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On 3 and 4 December 2014, OCHA hosted its third annual Global Humanitarian Policy Forum (GHPF). The forum was convened by the Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB). Participants included over 100 humanitarian practitioners, academics, private sector partners, and representatives of international organizations and non-governmental organizations.

The GHPF aims to build a more inclusive policy community, identify latest trends, showcase research, and foster a coordinated policy-and-research agenda that contributes to the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS). The 2014 GHPF focused on the following specific objectives:

- Build a common understanding of the term “interoperability”.
- Identify the systemic issues and priority research, policy and operational gaps pertaining to interoperability on which the international community should focus.
- Identify initiatives to be taken by different actors to foster interoperability as a way to enhance the effectiveness of global humanitarian action.

**Interoperability** describes the effort to optimize the response to affected people’s needs by making systems work better together in a predictable way, based on their respective comparative advantage.

The GHPF comprised a Humanitarian Symposium, open to the public. This was followed by an off-the-record Policy Conclave with working-level experts. Both sessions analysed the concept of interoperability. The second day included a series of workshops, four of which supported the thematic areas identified under the auspices of the 2016 WHS (effectiveness, managing risk, innovation and serving the needs of people in conflict). The workshops examined the following topics:

- Improving effectiveness through better response.
- Managing risk through more effective planning and programming.
- Enhancing research-and-development efforts in the area of innovation.
- Best practices for reaching hidden populations of urban internally displaced persons, including the use of tools and data methods.

A fifth workshop examined the application of complexity science theory to improve humanitarian response capabilities.

“As a participant I gained valuable information from the discussion and comments that you contributed. Platforms such as this, with so many important actors and stakeholders from around the world, allow us to make valuable connections with likeminded organizations and individuals—something that we look forward to building upon in the near future as we take the lessons and discussions from the conference and put them into practice.”

_Lana Ghawi Zananiri, ARDD-Legal Aid_
The GHPF Symposium included two panel discussions, commencing with an introductory statement by UN Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson. He then joined UN Under-Secretary-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator Valerie Amos, USAID Assistant Administrator Nancy Lindborg and moderator Laura Trevelyan of BBC News America for an hour-long discussion on interoperability, titled “The International Humanitarian System: Preparing for the Future.” Following their discussion, Ms. Trevelyan presided over a second panel featuring Alicia Bala, Deputy Secretary-General of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN); Camilo Buitrago Hernandez, National Director of Social and Humanitarian Assistance, Special Administrative Unit for Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation of Victims, Colombia; and Robert Piper, UN Humanitarian Relief Coordinator for the Sahel. The panel discussed interoperability through the lens of affected States.

The two symposium panels identified the following main challenges:

- **Lives and resources are lost when humanitarian assistance is siloed.** Despite overwhelming evidence that humanitarian needs would best be met through long-term planning and better coordination with development partners, funding streams remain short term in nature, and coordination between humanitarian and development actors is insufficient. The present “band-aid” approach, owed in part to donor fatigue with protracted crises, undermines long-term planning and further limits the capacity of an over-stretched humanitarian system. All estimates indicate that the trend towards bigger crises will continue more often, further stretching existing response mechanisms and underscoring the need for a more interoperable approach.

- **Leadership accountability remains a major gap within affected States, and the interoperability discussion raised important questions in this respect.** Some participants suggested that leadership accountability is imperative for creating an interoperable system, and that interoperability without an accountability mechanism is simply “diffused responsibility.” Although there are measures that do hold leaders to account, rules and laws too frequently fall short of expectations: new strategies are needed to ensure the humanitarian principles are adhered to, particularly in light of the expanding list of actors involved with humanitarian response. In addition to Security Council resolutions, participants mentioned that information and data sharing can put pressure on leaders to meet humanitarian needs, and that new technology and coordination efforts are helping to streamline work in this area.

- **Other participants held the view that the distinguishing feature of an interoperable approach is that it recognizes multiple power centres that create flat hierarchies.** By virtue of multi-polarity, some poles, including those occupied by Governments, may play a bigger role than others. However, their interaction must be governed by shared standards and collective responsibility, rather than through centralized leadership and coordination.

- **An ever-larger number of States are relying on their own disaster management mechanisms, eschewing international assistance.** There will always be a need for an international humanitarian system to provide support when national systems are overwhelmed, but all emergencies start and end...
The development of national mechanisms—governmental and non-governmental—should therefore be encouraged by all actors working on humanitarian response.

- **The politics of aid delivery further limit humanitarian assistance.** Governments—affected and donor—must look beyond narrow political interests and allow humanitarian response efforts to advance unimpeded, wherever there is a need. Aid is only provided in areas that are easy to access, leaving large populations neglected because they are hard to reach. In donor States, dramatic images broadcast by the news media raise awareness, but they have perpetuated a short-term view of humanitarian crises that favours the immediate delivery of assistance. Humanitarian action is sometimes seen as a “solution”, but in reality, solutions must be pursued using political means.

- **The humanitarian system is not “broken”, but it is under pressure to reform.** Newly emerging exogenous factors are challenging the capacity of humanitarian work to develop plans and structures that keep up with rising humanitarian needs, while simultaneously maintaining neutrality and complying with the humanitarian principles. Factors challenging the humanitarian system include the increasing presence of non-state actors; the scale of emergencies, which engulf entire regions and are no longer confined to countries; and the expansion of climatic effects, which lead to a deterioration of pre-crisis conditions within communities.

- **Participants suggested that achieving an interoperable humanitarian system requires common understandings and standards of what humanitarian response should look like.** Even though some participants thought that different actors will necessarily have different motivations and approaches, most agreed that interoperability should evolve around a common goal: to meet affected people’s needs. To this end, there is value in exchanging information on the added value each actor can bring to a response, and for international humanitarian agencies to share technical standards, advice and guidance for humanitarian response. Risk management should be a focus, so as to

---

**“The most important thing is accountability for leaders who don’t care about the well-being of their people.”**  
Nancy Lindborg, USAID Assistant Administrator
**MEETING AFFECTED PEOPLE’S NEEDS**

The central and common motivation of any response effort—whether by international humanitarian agencies, affected Governments, private sector actors or others—is the goal to address and meet the needs of the affected population. Only secondarily does it matter who meets those needs—it is of primary importance that those needs are being met.

- The vast array of humanitarian actors has made it more challenging to develop an accurate assessment of humanitarian need. The present information gap is perpetuated by several factors, including difficulties in measuring the impact of the humanitarian community; the challenge of developing a whole-of-system picture to understand each actor’s contribution; and limitations in data-collection capacity, including the need to analyse and disseminate real-time, verifiable figures that improve humanitarian response. The information gap is further widened by organizational capacity limitations, access issues, and underdeveloped guidance around standards and ethics.

**KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

This section will explore the challenges and opportunities in achieving interoperability, based on the outcome of discussions within the Humanitarian Conclave.²

**INTEROPERABILITY: HOW CAN THE DIFFERENT SYSTEMS WORK BETTER TOGETHER?**

“Aren’t you happy when the Government says, ‘Thank you, but we can do it ourselves’? This is the ultimate measure of the UN’s success.”

Alicia Bala, Deputy Secretary-General, ASEAN

The overarching sentiment of conclave participants was that the multilateral system is most relevant for setting standards and principles, while international response to emergencies should focus on complementing, rather than substituting, national resources and capacity. States have the primary responsibility in coordinating and delivering humanitarian assistance.

Developing trust with local communities, outreach to marginalized groups and discrete efforts by international actors to backstop Governments and civil society are critical factors in creating conditions for interoperability. Capacity must be developed within these sectors in order to foster self-reliance and sustainable development.

“Communities can play a key role in overseeing Government. Are we doing our job properly, are our interactions having any positive impact? Communities are the ones to evaluate our work.”

Camilo Buitrago Hernandez, National Director of Social and Humanitarian Assistance, Special Administrative Unit for Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation of Victims, Colombia

² The Humanitarian Conclave is a closed-door, off-the-record dialogue between the GHPF participants. This year’s conclave focused on how different systems can work better together.
Frequently recurring questions were “How do different actors work together? Who is taking the lead in humanitarian response?” “If the humanitarian system is devolving, why does it still persist?” Participants’ comments during the conclave’s plenary session focused on the need for a humanitarian system that is nimble enough to respond to different contexts, that is prepared to view community actors and affected Governments as equals, and that recognizes development agencies and the private sector as being integral components in creating an interoperable humanitarian system. Interoperability was described as “coalition building”, but actors currently lack the necessary skills to systematically build bridges across different sectors.

**MEETING AFFECTED PEOPLE’S NEEDS: WHERE ARE THE GAPS?**

Better communication is critical in addressing gaps in delivering aid to affected people. Affected communities’ needs aren’t necessarily changing, but humanitarians increasingly recognize that listening to communities is vital for designing an effective and inclusive humanitarian response. Due to increased information flows, humanitarian responders’ expectations are also increasing from the perspective of communities. Additional work is therefore needed to ensure that networks are used in order to enhance two-way communications between communities and responders. Empowering community members to negotiate and take responsibility for leading their own humanitarian response is also an emerging trend, particularly as evidenced in the rapidly growing cash sector.

