

IASC Operational Policy and Advocacy Group Meeting

11-12 April 2019, Geneva

Summary Record

INTRODUCTION

The Operational Policy and Advocacy Group (OPAG) of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) held its first meeting of 2019 hosted by the World Food Programme in Geneva, on 11 and 12 April 2019. The agenda of the meeting and the list of participants are contained in annexes I and II.

In welcoming the OPAG members¹, the co-Chairs, Ms. Valerie Guarnieri and Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, expressed special appreciation for the efforts of its members in engaging in the IASC reform as this was the first meeting of the OPAG under the new IASC structures to make the OPAG and its five Results Groups reporting to it more effective, nimbler, less bureaucratic, more results and field oriented.

In outlining the purpose of the Group, the co-Chairs noted that the OPAG serves as a forum to support the normative and strategic policy work of the IASC, including on system-wide policy matters with direct bearing on humanitarian operations. It is responsible for overseeing and guiding the work of the Results Groups on behalf of the IASC. Additionally, the co-Chairs laid out the agenda for the meeting, soliciting members' views on the opportunities and risks for the OPAG in light of the new IASC structural reform; on delivering on the IASC's vision and priorities; agreeing on priority areas of work for Results Groups; clarifying working methods, including linkages to other IASC and non-IASC structures; and on UNDS reform and its impact on humanitarian action ahead of the Principals meeting on 29 May. To this end, the co-Chairs invited Ms. Mervat Shelbaya, Head of the IASC secretariat to present on the OPAG's working methods and welcomed members' views.

SESSION 1: OPAG AND RESULTS GROUPS – PURPOSE AND WORKING METHOD

The IASC secretariat underscored that the IASC is, by definition, the Committee of the Principals and that all of the subsidiary bodies approved in the IASC reform structure are specifically there to support the implementation of the vision and priorities of the IASC. In this regard, it was important to demonstrate added value and relevance of the new structures with an emphasis on timebound deliverables. Work carried out by the OPAG and the respective Results Groups needed to consider the limited nature of time, capacities and resources, and, as such, it was critical to focus on critical areas of work that will have the most impact on humanitarian action, particularly focusing on normative policy and advocacy issues that have a direct bearing on strengthening field effectiveness. The IASC secretariat added that while it was critical to move forward on implementing the IASC biennium workplan for 2019-2020, there would be a phase of adjustment during the coming period to adapt to the new structures and consider the most efficient ways to deliver on concrete results. Membership to the OPAG and Results Groups will be limited to IASC members (including two additional seats for each of the NGO consortia) for accountability purposes. However, each Result Group is expected to, and will be assessed on the extent to which they reach out to non-IASC partners, particularly those from the Global South, as guided by (but not limited to) the draft "*Initial Mapping of Inter-Agency Bodies for Engagement by IASC Results Groups*" document, to ensure that the expertise from outside of the IASC membership informs the critical work being carried out. Limited participation with broader consultation will be a way to balance both accountability of members and inclusivity.

¹ The term "members" throughout the document refers to both "full members" and "standing invitees".

The IASC secretariat also noted that temporary participation of non-IASC entities/representatives in the Results Groups is encouraged for specific/ technical issues relevant to their participation. Furthermore, each Results Group should be managed according to what is deemed most appropriate to deliver on concrete and time-bound results, including working closely with other Results Groups and assigning lead organizations within their respective members to take forward key deliverables.

In the ensuing discussion, members highlighted the need to work by consensus as the OPAG arrives at decisions. Additionally, members overwhelmingly expressed the need to show results quickly to showcase the added value of the OPAG and its Results Groups. This is particularly important given that the new structures will be reviewed in a year. There was recognition of the empowered role of the IASC secretariat to serve the interests of all members and emphasized the importance of its independence.

