

After the World Humanitarian Summit

Better Humanitarian-Development Cooperation for Sustainable Results on the Ground

A thinkpiece drawing on collaboration between OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank, supported by the Center on International Cooperation



Syrian refugees walk among tents at Karkamiş refugee camp on Jan. 16, 2014, near the town of Gaziantep, Turkey © Ozan Kose AFP | Getty Images

June 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The thinkpiece was developed through ad hoc inter-agency collaboration between staff of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Bank, supported by the Center on International Cooperation (CIC). The thinkpiece was developed to inform inter-agency policy and practice, but it is hoped that the analysis will also be of interest to a wide range of development and humanitarian actors. We are grateful to all the inter-agency contributors for the analysis, lessons, and extensive inter-agency consultation and peer review that went into producing this thinkpiece.

Table of Contents

After the World Humanitarian Summit

A thinkpiece drawing on collaboration by OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank, supported by the Center on International Cooperation

I. Introduction	2
II. Are closer development-humanitarian links feasible in all contexts, and are they consistent with humanitarian principles?	3
III. What is meant in practical terms by key concepts like collective outcomes, multi-year approaches and working on the basis of comparative advantage?	6
IV. What concrete steps will be needed after the WHS to implement the shift in approach?	13
IV.1 Assessment and analysis: Owning a joint problem statement	13
IV.2 Planning: A strategic vision for the short-, medium- and long-term	15
IV.3 Programming: Moving from individual short-term projects to collective outcomes:	16
IV.4 From funding to financing: Overcoming fragmentation	17
IV.5 Effective leadership, coordination and monitoring	20
V. Conclusion	21
Annex 1: Indicative follow-on measures after the WHS, drawing from the core commitments related to humanitarian-development cooperation	22
Annex 2: Exploring each end of the spectrum – two typologies and the implications for joint action	24
Annex 3: The relevant results of recent reviews and key global agendas	25
Endnotes	27

I. Introduction

1. The World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) called for a step change in how humanitarian action is conceived, planned, implemented and monitored – and by whom. The United Nations Secretary-General (SG) has set out a clear vision to ‘Change people’s lives: from delivering aid to ending need’ as one of five Core Responsibilities in his Report for the *World Humanitarian Summit ‘One Humanity: Shared Responsibility’*. The report notes that Agenda 2030’s commitment to leaving no one behind and reaching those furthest behind first, including its specific references to people affected by humanitarian emergencies, creates a common framework under which both humanitarian and development actors can work together to ensure the safety, dignity and ability to thrive for the most vulnerable and at risk populations.

2. Participants at the Summit were asked to generate bold commitments to advancing this vision over the coming years. In particular, the Secretary-General and the heads of 8 UN entities, with the endorsement of the World Bank and the International Organization of Migration, issued a joint commitment to action to implement a *New Way of Working*¹ based on three main elements: (1) Working to collective outcomes across the UN system and the broader humanitarian and development community, including Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs); (2) Working over multi-year timeframes, recognizing the reality of protracted crises and aiming to contribute to longer-term development gains, in the logic of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); and (3) Working collaboratively based on comparative advantage of diverse actors.

3. From both humanitarian and development perspectives, a new way of working together and partnering with peacebuilding actors is urgently needed because:

- Humanitarian needs have risen to a level not seen since the end of World War 2, with 60 million displaced and 125 million people affected. These are the people most likely to be left far behind in achieving the SDGs.
- Crises are more protracted: humanitarian appeals today last for 7 years on average and 89 percent of humanitarian financing goes to crises lasting more than 3 years.

- Conflict has become a very significant driver of humanitarian needs (over 80 percent), as well as a significant constraint on achieving the SDGs in fragile situations.
- Global crises are more than ever results of interdependent challenges like climate change, conflict, pandemics or population growth. Humanitarian emergencies can no longer be viewed as isolated, short-term events but often are manifestations of governance failures or more structural and complex environmental or socio-economic developments.
- Those with most at stake in humanitarian crises – affected people, governments and other responders – have been calling in the consultations for the WHS for new approaches that are more sustainable and make better use of local capabilities. This is reflected in the call in the Report of the Secretary-General to “reinforce, do not replace, national and local systems”.

4. At the most fundamental level, durable political solutions to conflict are needed to prevent a continued escalation in humanitarian needs. Political pressure to uphold international humanitarian law and principles remains crucial. But development and humanitarian interaction also needs to adapt to changing needs, and to the essential and evolving role played by crisis-affected populations and communities, governments, regional organizations and the private sector.

5. In the consultations and debates leading up to the WHS, the idea of transcending humanitarian-development divides has received much support, but has also raised questions, including: (i) Are closer development-humanitarian links feasible in all situations, and are they consistent with humanitarian principles?; (ii) What do some key conceptual shifts, like collective outcomes, multi-year approaches and working on the basis of comparative advantages, mean in practice?; and (iii) What concrete steps will be needed after the WHS to implement the shift in approach? The purpose of this paper is to elaborate on these practical questions.

II. Are closer development-humanitarian links feasible in all contexts, and are they consistent with humanitarian principles?

6. Humanitarian, development and peacebuilding approaches need to be tailored to specific contexts – one-size-fits-all approaches do not work. Taking context as the starting point is important for all actors.

7. Are closer development-humanitarian links feasible in all situations? The table below addresses the issue of how development, humanitarian and peacebuilding processes

can interact in different contexts.² The two principal factors used to differentiate approaches are:

- The characteristics of crisis, including conflict and levels of violence, breaking down differences between acute emergencies, protracted crises and fragile/high-risk situations. This is important because high levels of conflict constrain the ability of development actors to assist programmatically.
- Whether the government has on-going/on-budget development assistance and control of affected areas. This is important because it determines whether international development actors can or should intervene quickly to amend on-going programs in the event of a crisis.³

Figure 1: A Spectrum of Approaches

	Acute	Protracted (in most cases)			Fragile	
	High intensity, active conflict	Lower intensity with emerging pol. settlement	Clear pol. settlement, cessation of conflict	Large-scale refugee flows to neighboring country	Disasters & Natural hazards	No active conflict but humanitarian risks
National government has on-going, on-budget development assistance	Information sharing; complementary positions on humanitarian access and development aid. Separate humanitarian plans and programs. Grant financing only	Either sequential and linked assessments and plans or joint , moving quickly to joint plans and programming. Range of financing instruments	Joint analysis and plans. Significant joint programming. Range of financing instruments	Joint analysis and plans. Significant joint programming. Range of financing instruments	Joint analysis and plans, moving quickly to joint programming. Range of financing instruments	Joint analysis and consideration of preventative and contingency measures in development plans. Range of financing instruments
National government has little on-going development assistance covering affected areas and populations	Humanitarian assessment informed by development and PB analysis. Separate humanitarian planning and programming; Grant financing only	Humanitarian assessments informed by development and PB analysis sequential plans moving to joint . Some joint programming	Joint analysis and plans. Significant joint programme. Range of financing instruments	Humanitarian assessment informed by development and PB analysis. Separate humanitarian planning and programming	Joint analysis, plans and programmes may be separate	Humanitarian assessment informed by development and PB analysis. Separate planning and programming; Grant financing only

8. Figure 1 shows that some form of collaboration is possible in all situations (at least on analysis), but the degree of joint planning and programming and when this might take place varies. In acute, active conflict, a traditional emergency humanitarian response is needed. But the protracted and high-risk scenarios are occurring with increasing frequency, and most of these do permit a new and much closer model of development-humanitarian cooperation: more joined up analysis, planning, and programming to achieve collective outcomes are possible, as well as a range of financing instruments. Annex 2 shows two cases at either end of the spectrum.