One critical gap is in the area of data, where a lack of leadership is perceived. There is frequently a lack of systematized baseline-data collection, too few incentives to encourage information sharing across organizations, as well as a lack of technical standards and ethical guidelines as to how data can be used and for what purpose. There are gaps in the type of information shared, which often focuses too much on people and not enough on infrastructure. The ready availability of data, including at the community level, has served not only to better inform affected people, but to also raise expectations towards receiving more information about the humanitarian response.

Addressing the rift between humanitarian and development work is vital, particularly in protracted crises. Some participants expressed concern that the multilateral system is sometimes too slow to respond, but others concurred that the UN and its partners are ultimately successful in delivering aid. Nevertheless, the transition to long-term humanitarian programming has been much less successful, mainly because the concept of “recovery” doesn’t exist within the donor vernacular. A new multi-hatted humanitarian worker is needed, one who understands the diverse concepts of risk reduction, aid delivery, recovery and development programming, as well as their links.

“The whole discussion on interoperability is not simply about more coordination, but it’s going much beyond that, recognizing that maybe we are not at the centre of the universe … There are many other actors we need to accommodate in this system. We can influence them, but we cannot command them. So we need to figure out ways to bring these different systems together around common values and standards, without necessarily having the kind of control that perhaps was envisaged early on.”

Robert Piper, UN Humanitarian Relief Coordinator for the Sahel

**THE INTERLOCKING SYSTEMS: MAKING INTEROPERABILITY WORK**

Participants discussed the dichotomies of urban versus rural, conflict versus disaster, resourced and underresourced, along with overall levels of preparedness and other key oppositions. They concluded that an approach that is uniquely tailored for any given circumstance is needed. In other words, context is critical to making interoperability work. Increasingly, the input-output management model is being replaced by one that is performance driven, and asks who is involved and how do we achieve our desired result.

GHPF discussions also concluded that interoperability depends not on consensus, but rather points of convergence. It recognizes the relative strengths, weaknesses and capacities of a diverse set of actors, and its achievement is dependent on a collaborative skillset that minimizes organizational ego, while moving away from a command-and-control approach. Soft skills are valuable for coalition-building around shared goals, tapping into available resources and identifying appropriate leaders to address different challenges.

Some participants stated that accountability, flexibility, principles and standards are also critical to achieving and sustaining interoperability. They felt that a compliance mechanism is essential for creating accountability in an interoperable system; in the absence of compliance, there is also a lack of accountability. Furthermore, while a modular approach is helpful in rolling out an appropriate, scaled response, it runs the risk of perpetuating silos. As a result, there is a need to ensure that modularity doesn’t supersede flexibility and inhibit cooperation. A modular system
requires the leadership of an objective arbiter who decides which actor is doing what and when. In some cases this may be the Government of an affected country. In other cases it may be the international humanitarian system, or another actor or system that has a natural leadership role in that situation.

**ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE RESOURCE USAGE**

The amount of funding sought through humanitarian appeals has soared from US$3 billion a decade ago to nearly $18 billion today. However, there has consistently been a 30 per cent funding gap in inter-agency appeals. Nevertheless, the way resources are being used in emergencies is increasingly changing. The private sector is increasingly looking at in-kind solutions to humanitarian assistance that build capacity and create opportunities for small businesses to develop in the field.

Agencies, including NGOs, are collaborating to pool funds and respond quickly to humanitarian needs (the START network’s START Fund is one such example). However, some participants felt that local NGOs are left out of such initiatives, and that little of the funding reaches local NGOs directly. One local NGO representative said that this was partly because local organizations lack the capacity to implement programmes, even if funds are received. Another participant said that some donors prefer to allocate funding in large amounts, making it even more challenging for local organizations to absorb large swaths of funding, making multi-agency funding pools all the more necessary.

**A modular approach is one where different actors, networks or systems, including the international humanitarian system, are considered a “module” that can be activated at a level commensurate with the necessity and severity of a crisis.**

### “What is needed for interoperability to work are adapters that allow us to better connect with each other – rather than constantly trying to influence each other’s way of working. Power needs to go both ways.”

Josef Reiterer, Head of OCHA’s Civil-Military Coordination Section

**THE SLIDING SCALE OF INTEROPERABILITY: DOES IT WORK IN CONFLICT?**

To understand how interoperability can work in conflict settings, some participants suggested that issues of State sovereignty, leadership (including challenges posed by UN relations with various armed actors) and the need for consensus among various actors would need to be more fully understood and fleshed out. Importantly, most participants agreed that **context matters**. Citing the
diverse examples of CAR, South Sudan and Syria, the humanitarian system needs to come together to discuss unique solutions based on the capabilities of the actors involved.

Over time, the UN has become more operational in nature, in addition to its historical role as a broker and advocate. It was felt that the multilateral system cannot be all things to everyone, and that its role should be focused in either direction, but not both.

Some participants were sceptical that a multilateral system that is an advocate and operational simultaneously could do both effectively, as there is an inherent conflict between the two areas. For example, strong advocacy efforts can limit an organization’s operational access in a conflict setting. An interoperable system therefore requires better definition of roles – figuring out who does what well. Interoperability calls upon organizations to take a bird’s eye view of the humanitarian landscape, selectively offering support in those areas where its skills and resources are most needed.

While not mutually exclusive or incompatible, humanitarian principles may come into conflict with locally held principles or values, such as solidarity or plurality. There needs to be consideration of the fact that universal norms in Africa cannot be applied the same way as in Asia, the Americas or elsewhere. The humanitarian principles cannot be seen as ideological; rather they must allow for a pragmatic response on the ground and help guide choices on how different actors might respond.

**SHORT-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CREATING AN INTEROPERABLE HUMANITARIAN SYSTEM**

This section highlights some of the specific actions and recommendations to achieve an interoperable humanitarian system, as suggested by participants during the forum.

**Who is involved?**

- Systematically map, document and analyse data pertaining to the current set of humanitarian relief providers. Establish their comparative capacities and advantages while taking into consideration different operational contexts.
- Augment the current discourse with the development of a corresponding strategic vision that identifies what innovations are needed by sector to support the achievement of specific interoperability goals in a specific time frame.
- Develop a theory and practice for assessing agencies’ “absorptive capacity” to test, pilot and integrate innovations aimed at integrating interoperability into their operational workflows.
- Re-emphasize that affected Governments are expected to take the lead in humanitarian response, alongside local NGOs and communities. The role of the international system is to backstop their work.
- Re-define the role of UN agencies from one of operational responder to that of advocate for standards and principles. A UN operational presence continues to be welcomed in circumstances where other providers lack sufficient capacities and resources to respond themselves, but this should be seen as a last resort.
- Establish incentives towards cooperation based on the shared goal of enhancing the effectiveness of humanitarian response.
- Seize the opportunity, wherever possible and relevant, to involve development actors in formulating plans and sharing information.

**What resources?**

- Begin a conversation on how to understand and measure humanitarian needs, based on affected people themselves rather than routine humanitarian constructs.
- Encourage better cooperation on the part of donor Governments so as to meet three- to five-year planning needs, thereby facilitating a risk management approach to programming.
- Draw on the resources and skills of all sectors, including the private sector, the scientific community and academia, in order to contribute to improving humanitarian action.

“More needs to be done to create change on the ground and to create space for other actors within the realm of interoperability.”

Ilwad Elman, Elman Peace and Human Rights, on extracting the unique expertise of local actors in Somalia
What standards?
• Begin a conversation on the humanitarian principles: in an age where politics permeates all facets of humanitarian work, can we afford to be neutral?
• Continue to develop data standards to facilitate information exchanges and encourage the formation of “communities of practice” to share lessons learned and good examples of innovative projects that contribute to effectiveness.

How to make the system accountable?
• Data and information can be used as a tool to pressure all humanitarian responders to work better together, whether donor or affected Governments, multilateral agencies, international or local NGOs, the private sector and diaspora groups, among others. Agreements between sectors must allow for open dialogue on best practices, including an understanding that all sides are accountable and that information is shared.
• Work with the news media and capitalize on social media to draw attention to crises no longer making front-page headlines, but which still need resources. Hold workshops with the news media to standardize terms, and engage in media partnerships to develop a deeper understanding of the work being done.
• Ensure plans are driven from the bottom up, rather than top down. Ensure local actors have a lead role in decision-making, as well as the evaluation of humanitarian programmes.

“For the first time, we got the private sector in West Africa to collaborate by creating the right space, using nothing but a phone line and a conference room.”

Alan Knight, Corporate Responsibility Manager, AcelorMittal
ANNEX I: POLL

During the symposium, audience members were asked: "What is the greatest issue impeding the creation of an interoperable humanitarian system?"

This is how they responded:

Participant Poll: “What is the greatest issue impeding the creation of an interoperable humanitarian system?”

- Trust between actors: 28%
- Lack of perceived value in being more interoperable: 17%
- Funding (either a lack thereof, or unreliable funding streams): 12%
- Uneven power dynamics across systems: 12%
- Lack of systematic protocols to engage: 12%
- Lack of coordination to take interoperability forward: 8%
ANNEX II: AUDIENCE QUESTIONS

Audience members had the opportunity to pose questions via an online platform, Pigeonhole Live. These are some of the questions, grouped thematically:

**Interoperability, Leadership and the UN:**
- Who is in charge of interoperability, or are we moving towards a different way of working altogether?
- Interoperability seems like a new word to describe old challenges – for UN agencies specifically. What’s really stopping them from working better with each other and other humanitarian actors?
- How do we accommodate different values and perspectives within an interoperable system, particularly where some actors may not want to coordinate?
- Interoperability is impossible without data standards and/or conventions. What information standardization project are you most optimistic about?
- Isn’t the UN humanitarian system trying to do everything at the same time? How realistic is that? Rather than being an implementer, it rather should focus on advocacy and empowering local communities, no?
- How can we prepare for both conflict and disaster settings simultaneously? Each brings unique challenges.
- If the humanitarian system(s) is broken, and if the way we currently work is only contributing to more disintegration, why do we keep it? Are we not better off starting from scratch?