In taking the Group's work forward, the group was reminded that the vision and direction for the OPAG and its Results Groups derives from the IASC. However, members noted that there should be a two-way channel of communication, recognizing that the OPAG has a vital role to play in advising and in putting forward strategic issues for consideration by the IASC and that the OPAG's co-Chairs would provide such a liaison role. Furthermore, they unanimously underscored the importance of applying the principle of subsidiarity vis-à-vis the IASC to allow the OPAG to move forward swiftly in carrying out activities and to empower OPAG to endorse IASC policies, guidance and normative documents, unless otherwise guided by the IASC. A majority of members raised concerns on the format of Principals-only sessions noting that, while Principals must have space to discuss issues openly, there was a recognition that clarity is needed around decisions emanating from such meetings as it was important for the IASC's subsidiary bodies and the respective IASC members to take these decisions forward. As such, there was a unanimous call to have at the minimum the IASC secretariat included in all sessions with a view to communicating any relevant decisions to OPAG members and other IASC structures. The format and working methods of the UN System Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB) were noted as good practices. The OPAG co-Chairs agreed to bring this issue to the attention of the ERC.

Members also expressed their views on membership within the IASC structures, particularly the Results Groups. Some Members requested clarification regarding the decision-making process for co-chairing roles of the Results Group, noting the need for transparency. The Head of the IASC Secretariat explained that decisions were made on the basis of clear criteria including the need to strike a balance between UN and non-UN co-Chairs for each group, level of nominations, in addition to other specific criteria to each group such as membership/linkages in other critical non-IASC coordination bodies. While membership is restricted to IASC members, various members expressed the need to ensure diversity and balance between United Nations and non-United Nations entities, taking into account the expertise and views of diverse stakeholders, such as national/local stakeholders. Members highlighted the need for flexibility in participation of relevant NGOs, giving space to strong engagement from developing countries, to ensure that IASC deliverables are based on the evidence/expertise from the ground. The Head of the IASC secretariat clarified that as has been established practice, inclusivity is an imperative thus each NGO consortia was allowed two additional seats in the OPAG and each Results Group. In addition, it was suggested that ICVA could be allocated 1-2 additional seats to allow for the representation of non-governmental organizations from developing countries. Ms. Shelbaya added that while only the IASC members can be held accountable for completing deliverables in timely fashion, each Results Group was required to engage with entities outside of the IASC, and that it was important for each Results Group to have a benchmark on the level of engagement with external partners. Members also agreed on the need for the OPAG to meet twice a year in person and on an ad hoc basis as needed (with consideration for a joint OPAG-EDG annual meeting).

In conclusion, the co-Chairs reflected on the views of members, including the need to put people at the center of the IASC's work; the need to ensure the principle of subsidiarity between the IASC and the OPAG; the need to focus on a few priorities and show concrete results of operational relevance and articulate the tasks of evaluation for the OPAG and Results Groups within a year; the need for collaboration, coherence, transparency, and complementarity across the Results Groups; the need to look at strategic use of the IASC bodies in terms of advocacy; the need to innovate and add value to efforts already being expensed throughout the humanitarian system; the need to contextualize the

OPAG's action and ensure that the OPAG provides normative and policy guidance that applies to the needs of the field and that Results Groups organize as they see fit to most effectively deliver concrete results.

Follow-Up Actions:

1. IASC members to ensure that their representatives in the OPAG and the respective Results Groups are appropriate and are at the optimal level.
2. The IASC secretariat will reflect views of the members in the draft "OPAG and Results Group Working Methods" document and will circulate to the OPAG for final review.
3. As an opportunity to encourage more participation of non-governmental organizations from developing countries, ICVA would be afforded 2 additional seats specifically for national NGO representation in the OPAG and Results Groups.
4. Results Groups to further review the draft "Mapping of Inter-Agency Bodies for Engagement by IASC Results Groups" to ensure critical bodies for their respective work are included in consultations and/or to take forward critical areas of work.

SESSION 2: RESULTS GROUPS – PRIORITY AREAS OF WORK

In introducing this session, the co-Chairs expressed that the OPAG should agree on the priority areas of work to be tasked to each Results Group throughout 2019. The co-Chairs of the five Results Groups were invited to the OPAG meeting to present on their proposed priority areas of work. A mapping of possible areas of work, provided by the IASC secretariat, guided this exercise. The mapping drew on decisions from IASC Principals meetings, the IASC endorsed biennium workplan for 2019-2020, thematic priority areas of work identified by the Emergency Directors Group (EDG) during the 2019 Annual Review of Operations, and also considered a number of recommendations of previous IASC Task Teams and Reference Groups.