9. **Is better development-humanitarian cooperation compatible with humanitarian principles?** Whether it is feasible to undertake development activities in humanitarian crises is a different question from whether closer development-humanitarian links *are compatible with humanitarian principles*. The main concern underlying this is on the role of government – since the implementation of development activities is coordinated closely with governments, do closer development-humanitarian links mean compromising humanitarian principles by working through governments who are party to a conflict to control humanitarian aid?


10. The application of humanitarian principles should remain paramount in all humanitarian crises, in particular in situations of conflict. Working with governments that are party to a conflict should be based on thorough context analysis, and safeguards applied to ensure that assistance is provided in a manner consistent with the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence.⁴

11. International development institutions have also adopted the principle of “do no harm” in their engagement in fragile situations⁵, to ensure that assistance is not partisan in perception or reality and does not undermine national governance. Many development activities have civil society and community partners as well as governments, and they can switch between different modes of operating depending on the circumstances. Links to development do not automatically mean links to government, although they can help strengthen links to government and to state-society governance issues when circumstances warrant, as they often do in protracted crises.

12. Governments bear the primary responsibility to respond to disasters, protect their own populations including internally displaced persons, abide by the refugee conventions and respect international humanitarian principles and law. Where they are willing and able to do so, local and international humanitarian and development actors can and should play a supporting role, as they have done in Indonesia after the Tsunami or Lebanon and Jordan today. Some governments are not able to honor their obligations under international law, in particular although not only during acute levels of conflict: humanitarian plans and programmes that are clearly needs- and rights-based, impartial and independent in relation to the Government’s role will be critical in these situations.⁶

13. This is generally the case in acute conflicts, but even in the grey areas in Figure 2, governments, at least in some parts of an affected country, may be able to fulfill some obligations but need impartial national and international

Figure 2: A progressive look at the humanitarian-development interface



counterparts in others. Conflict situations do not transition in a linear way from war to peace: development-humanitarian cooperation in one part of a country may coexist with acute emergency responses to active conflict in another: emerging political settlements may gradually increase trust in national and local institutions, which can then play a greater role - but not necessarily on all functions at once.

14. Getting the balance right is not simple, but it is important to deliver the best possible outcome. Too little reliance on national or local institutions may undermine the development of local rights-respecting systems, while too much may hurt populations of concern and discredit gradual national institution strengthening.

III. What is meant in practical terms by key concepts like collective outcomes, multi-year approaches and working on the basis of comparative advantage?

15. What do collective outcomes that transcend humanitarian–development divides mean in practice?

In its imperative to *leave no one behind and reach those furthest behind first*, the new development agenda recognizes that humanitarian and development actions converge around the need to prevent, prepare for and respond to crises, particularly with regard to the most vulnerable and at risk populations. This is the basis for focusing on collective outcomes.

16. The concept also builds on the lessons from many crisis situations that a) as noted above, the transition from emergency relief to post-crisis recovery and development is rarely linear; b) effective emergency response can help protect hard-won development gains by meeting immediate needs in a manner that also builds the basis for longer-term development; and c) development planning must be sensitive to risks, which often intersect and can impact and reinforce each other, and be responsive to sudden shocks and changes in the needs of vulnerable populations to ensure that the SDG promise of better outcomes for everyone, everywhere becomes a reality.

17. **How would individual organizations use collective outcomes in their own programmes?** Governments, humanitarian agencies, national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), philanthropic foundations, multilateral development institutions, bilateral donors and the private sector may all contribute to an agreed collective outcome. To keep clear accountability, individual entities might refer to collective programme outcomes (such as reducing food insecurity in the example in Box 1) while also distinguishing the specific contributing results which they are aiming to achieve (such as WFP reaching a specific percentage of the vulnerable through cash transfers).

18. **Can collective outcomes encompass the fundamental humanitarian objective of ‘saving lives’?** Yes. The Sahel Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) is an example. (See Box 1) Agenda 2030 in fact requires development actors to recognize that “peaceful and inclusive societies” are part of development outcomes.

19. **Can collective outcomes encompass a traditional development focus on poverty reduction, capacity building and environmental sustainability?** Yes: collective outcomes that link humanitarian and development action would naturally target the poorest populations in the most hazard-prone environments. The commitment to “reinforce, do not replace, national and local systems” reflects the increasing emphasis humanitarian actors have been placing on developing local capacities and resilience, long a goal of development actors. Humanitarian action has also in recent years placed much greater emphasis on environmental sustainability.

20. **Who decides on collective outcomes?** In an acute crisis or a rapid onset emergency, the humanitarian imperative dictates a priority on saving lives and alleviating suffering, and a lengthy and consultative planning process is often not possible. In pre-crisis, protracted crisis and post-crisis situations, both humanitarian and development communities should work together to support a people-centered, inclusive approach to decide on collective outcomes, often led by governments but also involving affected persons and communities, civil society and other stakeholders.

Box 1: What do we mean by collective outcomes?

A collective outcome is a commonly agreed result or impact in reducing people's needs, risks and vulnerabilities and increasing their resilience, requiring the combined effort of different actors (SG's Report. One Humanity; Shared Responsibility)

1. **What is the basic idea?** The idea is a simple one: humanitarians have an interest in connecting their populations of concern to development opportunities; while development needs to ensure that assistance reaches those furthest behind, which often includes populations affected by humanitarian crises. Both approaches have an interest in creating sustainable local capacities and resilience, to reduce inequalities and to advance people's ability to live in safety and dignity.

2. **Give me some practical examples:**

- **A shift from emergency food distribution towards the deliberate achievement of measurable reduction in food security.** Sahel Humanitarian Response Plan 2014–2016 acknowledges that sustainable food security is a collective outcome for national governments, regional organizations, and different UN agencies supporting humanitarian and development action. It sets in place measurable, shared objectives. For instance, the plan aims to reduce the overall number of people at emergency levels of food insecurity (IPC levels 3 and 4) by 38% over 3 years. In order to build the resilience of vulnerable populations, the plan aims to triple the number of countries with social protection policies, and increase the number of countries whose development budgets target vulnerable populations to 9, from a baseline of 7.
- **A shift from delivering increasing annual amounts of short-term assistance to displaced people towards an approach that seeks to reduce displacement and strengthen the self-reliance of displaced persons.** The Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) brings together more than 200 partners in a coordinated region-wide response to the Syria crisis. It has two components: Refugees (protection, emergency assistance to refugees and vulnerable communities) and Resilience (enhancing capacities, resources, and self-reliance of refugees, households, and national delivery systems). Under the regional plan, individual national plans set collective outcomes, which aim benefitting both refugees and host communities, and strengthening national systems. For example, the Jordan Response Plan has specific targets to enroll 222,000 Syrian refugee children in school in 2016, while also increasing education management capacities, improving access to adequate and safe schools for Jordanians and Syrians alike, and decreasing overcrowding by building, renovating and refurbishing schools and training education service providers.