**The Global South, Local Systems and Challenges for Creating an Interoperable System**
- We’ve had humanitarian standards for some time, but these seem to be having a legitimacy crisis. To what extent is this a result of standards not being applied equally to rich and poor countries?
- To what extent is the rejection of humanitarianism by developing nations linked to their association of humanitarianism with the west?
- How can local NGOs and other stakeholders become more “interoperable” with the international system? And vice versa?

**The Humanitarian-Development Divide and Relevance of Humanitarian Principles**
- Unless humanitarianism is linked up with the UN’s development agenda, it will remain a “band aid”! What can be done to heed the SG’s call to leave no one behind, especially those in desperate need?
- Where are the SDGs in all this? How can the UN’s development agenda be sustainable if it excludes millions of desperate people dependent on humanitarian handouts?
- I am curious to know what role the humanitarian principles have in light of the new humanitarian actors – including military, private sector, etc. Are they still relevant?
- If empathy and humility are to be humanitarian principles, how does this work at the operational level?
“Collecting information on Urban IDPs; Defining Best Practices in Different Contexts”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The workshop sought to address a major gap in operationalizing humanitarian response in urban areas: how to identify people in need using displacement as a lens, particularly as many are often hidden, and to create a common understanding of their vulnerabilities. It first looked at specific features of urban displacement and methodologies to better identify the most vulnerable people, and it then discussed how to translate these findings into relevant policies and programmes.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS

- **Ascertain why we need to collect information**: Collecting data enables us to better target assistance and to ensure that we “do no harm”, including through the analysis of the broader context of displacement. Other reasons for collecting information may include national Governments’ interest to showcase the presence of IDPs to attract resources or, conversely, to signal that displacement has been “solved” and that the country no longer faces a crisis. Some agencies may also use the “IDP” category to help target assistance. Collecting information also raises expectations on the part of the community, which need to be managed. Profiling exercises require a four- to six-month time commitment, which has to be factored in decision-making and its timing.

- **Foster the right partnerships**: There was some concern that involving too many partners could paralyse the information collection process, but working with partners to collect and analyse information was seen as advantageous and crucial to ensuring buy-in. Collaborating to design and implement profiling processes can also foster a common understanding of the situation, generate consensus and, when managed well, lead to joint response efforts. The role of national Governments, which have the primary responsibility to protect and assist their populations, including IDPs, was discussed at length. International partners can advocate with Governments to use comprehensive methodologies to map displacement from the onset of the crisis, and information collected over time can also serve to inform programmes intended to foster durable solutions.

- **Determine the type of information needed**: The data collected should not only inform us about the location of IDPs, their needs and their numbers, but also about resources, resilience, capacity and options for solutions. The data should be vetted to ensure its credibility, adhere to common standards and refer to the capacity of neighbourhoods or cities to absorb IDPs, since this also influences the nature and scope of vulnerabilities. Data not only helps us target the most vulnerable people, but it also helps us to understand the relationship between IDPs, host communities and authorities. Some participants highlighted the need to ensure the confidentiality of sensitive data, particularly on protection risks and violations. The workshop also highlighted the need for information that takes into account larger societal dimensions of displacement. For example, a model used to forecast displacement due to urban violence in Central America, presented by a workshop participant, evidenced how the influx of IDPs and their impact on infrastructure and social services can upset the social fabric in host areas. The model highlighted that when confronted with gang violence, rather than becoming displaced, some people may end up joining a gang. The model also considered the impact of massive displacement within origin communities and highlighted the challenges of finding and accessing quality data to feed into such a statistical model.

- **Respond to protracted urban displacement**: Participants discussed the importance of assessing whether IDPs still have specific vulnerabilities resulting from displacement several years after fleeing their homes. Without such long-term analysis, too often a situation of displacement is declared as “solved” (for example, when a camp is closed or a cash grant is provided), particularly as Governments may be incentivized by political processes to make this assertion. Several initiatives fostering partnerships between humanitarian and development actors in protracted situations were highlighted in the workshop: The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) is working with the Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs and other partners to define indicators based on the eight criteria for a durable solution, as per the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs. The Transitional Solution Initiative (now part of the Solutions Alliance Initiative) has fostered collaboration between humanitarian and development actors, including through an agreement on a common data set. Still, close collaboration between humanitarian and development actors in protracted displacement settings is not without challenges and not always widely applied.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Given the complexity of urban environments, it is important for humanitarians to work with a wide range of actors.** This should include the Government at the national, regional and municipal levels, as well as humanitarian and development partners. It is important to have as complete a picture as possible and to reach out to non-traditional actors in urban contexts,
such as the police, hospitals and local authorities, who can provide important data on the urban displacement situation.

- **More work needs to be done on understanding the relationship between vulnerability and displacement in urban contexts.** It was clear from the workshop that IDPs are just one category of vulnerable people among many. Stranded people (for example those in Syria), migrants, refugees and host communities also have specific vulnerabilities that have to be taken into account. Better understanding through more nuanced profiling methodologies is needed with regards to how displacement makes people more vulnerable and the way that pre-existing vulnerabilities intersect with displacement. This is particularly important in urban contexts where such vulnerabilities are markedly harder to determine.

- **Collecting information on urban displacement provides an opportunity for collaboration between humanitarian and development actors.** Examples of cooperation, such as the Solutions Alliance, show that the collection of information in itself is a valuable endeavour to agree on a common set of indicators and priorities. Tools such as the indicators to operationalize the IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs should be supported and used by humanitarian and development actors.
ANNEX IV: REPORT OF WORKSHOP II

“Fostering R&D in the Humanitarian System – From Pilots to Scaling”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

Given the increase in discussion about innovation in the humanitarian system, there is a new focus on targeted research and development (R&D) as a means to identify new solutions that could reduce overall costs of humanitarian operations and increase effectiveness. The workshop set out to consider how to better finance and support R&D to ensure that humanitarian organizations are able to integrate the most advanced technologies and approaches, including an identification of gaps in funding or resources.

Under the broader theme of interoperability, the session also highlighted some of the shared challenges between innovation, which relies on collaboration and partnerships, and interoperability more broadly, such as the need for standards and guidelines; the need for greater “business” or structural incentives to collaborate; the importance of locally driven and locally owned solutions; and the question of “who is in charge” of identifying the best solutions and driving systemic change to adopt them more widely.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

- To provide participants with an illustration of recent innovations, the workshop opened with three five-minute presentations on specific innovation projects. The presentations addressed cash-based programming, related market assessment and cash-delivery tools; 3D printing of medical supplies in Haiti; and solar-powered “life towers” that alert residents of impending floods. Presenters described the specific challenge they set out to tackle, and how they designed and tested their proposed solutions.

- The workshop then moved into a panel discussion with three presenters, highlighting the models that they used to support R&D at their institutions, including the funding that enabled their process. The discussion set out to compare various financing models (e.g., private business, Government funding, crowdsourcing) and management models for supporting R&D for humanitarian challenges.

- The first presentation identified the need for greater direct funding for users and innovators at the local level to expand and further test pilot solutions. Creating a network at the local level would further assist in developing comprehensive solutions, thereby facilitating a smooth transition to long-term development programming after a disaster.

- The second presentation noted that in deciding which solutions to scale, it is critical to have a sound understanding of the political economy that prevents certain solutions from being more widely adopted.

- The final presenter highlighted that the product itself is not enough to make an innovation take hold, but that the system around it needs to support its adoption.

- Participants then divided into groups to explore specific proposals to support R&D in the wider humanitarian system, including which resources, organizational changes and partnerships or collaborations are needed to enable innovation. Themes that emerged in the group discussions included:

  ~ Managing innovation and partnerships: At the organizational level, significant staff time is required in two areas: 1) building and managing the external relationships that are required to launch innovation, including building trust and establishing a shared language and goals, and 2) testing and refining new products and processes to refine the innovations themselves.

  ~ Evidence: It was commonly noted that humanitarian actors are weak in terms of creating an evidence base that identifies which solutions do and do not work. This further hinders efforts to determine which solutions should be brought to scale, as it is difficult to know what has really worked.

  ~ Funding: It was widely agreed that the main problem is less one of availability of funding than of the nature of funding and the way it is made available. Funding should be more open and flexible (e.g., less bound to a traditional logical framework with set outcomes, and more open to let projects evolve as they are tested), and it should take the form of more joint or pooled funding that would allow donors to share the risk of investing in untested solutions.

  ~ Brokers: Many noted the need for one or a small number of “neutral brokers” to bring coherence to R&D efforts. Such brokers could help focus attention on priority challenges and connect technical partners with those facing specific challenges in order to accelerate the spread of new solutions.

