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The Humanitarian Affairs Segment (HAS) of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) took place from 27 to 29 June 2016 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, under the leadership of H.E. Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations and Vice-President of ECOSOC.

This year’s HAS was particularly important as it represented the first opportunity to discuss the issues flowing from the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in an intergovernmental forum. It was also a key occasion to explore the humanitarian dimension of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development and the commitment to leave no one behind. To reflect these developments, the ECOSOC adopted a new theme for the HAS: “Restoring Humanity and Leaving No One Behind: Working together to reduce people’s humanitarian need, risk and vulnerability”.

For the first time, the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General participated in the opening of the Humanitarian Affairs Segment. On 27 June, Mr. Jan Eliasson gave keynote remarks on the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit, which were complemented by a statement from H.E. Ambassador Hasan Ulusoy, Director-General for Multilateral Political Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey.

This year, the number of high-level panel discussions was also increased to three (from the standard two) to allow for more substantive discussion on key issues flowing from the WHS. The high-level panels, complemented by the Transition Event from Relief to Development, generated substantive discussions, which reaffirmed some of the outcomes of the WHS:

- The Transition Event from Relief to Development on “Understanding the humanitarian-development nexus” preceded the Segment and was co-chaired by Switzerland (ECOSOC Vice-President in charge of the HAS) and Honduras (ECOSOC Vice-President in charge of the Operational Activities for development Segment). This event provided insights into how to translate the “new way of working” aimed at overcoming humanitarian-development silos into reality as well as how to turn best practices from the field into standards and policy. As the panellists emphasized, the “new way of working” means having a strong evidence base of needs and vulnerabilities, agreeing on the collective outcomes that need to be achieved and ensuring those who are best placed to lead and contribute to those outcomes are at the table. There was also a strong call to promote equitable partnerships with local and national actors and to promote local ownership of response, which should be matched by investment in national and local actors, including financial resources and mechanisms, such as pooled funds.

- The high-level panel on “Moving beyond business as usual: Working together to reduce need, risk and vulnerability” demonstrated support for the Secretary-General’s commitment to a “new way of working” that not only meets needs, but reduces risks and vulnerabilities that contribute to needs. Panellists outlined strong examples of more collaborative approaches among humanitarian and development actors to make measurable improvements in people’s lives. This included efforts to reinforce - and not replace - local and national actors and response capacity, move towards collective outcomes through joint analysis and planning and genuinely transcend the humanitarian-development divide. Affected countries, civil society and donors made positive comments encouraging these changes and taking this forward practically in the field. The “new way of working” and linkages with the 2030 Agenda were two key messages that emerged from the panel discussions and Member States interventions.
The high-level panel on “Leaving No One Behind: Addressing Forced Displacement” strengthened the call to leave no one behind in humanitarian contexts, including internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, at a time when some 65 million people are forcibly displaced, including over 40 million IDPs. The discussion emphasized the importance of strong political leadership and will in finding solutions for people, and the need to respect and comply with international humanitarian law (IHL), human rights law and refugee law to prevent forced displacement. In light of the upcoming 19 September High-Level Meeting to Address Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants, it was also stressed by some Member States and panellists that IDPs must not be left behind as we move ahead in these discussions and in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

The high-level panel on “Impediments to the Protection of Civilians” echoed messages from the WHS, and focused on the need for Member States to take concrete actions to improve compliance and humanitarian access, including through aligning national legislation, training armed forces, and disseminating IHL. Participants underlined that humanitarian organizations have a key role to play in supporting Member States in these efforts. Participants also underlined the importance of reliable data, fact-gathering and reporting to support dialogue on IHL compliance. Panellists described the serious impact of lack of compliance with IHL on the provision of healthcare in conflict and highlighted the need to strengthen efforts to carry out independent investigations into allegations of serious violations and to ensure that violations do not go unpunished. Discussions also focused on protection of particularly vulnerable populations, including children, persons with disabilities, the wounded and sick, as well as detainees and the disappeared.

In addition to the high-level panels, the Segment was enriched by 20 side-events organized by humanitarian partners and Member States, and which continued to build on some of the themes and initiatives flowing from the WHS, such as: enhancing humanitarian-development cooperation; better responding to urban crisis; improving resilience to natural disasters; preparing for future global humanitarian health response; gender equality and women’s empowerment; the rights of persons with disabilities in humanitarian crisis; addressing protracted internal displacement; safeguarding health access in conflict; and humanitarian financing, including the role of pooled funds.

During the General Debate, Member States and other stakeholders held a general discussion on the theme “Restoring Humanity and Leaving No One Behind: Working together to reduce people’s humanitarian need, risk and vulnerability”. Many delegations showed support for the WHS, calling for follow-up and for the implementation of the commitments and initiatives made in Istanbul in order to maintain momentum. Member States reaffirmed their commitment to the humanitarian principles and the centrality of the respect of international law. Numerous speakers emphasized the need to transcend the humanitarian-development divide through more coherent programming, joint analysis and multi-year planning, building on the comparative advantages of humanitarian and development actors. Forced displacement featured prominently during the discussion, with particular emphasis on the need to leave no one behind and on searching for global solutions to address this global challenge. Delegations also stressed the importance of ensuring sufficient and efficient funding for humanitarian needs and a number of Member States conveyed their support for country-based pool funds (CBPFs) and for the Secretary-General’s proposal to increase the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) to $1 billion by 2018.
The segment concluded with the adoption of a consensus resolution on Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations (E/RES/2016/L.20). Co-facilitated by Bangladesh and Switzerland, the 2016 ECOSOC resolution encompasses new and strengthened language (see Annex I) and will feed into the humanitarian omnibus resolution during the seventy-second session of the General Assembly in December 2016.
SECRETARY-GENERAL’S REPORT ON STRENGTHENING OF THE COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The report was prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/182, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report annually to the Assembly and the Economic and Social Council on the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance. The report was also submitted in response to Assembly resolution 70/106 and Economic and Social Council resolution 2015/14, covering the reporting period from January to December 2015.

The report featured an overview of the humanitarian responses to complex emergencies and disasters associated with natural hazards in 2015, as well as of the Ebola virus disease emergency response. The number of people targeted by the United Nations and its partners to receive humanitarian assistance tripled since 2005 to reach 82 million in a record 38 countries in 2015. During the same period, the requirements of coordinated inter-agency appeals increased from $5.4 billion to $19.9 billion. In 2015, only $10.6 billion was received, which represents the largest funding gap ever.

In 2015, 346 natural disasters were recorded, claiming an estimated 23,363 lives, affecting 90.3 million people and causing damage worth more than $65.2 billion. Almost half of the recorded natural disasters occurred in Asia. It is estimated that 19.2 million people were displaced by disasters associated with natural hazards in 2015. One of the strongest El Niño events on record has also led to substantial increases in humanitarian needs across numerous regions.

As of December 2015, the number of people internally displaced by armed conflict and violence had reached a record of 40.8 million, an increase of 2.8 million compared with figures at the end of 2014. The global refugee total had, as mid-2015, reached 20.2 million, the highest number since 1992. In addition, there are an estimated 10 million stateless persons worldwide.

The report emphasized the new opportunities that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as the World Humanitarian Summit and United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development, would provide to further enhance humanitarian action. It also gave an overview of the key efforts to improve humanitarian coordination and response, and described major humanitarian trends, challenges and thematic issues. It called for improving compliance with international law, humanitarian access and the protection of humanitarian and health-care workers. It underscored that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the commitment to leave no one behind provided an opportunity to better meet the needs of internally displaced persons, refugees, stateless persons and migrants, as well as to empower and protect women and girls. The report described the need for a “new way of working” to reduce need, risk and vulnerability, and which should focus on preventing crises and managing risks and reinforcing national and local capacity in order to transcend the humanitarian-development divide. It also set out ideas and a way forward on how to further strengthen humanitarian financing.

Finally, the report provided a set of recommendations aimed at Member States, the United Nations and its partners, humanitarian organizations and other relevant actors, in order to further strengthen the normative framework for humanitarian action and the coordination of the emergency assistance of the United Nations.
The ECOSOC joint informal event of the humanitarian and operational affairs segments on the transition from relief to development entitled “Understanding the Humanitarian-Development Nexus”, took place on Monday, 27 June 2016, in New York. The three-hour panel discussion focused on new approaches and good practices by the UN system and its partners at the country level to address the humanitarian-development nexus in crisis and post-crisis situations.

Building on the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) outcomes, the discussion focused on: how UN humanitarian and development partners, working with national authorities and civil society, can develop multi-year planning frameworks with collective outcomes based on shared analysis; what is meant by building national capacity to reduce the need for international humanitarian response; and what are the financial options, such as pooled funding arrangements, which can support bridging humanitarian and development needs, in particular recovery pooled funds, with a focus on natural disaster response. The panel explored what is working and what is not, and built on the outcomes of the 2030 Agenda commitments and the WHS.

The panel, co-chaired by the Vice-Presidents of ECOSOC, H.E. Ambassador Héctor Alejandro Palma Cerna and H.E. Ambassador Jürg Lauber, and moderated by Ms. Kanni Wignaraja, Director of the UN Development Operations Coordination Office, included: Dr. Khalil Gebara, Advisor to the Minister for Interior and Municipalities in Lebanon; Dr. Sami Atallah, Executive Director of the Lebanese Center for Policy Studies; Mr. Spyros Demetriou, Head of the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator Lebanon; Mr. Toby Lanzer, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel; and Ms. Jennifer Topping, Executive Coordinator of the UN Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office.

Concerning Lebanon, the panel highlighted the critical test to its stability, and the ongoing efforts to move beyond the current humanitarian response to the Syrian crisis by simultaneously strengthening national and local service delivery and reinforcing economic and social stability, while ensuring immediate humanitarian assistance. The importance of holding both central and local government institutions accountable for service delivery and being able to sustain those services in areas and for people who need it most, was stressed. To do so, the need to be creative and use new technologies for service delivery was examined. The changing roles and approach of the UN in Lebanon was highlighted. This new approach centres on a ‘whole of Lebanon approach’ and focuses not only on humanitarian and development impact, but also more broadly on peace, security and governance issues. The Lebanon UN Strategic Framework for 2017-20 brings together 25 UN entities and provides a comprehensive set of priorities covering: i) maintaining peace and security; ii) promoting stability and good governance and iii) supporting socio-economic development through a dual track approach focusing both on the humanitarian response and the durable forms of assistance for this protracted crisis situation.

Concerning the Sahel, the panel provided important insights on the priorities of the affected populations in the Sahelian belt, the challenges they face related to poverty, climate change, violent extremisms, and the additional challenges linked to the high population growth rates. The need for a cross-UN-Charter approach
to address the challenges was highlighted along with the importance of tackling root causes. The commitments to new ways of working coming out of the World Humanitarian Summit were welcomed.

On financing, the panel pointed to the evidence base which has shown that the financing picture in the UN system is less fragmented on the humanitarian side as compared to the development side. A very small percentage of overall financing currently goes through the types of financing instruments which help us pull together across the system, with some 15 per cent of humanitarian and 7-8 per cent of development financing to the UN going through pooled funding instruments. The strong calls coming out of the WHS and across the UN system on increasing the use of pooled financing instruments were stressed. Quality improvements in pooled financing instruments due to changes in overall design and policy were also highlighted. The panel stressed that in order to ensure a more synergetic and strategic use of pooled funds, some key elements are needed, for example: a robust needs’ analysis, a common agenda and strategic framework for results, as well as a prioritization of deliverables within a multi-year timeframe.

A number of commonalities emerged from the discussion that followed, very much in line with Agenda 2030, as well as the World Humanitarian Summit outcomes.

First, the importance of strengthening the capacities of national and local systems and actors was stressed. The important role of host communities and of strengthening local absorption capacities was also highlighted. High priority was given to ensuring progress on the resilience, response and recovery by households and local communities in the face of crises and their aftermath.

Second, longer-term planning that includes multi-year planning and funding frameworks was called for. The Lebanese example of moving from a one year crisis response plan to a four year plan was highlighted. Similarly, there were several calls for moving towards collective outcomes across development, humanitarian, human rights and peacebuilding, where and when possible. The collective outcomes should be based on shared vision, common analysis and risk assessment frameworks, while also respecting humanitarian space and responding to immediate humanitarian needs.

Third, the importance of space for differentiated approaches and for bringing coherence through contextualized programmatic and business models was underscored. Examples of United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAFs) that include an emergency component, which allow for the flexibility to address recurrent natural disasters was highlighted as a useful approach. This approach could be further supported by having standing contingency financing, such as was the case in Mozambique. Reference was made to the new interim UNDAF guidance, which is currently being tested in the field, and which takes a cross-UN-Charter approach. The Lebanon UN Strategic Framework is an example of how the UN is already responding to such multi-dimensional realities. This approach could evolve to be the blueprint for the central strategic framework for the UN’s actions and contribution across all areas of work in country.

Fourth, multi-year financing would increase the predictability of funding, and the greater use of well-designed pooled financing instruments was emphasized as a good practice.

Finally, the discussion underscored the importance of delegating further authority to UN Resident Coordinators in the field. Their ability and authority to draw on the capacities and assets of the whole system is key. Greater authority and decisions over resource flows and distribution were also emphasized as a strong factor in incentivizing greater coherence.
H.E. Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations and Vice-President of the Economic and Social Council, noted that the demand for humanitarian assistance has reached a new record level in 2015, with 130 million people in need, among them 41 million internally displaced persons and 20.1 million refugees. The 2015 El Niño phenomenon was the worst on record and had severe humanitarian impacts, particularly across Africa, Central and South America and the Pacific. Throughout the year, 346 natural disasters were recorded, claiming thousands of lives and affecting millions of people, especially among the most vulnerable. In addition, international humanitarian law (IHL) continued to be flouted, with sexual and gender-based violence (GBV) being used as a form of persecution and a driver of forced displacement; civilians being denied food, water and medical attention; consent to relief operations being withheld by parties to conflict; and health-care workers, facilities and transports being targeted and attacked. It is critical to move forward on these issues.

Mr. Jan Eliasson, United Nations Deputy Secretary-General, stated that despite the record number of people requiring humanitarian assistance, there has been a tangible sense of fatigue with regard to its funding, demonstrated in the greatest shortfalls ever in humanitarian financing. He emphasized that the WHS, held in Istanbul, Turkey, on 23-24 May, had been convened also for this reason and constituted a special event, bringing together 180 Member States, humanitarian and development organizations, leaders from civil society and the business community, among other stakeholders, to discuss solutions to shared humanitarian challenges. As a result, more than 3000 commitments to action were generated.

Mr. Eliasson stressed the important achievements at the WHS in four key areas: first, the Summit marked a clear demonstration of leadership and political will to address the costs and causes of crises. Leaders recognized that most humanitarian crises require political, not humanitarian, solutions and many of them mentioned the importance of international humanitarian and human rights law. Second, the Summit consolidated some important shifts in global humanitarian action within the broader political, peacekeeping and development contexts. Participants agreed to transcend the humanitarian-development divide, and the Secretary-General and eight United Nations agencies committed to a “new way of working”, based on achieving collective outcomes over longer timelines. WHS participants also recognized the critical role of local and national actors, and committed themselves to collaborate more closely and to provide more direct support and resources to those closest to the realities on the ground. Third, the Summit generated several new partnerships and initiatives that bridge traditional divides. Multilateral development banks came together to discuss investment in fragile states and communities, donors met with city mayors and leaders to find and fund local solutions, the private sector formed coalitions to bring business skills and resources to people before and after crises and international and Southern-based NGOs agreed on a charter to strengthen local response. Fourth, the summit demonstrated a shift in the way the international community thinks and acts in terms of financing. This shift entails a move away from shorter to longer-term financing and investment in order to reduce risk and prevent and respond to crises and build resilience. It also includes clear commitments to multi-year financing, to diversifying the donor base and to increasing the reach of the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF). In addition, donors and aid agencies finalized steps to improve the effectiveness of their response in the “Grand Bargain” agreement.

H.E. Ambassador Hasan Ulusoy, Director General for Multilateral Political Affairs of the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said that the current humanitarian system can no longer adequately respond to today’s humanitarian needs.
crises, which is why the WHS was such an important event. Turkey is not only hosting millions of refugees, but it has also shared its ideas and experiences aimed at the transformation of the global humanitarian system in order to serve people better than in the past. Among these ideas, Turkey has advocated for the need to complement humanitarian action with crisis prevention measures; for the importance of development-oriented humanitarian assistance; for predictable, reliable and sustainable humanitarian financing; and for fair burden-sharing in assisting refugees. H.E. Ambassador Ulusoy further argued that the WHS should not remain a one-time-event, but entails a process with a clearly defined follow-up. It is important to build on the momentum that the Summit has generated and to improve the international community’s collective response to humanitarian needs in line with the principle of shared responsibility.