21. **Why can't we just talk about complementary outcomes?** Collective outcomes is a stronger concept. For example, it is easy to assume that reducing infant mortality and malnutrition through food assistance is complementary to strengthening long-term nutrition outcomes and reducing food insecurity. But adopting a collective outcome, which encompasses both will force some important choices that can improve long-term results: should short-term assistance be given in food or cash? Should food be purchased nationally or imported? Should national systems for social protection devote more staff and resources to areas affected by humanitarian needs, both to deal with this crisis and prepare against future risks? Collective outcomes will force humanitarian and development action to be more genuinely complementary – not just co-existing, but mutually reinforcing.

Multi-year timeframes

22. **For humanitarians, protracted crises have become the new normal.** Displacement, food security, and public health challenges like epidemics and pandemics are longer-term endeavours and require multi-year objectives and planning to make a tangible difference for affected people. While some progress has been made in recent years, multi-year plans and programmes on the humanitarian side are still the exception rather than the rule.

23. **In development, there has long been a recognition that assistance, particularly in fragile situations with weak institutions, needs to be long term** (for example, the World Development Report estimates that countries recovering from crisis in the 20th century took at the very fastest pace 15 years to develop sound institutional capacity, and often over 30 years). Yet even for development activities it has been a struggle to put multi-year commitments in place. Many donors – and some governments – are also challenged by parliamentary and budgetary approval processes that make multi-year commitments difficult. Yet addressing this is key to delivering better outcomes, if we are to actually make progress towards resolving crisis situations rather than repeating short-term assistance.

24. **Does this mean losing the traditional humanitarian emphasis on rapid action, if the focus is on long-term outcomes?** No. As in the Timorese example above a longer-term strategic vision will normally lead to defining short-, medium- and longer-term interventions. A long-term outcome of poverty reduction for the poorest might include urgent short-term food assistance for poor people affected by humanitarian emergencies until longer-term sources of livelihood are in place.

25. **Are multi-year approaches always needed?** Almost always. Sometimes when conflict is escalating only short-term approaches can be used. Sometimes a natural disaster where the impact is not very severe and the institutional capability to rebuild strong may be resolved within a year, but most take much longer and even when they are short, they may still be recurring. This is likely to increase given the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projections that climate change is likely to increase the frequency and intensity of disasters. No protracted crisis or post-conflict-related example we are aware of has returned to “development as normal” within a year.

26. **Can multi-year approaches be adopted right from the beginning?** Not always. Where conflict is active and potentially escalating short-term approaches are often needed (although even here analysis of what would be needed for long-term recovery can be useful). But in situations emerging from conflict, protracted crises and situations of high-risk, a multi-year approach could be adopted from the outset, and almost always within six months of a crisis.

Box 2: What do we mean by multi-year timeframes?

A multi-year timeframe refers to analyzing, strategizing and planning operations that build over several years to achieve context-specific and, at times, dynamic benchmarks.

1. What is the basic idea? Multi-year timeframes allow humanitarian agencies to frame their responses to protracted crises in ways that will contribute to, and complement, development investments designed to meet the SDGs. They provide for the opportunity to measure progress against agreed strategic objectives and to adjust programming as conditions evolve.

2. Give me some examples:

- The **Sahel Regional Response Plan** and **The Syria Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP)**, described in Box 1, are both multi-year plans.
- **Timor Health Sector Programme:** In early 2000, Timor-Leste faced serious internal displacement, health problems, a destroyed infrastructure, and virtually no trained personnel. Timorese leadership and the UN led a phased approach which had a multi-year timeframe from the outset:
 - i. In the first phase, international and national NGOs provided emergency health services throughout Timor-Leste, independently funded through humanitarian assistance.
 - ii. In the second phase, the Interim Health Authority signed agreements with international humanitarian NGOs to standardize health services for each district, with the support of bilateral donors, WHO and the World Bank: Timorese health professionals were brought on the government payroll and programmes to train new Timorese health workers initiated.
 - iii. In the third phase, the Timorese Ministry of Health assumed district management of the system, still with significant technical assistance from international NGOs.
 - iv. In the last phase, technical assistance decreased, and functions such as pharmaceutical distribution and hospital management were brought under government responsibility.
 - v. As a result of this framework, between 2000 and 2004, an estimated 90 percent of the population were provided with a functioning health facility within a two-hour walk, with outpatient visits at almost 3.0 per capita from 1.0 three years previously. The health ministry and district operations were among the few state functions resilient to renewed violence in 2006.
- Similarly, **UNICEF's work with national authorities, other UN agencies and international and national NGOs in Somalia** has a multi-year perspective for collective humanitarian-development outcomes:
 - i. Against the backdrop of the 2011 famine in Somalia, a coalition of international organizations launched a large-scale cash and voucher programme. In the first stage (6 months), the programme aimed to provide households with immediate life-saving support.
 - ii. The next stages focused on harmonization of transfer amounts, accompanied with the use of new delivery mechanisms and technologies (such as the use of mobile phones for delivering money).
 - iii. Since the end of the famine, the programme aims to balance two priorities: building toward longer term, government-owned social protection systems while maintaining the flexibility to meet shorter-term emergency needs. The program design is sensitive to different conditions in different regions of Somalia.
 - iv. The program evaluation judges that cash and vouchers made a quantifiable difference in reducing hunger and improving food security, and did not result in price inflation.

Comparative Advantages

27. The new way of working depends on contributions from all actors based on their comparative advantage and capacity to actually deliver responses in a given context. But what do comparative advantages look like in practice (see Box 3 below)? Getting the best results out of the concept of comparative advantage requires good joint analysis and planning to identify where comparative advantage lies, which is covered in the next section.⁷

Box 3: What do we mean by comparative advantages?

A comparative advantage is the capacity and expertise of one individual, group or institution to meet needs and contribute to risk and vulnerability reduction, over the capacity of another actor.


1. **What is the basic idea?** Comparative advantage is about who has the best capacity to deliver the different activities needed to achieve collective outcomes like better education, health and jobs for people affected by protracted crises. Some general principles include:

- Comparative advantage may be based on cultural acceptance, trust and familiarity with local populations and knowledge of local circumstances, technical expertise, implementing capacities, speed, cost, international reputation and compliance with international standards, predictability, past performance, the means and ability to access people in need as well as the legitimacy that derives from having an international mandate to intervene in situations where state sovereignty can be used as a pretext to influence how and to whom aid will be delivered.
- Comparative advantage goes far beyond multilateral humanitarian and development actors, including national and local governments, humanitarian, development, peace and security, human rights and environmental actors, civil society and the private sector.
- Comparative advantage adapts over time. Comparative advantage is not about a rigid definition of which actors can work in which situation, but is based on what kinds of activities and capabilities are needed and can be reasonably undertaken in situations of fluid security dynamics, population movement, evolving institutional and rule of law capacities.