  ~ Absorption: Some participants noted the importance of not forcing new ideas just because they are new, but rather having clear objectives of what needs to be achieved and then allowing those to guide the areas in which innovation happens. It was suggested that innovation is only as useful as organizations’ capacity to absorb new methodologies.

  ~ Close to the Challenge: Several groups emphasized the importance of user-led design, and that all stages of innovation (problem definition, testing and scaling) need to be determined by the priorities of those who are “closest to the challenge”.
RECOMMENDATIONS

• **Leadership and Vision**: Leadership and management support and incentives to take risks and to learn from them, including the funding, staff time and technical skills required to manage partnerships as well as to manage the innovation process itself.

• **Local Innovation**: Support for innovation to happen close to the problem, ideally driven by local priorities rather than in a remote manner.

• **Incentives for collaboration**: As a participant stated, the humanitarian system is “uniquely positioned to talk about standards and cooperation because there is a shared vision for the kind of environment that you wish to create.” To focus limited resources on the most pressing needs, and to ensure that the best solutions are scaled, the system needs greater incentives for innovating in a coherent manner.

• **Brokering and platforms**: The system needs better connections among those defining the challenges and those with the capacities to solve them (local organizations, science, academia, business, technology, humanitarian practice, etc.). Better platforms and brokers are needed to identify and facilitate these connections.

• **Innovation management**: The UN should take a leadership role in managing the strategy and discourse around innovation management in order to ensure that the humanitarian innovation agenda is cohesive and coherent.
“Crisis Risk Management: What does it take from a humanitarian perspective?”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The compounded effect of global challenges, such as climate change, population growth and rapid urbanization, combined with longer-lasting humanitarian crises, is placing the humanitarian system on an unsustainable path where needs cannot be met by the response capacity. In 2014, OCHA’s *Saving Lives Today and Tomorrow* report highlighted the importance of embedding risk management into humanitarian and development responses. This has also been recognized in the Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), whose final outcome document has several references to disaster risk reduction and resilience. Overall, this reinforces the point that a longer-term approach, using humanitarian and development tools, is required to adequately manage the risks of humanitarian crises and strengthen resilience to shocks, especially in contexts of chronic vulnerability and cyclical natural hazards.

The workshop featured presentations followed by open discussions on the following four topics: a) Understanding humanitarian risks over a long-term horizon and how to build actionable evidence-base for humanitarian action; b) Multi-year humanitarian planning experiences: what are the obstacles and what are the next steps? c) Reducing vulnerability to crises, including an examination of new programmatic approaches; d) Funding risk management: what systemic changes are required to support a move towards a more anticipatory approach to humanitarian aid?

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

- **Risk analysis and triggers to early action:** The workshop started with a presentation examining how risk transfer mechanisms, such as insurance, can be used to protect people’s livelihoods. Risk analysis allows better understanding of risk by asking how likely it is that an event will occur, how severe will its impact be and how vulnerable is the population? Better risk awareness enables the humanitarian community to move from reactive to proactive. Losses from disasters cannot be eliminated, but they can be mitigated, shared and transferred. Disaster risk financing minimizes the financial loss and provides greater financial flexibility for other priorities. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank Integrated Disaster Risk Management Framework aligns its financial instruments with the same parametric triggers so that increasingly severe events receive more financial resources.

- **Translating multi-year planning into multi-year programming:** The second presentation highlighted that development actors are already engaged in multi-year planning, while humanitarians need to plan based on existing data that in fact demonstrates most crises are predictable. For resilience planning to work, it needs to be more than 12 months in duration, while funding must also be long term as part of a global compact framework in partnership with Governments. Early warning systems can be planned over the course of many years, yet as humanitarians respond to crises, the underlying causes remain challenging to address. To mitigate this challenge, humanitarians are able to use the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) to decrease humanitarian impact over the long term. A good development coordination process is needed, coupled with effective monitoring mechanisms to measure the progress over the long term.

- **Best practices of an anticipatory approach to humanitarian crises:** The discussion on risk-informed programming highlighted three key elements including early warning, insurance and response, and the need to work more effectively together. More complex conflict situations are more difficult to anticipate, but it would be possible to also apply some lessons learned to those situations. There was agreement that Strategic Response Plans need to factor in insurance schemes such as the African Union’s African Risk Capacity (ARC).

- **National experiences implementing a crisis risk management approach to disasters:** The session concluded with a presentation on India’s experience in responding to three major cyclones (1999, 2013, 2014). The death toll was lower because of preparedness work, including the building of cyclone shelters. Further, the development of a robust three-tier institutional mechanism at the national, provincial and local levels, and an effective response mechanism (National Disaster Response Force with 13,000 people dedicated to response) have greatly contributed to an effective response at all levels. Early warning systems, coupled with weather forecasts, have improved tremendously, while tsunami early warning centres and satellite systems have also contributed to the improvement. The three-tier approach is an example of effective interoperability.

- **The presentation also discussed parametric insurance, an innovative type of insurance that is based on the type and intensity of natural hazards, resulting in faster payout as there is no loss assessment. Parametric insurance creates certainty around what countries will receive, as compared with donor money, which can sometimes be slow to arrive while also being earmarked for specific initiatives.**

ANNEX V: REPORT OF WORKSHOP III
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Multi-year integrated development/humanitarian planning with transformative elements and benchmarks that are part of longer-term compacts/frameworks are needed.

- To effectively support resilience, flexible and multi-year funding that supports long-term programming is essential.

- Risk-transfer mechanisms can have a significant life-saving impact. Explore how experiences such as the ARC can be scaled up to other types of hazards and other geographical regions.

- A paradigm shift is needed from reaction to crises towards a more anticipatory approach to humanitarian action that works with Governments and builds capacity for nationally led crisis risk management.
“Effectiveness: New Perspectives for a Better Response”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

During the 2013 GHPF, humanitarian effectiveness emerged as a major policy issue and research area for OCHA. Building on OCHA’s work on humanitarian effectiveness in 2014, the workshop brought together actors from international and local organizations, diaspora, Governments, regional organizations, the private sector, the military and academia. There are many elements required for humanitarian effectiveness, but the workshop focused on interoperability as a key element in line with this year’s GHPF theme. The workshop’s goal was not only to create a common understanding of the unique contribution of each actor or system, but to make practical recommendations for how to collectively optimize their response. Following four brief presentations, participants were divided into groups to discuss their unique contribution to meeting affected people’s needs, and how to effectively connect with actors or systems. The outcomes will feed into the OCHA study on humanitarian effectiveness to be published in 2015.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

- **A call to transform coordination in a way that local actors can better “plug in” to, using their unique comparative advantages.** Even in Somalia, one of the most difficult environments to operate in the world, neutral and principled action by international organizations can be complemented by traditional leaders vetting local organizations; academia acting as “whistle blowers” on diversion of aid; or private sector groups enabling cash grants through mobile banking.

- **A model for a modular and scalable approach to natural disaster response that only provides what is really needed.** Canada only deploys its civilian and military assets in overseas disasters as a last resort, when requested by the affected Government and based on close consultation with local authorities on where response gaps exist. This needs-driven rather than capacity-driven approach allows Canada to respond in a manner that is respectful of local and other capacities, and it effectively avoids duplication.

- **Best practice for private sector coordination in the context of the Ebola response in West Africa.** A leading international mining company mobilized more than 100 private sector actors to coordinate their contributions to the Ebola response, while at the same time leading by example in educating its 4,000 employees so effectively that none were infected with Ebola. The private sector not only provides resources (financial and in-kind), but it can use its reach and influence to raise advocacy on global issues. There is a need to move away from the idea that businesses need to be incentivized to participate in humanitarian response and instead better understand what they are doing or can do to respond. There is also a need to recognize that there is an important role for paid business solutions in humanitarian response, in addition to the pro-bono work being done by many companies.

- **An alternative way of working effectively in armed conflict or other highly politicized situations, by working in a more decentralized way at the local level.** Even in Somalia, where it is difficult to operate, neutral and principled action by international organizations can be complemented by traditional leaders vetting local organizations, academia acting as “whistle blowers” on diversion of aid, or private sector groups enabling cash grants through mobile banking.

- **Coordination was an essential piece of effectiveness that needed to be revived to respond to the requirements of the many different actors and response systems, and to effectively manage their interaction.**

- **In considering what was needed to move to a more interoperable humanitarian system, a list of priorities was cited by participants across all groups and throughout the GHPF.**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants made a number of practical recommendations that could help advance the interaction, coordination and interoperability between actors for a more effective response.

- **Map actors and services and create common platforms to exchange information, engage in regular dialogue and coordinate their response activities.**

- **Create physical spaces for interoperability, for example by systematically including humanitarian personnel in military Joint Operation Centres, provided they receive necessary security clearance.**

- **Define and name common ground between actors.** For example,
between humanitarian organizations and the private sector, the common ground could be to establish stability in communities and strengthen household-level economies.

- Systematically share standards used in humanitarian response (SPHERE standards, etc.) with actors outside the humanitarian system. For example, the private sector may have the technical know-how to build shelters, but it may not be familiar with refugees’ specific requirements.

- Systematically prioritize local leadership in coordination mechanisms, including in clusters and related working groups.

- Provide direct funding to local organizations as a concrete way of implementing commitment to support local organizations and as a trust-building measure.