Mr. Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, expressed his gratitude to the Turkish government for hosting the WHS, which represented a momentous occasion to address urgent humanitarian topics. He also presented the Secretary-General’s report on Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations (A/71/82–E/2016/60). Despite the progress the humanitarian community has made in some areas, such as improved risk analysis and needs assessments, enhanced accountability to people in need and the inclusion of a more diverse set of actors, 2015 was also a year of shortfalls. This is demonstrated by the largest humanitarian funding gap ever; inter-agency appeals rose to more than $20 billion, but the funding increased to only $10.6 billion. Therefore, the international community urgently needs to move forward on key issues. First, there is a clear crisis in the protection of civilians, with parties to conflict employing explosive weapons in urban areas and using sexual violence as weapons of war; health-care workers and facilities being deliberately attacked as a war tactic; and civilians besieged and cut off from aid, trade and essential supplies. Second, there is a growing global crisis of forced displacement. At the WHS, it became clear that forced displacement is not only a pressing humanitarian issue, but first and foremost a development and political challenge. Efforts should be made to reduce the number of displaced people by 50% by 2030. Third, today’s context requires a “new way of working”. Short-term humanitarian aid must be complemented by long-term projects to achieve the SDGs. Better cooperation between all the stakeholders in the humanitarian field is required to pave the way to collective outcomes that significantly reduce risk and vulnerability over multiple years. The “new way of working” also requires much higher investment in local, national and regional leadership, capacity-strengthening and respond-systems.
During the General Debate, Member States and other stakeholders held a general discussion on the theme of “Restoring Humanity and Leaving No One Behind: Working together to reduce people’s humanitarian need, risk and vulnerability”.

The first-ever World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), which took place five weeks before the Humanitarian Affairs Segment (HAS) in Istanbul, Turkey, on 23-24 May, was a crucial feature of the debate. Member States stressed the importance of ensuring an effective and efficient follow-up to the commitments made by stakeholders in Istanbul. The Member States and other stakeholders that made individual commitments at the Summit stressed their resolve to implement them. Delegations also emphasized the links between the Summit and the other significant new frameworks agreed upon in 2015 on disaster risk reduction, sustainable development and climate change. In this regard, integrating the implementation of the commitments made at the Summit with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development will help to foster synergies and promote efficiencies. Member States also noted that the Summit recognized the importance to strengthen prevention and conflict resolution.

Member States reaffirmed their commitment to the humanitarian principles and the centrality of respect for international law and, particularly, IHL. Compliance with IHL by all parties is crucial and violations of international human rights law should be condemned consistently and systematically.

During the General Debate, numerous delegations highlighted the need to transcend the humanitarian-development divide through more coherent programming, joint analysis and multi-year planning, as well as more focus on resilience-building and preparedness. Marshalling the comparative advantages of humanitarian and development actors will also contribute to transcend this divide. Some delegations noted that strengthening the humanitarian-development nexus should not take place at the expense of resources for development. A number of Member States mentioned individual initiatives to increase financial resources that would improve the cooperation between humanitarian and development actors and noted that these actors need to work collectively to prevent, reduce and respond to protracted crises.

Member States stressed the importance of ensuring sufficient and efficient funding for humanitarian needs. They welcomed the report of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, as well as the “Grand Bargain” between donors and humanitarian organizations. A number of Member States conveyed their support for country-based pool funds (CBPFs) and for the Secretary-General’s proposal to increase the CERF to $1 billion by 2018. Some Member States announced additional financial contributions to CBPFs and to the CERF, including multi-year contributions.

Forced displacement was discussed at the General Debate with particular emphasis on the need to leave no one behind and on searching for global solutions for displaced persons. In the light of the General Assembly High-Level Plenary Meeting on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants on 19 September 2016, Member States stressed the importance of ensuring that this key meeting addresses the root causes of displacement and migration; responsibility-sharing; international cooperation; and combatting racism, intolerance and xenophobia.
Delegations stressed the central role of women and girls in humanitarian action and the importance of strengthening efforts for gender equality and women’s empowerment. Some Member States made financial pledges to assist and empower women and girls in humanitarian crises.

Member States also highlighted that building partnerships and strengthening cooperation and coordination among all humanitarian actors would greatly contribute to making humanitarian response timelier, more effective and better targeted.

CLOSING SESSION
29 June, ECOSOC Chamber, UN Headquarters, New York

During the closing session, the draft resolution on Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations (E/RES/2016/9) was adopted by consensus.

In his closing remarks, Mr. Stephen O’Brien reminded the international community that urgent action is required to deliver the change initiated at the WHS. This HAS has been the first opportunity to discuss the issues flowing from the Summit and the Agenda for Humanity. Summarizing some of the key features of the HAS, Mr. O’Brien highlighted the need to transcend the humanitarian-development divide and to deliver collective outcomes based on the “new way of working”. He also highlighted the strong call to not leave behind IDPs and refugees. Investment in local and national actors is needed, including through mechanisms such as national pooled funds.

Efforts to improve the humanitarian situation worldwide also require stronger compliance of all actors with IHL, human rights law and refugee law. Problems with respect to these laws are not due to a lack of legal frameworks, but due to a lack of political will to implement them. To address this lack of implementation, independent investigations of abuses must be promoted, conditions for dialogue with non-state armed groups created, national legislations aligned and armed forces trained. International organizations have a key role in supporting Member States in their efforts to improve compliance with international law. Finally, Mr. O’Brien referred to the General Assembly High-Level Plenary Meeting on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants on 19 September 2016 as a unique opportunity to build on existing refugee protection frameworks, take up the fight against xenophobia and support countries, including middle-income countries that host large numbers of refugees, through responsibility-sharing.
High-level Panel: “Moving Beyond Business as Usual: Working Together to Reduce Need, Risk and Vulnerability”
28 June, ECOSOC Chamber, UN Headquarters, New York

Chair: H.E. Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations and Vice-President of ECOSOC
Moderator: Mr. Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Panellists
- Dr. David Nabarro, Adviser to the Secretary-General on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
- Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, Under Secretary General for Partnerships, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
- Ms. Smruti Patel, Interim Executive Director, Network for Empowered Aid Response
- Mr. Amir Mahmoud Abdulla, Deputy Executive Director World Food Programme
- Ms. Nazanin Ash, Vice President, Public Policy and Advocacy, International Rescue Committee

In his introductory remarks, Mr. O’Brien stressed the resolve coming out of the World Humanitarian Summit to reduce humanitarian needs by undertaking a “new way of working” and financing that promotes not just surviving, but thriving. He highlighted the 500 commitments that had been made by various stakeholders under this theme: to support people in reducing their risk, need and vulnerability by promoting locally-led response; supporting meaningful community engagement; investing in risk analysis and early action; and transcending humanitarian-development divides. He pointed to the Commitment to Action on transcending humanitarian-development divides (signed by eight UN Agencies and endorsed by the World Bank and IOM) as well as the Stockholm Declaration (signed by the OECD’s International Network on Conflict and Fragility), as indications of the willingness of all involved to work toward collective outcomes over multi-year timeframes, based on comparative advantages in each context.

Mr. O’Brien stressed that we must also look beyond short-term, sector-based projects and work toward collective outcomes over multi-year timeframes to help achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This, he stated, will require more predictable participation and inputs by private sector actors, as well as local and civil society actors. He reminded that in working differently, we must make sure that the capacity and space for upholding humanitarian principles are not compromised, and aim to secure access to life-saving assistance to people in dire and urgent need, as witnessed in Syria, Yemen and other active conflict situations.

Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Dr. David Nabarro, referred to the 2030 Agenda as a shared framework for action, and highlighted five main principles linked with its 17 goals: universality, indivisibility, leaving no one behind, integrated response and partnerships. He stressed that the commitment of the international community, as it takes forward the SDGs, is to make sure that humanitarian action is centred in humanitarian principles and is integrated into development and peacebuilding work in an indivisible manner. To do so will require thinking, organizing and reporting in new ways: i.e. humanitarians should think in terms of ecosystems rather than organizations, refer to principles more than projects and recognize the diverse networks and skills of all actors involved.
Ms. Smruti Patel, the Interim Executive Director of the Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR), noted that NEAR was created from the aspiration of national and local NGOs to promote a more equitable and dignified humanitarian response. She pointed to the low levels of investments in local capacities, and emphasized that the “new way of working” should support local and national actors in meeting the needs of their community through equitable partnerships, direct resources and community engagement. Further, the commitments made at the WHS should be implemented under a transparent, multi-stakeholder approach. In order to ensure better accountability of local and national actors, Ms. Patel suggested extending accountability frameworks already used within local systems into the international humanitarian ecosystems and establishing tracking systems at the national and local levels. She also urged the international community to establish innovative ways for providing direct financing to local actors, citing local pooled funds as a positive example.

Quoting one of the key messages of the Secretary-General’s report for the WHS - “as local as possible, as international as necessary” - Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, Under Secretary-General for Partnerships at the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), offered insights on the importance of localized approaches, stressing that international actors should allow local actors the space to lead humanitarian responses, as context allows. She underscored that effective humanitarian action requires good program and financial management as well as and strong reporting and accountability. She described the National Society Investment Fund, launched by IFRC and ICRC, which provides material investments in operational and functional capacity alongside tailor-made technical assistance, in order to enable each National Society involved in the Fund to develop, innovate and grow along the path it has set for itself. As a part of its efforts to promote preparedness, Dr. Mahmood announced that the IFRC is working with governments in 50 countries to enhance legal preparedness. Another key initiative is the One Billion Coalition for Resilience, which is a commitment from communities, governments, the private sector and other actors to mobilize the potential of collective networks and to coordinate shared resources to create a more resilient world.

Deputy Executive Director of the World Food Programme (WFP), Mr. Amir Abdulla, asserted that humanitarian action should be grounded in a longer-term perspective that allows for short-term lifesaving assistance when needed. Humanitarian action should be more effectively imbedded within activities that aim to reduce needs and vulnerability over multi-year timeframes. Mr. Abdulla stated that relief activities are still critical, but that they must work in a way that protects development gains in a country. Recognizing that national systems need to be strengthened, he highlighted work on the drought response in Ethiopia, which is driven solely by national responders and has established mechanisms that can enable future local response. He said that “business as usual is insufficient to build resilience” and that both development and humanitarian actors recognize the benefits of working towards collective outcomes through joint analysis, multi-year planning and multi-year financing, while also stressing the centrality of humanitarian principles in all cases. The “new way of working” signals a movement towards this change in mind-set and approach.

Ms. Nazanin Ash, Vice President for Public Policy and Advocacy at the International Rescue Committee (IRC), expressed strong support for the “new way of working”. She maintained that there is still work to be done and that humanitarian actors must explicitly define the measurable collective outcomes they aim to achieve for vulnerable populations, as an organizing principle for joint assessments, joint planning, common reporting and accountability frameworks. Ms. Ash highlighted the IRC’s two-year effort to define outcomes in 5 priority areas: health, education, safety, economic well-being and power. Humanitarian actors had not invested sufficient time and resources in understanding what it takes to achieve measurable improvements in people’s lives. For
example, over 2500 impact evaluations have been conducted in development contexts, while only 100 have been undertaken in humanitarian contexts. Ms. Ash therefore encouraged the international community to invest more resources into building the evidence base in humanitarian contexts, and into establishing a specific, time-bound process for actualizing the Commitment to Action signed at the WHS.

The panel discussion was followed by a variety of questions and comments from the floor concerning practical steps needed for establishing an inclusive humanitarian system, variable mechanisms to support localization and the need for accountability and trust-building.

Panellists called for joint-need assessments; direct, reliable and multi-year funding; as well as innovative mechanisms for direct funding to local actors. Panellists also discussed the benefits of cash assistance and equitable partnerships as means of realizing people-centred approaches. Responding to a question on how to build trust and improve cooperation, Dr. Mahmood emphasized that only by truly working together and sharing experiences can trust be built amongst the diverse set of humanitarian actors. Regarding mechanisms for funding to local actors, Mr. Abdulla stressed need for direct, reliable and multi-year funding with low overhead costs, and Ms. Patel reiterated the potential benefits of local pooled funds as a viable mechanism to support local actors.

For the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in both emergency and non-emergency contexts, it was deemed necessary to translate the “new way of working” into operational activities. The political responsibility of those engaged in conflict must not be overlooked, and the international community must strive to achieve Core Responsibility 1 of the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity: “To Prevent and End Conflict”. It was also emphasized that, while the central aim is to put people at the centre of response, humanitarian actors must also strive to respect affected communities and their needs.

UNHCR outlined four major shifts necessary to achieve a “new way of working”: planning with longer-term perspectives; engaging with national and local actors; shifting orientation; and shifting capacities, to adapt to the evolving ecosystem. UNHCR asserted that, if adopted, these shifts could enable the realization of better collective outcomes.

In her closing remarks, Ms. Smruti called for a shift in attitudes that will enable equitable partnerships with local actors, and encouraged international actors to ensure that the quality of funding and support provided to local actors is relevant, sufficient and sustainable. Dr. Mahmood emphasized the need for incentives for managing risks, and the importance of trust and humility in international humanitarian response. Mr. Abdulla encouraged humanitarian response that focuses on multi-year planning and financing and which is delivered through the use of the comparative strengths of the humanitarian and development actors at the country-level. Describing the WHS as an accelerator, Ms. Ash urged the international community to move beyond this moment of recognition to a sense of urgency about the actions that remain.

In closing the discussion, Mr. O’Brien reiterated the collective commitment to take forward the Summit’s momentum. He recalled the critical importance of investing in local and national capacities, reporting with transparency, information sharing and measuring progress, encouraged humanitarian actors to move beyond business as usual, to deliver a “new way of working” to meet humanitarian needs.
In his introductory remarks, Mr. O’Brien stressed that responding to the needs of the 65 million people displaced due to violence and conflict, including 40 million internally displaced persons (IDPs), as well as the needs of millions displaced every year in the context of natural disasters and climate change, requires a much stronger and more coherent humanitarian, development and political response. In line with the call of the 2030 Agenda to leave no one behind, the Secretary General’s Agenda for Humanity recommends to step up support to countries with refugees and IDPs and to communities hosting them, as well as to strengthen support to durable solutions, including by working towards halving the number of IDPs by 2030. A specific emphasis should be placed on creating innovative and predictable financing instruments to generate incentives for local and international business communities and to promote localised programs. Humanitarian and development actors must work more collaboratively across silos and mandates towards clear, measurable and collective outcomes that reduce vulnerabilities of displaced and host communities over the long-term. Strong protection frameworks must underpin all those efforts, and special emphasis should be put on addressing the root causes of forced displacement. More than 350 commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit focused on forced displacement. It is imperative to ensure that they are all implemented, and make use of the intergovernmental processes at the ECOSOC, the General Assembly High-Level Plenary Meeting on Addressing Large Movement of Refugees and Migrants on 19 September and the 20 September United States’ President Summit on Refugees to carry these commitments forward. Finally, he asked for support for the campaign against xenophobia launched by the Secretary-General in the context of the 19 September meeting.

The Presidential High Commissioner for Human Rights in Colombia, Ms. Paula Gaviria then spoke about her Government’s recent signature of an agreement with FARC guerrillas to lay down arms. Some 45,000 people disappeared during the conflict, and over six million people are still internally displaced in Colombia today. She explained that the best way to find solutions for protracted situations is to seek negotiated agreements between all parties to the conflict. In Colombia, approximately $16 billion was invested to address natural disasters and conflict, including a substantive reparation program. She stressed that States need to shoulder the responsibility for IDPs and maintain a focus on human dignity. Ms. Gaviria said that a practical step is to assess who is affected and to determine their needs. Humanitarian assistance needs to be in line with longer-term development, rather than creating parallel structures. Ms. Gaviria also stated the need for accountability in how the State responds to and integrates IDPs’ needs in its programs, and stressed her hope for Colombia’s peace process to be an example for others.
Mr. Ivan Brenes Reyes, the President of the National Commission on Risk Reduction and Emergency Response for the Government of Costa Rica, gave an overview of disaster risk reduction (DRR) efforts in Costa Rica. He highlighted the three international frameworks finalised in 2015 that address disaster risk reduction and sustainable development: the Sendai Framework; the SDGs and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. Costa Rica has undergone a thorough process to improve its disaster prevention management, which culminated in Law No. 8488 on Emergencies and Risk Prevention. An important goal of this law is to build the capacity of local actors and partners, as well as to promote resilience. Mr. Brenes Reyes stated that one of the main obstacles for Costa Rica in dealing with the current migration crisis is that it is a middle income country, with little resources and is generally not on the international community’s radar. He stressed the need for the international community to support host countries in their response. He also highlighted the benefit of a regional response to disaster management and migration.

Failure to prevent new displacement and to solve situations of protracted displacement were the two reasons that Mr. Chaloka Beyani, the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs, highlighted as causes of the continued rise of IDPs. Mr. Beyani said that the root causes of forced displacement must be addressed, including poverty, marginalization, violence, armed conflict and the lack of respect of IHL by parties to a conflict. National sovereignty also requires to protect IDPs and States should strengthen internal protection measures for them. Other measures needed include: increased disaster preparedness and DRR; the integration of the needs of marginalized people into the design of humanitarian responses; a stronger focus on education; efforts that build on local capacity and knowledge; the collection of data on internal displacement and the enablement of durable solutions. Mr. Beyani was encouraged by the support expressed at the WHS to address forced displacement, and said that acting on the commitments made would help create positive change for IDPs.

