
IASC Results Group 3 – Collective Advocacy
7 July 2020

Summary Record

IASC Results Group 3 on Collective Advocacy met on 7 July 2020 to discuss (i) an update on humanitarian financing for the COVID-19 crisis and discussion on joint collective advocacy with RG5 co-Chair; (ii) Covid-19 protection advocacy messages prepared by the Global Protection Cluster (iii) the Global Protection Advocacy Strategy; (iv) Covid-19 and collective advocacy presented by the RG3 co-Chairs; (v) an update from sub-group co-Chairs on counter-terrorism; (vi) an update from the sub-group co-Chairs on climate change and humanitarian action; (vii) and an update on the RG3 OPAG presentation.

Action points:

1. RG3 members invited to share their funding flexibility messages with the co-Chairs to inform the agenda preparation of the RG5 meeting with the GHD.
2. RG 3 members to share evidence related to stigmatization with the RG3 co-Chairs to feed into World Humanitarian Day key messages.
3. Global Protection Cluster to finalize protection key messages by integrating language from the GHRP. *[ACTIONED – submitted to OPAG]*
4. FAO to share longer version of the food security key messages *[ACTIONED – attached long and short version]*
5. Global Protection Cluster to share final ODI protection scoping study with RG3 members.
6. Interested RG3 representatives interested in joining the GPC's taskteam focused on developing targeted advocacy products invited to contact Dorothy Sang - dorothy.sang@oxfam.org.
7. Sub-group co-Chair OCHA to share with the RG3 the mapping of the UN counter-terrorism architecture to inform advocacy entry points. *[ACTIONED – attached – pls do not share beyond the RG3 - this is a technical-level working paper aimed at informing the work of the IASC RG3 on COTER. It is not an official OCHA document and should not be interpreted as representing OCHA or the UN Secretariat official views on any issue.]*
8. Sub-group co-Chairs on climate change to share COVID-related key messages and the advocacy strategy with the RG3 once finalized by the sub-group.
9. IASC secretariat to share the RG3 progress report with the RG3. *[ACTIONED – attached]*
10. IASC secretariat to share a list of IASC-related sub-groups with the RG3. *[ACTIONED – attached]*

Update on humanitarian financing for the COVID-19 crisis and discussion on joint collective advocacy - RG5 co-Chair Jeremy Rempel

- RG5 co-Chair Jeremy presented the RG5 agenda relating to COVID-19. The two focus areas had been funding flexibility measures of existing contractual and partnership agreements; and strategic approaches to unlocking funding to NGOs on which also the ERC had engaged.
- On funding flexibility measures, there was now a final IASC guidance on a harmonized approach outlining nine specific commitments in the areas of budget flexibility; no-cost extensions; reprogramming; and due diligence/ risk management processes. To advance this area, a meeting was being planned between the RG5 and GHD

co-Chairs to explore a common agreement around the nine commitments. IOM raised the question how RG5 and RG3 could join funding flexibility advocacy efforts ahead of the meeting with the GHD. Mr. Rempel noted that a coordinated approach across the RGs would be ensured once the format and agenda were clarified.

- On NGO funding, steps had been undertaken to improve NGO engagement in the GHRP process; to improve pass-through mechanisms for NGOs in pooled funds; and to improve data tracking of NGO flows via FTS. On NGO engagement, the revised GHRP funding ask has been built up from the country-level, and NGOs have been able to engage to variable degrees.
- Regarding OCHA-managed pooled funds, an innovative \$25m CERF allocation for NGOs has recently been launched with IOM as an administrative agent in 6 countries¹. NGO selection and partnerships were largely handled by OCHA teams at the country levels. While \$25m was not a significant amount, this initiative was seen as an initial step. Another, more medium-term initiative was the regional pooled fund approach which was currently discussed with donors. At the regional level, there would be pooled resources for back-end accounting, while at the country level NGOs would have access to pooled fund money located at the regional level.
- On tracking for funds, RG5 had engaged with FTS to streamline data processing. There seemed to be more of a process than system challenge to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of NGO's funding access, based on which improved process understanding of who should report what when should bring about greater funding tracking clarity. On a related note, InterAction and ICVA had also undertaken a survey to get an evidence base of NGO funding flows during the COVID-19 response. Preliminary findings revealed inconsistencies in the system with partners reporting both quick and slow turn-around times of funding flows. The availability of funding in the first place was not possible to capture via this survey.
- Regarding the recent pledging conference, the RG5 co-Chair explained that pledging conferences did not have explicit targets. The Yemen pledge result had been disappointing with less funding pledged than the year before. Regarding the food-related advocacy messages, OCHA referred to the ERC's advocacy efforts.² The RG 3 co-Chair also highlighted NGO funding advocacy efforts. Mr. Rempel added that the Syria pledging result had been more encouraging with \$5.5 bn pledged for 2020, as well as \$2bn for resilience in 2021.
- OCHA confirmed that the GHRP updated version will be launched on 16 July.
- Related to the counter-terrorism measure agenda, Mr. Rempel highlighted the potential linkages between counter-terrorism measures and the ongoing localization discussion, including the links to the COVID-19 funding discussions to local partners.
- In his summary, the RG3 co-Chair Mr. Michel Anglade added that the RG3 had also discussed funding advocacy needs to WFP's managed common services. WFP commented that \$142m had been received out of some \$960m required to the end of the year.