- Draw on the specific skills of other actors, such as the scientific community, to provide solutions, for example in the area of modelling for natural disaster response, and make them usable by local communities.

- Be proactive and specific in requesting information and support from other actors. For example, in crises ranging from Bosnia to Haiti and Libya, humanitarian organizations were given access to military information when they requested it specifically and by using the right channels.

- There is a need to be cognizant of the “survey fatigue” experienced by many local organizations. To mitigate this challenge, greater information sharing and transparency are needed, including improved data standardization for enhanced clarity and understanding.
ANNEX VII: REPORT OF WORKSHOP V

“Managing Complexity: The Nexus between Global Pandemics, Humanitarian Action and Contexts of Fragility”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

Inspired by the principles of complexity science, participants were encouraged to think creatively and share experiences on the complex system of factors that have created the conditions for the emergence and spread of various global pandemics and infectious diseases. Participants were also invited to specifically reflect on the existing structure of coordination and interaction within humanitarian settings, and on the role of cross-sectoral networks that work to bring together Governments, international organizations, NGOs, the private sector and scientists to address complex problems, the strengths and weaknesses of networks, and how they might be better supported and facilitated in the future.

The workshop was organized as a series of experts’ presentations and thematic open discussions aiming to cover the following topics: identifying elements of complex systems in health; understanding the potential of response networks; enabling social, economic and political (and other) conditions that have led to major health crises and their connections; and examples of networked responses to disease challenges.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

- **Complexity: the nexus between pandemics and contexts of fragility:** The workshop started with a presentation on complexity theory and its application to understanding the interaction between pandemics and conflict. Complex systems are marked by a few distinct elements, including:
  a) **Emergence:** that which arises from the interaction of two entities (individual, groups or States) creating a system that is more than the sum of its parts (non-additive/cumulative). It is therefore unpredictable: we can see patterns but not specific individual behaviour.
  b) **Self-organization:** a process where global order or coordination arises out of local interaction between the components of an initially disordered system without external influence.
  c) **Co-evolution:** reciprocal influence that changes the behaviour of the interacting entities. Co-evolution takes place within a social ecosystem.

- The adaptive moves that a system takes when pushed into a position far from equilibrium are essential for innovation and exploring multiple micro-strategies that cover specific characteristics and dynamics. When the environment changes significantly, some strategies that used to work can become unsuccessful.

- **Cooperation networks and structures in an urban context:** Building on New York City’s experience managing natural disasters and global pandemics, such as H1N1, the second session covered the issue of how to establish ordered systems to bear and solve a problem in the midst of chaos. Time criticality is the biggest challenge, as evidenced in sudden-onset crises where supply chains and unanticipated problems cannot be managed separately. In the end you have to do “everything at the same time”, hence emergency response may not be the most cost-effective way to deal with all crises. Coordination and preparedness ahead of time enable an orderly and effective response to pandemics, as well as other emergencies. In the pandemic context, doctors are trained and are familiar with specific protocols, response systems are in place, and people are alerted and thus able to manage their own risk.

- **Managing the risk of pandemics, preparedness and coping mechanisms:** The final presentation focused on the cholera outbreak in Haiti. The discussion noted that the epidemic was a symptom of poverty and poor governance, and it highlighted the direct correlation between investment and better education and health systems. Historically, previous outbreaks ended with the creation of water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) systems. Similar crises tended to start with weak capacity and infrastructure. Haiti is an example of a complex system, involving many factors including the 2010 earthquake, media pressure, NGO fragmentation, the UN’s Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), poor health, water and sanitation systems and funding architecture. The cholera epidemic persists mainly due to the lack of access to water and sanitation facilities. The Government of Haiti developed a 10-year plan to eliminate cholera requiring $2.2 billion, of which 90 per cent is needed for WASH. At the current rate of funding disbursement, it would take 40 to 50 years to reach the same WASH levels as other countries in the Latin America region. As of December 2014, the UN Support Plan, which includes humanitarian needs, was only 45 per cent funded, amounting to a “band aid” for the response.

There is no such thing as an optimum/single strategy; rather multiple strategies are needed to achieve resilience. To that end, it is possible to analyse the pandemic problem space and create an enabling environment to facilitate a response to a specific crisis. Social, technical and physical dimensions (all are interrelated) can’t tackle just one problem: we have to address the whole cluster of areas and at multiple scales (local, national and international).
RECOMMENDATIONS

• Fostering a culture of preparedness: Ebola’s spread wasn’t because of the lack of trained staff (Senegal has plenty of doctors and nurses), but rather because preparedness wasn’t taught in schools or universities.

• “Explore the space of possibilities”: Integrate the idea that plans cannot be replicated and copied in humanitarian planning. It is the principles of best practices that can be adapted to different situations. In complex systems, plans become obsolete quickly and need to be constantly revised. Learn from mistakes as much as from success.

• Use insights of complexity theory into humanitarian context analysis of Strategic Response Plans.

• Building coalitions for effective response is about creating an enabling environment that fosters cooperation, not about coercion or pressure.
ANNEX VIII: FACT SHEET FROM WORLD HUMANITARIAN DATA AND TRENDS

*World Humanitarian Data and Trends* (WHDT) is an annual OCHA publication that presents global- and country-level data-and-trend analysis about humanitarian crises and assistance. The report covers two main areas: humanitarian needs and assistance in 2013, and humanitarian trends, challenges and opportunities. The data presented in this report comes from a variety of expert source organizations, as well as from OCHA-managed processes and tools. Many of the figures discussed and presented at the GHPF come from WHDT 2014.


Humanitarian needs and assistance in 2013

- **Inter-agency appeal funding requirements**
  - $3 billion in 2004
  - $17.9 billion in 2014
  - 600% increase

- **Number of individuals forcibly displaced by conflict**
  - 51.2 million
  - Asylum-seekers: 1.2 million
  - Refugees: 16.7 million

- **Total economic damages caused by natural disasters**
  - $118 billion
  - 97 million people affected by disasters

**Top five countries by number of people affected**

- China: 27.5 million
- Philippines: 25.7 million
- India: 16.7 million
- Vietnam: 4.1 million
- Thailand: 3.5 million

**Average amount of funding received**

- $83 per person in 2011
- $154 per person in 2013

Funding received in 2013

- $8.3 billion
- 39% Syria response plans
- $3.1 billion

More than DRC, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan combined

These countries had previously received approximately 60% of appeal funding.
Trends, challenges and opportunities – the importance of partnerships to deliver

Social media

440,000 Tweets

Of more than 440,000 tweets posted after Typhoon Haiyan, 44 per cent related to needs and donations.

Remote sensing

Unmanned aerial vehicles and/or satellites were used in 22 countries by various relief organizations to cover a number of humanitarian situations.

Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan

25
89

2010
2013

In Yemen, the number of organizations included in the Humanitarian Response Plan more than trebled from 25 in 2010 to 89 in 2013.

Foreign military assets

21 UN Member States deployed military assets to support relief efforts for Super Typhoon Haiyan.

The Syria Response Plan

Average appeal

The Syria Response Plan was 209 times bigger than the average appeal. More than 150 agencies and aid groups are working with local partners and national authorities to provide relief to the Syrian people in the region.

Languages

6 countries

In six countries with an inter-agency appeal, the country’s official language(s) did not match the official UN correspondence language.

Reporting on Syria

2011 NGOs and governments

Reporting on Syria by NGOs and governments has steadily increased since 2011.

Mobile phone data analysis

revealed that credit spending peaked just before Cyclone Mahasen made landfall in Bangladesh, showing the importance that at-risk communities place on access to communications.

ANNEX IX: VISUAL FACILITATION

During the forum, a Graphic Illustrator captured the discussions. These are her drawings:

Figure 1:

Figure 2:
ANNEX X: GLOBAL HUMANITARIAN POLICY FORUM AGENDA

3 - 4 December, UNHQ Secretariat, New York

3 DECEMBER
10:00 – 12:30
HUMANITARIAN SYMPOSIUM
From Reactive to Proactive: How to enhance cooperation in the face of increasing global threats?
LOCATION: UNHQ ECOSOC Chamber

FORMAT
10:00: Introductory Remarks: Mr. Jan Eliasson, UN Deputy Secretary-General

Panel 1: The International Humanitarian System: Preparing for the Future
10:10: Introductions.
10:15 – 11:15: Discussion, led by moderator, incorporating audience questions through online platform.

Panel 2: Making Humanitarianism Work: Perspectives from Affected States and Private Sector
11:20 – 12:30: Discussion, led by the moderator, incorporating audience questions through online platform.

12:30-14:00
LUNCH
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room

14:00-17:00
THE POLICY CONCLAVE
Advancing Interoperability: Highlighting How Different Humanitarian Systems can Work Better Together
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room

There is growing recognition of the critical need to maximize resources and expertise by connecting different responders, systems and networks with each other more predictably and systematically to maximize their cooperation, coordination and impact to meet people’s needs. Humanitarian needs are already being met by a multiplicity of actors, including affected communities, civil-society organizations, local businesses and national and sub-national Governments, as well as by long-overlooked contributors such as faith-based communities and diaspora networks. Each system has its own comparative advantages, capacities, drivers, risks and limitations.