2. **Give me some examples:**

- **The Refugee and Host Population Empowerment Framework (ReHoPe)** in Uganda is a multi-sectorial, multi-year and development oriented framework, which focuses on meeting the needs of refugees and host communities, while building their resilience for future shocks. Continued exposure to refugee influxes resulted in the Government of Uganda taking the decision to integrate refugee management and protection into Uganda's national development plan. In support of these national priorities, WFP and UNHCR work together to target refugees and host community households; a public-private partnership involves refugee and host community households in commercial agriculture; a social entrepreneurship initiative trains youth, and Japan supports infrastructure, value chain upgrading and vocational training.
- **Timor Health Sector Program (described in Box 2).** At the outset, the UN was the legal transitional government, but understood that, as a transitional authority, it did not have legitimacy to set long-term development strategies. The Timorese leadership did not at that time have an independent state, but they had political leadership and health professionals who were widely respected: the Timorese therefore set the strategy and policy, with support from the UN mission, and staff seconded by WHO. International NGOs and Timorese health professionals, funded primarily by ECHO, provided the first responder capacity before state structures were operational, running clinics and hospitals. The World Bank provided financing and technical assistance, and coordinated the long-term sector strategy. Australia, Portugal, Japan and the EU provided specialized services within an overall sector programme with collective outcomes, as well as funding the sector programme through the multi-donor trust fund.

Figure 3: Practical steps to implementing a new way of working:



IV. What concrete steps will be needed after the WHS to implement the shift in approach?

28. Changing the reality on the ground will mean changing the approaches and behaviors of many different actors, their systems and *modus operandi*, which in turn requires addressing incentives. The main steps needed to put in place new ways of working will occur in assessment, planning, programming, financing and coordinating and monitoring decisions. These are shown in Figure 3: without changes at each of these steps, change will not happen on the ground. Annex 4 gives a practical example.

IV.1 Assessment and analysis: Owning a joint problem statement

29. A common understanding of the context and its risks can provide a better basis for joint humanitarian, and development efforts – with the right links to peacebuilding. Yet assessments tend to be done after a crisis has occurred, and joint analyses that include humanitarian, development and peacebuilding dimensions remain the exception rather than the rule.

30. Committing to a new way of working will mean greater investment in strategic and shared analysis, wherever possible localized – from identifying pre-crisis risks and baselines, to in-crisis and immediate post-crisis analysis, to taking account of evolving needs and institutional dynamics. Good examples do exist of these approaches (see Box 4). Setting up and scaling up these approaches globally would require much better mechanisms to share analysis between international actors, as well as rapid and intensive technical advice and training support to strengthen local and national actors' assessment and analysis capacity.

Box 4: Examples of pooled and combined data and analysis:

- Pulse Lab Jakarta – a nationally-driven exercise to provide feedback loops on Agenda 2030 which is also used for humanitarian needs
- The OCHA-led risk analysis tool in Afghanistan, which predicts six to nine months of emergency risk to guide collective decision-making
- The Lebanon risk and resilience analysis which brought together the government, civil society, development and humanitarian actors to identify risks and approaches
- The Yemen Post Conflict Needs Assessment (regional in 2011, national in 2012) and the Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment – formally known as Post Conflict Needs Assessment – in Ukraine (2014-2015) and North East Nigeria (2016)

Possible post-WHS actions (building on core commitments):

- At least X governments volunteer to lead assessments of risk with international support by 2017
- In at least X cases, UN agencies and the World Bank agree to support joint assessments that include humanitarian, development and peacebuilding perspectives in the pursuit of collective outcomes, including capability mapping of local institutions
- By 2017, at least X Governments and multilateral institutions that have separate early warning and risk analysis agree to come together to develop a protocol to share information on risks

31. Building on the new ways of working outlined in the Secretary-General's report, our analysis also needs to ask a different set of questions.⁸ These include:

- What is the level of conflict and political contestation that shapes the operating environment and the factors influencing the political security environment?
- What are the immediate needs and the factors shaping vulnerability?
- What is the role of national and local government in conflict prevention and crisis response?
- What are the historic and current national/local capabilities and state-society relations, and how have they evolved?
- What are the best ways to achieve inclusive local and national ownership, and enhance local and national capabilities?
- What actors are present in context beyond governments and international institutions (civil society, private sector, philanthropic institutions), and what comparative advantage does each bring to addressing short-term needs and underlying vulnerability? What is the best way to partner with them?
- What are the outcomes that affected people aspire to, immediate and long term?
- How can we best achieve those outcomes over a multi-year period, and who should do what?

32. The following recommendations are designed to make the analysis of risks and vulnerabilities by a full range of stakeholders more collaborative, comprehensive and effective:

- **Support national and local capabilities:** To the extent possible, the analysis should reinforce existing data collection and assessment systems and support decision-making at different levels of governance.
- **Invest in strategic and common analysis and better coordination:** Whether assessments are separate with pooled information-sharing, sequential or joint, the aim should be to arrive at shared problem statements between development, humanitarian and peacebuilding actors, and where possible with national authorities.⁹

- **Strengthen joint analysis at the field,** by strengthening analytical capabilities of field conveners where possible rather than “parachuting in” assessment teams.¹⁰
- **Use online platforms** to foster joint analysis, facilitate smoother information integration from both humanitarian and development perspectives, and assess both immediate and longer-term crisis related vulnerabilities, needs and risks.
- **Involve people in needs assessments:** Affected communities, including marginalized sub-groups, should be full partners throughout the analysis process and not just sources of data or stakeholders to be consulted at the end.

IV.2 Planning: A strategic vision for the short-, medium- and long-term

33. Reaching the most vulnerable and most in need is the central challenge spanning both emergency response and sustainable development in the Agenda 2030 era. The success of achieving implementation of the SDGs will be anchored in the premise of reducing vulnerabilities and, ultimately, humanitarian as well as development needs. This new imperative is led by national governments as well as international institutions. Achieving the SDGs will require a new approach to planning that is based on the articulation of agreed collective outcomes over a multi-year horizon in humanitarian crises – and on identifying and leveraging those actors with the capacities and comparative advantage to support achievement of these collective outcomes. There are good examples (Box 5) but specific commitments will be needed to make these approaches more systematic.

