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**Introduction**

The nature and scale of humanitarian crises has changed, becoming more protracted (with an average length of displacement of 17 years) and intractable and displaying increasingly complex interactions among social, economic, environmental, climatological, geographical, human rights, political and security drivers and consequences. Currently, 125 million people require humanitarian assistance – most of them affected by violent conflict – and displacement has reached the highest level after World War II at 65 million. Between 2002 and 2013, 86 per cent of resources requested through United Nations humanitarian appeals were destined to humanitarian action in conflict situations.

The international community has in recent years been in a state of crisis management, reacting to events rather than proactively addressing root causes and supporting the long-term capacities and institutions that are required for sustainable peace and development. Several recent reports, agreements and resolutions[[1]](#footnote-2) have emphasized the need to focus on preventing crises and addressing the drivers of conflict and subsequently reducing human suffering.

Humanitarian action cannot prevent violent conflict, nor can it end humanitarian needs in the absence of political solutions to conflict. Humanitarian assistance can have both positive and negative impacts on conflict dynamics. Where not carefully calibrated, whether in the targeting of beneficiaries, procurement, distribution of resources or service delivery, or (re-)settlement of displaced people, it can have negative impact. The provision of assistance can have a positive impact by reducing tensions and prevent competition over resources. Awareness of the context into which humanitarian assistance is delivered is therefore at the heart of the principle of “do no harm.” While humanitarian action can contribute to a reduction in the risk of violence and to sustaining peace, its primary purpose always remains to address life-saving needs and alleviate suffering. Improved context-specific coordination and coherence among peacebuilding, development and humanitarian action presents opportunities for mitigating the risks and fostering more sustainable outcomes. At the same time, humanitarian organizations must ensure, and others must respect, that humanitarian action remains guided by the principles of humanity and impartiality; that humanitarian priorities are defined on the basis of needs and that assistance and protection is given as a matter of priority to the most vulnerable. Peacebuilding and development actors on the other hand must not only be cognizant of power dynamics, (to do no harm) but also work to balance them out, find negotiated compromises among elected as well as other parties for sustainable peace and development by addressing poverty and inequalities and together with humanitarians, ensure that no one is left behind.

In short, the international community has a responsibility to work together across silos and at the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus in addressing the drivers of violent conflict, delivering humanitarian assistance and developing institutions, resilience and capacities simultaneously in a complementary and synergetic way in order to end humanitarian needs, in a context-specific manner that safeguards humanitarian principles.

**What it is**

The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus is a somewhat awkward term as it combines a state (peace), a process (development) and an adjective (humanitarian). This incongruity could partly be addressed by replacing peace with peacebuilding. This also has as an advantage that collaboration with peacebuilders is perhaps more acceptable to some humanitarian actors than peacekeepers.

The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus can be interpreted in various ways:

* As a reflection of the reality of interaction among the three constituent parts, i.e. humanitarian needs are a result of the absence of peace; development is hindered by violence; and humanitarian needs that are a result of violence often take precedence over development.
* As a policy imperative where the UN should (re)formulate policies as a result of the reality on the ground, where the three aspects interact with each other, or because of the operational consequences of this reality..
* As an operational imperative where the development, humanitarian and peace-related actors need to take account of each other’s actions – and possibly collaborate – to be efficient and effective because their activities have impact on each other and each actor is affected by the broader context where peace, development and humanitarian action interacts as well.
* As a conundrum that needs to be solved, i.e. how can the international community best design its peace-related, development and humanitarian activities to ensure maximum efficiency and effectiveness.
* As whole-of-system approach where coherence among the development, humanitarian and peace-related actors, policies and operations should be ensured.
* All of the above.

**What it is not**

The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus is not the same as the sum of the Humanitarian-Development Nexus plus the Development-Peace Nexus because that would mean that only two sides of a triangular relation are covered and that the Peace-Humanitarian Nexus is left out.

The Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus is not a linear or a process with three clearly identifiable phases.

The Nexus is not about shifting resources, neither from humanitarian to peacebuilding nor from humanitarian to development, or vice versa. Instead, it is about collaborating and ensuring complementarity and synergies.