Co-Chairs of Results Group 1 – Operational Response highlighted the following as priority areas of work for the Group: centrality of protection in humanitarian action to be operationalized in the field; humanitarian system-wide emergency activation, including the SUSTAIN protocols; review of coordination in IDP settings; humanitarian leadership with a focus on the collective accountability framework; and Early Warning and Early Action, in particular how to ensure a strengthened production of the Early Warning-Early Action and Readiness analysis, and strengthen the implementation of preparedness measures, and its appropriate dissemination and use.

Co-Chairs of Results Group 2 – Accountability and Inclusion highlighted the following as priority areas of work for the Group: humanitarian responses informed and adapted by feedback from affected populations; Regional Networks are strengthened; better prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA) and Sexual Harassment (SH) for communities as well as for personnel and partners; improved support to PSEA/SH at field level, including on delivering the IASC framework and training PSEA field support teams; development of a global platform to provide direct support, guidance and best practice to aid agencies, including through a help desk and a one-stop virtual multi-lingual/interactive platform; and dissemination and promotion of IASC Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action. The Results Group's co-Chairs also provided a notable Working Principle for the group overall: 'to ensure and promote a coherent approach to AAP, PSEA, gender, age, disability, diversity, age whilst recognising the distinct expertise that exists for each of these areas'.

Co-Chairs of Results Group 3 – Collective Advocacy highlighted the following as priority areas of work for the Group: impact of counter-terrorism measures and legislations on humanitarian action, including mapping of current counter-terrorism measures and legislation in collaboration with Results Group 1– Operational Response; identifying concrete deliverables on displacement; protection of civilians, including mobilizing around key events such as the 70th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions, 3rd International Conference on Safe Schools and 30th anniversary of the Convention of the Rights of the Child; resource mobilization to enhance protection and further solutions; bureaucratic impediments, including mapping of bureaucratic impediments in a few selected crises; and humanitarian access,

including mapping on key humanitarian access issues in selected crises and examples of good practices in areas of no/limited access and high-risk environments.

Co-Chairs of Results Group 4 – Humanitarian-Development Collaboration highlighted the following as priority areas of work for the Group: defining the parameters of strengthening collaboration with the Joint Steering Committee and other similar coordination mechanism; mapping and elaboration of potential modes of financing collective outcomes Results Group 5 – Humanitarian Financing or similar objectives by IFIs in contexts where the government is unwilling/unable; developing guidance on a common understanding for analysis, funding and financial strategies collaborating with Results Group 5 – Humanitarian Financing and effective coordination initiatives (light IASC guidance on collective outcomes); establish coordination and support mechanism in two countries where different actors, including private sector and local actors will analyze and plan jointly; mapping of good practice and lessons learned of humanitarian-development collaboration; strengthening country snapshots; finalizing the development of an inter-agency guidance on the humanitarian-development nexus and its linkages to peace, while safeguarding humanitarian principles; expanding and utilizing the humanitarian-development nexus community of practice network; defining a system for pooling capacities from five main sources identified.

Co-Chairs of Results Group 5 – Humanitarian Financing highlighted the following as priority areas of work for the Group: facilitate the development of innovative approaches to humanitarian financing that deepen and widen the resource base, through learning lab series, early action/anticipatory financing thesaurus, CERF early-action pilots; map financing instruments with development co-benefits collaborating with Results Group 4– Humanitarian-Development Collaboration; improve the practical linkages between development funding and unmet humanitarian needs in collaboration with Results Group 4 – Humanitarian-Development Collaboration, identifying good practices; facilitate the ongoing process of simplification and harmonization of UN systems to reduce burdens and free additional resources for humanitarian operations, by building the evidence for multi-year and unearmarked funding and capitalizing on the UN harmonization of agreements. There were also calls for coordination with Results Group 3 – Collective Advocacy.

In the ensuing discussion, OPAG members recommended the key priority areas of action for Results Groups going forward. For details, please refer to the OPAG *Priority Areas of Work for the IASC Results Groups* document.

Members noted the need for the Results Groups to further concretize their priority areas of work, including clear deliverables, and the need to sequence these over the next months to ensure time-bound deliverables and quick results that demonstrates the effectiveness and relevance of the Results Groups whilst maintaining some flexibility for relevant issues which may arise. Members also stressed that while the membership of the Results Groups is limited to the IASC members for accountability reasons and to facilitate and expedite decision-making processes, the Results Groups will be expected to engage systematically with each other as well as key entities outside of the IASC that have the expertise to contribute to and or to take forward critical areas of work.