Box 5: Existing examples of joint planning:

- The Somalia Compact, in which the Government works with humanitarian, development and peacebuilding partners to analyze and address resilience and peace building needs together
- The Sahel Regional Response Plan
- The Lebanese Crisis Response Plan 2015–2016, and the Jordan Response Plan for the Syria Crisis 2016–2018

Possible post-WHS actions (building on core commitments):

- At least X joint planning frameworks, driven by inclusive national priorities and collective outcomes, adopted by UN development and humanitarian actors and the World Bank and underway by mid-2017
- At least X country situations with an agreed private sector role in humanitarian response plans in place by end 2017

34. The following recommendations could help foster joint humanitarian, development and peacebuilding plans in scenarios where this is appropriate, to ensure that ‘no-one is left behind’:

- **Supporting national plans and localized planning:** Joint plans will work best in situations where national authorities are able to take the lead in an inclusive process. For international actors, this means a) defining with national actors, as relevant, a shared problem statement and long-term vision for collective support, including priorities and risks, to address the common problem statement; and b) timing international plans, programmes and appeals to fit where possible with national planning cycles.
- **Addressing cross-sectoral issues:** Agenda 2030 is designed to be indivisible, where each goal relates to others and cannot be achieved independently: not only do issues such as human rights and gender cut across all areas, but there are many links between actions in health, in education, in poverty reduction, in jobs, and in the environmental areas. Humanitarian practice has also evolved to more cross-sectoral work, but both humanitarian and development actors have difficulty in applying multi-sectoral approaches in practice. This is true of governments as well as international agencies, and is a challenge in the new agenda. Working in detail on multi-sectoral initiatives, within HRP and national development plans, will be needed. By doing so, a rights-based and gender-sensitive approach should be the norm.
- **Making multi-year commitments:** As discussed in section III, new approaches should aim to achieve collective outcomes over multiple years to combine the flexibility of humanitarian action with the longer-term strategic vision necessary to support the achievement of sustainable development outcomes for the most vulnerable under Agenda 2030. The increasingly protracted nature of conflict and displacement, and the fluid dynamic of current crises – spanning sudden onset emergencies, recurrent waning and spiking crises, and protracted crises – necessitates multi-year, preventive and flexible approaches.

IV.3 Programming: Moving from individual short-term projects to collective outcomes:

35. Joint programming is important because it is the moment at which we translate the good intentions of joint analysis and planning into reality. Joint programmes can come in different forms, from those based on pooled funding and implemented together to those where inputs are coordinated within a joint programme framework to achieve collective outcomes, but individual actors receive and disburse funds separately. There are some good examples of joint programming frameworks (Box 6) but these are centered in a very small number of countries: scaling them up and making them generalized will require actions after the WHS.

Box 6: Existing Examples of Integrated Programming:

- Lebanon Reach All Children with Education (RACE) Plan
- Lebanon National Poverty Targeting Program
- Lebanon Host Community Support Program (LHSP)
- Jordan Host Communities Program
- Timor Leste Health Sector Programme
- Niger 3Ns programme

Possible post-WHS actions (building on core commitments):

- At least X joint programming frameworks involving humanitarian and development (and where possible peacebuilding) actors by 2017
- In at least X governments by 2017, identify whether national legislation or administrative regulation provides any bar to addressing the needs of populations affected by humanitarian crises and address these

36. Linking together programming among development, humanitarian and peacebuilding actors, in scenarios where this is relevant, will likely require a 'change in mindset' and efforts to overcome different institutional culture, discourse and incentives. Some of the questions that humanitarian and development actors will need to work through together to make integrated programming work include:

- **Targeting:** Humanitarian action most frequently uses a form of vulnerability assessment for targeting. Indicators may include structural (dependency ratio, access to water and sanitation, education and health); food consumption or income-based; and related to registration. Development activities typically use poverty measures for targeting, through income and expenditure data, through proxies which include assets or through self-selection methods.
- **Cash-based, multi-sectoral programming:** Recent protracted crisis have seen a move towards increased cash-based, multi-sectoral humanitarian programming; this has long been used by development actors in social protection and community-driven development. While cash and voucher-based programmes can be sectorally earmarked, they lead towards multi-sectoral programming (because households spend the money how they want). For both development and humanitarian actors, agreeing on and assigning responsibility for multi-sectoral programming is challenging.
- **Mapping:** Educational and health programmes generally use some form of mapping exercise to analyze and decide on the location of infrastructure in relation to target populations. If displaced people (including refugees) are to be included in scaled up national systems, how is mapping adapted to deal with uncertainties over physical location?
- **Fiscal sustainability:** Development-humanitarian programmes where government is a major delivery channel may face issues of fiscal sustainability: if government needs to increase recurrent expenditures (such as more health or educational staff) to cater to displaced populations within country systems, how is this expansion viewed in fiscal sustainability terms and how are risks mitigated?¹¹

- **Legal and fiduciary arrangements:** If closer development-humanitarian links are to result in more situations where funds may be transferred from a humanitarian entity to a development entity to implement, or vice versa, the processes for making these agreements are important. Despite longstanding attempts both within the UN and between the UN and the WB to create pre-standing legal and fiduciary agreements, this area is still a barrier: for example in Lebanon, a recent attempt for UNHCR to transfer funds to the Bank to deliver through the government's national poverty targeting programming foundered on legal and fiduciary difficulties.

IV.4 From funding to financing: Overcoming fragmentation

37. For humanitarian operations, financing has by and large been stovepiped to deliberately separate humanitarian from developmental activities, and has been limited to one instrument: grant-based financing. The compartmentalization of humanitarian/development funding hampers efforts to realize collective outcomes, and the limited horizon on types of financing constrains the mobilization of additional resources that could help provide more sustainable solutions. These constraints have been confirmed both in the recent report of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, as well as the SG's report on the WHS, in the Core Responsibility 5 on "Invest in Humanity".

38. Both reports include significant propositions that require all stakeholders – implementing organizations, donors, Member States and others – to change the way they work, such as:

- **Making better use of different financing instruments:** A fuller range of financial tools should be employed to reduce risk over a multi-year period, while incentives should be added to promote innovation as a means for developing tools that enhance preparedness and reduce fragility and risk. This will include reviewing current financing instruments, tools and approaches that may be used in fragile and protracted crises and that can have a complementary and positive effect in addressing humanitarian caseloads, such as public-private partnerships, private sector project finance, loans and political risk insurance (see Box 7) – as well as innovative

mechanisms such as the proposed international solidarity levy or complementary emergency funds such as Pandemic Emergency Fund.

- **Breaking down silos in donor budgets:** Donors maintain separate humanitarian budgets for good reason, in order to prioritize life-saving interventions and be able to respond flexibly in crises. Yet rigidities in donor budgets prevent the allocation of funds that were put aside for humanitarian purposes to go to the destination that can most effectively reduce humanitarian needs (to making peace, or to developing long-term income opportunities for refugees). Equally, development budgets are often constrained in their use in humanitarian emergencies, even where this would clearly result in preservation of human, social and institutional capital. Focusing on overall objectives in donor budgets rather than inputs would help address this problem.
- **Overcome impediments regarding support to middle-income refugee-hosting countries:** In the past, development support to middle-income countries has been severely constrained, despite the severe impact on their societies and the global public good that many are providing in hosting refugees. Shifting the terms of MDB loans to middle-income countries to recognize this is an important part of a comprehensive financing response.
- **Prioritizing equitable, flexible, predictable and multi-year financing commitments:** Successful implementation of the "Grand Bargain" will be an essential step. While humanitarian actors and agencies must demonstrate greater transparency on expenditures, donors must increase multi-year commitments and unearmarked funding, and simplify reporting procedures and funding conditionalities. Broadening the donor base will also be essential.
- **Greater investments in high-risk areas:** The need for greater investment in preparedness, prevention and peacebuilding has been evidenced in a wide variety of reviews and processes at the UN in 2015¹², in order to ensure that risks and vulnerabilities are not transformed into needs and crises that overburden the humanitarian sector.