**What the implications are**

* Collaboration among peacebuilding, development and humanitarian actors when relevant, including on, e.g. analysis, identification of collective outcomes, risk assessments, planning, programming and monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The extent of the collaboration depends on the context,[[2]](#footnote-3) and can run from supporting broad collective outcomes (e.g. reducing humanitarian needs) and sharing conflict/context analysis and risk assessments to joint strategies, implementation and M&E. It can be considered part of the New Way of Working outlined in the Secretary-General’s report and the Commitment to Action (see Annex).
* Joint conflict/context analysis and risk assessments: Actors operating in a conflict-affected environment should conduct regularly an analysis of the context, risks and conflict dynamics to ensure common and shared understandings of the contexts to inform their work, *inter alia,* responsible and principled humanitarian action, contributing to the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies, fostering social cohesion, gender equality and respect for human rights and strengthening institutions and resilience at the household, local, national and regional levels. The simplest form of collaboration around analysis is sharing of documents; the more complex involves conducting a joint analysis. The Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) Policy (see Annex) guides integrated assessments.
* Do no harm and conflict-sensitive programming: By doing a conflict analysis and applying a conflict-sensitive approach in the design and delivery of programmes, humanitarian actors can prevent that their activities do harm by having a negative effect on conflict dynamics. By applying the same strategy, humanitarian actors can not only avoid a negative but also create positive impacts (“Do More Good”), for example, by developing capacities and institutions, enhancing social cohesion and trust, strengthening resilience, promoting and protecting human rights and reducing the risk of violence, while engaging local stakeholders.
* Take short-, medium- and long-term perspectives: Humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors should include a long-term perspective in their activities because of the protracted nature of most complex humanitarian situations, resilience needs the benefit of time to grow stronger, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the long-term nature of institution-building and the recurrent nature of violent conflicts. This requires a context-specific alignment of short-, medium- and long-term objectives, which include addressing humanitarian needs, addressing the drivers of crises and violent conflict, developing institutions, enhancing resilience and developing capacities simultaneously in a complementary and synergetic manner based on respective mandates and comparative strengths.
* Identify collective outcomes: Collaboration should be driven by collective objectives – not by integration or collaboration for its own sake. At an aggregate level, collective outcomes among humanitarian, development and peacebuilding actors should not be too difficult and could, for example, be defined around reducing humanitarian needs, the 2030 Agenda or peaceful, just and inclusive societies.
* Joint planning and programming: An agreement on collective outcomes, based on a joint analysis, also could (but does not need to) imply collaboration on strategy, planning and designing programmes to enhance synergies, complementarity and coherence. Joint planning and programming does not necessarily refer to using jointly the same project documents, which could remain agency specific. It is more a matter of agreeing on a strategy, a division of labour and broadly the activities involved. It does also not necessarily mean that programmes are implemented jointly. Implementation can occur concurrently.
* Joint implementation: Joint implementation is not necessary in order to work towards the same collective outcomes. It might also be complicated – for many reasons (e.g. because of incompatibility of procurement, personnel, reporting, auditing and security systems). The most likely joint implementation is probably between humanitarian and development actors, for example, on the capacities and institutions delivering social services.
* Joint monitoring and evaluation: Short-, medium- and long-term outputs and agency-specific and collective outcomes – e.g. related to life-saving support, peace, trust, institutions, capacities and resilience – can also be jointly monitored and evaluated. It is particularly important to organize inclusive processes involving the local population, communities and civil society in the monitoring of activities, including through the establishment of participatory mechanisms to express feedback and grievances, and respond to feedback.
* Address the drivers of the crises: Humanitarian needs will not be reduced without addressing the root causes and drivers of crises, violent conflicts and fragility. This is not the primary task of humanitarian actors, but is that of the peace and development communities. Yet, humanitarian actors can contribute to it, for example, through building trust among groups and between the Government and the population and by ensuring equitable access to services.