Members agreed that the IASC secretariat will consolidate the priority areas of work as discussed at the meeting, including reflecting any views from OPAG members, and circulate to the Results Group co-Chairs for their inputs before submission to the OPAG for final review and agreement. The priority action areas will then be communicated by the IASC secretariat to the respective Results Groups for implementation.

Follow-Up Action:

1. By 17 April, the IASC secretariat will share a draft document outlining key priority areas of work with the co-Chairs of each Results Group for review prior to circulation to the OPAG members for review/endorsement. The aim will be to have a final list of priority areas finalized by 10 May to share with Results Groups for implementation.

SESSION 3: LINKAGES WITH OTHER STRUCTURES

OPAG co-Chairs invited members to discuss and agree on the most effective way to engage with key structures within and outside of the IASC to ensure that decisions and normative work carried out by the OPAG is informed by field

realities and expertise within and outside the IASC. To begin the discussion, the IASC secretariat offered initial thoughts on how to strengthen engagement with IASC structures²; when/how to engage with the entities associated with the IASC³; and how to ensure systematic engagement with structures outside of the IASC, including donors and the multilateral system.

The Head of the IASC Secretariat emphasized the need for the IASC structures to systematically engage with non-IASC partners to better inform IASC bodies of work and decisions. To aid the discussion, the Group was provided with “*Mapping of Inter-Agency Bodies for Engagement by IASC Results Groups*” document which outlines inter-agency bodies that Results Group ‘must’ and ‘should’ engage with. The mapping, which will be updated with feedback from the OPAG members, took into account inputs from the co-Chairs of former and current IASC subsidiary bodies.

In the ensuing discussion, members stressed the principle of subsidiarity, noting in particular that the OPAG is accountable to the IASC and that Results Groups and Entities Associated with the IASC are accountable to the OPAG. To perform this task fully, the OPAG should closely consult and coordinate within the IASC, particularly with the EDG, among the Results Groups, the field as well as outside the IASC. It was suggested that it was equally important to engage with donors and international financial institutions as well as affected states where relevant/necessary.

With regard to how the OPAG works with the EDG, it was noted that there are many opportunities to ensure strengthened engagement between the OPAG and the EDG to ensure effectiveness and complementarity of work. This can take various forms, including capitalizing on the dual membership of the OPAG and EDG members; close coordination between the co-Chairs of both groups to engage systematically, including potentially through annual joint meetings; enhanced information flows between both groups; participation of the co-Chairs in each other’s meetings; among others. Ultimately, close coordination between the two bodies should be focused on results and supporting each other’s work, including by the EDG identifying normative areas of work that requires the support of the OPAG and Results Group, and the EDG determining how they can contribute to translating the critical normative work to field operations. It was also suggested that the OPAG should maintain informal links with the Deputies Forum and consider how the Deputies can support the work of the OPAG especially in engaging with donors and affected states.

With regard to engaging with Entities Associated with the IASC, they are accountable to the OPAG. The exact modalities of work are to be determined and will vary between the entities. The OPAG will capitalize on their expertise and their networks to ensure that these entities are used as reference bodies either for consultation on specific bodies of work carried out by the Results Groups or to be tasked to carry out certain areas of work by the OPAG and/or the Results Groups.

Members also reflected on the work of the former Reference Group on Risk, Early Warning and Preparedness and agreed that it was important to engage with the early warning and early group experts and that their work should continue to feed into and inform the EDG and Principals meetings. While the work of this group is preserved under the Results Group 1 on Operational Response, the co-Chairs suggested to explore more suitable options to support this group, whether as a stand-alone entity or as a body linked to the IASC.

Follow-Up Action:

1. Explore the most suitable and practical options to ensure strengthened linkages between the OPAG and the EDG, including with enhanced information flows, regular engagement between the Chairs of both groups, and capitalizing on the dual membership of both groups.
2. Results Groups to ensure systematic engagement with non-IASC members, particularly from the Global South, including by reporting in their Quarterly reports to the OPAG on how they achieved inclusivity in their consultations/engagement and with what outcomes.