- **Using MDTFs can bridge gaps and provide incentives for joint programming of development – humanitarian – peacebuilding assistance:** While much of the focus will be on aligning bilateral initiatives behind collective outcomes, often in the form of integrated planning and programming frameworks rather than pooled funding. MDTFs can also play a crucial role. At a country level they can provide a critical mass to anchor coherence (as has been the case for development action in post-conflict or conflict-affected settings such as Iraq, Afghanistan, OPT and Timor-Leste, but typically without strong links to humanitarian activities). Globally, the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF), the State and Peacebuilding Fund (SPF), the UN and World Bank Fragility and Conflict Partnership Trust Fund can be used to break down institutional barriers, incentivizing practical joint efforts.

39. **Does a new model for development-humanitarian cooperation mean moving budget from development to humanitarian action, or alternately from humanitarian actors to development actors?** The new way of working is not primarily about shifting funding — rather, it is about:

- Using existing resources and capabilities better, improving SDG outcomes and shrinking humanitarian needs over the long-term;
- Galvanizing new partnerships that bring additional capabilities and resources, such as through the private sector and Multilateral Development Banks.

Box 7: A range of financing instruments

Flexible multi-year grant-based instruments	USAID’s Resilience in the Sahel-Enhance (RISE) initiative, which aims to build resilience over five years, and can scale up or down depending on need, and the UNDP-UNHCR Regional Refugee and Resilience plan in response to the Syria crisis
Commercial and concessional loans with interest buy-down	Pakistan polio operations (IDA and IsDB; Nigeria polio; China post IDA-graduation; Botswana HIV; Samoa power)
Bonds with guarantees	IFFIm (including Islamic financing (sukuks), World Bank proposal for “Middle East North Africa bonds”)
Project finance for private sector investment	Iraq cement; Myanmar microfinance institution; Cote D’Ivoire power; Afghanistan power
Public-private partnerships	Many pure infrastructure examples. Pan American Development foundation PPP for micro-enterprises for IDPs in Colombia
Political risk insurance	Cote D’Ivoire Energy, Pakistan hydropower, Rwanda grain mill, DRC energy
Catastrophic risk financing	Mexico CAT bond. African Risk Capacity. Various World Bank CAT-DDO contingent financing operations
Corporate social responsibility	Pharmaceutical companies donating drugs, tech companies donating hardware or software to schools. GAVI has matching fund for CSR contributions
Remittance matching schemes	Lebanon proposal on matching funds for diaspora contributions; Mexico small infrastructure program; El Salvador Education

40. A new model for humanitarian-development cooperation will benefit those concerned about development outcomes, because it encourages humanitarian actors to develop programmes that strengthen national and local institutional capacity and benefit host communities as well as internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees. This helps governments show the benefits for national citizens and local communities affected by the secondary impacts of humanitarian crises, while still protecting the welfare of the most vulnerable. Conversely, the new way of working will benefit those concerned about humanitarian outcomes, because it involves development actors in the struggle to prevent humanitarian crises and find long-term recovery and opportunity for those who have been impacted.

Box 8: Existing examples

- Ebola: As of 2015, the World Bank Group had mobilized US\$1.62 billion in financing for Ebola response and recovery, including US\$1.17 billion from IDA and at least US\$450 million from IFC. Of the initial \$518 million committed through IDA, \$390 million was comprised of new money provided in grants from the World Bank Group's IDA Crisis Response Window. The grant amount of the World Bank support to the Ebola crisis alone amounts to about 80% of the whole global budget of the CERF in one year and is about four times larger than the annual allocations of the UN Peacebuilding Fund worldwide.
- Forced displacement and the regional impact of the Syria crisis: In April 2016, the international community created the MENA concessional financing facility capitalized with a package of US\$1.6 billion -- US\$141 million in grants, US\$1 billion in soft loans, US\$500 million in guarantees. The financing facility is the latest example of how the World Bank and other MDBs are scaling up their role in providing financing options in fragile and humanitarian contexts.

Possible post-WHS actions (building on core commitments)

- Mechanisms in place to track the finances dedicated by national and local governments, donors and international agencies, civil society and the private sector
- At least X humanitarian donors able to commit funds over multi-year timeframes/An increase in the proportion of the global humanitarian budget committed in multi-year frameworks, from X to X percent
- At least X country situations where multi-donor trust funds can support integrated programming and cover at least X percent of total funds
- Increase in global pooled funding available to X to finance local capabilities for analysis and joint assessments, to incentivize joint humanitarian and development approaches

41. It would be wrong to suggest that there are no issues around humanitarian and development funding. Recent years have seen humanitarian funding become a higher proportion of total Official Development Assistance (ODA), because of the increase in crises worldwide. Donor governments have always possessed the right to move funding from development to humanitarian needs, and it would be difficult in the face of lives at risk to say they should not do so. It is, however, in the interest of all humanitarian and development actors to see more financing dedicated to reducing the humanitarian needs of the most at risk populations over time, by adopting new and more sustainable approaches – and thus, in the long-term, freeing up more resources for development.

IV.5 Effective leadership, coordination and monitoring

42. The Secretary-General's Report on the World Humanitarian Summit stresses that we must "move beyond the comfort of traditional silos, work across mandates, sectors and institutional boundaries, and with a greater diversity of partners towards shared results". In order to transcend divides and move towards achieving common causes and collective outcomes, effective coordination a) with national and local actors, where relevant; b) with all relevant partners including new actors; and c) to achieve strategic and operational coherence within the UN system is necessary.

43. One fundamental shift that needs to occur is the way in which international coordination mechanisms relate to national and local ownership. Where scenarios permit, the primary objective should be to enhance national and local capacities to coordinate monitoring against a plan. This is a two-way process: international engagement can also help break national and local silos in the country that hamper effective national response. Building local monitoring capacities will include attention to both lower and higher level results (for programme outputs and outcomes). It should also include use of social accountability tools, which can be used differently depending on level of capacity and institutional trust.

44. Monitoring should also, as soon as possible after acute conflict recedes and particularly in protracted crises, follow a coordinated and multi-year planning process and have clear feedback loops to corrective action. While in many circumstances humanitarian actors will need to preserve an independent monitoring of the life-saving response, in most situations this will not be incompatible with developing collective indicators for results that link to the longer-term goals and targets of Agenda 2030. Rather than only coordinating in small groups providing humanitarian inputs, humanitarian actors may coordinate their implementation with more diverse actors aiming at achieving collective outcomes.

45. Actors contributing to monitoring will include not only governments and international institutions, but also regional and sub-regional actors, municipalities, businesses, local response groups, private sector, faith-based groups, diaspora networks and civil society organizations. It is necessary to consider how to engage and facilitate the considerable capacity of these actors, and ensure that adequate coordination is ensured with the efforts of national authorities and international actors.

