and tools, developing at necessary guidance for operationalizing the new way of working. The policy level work to inform the field (making sure that it is in line with field learning) should be emphasized.

UNDP: building on the comments from OCHA, agree to emphasize the policy aspects of the TT's work. This work should be linked with the work being done in the UN working group on transitions.

OCHA: There is a need to map who is working on this issue outside the IASC – this can easily be done. We are receiving more and more requests from the field for guidance. A proposal may be that we focus on field missions, learn from them, and then begin to codify these experiences into guidance. We can start with the mission in South Sudan, and perhaps generate generic terms of reference that can be applied and then adapted to other countries.

Co -Chair UNDP: concur that new guidance and policy frameworks will be required. We are hearing this from both the bilateral meetings with task team members as well as in the workshop in Dakar, where a few HCs highlighted the need to adapt current emergency response guidance as they essential outline “the old way of working”.

WFP: requested more information on the SG mandated Principal's level joint IASC-UNDG steering group.

IASC Sec: Limited information: the SG has proposed a small steering committee of some of the funds and programmes, co-led by UNDP- OCHA as UNDG and ERC chairs respectively. Potentially meeting every 4-6 weeks, with the first meeting being held in mid-March. The modalities and its terms of reference are still unclear. As far as we know it is linked to the four famine/pre-famine situations and not a permanent structure in itself.

IASC Sec: Looking at the progress report, the NGO participation seems to be missing. In some ways the general sentiment from NGO colleagues is that NWOW is a UN-centric process with largely does not connect to the work of those outside the IASC.

Co -Chairs: This was a topic of focus during the bilateral conversation the co-chairs held with ICVA. In this discussion we stressed the importance of the NGO voice in this agenda, and discussed ways to facilitate better inclusion from the field. In addition, the co-chairs are linked with the Sphere secretariat where a thematic brief on the humanitarian

development nexus and the new way of working was drafted to guide the on-going revision of Sphere standards. Lastly, a number of webinars have been organized through ICVA to sensitize and get input and feedback from NGOs.

ACTION: Co-chairs to revise progress report (**COMPLETED**).

ACTION: Co-chairs to work towards getting consensus on the shared narrative and key messages on Humanitarian Development Nexus: The New Way of Working

ACTION: Co-chairs update and complement the mapping (**COMPLETED**).

ACTION: Develop background material to the Working Group, asking for a consensus based decisions on how the New Way of Working fits with the Sustaining Peace Agenda (**COMPLETED**).

Agenda Item 3: Debrief on UN WGT Work Planning Retreat:

Introduction (OCHA, UNDP): The main take-away from the work planning retreat was the opportunity to hear the perspective of the EOSG. From the SG special advisor on Policy, it was clear the Prevention will be at the centre of the new SG's approach. Prevention, here, is broader than conflict prevention, this would include natural disasters as well; how that the United Nations in all its functions can stop being reactive and being proactive. It is clear that through this lens the intersection of the humanitarian-development – peace nexus will come in the countries that are deemed 'fragile'.

No discussion

Agenda Item 4: IASC Work Planning Discussions: *following a brief discussion on progress made against some workplan items, the conversation was parked pending outcome of WG session and potential new tasking. The co-chairs will also aim to reach out to individuals and co-leads when the revised workplan is drafted to see what aspects of the 2016 workplan can be carried over. The revised workplan will also reflect a mapping of other initiatives where strategic linkages can be made as well as outcomes of the bilateral conversations with TT members.*

Agenda Item 5: Implementation of HDN:

Introduction (co-chair, UNDP) The Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, in agreement with the Sudan HCT and UNCT, and with support from the INGO community and several key donors, therefore requested the Global Cluster Coordination Group, IASC Task Team on the Humanitarian Development Nexus in Protracted Crises and the UNDG Working Group on Transition to support the implementation and work through some of the practical issues in relation to improving the coordination architecture, with an evolution toward a new way of working across the humanitarian and development ecosystems including the prospects for joint analysis, joined up planning and programming and aligned coordination structures.

IOM: given that the key messages and shared narrative will be drafted by the time the mission to Sudan takes place is there scope to see how these messages resonate with the field? We don't want these messages to float at the HQ level.

Co-chair: there will be scope to present the key messages if they are ready. In the schedule for the mission, there will be a joint retreat where the global discourse on this subject will be presented.

UNHCR: There is a lack of clarity of the scope of the part of the mission that relates to the NWOW, bearing in mind that last year there was a joint mission looking at the coordination model for responding to the refugee situation in Darfur. Will this mission be looking only at IDPs? Will it focus on Darfur?

ACTION: Co-chairs to feedback concerns and questions from the TT into the planning group of the Sudan mission. (**COMPLETED**).