² namely, Principals, Deputies, EDG and Results Groups

³ namely, the Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG), the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Group (IAHE), the Humanitarian Programme Cycle Steering Group (HPC SG), the previous Reference Groups on Gender and Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support.

3. The entities associated with the IASC primarily to be capitalized on as a reference. The IASC secretariat to further explore the modalities for better engagement with the entities associated with the IASC.
4. Consider how best to capitalize on the work of the Early Warning group of analysts responsible for the production of the IASC EW-EA report to ensure strengthened early warning analysis and improved early action, including by the Principals and the EDG.

SESSION 4: UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM (UNDS) REFORM

The co-Chairs invited members to reflect and engage on UNDS reform and its opportunities and risks for the humanitarian architecture and indeed humanitarian action.

The co-Chairs noted that the UNDS reform involves a set of far-reaching changes to support countries in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Its aim is to realign with the paradigm shift ushered in by the 2030 Agenda and it benefits from strong leadership and support from Member States. It touches on how the UN system's work at the global, regional and country level and applies universally – to all entities of the UNDS system and all UN country teams. It also seeks to address structural challenges in coordination mechanisms and mindsets, for a truly transformational impact, and ranges from the UN's strategic planning approaches and instruments to accountability systems, administrative arrangements, and budgetary practices.

A background paper on the status of UNDS reform was shared with members. While the reform is in full swing, humanitarian coordination continues to feature in national, regional and global discussions. The co-Chairs noted that this discussion was timely to prepare the IASC for a fruitful dialogue on the opportunities and highlight areas that may require joined up approaches to safeguard principled humanitarian action and humanitarian space.

In sharing their views, members expressed their enthusiastic support for the IASC to engage on UNDS reform, particularly by ensuring that the IASC spoke collectively with one voice and as a bloc, including at key fora such as the CEB. Members expressed strongly that the IASC has a duty to influence UNDS reform discussions, and in this regard, they advocated for an assertive role of the IASC.

Some members noted the need for civil society participation and representation from NGOs in the UNDS reform processes. It was also expressed that the IASC was siloed from the peace and security reform / the UN Secretary-General's prevention agenda. Some members expressed that the UNDS reform presented some opportunities to revise common information management systems through the Resident Coordinator and for raising protection issues at the highest level. Some members also expressed that UNDS reform processes are exclusionary of NGOs and cited the Joint Steering Committee of Principals for humanitarian and development cooperation as a typical coordination instrument linked to the UN reforms that is very opaque in its functioning.

Members expressed that UNDS reform processes were heavily focused on priorities of governments and though this was rightly so, it was equally important to ensure that in all the reform discussions, people's needs particularly the most marginalized were placed at the center. Communicating strongly on this paradigm shift was a necessity.

While members welcomed efforts to empower Resident Coordinators, they noted that it was important to ensure common approaches for the IASC to engage with Resident Coordinators and with their Offices. They also noted the importance to ensure that their selection takes into account proper training, vetting, experience working across pillars, and more. The IASC plays an important role in the selection of Humanitarian Coordinators and should systematically engage in the definition of the selection criteria for Resident Coordinators and in their performance assessment when posted in emergency contexts.

Members expressed that UNDS reform provided vast opportunities for the IASC as most humanitarian operations were in protracted crises, the IASC needed to engage more effectively to move from life-saving to restoring dignity and the SDGs were an important entry point in this regard. Humanitarian agencies should engage early on in UNDS reform processes, particularly on Common Country Assessments and the UNDAF. Members expressed that prescriptive

language of the new UNDAF that translates into agency priorities was a clear and direct challenge to how agencies work. Work to improve the UNDAF needed to consider how to reduce risks and prepare for response. Common and clear analyses among all actors was a step in the right direction, but it was important to review risks that go beyond humanitarian vulnerabilities. It was suggested that the New Way of Working points to some opportunities on how the IASC can work beyond more effectively to engage with development actors, particularly in protracted crises.

UNDS reform was also an opportunity for the IASC to broaden its appeal to engage with other actors not necessarily engaged in humanitarian action. . In this regard, the work of *Results Group 1 on Operational Response* was key to ensuring points of convergence between humanitarian and development operations. .