Mr. Volker Türk, the Assistant High Commissioner for Protection for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), emphasized the importance of the “Grand Bargain”, which tries to address the issue of the overwhelming scale of needs and the finite amount of financial resources. Mr. Türk also said that it is important for Member States to use the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement to inform their responses to internal displacement. He explained that onward movements of refugees often occur because the first asylum countries may struggle to offer the necessary livelihood opportunities and basic services given the large number of people in need of support. Onward movement also occurs because families want to reunite in countries where some of their members have already found refuge. He deplored that despite the generosity of host communities, xenophobia is still influencing policies and creating barriers to entry for refugees. He hoped for a strong response at the 19 and 20 September Summits, to devise more equitable and predictable solutions for refugees, building on the existing international refugee protection regime, and called for political leaders to give a strong political statement on a solutions-based perspective that includes resettlement, complementary pathways and family reunification. He also emphasized the need to focus on education for refugees and host communities.

During the discussion following the presentations, council members and other members of the audience supported the need to address the root causes of forced displacement, invest in livelihood and education, and to carry the WHS commitments forward.

Others highlighted the need ensure respect for IHL in conflict, which will not necessarily solve displacement, but will improve the protection of human rights and help prevent forced displacement, and called for urgent implementation of the WHS commitments to enable progress on the ground.
Responses to forced displacement should include a combination of humanitarian assistance, long-term development assistance, political dialogue, and support for host communities. The private sector had an important role to play in the provision of livelihood support.

In his closing remarks, Mr. O'Brien highlighted a number of key areas discussed during the panel to better address forced displacement, including: the need to tackle the root causes of displacement; the importance of Governments' leadership for the protection of IDPs; and the necessity for Governments, humanitarian and development actors to work together towards finding durable solutions for IDPs. Recalling the commitments made at the WHS and addressing the upcoming 19 September Summit, he emphasized the need to make IDPs more visible and to take the policy and operational steps to ensure they are not left behind.
HIGH-LEVEL PANEL: “IMPEDEMENTS TO THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS”
29 June, ECOSOC Chamber, UN Headquarters, New York
Chair: H.E. Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the United Nations and Vice-President of ECOSOC
Moderator: Mr. Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Panellists
- Ms. Leila Zerrougui, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict
- Mr. Yves Daccord, Director-General, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
- Mr. Jason Cone, Executive Director, Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières, USA
- Ms. Elisabeth Decrey Warner, President, Geneva Call
- Mr. Hassin Ahmed Abdulkarim, Director, Iraqi Health and Social care Organization

Mr. O’Brien stressed that blatant disregard for international humanitarian and human rights law by parties to today’s conflicts continued to cause civilian casualties and displacement. He reminded that the protection of civilians was at the heart of these bodies of law and of the UN Charter, as underscored in the Secretary-General’s report for the WHS, recent reports on the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict and the report on Strengthening of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations. Mr. O’Brien noted that the more than 400 commitments made by various stakeholders at the WHS on these topics constituted an essential first step in implementing the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity. He reminded of the Secretary-General’s call in this Agenda for all stakeholders to use their influence to promote compliance with IHL and to publicly condemn violations. He stressed the need for better collection, analysis and presentation of data on violations and facts on the ground, and called for a broad-based global campaign demanding an end to the erosion of respect for international law.

Asked about concrete measures that stakeholders should implement to address issues of compliance, Mr. Yves Daccord, Director-General of the ICRC, noted that it would be important, as a preliminary step, to reaffirm the relevance of IHL as a framework of reference. Mr. Daccord stressed that the primary responsibility to implement and ensure the implementation of IHL rests with States, and underlined the importance of translating IHL obligations into practical measures in military manuals and other operational directives, and noted that the ICRC stood ready to provide assistance in these tasks. Mr. Daccord observed that States’ failure to agree on the ICRC’s proposal for an inter-State mechanism on compliance at the 32nd International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent - despite the extensive consultation process that led to this proposal - illustrates the difficulty of intergovernmental action on this subject. He noted that discussions on the creation of such an inter-State mechanism were continuing under the leadership of Switzerland, and called for support for this initiative.

Mr. Jason Cone, Executive Director of MSF - USA was invited to share his views on the role of different stakeholders in implementing the recently adopted Security Council resolution 2286 (2016) on the protection of healthcare in armed conflict. Mr. Cone said that enhancing or impeding the protection of civilians was first and foremost a matter of political choices. He called upon States to make the right choices in this regard, namely to allow humanitarian organizations to enter into and maintain dialogue with all parties; refrain from criminalizing the provision of medical assistance, even to groups considered as enemies; investigate, in an impartial and transparent manner, all incidents of violence that impact healthcare in conflict; and take corrective action and provide reparations.
Ms. Elisabeth Decrey Warner, the President of Geneva Call, observed that outside of groups such as ISIL or Boko Haram, whose modus operandi is blatantly contrary to IHL and that seem to have no interest in following IHL, hundreds of armed groups are willing to make efforts to improve their compliance with IHL. This willingness by some armed groups was demonstrated in a recent Geneva Call study entitled “In Their Words: Perceptions of armed non-State actors on humanitarian action”. The three main impediments to such efforts are: 1) the lack of understanding and lack of ownership of IHL rules, which can be remedied through training and awareness raising; 2) the lack of a unified chain of command, and more generally, a lack of capacity; and 3) the fact that more and more conflicts are protracted in nature, which has led armed groups to prey on the population for resources in the absence of prospects for a political solution. Ms. Decrey Warner stressed that the international community should facilitate humanitarian organizations’ access to and dialogue with armed groups for the purpose of increasing compliance with IHL, noting that, too often, States are criminalizing such engagement, in particular with armed groups considered as terrorist.

Drawing from his own experience of the Iraqi conflict, Mr. Hassin Ahmed Abdulkarim, Director of the Iraqi Health and Social Care Organization (IHSCO), stressed the need for enhanced preparedness efforts by States to enable efficient response to medical needs in times of crisis. Mr. Abdulkarim noted that the main challenges to this response included lack of access to conflict zones, in particular besieged areas; lack of basic resources such as electricity and water; lack of equipment; and insufficient public and private medical structures to respond to increased needs – in particular for vulnerable groups such as IDPs or persons with disabilities. The use of medical assets and facilities by parties to conflict for military purpose also represents an important impediment to the safe provision of healthcare. Mr. Abdulkarim concluded by calling attention to the situation in Fallujah, which had been under siege for two years and during which it has been extremely difficult to get any medical supplies into the city.

Invited to share her perspective on the impact that the monitoring and reporting mechanism on children and armed conflict (MRM) has had on the behaviour of parties to conflict, Ms. Leila Zerrougui, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, reminded the audience that the Security Council first requested the establishment of the MRM in 2005. The Council requested the establishment of this mechanism as a tool to justify the listing of parties in the annexes to the Secretary-General’s annual reports on children and armed conflict as perpetrators of grave violations against children, and more broadly, as a tool for the UN to engage with all actors, including governments and non-State armed groups, in order to take action towards delisting. MRM is an element of this listing/delisting mechanism and serves as a basis for dialogue with parties to conflict for the elaboration of action plans. Ms. Zerrougui stressed that States should protect and support this mechanism as they originally established it. A number of armed groups were willing to work with the UN and take concrete action to prevent and remedy such grave violations. In the past 10 years, more than 150,000 children had been released by parties to conflict as a result of engagement with the UN and in-country partners.

During the discussion, Member States stressed the importance of close cooperation between the UN and non-governmental organizations, to provide relief to conflict-affected persons, and called for enhanced coordination in this regard.

The importance of access to protection and humanitarian assistance for all citizens was highlighted. One of the biggest challenges for the protection of civilians lied in lack of compliance with IHL. Some expressed hope that commitments made at the WHS would lead to improvements in that regard, and noted the need for better training and awareness-raising on IHL both before a conflict breaks out and during conflict.
Others called for concrete measures to be taken, including bringing military standards and domestic legislation in line with IHL; denouncing publicly violations; ensuring prompt and impartial investigations into all acts that could constitute serious violations; activating an International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission; and systematically collecting data on access to healthcare and assistance, including examples of best practices.

Existing gaps in the law which allowed for attacks against healthcare facilities when used by armed groups for military purposes must be addressed this gap, and investigations into acts of violence must be conducted systematically by an independent body.

Participants addressed the issue of healthcare in armed conflict, notably through references by the ICRC and MSF to the importance of ensuring the full implementation of the recently adopted Security Council resolution 2286 (the first ever on this issue). Both stressed that the implementation of this resolution implies aligning national legislation with IHL, ensuring that the provision of healthcare in line with medical ethics is not criminalized and cannot give way to punishment and also ensuring that impartial and independent investigations into allegations of serious violations impacting healthcare are systematically conducted.

The use of wide-area explosive weapons in populated areas was also raised. Mr. O’Brien noted that he had witnessed the impact of such use first hand during his recent visit to Aden, and stressed that such impact included both immediate and long-term consequences. The ICRC seconded that point, noting that long-term consequences were multiple, including the destruction of basic infrastructure, for example water and sanitation infrastructure. The ICRC highlighted the high probability of the use of wide-area explosive weapons in populated areas, which have an indiscriminate impact, and repeated its call on parties to conflict to refrain from such use.

The issue of monitoring data and trends, and fact gathering, featured prominently in the discussion. Mr. O’Brien stressed the importance of gathering the facts as a necessary first step towards accountability. He highlighted the need to better monitor data and trends as well as the need for more evidence-based information. MSF added that more data was needed, not only on the immediate consequences of acts of violence during conflict, but also on the long-term consequences of conflict on communities, for example data on the long-term impact of the destruction of medical facilities.

In his closing remarks Mr. O’Brien highlighted a number of key areas discussed during the meeting to foster compliance with IHL, including: political will, direct and regular dialogue with a wide variety of government branches and non-State armed groups, consistent fact-gathering and reporting, independent investigations into allegations of serious violations of IHL and efforts to ensure that violations do not go unpunished.
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1. Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA): Translating Articulated Commitments into Concrete Action for Preventing and Addressing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: International Organization for Migration (IOM) and InterAction

Objective: Contribute to Member States’ understanding of existing commitments and actions taken by humanitarian response agencies to actively combat sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA), strengthen responses internally and collectively, and further systematize the prevention of SEA within emergency response operations and the humanitarian architecture.

Moderator: Tristan Burnett, PSEA Global Project Coordinator, IOM

Panel: Monique Pariat, Director-General, Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, ECHO; Catherine Wiesner, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, United States; Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner, UNHCR; Kyung-wha Kang, Assistant Secretary-General and Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator (ASG/DERC), OCHA; Luc Ferran, Director – Ethics and Compliance Unit, International Rescue Committee (IRC); Mohammed Abdiker, Director – Department of Operations and Emergencies, IOM

Discussion:
The opening remarks emphasized that it is the responsibility of all humanitarian actors to actively protect members of affected populations from being subjected to abuse by those charged to assist and protect them. Following deliberations at the WHS in Istanbul, the discussion was designed as an opportunity to advance institutional commitments on PSEA and to further strengthen the collective response.

The discussion began in the context of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Principals’ Statement on PSEA that was issued in December 2015. The statement affirmed the commitment of the IASC Principals to actively prevent and respond to SEA by humanitarian workers, and the role of PSEA Senior Focal Points, Humanitarian Coordinators (HC), and the Humanitarian Country Teams (HCT) to implement this commitment in all humanitarian response operations. The IASC is the primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance involving key UN and non-UN humanitarian partners. As such, the IASC is well-positioned to ensure a system-wide PSEA response that also reaches the field. The panel noted that to help without hurting is the most basic responsibility, and it was more important than ever to hold humanitarian workers accountable and to ensure PSEA remains high on the collective agenda. This fostering of a collective culture of accountability required both strong leadership and consistent resource allocation. The panel agreed that the leadership of the HCs and HCTs, as reflected in the 2015 Principals Statement, represented an extremely positive step in ensuring country-level leadership on preventing and responding to SEA. It will, however, be important to continually monitor the effectiveness of its implementation.

The discussion also highlighted an IASC pilot project in 2015 focused on the establishment of community-based complaints mechanisms (CBCM) in two humanitarian settings. Participants in Ethiopia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) received comprehensive training in how to set up an inter-agency system, and beneficiaries received extensive information on how to access the mechanism. Lessons learned during these projects were used to develop Global Standard Operating Procedures and a Best Practices Guide that will enable CBCMs to be replicated in other humanitarian settings. Panellists acknowledged the leadership of IOM,
the contributions of a range of wider actors, and donor support, which have all been instrumental in the success of this project to date.

Examples of existing good practice relating to PSEA across the humanitarian system include training programmes, the establishment of a network of PSEA focal points to provide peer support, and the development of longer-term corporate PSEA strategies. The discussions also highlighted that while many preventative measures are now widely applied, these must go further if SEA is to be permanently eradicated. For example, training should be translated into different languages and adapted to meet the specific needs at different levels within agencies. Initial PSEA training should be improved with regular follow up - and group training to enable operational teams to identify how they can actively prevent SEA. Agencies should be preparing collectively, to ensure swift a response when allegations are received. Further, investigations into allegations of SEA can present very specific challenges compared to other forms of staff misconduct. It is therefore imperative that agencies have the necessary capacity in place, including the ability to maintain an appropriate level of separation between investigators and those being investigated.

The discussion also emphasized the importance of building the capacity of local responders and national organizations in preventing and responding to SEA, particularly given their close proximity to affected populations. More than the provision of basic training packages this required trust among implementing partners, to address root causes of SEA collectively rather than concealed. This included working together towards collective outcomes and establishing joint approaches to CBCM and investigations.

The panel noted the important role that donors have to play through their own PSEA standards and the standards expected of their partners. Beyond requiring a PSEA Code of Conduct to be in place this includes regular training for donor staff, as well as additional funding for PSEA prevention and response systems, including coordination and activities to raise awareness.

The discussion highlighted the importance of including affected populations in discussions. All agencies should proactively assess the specific vulnerabilities to SEA within their programming and take steps to mitigate these risks accordingly. It is essential to ensure adequate ‘whistleblowing’ protections, to receive and process anonymous complaints, and highlighted the importance of technology in this regard. The panellists agreed that all humanitarian actors must remain committed to seeking and applying innovative solutions in improving prevention and response to SEA, and called for a robust, system-wide vetting mechanism that will prevent the re-recruitment of known offenders. Potential benefits of increasing the proportion of female personnel within peacekeeping deployments should be explored further.
2. Maximizing cash-based programming’s contribution to ‘leaving no one behind’, ending extreme poverty and achieving zero hunger
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Permanent Mission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the United Nations; Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations; World Food Programme (WFP); World Bank (WB); Overseas Development Institute (ODI); World Vision International (WVI)

Objective: Discuss priority actions required to accelerate the scaling up of cash transfers in the provision of humanitarian assistance; explore how the use of cash in the delivery of food assistance can inform programme design, including for the establishment of common platforms and multi-sector programming; consider requirements to strengthen the evidence base for assessing the impact, risks, costs and benefits of cash transfers across a wide range of humanitarian contexts.

Chair: Amjad Al-Moumani, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the UN

Moderator: Eran Nagan, Senior Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the UN

Panel: Dina Kawar, Permanent Representative and Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the UN; Amir Abdulla, Deputy Executive Director, World Food Programme; Colin Bruce, Senior Advisor to the World Bank President; Sarah Bailey, Secretariat Manager and Technical Expert, High Level Panel on Humanitarian Cash Transfers; George Fenton, Director Global Humanitarian Innovation and Partnering, World Vision International

Discussion:
Jordan highlighted that vouchers can contribute to job creation and tax revenues for host governments. In addition, it recalled that achieving nutrition and food security are essential to the SDGs, and that cash tools are important to foster partnerships, within and beyond humanitarian communities.

The Netherlands noted it is a strong proponent of cash transfers – an important step to improving efficiency of aid. It stressed, however, that cash transfers are not a panacea and depend on the context and hence recommended that humanitarian actors look more at when, how and where cash transfers are most beneficial. It also emphasized that WFP is already doing this on a large scale.

World Vision International shared a video that highlighted a joint World Vision and WFP voucher programme in a Protection of Civilian site in South Sudan to kick-start and frame the discussion. It can be accessed online: http://www.wvi.org/video/cash-based-programming-south-sudan-video.

WFP expressed that cash is not a panacea and is contingent on context, but undoubtedly the way forward. The question is no longer “should we” or “shouldn’t we,” but how do we take it to scale. The agency also pointed out that work in this regard must be carried out in partnership; taking cash transfers to scale will be different in different settings and it is crucial to analyse what works best (i.e. cash, vouchers, in-kind commodities, combination thereof). Cash and voucher programmes will not replace programmes aimed at
building water and sanitation services, but will help with broader conditions. It is not necessarily one or the other, but a combination of interventions. Simultaneously, aid organizations had to learn to flexibly and effectively combine cash-based programming in all its forms with in-kind assistance to successfully deliver aid in different circumstances. The determining factors encompassed the condition of local markets, the availability of products, such as food, the local communication infrastructure and the funding sources of the aid organization. WFP stressed that it is able to switch between vouchers and in-kind commodities in Somalia via beneficiary cards, since cash programmes need to be flexible, focused on longer term solutions and activated quickly in crises. There is also a need to make this part and parcel of getting it into government social welfare and social protection systems that are shock responsive; different types or levels of assistance may change in times of crisis, but basic, shock responsive government-led social protection systems should be leading the way. WFP also raised the question whether a peaceful South Sudan can be in place, with a social protection system, in five years. It highlighted that the WHS and the “Grand Bargain” proved that cash programming and the humanitarian-development nexus is a very important conversation with momentum, and that further work must build on this. This needs to be done together, in partnerships that leverage unique skills and comparative strengths.