“Interoperability” in the humanitarian context therefore describes the effort to optimize the response to affected people by making different networks and systems work better together to deliver assistance based on their comparative advantages and capacities in a predictable, systematic and coordinated way. This may require the creation of joint forums, standards and protocols. In all of these efforts, the ambition of meeting affected people’s needs must be at the centre. As a result, in evaluating a response, the starting point should not be how a single actor or system performed in a humanitarian crisis, but rather whether affected people’s needs have been met.

There is recognition of the need to create a more interoperable humanitarian system, but the Policy Conclave will focus on how this is best achieved. It will seek to answer questions such as: How can the different systems and networks work better together to meet humanitarian needs? What arrangements, forums, tools and mechanisms, standards and common understandings need to be strengthened or established to achieve greater and more predictable interoperability between different systems and networks in a response? Who should provide leadership in a different context in order to coordinate interoperability?

FORMAT
14:00: Introductory Remarks: Hansjoerg Strohmeyer, Director, OCHA PDSB

14:10: Panel Presentations
Panellists, representing different sectors, will deliver very brief presentations on how they see the need for change within the humanitarian system in order to prepare for the future.

14:30: Panel Q and A

15:00: Breakout Groups

The 10 tables will be divided into four groups in order to address the following themes and questions, before presenting their findings to the remaining participants.

GROUP 1 (Tables 1, 2, 3): Meeting the Needs of Affected People: Where are the gaps?
With dramatic shifts driving the demand for humanitarian action ever higher, and with expectations growing alongside them, how will humanitarian actors ensure that needs are met? To address this, Group 1 will examine the needs of people at the centre of a crisis by answering the following questions:
• How are the needs of affected people changing, and how are they likely to change in the future, both in conflict and disaster settings?

• What are the gaps in response, both past and present, and what lessons can be drawn to avoid future mistakes, again looking at the full spectrum of humanitarian responses?

• How can capacity be developed in order to empower local actors before, during and after crises?

• How can affected people be consulted more effectively, and how can capacity be developed in order to empower them to respond?

GROUP 2 (Tables 4, 5, 6): The Interlocking Systems: Making Interoperability Work
It is increasingly acknowledged that the multilateral system need not necessarily position itself at the centre of every humanitarian response. Instead, a modular approach is increasingly being used in order to allow for different actors, networks and systems to be activated depending on the needs and extent of a crisis. To this end, the international system’s role may differ depending upon the context, phase and scope of an emergency. The international system’s response may expand or contract as required, along with the various actors and systems working in tandem. Group 2 will therefore work to:

• Examine how a “modular” approach can be used to plug the different resource and response gaps. By using a modular approach, the international humanitarian systems are able to target their efforts where needed, while ensuring that national and local efforts remain at the fore, thus benefiting long-term recovery and capacity-building efforts. What is preventing the more consistent use of this approach?

• Discuss how best to make those systems work together: What forms of coordination/cooperation are imaginable, and who provides leadership and coordinates an interoperable system? Is this system moving towards more flexible forms of cooperation?

• How can the core humanitarian principles (humanity, neutrality, impartiality, independence) be translated into practical guidance for the wider range of actors?

GROUP 3 (Tables 7, 8): Achieving Effective Resource Usage
The amount of funding sought through humanitarian appeals has soared from $3 billion a decade ago to nearly $18 billion at present. Despite this massive increase, less than half of humanitarian funding needs are being met. To address the questions of how to use resources more effectively, people seated at tables within Group 3 will:

• Comment on humanitarian funding trends: what prevents an accurate assessment of humanitarian needs from being achieved?

What should change in order to create an accurate assessment?

• Consider the limitations and advantages of different humanitarian actors in meeting resource needs. What resources do different groups require, and how can they work together to draw on their respective capacities to ensure resources are used as effectively as possible?

GROUP 4 (Tables 9, 10): The sliding scale of interoperability: Does it work in conflict?
The centre of gravity to facilitate interoperability should principally lie with the affected national Government, which has the primary responsibility vis-à-vis its citizens. However, there may be situations, particularly in armed conflict, where the Government’s interest is in direct opposition to meeting people’s needs. In such situations, there should also be interoperability of advocacy (operational international humanitarian law) to connect local communities and organizations with the media, diaspora, peacekeeping operations, the multilateral humanitarian system or others to highlight key advocacy issues, and to bridge the gap between affected people and high-level advocacy, for example through the Security Council.

• Does there need to be a set of common values/principles for actors/systems to work together in humanitarian response? If so, how can core humanitarian principles (humanity, neutrality, impartiality, independence) be translated into practical guidance for the wider range of actors relevant to all parts of the humanitarian system?

• What role can interoperability play in conflict situations? Does it work? Are there existing examples?

16:00: Coffee Break
16:15: Breakout Group Presentations and discussion. One table from each group will be selected to present its findings, with additional tables adding any additional input following.
17:00: End of Conclave
17:00-19:00 COCKTAIL RECEPTION HOSTED BY OCHA
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, West Side Terrace
17:30: Welcome Remarks by Assistant Secretary-General and Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator Kyung-wha Kang.
4 DECEMBER

09:00-18:00
POLICY WORKSHOPS: INTEROPERABILITY THROUGH DIFFERENT LENSES

LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 27th Floor: S-2723, S-2724, S-2726, and Conference Room A

09:00–12:00
MORNING SESSION

**Coffee will be available for participants outside of the meeting rooms from 10:20-10:50.

WORKSHOP 1 THEME:
SERVING THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE IN CONFLICT
Collecting Information on Urban IDPs: Defining Best Practices in Different Contexts
LOCATION: S-2723

Population growth, rapid urbanization and increases in human mobility have all contributed to a growth in displacement, particularly in urban areas. This workshop will identify specific features of urban displacement, including in Colombia, DRC and Somalia. It will also review data collection efforts by various actors, ranging from mapping of urban contexts, identification of displaced people, appropriate indicators and methodologies, to new models forecasting risks of displacement, including risks due to urban violence. Furthermore, it will examine the critical role of national Governments in ensuring evidence-based policies and programmes, with a particular focus on Uganda. Finally, it will discuss forward-looking proposals to identify the number, location and aspirations of the most vulnerable people in urban areas, and translate these findings into relevant policies and programmes, both to alleviate immediate needs and to support durable solutions.

WORKSHOP 2 THEME: INNOVATION
Fostering R&D in the Humanitarian System – from pilots to scaling
LOCATION: S-2724

Several recent studies have identified a need to rethink the way that innovation in the humanitarian sector is financed and supported, to ensure that long-term investments in capacity building are not neglected, even during periods of high demand for humanitarian services. To address this challenge, the workshop will further explore the case for R&D on humanitarian issues, testing the prevailing assumptions about what keeps great humanitarian ideas and pilots from going to scale. Is more R&D what is needed? What are the benefits of existing models, and what benefits can be gained from creating something entirely new? The workshop will focus on developing concrete ideas for how to better finance and support humanitarian organizations and disaster responders to stay abreast of the most advanced technologies and approaches. Workshop participants will consider the pros and cons of different structures, such as innovation labs, grand challenges or innovation funds, and how to promote uptake and scaling of successful projects.

WORKSHOP 3 THEME: RISK MANAGEMENT
Disaster Risk Management: What does it take from a humanitarian perspective?
LOCATION: S-2726

There is an understanding that development will not be sustainable if the risk of humanitarian crises is not sufficiently taken into account in long-term development planning and programming. Given the importance of risk management, this workshop will explore good practices that are already being implemented in order to support crisis risk management. It will also identify elements of systemic adaptations that may be needed to seize the opportunities offered by the various post-2015 global agendas in order to strengthen the coherence between humanitarian and development systems through better risk-informed assessments, planning, programming and financing. The workshop will focus on four key topics, namely evidence-based risk analysis, multi-year planning cycles, more flexible funding, and concrete ways to overcome institutional and structural barriers towards a more anticipatory approach to humanitarian crises. Participants will be encouraged to think and talk creatively and freely on this topic, thereby helping to identify best practices and new elements of systemic adaptations that are required to move towards a more anticipatory approach to humanitarian action.

12:00-13:45
LUNCH
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room

14:00 – 17:00
AFTERNOON SESSION

**Coffee will be available for participants outside of the meeting rooms from 15:15-15:45.

WORKSHOP 4 THEME: EFFECTIVENESS
New Perspectives for a Better Response
LOCATION: Conference Room A (Conference Building, Basement Level)

2014 was dominated by responses to five Level 3 emergencies (the Philippines, Central African Republic, South Sudan, Syria and
Iraq), an unprecedented public health emergency (Ebola) and the continuation of other crises that cause tremendous suffering. Humanitarian needs are increasing, the cost of response is rising, and new pressures, such as climate change, population growth and urbanization, have led to more frequent and intense humanitarian crises, which are outstripping traditional response capacities. This workshop will bring together actors from international and local organizations, the military and the private sector, to share their perspectives on humanitarian effectiveness, and to discuss practical ways to collectively optimize their response to affected people. The aim of the workshop is not only to create a common understanding of what each of these actors brings to the table, but to make practical recommendations for how they can connect in a way that goes beyond “coordination” as it has been practiced in the aid world so far. The outcomes will feed into the recommendations of the OCHA study on humanitarian effectiveness to be published in the spring of 2015.