Several members expressed their concern about the risks of unintended consequences of UNDS reform for example on co-location of UN agencies which may offer challenges on engagement with civil society. It was important therefore to ensure that empowered Resident Coordinators ensured effective ways to engage with NGOs and civil society.

Several members, particularly NGOs, noted that it was difficult to follow UNDS reform process, how to make it clear to stakeholders on the ground on ways of engagement, how to ensure they have the right space to influence or be listened to in this process, and what support can these processes offer when national government policies contradict international policies. In this regard, it was important to ensure linkages with the work of the *Results Group 3 on Collective Advocacy*.

The issue of humanitarian space, accountability, humanitarian principles and processes requiring a lot of efforts from Agencies and the question of whether this is in support of vulnerable people or more processes. In this regard, while reiterating how crucial joint analysis is, members stressed the importance to respond to the gaps and needs identified through different frameworks and/or plans. This will preserve humanitarian principles and ensure rights-based and protection approaches remain a priority to IASC members and are not diluted in broader State-led development approaches. Humanitarian space and protection were also highlighted by some Members as key issues for the IASC that are not core to the work of UN Development System.

In concluding the discussion, members reiterated the collective voice of the IASC as being vital to UNDS reform process, the need to ensure participation of NGOs and civil society, the need to influence the process early on through joint analysis and common messaging, including at country level on UNDAF and related processes, and the need to ensure right people with the right skill sets are selected and empowered as Resident Coordinators.

Members agreed that OPAG was a useful platform to reflect on system-wide issues such as UNDS reform. To that end, the co-Chairs would share their reflection of this discussion with the ERC.

Follow-Up Action:

1. The co-Chairs will share their reflection of the discussion on UNDS system reform and its impact on humanitarian action with the ERC in preparation for the 29 May IASC meeting where the issue will be discussed.

AOB:

Some members requested that key IASC documents should follow a consistent and transparent endorsement procedure to be considered as endorsed by the IASC. Others noted that the “IASC Structures and Working Methods” document which was presented in the background documents to the OPAG meeting as “endorsed by Principals” had only been shared as final to Principals. It was also noted that for any IASC document to be considered as endorsed by Principals, it must go through formal meetings/ teleconference or electronic endorsement procedure.

CONCLUSION

The co-Chairs thanked members for their engagement throughout the two-day meeting. They expressed that the OPAG members demonstrated the value of working together given the new reform of the IASC and in that sense doing things differently. They looked forward to reviewing the outcome of the Results Groups implementation of priority areas of work and to meeting as the OPAG later this year.

Annex I
Inter-Agency Standing Committee
Operational Policy and Advocacy Group Meeting
Geneva, 11-12 April 2019
Host: World Food Programme

Agenda

DAY 1: THURSDAY, 11 APRIL

08:30 - 09:00 ARRIVAL

Coffee/tea served throughout the day

09:00 - 09:15 CHAIRS' OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP
Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC

09:15 - 10:45 SESSION 1: OPAG AND RESULTS GROUPS: PURPOSE AND WORKING METHOD

Presenter: Ms. Mervat Shelbaya, Head, IASC secretariat

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK

[NOTE: CO-CHAIRS OF THE RESULTS GROUPS ARE INVITED TO SESSION 2]

11:00 - 17:15 SESSION 2: RESULTS GROUPS: PRIORITY AREAS OF WORK

Facilitators: Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP
Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC

**11:00 - 12:00 SESSION 2.1: RESULTS GROUP 1 –
OPERATIONAL RESPONSE**

Presenters: Mr. Ramesh Rajasingham, Director, Coordination Division, OCHA
Mr. Julien Schopp, Director, Humanitarian Practice, InterAction

**12:00 - 13:00 SESSION 2.2: RESULTS GROUP 2 –
ACCOUNTABILITY AND INCLUSION**

Presenters: Ms. Bernadette Castel-Hollingsworth, Deputy Director, Division of
International Protection, UNHCR
Mr. Charles-Antoine Hofmann, Senior Advisor, Community
Engagement & Accountability, UNICEF (on behalf of Mr. Sikander
Khan)

13:00 - 14:00 LUNCH

**14:00 - 15:00 SESSION 2.3: RESULTS GROUP 3 –
COLLECTIVE ADVOCACY**

Presenters: Mr. Michel Anglade, Director and UN Representative, Geneva
Office, Save the Children