World Vision International (WVI) noted that cash transfers are one of the most significant and exciting innovations in humanitarian assistance in recent memory. They offer greater dignity, choice and flexibility for disaster-affected people and an opportunity for us to become better humanitarians. Last year, WVI provided 32% of food and 25% of all humanitarian programming through cash. WVI’s cash-related commitment at the WHS was that it will seek to deliver 50% of its humanitarian aid through a multi-sectoral and multi-purpose cash first approach by 2020, where context appropriate, such as in urban settings. WVI stressed the importance of improving analytical abilities to make the right modality choice (or combination of modalities). Cash programming can be a viable option even in the most vulnerable contexts, as seen in South Sudan. Key lessons WVI learned from voucher and in-kind programming in South Sudan Protection of Civilian sites were: building trust with communities is essential to explain and address concerns; fluctuating currencies and voucher values requires program flexibility; and vouchers/cash have to make economic sense for traders, regarding cash flow and storage. The voucher programming in the Kurdish Region of Iraq provided the following key lessons: the need to combine cash and technology for efficiency and transparency; the need to make sure that data platforms are interoperable and not competing; the need to ensure data privacy (with strict access controls and industry standards); the lack of appetite for risk for cash programming from donors and organizations; the need for multi-year funding for fragile contexts; and the need to build on national social safety nets.

The World Bank declared that in December 2015, the IASC asked it to review the evidence in support of the use of cash and to identify gaps and strengths to begin thinking about what a more ambitious program would look like. The World Bank has hence published a study reviewing the available evidence, gaps and constraints vis-à-vis cash-based programming in crisis situations (Title: The Other Side of the Coin – The comparative evidence of cash and in-kind transfers in humanitarian situations; Author: Ugo Gentilini; 2016). The study found that long-term global trends suggested that cash would be increasingly appropriate as a humanitarian response. While the effectiveness of cash and in-kind was similar, efficiency considerations were generally in favor of cash. The best modalities for cash-based programming depended on context and were drawn from a response analysis that assessed needs. Cash-based programming was also encouraged by the wealth of innovation already taking place by agencies like WFP and UNICEF – there is already a strong basis of evidence for scaling-up cash programming. The World Bank stressed as well that host countries are shifting: previously, social protection programmes and the use of cash were less embraced; now the opposite is taking place. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the number of cash-based programmes went from 20 to 40 between 2010 and 2013. Host
governments are interested in the ability of cash to build social protection systems. As a further conclusion, the organization mentioned that, when thinking about moving to scale, it is crucial to think about other aspects of the conversation, such as in the context of the “Grand Bargain”. For the World Bank to really take forward the agenda on cash, it has to draw on the issues and solutions that have been discussed in the “Grand Bargain”, including; multi-year planning, outcomes, needs assessments and response analysis methods. As an institution, the World Bank is interested in working with humanitarian colleagues to see how we can take forward cash transfers. It is aware that this is compelling, but also knows that there are evidence gaps, such as specifically related to cash programming for shelter, health, basic social services.

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) pointed out that cash transfers are still under-utilised, as they only represent 6% of all humanitarian assistance. Cash transfers fundamentally challenge the humanitarian system and the way aid is delivered, since the evidence that cash transfers can be effective and efficient is unequivocal. For instance, they can improve nutritional quality and are efficient for delivery. Therefore, the question humanitarian actors have to be asking is: “Why not cash?” Many times there will be a good answer for “why not cash,” but there is a need to distinguish between good reasons and bad excuses. At the same time, organizations need to be realistic on what they can and cannot do. In the context of social nets, cash transfers cannot always be used as is – for example, in the Philippines, they worked, but were targeted only towards parents with children, while other demographics were left out. Yet, cash can bridge silos and sectors; the sectoralization of cash does not make sense, especially when it can be used for multiple sectors. ODI further suggested using a single transfer card and monitor the outcomes.

**Recommendations and Conclusions**

In light of compelling evidence, the panellists championed the scaling up of contextualized cash-based programming. They agreed that while cash-based programming is not a panacea for all humanitarian crises and must be driven by context, the use of contextualized cash transfers has to be accelerated. Panellists noted that cash transfers are emerging as a default approach for humanitarian aid, as they are even being employed in complex and fragile contexts with limited resources, such as South Sudan and Somalia.

To further enhance the impact of cash transfers, the panellists recommended that cash transfers be established based on trust, communication and accountability with communities. They should be adaptable to take into account fluctuations in currencies and markets, and make economic sense for traders. Cash transfer programs should strive to leverage technology, use interoperable data platforms and ensure data privacy. They should also support government social welfare and social protection systems. Finally, cash transfer programmes should bridge sectors and silos have multi-year, flexible support; be central to strategic humanitarian plans; and anchor into an agreed coordination mechanism. Panellists further argued that partnerships are seen as increasingly important to deliver effective and efficient relief by leveraging unique skills and comparative strengths.
3. Investing in Humanity: Meeting the Needs of Vulnerable People in 2016
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: USAID, Development Initiatives and OCHA

Objective: Present current trends in humanitarian financing, drawing upon the Global Humanitarian Overview (GHO) 2016 June Status Report and the Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) 2016 report, and setting the current global needs and the urgent requirement for more funding in context; identify approaches for addressing the funding gap – both by mobilizing additional resources and by using the resources that are available more effectively.

Chair and moderator: Jeremy Konyndyk, Director USAID/OFDA

Panel: Main Presenters: Stephen O’Brien, United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator; Charlotte Lattimer, Lead Author of the GHA Report 2016, and Senior Policy and Engagement Advisor, Development Initiatives

Key Respondents: H.E. Alya Al Thani, Permanent Representative of the State of Qatar to the United Nations in New York; Mariola Pogacnik, Director Public Sector, PricewaterhouseCoopers; Joshua Bennett, Executive Vice President, Show of Force; Dr. Lynne Sherburne-Benz, Senior Regional Advisor, Africa Region, The World Bank

Discussion: Jeremy Konyndyk, Director USAID/OFDA noted that, while overall humanitarian funding had increased, the funding gap remained alarming. The WHS had placed attention on growing humanitarian needs and the necessity of changing the humanitarian system to better address those needs, including through improved financing. The High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing had made several recommendations. One of the key goals of the 20 September Meeting hosted by President Barack Obama would be to generate significant additional new financing for global humanitarian response. Mr. Konyndyk addressed the role the private sector and the general public might play in addressing the funding gap, the potential for multilateral development banks to ensure sufficient resources are harnessed and the need to remove barriers between the humanitarian system and non-traditional donors.

Mr. Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator, drawing on the Global Humanitarian Overview June 2016 Status Report, spoke of the 130 million people in 40 countries now in need of assistance just to survive. The UN-coordinated humanitarian appeal called for $21.6 billion to meet the needs of the most vulnerable 95.4 million people. Two sudden-onset disasters - the cyclone in Fiji and the earthquake in Ecuador - and the repercussions of the El Niño phenomenon, which caused droughts in Ethiopia and Zimbabwe, were largely responsible. Appeals had also been issued recently for Burundi and Haiti. Humanitarian donors had been more generous with each year, yet we now faced a funding gap of $16.1 billion. The Lake Chad Basin had received just 20 per cent of the $527 million required for this year; the Central African Republic appeal is only 14 per cent funded and the Myanmar appeal a little over 25 per cent. We stand in need of predictable, flexible and adequate funding. Data for the Global Humanitarian Overview June Status Report presented here had been calculated from the OCHA-managed Financial Tracking Service. OCHA relies on donors and contributors from every sector to report regularly for the data to be as accurate as possible.
Ms. Charlotte Lattimer, Lead Author of the GHA Report 2016 presented highlights from the GHA 2016 Report. It explores the critical questions of how much humanitarian financing there is, where it comes from, where it is spent and how it reaches beneficiaries. In 2015, the amount had reached a record high of US$28 billion, an increase of 12 per cent over the previous year and more than 50 per cent higher than the amount provided in 2012. Funding within and outside the UN-coordinated appeals revealed a concentration on ‘mega-crises’. By 2015 emergencies in Syria, Yemen, South Sudan, Iraq and Sudan accounted for more than half of all funding. Many other places received considerably less attention and funding, were not covered by UN appeals and were almost completely missing from international media headlines and donor discussions. The largest percentage increases came from governments in the Middle East and north Sahara region. Their contributions had risen almost 500 per cent since 2011, mainly driven by contributions from Gulf States in response to crises in the Middle East.

Individuals, companies, corporations, trusts, foundations and national societies traditionally respond more generously to disasters caused by natural hazards. Private donors gave nearly one third of all reported humanitarian funding towards the response to the Nepal earthquake in 2015, for instance. Private donors also gave generously to the Syria response last year, making it the largest recipient of private funding in 2015. Most of that funding was channelled outside the UN-coordinated appeals for Syria. The bulk of funding from private donors comes from individuals, but contributions from domestic private actors are largely missing from Development Initiative’s calculations due to a lack of available data.

The multilateral development banks are playing an increasingly important role in crisis settings. Development Initiatives analysis indicated that in 2014 multilateral development banks provided at least US$2.6 billion in crisis-related funding. Most of this funding was concessional; of non-concessional funding, more than half was given towards hosting of Syrian refugees in Jordan and Turkey.

At least 76 per cent of people living in extreme poverty, or an estimated 677 million, reside in countries that are politically fragile, environmentally vulnerable or both. The real number is likely to be much higher since those most at risk are often missing from poverty data. It is clear that international humanitarian assistance is neither sufficient nor appropriate for addressing the full spectrum of people’s needs and vulnerabilities in crisis contexts. A much wider set of resources is required and is to some extent available. In the 20 countries that receive the most humanitarian assistance, domestic resources make up the greater part of total resources. On the other hand, national and local resources and capacities are often most lacking in the very places most vulnerable to crisis. That is why international resources are a vital necessity. Of the international resource flows, overseas development assistance (excluding humanitarian assistance) accounted for 12 per cent in 2015, and remittances accounted for around 25 per cent. International humanitarian assistance accounted for just 4.8 per cent of all international flows to the top recipients of humanitarian assistance in 2014.

The challenge facing us is to determine how all resources should come together and work to their comparative advantages in different contexts to truly invest in humanity – to help pull people out of poverty and reduce the impact of crises on the world’s most vulnerable people.

Concluding remarks:
H.E. Alya Al Thani, Permanent Representative of the State of Qatar to the United Nations in New York highlighted that political processes are needed first and foremost to solve crises and address their root causes. Qatar has provided very substantial funds to many humanitarian operations. We must all think creatively about how to generate resources and invest in long-term resilience, preparedness and development. Strong
coalitions among international community stakeholders and between the public and private sector were of paramount importance. Qatar particularly promoted education for refugee children. To reduce the current funding gap local organizations must be empowered; Qatar championed the WHS local empowerment agenda to channel 25 per cent of aid through local groups.

Ms. Mariola Pogacnik, Director, Public Sector, PricewaterhouseCoopers believed private sector funding could be increased if more guidance was issued on aligning private sector strategies and operations with sustainable development. PwC explains actual risks to clients and how much their bottom line will be impacted if they do not take specific action. To engage corporations, it is essential to ensure greater transparency and trust in how funds are spent. One way could be to reduce duplication around assessing, monitoring and managing implementing partners. We need to change the message on addressing humanitarian issues to awaken consciousness that “we are one humanity”.

Mr. Joshua Bennett, Executive Vice President, Show of Force shared the success of the digital campaign “Half the Sky”. Its results had confirmed the power of the media in building an active and engaged community and in expanding the donor base. Aid groups need to work strategically to reach people through new media platforms. Multiple studies proved that one in every three donations comes from peer-to-peer recommendations that are essentially value declarations. Storytelling and innovative models on new platforms can break down the inaccessibility of the multilateral system.

Dr. Lynne Sherburne-Benz, Senior Regional Advisor, Africa Region, the World Bank stated that displacement crises constitute a development challenge and addressing them could help to achieve the SDGs and the World Bank twin goals of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity. WB recognized the need to engage earlier in humanitarian crises, to provide more financing and knowledge in fragile countries and to leverage resources to scale up impact in affected countries. Existing resources had to be used more efficiently and effectively to maximize impact. There is a lot to be gained by establishing a common understanding of immediate needs and longer-term development challenges. It was necessary to conduct joint analysis of operational responses and to create space for less traditional partners. WB is just one of the multilateral banks involved, and as such represents just one facet of resources available.
4. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in the Post-WHS Landscape: Taking the Gender Commitments Forward
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: OCHA, UNFPA, UN Women and the IASC Gender Reference Group

Objective: The event aims to build further awareness and support for the gender commitments made at the WHS, in order to close existing gaps, leave no one behind and advance the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Moderator: Ramiz Alakbarov, Programme Director, UNFPA

Panel: Kyung-wha Kang, Assistant Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator; Dan Seymour, Deputy Director of Programme, UN Women; Fatima Muriel de Florez, President, Alianza de Mujeres del Putumayo; Yannick Glemarec, Assistant Secretary-General and Deputy Executive Director for Policy and Programme, UN Women; H.E. Per Örnéus, Swedish Ambassador for Humanitarian Affairs

Discussion:
OCHA Assistant Secretary-General Kyung-wha Kang delivered keynote remarks and highlighted the many commitments made at the WHS and stressed the importance of turning these commitments into concrete action through joint efforts backed by adequate resources. Commitments made will be available on an online platform, which will serve as a powerful tool to track commitments and hold actors accountable. While underscoring funding challenges, she praised the work of civil society involved in the WHS especially the women’s groups, and noted that the eight regional groups want to continue their work and play a role in taking the commitments forward. In the discussion, ASG Kang noted GenCap as a “catalytic investment” to support gender equality and women’s empowerment in humanitarian settings.

Minister Lilianne Ploumen of the Netherlands stressed that the commitments made at the WHS should be closely monitored. The concept of this online platform allows national groups to voice what resources and advocacy is required, and to tap into these resources. Humanitarian actors must continue to build on the multi stakeholder approach of the WHS, bringing together private sector, NGOs and youth representatives.

Fatima Muriel de Florez, President of Alianza de Mujeres del Putumayo, spoke about the challenges of women and girls as victims and also as actors who joined forces in solidarity to protect the lives of their children in the context of the conflict in Colombia. Acknowledging the lengthy difficult process ahead, she stressed that the voices of women should be heard as leaders at this critical moment in the peace process.

Dan Seymour, Deputy Director of Programmes at UN Women, suggested finding a better way to track the resources devoted to gender equality commitments; he also noted the importance of leveraging innovation such as using cash assistance as a vehicle for improved humanitarian response. He underscored the crucial need for minimum standards at all levels and applicable to all clusters within all phases of the humanitarian cycle and suggested that more attention should be paid to bridging the humanitarian-development divide. He also noted the need for capacity to integrate gender and prevent and respond to GBV in recruitment of humanitarian personnel.
Swedish Ambassador for Humanitarian Affairs, Per Örnéus, noted that widespread GBV is one of most persistent and neglected injustices in the world. He stated that Sweden will expand key partnerships in support of engaging and leveraging the voices of women. He also noted the need to “broaden the partnership” of the Call to Action on Protecting Girls and Women in Emergencies (currently 54 partners) as a way to hold each other accountable and work together in a multi-stakeholder mode.

Ramiz Alakbarov, Programme Director, UNFPA, pointed out that in addition to prevention and response to GBV, humanitarian actors need to prioritize and ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights for all women and adolescent girls in crisis settings, as agreed in the ICPD, the Beijing Platform for Action and the WHS commitments. He noted that women do not stop getting pregnant or having babies during adverse circumstances and added that, even in humanitarian and fragile settings, maternal death can be prevented. As an example of a strategic intervention, he noted the effort of the Secretary-General’s strategy on Every Woman Every Child Everywhere to prioritize sexual and reproductive health and rights not only within the humanitarian response, but also by bringing together diverse actors and linking SRH to development.

Yannick Glemarec, ASG and Deputy Executive Director for Policy and Programme, UN Women, remarked that GBV is today not yet considered a humanitarian priority and noted that this has to urgently change. To affect this change, he stressed the need for a “change in mentality” to prioritize GBV in emergencies and the need to “break siloes” with more women’s engagement in humanitarian action. He also echoed Mr. Seymour’s comments on the need for innovation.

Recommendation and Conclusions:

- **Leadership and accountability:** all partners must sustain the momentum generated at the WHS and fully implement WHS commitments, this will contribute to making progress on ensuring that gender equality and women’s empowerment is a non-negotiable norm in humanitarian action.

- **Innovation for participation:** the collective move towards utilization of technology and social media can provide access to hard-to-reach populations, including women, and advance their participation in humanitarian action.

- **Participation of local women’s groups:** include women and girls in formal and informal decision-making processes at every level; and ensure that local groups are considered legitimate voices and are included in shaping humanitarian response.