**WORKSHOP 5 THEME:**
**COMPLEXITY SCIENCE AND HUMANITARIAN ACTION**  
*Bridging the nexus between global pandemics, humanitarian action, and international peace and security*  
LOCATION: S-2726

As humanitarian emergencies are seldom “straightforward”, the response of humanitarian actors also needs to be similarly nimble. As the current West Africa Ebola outbreak is showing, there is a complex nexus between humanitarian action and health emergencies, as well as matters of international peace and security. To address the challenges posed by today’s humanitarian threats, participants will use complexity science theory to identify solutions to the following problems:

a) The existing structure of cooperation within humanitarian settings, identifying the existing relationships between actors, as well as trouble spots, with the purpose of identifying “messes”, “problems” and “puzzles” and how best to repair these relationships.

b) The concept of “feedback” to ensure the amplification of positive relationships, as well as discussion around “co-evolution” to ensure that predator/prey relationships are minimized.

c) “Strange attractors”, “adaptive agents” and “self-organization” to examine how different organizations and entities come to interact with one another sometimes by chance, and the collaborative challenges posed by organizations working in the same system but with independent mandates.

The outcome will include recommendations for how the humanitarian system might address cataclysmic and existential challenges of the future using complexity science theory, as well as to identify what future threats there may be.

---

**17:00-18:00**
**OFFICIAL CLOSING**  
LOCATION: DHL Auditorium

After brief summary remarks, a rapporteur from each workshop will present workshop objectives and findings, at which point the floor will be opened for discussion among audience participants. To conclude, a short video on interoperability, prepared by OCHA’s Strategic Communications team, will highlight key messages from the GHPF 2014, as well as from the field.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvashi Aneja</td>
<td>OP Jindal Global University, India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uaneja@jgu.edu.in">uaneja@jgu.edu.in</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herimpitia Estelle Rolande Antilahy</td>
<td>SAF/FJKM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herimpitia_estelle@yahoo.fr">herimpitia_estelle@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuta Aung</td>
<td>HamsaHub</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thuta.aung@hamsahub.com">thuta.aung@hamsahub.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Baal</td>
<td>JIPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baal@jips.org">baal@jips.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bailey</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarahbaileyk@gmail.com">sarahbaileyk@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Baker</td>
<td>mFieldwork</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leithb@mfieldwork.com">leithb@mfieldwork.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Bala</td>
<td>The ASEAN Secretariat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alicia.bala@asean.org">alicia.bala@asean.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Barber</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjpbarber@btinternet.com">mjpbarber@btinternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephane Bonamy</td>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbonamy@icrc.org">sbonamy@icrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Boutin</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gboutin@unicef.org">gboutin@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Bourns</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bourns@un.org">bourns@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelin Briggs</td>
<td>NRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:caelin.briggs@nrc.no">caelin.briggs@nrc.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayna Brown (Majarowitz)</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbrown@cdacollaborative.org">dbrown@cdacollaborative.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cafferty</td>
<td>Women’s Refugee Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elizabethc@wrcmission.org">elizabethc@wrcmission.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Carle</td>
<td>Swiss Re</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bridget_Carle@swissre.com">Bridget_Carle@swissre.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Chin</td>
<td>Oxfam International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sally.chin@oxfaminternational.org">sally.chin@oxfaminternational.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Christensen</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne.christensen@ifrc.org">anne.christensen@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Coughlan de Perez</td>
<td>Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre</td>
<td><a href="mailto:coughlan@climatecentre.org">coughlan@climatecentre.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crowley</td>
<td>World Bank and OCHA/HXL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcrowley@worldbank.org">jcrowley@worldbank.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filiep Decorte</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:decorte@un.org">decorte@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iillac Diaz</td>
<td>Liter of Light</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myshelterfoundation.ph4@gmail.com">myshelterfoundation.ph4@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahabo Diriye</td>
<td>Road-International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shalle05@yahoo.com">shalle05@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabien Dubuet</td>
<td>Médecins Sans Frontières</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fabien.dubuet@newyork.msf.org">fabien.dubuet@newyork.msf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilwad Elman</td>
<td>Elman Peace and Human Rights Center</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ilwad@elmanpeace.org">ilwad@elmanpeace.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Entrikin</td>
<td>Médecins Sans Frontières</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amanda.entrikin@newyork.msf.org">amanda.entrikin@newyork.msf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Farrant</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afarrant@christian-aid.org">afarrant@christian-aid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa Fast</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lfast@nd.edu">lfast@nd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Ferris</td>
<td>Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement</td>
<td><a href="mailto:efferis@brookings.edu">efferis@brookings.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jules Frost</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jules_frost@wvi.org">jules_frost@wvi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Gardoll</td>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cgardoll@worldbankgroup.org">cgardoll@worldbankgroup.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Gilman</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gilman@un.org">gilman@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Ginnetti</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
<td><a href="mailto:justin.ginnetti@nrc.ch">justin.ginnetti@nrc.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Gray</td>
<td>Gray Dot Catalyst</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ian@graydotcatalyst.com">ian@graydotcatalyst.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Haver</td>
<td>Humanitarian Outcomes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:katherine.haver@humanitarianoutcomes.org">katherine.haver@humanitarianoutcomes.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Hersh</td>
<td>Refugees International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcy@refintl.org">marcy@refintl.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hockaday</td>
<td>Save the Children / Start Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.hockaday@savethechildren.org.uk">d.hockaday@savethechildren.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Hurwitz</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hurwitz@unhcr.org">hurwitz@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ama Hussein</td>
<td>MDMC (Muhammadiyah Disaster Management Center)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amahusein@umy.ac.id">amahusein@umy.ac.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Hussein</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:husseinp@un.org">husseinp@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Irvine</td>
<td>Sarapis Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marie@sarapisfoundation.org">marie@sarapisfoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Jacobsen</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.jacobsen@tufts.edu">karen.jacobsen@tufts.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric James</td>
<td>Field Ready</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.james@singularityu.org">eric.james@singularityu.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udo Janz</td>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janz@unhcr.org">janz@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyra Kaszynski</td>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkaszynski@deloitte.com">kkaszynski@deloitte.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feleke Tadele Kelkil</td>
<td>HelpAge International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bymref@gmail.com">bymref@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Kindergan</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit Secretariat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kindergan@un.org">kindergan@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano Lasker</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lasker@un.org">lasker@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern Mwakalimi Kita</td>
<td>Department of Disaster Management Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stenkita@gmail.com">stenkita@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Knight</td>
<td>Alnemittal</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alan.knight@arcelormittal.com">alan.knight@arcelormittal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Komujuni</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pamgumis@yahoo.com">pamgumis@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Le Duc</td>
<td>ALIMA - The Alliance for International Medical Action</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gld@alima-ngo.org">gld@alima-ngo.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Leather</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrisleather@hotmail.com">chrisleather@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eirini Lemos Maniati</td>
<td>NATO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lemos-maniati.eirini@hq.nato.int">lemos-maniati.eirini@hq.nato.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanhong Lin</td>
<td>American Red Cross - Greater New York</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kanhong.lin@redcross.org">kanhong.lin@redcross.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myles Lock</td>
<td>UN Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:milock@unfoundation.org">milock@unfoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Macleman</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hmacleman@redcross.org.uk">hmacleman@redcross.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imran Madden</td>
<td>Islamic Relief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imran.madden@irworldwide.org">imran.madden@irworldwide.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Maramis</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry.maramis@asean.org">larry.maramis@asean.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Marx</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marxm@un.org">marxm@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea Matheson</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Imatheson@iom.int">Imatheson@iom.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie McDonough</td>
<td>Souktel Inc.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maggie@souktel.org">maggie@souktel.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly McKinney</td>
<td>American Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kelly.mckinney@redcross.org">kelly.mckinney@redcross.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve Mitleton-Kelly</td>
<td>London School of Economics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.mitleton-kelly@lse.ac.uk">e.mitleton-kelly@lse.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuela Mioc</td>
<td>Canadian Department of National Defence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan Mohanna</td>
<td>Amel Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hassan.Mohanna@nyu.edu">Hassan.Mohanna@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mosselmans</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmosselmans@christian-aid.org">mmosselmans@christian-aid.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massa Mufti</td>
<td>ABNI &amp; SONBOLA Syrian Civil Society NGOs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:massa.mufti@nyu.edu">massa.mufti@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Muthungu</td>
<td>NCCK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmuthungu@ncck.org">gmuthungu@ncck.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamadou NDIAYE</td>
<td>OFADEC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mndiaye@ofadec.org">mndiaye@ofadec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Noyes</td>
<td>OCHA - WHS Secretariat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:noyesa@un.org">noyesa@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Obrecht</td>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.obrecht@alnap.org">a.obrecht@alnap.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Powell</td>
<td>Development Gateway</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpowell@developmentgateway.org">jpowell@developmentgateway.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animesh Prakash</td>
<td>Oxfam India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:animeshprakash@gmail.com">animeshprakash@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiba Qaraman</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hiba.Qaraman@savethechildren.org">Hiba.Qaraman@savethechildren.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Raymond</td>
<td>Harvard Humanitarian Initiative</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nathaniel.raymond@gmail.com">Nathaniel.raymond@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyla Reid</td>
<td>GSMA Mobile for Development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kreid@gsma.com">kreid@gsma.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Reiterer</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reiterer@un.org">reiterer@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Robins</td>
<td>Centre for Applied Human Rights, University of York</td>
<td><a href="mailto:simon.robins@simonrobins.com">simon.robins@simonrobins.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Salomons</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ds2002@columbia.edu">ds2002@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Savage</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:savagekevin@gmail.com">savagekevin@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Schroeder</td>
<td>Direct Relief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aschroeder@directrelief.org">aschroeder@directrelief.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Scriven</td>
<td>ELRHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.scriven@savethechildren.org">k.scriven@savethechildren.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabih Shibli</td>
<td>American University of Beirut</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rs85@aub.edu.lb">rs85@aub.edu.lb</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari Shrestha</td>
<td>Tribhuvan University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harisunita@gmail.com">harisunita@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra Sicotte-Levesque</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sicotte-levesque@un.org">sicotte-levesque@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar M. Singh</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmsingh100@gmail.com">kmsingh100@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sixpence</td>
<td>Centre Stage Media Arts Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:psixpence@gmail.com">psixpence@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnhild Spence</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arnhild.spence@wfp.org">arnhild.spence@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Stoddard</td>
<td>Humanitarian Outcomes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abby.stoddard@humanitarianoutcomes.org">abby.stoddard@humanitarianoutcomes.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Syroka</td>
<td>African Risk Capacity</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanna.syroka@africanriskcapacity.org">joanna.syroka@africanriskcapacity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tyson</td>
<td>Special Project Office</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard@specialprojectoffice.com">richard@specialprojectoffice.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAME | ORGANIZATION | EMAIL
---|---|---
Paula Valencia | Universidad de Medellin | paula_andrea_valencia@hotmail.com
Rodolfo Valente | OCHA | valenter@un.org
Ananita Varughese | OCHA | varughesea@un.org
Sarah Vieweg | Qatar Computing Research Institute | svieweg@qf.org.qa
Marcy Vigoda | OCHA | vigoda@un.org
Kristele Younes | IRC | kristele.younes@rescue.org
Lana Zananiri | Legal Aid | lzananiri@ardd-legalaid.org
Greta Zeender | OCHA | zeender@un.org