[UN PBSO/PPAB, HJB, 27ix2016, 2nd draft]

**Annex Relevant paras. in various documents regarding the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus [**underlining added, **bold in original]**

1. **Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP), 9 April 2013**

“2. Integrated assessment and planning processes are intended to maximize the individual and collective impact of the context-specific peace consolidation activities of the UN system. While there are important systemic constraints to integration within the UN, it is crucial that, at a minimum, the political, peacekeeping, humanitarian, human rights and development entities of the organization share a common analysis and agree on a set of common strategic objectives for peace consolidation as a starting point for planning and implementing their responses in conflict and post-conflict settings. […]

9. While humanitarian action can support peace consolidation, its main purpose remains to address life-saving needs and alleviate suffering. Accordingly, most humanitarian interventions are likely to remain outside the scope of integration, which can, at times, challenge the ability of UN humanitarian actors to deliver according to humanitarian principles. Depending on the context, certain activities related to protection of civilians, return and reintegration and early recovery may be included in the UN’s integrated strategic approach. Therefore, in all cases, shared analysis and coordination among humanitarian and peace consolidation actors should be supported in UN integration arrangements. […]

23. **Recognition of the diversity of UN mandates and principles:** Integrated assessment and planning processes must take into account all recognized principles of UN engagement across humanitarian, human rights, development, political and security areas.

24. **Upfront analysis of risks and benefits:** Integrated assessment and planning processes must include an analysis of the risks and benefits that integration arrangements may result in,[[3]](#footnote-4) particularly for humanitarian activities. […]

28. The purpose of a Strategic Assessment is to bring the UN political, security, development, humanitarian and human rights entities together to develop a shared understanding of a conflict or post-conflict situation, role of stakeholders and core peace consolidation priorities, and to propose options for UN engagement on the basis of an assessment of risks and opportunities.”

1. **UNDG key messages for a strategic 2016 QCPR, 25 January 2016**

“Define the functions that the UN development system will be expected to perform in the post-2015 era, including […] vii) delivering integrated humanitarian-development-peacebuilding-human rights support. […]

Provide strategic guidance on integrated approaches for delivering results at the country level, including: […]

ii. Better integrating work across the three pillars of sustainable development and the pillars of the UN system (development-humanitarian-peacebuilding-human rights) with a focus on integrating planning frameworks across the pillars at country level that are based on shared strategic outcomes, root cause analysis, risk assessment and management, planning and monitoring. […]

iv. Bringing together humanitarian-development-peacebuilding analysis, planning, programming financing and leadership, with a strong focus on how the national systems can be strengthened to be better prepared and resilient for shocks/crises (i.e. preparedness, resilience, capacity and planning and operational instruments);”

1. **Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, *One humanity: shared responsibility* (A/70/709, 2 February 2016)**

43. “In line with the provisions in the 2030 Agenda, assistance frameworks and strategic goals of national Governments and international partners should be adjusted accordingly, to 10-to-15-year timespans, to reflect this reality better. Strengthening the evidence base will be important for financing the humanitarian, development and peacebuilding interventions known to prevent conflicts, reduce people’s vulnerability and contribute to peaceful and inclusive societies. […]

**Deliver collective outcomes: transcend humanitarian-development divides**

124. At present, in many countries, humanitarian, development, peace and security and other international institutions work side by side on different projects but within the same communities. Too often, each sector brings different goals, time frames, disjointed data and analysis, and resources to those same communities, creating and implementing activities towards different objectives. The resulting divisions, inefficiencies and even contradictions hinder optimum results for the most vulnerable.

125. Humanitarian actors need to move beyond repeatedly carrying out short-term interventions year after year towards contributing to the achievement of longer-term development results. Development actors will need to plan and act with greater urgency to tackle people’s vulnerability, inequality and risk as they pursue the Sustainable Development Goals. Development responses also need to become more predictable, both in programmatic and financial terms, from day one of a crisis, to ensure that a country is put back on the pathway to achieving resilience and national development targets as soon as possible. […] We must now bring the different aid communities together and use the opportunity of the 2030 Agenda, the Sendai Framework, the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the World Humanitarian Summit to leave institutional divides behind. It is time to focus on demand rather than the provision of supplies and on collective outcomes and comparative advantage, rather than project delivery and “mandates first.”