- **Resources:** States and humanitarian partners should make commitments and/or implement commitments that increase funding of women’s groups, gender equality programs and strategic gender/SGBV initiatives such as the Call to Action and IASC GenCap project.
5. One month on from the World Humanitarian Summit: What Next for Humanitarian Financing?
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Germany, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Development Initiatives, FAO, ICVA, IFRC and OCHA

Objective: Discuss the delivery of the Grand Bargain commitments within the broader framework of WHS financing-related outcomes, with a particular focus on aspects related to transparency, funding to local and national actors, and innovative and flexible multi-year funding

Chair: Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, Under Secretary General of Partnerships, International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Society

Moderators: Ambassador Hesham Youssef, Assistant Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs, Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC); Nan Buzard, Executive Director, International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)

Panel: Sophia Swithern, Head of Research & Analysis, Development Initiatives (DI); Rüdiger König, Director-General for Crisis Prevention, Stabilisation, Peacebuilding and Humanitarian Assistance, Germany Federal Foreign Office; Smruti Patel: Interim Executive Director, Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR); Amir Abdulla: Deputy Executive Director, World Food Programme

Discussion:
IFRC noted that the conversation on the humanitarian funding gap has shifted since the WHS provided a venue for several important announcements, like the “Grand Bargain” on efficiencies in humanitarian financing, the Education Cannot Wait Fund, the CERF to $1 billion campaign, the Global Response Platform, etc.

DI highlighted key findings in the Global Humanitarian Assistance Report for 2016 as they relate to effectiveness – including multi-year funding, localization, transparency and the need to think about a wider set of solutions. DI emphasized the need to better track and fund multi-year funding and the need for first level recipient agencies to pass on the benefits of multi-year agreements to their partners, many of whom are on the ground for the long haul. DI also emphasized the need for a major shift in the quality of reporting and greater transparency, which is a pre-requisite of all the GB commitments from cash to localization. This can be achieved by publishing timely, transparent, harmonized and open high quality data with a deadline of 2 years based on International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standard. Better reporting would not only strengthen accountability of donors but also recipients.

Germany emphasized the two-fold challenge ahead of us: 1) what can we do within the already functioning humanitarian system to make it even more responsive, and 2) what can we do in the political, stabilization and development realms? Germany also stressed that efficiency is not enough, and that we need a greater volume of funding from diverse sources. The new Network for Empowered Aid Response (NEAR) praised the Grand Bargain’s commitment of a collective 25% target to fund as directly as possible national and local actors and posed questions: Who is a “national or local” actor? What does “direct as possible” mean? Who decides? How will investments be made in capacity? How will this commitment be tracked? How can we ensure that sub-contracting is included and overcome the technical details?
WFP pointed out that multi-year programming needs to be backed up by multi-year funding. Efficiency gains will only cover part of the funding gap; to apply development funding to humanitarian needs would require “huge” transformational change by UN agencies, other actors as well as donors.

ICVA pointed to the opportunity of the “Grand Bargain” to address some bureaucratic hurdles impeding NGO access to critical funding. Harmonizing and simplifying reporting requirements as well as developing a common approach to UN partnership agreements with NGOs could free up resources for humanitarian action.

Audience members asked about linking to the development sector and leveraging other funds. Germany called for a pragmatic approach that clarifies who does what for whom (for example humanitarians for displaced persons and development actors for host communities). WFP talked about the need to discuss “risk appetite”. IFRC recalled the existence framework for the resilience agenda.

Conclusions and recommendations:
Many of the commitments made at the WHS on efficiency in humanitarian financing relate to the “Grand Bargain”. Stakeholders must now redouble their efforts to implement those commitments through an inclusive process, recognizing that the implementation of the “Grand Bargain” will be “tough”. In the short-term, pragmatic action should be taken on issues like cash, transparency (IATI), reporting, and multi-year funding. More challenging issues include reducing the barriers to support national and local actors as well as investing in their capacities.

In any case, the humanitarian community should recognize that it is a “small piece of the puzzle”. We should think more broadly about how to address the humanitarian funding gap by connecting to resources and processes beyond the humanitarian sector. Our actions should be done in a way that preserves the well-functioning aspects of the humanitarian ecosystem and humanitarian principles. All participants were challenged to consider how they as individuals and organizations could change.
6. The Humanitarian Data Landscape: From local to global use and impact
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: The Government of the Netherlands, IDMC, IOM, NYU Governance Lab, Emergence and OCHA

Objective: Give participants a sense of the opportunities and challenges with using humanitarian data and how things can be improved going forward; promote the idea of open, connected data that can be used to improve how citizens, affected people and humanitarians prepare, respond and recover from crises; understand the patterns of human mobility in crises – when, why, how and where to people move, and which factors influence their decision-making; look at several use cases of how humanitarian organizations are partnering to share and analyze data to improve reach and impact; and assess the data policy environment for sharing and using humanitarian data and how this can be strengthened across partner networks.

Chair: René van Nes, Special Envoy for the World Humanitarian Summit, the Government of the Netherlands

Moderator: Raj Pannu, Co-Founder and CEO, Emergence

Panel: Nuno Nunes, Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Coordinator, IOM; Justin Ginnetti, Head of Data and Analysis, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre; Sarah Telford, Head of the Humanitarian Data Exchange, OCHA; Stefaan Verhulst, Co-Founder and Chief of Research at the NYU Governance Lab

Discussion: The discussion focused on how data is being collected and used in the field and globally to better understand humanitarian crises and the needs of affected people. Mr. Nunes (IOM) explained how IOM does regular reporting and data collection on displacement in 34 countries. Between 2014 and 2015, IOM monitored the mobility of some 14 million people using the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) tool. This added up to over 2 million pieces of information over the course of a year, a small portion of which ends up being aggregated to one overall global number. Mr. Nunes talked about how we need to use more of the data that is being collected at the field level.

Justin Ginnetti (IDMC) discussed the challenges of populating a complex data model that calculates the number of internally displaced people (IDPs) around the world each year. He referred to the Sustainable Development Goal for reducing the number of IDPs and how challenging this will be considering the number of IDPs is increasing every year.

Sarah Telford (OCHA) talked about the data aggregation work that OCHA is doing through its Humanitarian Data Exchange platform. She gave examples of data visualizations that have been created with partners and demonstrated an interactive map explorer with data from multiple sources for the Lake Chad crisis. OCHA also planned to set up a humanitarian data center in The Hague in early 2017 with initial support from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The center will focus on three areas: data services, data policy and data literacy.

Stefaan Verhulst (NYU GovLab) talked about the importance of using data in responsible ways so that no one is harmed from information ending up in the wrong hands. He went through a four-step data risk framework.
that can be used to assess risk and ensure appropriate counter measures are taken to avoid harm to individuals and groups in vulnerable situations.

Henrike Trautmann (ECHO) highlighted the importance of using data for decision-making and the support that ECHO will be offering for data projects such as those mentioned by IOM, IDMC and OCHA. It was important to bridge the gap between policy makers and technicians when it comes to talking about and using data.

**Conclusions and recommendations:**
The side event raised a number of important issues being faced by the humanitarian community as it becomes more data-driven. It built on the outcomes of the WHS that focused on inclusive approaches that leave no one behind and changing the way we work to end need. Panellists agreed to continue to work closely together on data sharing and using data responsibly. More specifically, OCHA asked for feedback and collaboration around its plans to establish a global humanitarian data center in the Netherlands in early 2017. IOM, IDMC and OCHA agreed to work together on mobility data and the Governance Lab recommended a new framework for understanding how to assess data risk.
7. Ending Needs in the Lake Chad Basin: Working Together to Leave No One Behind
27 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: ECHO and the United States

Objective: Bring diverse actors together, to explore how best to achieve collective outcomes for people affected by the humanitarian crisis in the Lake Chad Basin; recommend ways to address immediate humanitarian needs of some 9.2 million across Nigeria, Chad, Niger and Cameroon, while also working actively to move people out of crisis and on to a path toward the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Opening Remarks: H.E. Ambassador Samantha Power, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations

Moderator: Toby Lanzer, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel

Panel: H.E. Magagi Laouan, Minister of Humanitarian Action and Disaster Management of Niger; Stephen O’Brien, Emergency Relief Coordinator and UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs; Monique Pariat, Director General of ECHO; Volker Türk, UNHCR Assistant High Commissioner for Protection; Lynne Sherburne-Benz, World Bank Senior Regional Adviser for the Africa Region

Discussion:
Panellists noted that despite concerted advocacy efforts, the humanitarian crisis in the Lake Chad Basin has not yet generated the international attention necessary to spur a more robust humanitarian response. Panellists recognized the need to increase funding for the humanitarian response in the region, as well as the need to build resilience into the humanitarian response and to strengthen development action to ensure that the most vulnerable are protected and assisted in the long run. On protection, the signature of the Abuja Action Statement was seen as a considerable step in strengthening efforts by governments in the region to address protection needs. The Representatives from Cameroon, Chad and Niger called for additional support from the international community.

Conclusions and recommendations:
• Greater mobilization is required to ensure that the Lake Chad Basin crisis is raised higher on the agenda of the international community;
• Panellists agreed that the Lake Chad Basin should be a test case for humanitarian and development actors to work together, so that they can contribute to reducing vulnerability and ending needs;
• The World Bank committed to the establishment of a stronger partnership with the humanitarian community in support of the humanitarian-development nexus; ECHO will also look at how to utilize its EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa to address resilience-building and development efforts;
• While welcoming the Abuja Action Statement, panellists called for its timely implementation and for a scale-up of the protection response;
• The UK committed to increase its funding to support the humanitarian response.
8. Better Humanitarian-Development Cooperation for Sustainable Results on the Ground
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Turkey, Denmark, UNDP, WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF, the World Bank and OCHA

Objective: In the consultations and debates before and at the WHS, the humanitarian-development nexus has received much support, but has also raised questions, which require a more detailed discussion. The purpose of this event is to present the results of a recent analysis produced by OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and the World Bank, in partnership with NYU/CIC, which provides some insights on the operationalization of the humanitarian-development nexus, and addresses the questions raised by the Secretary-General’s report for the WHS and highlighted in the Commitment to Action Transcending humanitarian-development divides Changing People’s Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending Need signed at the WHS. The event will also foster a debate around practical next steps for better development-humanitarian cooperation on the ground.

Chair and moderator: Sarah Cliffe, Director, NYU/CIC

Panel: H.E. Ambassador Hasan Ulusoy, Director-General for Multilateral Political Affairs, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Amir Abdulla, Deputy Executive Director, WFP; Izumi Nakamitsu, United Nations Assistant Secretary-General and UNDP Assistant Administrator, Crisis Response Unit; Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, Chief, Policy Development and Studies Branch, OCHA; Toby Lanzer, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel; Edward Kallon, UN Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator, Jordan; Stephan Schönemann, Director, Humanitarian Action, Migration & Civil Society, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark

Discussion:
Ms. Sarah Cliffe outlined the key global trends that are impacting the humanitarian landscape (protracted, urban settings, conflict and displacement). To address them, new approaches to tackle humanitarian crises in a more sustainable way are needed.

WFP’s Deputy Director Amir Abdullah presented the key arguments of the think piece. He noted that the Commitment to Action signed by the UN Secretary-General, the heads of eight UN entities and endorsed by the World Bank and IOM is at the heart of the paper. He reiterated that the humanitarian needs will continue to increase, and having the same response model will not abate this – not least because of other factors such as climate change and increased instability adding to the length and intensity of crises. He called for a fundamental change of approach – through the “new way of working”, while adhering to humanitarian principles, and stressed the need to be more dynamic, and to not to be boxed in through the current narrow binary models. He expressed concern that the 2030 Agenda will not be met if the needs of the most vulnerable and in fragile situations are not met. Mr. Abdullah noted that the 2030 Agenda provides the adequate long-term vision for all actors to achieve collective outcomes. While a pathway towards humanitarian and development action was getting clearer, the same cannot be said about financing where more work needed to be done to provide incentives and rewards for better joined up action. He noted as an example that UNDAFs are currently being revised to reflect some of this thinking as a step towards operationalization. He stressed that as the UN moves to implement this vision, it should define its priorities in line with the SDGs, develop a strategic vision and urge donors to fund this new generation of strategies for collective outcomes.
H.E. Ambassador Ulusoy (Turkey) welcomed the commitment to action signed in Istanbul, which was aligned with Turkey’s internal aid policies that transcend the humanitarian development divide. He noted that the Commitment to Action is not a compromise between two different camps, but rather a way of working together for common goals, a win-win. He referred to the situation in the Sahel and Somalia as examples of how this is working for recurring and protracted crises. The ideas set out in the Secretary-General’s report ultimately helped achieve sustainable development by working better together and avoiding duplication. The system needed to be flexible and have tailored responses on a case-by-case basis, but through a holistic lens. He highlighted five key elements to move forward: 1) efforts need to be made to overcome the bureaucratic barriers for both sectors to work better together; 2) each response has to have a tailored response that is case-specific, but at the same time holistic; 3) joint analysis needs to be the basis for planning to occur; 4) flexible budgeting needs to be provided to address the most relevant needs; 5) a paradigm shift is required within the community to make this change happen.

Ms. Nakamitsu, Assistant Secretary-General of UNDP highlighted the intrinsic links between humanitarian objectives and the SDGs – noting that in many ways the SDGs themselves can help in bridging the humanitarian-development divide. For example, SDGs 16, 8, 10 and 17 (respectively on peaceful societies, inclusive growth, reducing inequality and revitalizing partnerships) were all relevant towards humanitarian concerns related to migration and displacement. The SDGs provided guidance to all actors on how to serve the common objective of leaving no one behind. This could be done by extending the SDG targets to more specific humanitarian contexts. To do so will require a new and different way of working at country level in the way humanitarian and development actors analyse, plan and finance over multi-year timeframes. Ms. Nakamitsu stressed four main points: 1) emphasizing the need for new indicators to monitor global outcomes; 2) reiterating the importance of the UN side to have joint assessment and analysis to inform planning and 3) programming; the need for incentives to be created by the donors to “reward” those entities that are working differently; 4) field workers need to think differently, requiring further training and re-profiling (including of leaders such as Humanitarian Coordinators/Resident Coordinators (HC/RCs)) to look at the challenges collectively.

OCHA’s Chief of the Policy Development and Studies Branch, Mr. Strohmeyer noted that the protracted nature of crises required a break from the “short-termism” that has traditionally defined humanitarian action, alluding to David Miliband’s remarks at the Global Humanitarian Policy Forum in 2013. The New Way of Working called upon both humanitarians (plan multi-year, be more strategic to not only meet needs, but also reduce them) as well as development actors (be more flexible, embed risk and vulnerability in your analysis and aim to end needs overtime) to change. The focus on reducing risk and vulnerability is where both communities meet and where collective outcomes are possible. He agreed with previous speakers on the central role of the 2030 Agenda as a common results framework as a way to move from just meeting needs, to reducing them. He highlighted that many humanitarian concerns, such as cholera or food insecurity, take years to abate and need multi-year programming and financing to address the underlying causes of vulnerability. To do so will also require shifting the focus from outputs (i.e. activities) to outcomes (i.e. positive change). This would require joint and integrated analysis, leading to a joint mission statement from both humanitarian and development entities on what needs to be achieved and by whom (according to their comparative advantage) – through adequate flexible and predictable financing. He summarized the key elements of the “new way of working” as: 1) achieving collective outcomes; 2) working over multi-year timeframes; and 3) based on the comparative advantages of different actors.
The UN Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel, Toby Lanzer, noted that beneficiaries in the Sahel are facing impossible challenges that will only increase if there is no change in the way humanitarian and development work is undertaken. The multi-year plans in the Sahel over the past few years had been a step in the right direction, though more needed to be done. A yearly approach to planning in situations of chronic vulnerability was not adequate. People affected by crises needed basic support which does not easily fit within humanitarian or development boxes. Lanzer stressed the need for strengthened leadership in order to push for collective outcomes. He noted that this was possible for UNDP Resident Representatives who had access to UNDP funding, as well as by Humanitarian Coordinators who have authority over country-based pooled funds; currently, the Resident Coordinator function lacks the resources or the authority over partners to be able to have the same leverage, and that needs to be addressed. He noted that collaboration among agencies is at times difficult as agencies are not programmed to cede space to others. This also required that donors provide the right incentives for the system to change and address the inherent tensions.

The UN RC/HC for Jordan, Edward Kallon, briefed on the experience of Jordan in addressing the humanitarian-development nexus. He highlighted the importance of collective outcomes for the UN and its partners, and noted that the artificial dichotomy between humanitarian and development was evident when dealing with issues such as vaccination or sanitation campaigns. In Jordan, this has been done by looking at the response from a resilience perspective by investing in both the refugee and local communities. Jordan had recognized the importance of the “refugee economy” and the potential added value. The push from the Government towards delivering on outcomes, including through “Delivering as One”, has been important. He noted that the Jordan Response Plan for 2016-18 has been a pioneer in transcending these barriers and the addition of new types of financing, including through the World Bank MENA Concessional Financing Facility, would be crucial in providing different options (through loans and loan guarantees) for delivering on the collective outcomes – particularly in terms of building the capacity for basic services in urban areas.

Speaking from the floor: UNHCR’s Assistant High Commissioner Kelly Clements noted that UNHCR – as a protection (and not emergency) organization - very much recognized the need for planning towards collective outcomes over multiple years. She noted that there is nothing about a refugee response that is not development. She highlighted four areas for practical next steps: 1) focusing on accurate collection and analysis of data on people of concern, working closely with national statistics office; 2) analyzing vulnerabilities to avoid one-size-fits-all approaches; UNHCR is already piloting six multi-year strategies and aims to triple their number by 2017; 3) financing must also incentivize the achievement of these collective outcomes and should support national efforts; 4) working with national counterparts, not only with refugee ministries, but increasingly with sectoral ministries such as health, education and economy.