SPEAKERS AND PANELLISTS, HUMANITARIAN SYMPOSIUM, DECEMBER 3rd

Ms. Valerie Amos | UN Under-Secretary-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator
Ms. Alicia Bala | Deputy Secretary-General ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, ASEAN Secretariat
Mr. Camilo Buitrago Hernandez | National Director of Social and Humanitarian Assistance, Special Administrative Unit for Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation of Victims, Colombia
Mr. Jan Eliasson | UN Deputy Secretary-General
Ms. Nancy Lindborg | Assistant Administrator, United States Agency for International Development
Mr. Robert Piper | Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel
Ms. Laura Trevelyan | BBC World News America (Moderator)

ORGANIZERS

Hansjoerg Strohmeyer | Director, Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB), UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) strohmeyerh@un.org
Brian Grogan | Chief, Policy Analysis and Innovation Section, Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB), UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) gogan@un.org
Andrew Billo | Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Policy Analysis and Innovation Section, Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB), UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) billo@un.org
Lilian Barajas | Humanitarian Affairs Officer, Policy Analysis and Innovation Section, Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB), UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) barajas@un.org

Participants by Organizational Type

- Government: 35%
- Think Tank/ Academia: 17%
- Regional Organization: 12%
- UN: 10%
- Red Cross Organization: 6%
- Private Sector: 5%
- NGO: 5%
- Other: 7%
Ms. Alicia Bala,
Deputy Secretary-General ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, ASEAN Secretariat

Alicia Bala is the Deputy Secretary-General for ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, based in Jakarta, Indonesia. Prior to assuming her present post in September 2012, Ms. Bala was the Undersecretary at the Department of Social Welfare and Development of the Philippines. She has been working in the field of social welfare for over 30 years. She was appointed by President Benigno S. Aquino III as the Philippines’ Representative for Children Rights to the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC) in 2010. As an expert in social welfare, community development and social protection, Ms. Bala has served as the chair/alternate chair to various councils and committees on social protection issues in the Philippines. She holds a Bachelor’s degree in Social Work from the Centro Escolar University (1972) and a Master’s degree in Social Work from the University of the Philippines (1978).

Ms. Valerie Amos,
UN Under-Secretary-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Valerie Amos is the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator. Ms. Amos brings extensive knowledge and experience to the position. She was previously the United Kingdom’s High Commissioner to Australia. She has been a long-time campaigner and advocate on human rights, social justice and equality issues. She is a former Secretary of State for International Development in the British Government and was also President of the Privy Council and Leader of the House of Lords. Born in Guyana, Ms. Amos holds a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and a Master of Arts in Cultural Studies, as well as honorary doctorates from 11 UK universities and one US university. She was awarded the order of the Volta by the Government of Ghana and she has been honoured by the Government of Benin. Ms. Amos was recognized by the Smithsonian Museum for African Art for her work on the continent.
Mr. Jan Eliasson,
**UN Deputy Secretary-General**

Jan Eliasson was appointed Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations by Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in March 2012. He assumed the role on 1 July 2012. From 2007 to 2008, Mr. Eliasson was the Special Envoy of the UN Secretary-General for Darfur. Prior to this, he served as President of the 60th session of the UN General Assembly. He was Sweden’s Ambassador to the US from September 2000 to July 2005. In March 2006, Mr. Eliasson was appointed Foreign Minister of Sweden and served in this capacity until the elections in the autumn of 2006. He served from 1994 to 2000 as State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, a key position in formulating and implementing Swedish foreign policy. He was Sweden’s Ambassador to the UN in New York from 1988 to 1992, and he also served as the Secretary-General’s Personal Representative for Iran/Iraq. Mr. Eliasson was the first UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and was involved in operations in Africa and the Balkans.

Mr. Camilo Buitrago Hernandez,
**National Director of Social and Humanitarian Assistance, Special Administrative Unit for Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation of Victims, Colombia**

Camilo Buitrago Hernandez is the National Director of Social and Humanitarian Assistance at Colombia’s Unit for the Assistance and Comprehensive Reparation of Victims. He is in charge of coordinating a nationwide operation for procuring humanitarian assistance to victims of the internal armed conflict, assessing the current needs of these people and facilitating their access to social programmes. His background comprises work in Colombia as a financial analyst, journalist, a volunteer community worker in conflict-ridden areas, and consultant to Government and international agencies in issues related to the assistance to victims of the internal armed conflict. He holds a BA in Business Administration from Universidad de los Andes (2000) and an MSc in Sociology from the London School of Economics (2004).
Ms. Nancy Lindborg, Assistant Administrator, United States Agency for International Development

Nancy Lindborg is the USAID Assistant Administrator for the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA). She leads the efforts of more than 500 team members in nine offices focused on crisis prevention, response, recovery and transition. Since being sworn into office in October 2010, Ms. Lindborg has led DCHA teams in response to the ongoing Syria crisis, the Sahel 2012 and Horn of Africa 2011 droughts, the Arab Spring and numerous other global crises. She continues to spearhead USAID efforts to advance resilience as a means to help communities out of chronic crisis. Ms. Lindborg has spent most of her career working on issues of transition, democracy and civil society, conflict and humanitarian response. Prior to joining USAID, she was president of Mercy Corps. She is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Ms. Lindborg holds a B.A and an M.A. in English Literature from Stanford University and an M.A. in Public Administration from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Mr. Robert Piper, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel

Robert Piper was designated UN Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sahel in March 2013. In this capacity, he supports humanitarian work in nine countries across the Sahel region (Senegal, The Gambia, Chad, Burkina Faso, Niger, Mauritania, Northern Nigeria, Northern Cameroon and Mali). The position holds the rank of Assistant Secretary-General. Mr. Piper has dedicated most of his working life to understanding and addressing the development dimensions of peacebuilding and disaster risk reduction. He started his development career in 1989 with the Australian aid agency AusAid. He joined the United Nations in 1990, first in Thailand with the UN Population Fund and then in Cambodia (1991-1994) and Fiji (1994-1997) with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). From 1997 to 2001, Mr. Piper held a number of key posts at UNDP headquarters, including that of Special Assistant to the UNDP Associate Administrator and of Deputy Director of UNDP’s Emergency Response Division (now the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery). From 2002 to 2004, Mr. Piper served as the United Nations Development Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative in Kosovo.
Ms. Laura Trevelyan,  
**BBC World News America (Moderator)**

Laura Trevelyan is an anchor of the BBC’s US newscast BBC World News America, which broadcasts on the global 24-hour news channel BBC World News. Covering the major national and international stories from the BBC studio in Washington, D.C., Ms. Trevelyan also anchors World News America on location when there’s a breaking story in the US - from tornadoes in Oklahoma to the Boston marathon bombings. As a correspondent, Ms. Trevelyan has reported for the BBC from around the world, covering humanitarian crises and diplomatic visits, and interviewing leading newsmakers and public figures. She was the BBC’s UN correspondent from 2006 to 2009, during which time she covered diplomatic activity at the United Nations Headquarters in New York, and the United Nations humanitarian and peacekeeping work in the field. She was deployed to Chad, Sudan, Haiti, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sri Lanka, Kenya and Gaza. Ms. Trevelyan has reported from Darfur on the UN’s attempts to deploy peacekeepers there, and from the International Criminal Court in The Hague when the Prosecutor accused Sudan’s President, Omar Al-Bashir, of committing war crimes and genocide in Darfur.
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