“The Global Humanitarian Policy Forum was groundbreaking in being able to really put on the table difficult conversations about power relations and actors in aid. It was refreshing to see some degree of anxiety in the room on what the future holds in terms of actors and action, and that should pave the way to form new partnerships, ideas and innovation to thrive. It is no longer a question of what them and us bring—it is the time to address what can WE do to achieve better outcomes in our response and preparedness.”

Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, King’s College

“The Global Humanitarian Policy Forum 2013 pointed out a need of transversality between actors. Risk management means managing complexity, hence the importance of integrating different levels, scales and actors. In this context, and to create momentum towards a sustainable humanitarian policy, it will be necessary to strengthen social and institutional networks, to reinforce the interaction between cities and campaigns, to anticipate rather than to prevent and to fill the gap in the field of risk management training, particularly in the Global South.”

Prof. Amadou Tahirou Diaw, Cheikh Anta DIOP University
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This is an analytical summary of the Global Humanitarian Policy discussions. It is not a record of the proceedings. The elements captured are meant to encourage humanitarian actors to begin envisioning the ideal humanitarian system(s) by 2025. It presents key policy-and-research questions, which the forum participants felt were important for the humanitarian community to rally around in the next few years. This summary will contribute to the World Humanitarian Summit deliberations.
INTRODUCTION

01. On 12 and 13 December 2013, humanitarian practitioners, academics, private-sector representatives, international organizations, and non-governmental and government representatives gathered in New York to attend the 2013 Global Humanitarian Policy Forum, convened by the Policy Analysis and Innovation Section of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The forum discussed the future of the formal international humanitarian system and where it would stand in 2025.

02. The forum comprised a public event, the Humanitarian Symposium, followed by a closed session, the Policy Conclave, to debate policy priorities for the coming years. It included four workshops representing the thematic platforms of the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), which are innovation, risk management, aid effectiveness and serving affected communities (see the agenda for detailed information). Over 400 participants attended the Humanitarian Symposium, and a select 100 humanitarian policy actors attended the Policy Conclave and workshops.

03. As a follow-up to the forum, instead of a record of the meeting, OCHA has produced an analytical summary that will:

- Highlight some of the key challenges, concerns and opportunities for the system.
- Outline the beginnings of a common vision for the “ideal” humanitarian system(s) in 2025.
- Present key work-and-research streams, which the humanitarian community can rally around in the lead-up to the WHS and longer term moving towards 2025.

“It’s important to understand that any structure that doesn’t change at a speed that is superior to the change in its environment is condemned to die... we better adapt.”

Mr. Claus Sørensen, Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the European Commission (ECHO)

---

1 www.worldhumanitariansummit.org
04. The overarching proposition that permeated the forum discussions was that the future is already here. There was widespread recognition that there was not one central or leading international formal humanitarian system, but rather multiple systems providing humanitarian assistance operating concurrently, each with different triggers and motives.

05. The challenge is to improve these systems’ interoperability and effectiveness. This could be achieved through improved recognition and understanding of each other’s comparative advantages and open discussions of possible coordination and/or cooperation frameworks, standards and practices. To remain relevant, the international humanitarian system must become more innovative in the tools and services it uses and the partnerships it establishes. It must find ways to adopt a risk-based approach to humanitarian action that strengthens people’s resilience to multiple shocks. However, it must not neglect the chronic challenge of how to serve conflict-affected people, including protecting civilians and advocating rapid and unimpeded humanitarian access.

06. Throughout the forum, it was confirmed that to take on these challenges, new or strengthened relationships must be built with host Governments, civil society, the military, development actors and especially local communities. Humanitarians should engage diaspora communities more, as they could provide important links and insights, particularly in countries where international actors have a limited presence. The key to remaining relevant as assistance providers is leveraging comparative advantages, fostering better collaboration with these actors, and possibly establishing common goals and an agenda. In this regard, the forum was the first public event, where Mr. David Miliband, President of the International Rescue Committee, spoke of the need to develop humanitarian goals equivalent to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

07. How we work with these different groups or actors needs to be assessed. For example, it is clear that local communities are active actors in humanitarian response, and in most cases the first responders. Despite this long-standing recognition, international humanitarian action has failed to capitalize on this reality. The role of international humanitarian organizations could be to build civil society early warning and response capacities. It is also critical that “beneficiary” be struck from the humanitarian lexicon and conceptual framework. Another example is that the private sector may be better poised to provide an initial capital injection for recovery, as there is a shared interest on the part of the Government, the affected community and the private sector to restart the local economy as soon as possible after an emergency.

08. Standards and norms still need to govern the delivery of humanitarian assistance related to fairness, humanity and dignity and ensure that the delivery of assistance is rapid and unimpeded (operational independence). Principles remain important, but the legal framework for their implementation has not evolved much during the past 150 years. If actors providing humanitarian assistance span a huge spectrum—from local communities, to scientists and armies—these frameworks must be strengthened and improved.