46. For the UN to consistently play an important coordinating role in humanitarian crises, ensuring that the right mix of capacities is available to UN leadership on the ground is important. This includes the mix of humanitarian, development and where necessary peacebuilding expertise; as well as knowledge of and respect for the capabilities, interests and decision-making processes of government and non-government partners.

V. Conclusion

47. This thinkpiece addresses three issues: (i) whether closer development-humanitarian links are feasible in all situations, and are consistent with humanitarian principles; (ii) what is meant in practical terms by key concepts such as collective outcomes, multi-year approaches and working on the basis of comparative advantage; and (iii) what concrete steps will be needed after the WHS to implement the shift in approach described in the Secretary-General's Report.

48. We conclude that it is indeed crucial to change the way we operate and that this is both feasible and consistent with humanitarian principles – but with an important caveat that this is a spectrum of approaches rather than a single model. Where circumstances indicate a change in mindset to a joint humanitarian–development approach, we believe that this will require changes in every step of our assessment, planning, programming and financing cycle. To deliver real change in peoples' lives, it is crucial that we go beyond rhetoric to the practical changes that deliver better outcomes on the ground.

49. It is therefore important not only to reach consensus on a shift in approaches at the WHS, but also to agree on a set of follow-on actions, which can translate these new processes into action. We have suggested some ways in which it may be possible to draw together the commitments made by member states, international institutions and other actors into follow-on targets in the sections above. In Annex 1 we draw these together into a concise set of follow-on process and outcome measures. These are examples intended for discussion, and how they are filled in depends on the discussions at the WHS at beyond. The key point is that such tangible follow-on steps and targets are needed to ensure that discussions on better humanitarian-development cooperation translate into better results on the ground.

Annex 1: Indicative follow-on measures after the WHS, drawing from the core commitments related to humanitarian-development cooperation

Outcome targets

50. All the principal partners involved will at some point need to decide on what measurable global changes would best symbolize the objective of “leaving no one behind” and moving from “delivering aid to ending need” in the context of humanitarian emergencies. International action will be galvanized most effectively on the basis of clear and simple targets, based on the SDGs but extending these to the particular circumstances of humanitarian crises. The type of targets that could play that role, likely over a ten-year timeframe, include those shown below.¹¹ For all people affected by humanitarian crises (defined in assessment?/N.B. which need baselines available?):

- Ensure access to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round; achieve internationally-agreed goals on wasting and stunting for children under 5
- Reduce preventable deaths of newborns and children and maternal mortality (global target 2030 to 12 and 25 per 1,000 and 70 per 100,000 respectively, what is baseline for this population group?)
- Ensure all children affected by humanitarian emergencies are in quality schooling and (by monitoring attendance and participation rates) on track to complete primary and secondary education
- Promote mental health (measurement?)
- Reduce by X percent gender disparities in social and economic outcomes
- Reduce extreme poverty (under \$1.25 per day)

51. There is also a possibility to adopt targets for people displaced by humanitarian emergencies more specifically (refugees and IDPs). In addition to the indicators above, these could include:

- Reduce the number of displaced persons worldwide by 50 percent (care would need to be taken to ensure that the refugee conventions, international humanitarian law and human rights are upheld, to avoid any pressure on people to remain in, or return to, insecure environments)
- Get children displaced by emergencies back in quality schooling within X weeks (N.B. UNICEF note strong caveat on implying that there is any acceptable period for kids to be out of school, but it seems that people who have been forcibly displaced will inevitably be out for some period: is it not possible to aim to reduce this period?)
- Ensure that at least X percent of adults displaced in humanitarian emergencies for more than one year have access to work opportunities
- Ensure X percent of displaced youth are in employment, education or training

52. This paper does not aim to set goals or targets, but simply to suggest that they would be useful in focusing both humanitarian and development efforts, and in galvanizing action from a wide range of partners. Actually determining such targets would need to be part of process measures agreed after the WHS. Some initiatives to be announced at the WHS – for example, the “Education Can’t Wait” initiative, are already likely to be considering such targets. There will be a need to bring these together between sectoral areas and give them global legitimacy.

53. In most cases this approach will also require a rapid effort to collect baseline data and continued investment in data collection and monitoring.

Process targets

54. Many countries and institutions will make process or financing commitments at the WHS. To make a sustained difference in outcomes on the ground, these will need to be aggregated and followed up globally. Some specific commitment to follow-on actions after the WHS on the humanitarian-development front will be needed. A short list might include, with targets set for 1, 3 and 5 years:

Overall and short term:

A process between the WHS and the September Summits for the main international humanitarian-development actors and sectoral partnerships to agree on:

- Key indicators to monitor global outcomes such as the examples above [potentially later to be presented for intergovernmental agreement]
- Agreements by host governments and the key multilateral institutions on specific country situations in which assessment, planning, programming and/or coordination will be done differently
- Changes in financing patterns from donors to incentivize better cooperation, such as steps forward on MDB financing; multi-year commitments; options identified for new global or country-level action/financing platforms; or the number of humanitarian donors who have developed white papers or other policy documents on humanitarian-development cooperation

Analysis:

- At least X governments volunteer to lead assessments of risk with international support
- In at least X cases, UN agencies and the World Bank/other MDBs agree to support joint assessments that include humanitarian, development and peacebuilding perspectives in the pursuit of collective outcomes, including capability mapping of local institutions
- At least X Governments and multilateral institutions that have separate early warning and risk analysis agree to come together to develop a protocol to share information on risks

Planning:

- At least X joint planning frameworks, driven by inclusive national priorities and collective outcomes, adopted by UN development and humanitarian actors and the World Bank/other MDBs and underway by mid-2017
- All planning frameworks are informed by a comprehensive understanding of crisis risks and needs,

existing response capacities and aim to reinforce national systems rather than replacing them, as a default mode of operation

Programming:

- Increase of percentage of humanitarian budget in cash-based programming from X to X percent
- At least X joint programming frameworks involving humanitarian and development (and, where possible, peacebuilding) actors by 2017
- In at least X governments by 2017, identify whether national legislation or administrative regulation provides any bar to addressing the needs of populations affected by humanitarian crises and address these

Financing:


- Mechanisms in place to track the finances dedicated by national and local governments, donors and international agencies, civil society and the private sector
- At least X humanitarian donors able to commit funds over multi-year timeframes/An increase in the proportion of the global humanitarian budget committed in multi-year frameworks, from X to X percent
- At least X country situations where multi-donor trust funds can support integrated programming and cover at least X percent of total funds
- At least X country situations with an agreed role for private sector, civil society and/or philanthropy in humanitarian response plans in place
- Increase in global pooled funding available to X to finance local capabilities for analysis and joint assessments, to incentivise joint humanitarian and development approaches
- Establishment of a long-term global crisis response action and financing platform for protracted crises or forced migration

Annex 2: Exploring each end of the spectrum – two typologies and the implications for joint action

55. The figure below shows possible typologies of the humanitarian–development interface, according to specific contexts (from high intensity conflict to political settlement/peace):

