
IASC Results Group 5 – Humanitarian Financing

20 August 2019

Summary Record

Follow-up on Action Points and Adoption of Minutes

The Results Group 5 on Humanitarian Financing met on 20 August in Geneva to discuss the following agenda:

- Review minutes and action items from the July RG 5 call;
- Presentation by Lydia Poole and discussion on the key recommendations emanating from the “Financing the Nexus Study” supported by NRC, FAO, and UNDP;
- Overview of links between RG4 and RG5 on development of joint humanitarian-development financing tools;
- Update on planning for September 19 workshop led by Grand Bargain co-conveners of the Quality Funding workstream;
- Updates from the group on any progress toward RG5 priorities.
- AOB
 - RG reporting

Action Points:

1. Share the recommendations from the Joint Steering Committee study. [attached to these minutes]
2. Share the Grand Bargain outcome document. [attached to these minutes]
3. NRC, FAO, UNDP, RG 5 co-Chairs and IASC secretariat to further define follow up action to publication of Financing the Nexus Study.
4. Convene a discussion in preparation of the GB workshop on 19 September and agree on collective messages (in collaboration with RG4). [Tentatively being planned for Sept 12 or 13]
5. Co-chair meeting with IASC secretariat to populate website and consider a common space with RG 4.
6. Follow up with UNFPA on their ongoing relevant work (action point from 23 July).

Presentation and discussion on the key recommendations emanating from the “Financing the Nexus Study” supported by NRC, FAO, and UNDP.

Lydia Poole presented on the key findings and recommendations emanating from the “Financing the Nexus Study”. Key findings included:

1. Gaps remain between discussion on the nexus at the global policy level and those implementing in country, as well as between nexus approaches in the country case studies (Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Ukraine). There are also significant conceptual and practical challenges to implement the nexus, particularly in crisis affected countries.
2. Increasing availability and quality of development financing, mostly provided through multilateral development banks and the IMF. However, there is no consistency on what good financing would look like in these contexts. Scaling up financing in high risk environments with few staff and no or limited guidelines has great potential to do harm. Significant conceptual and policy differences remain. Relevant available financing mechanisms are mostly managed from Headquarters and funding is highly earmarked. This undermines country level prioritization and coordination (there is little appetite to coordination outside the humanitarian realm). There is little evidence of and appetite for joint or

collective outcomes. The use of funding to create incentives to support nexus priorities and encourage collaboration across the nexus is underdeveloped. Though there are a few interesting examples of donor funding instruments (created by France, Germany, EU), there is little evidence of how to use financing more strategically at the country level, despite its potential key role in incentivizing new way of working.

3. Multi-year humanitarian funding has increased but remains insufficient to drive a significant change and is inadequate vis-à-vis needs. There are high levels of support in principle but not often in practice to assume collaborative and joined up approaches. Programme design remains annual and focused on life-saving interventions. Up to now, ongoing programmes are being fit into the narrative.
4. Political environments are not enabling collaborative programming. Policy barriers are limiting ability to implement programmes. There are significant differences between country case studies in terms of the role of the local government, a role which is deemed vital for implementing the nexus.
5. Limited consideration of how to manage the risk of doing harm.
6. In many cases actors at the country level were still struggling to deliver nexus outputs. The authors of the study received some indication that donors were considering scaling back multi-year funding due to disappointment over lack of delivery.

Key recommendations include:

Global:

Define purpose and scope of nexus approaches.

Provide country teams with guidance, technical support and resources (not new planning frameworks but support enabling collaborative work).

Address structural gaps and disincentives to donor coordination.

Agree on global-level commitments to policy coherence and do no harm approaches while scaling up the engagement of International Financing Institution in crisis affected settings.

Provide enough funding, with enough flexibility, and realistic time frames

Country level

Invest in enabling conditions for coherent response.

Develop financing strategies to ensure policy coherence, sequencing and the identification of responsibilities.

Establish spaces for dialogue on financing to enable policy coherence and discussions on preventing risk and doing harm.

Use funding to incentivize collaborative approaches and bring successful programming to scale.

Invest in institutional capabilities to design and deliver better programming.

In the ensuing discussions, participants noted:

- a) Similarity of recommendations ensuing from the Joint Steering Committee mapping exercise.
- b) The IASC has endorsed key messages on the humanitarian development nexus which provide overall guidance on the scope and purpose of the Nexus. Results Group 4 will develop light guidance on collective outcomes which should address some of the recommendations raised in this study.
- c) The workstreams 7 and 8 of the Grand Bargain should pay more attention to the planning side of multi-year programming.
- d) Country level teams are already overwhelmed by planning processes. Collective outcomes planning is mostly not welcome, as there is a perception that it will add layers of complexity. They are interested in working differently, ensuring that nexus considerations are mainstreamed.

- e) There is little evidence of local government being incentivized or capacitated to engage on collective outcoming. The study highlights that nexus priorities are often at odds with the priorities of government.
- f) Ongoing discussions within organisations on the recently published OECD DAC principles and around the potential of their endorsement. The OECD will establish work streams for each of its principles, many of which will overlap with workstreams under the Grand Bargain and of Results Group 5.

Planning for the Grand Bargain September 19 workshop

The co-Chairs of Results Groups 4 and 5 and the IASC secretariat are invited to the Grand Bargain workshop convened by Workstreams 7 and 8 (quality funding – unearmarked and multi-year) on the barriers to quality funding. Results Group 5 aims to agree on collective messaging to donors on identified key barriers and recommendations to overcome them; agree to do so in collaboration with Results Group 4. On the basis of the report being completed by NRC/DI looking at barriers to multi-year funding, RG5 will convene a meeting to discuss messaging, probably September 12 or 13, inviting members of RG4. The September 19 workshop will be key to define specific areas where RG5 can best add value in addressing barriers (beyond high-level political persuasion). There will be a high-level donor breakfast meeting in the margins of the UN General Assembly linking up to the September Grand Bargain workshop; this is another opportunity for advocacy. This is followed by the Grand Bargain High Level meeting in late October or early November.

AOB:

Results Groups are asked to report to the OPAG by 11 October 2019. Co-Chairs shared the reporting template.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 17 September 2019.