Covid-19 protection advocacy messages – Ms Dorothy Sang/ Global Protection Cluster

- On the background of the protection key messages prepared by the Global Protection Cluster (GPC), the RG 3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade noted that RG 1 had prepared a paper on the protection aspect of stigmatization from a programmatic perspective. To this end, the GPC had focused on the advocacy aspects. The objective was to submit the messages to the OPAG for review, and convert them into an IASC product upon IASC Principals' endorsement.

¹ Bangladesh, the Central African Republic, Haiti, Libya, South Sudan and Sudan

² <https://radio.foxnews.com/2020/07/03/global-pandemic-a-perfect-storm-in-yemen-with-war-famine-and-covid-19/>;

- Ms. Dorothy Sang from the GPC noted that the focus areas of the key messages included: the negative coping strategies due to secondary impacts; the increase of violence, including GBV; unequal access to services; and xenophobia. The messages were based on evidence obtained from country-level protection clusters. OCHA suggested that the messages feed into the World Humanitarian Day key messages.
- Further to OCHA's question regarding information on stigmatization, Ms. Sang and Mr. Anglade referred to the GPC sitreps, the RG1 paper on stigmatization, and NGOs' and other RG3 members' related evidence.
- Upon InterAction's query related to the outcome of the broad-based protection messages, Ms. Sang noted that the key messages were to outline broad recommendations, yet that the protection advocacy strategy would focus on more targeted advocacy products on which the GPC and the RG3 could engage.
- Referring to the GHRP draft update, ICVA referenced inclusion of specific language regarding GBV, elderly people and disabilities in the revision, which had been a key ask from the NGO community; and suggested that the protection key messages integrate some of the language for consistent messaging purposes between the GHRP and the RG3 key messages. Concurring with the recommendations, the RG 3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade deplored the low funding for protection programming in the global COVID-19 response. He also highlighted that the protection key advocacy messages would need to be updated on a regular basis to reflect emerging issues.
- UNICEF affirmed its agreement with the messages, and highlighted the need to also deepen the analysis on specific groups in addition to issues. Going forward, UNICEF's areas of attention included the impact of protection concerns in conflict-specific thematic areas, such as the attack on infrastructure and personnel, and to which extent they affected vulnerabilities and survival; and the secondary impact of potential recruitment into armed groups, specifically children. Interested RG3 members were invited to join analysis efforts with UNICEF. WHO confirmed its interest in investigating the impact of attacks on health infrastructures, and to which extent these attacks had been COVID-related, as well as to which extent COVID was fueling conflict more broadly.
- The Global Protection Cluster commended the RG3's efforts to place protection at the core of its work.

Covid-19 and collective advocacy related to food security - RG3 co-Chairs

- Regarding increasing food security concerns, FAO outlined its advocacy efforts via the Global Food Security Cluster (FSC), which resulted in a set of food security key messages to inform messaging of country-level food security leads vis-à-vis donors and governments. The messages had further been disseminated via the FAO/African Union taskforce of which WFP was also a member. WFP commented that it was also working to ensure that agriculture ministries were taking part in this taskforce.
- FAO noted that other advocacy efforts included: (i) a WFP/FAO brief to the IASC Principals on the hotspot analysis on 10 July, with which the FSC key messages were in full alignment; (ii) the publication of a joint analysis of food security hotspots on 15 July; and (iii) a meeting of the global network related to food crises on 22 July accompanied by a social media campaign.
- FAO noted that RG3 members would be invited to feed into the longer version of protection messages, such as on nutrition.
- WFP outlined the food security facts and figures. The estimated figure of food insecure people in 2020 stands at 270m people, representing an average 82 per cent increase compared to pre-COVID overall, with Latin America and the Caribbean being the region most affected with an over 200 per cent increase compared to pre-COVID.
- WFP's priority is to reach 138m food insecure people via social protection measures, school-based interventions, as well as nutrition services and food systems. To achieve this, WFP requires \$7.8 bn of which the shortfall

amounts to \$4.8bn, in addition to the shortfall related to the common services.³ The WFP Executive Director's key message is that not reaching people with adequate support packages is to expose them to the risk of starvation.