56. In cases where levels of violence and political contestation are very high, there is a need to separate humanitarian action from other activities, closer to the red-colored spectrum of options presented above. In contexts where a post-conflict political settlement is emerging, as well as in refugee-hosting countries with on-going development programmes, the default option should be one of multi-dimensional responses, which is closer to the green-colored spectrum of options. Below are illustrations of the typologies at each end of the spectrum:

Figure 2: A progressive look at the humanitarian-development interface



Annex 3: The relevant results of recent reviews and key global agendas

General Assembly Resolution/ Security Council Resolution on UN Peacebuilding Architecture:

- The role of the PBC in facilitating preventive approaches and bridging institutional and sectoral divides, particularly through ECOSOC – PBC cooperation to promote coherence and complementarity between the United Nations peace and security, development, human rights and humanitarian work
- The important contributions of the United Nations development system to peacebuilding, including through the overarching framework of the United Nations operational activities for development
- A long-term vision of “sustaining peace”, as a shared task and responsibility, running across institutional, sectoral and geographical divides, before, during and after conflict
- The primacy of politics and the imperative of preventive solutions
- Inclusive national ownership
- Effective partnerships, especially with the World Bank and African Union
- Adequate, predictable and sustained financing to peacebuilding
- Joint analysis and effective strategic planning across the UN system
- Effective and responsive leadership in UNCTs

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda

- A new social compact is needed for social protection and public services for all
- A global infrastructure forum is necessary, to bridge the infrastructure gap
- An LDC package to support the poorest countries (there are ODA, foreign direct investment (FDI) and domestic financing gaps for peacebuilding and for development in LDCs)

- A technology facilitation mechanism to advance the SDGs
- Enhanced international tax cooperation to help raise domestic resources
- Devoting specific attention to development issues in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations
- Peaceful and inclusive societies is a “cross-cutting” issue
- Report on the Advisory Group of Experts on the UN Peacebuilding Architecture:
- Prioritizing the long-term vision of peace across actors, sectors, pillars, institutional divides
- The need to examine the success of the United Nations system in bringing together development, humanitarian and peace and security actions, including through subsequent QCPRs
- The primacy of politics and the imperative of preventive solutions
- Strategic, intergovernmental and operational coherence

Global Study on the Implementation of UNSCR 1325

- Prioritize conflict prevention
- Localize approaches
- Foster inclusive and participatory processes
- Enhance system-wide accountability, coordination and coherence both at headquarters and in the field
- Invest in partnerships. All key actors must play their role

Independent Review on the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States

- The 2008 Financial Crisis precipitated reduced commitment to aid effectiveness, and aid is under increasing pressure from humanitarian crises, which must force urgent new thinking on aid modalities, aid tracking and more effective use of resources
- Strengthen operational effectiveness and policy relevance, to identify what needs to happen, and how
- Strengthen southern capacity and knowledge
- Improve organizational and coalition impact

The Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction

- Recognition of Disaster Risk Management as part of sustainable development
- Strengthen the use of science and technology to contribute to joint analysis of risks and capacities
- Multi-hazard scope of disasters (natural and man-made hazards)
- Targets outlining the substantive reduction of global disaster mortality by 2030
- Complement and reinforce national action on Disaster Risk Reduction

The report of the High Level Panel on Global Health Crises

- Strengthen local health systems
- Enhance UN system-wide coordination in the global response to health crises
- Integration of health and humanitarian crisis trigger systems
- Appropriate leadership and coordination functions adapted to the task at hand
- Partnerships with NGOs and a wide range of actors.
- The report of the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing

The report of the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing and its “Grand Bargain”

- More support and funding tools to national first responders.
- Scale up use of cash-based programming and more coordination in its delivery.
- Reduce duplication and management costs.
- More joint and impartial needs assessments.
- A Participation Revolution: listen more to and include beneficiaries in decisions that affect them.
- More multi-year humanitarian funding.
- Less earmarks to humanitarian aid organisations.
- More harmonized and simplified reporting requirements.

The Paris Agreement on Climate Change

- Recognize the role of sustainable development in reducing the risk of loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events
- Enhance understanding, action and support on a cooperative and facilitative basis with respect to loss and damage, including: (a) Early warning systems; (b) Emergency preparedness; (c) Slow onset events; (d) Events that may involve irreversible and permanent loss and damage; (e) Comprehensive risk assessment and management; (f) Risk insurance facilities, climate risk pooling and other insurance solutions; (g) Non-economic losses; (h) Resilience of communities, livelihoods and ecosystems

Endnotes

¹The New Way of Working is complementary with other commitments that came out of the WHS such as workstream 7 of the Grand Bargain and commitments from the OECD, the World Bank and the individual commitments made by the signatory agencies: <https://consultations2.worldhumanitariansummit.org/bitcache/50b4cd3ad07469f44235f8a4c60353dfda17d0bb0?vid=581741&disposition=inline&op=view>

²The idea of mutually reinforcing linkages is supported in many different recent resolutions and reviews, summarized in Annex 3.

³“Can” and “should” are both relevant, since governments without on-going development assistance will be either high-income or developing countries cut off from international assistance, often because of very weak governance or conflict. In areas where government do not control territory the ability of some development actors to assist without a recognized national counterpart will be constrained, although some will be able to carry out community-level activities.

⁴In contexts where violent conflict is not present such as in the response to some natural disasters or health emergencies, the fundamental principle of Humanity, which embodies the humanitarian imperative to save lives and alleviate human suffering everywhere, as well as the principle of impartiality, remain the key guiding framework for emergency operations. The way in which the derived principles of neutrality and independence are applied, given their role as enablers of the higher level principles of Humanity and Impartiality, varies depending on context. For example, Humanitarian actors worked closely with international military forces in the response to the Ebola crisis or Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, while similar collaboration with international military forces parties to the conflict and their provincial reconstruction teams in Afghanistan was perceived as problematic in light of independence and neutrality.

⁵DAC Principles of good international engagement in fragile situations; New Deal.

⁶This does not mean no humanitarian-development cooperation is possible in acute conflict: development actors may make important contributions to analysis.

⁷This builds on lessons learned from humanitarian assessments and PCNAs.

⁸In practice, this is likely to mean one clear problem statement per major objective, leading to clear quantifiable results on that objective.

⁹This is not always feasible, when local institutions are weak: sometimes they need the support of neutral international counterparts. The DPA-UNDP Programme on Building National Capacities for Conflict Prevention and the deployment of Peace and Development Advisers have been important steps in the right direction, but achieving the desired outcome of joint and strategic analysis will require more time and resources.

¹⁰The difficulties are greater in refugee situations than for IDPs, although even in cases of internal displacement and humanitarian crises there may be a need for higher transitional expenditures that raise fiscal sustainability concerns. Refugee situations clearly pose greater upstream political, legal and institutional questions to navigate.

¹¹The General Assembly and Security Council resolutions on the UN Peacebuilding Architecture, the Report on the Advisory Group of Experts on the UN Peacebuilding Architecture, The High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations’ report, High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

¹²Data collection to be able to measure this type of target is also important.

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

New York University
726 Broadway, Suite 543
New York, NY 10003
(212) 998-3680
cic.info@nyu.edu
cic.nyu.edu