126. Based on the broad-based consultations of the World Humanitarian Summit preparatory process with local and national actors, humanitarian and development agencies, donors and international financial institutions, and in line with my previous calls for a United Nations system that moves beyond the comfort of traditional silos, able to work across mandates, sectors and institutional boundaries, and with a greater diversity of partners, towards shared results, I believe that the eight elements set out below are critical to achieving this new approach:

**1.** **Context matters: create joint problem statements driven by data and analysis**

127. All relevant actors from national and local authorities and the humanitarian, development, environmental and peace and security communities need to come together to achieve a common understanding of risks, needs, gaps and existing capacities. […]

**2. Move from individual short-term projects to collective outcomes**

130. Most importantly, the problem statement needs to lead to agreement on collective outcomes that are strategic, clear, quantifiable and measurable. Working towards agreed collective outcomes over a multi-year time horizon is how we ultimately transcend the humanitarian-development divide. The articulation and achievement of such collective outcomes will allow a range of diverse actors – national and local authorities, humanitarian, development, human rights and peace and security actors, and possibly even private enterprises – to work together towards a common goal. This common goal requires actors to transcend their traditional silos and work together based on clear and predictable roles and contributions. […]

**3. Draw on comparative advantage**

134. Collective outcomes will require a new level of collaboration among diverse groups of stakeholders, namely, national and local governments, humanitarian, development, peace and security, human rights and environmental actors, civil society and the private sector, based on comparative advantage.

**Agenda for Humanity**

**Core responsibility four: Change people’s lives: from delivering aid to ending need**

**…**

**C. Deliver collective outcomes: transcend humanitarian-development divides**

Commit to the following elements in order to move beyond traditional silos, and work across mandates, sectors and institutional boundaries, with a greater diversity of partners, towards ending need and reducing risk and vulnerability in support of national and local capacities and the achievement of the 2030 Agenda.

**Create a joint problem statement driven by data and analysis**

Make data and analysis the basis and driver for determining a common understanding of context, needs and capacities between national and local authorities and the humanitarian, development, human rights and peace and security sectors.”

1. **Resolutions on the review of the peacebuilding architecture (A/RES/70/262 and S/RES/2282 (2016), 27 April 2016)**

“10. Stresses the importance of closer cooperation between the Economic and Social Council and Peacebuilding Commission, in accordance with their respective mandates, including through enhanced dialogue in support of promoting coherence and complementarity between the United Nations’ peace and security efforts and its development, human rights and humanitarian work, and encourages the Peacebuilding Commission to draw on the expertise of relevant Economic and Social Council subsidiary bodies, as appropriate; […]

13. Recognizes that effective peacebuilding must involve the entire United Nations system, and in this regard, emphasizes the importance of joint analysis and effective strategic planning across the United Nations system in its long term engagement in conflict-affected countries;”

1. **World Humanitarian Summit, 23-24 May 2016, Chair’s summary**

“A new and coherent approach is required based on addressing root causes, increasing political diplomacy for prevention and conflict resolution, and bringing humanitarian, development and peace-building efforts together.”

1. **Draft outcome document of the high-level plenary meeting of the General Assembly on addressing large movements of refugees and migrants (A/70/L.61, 30 August 2016)**

“12. We are determined to address the root causes of large movements of refugees and migrants, including through increased efforts aimed at early prevention of crisis situations based on preventive diplomacy. We will address them also through the prevention and peaceful resolution of conflict, greater coordination of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts, the promotion of the rule of law at the national and international levels and the protection of human rights.” […]

37. We favour an approach to addressing the drivers and root causes of large movements of refugees and migrants, including forced displacement and protracted crises, which would, inter alia, reduce vulnerability, combat poverty, improve self-reliance and resilience, ensure a strengthened humanitarian-development nexus, and improve coordination with peacebuilding efforts.”

1. **Report of the Secretary-General on the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (A/70/XX, XX September 2016)**

“Bridging the divides and strengthening the synergies across the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus is critical to realize and sustain peace and development gains, mindful of the distinct operational realities in each area of work. This should be done in a manner which respects and safeguards humanitarian action and the space for emergency humanitarian response.” …

In addition, the work of the UNDS is geared towards capacity-building and technical assistance, and it can help strengthen and build synergies across development, humanitarian and peacebuilding interventions, in line with the Agenda and the resolutions on sustaining peace.