UNICEF’s Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Programmes Yasmin Haque, speaking from the standpoint of a dual mandated organization expressed her support for the new way of working, also noting the importance of joint assessments as a way to build upon what is already known in order to have more robust preparedness. This in turn would strengthen response plans that could build resilience. She stressed the importance of having an adaptive coordination mechanism mirroring national capacity, backed up by flexible, predictable and multi-year financing.
9. Including the Excluded: Addressing Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Situations of Risk and Humanitarian Crisis
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: The Permanent Missions of Finland, in partnership with United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the International Disability Alliance

Objective: Raise awareness on the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action among humanitarian actors, and discuss salient issues regarding its implementation; highlight the importance of participation of persons with disabilities in all phases of humanitarian action and how it can be achieved; raise awareness on protection issues of children with disabilities in situations of armed conflict and measures required to ensure their safety and protection; underscore the importance of empowering women and girls with disabilities.

Chair and moderator: Valerie Scherrer, Director of Emergencies, CBM International

Panel: Claus-Jerker Lindroos, Director of the Unit for Humanitarian Assistance and Policy, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland; Afshan Khan, Director, Office of Emergency Programmes, UNICEF; Vladimir Cuk, Executive Director, International Disability Alliance

Discussion:
Following the launch of the Charter on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action at the WHS, this side event focused on how the UN system and Member States could make progress in better protecting the rights of people with disabilities in humanitarian contexts, particularly in conflict settings. Finland, Australia and Thailand have been closely involved in the development of the Charter, which had already been endorsed by 150 entities, including UN agencies, Member States and NGO networks such as ICVA and Inter-Action. As part of the implementation of the Charter, a Task Team has been created, co-led by UNICEF, International Disability Alliance (IDA) and Handicap International to develop guidelines for the inclusion of persons with disabilities into humanitarian action. Guidelines will be developed under the IASC and they will be included within the system-wide coordination mechanisms. The IDA noted the progress on disability inclusion that has happened over the past 20 years, and highlighted the importance of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), that has been ratified by 164 countries. CRPD article 11 specifically refers to addressing the rights of people with disabilities in situations of risk and humanitarian responses. IDA reinforced the unique feature of the Charter as a first point where Member States, as well as UN agencies and the NGO community, can start including persons with disabilities.

Finland noted that the majority of today’s humanitarian needs arise from man-made conflict, where international humanitarian law has been violated. Finland restated the particular impact this has on people with disability and its concern over this trend. Finland called for the need to respect these norms and laws. In situations of armed conflict and natural disasters, children with disabilities represent one of the most vulnerable and marginalized social groups. Finland also highlighted the importance of the empowerment of women and girls with disabilities.

UNICEF highlighted the important role that parties to conflict can play in better protecting people with disabilities. For example, before military operations, parties are usually required to warn civilians in the area of an impending attack and give them time to shelter or evacuate. Parties to conflict should design ways to
ensure that children and adults with disabilities are warned through different types of accessible communications or other procedures. Military forces should be aware of how to support persons with disabilities who are evacuating or otherwise fleeing an area.

IDA highlighted the need for more systematic participation of persons with disabilities in humanitarian responses. There is knowledge and expertise among people with disabilities, as well as within organizations of people with disabilities (DPOs) which could help make humanitarian action more inclusive. However, there is also a need to further build the capacity of DPOs for more effective participation. IDA noted the strong global and regional presence of organizations of people with disabilities, and expressed hope to see these issues discussed disability at the September High-Level Summit on Migrants and Refugees. Gender elements also have an impact on protecting the rights of people with disabilities, women with disabilities are more vulnerable, and in instances are up to 10 times more likely to experience sexual violence.

The importance of strengthening humanitarian needs assessments and planning to be more disability-inclusive was also highlighted. Challenges included the need to strengthen evidence base to enable better planning and integration in sectoral programming. A strengthened sectoral approach based on better data and evidence will result in a more systematic approach in engaging people with disabilities in humanitarian action. A strengthened focus on preparedness was necessary, for example through better pre-positioning of inclusive supplies and goods as well as relevant training on disability in civ-mil cooperation in relevant contexts, and early contact with associations of people with disability.

Conclusions and recommendations:
• Continue strengthening participation of persons with disabilities and DPOs as well as awareness-raising to improve the inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action;
• Continue outreach for further endorsements of the Disability Charter;
• Focus on implementation of the commitments made at the WHS in Istanbul. Development of the Standards and Guidelines within the IASC will be essential part of the implementation. Important to continue the multi-stakeholder and inclusive approach;
• Pay special attention to the needs and empowerment of women and girls with disabilities;
• Start developing a strategy, which is in line with International Law and Conventions, to enhance the understanding of disability and the protection of people with disabilities by the military - as many of the emergencies today are related to conflict and the military is playing and increased role in responding to emergencies (including disasters).
10. UN Humanitarian Pooled Funds Post-World Humanitarian Summit
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Irish Aid and OCHA

Objective: Reflect on the role that UN Humanitarian Pooled Funds (HPFs) play in more effectively empowering the humanitarian community to program and deliver timely, coordinated and principled assistance, and contribute to “leave no one behind”. Provide Member States and stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss the vision for the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) following the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS).

Chair and moderator: Stephen O’Brien, Emergency Relief Coordinator and Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs

Panel: Alison Milton, Director of Humanitarian Unit Irish Aid; Dr. Samah Bassas, Chief Executive Officer of Syria Relief Network; Lise Grande, Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq; Amir Abdulla, Deputy Executive Director of the World Food Programme

Panel discussion:
Mr. O’Brien delivered opening remarks, posed questions to the panellists, and moderated the discussion while providing context to the current global humanitarian situation. Panellists subsequently addressed key discussion points including the expanded roles of HPFs in promoting leadership in humanitarian action, the need for fast/flexible/une earmarked humanitarian funding, and collective stratégic humanitarian need-based responses to emergencies.

Ms. Milton noted HPFs fund humanitarian needs as quickly and appropriately as possible, especially in countries where donors do not have a direct presence. She called for the strengthening of the coordination function of the HPFs. She noted the need to expand the donor base for both pooled funds and to share risk to alleviate the burden on OCHA and local organizations, as well as to continue to implement recommendations from CBPFs global evaluation. She stressed that the CERF is working well and that any improvements need to be evidence-based and context specific. Finally, she encouraged continuing to track performance in various contexts and increasing the visibility of the funds.

Dr. Bassas praised the HPFs while noting their strategic ability to invest in and build the capacity of national responders by ensuring ownership and active participation in the cluster decision-making process. HPFs also increased collaboration between local NGOs.

Ms. Grande commended HPFs as key to accelerate the “Grand Bargain” and should be the primary modality for funding humanitarian operations. They fund the right partner, incentivize collective accountability and transparency, create risk sharing among partners to promote solidarity and accelerate innovation and reform.

Mr. Abdulla discussed six key benefits of pooled funds, including their ability to provide timely funding, a lifeline for common services delivered by humanitarian stakeholders, predictability, an opportunity for resource mobilization, improved coordination and an opportunity to invest in national capacity building through local responders.
During the ensuing discussion, some Member States noted that HPFs were well-placed to channel funding to local NGOs, which often have better access in besieged and hard-to-reach areas. This required true and equal partnerships and a scaling up of the capacity of local organizations. Others added that HPFs were already role-modeling the ambitions of the WHS and the Grand Bargain in terms of joint prioritization and assessment, and localization, in particular CERF’s people-center approach. In addition, HPFs’ collective and outcome-based mechanisms were a critical part of humanitarian infrastructure, and other donors should step up support. Donors noted the need for to keep reserves for unexpected crises, but HPFs had practical advantages for receiving contributions towards the end of the year; As well as the importance of the quality of management and governance of the pooled funds for collective outcomes, and stressed the need to vet partner organizations for operational capacity to deliver quick responses. UN agencies should explicitly include support for HPFs when approaching donors. Others were interested to see what CBPFs can do more to directly support national responders as a critical agenda of the GB, expressing appreciation for the increased communication on CERF (press releases on allocations, etc.), which were essential for reporting back.

UNHCR mentioned that CERF was a key tool for UNHCR’s rapid response: 30% of UNHCR’s operational budget is channeled through NGOs, of which 12% is through national NGOs and front line responders. The agency welcomed an increased CERF; the former High Commissioner called for a super CERF to ensure agencies have access to substantial immediate funding for L3 emergencies. IFRC emphasized that its own disaster emergency response fund is complementary with HPFs. The organization added that there is increasing demand for pooled funds in protracted and underfunded emergencies response and forecast financing and resilience building. WHO stated that funding from HPFs has been essential for the provision of health care in many countries with predictability, and declared its support of HPFs. ICVA suggested that CERF should consider expanding its access to NGOs. NEAR Network proposed CERF to include a component to increase capacity of local organizations.

Conclusions and recommendations:
- HPFs are the funding mechanisms of choice and allow HCs to bring coherence and precision in response;
- Need to continue to improve based on evidence, in particular with timeliness and look at the barriers that prevent more timely response (CBPFs in particular);
- Need to better communicate successes and impact of HPFs;
- The success of HPFs lies in the joint assessment of needs, a prioritized response plan and allocation to those best placed to respond;
- Call for increased funding to national and local responders through CBPFs as well as NGO access to CERF;
- Need to ensure they are in complementarity and not in competition;
- Donor base needs to be increased.
11. The role and contribution of collective response evaluation for accountability and learning to accelerate progress towards the 2030 Agenda
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation Steering Group

Objective: Provide Member States an opportunity to consider some of the key learning from recent collective evaluations, and to discuss the role that evaluation should play in the follow up, review and assessment of progress towards the achievement of the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit, the five commitment areas of the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity, and as a vital and independent source of evidence on the global humanitarian system’s performance and results.

Chair and moderator: Victoria Saiz-Omenaca, Chief a.i. Evaluation and Oversight Unit, OCHA

Panel: James Darcy, Senior Independence Evaluator, and Vice-Chair of Oxfam’s GB Board of Trustees, and Chair of Oxfam’s Programme Committee; Manuel Bessler, Ambassador, and Head of Swiss Humanitarian Aid, Switzerland; Loreine Dela Cruz, Executive Director, Center for Disaster Preparedness, Philippines; John Mitchell, Director, ALNAP

Discussion:
The panel discussion was initiated by a presentation of key findings from Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations (IAHEs), which inform key areas of the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity. Evidence from the evaluations highlights the extent to which humanitarian response outcomes crucially depend on political action. They identify challenges faced in the current joint planning and needs assessment models and suggest areas for improvement to ensure they better inform operational decision-making. Evaluations also identify how to better engage with national stakeholders, including government, civil society and affected people themselves. Findings have highlighted areas where the current coordination system can be improved; further analysis with regard to the system’s coherence, the cost-effectiveness of coordination and use of lighter coordination processes, empowered leadership and accountability for collective goals should be undertaken.

Recent research undertaken by ALNAP suggests that the current centralized planning may not be as effective as a planning structure that aims towards alignment rather than centrality. The same research stressed that leadership works best when it is aimed at the creation of a shared understanding and the strengthening of the relationships between response actors. While there may be an imbalance in the cost-benefit of coordination, past experience has also shown that coordination in itself is an asset.

From a donor government perspective, evaluation is a must. It is a critical tool to build trust, to let donors know that funds provided for response operations are adequately channeled to the most affected people, and are spent effectively and efficiently. Donor governments have an obligation to report on the adequate use of their funds to their citizens, and the independent evidence provided by evaluations is a key tool to do this.

From the perspective of civil society, evaluations must also be understood as a right of citizens. They fulfill the right to be informed by sound and independent evidence. Politicians and decision-makers, therefore, have a responsibility to empower people to be informed by evaluations.
Findings from humanitarian evaluations are an important source of evidence to inform progress towards the achievement of the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity, and to help guide decisions and actions related to the Agenda’s implementation. Despite the complexity and longer-term nature of policy change, evaluations have the potential to lead to a fundamental re-thinking of the way business is done. For example, evaluation findings have informed key transformative humanitarian processes and policies such as those stemming from the Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda and the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition.

Challenges remain: Sometimes evaluation recommendations are overly ambitious and call for unrealistic changes in the humanitarian architecture. It is important to also note that change takes time. The need to improve the engagement of stakeholders in evaluations is constant. Humanitarian evaluations often struggle with the limited availability of data on the ground, and in this regard, the opportunities offered by new technologies need to continue to be explored. Finally, it is important to be mindful of the potential “dangerous use” of evaluation: what is evaluated, for what purposes, and who decides it, has big implications. For this reason, transparency and accountability in decisions related to evaluation, as well as safeguarding the independence of evaluations is crucial.

Conclusions and recommendations:

- Collective and Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations (IAHEs) support the international humanitarian system’s commitment to learning and continuous improvement for even more coherent, effective and efficient humanitarian responses. Evaluations increase the transparency and accountability to those that seek to help and those who pay for it, as well as to people affected by crises.

- The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations Steering Group will continue to conduct collective evaluations, in order to inform the way forward towards the achievement of the WHS outcomes, the 2030 Agenda and the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity. IAHE reports are accessible online (https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/evaluations). The IAHE Steering Group looks forward to a continued engagement and dialogue with practitioners and policy makers to ensure evaluation evidence is relevant to their discussions and decision-making.

28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

**Sponsors:** Inter-Agency Standing Committee and Inter-Agency Reference Group for the Gender-based Violence Guidelines

**Objective:** The event constituted the formal New York launch of the new Inter-Agency Standing Committee Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action (“GBV Guidelines”). The Guidelines provide practical, field-tested recommendations for all humanitarian response sectors to prevent and reduce the risk of GBV in their work – building on the fundamental humanitarian principle of do no harm, and providing stakeholders with a key tool to help them achieve the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit. The Guidelines have been endorsed by the ERC, the IASC and the key cluster and sector lead agencies, making them the accepted standard for GBV prevention and risk mitigation in humanitarian contexts globally.

**Chair and moderator:** John Ging, Director of the Operational Division, UNOCHA

**Panel:**
- H.E. Sarah Mendelson, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations Economic and Social Council
- Helena Yanez Loza, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Republic of Ecuador to the United Nations
- Ted Chaiban, Director, UNICEF Programme Division
- Jodi Nelson, Senior Vice President (Policy and Practice), International Rescue Committee, IRC

**Discussion:**
The first segment of the moderated discussion focused on GBV related challenges and the realities of addressing GBV in the field. The panel stressed the importance of addressing GBV, characterizing it as one of the areas where the humanitarian community can have the greatest positive impact on countries in which they work and in support of the communities and people it serves. As a cross-sectoral priority in both humanitarian and development contexts, GBV cuts across economic brackets. This means that the humanitarian community’s response to GBV similarly requires cross-sectoral guidance, a gap which the GBV Guidelines aim to fill. The Guidelines suggest solutions to GBV-related problems, as well as a process and methodology to think through them, in line with the humanitarian programme cycle and with specific guidance for each of 13 different humanitarian response sectors. Thinking systemically is key to scalability, which in turn brings further accountability. The panel repeatedly highlighted the crucial role of leadership in addressing GBV and the need for accountability to ensure delivery. Humanitarian leadership should not only be sensitized to GBV-related issues but energized in order to carry out and promote the integration actions laid out in the GBV Guidelines, as well as to hold practitioners accountable to the highest standards.

Women’s needs are often still considered as an afterthought with insufficient investment in prevention or response. Over the years, through community dialogues and by working with women, GBV-related issues and their solutions are now readily known but the challenge remains in putting them in practice consistently. The panel stressed the need to move forward with implementation of these solutions, many of which are as simple
as putting a light in a latrine, as well as investing in evidence generation. Humanitarians need to be freed up to consider what is needed to achieve outcomes and results, rather than constantly reporting on activities. Donors should fund organizations to implement solutions. In practical terms, for example, the two main provinces in Ecuador affected by the earthquake had a high incidence of GBV; the lack of shelter heightened the vulnerability of women and girls. Ecuador benefited from having worked with UNDP on contingency planning before the earthquake struck. Emphasis was also placed on the need to see GBV as a security issue, not only as a “women’s issue.”

The second segment of the event focused on the importance of GBV prevention and risk mitigation in line with the new GBV Guidelines and the need for all levels and sectors of humanitarian action to live up to their responsibilities to reduce GBV-related risks. Women and girls face structural constraints to their equality, including female staff and, especially, national female staff. A gender lens should be applied to all areas of human resources, at all levels, including staff recruitment and development. The panel stressed that GBV is not normal in any culture. Good practice in addressing GBV, especially in terms of GBV prevention and risk mitigation, is reflected in Ecuador’s national-level disaster preparedness and response frameworks, for example. Psychological support to all those affected by the earthquake and of training staff to address GBV, in order to support women affected by violence has been extremely important in this regard. However, globally there is a great need to train staff in addressing GBV.

The Guidelines should be fully integrated throughout all sectors and operations by integrating them into all management work-planning, beyond just the area of health. Integrating GBV efforts and having stand-alone programming is important. Leadership must echo vision on reducing siloes by prioritizing GBV across sectors, with addressing GBV no longer seen as a subcomponent of protection but as a core activity and priority. Funding should be conditional on prevention and progress.

