

GRAND BARGAIN FACILITATION GROUP TELE-CONFERENCE

28 March 2018

Participants

FG Member	Name
UK	N/A
Germany	Lea and Marie
OCHA	Antoine
UNHCR	Hiroko
InterAction - Chair	Kate and Lindsay
ICRC	Elena
GB Secretariat	Gianmaria

Discussion

Agenda item	Content	Action points
<i>Introduction and brief review of February action points</i>	OCHA has been appointed as co-chair of the HFTT with ICVA. OCHA and ICVA are already discussing how to build synergies with the GB	
<i>FG workplan</i>	<p>Clean and track change versions of the WP circulated. It is necessary to refine the language on safe-guarding (page 2). There is no process for collecting best practices nor the FG wants to lose focus on other priorities. The proposal is to ask the EP to specify in the cover letter/communique (before the Annual meeting) that the GB is rooted on ethics and integrity. WB seems fine with this approach, yet the EP is keen to use the GB as a unique forum for collecting and sharing best practices.</p> <p>Therefore, the language to be used with Co-convenors and Signatories is to voluntary share best practices, without</p>	<p>InterAction to fine tune the safe-guarding language</p> <p>DFID to clarify on if and how to share the info DFID collected from implementing partners on safe-guarding practices</p> <p>InterAction/UNHCR/DFID to have a call and blend all the information they have, with the idea to share the information with the WB. It is clear that these best</p>

	<p>creating a specific platform with the risk of losing focus and needing to develop procedures.</p> <p>DFID was collecting practices of its partners. The WB is also looking internally on best practices so sharing this information can be useful. However, the risk is that the FG is perceived as pushing a specific agenda, therefore once again it is important to insist on the voluntarily of the process</p>	<p>practices are not representative of all the humanitarian community as other actors might have different practices</p> <p>The communique cover note will be done before June, with a suggestion to have a tweet from the EP on the GB language</p>
<i>Formal acknowledgment of new GB Signatories</i>	<p>WHO asked to have a formal acknowledgement from the EP. The Secretariat clarified that the Gb is based on a light process, plus it is important not to create a precedent. Finally, it is important to use strategically the EP</p>	<p>Besides the formal endorsement of new signatories at the Annual Meeting, the Sherpa of the FG Chairs will also send a formal letter of acknowledgment – InterAction will send a letter to the 4 new members</p> <p>It is important to reinforce the message that the GB is a light structure and it is open, even if the focus is currently on reinforcing the current membership</p> <p>The Secretariat to add the endorsement of new Signatories to the running messages for the Annual meeting</p>
<i>EP meeting follow up, based on summary notes</i>	<p>All comments on the summary notes sent and received. Points to be clarified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Dinner 1</u>: dinner with the WB for FG members and co-convenors possibly at decisional level (before the Annual Meeting – Sunday 17 June). The topic should be expanding membership. It must be clearly communicated that to the EP that, despite 'decisional 	<p>A final draft of the notes will be shared by the Secretariat on 29/03 mid-day with FG for red lines. The email with the notes will also highlight the parts about dinners and WS10 for easy visibility. Thursday 5 April is the internal deadline for sharing it with the World Bank</p>

	<p>level' will be requested probably the dinner will be at Sherpa level and possibly not principle level</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>Dinner 2</u>: dinner with outgoing and incoming FG after the annual meeting. This is a technical meeting 3. <u>WS10</u>: there is a growing concern around the WS10, therefore the summary notes need to be very clear about how the decision was articulated. It must be clear that closing WS10 is not a decision of the EP, but rather stressing that the FG was heavily involved, there was a long conversation to clarify next steps. In fact, closing a work-stream is not just about sending a letter, but rather a full process. It is also important not to ask further process to the Co-convenors of WS10 	<p>Dinner options will be checked with the World Bank to confirm the level (probably Sherpa) is acceptable for the EP. It can be flagged that a high-level dinner can be done on margin of UNGA, with a particular focus on safe guarding</p> <p>WS10 closure is the result of a long process and discussion – This is how it is articulated in the notes.</p> <p>WS10 Co-convenors will not be asked to take any other action from the FG, WB or EP in order not to unnecessarily prolong the discussion</p>
<i>Annual meeting</i>	<p>There are some logistic challenges, around space, lunch and break down in smaller groups. The Scandinavia House should have space for hosting the event, including 2 or 3 side rooms, but with some logistic challenges that need to be verified.</p> <p>Possibility of having a social gathering: if yes, it needs to be included in the agenda and logistics</p>	<p>The decision on the logistic will define which location will be chosen.</p> <p>Gian to verify with NORCAP how to do the payment for Scandinavia House, if necessary</p> <p>The option of organizing a social gathering will be discussed on a second moment</p>
<i>M&E framework</i>	<p>The WB is very encouraged that UNHCR is willing to test the framework as co-convenor of WS4. In order to facilitate the adoption of the M&E framework, one option is to ask a cover note from the EP where the need for more impact oriented analysis is explained, in order to generate some momentum. In the cover letter co-convenors will be invited to design what</p>	<p>All co-convenor representatives of the FG go through the exercise and then reconvene, bearing in mind to look at the template in a flexible way but also with a more robust attention to impact. ODI findings will need to be taken into</p>

	<p>success look like, within this framework or not.</p> <p>It is important to clarify that the vision of success is defined by the co-convenors, because different stakeholders have a different vision of what success looks like. It is important to stress that the template is a kick start of the discussion not a must-use tool. For example, it does not capture the impact level, which should be identified.</p>	<p>consideration as well</p> <p>After there is consensus, InterAction will communicate with the WB and identify clear messages that can be reinforced by the EP for Y3</p>
<p><i>Hand over from current FG Chair (InterAction) to incoming FG Chair (UNHCR)</i></p>	<p>Lindsay will take a step back from the GB. Hiroko will be the Chair of the FG for April and May</p>	
<p><i>AOB</i></p>	<p>No AOB</p>	