Countries with special challenges, such as conflict-affected countries, LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS, and countries adversely affected by disasters, will continue to require various forms of direct support and service delivery through integrated approaches, including across development, humanitarian and peace sectors to build resilience, sustain and prevent the reversal of development gains. …

The UNDS is fully committed to adopting coherent and complementary approaches to the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus, and supporting multi-stakeholder planning mechanisms that incorporate the contributions of a diverse set of actors, as well as a common narrative on planning, programming, structural/architectural changes and funding issues. …

**D. Strengthening coherence: the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus**

Sustainability of development efforts is strictly linked to building resilience, sustaining peace, and reducing disaster risk, particularly in the most vulnerable country contexts, and vice versa. Yet, development, humanitarian and peacebuilding efforts are often carried out in silos. And while there have been efforts on cross-fertilization, given their interlinked nature a step change is needed. Many of today’s crises and reversal of development gains are a result of the compounding effect of different vulnerabilities and root causes which could be reduced and prevented through a more risk-informed and earlier, coherent development action.

Humanitarian and development capacities and expertise are needed to work towards collective outcomes. At the same time, the UN needs to retain emergency capacity to be prepared and flexible enough to respond to humanitarian crises. In such situations, addressing humanitarian needs through principled humanitarian action, including through humanitarian response plans, will remain necessary.

In protracted or recurrent crises, humanitarian action will need to move beyond repeatedly carrying out short-term interventions year after year, and move towards contributing to longer-term development gains or, when there are operational constraints hindering their ability to do so in specific contexts, operate in synergy with other actors who ensure these long-term development outcomes are achieved. Conversely, development actors will need to plan and act with greater urgency to help build national systems and capacities for prevention and preparedness, tackle people’s vulnerability, inequality and risk as they pursue the SDGs, including in crises settings wherever possible, by placing greater emphasis in early engagement and bold steps to reach those furthest behind.

For the system to move from delivering aid to ending needs, it is essential to develop a new way of working together across institutional divides. This was recently embodied in a commitment to action on transcending the humanitarian and development divides. This new way of working will require focusing on collective outcomes, working over multi-year timeframes, based on the specific comparative advantages of different actors within and beyond the UN-system. It also offers opportunities to include peacebuilding where appropriate.

Shifting from delivering aid to ending needs will be successful only if structures, processes and financial systems at headquarters of both UNDS entities and donors reinforce this approach. This requires more flexible and context-specific approaches including joined-up needs assessments and risk analyses, the formulation of collective outcomes that the UN-system will advance through flexible and dynamic funding instruments and an empowered leader with the requisite capacity and profile.

**Develop system-wide guidelines and a joint approach on the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus**

At global level, guidelines on options for better joined up approaches to the analysis, planning, and implementation on the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding nexus should be developed.

**Move towards greater coherence at the country-level**

At country-level, an overall vision for collective outcomes should be developed, embodying the “one country, one UN framework” approach, when and where appropriate, ensuring complementary multi-year planning, encompassing development needs and protracted crises requirements, all based on joint analysis and comparative advantages. This approach should provide sufficient flexibility to allow for development, humanitarian and peace actions to be carried out simultaneously, with due respect for the distinct principles that underpin each area and where activities across the three spheres are demand-driven, risk-informed, mutually reinforcing and reflected, as appropriate, in joined up planning frameworks. This approach will need to be developed in a manner which preserves the space for separate, targeted and nimble humanitarian action and response plans, fully respecting humanitarian principles.

**Ensure measures to safeguard and mutually reinforce development and humanitarian funding**

Strengthening the links between the development, humanitarian and peace efforts should not result in a diversion of development resources to emergency priorities, and vice versa. The new way of working is not about shifting funding from development to humanitarian programmes, or from humanitarian to development entities but working collaboratively across institutional boundaries on the basis of comparative advantages.

**Update the terminology**

For the purposes of the QCPR, key terminologies, together with new concepts, should be reviewed, as post-crisis “transitions” are not linear or binary processes with clearly identifiable phases. Rather, they refer to a broad and diverse set of circumstances and root causes, including but not limited to complex protracted crises, conflicts, disasters, human-rights violations and political crises. Member States should consider changing references from “transition”, to better recognize that short-term and long-term activities contributing to SDG implementation and leaving no one behind happen in parallel, rather than sequence.