Ms. Henia Dakkak, Chief, Humanitarian and Fragile Contexts
Branch, UNFPA (on behalf of Mr. Dereje Wordofa)

15:00 - 15:15 COFFEE BREAK

**15:15 - 16:15 SESSION 2.4: RESULTS GROUP 4 –
HUMANITARIAN DEVELOPMENT COLLABORATION**

Presenters: Ms. Marta Valdes Garcia, International Deputy Humanitarian
Director, Oxfam
Ms. Awa Dabo, Team Leader, Policy and Engagement Team,
Crisis Bureau, UNDP

**16:15 - 17:15 SESSION 2.5: RESULTS GROUP 5 –
HUMANITARIAN FINANCING**

Presenter: Ms. Marcy Vigoda, Chief, Partnerships and Resource Mobilization
Branch, OCHA (also presenting on behalf of ICVA, co-chair)

DAY 2: FRIDAY, 12 APRIL

08:30 - 09:00 ARRIVAL

Coffee/tea served throughout the day

09:00 - 09:15 RECAP OF DAY 1

Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP
Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC

09:15 - 10:15 SESSION 3: OPAG – LINKAGES WITH OTHER STRUCTURES

Presenter: Ms. Mervat Shelbaya, Head, IASC secretariat

10:15 - 10:30 COFFEE BREAK

10:30 - 12:00 SESSION 4: UNDS REFORM

(Preparatory Discussion ahead of the IASC Principals' Meeting)

Facilitators: Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP
Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC

12:00 - 12:30 AOB AND CHAIRS' CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP
Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC

Annex II

IASC Operational Policy and Advocacy Group (OPAG) Meeting 11-12 April 2019

Participants List

OPAG members:

OPAG Co-Chair	Ms. Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director, WFP Mr. Geir Olav Lisle, Deputy Secretary-General, NRC
FAO	Mr. Dominique Burgeon Mr. Rodrigue Vinet
ICRC	Ms. Allanah Kjellgren
ICVA	Ms. Mirela Shuteriqi
ICVA - IMC	Ms. Mary Pack
ICVA – FRD	Ms. Emmanuelle Osmond
IFRC	Prof. Cecile Aptel (also representing ICRC) Ms. Victoria Stodart
InterAction	Mr. Julien Schopp Ms. Priscilla Yoon
IOM	Ms. Tristan Burnett Ms. Angela Staiger
OCHA	Mr. Ramesh Rajasingham
OHCHR	Mr. Roberto Ricci Mr. Alessandro Cassinardi
SCHR	Mr. Gareth Price Jones
SCHR - Christian Aid	Mr. Michael Mosselmans
SCHR - Save the Children	Ms. Leah Finnigan
SR on HR of IDPs	Ms. Katrine Gertz Schlundt
UNDP	Ms. Awa Dabo Mr. Roberto Paganini
UNFPA	Ms. Henia Dakkak Ms. Maryline Py
UNHCR	Mr. Arafat Jamal Mr. Nicolas Brass
UNICEF	Mr. Manuel Fontaine Ms. Segolene Adam

WFP Ms. Gordana Jerger
Mr. Brian Lander

WHO Mr. Rudi Coninx
Mr. Guillaume Simonian

Presenters:

Co-Chairs of Results Group 1 – Operational Response: Mr. Ramesh Rajasingham, Mr. Julien Schopp

Co-Chairs of Results Group 2 – Accountability and Inclusion: Mr. Charles-Antoine Hofmann, Ms. Grainne Ohara

Co-Chairs of Results Group 3 – Collective Advocacy: Ms. Henia Dakkak, Mr. Michel Anglade

Co-Chairs of Results Group 4 – Humanitarian-Development Nexus: Ms. Marta Valdes Garcia, Ms. Awa Dabo

Co-Chairs of Results Group 5 – Humanitarian Financing: Ms. Marcy Vigoda

IASC Secretariat:

Ms. Mervat Shelbaya, Head, IASC Secretariat

Ms. Wendy Cue

Ms. Tanja Schuemer

Ms. Cynthia Viveros Cano

Mr. Yasin Samatar

Ms. Jione Park

Ms. Mirlinda Pasoma