The discussion also focused on the link with the SDGs, long-term impacts of GBV on women, collective action, the accountability and prioritization of humanitarian leadership and maintaining momentum of and bringing new partners into the Call to Action on Protection from GBV in Emergencies.

Conclusions and recommendations:
The event built on the momentum generated by the WHS to create high-level political and humanitarian leadership support for the GBV Guidelines and encourage global leadership to establish mechanisms to implement GBV prevention and risk mitigation actions and hold decision-makers and leadership accountable for progress and results across all levels and sectors of humanitarian response, including and especially the key actors represented in the panel: donor and affected country leadership, UN agencies, NGO implementing partners and civil society.
13. Addressing protracted internal displacement: a multi-faceted challenge
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: ICRC and the African Union

Objective: The event highlighted internal displacement as a global challenge and a critical humanitarian and development issue to be recognized and addressed in its own right. The aim was to explore how, in which areas, relevant stakeholders can best help governments to discharge their responsibility toward IDPs and resolve internal displacement situations. The idea was also to draw attention to other regions than the Middle East (which tends to dominate the debate on forced displacement as a consequence of the Syrian refugee crisis in Europe), particularly Africa, where the Kampala Convention offers a strong normative framework for IDP protection and assistance. In this regard, the ICRC noted its stocktaking exercise as a contribution to move forward in the practical implementation of the Convention.

Chairs: H.E. Ambassador Tete Antonio, Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations (replacing Olabisi Dare, Head of the Humanitarian Affairs, Refugees and Displaced Persons Division in the Department of Political Affairs of the African Union Commission); Philip Spoerri, Head of Delegation, Delegation of the International Committee of the Red Cross to the United Nations

Moderator: Pierre Gentile, Head of ICRC Protection Division

Panel: Alexandra Bilak, Interim Director, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC); Chaloka Beyani, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons; Monique Pariat, Director-General of DG ECHO (Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the European Commission), European Union; Deborah Bagliole, Humanitarian Adviser, Humanitarian Policy and Partnership Group, Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department, DFID (replacing Dylan Winder head of Humanitarian Policy and System, DFID)

Discussion: Both the African Union (AU) co-chair and ICRC moderator put particular emphasis on the Kampala Convention in their respective introductions. The ICRC stocktaking exercise was also mentioned as a contribution to identifying good practices on operationalizing the Convention.

Alexandra Bilak discussed how the phenomenon of internal displacement was evolving and specific features by region. She summarized the findings of IDMC 2016 General Report on Internal Displacement (GRID) emphasizing that the Middle East and Africa continued to bear the brunt of conflict-related displacement and some States in these regions have been featuring in the list of countries with the highest number of IDPs for many years consecutively, which is linked to the protracted nature of armed conflict and related displacement in those contexts. Situations of internal displacement that are resolved in a matter of weeks or months are very rare. Key challenges were highlighted: 1) remaining gaps in our knowledge of the phenomenon, there are still dimensions of the problem that we don’t understand and situations of internal displacement that don’t make it in the global reporting such as those related to climate change, development project and criminal violence; 2) quality of data (different sources, different methodologies, different ways of understanding the phenomenon, lack of updated data for certain contexts as when humanitarian actors leave, persisting IDP
situations stop being monitored; 3) failure to understand internal displacement as a manifestation of complex inter-related political, social, economic systems that are collapsing, where the same factors are often both drivers of displacement and obstacles to finding durable solutions and preventing future crises and displacement risks. Thus, responses tend to be fragmented, while there is a need to bring together the different perspectives and work holistically on operational and policy frameworks.

Chaloka Beyani provided key recommendations to bring real changes for IDPs on the ground. He stressed the need for comprehensive responses reflecting the possible nexus between IDPs and refugee situations. The current focus on cross-border displacement overlooks that IDPs and refugees are sometimes driven by the same factors (the IDP definition as per the Guiding Principles was extrapolated from the definition of refugees as per the AU Refugee Convention and the Cartagena Declaration) and the failure of national protection systems may contribute to IDPs fleeing across borders. Beyani also stressed the critical importance of addressing protracted displacement to curb the trend of increasing global displacement figures. This is where development actors become particularly useful to complement the efforts of humanitarian organizations. Collaborative approaches designed for refugee situations (e.g. Wilton Park) can be valuable also in protracted IDP situations, where local integration can be pursued through area-based development interventions benefitting host populations and IDPs alike. There is also a need to make the link with Habitat III to ensure that displacement is integrated in urban planning to enable promoting adequate shelter for IDPs. He further echoed calls for quality data, particularly disaggregated data, reflecting the different needs IDPs may have based on their gender, age etc., and said the Kampala Convention can be a model for other regional instruments.

Monique Pariat discussed how Governments can be encouraged to address internal displacement through sustainable solutions. She stressed the EU’s commitment to address internal displacement through an integrated approach combining humanitarian and development tools - ensuring that IDPs are included in development initiatives with the purpose of building resilience and self-reliance of both IDPs and host communities. As citizens of the country in which they are displaced, IDPs need to be granted full and equal access to public services as well as livelihood possibilities. Local and national authorities need support in this regard and instruments such as the Kampala Convention can inspire national frameworks for action. Pariat stressed the need for establishing data on IDPs’ skills and capacities as a first step to allow them access to livelihoods.

DFID addressed the long-term impact of protracted displacement in light of the SDG and the new Agenda for Humanity, particularly on the role of development actors and financial institutions. Five key issues were identified: 1) promoting a coherent and holistic response for IDPs; 2) recognizing the impact of displacement on host communities, particularly in terms of overburdened services; 3) acknowledging and supporting the role of municipalities in responding to internal displacement in urban environments; 4) addressing the root causes of displacement, focusing on prevention and preparedness; 5) inclusion of IDPs in development frameworks. IDPs must not be forgotten by focusing only on refugee movements – in fact they may become tomorrow’s refugees and their protection and assistance needs in their country must be addressed. IDPs are sometimes harder to protect and assist than refugees because of less visibility, issues of State sovereignty, as well as insecurity as they remain in a context of armed conflict. Yet, they are at high risk of violence, abuse, exploitation and further poverty.

From the floor: GPC Coordinator Simon Russel also emphasized the lack of reliable data as the main challenge in order to implement solid pragmatic responses to internal displacement. UNHCR stressed the importance of
capacity-building of national authorities on law and policy, mentioning Mali as good practice. Although IDP laws are important, policy and strategies can be just as effective in providing a national framework for action. The International Peace Institute asked two related questions: looking at the Kampala Convention as a possible model for other regional instruments, what were the key ingredients for success in establishing this Convention, and what role can be played by the UN and other actors? Would there be any advantages in reaching a global instrument and, if so, how would this interact with regional instruments?

Responding to questions, Chaloka Beyani stressed the need to take stock of the Kampala Convention. On the opportunities for regional instruments, he mentioned that there seems to be a strong commitment in this regard in the Middle East region, while Latin America is more hesitant. However, there is still a possibility to try to push for an equivalent of the Cartagena Declaration for IDPs (i.e. a statement of principle applicable to IDPs within the Inter-American system). In terms of key ingredients, it is crucial that the initiative comes from the region itself, it cannot be imposed. In addition, partnerships with international organizations and civil societies are an important element. Conversely, developing a global instrument appears far off, and attempting to do so may actually destroy what we already have (i.e. Guiding Principles) as there would be strong resistance from some States. It would be better to focus on regional frameworks where possible, as well as on national legislation and policy. That said, an international instrument could emerge gradually by inviting non-AU State Parties to become part of the Kampala Convention. Both the AU co-chair and Monique Pariat stressed the importance of political will in order to advance in implementing the Kampala Convention as well as in establishing other regional frameworks. The international community can support when national authorities lack capacity to respond (in terms of governance, financial resources etc.), but the responsibility remains with the State.
14. High-Level Panel on “Resilience to Natural Hazards and Climate-Induced Disasters”
28 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: The Permanent Mission of Fiji to the UN, the Permanent Mission of Mozambique to the UN, the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the UN, UNISDR and FAO

Objective: Present concrete actions for building resilience and managing consequences of natural hazards and climate disasters.

Panel: Carla Mucavi, Director of the FAO Liaison Office in New York; H.E. Ambassador Peter Thomson, Permanent Representative of Fiji to the UN and president-elect of the General Assembly; H.E. Ambassador António Gumende, Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the UN; H.E. Ambassador Irene Susan Natividad, Deputy Permanent Representative of the Philippines to the UN; Alasan Senghore, Head of Delegation of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (IFRC) to the United Nations; Neil McFarlane, Director of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) in New York

Discussion:
Building on the discussions and commitments from the WHS, panellists explored further the best ways to work collectively to better understand, anticipate and reduce natural hazards risks for building resilience.

It was emphasized that typhoons, floods, droughts, earthquakes and other natural hazards cause massive loss of life and livelihoods throughout the world. Over the last two decades, disasters caused by natural hazards have claimed 1.35 million lives and affected on average 218 million people per year, mostly in developing countries. Economic losses now reach $250–$300 billion per year. Between 2008 and 2014 a total of 184 million people were displaced by disasters, an average of over 26 million newly displaced per year.

Natural hazards and climate-induced hazards hinder national development and constrain achievement of the SDGs. For example, one of the recent hazards that hit Fiji was Cyclone Winston, the most powerful storm on record in the Southern Hemisphere, which caused unprecedented damage and loss, particularly in terms of agricultural production.

In 2015-2016 El Niño caused devastating effects worldwide. Currently, Mozambique is simultaneously facing the effects of floods in the Northern provinces and drought in the South. The droughts and floods affect the gross domestic product growth rate, causing, among others, food insecurity and displacement of the affected population. Furthermore, climate change and climate variability will increase the risk of floods and coastal erosion due to sea level rising, threatening infrastructure and livelihoods of communities. All of this impact will cause development setbacks. The Government of Mozambique has taken a number of measures aimed at reducing such impacts by strengthening of capacity building, with specific emphasis on early warning systems, preparedness and response, contingency planning and recovery as well as mitigation and adaptation to natural hazards. For example, the Government is mainstreaming DRR and climate change adaptation into all national development planning processes as well as in the education curricula.

Panellists noted that climate change makes extreme weather events more frequent, violent and unpredictable. The impacts of climate change will not be homogenous and conditions of vulnerability should
be considered. There is a need to better anticipate hazards, absorb shocks and reshape development to reduce climate risks.

There was general consensus among the panellists that greater investment and mobilization of resources in national and local preparedness for risk reduction and early warning will reduce number of casualties and losses. Additionally, there is a need to establish national policies and programmes that prioritize prevention rather than emergency relief. For DRR it is important to follow the Sendai Framework’s four Priorities for Action. Additionally, investment in climate change mitigation and addressing the root cause of climate change will further decrease the cost of climate-induced disasters.

Global partnerships and initiatives can play a crucial role in enhancing preparedness, risk reduction and building resilience at the country level. One of the initiatives is the Global Preparedness Partnership (GPP) which aims to support building the resilience of rural communities. The Global Preparedness Partnership was launched by the Philippines, as Chair of the Vulnerable Twenty Group of Finance Ministers (the V20).

During the event information was shared on the anticipated transformational impact of the One Billion Coalition for Resilience initiative (1BC), that aims to strengthen the safety, health and well-being of vulnerable populations everywhere and builds on existing initiatives. The 1BC invites everyone to be agents of change to create a more resilient world.

Conclusions and recommendations:
Participants reaffirmed that to understand, anticipate and reduce risks there is a need for collective cooperation and action between humanitarian, development and climate change communities. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Paris Climate Agreement, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the overarching 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development guide the way forward. Effective partnerships and better coherence between local, national, regional and international efforts are needed for their implementation.

The following actions are required for building resilience:
- Move beyond traditional silos between humanitarian and development actors to deliver collective outcomes;
- Invest in preparedness, DRR and early warning in order to reduce the number of casualties and losses;
- Mainstream DRR and climate change adaptation into national policies and plans;
- Involve women and other vulnerable groups in disaster management;
- Promote application of risk sensitive technologies, good practices and social protection, and;
- Put in place effective partnerships for building resilience to natural hazards and climate-induced disasters.

The panel concluded that there is a need for a paradigm shift and redefinition of success. The success rate should not only be measured by the number of people who were reached, but by the number of people whose resilience was built and strengthened to better anticipate and/or deal with future natural hazards and disasters.
15. Colombian Humanitarian Efforts: Benchmarking the Colombian State-led humanitarian assistance against the Core Humanitarian Standard
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Government of Colombia (Presidential Counsellor’s Office for Human Rights; Victims Unit – Unit for the Comprehensive Attention and Reparation of Victims; Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations in New York) and Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI)

Objective: After about half a century of an internal conflict that caused more than a million casualties and 6 million IDPs, a peace agreement is about to be signed between the government and the FARC guerrilla in Colombia. In a transition phase from conflict to post-conflict, the government aims at keeping the assistance to affected people relevant and efficient, while coping with a diminishing financial capacity. The Colombian Government and the Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI) have joined forces to efficiently identify strengths and weaknesses of the Colombian humanitarian attention model, to focus resources where they are most needed, and enable a more accountable humanitarian system that puts the people at the centre, allowing victims of the internal conflict to regain their independence and facilitate their integration into the peace building process.

The objective of this side event was to engage different allies and stakeholders interested in promoting a project/discussion on innovative approaches to assess the effectiveness of state led assistance mechanisms. It discussed the challenges of humanitarian assistance in the transition from conflict to peace; the extent to which social auditing methods can apply, are useful and efficient in the framework of governmental processes; and how the Core Humanitarian Standard – CHS, (highlighted as a good practice to improve accountability in the Secretary-General’s report on Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations) can help put the people at the centre of governmental humanitarian assistance in the context of sustainable peace building.

Panel: Paula Gaviria, Presidential High Commissioner for Human Rights – Colombian Government; Pierre Hauselman, Executive Director – Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI); Chaloka Beyani, UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons

Discussion: The discussion emphasized that Colombia is experiencing a historical moment in which the country is moving towards post-conflict with a complex situation of protracted displacement and a quarter of its population being victim of the conflict. The government is promoting a transparent process for strengthening its accountability to the people and opening out to international expertise to assess its aid mechanisms and make sure all efforts are on track. In addition, an NGO specialized in independent quality assessment (HQAI) and a governmental agency (the Victims’ Unit) have forged an alliance to identify durable solutions and opportunities to put the people at the centre. Standards and innovative approaches are used to assess the effectiveness of the State led humanitarian mechanisms. Moreover, a model for cost effective audit methods has been created to improve the use of data for progress and long-term impacts measurement. In this project, the Core Humanitarian Standards are seen as an opportunity for putting the people at the centre of governmental humanitarian assistance in the context of a sustainable peace building process where human rights are respected. The Colombian case is also a model that can be replicated to other contexts as one of
the potential mechanisms for sustainable and efficient “localization” of aid through the strengthening of national capacities and mechanisms for putting the people affected by crisis at the centre of all actions. It was also stressed during the panel discussion that an exchange of experiences between the Colombian model and other contexts/countries, particularly where humanitarian relief takes place in protracted crises and in peace negotiation scenarios, should be promoted.

Conclusions and recommendations:

- The importance of the Colombian State commitment not only throughout the implementation of the Victim’s Law but also seeking to compare its model with the Core Humanitarian Standards through an innovative project with an expert NGO;
- A historical moment for peace building: Colombia recognizes the conflict. Colombia works to restore rights and heal the damage. There is an on-going peace negotiation with the victims at the centre;
- Colombia has important lessons to share with the world and the results of this project will also bring important innovations to share globally. The focus on risk analysis and critical control points will certainly help shape a new model for external verification processes;
- The results of the project should also be shared at the national level to engage local authorities and the communities;
- The project should include a mechanism of impact measurement and follow up on the results of the project;
- Colombia needs international technical and financial support for the post conflict scenario;
- The importance of implementing durable solutions framework to measure progress and address the root causes of displacement.
**16. Strengthening Africa’s Effectiveness for Humanitarian Action**
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

**Sponsors:** AU, ECOWAS, IGAD and OCHA

**Objective:** Appraise participants of the opportunities for enhancing and fostering disaster preparedness and response capacities in Africa; explore networks and collaborations that could be forged to support a robust implementation of the post-WHS agenda of the African Union; examine the coordination requirements necessary for adapting and scaling up initiatives around the post-WHS agenda, including the SDG Implementation framework, the AU Humanitarian Policy Framework and the AU Vision 2063.

**Panel:**
- Guleid A. Artan, Director, IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC);
- Yvette Chesson-Wureh, Establishment Coordinator, Angie Brooks Center for Women’s Empowerment, Leadership Development, Peace and Security;
- Kennedy Osemwegie, Director of Training, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre, Accra, Ghana (West Africa Disaster Preparedness Initiative);
- H.E. Ambassador Leon Tannou, Permanent Representative of ECOWAS to the UN;
- Colonel Kennedy Osemwegie, West African Disaster Preparedness Initiative (WAPDI)

**Discussion:**
With regards to humanitarian action in Africa, IGAD argued for a strong regional approach to supplement national efforts, including dealing with drought which is a recurrent challenge. The Horn of Africa is easily affected by drought. It has about 200 million people who represent 3% of the global population, but receive 40% of global food aid. The region is especially vulnerable to climate change. The Southern Sector (Kenya – Rwanda) usually receives above average rainfall but has been badly affected this year and received less than the average rainfall. The Equatorial sector fared better. In 2000, a disaster risk management mechanism was put in place to support resilience building. As a result, the IGAD Drought Disaster and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRISI) was created. ICPAC was formed in 2007 for climate prediction, early warning and DRR and to provide links between the 11 Early Warning Centers in its region. ICPAC runs the Climate Outlook Forum (COF), a process which brings together experts before the rainy seasons (usually in March-May, June and December) to share their early warning notes. The COF is also the main mechanism for disseminating climate early warnings. The first was in May 2015, and the region was relatively prepared thanks to ICPAC early warnings. ICPAC provides an opportunity for international cooperation and partnerships for coordination and early action. Currently, a review is ongoing to see what went well, how to improve in the limited areas and to prepare for La Niña later this year.