Global Protection Advocacy Strategy – Ms Dorothy Sang/ Global Protection Cluster

- Ms. Dorothy Sang from the Global Protection Cluster noted that the GPC's draft protection advocacy strategy was based on a scoping study undertaken by ODI, which resulted in ten recommendations, of which a key suggestion was to identify the GPC's added value given its broad-based membership.
- The overarching objectives of the draft strategy focused on (i) protection activities being fully funded via the GHRP; (ii) the centrality of protection informing advocacy efforts of IASC Principals, donors and partners; (iii) and ensuring the prioritization of vulnerable groups in the COVID-19 response. Further to InterAction's comments regarding the objectives, Ms. Sang expressed interest in continuing discussions on the sub-objectives in greater detail at the technical level.
- The following priority thematic areas have been identified to inform a coherent narrative: (i) protection violence and COVID-19; (ii) joined up efforts between the GPC and other sectors to prevent negative coping strategies; and (iii) the identification of neglected countries with emerging protection concerns. Targeted advocacy products would be developed via a taskteam.
- Upon the question of RG 3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade regarding expectations vis-à-vis RG3, Ms. Sang suggested that the RG 3 could focus on more collective products, or coordinated advocacy efforts related to protection.
- The RG 3 co-Chair Ms. Shoko Arakaki suggested that following elements be considered in the advocacy strategy: (i) highlight that protection activities were lifesaving; (ii) demonstrate that vulnerable groups were agents of change in society, and the risk of not protecting these groups would have an impact on future generations; (iii) the risk of not engaging on protection was to jeopardize societies' resilience.

Up-date on Counter-terrorism (COTER) and humanitarian action - RG3 sub-group co-Chairs

- OCHA reminded that the workplan was related to the IASC Principals' decisions in Dec. 2018. In this regard, the mapping of the UN's counter-terrorism architecture was completed. In addition, OCHA was working on a calendar of counter-terrorism events at the UN Secretariat to be finalized shortly, as well as on a related guidance to HCs. InterAction's work on gathering additional evidence was progressing; and so was Save the Children's work on the solution workstream.
- This week was the counter-terrorism week at the UN. Due to COVID, many high-level events had been postponed. The link to the events had been circulated, including for the discussion on terrorist fighters.
- Upon the question by RG 3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade regarding the status of the CTED/ OCHA report, OCHA noted that it was postponed due to COVID. CTED was yet to recruit a consultant. The decision whether CTED was to brief the counter-terrorism committee on the status of the report around the end of the year.
- The RG3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade referred to the recently launched toolkit by NRC⁴, providing guidance on how to deal with counter-terrorism measures.

³

⁴ <https://www.nrc.no/toolkit/principled-humanitarian-action-managing-counterterrorism-risks/>

Up-date on climate change, humanitarian action and collective advocacy - RG3 sub-group co-Chairs

- The RG3 sub-group co-Chair Ms. Kirsten Mildren noted that the climate change key messages and advocacy strategy would be shared with the RG 3 following the next sub-group meeting.
- Numerous climate change related events were planned from the GA week to the end of the week. The private sector seemed to take climate change more seriously, in terms of ensuring that COVID recovery plans included reference to climate change. Climate change actors' advocacy efforts also focused on national government to integrate climate change reference into their recovery plans.

Update on the RG3 OPAG presentation – RG3 co-Chairs

- The RG3 co-Chairs were to update the OPAG later that week on the RG3's priority areas, and share their reflections with the OPAG. In terms of challenges, RG 3 co-Chair Ms. Arakaki noted that IASC Principals and the EDG were conducting inter-agency partnership advocacy as well. In addition, advocacy results were difficult to measure in terms of behavioral change. To this end, the RG3 co-Chairs will pose some framing questions to the OPAG to further define the RG 3's added value.

AoB

- Upon WFP's query regarding a list of sub-groups related to the IASC structures, the RG 3 co-Chair Mr. Anglade explained that RG 3 had two sub-groups: (i) on counter-terrorism and humanitarian action co-chaired by OCHA/Save the Children and InterAction; (ii) and on climate change and humanitarian action co-chaired by IFRC and OCHA.