1. **Report of the Secretary-General on the Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit (A/71/XXX, XXX 2016)**

17. In a Peace Promise, 30 United Nations entities and civil society organizations also committed to address the drivers of conflicts and vulnerability and reduce subsequent humanitarian needs.

**C. A New Way of Working**

(Advancing Core Responsibilities Three, Four and Five)

33. The consultations leading to the Summit called for a new way of working that not only meets people’s needs in a principled manner, but also reduces them by reducing people’s risks and vulnerabilities.

34. Almost 120 entities, including 34 Member States and almost 60 NGOs, aligned to the commitment to a New Way of Working that meets people’s immediate humanitarian needs, while at the same time reducing risk and vulnerability over multiple years through the achievement of collective outcomes. This core commitment received more alignments by all stakeholders than any other core commitment. …

35. Together, the Summit demonstrated strong momentum toward this New Way of Working, embodied by commitments to: reinforce local leadership and ownership; transcend the humanitarian-development divide while ensuring full respect for humanitarian principles; increase preparedness and risk-driven planning and programming; create diverse partnerships and alliances to tackle specific challenges; and provide coherent and aligned financing to enable these shifts. …

***Transcend the Humanitarian-Development Divide***

39. The Summit culminated in a long-sought commitment to change the way that humanitarian and development actors work together.

40. In its Commitment to Action[[4]](#footnote-5), the United Nations pledged to strengthen its contribution to meeting needs, reducing vulnerabilities and managing risk better by working together towards collective outcomes over multi-year time frames and based on comparative advantage in each context. Some Member States, NGOs, and international organizations committed to internal reforms to improve joined-up humanitarian and development programming and financing, while others committed to flexible and multi-year financing to support collective outcomes. …

\*\*\*

**We have committed to a new way of working, and now we must deliver on it. Commitments should be quickly translated into practical, flexible and context-specific change in practice, while ensuring full respect for humanitarian principles. Policy and operational guidance should be rapidly developed, particularly in the areas of analysis, planning, coordination, leadership, and financing. I urge all Member States to recognize the transformative impact that transcending the humanitarian-development divide can have on ensuring more resilient and inclusive communities and to lend their support to achieving it.**

1. See, for example, Report of the Secretary-General for the World Humanitarian Summit, *One Humanity: Shared Responsibility* (A/70/709, 2 February 2016); the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (A/70/95-S/2015/446, 17 June 2015); the reaction of the Secretary-General to the Panel’s report, i.e. *The future of United Nations peace operations: implementation of the recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations* (A/70/357-S/2015/682, 2 September 2015); the review of the peacebuilding architecture, which include a General Assembly resolution (A/RES/70/262) and a Security Council resolution (S/RES/2282 (2016)), adopted on 27 April 2016, and a report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture (A/69/968-S/2015/490, 30 June 2015); the Global Study on the implementation of the Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) on Women, Peace and Security; and the Secretary-General’s report on the issue (S/2015/716, 16 September 2015). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A recent publication on the humanitarian-development nexus identifies a number of typologies that determine the degree of collaboration, which are determined by the intensity of the violent conflict, the emergence or existence of a political settlement, the number of refugees, whether development assistance is on-budget and whether there is a natural disaster. See *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 (New York, June 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Examples of models of structural integration include: (1) No structural integration; (2) The DSRSG and RC function are brought together but the HC function remains separate; (3) The DSRSG, RC and HC functions are brought together but the offices remain separate; (4) The DSRSG, RC and HC functions are brought together, supported by an integrated DSRSG/RC office established to support the DSRSG and RC functions, with OCHA staff supporting the HC function; (5) The SRSG, RC and HC functions are brought together, under the title of ERSG (Executive Representative of the Secretary General); and (6) The mission and the UNCT form integrated structures, e.g. joint units. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The Commitment to Action was signed at the World Humanitarian Summit by the United Nations Secretary-General and seven United Nations entities (WHO, UNDP, WFP, UNHCR, FAO, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNOCHA), and endorsed by the World Bank and the International Organization of Migration (IOM) and remains open to additional signatories. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)