H.E. Ambassador Leon Tannou, Permanent Representative of ECOWAS to the UN, emphasized that enhanced capacities are required to raise resilience and stressed the importance of durable solutions. He added that the question of humanitarian challenges has global effects and the WHS was a good initiative to improve how we address future crises. With climate change aggravating displacement and also recalling the Paris climate change summit, Africa has seen the need to link these frameworks to the AU Vision 2063. African governments are striving to have early-warning systems in place for every member state and at the regional level, such as in ECOWAS, which requires support and cooperation of the international community, in particular the exchange of experience and transfer of technology. ECOWAS has put in place a mechanism for conflict prevention and humanitarian crises. Technicians have been training as part of the West African Disaster Preparedness Initiative (WAPDI) that requires international support to enable mitigation of humanitarian crises.
Colonel Kennedy Osemwegie from the WAPDI, stressed that his organization serves as a resource for disaster management platform planning and engagements. The trained personnel and resources are at the disposal of the AU. Mr. Osemwegie stressed the importance of replicating this model throughout the continent, while also considering the diverse nature of African Member States. WADPI is an all-hazards type approach and an all-government response to disaster and its management. Fifteen countries have already participated. Cape Verde will be covered later this year in August. WADPI takes in about 60 participants per country, and has provided cascade training for 400 community workers in all 15 counties in Liberia. 1,400 participants trained on disaster management, including operations, health risks, Ebola, health surveillance (critical infrastructure and hazard mapping) and a composite track on logistics and civil-military coordination. The initiative intends to increase the ratio of female participants and gender mainstreaming in future iterations (from 17% currently to 30%). Next steps for WADPI include a five year plan and continuation of in-country training and expansion to other regions.

Ambassador Antonio Tete, Permanent Representative of the AU to the UN, called for a shift from the current focus on dealing with consequences of disasters to capacity building. The key message is investment in capacity and the expansion of WADPI to other regions of Africa.

Renny Mike Wafula from the AU presented the African Union Common African Position (CAP), which calls for the establishment of an African Humanitarian Agency. Developing the post WHS roadmap will be based on leveraging platforms such as the Annual AU Humanitarian Symposium to get the voices and perspectives of local and civil societies and the African Union Humanitarian Architecture, based on Agenda 2063. He stressed the importance of addressing root causes, especially dealing with political crises and conflicts. The CAP is closely linked to the SDGs and envisages a 10 year transformative period supported with an action plan to shape how Africa engages with the world and vice versa on humanitarian issues, calling for reforms of the global humanitarian architecture. Global humanitarian action and policies should reflect the centrality of states and their primary responsibility to prepare for, respond to and recover from crises. Resolution 46/182 needs to be reviewed, including the revision of current structures for greater and more diverse inclusion that would facilitate contemporary contextualization and more effective collaboration. With regards to humanitarian financing, Mr. Wafula said that the “Grand Bargain” needs be opened up to take into account Africa’s interests. The AU plans continental conference on the outcomes of WHS in early 2017. Major directions from the CAP include: policy and legal and operational effectiveness, including the establishment of the Africa humanitarian agency and of a humanitarian policy framework; engagement of the African standby force, the African CDC and other tools to be strengthened; solidarity and partnership and home grown solutions;

Yvette Chesson-Wureh from the Angie Brooks Center for Women’s Empowerment highlighted the Women’s Situation Room, a peace-building project that empowers women to be the leading force for democratic and peaceful elections by training and deploying them as election observers. The project was recently employed in Uganda and is being prepared for use to support women in Ghana. The WSR has been used in eight countries in Africa, after its first deployment during the 2011 elections in Liberia.

Conclusions and recommendations:
• Strengthening Africa’s effectiveness in humanitarian action involves building and coordinating capacities locally and regionally as well as across the continent;
• Initiatives such as WADPI, ICPAC and the Women’s Situation Room need to be expanded throughout the regions in Africa;
• Early warning and DRR have good returns and thus the Ministries of Finance need to be involved to ensure spending on comparatively cheaper disaster preparedness and conflict prevention. This is happening in the IGAD region and the Ebola crisis has triggered similar approaches in West and Central Africa.
17. The Future of Global Humanitarian Health Response
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York


Objective: The World Humanitarian Summit Chair’s Summary calls for a “transformational change in the approach to protecting and promoting the health of the millions of people that are affected by crises” and also calls for “new global undertaking for health action in crises”. Against this backdrop, the side event focused on: 1) The development of strong coordination models for response to health emergencies and infectious hazards; 2) The development and delivery of a predictable essential health package for emergencies and flexible multi-year financing to deliver it; 3) The promotion of sustainable health outcomes through multi-sector cooperation; 4) The protection of health workers and health facilities. These four elements proposed for presentation and discussion form a strong basis for this “new global undertaking”, for consideration by UN Member States.

Chair: George SW Patten, Charge d’Affaires of the Liberian Mission to the UN

Moderator: Rick Brennan, Director, Emergency Operations, WHO

Panel: Alasan Senghore, Permanent Observer; IFRC Delegation to the United Nations; Ted Chaiban, Director, Program Division, UNICEF; Simon Russell, Global Protection Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR

Discussion: The panellists generally agreed that better coordination is key for improving the humanitarian health response, including the importance of better alignment and information among agencies and partners, as well as multi-sectoral collaboration across the health and humanitarian communities. In this regard, several successes in multi-sectoral collaboration were noted in South Sudan, the Philippines and most recently the Zika response. The Chair highlighted the important efforts made and successes obtained in Liberia. It was noted, however, that this coordination is not systemic and more work needs to be done in this area. The key role of local and national actors was also highlighted throughout the discussion, with panellists noting that successful strategies are dependent on the involvement of local communities and the establishment of local sustainable capacities. A Zero Tolerance approach for attacks against health care was also discussed, including the need to work more closely with religious and community leaders to promote social cohesion in times of crises. Other recommendations included promoting respect for IHL among combatants, enforcing the rule of law and punishment for offenders, and stressing that protection should be integrated into all sectors.

On funding, it was noted that multi-year and systemic funding is important, as well as funding for prevention. Investment in prevention was encouraged as a priority area. Linked to that, countries should be encouraged to comply with the International Health Regulations. This was further stressed as we are seeing a new reality with regards to increased risks of outbreaks, with 70% of new and emerging diseases coming from the animal sector. The importance of integrating outbreaks and humanitarian response was also highlighted, which is one of the areas which WHO and the IASC have been working on.
Conclusions and recommendations:
Following the panel discussion and interventions from the audience, it was clear that the humanitarian system is in the process of better coordinating its work in health responses, including with the recent agreement of the IASC Principals to use classic IASC mechanisms for outbreaks. The role of the WHO was highlighted throughout the discussion, including the recent adoption of its new Emergencies Program. Some specific recommendations are as follows:

- There is a need for the definition and implementation of a comprehensive essential health service package;
- Investing in prevention is key;
- Good work has been done in multi-sectoral coordination, but more needs to be done and it needs to be done at all stages of the emergency cycle;
- Zero tolerance for attacks against health care; including specific recommendations around IHL compliance by combatants, enforcement of rule of law and punishment of offenders;
- Humanitarian response and outbreak response need to be integrated;
- WHO should continue to strengthen its coordination role and continue to work closely with partners.
18. Urban Crisis and the New Urban Agenda
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: The Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the UN, the Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the UN, UN-Habitat

Objective: Make recommendations to enhance collaboration between authorities and humanitarian actors in urban areas in order to better anticipate, prepare for and respond to shocks and crises, saving lives as well as contributing to building resilient cities.

Chairs: Dylan Winder, Head Humanitarian Policy and Partnerships, Department for International Development, UK; Helena Yáñez, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the UN

Moderator: Esteban Leon, Chief Technical Advisor, Urban Risk Unit, UN-Habitat

Panel: Dr. Lucy Earle, Urban Advisor (IRC/ UK-DFID); Michael Talhami, Water and Habitat Coordinator for North Africa and the Middle East (ICRC); Mostafa Mohaghegh, Manager, Partnership for Urban Disaster Risk Reduction, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC); Filiep Decorte, Deputy Director (UN-Habitat)

Discussion:
In opening the panel discussion, Mr. Dylan Winder (UK-DFID) drew attention to the devastating long-term consequences conflicts in urban areas have on infrastructure and service provisions. This should be an incentive to come together and respond more effectively, as humanitarians can gain better understanding of the urban context and its needs, especially in the light of the 2030 Agenda. Ms. Helena Yáñez expressed her gratefulness for the local and international response to the recent earthquake in Ecuador. She encouraged a human-rights based approach to deal with problems in cities.

Dr. Lucy Earle (IRC/ UK-DFID) was positive about the progress made at the WHS and especially about the launch of the Global Alliance for Urban Crises with nearly 70 member organizations. Habitat III is focusing on the positive nature of urbanization, but we also have to keep the challenges in mind. Dr. Earle argued that the New Urban Agenda should make specific reference to the impact of conflicts and violence on services in cities. There are four specific areas where members of the Global Alliance will be focusing on: 1) generating great understanding of the needs and vulnerabilities of the displaced; 2) developing new tools and approaches on how to identify and target vulnerable groups in urban areas affected by crises; 3) establishing surge capacity to ensure urban expertise is available during crisis response, including for municipal authorities; 4) encouraging the many initiatives focusing on building urban resilience, to incorporate emergency preparedness and response capacity for communities and local institutions.

Mr. Michael Talhami (ICRC) stated that response to armed conflict in urban areas is a big challenge which requires more than just infrastructural support. Policy has to support resilient urban services and recognize the cumulative long-term impact on services and infrastructure and their interconnectedness. Measures have to be taken to remind States of their obligations under international humanitarian law regarding weaponry, protection of civilians and staff etc.
Mr. Mostafa Mohaghegh (IFRC) stressed the importance of giving extra attention to cities as they are constantly exposed to evolving internal and external risk factors (rural to urban migration, expansion of slums, poverty and unemployment and violence). Availability of baseline data for better risk mapping, basic infrastructure, better communication means, etc. are opportunities for progress. People and communities are not only the first responders to disasters, they are also agents of positive change through risk reduction. This, however, requires knowledge, skills and resources. Therefore, investment in community and institutional capacity development is an imperative for success.

Conclusions and recommendations:
Urban areas are increasingly the sites of humanitarian crises, including natural disasters, protracted conflicts and displacement. A recommendation for the New Urban Agenda is to make specific reference to the long-term consequences these crises have in urban areas on both infrastructure and service provisions. To adequately address these issues and reduce risk, investments have to be made to train people and (local) authorities and build institutional capacity for crisis preparedness and response.
19. Safeguarding health access in conflict, upholding international humanitarian law
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Global Protection Cluster

Objective: This side event built on the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity, in particular the Core Responsibilities to prevent and end conflict; to respect the rules of war and uphold norms; and to leave no one behind, as well as Sustainable Development Goals 3, 6 and 16. This event is crosscutting for the pillars of the UN, bridging peace and security, human rights and humanitarian and development agendas. It is an issue that also cuts across and galvanizes many different communities and on which even Member States who cannot find political resolution to intransigent conflicts can agree and provide an entry point for common consensus.

Panel: Richard Wright, Director of the New York Liaison Office, UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees; Dr. Rick Brennan, Emergency Director, World Health Organisation; Pierre Gentile, Head of Protection, International Committee of the Red Cross; Len Rubenstein, Center for Public Health and Human Rights, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; Fabien Dubuet, Head of the New York Liaison Office, Médecins Sans Frontières

Discussion:
The panel noted that attacks on health facilities and personnel are not so-called “collateral damage”, but are often deliberate attempts to disrupt whatever sense of safety there is in times of conflict. Such attacks have direct effects and flow-on effects: for example, in times of conflict it is the people with means who leave. Health workers are often people with means and they are often the first to depart. So, health facilities are understaffed from the beginning of a conflict. The panel noted the need to understand better the consequences of attacks on health care. In Yemen, it is estimated that 10,000 children have died as a result of more than 100 attacks on health-care facilities.

The panel noted the astonishing scope and scale of attacks on health facilities and personnel. There is an incredible variety of types of interference with the provision of health care and a wide range of motives: in Syria there is deliberate targeting of facilities whereas in Yemen damage is mostly indiscriminate. For Palestine refugees in Syria, Yarmouk is emblematic of a situation in which the provision of services and medicines by UNRWA presents huge challenges in a situation of extraordinary difficulties and danger.

Notwithstanding the bleak picture of attacks on health access in current conflicts the panel noted some positive developments and suggested some steps forward. First, the unanimous adoption of Security Council Resolution 2286 sends a strong message and is very helpful. Second, there is a new consciousness about the wrongfulness of attacks on health-care facilities. Third, tremendous innovative measures to reduce and mitigate attacks on health care have been taken, including moving hospitals underground, creating health points often in IDP centres to replace damaged health centres, modifying the types of interventions and negotiating access. Fourth, there are many sources of authority in the system and while not all are being used - for example, the provision in IHL for fact-finding enquiries - some are being used in effective ways. With respect to Gaza, the UN Secretary-General used his powers to set up a Board of Inquiry into incidents affecting UNRWA’s schools and he also created a special investigative commission on Syria. The Special Representative on Children in Armed Conflict can also undertake enquiries. Finally, it was noted that armed forces can be persuaded to change their tactics and adopt training in IHL, particularly in situations of counter-insurgency.
Conclusions and recommendations:
The panel noted that it is not easy to collect facts in conflict situations and there was a suggestion that the fact-finding process should be opened up. The panel made a number of concrete proposals to safeguard health access in conflict:

- There must be dialogue with all belligerents as a fundamental operational principle. Dialogue with anti-government elements must not be criminalised because it saves lives.
- The treatment of all people, whoever they are, must be respected and health centres, health workers, and the provision of health services should be protected at all times. Respect for UN premises, which are inviolable under international law, is crucial.
- The good momentum created by the WHS needs to be followed by concrete discussions about IHL, counter-insurgency and counter-terrorism operations.
- Prevention and mitigation of attacks and the identification of attacks, including through the use of new technology and innovation, needs to be emphasised.
- Data on attacks needs to be consolidated, to better understand trends and incidents.
- The existing fact-finding mechanisms need to be used better - this is not just about justice and punishment but about finding out what happened and why.
- Member States should hold each other accountable and the political cost of attacks on health facilities and personnel needs to be raised.
- More advocacy on this issue is necessary, including on related questions such as the sale of arms to belligerents.
20. Taking the Agenda for Humanity Forward: The Secretary-General’s report on the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit
29 June, United Nations Secretariat, New York

Sponsors: Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

Objective: The first-ever World Humanitarian Summit produced an ambitious and wide-ranging set of commitments from a diverse group of stakeholders in support of the Agenda for Humanity. As requested by Member States, the Secretary-General will report to the General Assembly on the achievements of the Summit in September and will propose ways to take commitments and the Agenda for Humanity forward. This event provided an opportunity for Member States and other key stakeholders to share views on possible means of implementation and advancement of their own commitments in relation to the overall Agenda for Humanity, for consideration in the Report of the Secretary-General on the Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit and the way forward.

Panel: Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, Chief, Policy Development and Studies Branch, OCHA

Discussion: Mr. Strohmeyer highlighted that over 3,000 commitments have been made in support of the Agenda for Humanity at the Summit, which was attended by over 9,000 participants, including 55 Heads of States and governments and representatives from 180 Member States. With such a high number of commitments, the central question would be on how Member States, UN Agencies, NGOs and other stakeholders intend to take these commitments forward and how progress on the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity would be measured. Member States and other stakeholders were invited to share their views on those questions, which would also provide an opportunity to inform the upcoming Report of the Secretary-General on the Outcome of the WHS. During the 71st General Assembly, Member States had requested the Secretary-General to report back on the outcomes of the first WHS.

During the discussion participants agreed that any follow up process should be light and use existing tools, mechanisms and frameworks as much as possible. The overall guiding principle should be that those who made a commitment in support of the Agenda for Humanity at the Summit would champion their implementation and are invited to report on progress based on self-reporting. Following these principles, the upcoming report of the Secretary-General should however provide a sense of direction and a framework for how to advance the Agenda for Humanity. In particular, it should outline how best to document and report back on commitments, how to track progress of the Agenda for Humanity and assess achievement in the future, and how to continue dialogue and engagement.

Conclusions and recommendations: Mr. Strohmeyer informed participants that a draft of the upcoming Report of the Secretary-General on the Outcome of the WHS would be shared with the members of the IASC in late July and urged participants to stay engaged in an exchange on how best to implement the achievements of the Summit, as well as to advance the Agenda for Humanity.