“One of the failures of the present times is the lack of sufficient funds to tackle humanitarian crises around the world, and this has to be addressed in many ways; the participation of the private sector and civil society is essential to that.”

Ambassador Bruno Figueroa, Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation

“Everyone has heard of the Millennium Development Goals and everyone knows that there are sustainable development goals being developed as their successors... but where are the humanitarian goals? We have SPHERE standards, but we need either to develop the humanitarian equivalent of the Millennium Development Goals, or ensure that the Sustainable Development Goals take proper account of the humanitarian priorities that after all speak to the lives of hundreds of millions of people.”

Mr. David Miliband, International Rescue Committee
09. This section will explore the challenges and opportunities of four thematic areas of focus for the forum.

INNOVATION IN HUMANITARIAN ACTION

10. Participants agreed that humanitarian innovation was a “process that promotes rapid learning and development of new ideas”. Heading towards 2025, innovation should help the formal humanitarian system to develop a model where services provided are closely linked to affected people’s needs.

11. The increase in mobile phone users, access to information and communication technologies and other new technological and scientific developments have empowered affected communities, allowing them to better organize themselves and giving them a stronger voice in the delivery of humanitarian assistance. Technology is helping to shift the balance of power in a humanitarian situation: strengthening the role of affected people as the first responders and giving them a certain degree of control over the imagery and data that are available to the global community. However, data security and privacy issues around digital technology and mobile communications are still emerging concerns. Humanitarians were often willing to use technologies in the field that were otherwise criticised in their home countries, such as biometric identification systems. There needs to be a way to balance these real concerns without slowing the adoption of new technologies or approaches.

“Local communities will be tech-enabled first responders. Tech-enabled self-help, tech-enabled mutual aid will build more resilient communities at the local level and then take off some pressure from the backs of the international humanitarian community.”

Dr. Patrick Meier, Qatar Computing Research Institute

KEY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
12. Innovation in humanitarian action, however, extends beyond technology. It should also focus on how organizations do business. Priority thematic areas for humanitarian innovation included: the relief-to-development gap; responding in urban environments to violence; engaging affected communities in needs assessments and programme design; adapting to local contexts; compliance, monitoring and reporting; responding to water crises; better engagement with Governments and local leaders; transforming financing and funding; promoting multi-sectoral approaches and capacity for partnership; and lowering the entry barriers for new NGOs and organizations.

13. Participants discussed organizational challenges to adopting more innovation, which include the “static” culture of humanitarian organizations. There is still not a clear way forward in terms of certain dilemmas, such as how to bridge humanitarian principles with private-sector values, and pulling apart the distinct challenges around engaging with local companies and businesses versus multinationals. But the humanitarian system must be open-minded and carve a new way forward.

14. A “bottom-up” innovation approach is critical. There is not enough focus on how to identify the needs of and demands from affected people. There is also a question of how to better engage local NGOs, and there are concerns about whether an innovation-focused system would tilt the balance in favour of larger organizations with greater research capacity.

15. There were calls for the humanitarian system(s) to prioritize truly transformative ideas, such as a major shift to cash programming and a recognition that positive disruptions were likely to come from outside, such as the introduction of e-transfer systems for remittances that were being rolled-out in several African countries. Organizations should consider the following key principles for humanitarian innovation: informed consent, equity, no harm, representation, complementarity and accountability.

“Cash is king and increasingly so in the humanitarian world.”
Ms. Jamie Zimmerman, New America Foundation

16. Working with actors outside the traditional humanitarian system is a necessity. The past decade has witnessed the proliferation of actors providing humanitarian assistance, alongside “traditional” aid actors, including the private sector and the diaspora. The forum discussed at length whether there was one system of aid (as envisioned in General Assembly resolution 46/182) or multiple systems, and which of the two options presents a better model for humanitarian assistance. The discussion concluded that there are multiple systems of aid provision, and while it may not be necessary to bring all these actors into one tent, it is critical that all the different tents are somehow inter-connected to ensure that the right actor at the right time can provide the required help in a principled manner.

17. Connecting these different tents goes beyond partnerships. The international humanitarian system should gear its coordination function towards more active facilitation, brokering and norm setting to enable humanitarian actors to collaborate with these external entities, and to benefit from advances achieved within their respective non-humanitarian fields. For example, does the humanitarian community need a platform similar to the Global Compact to better engage private-sector actors in humanitarian action?

ELEMENTS OF EFFECTIVENESS

CONTEXT: Humanitarian response differs from one situation to another; what is effective in one context may not work in another.

PERSPECTIVE: An NGO, the Government or a private-sector actor will each have different motivations and drivers.

TIMING: What is effective and needed in the first days of the crisis may not be appropriate after three months or a year.

Humanitarian assistance should be sensitive to local cultures, gender and age.
Prior to establishing platforms and forums, the starting point is the need to have clarity as to what makes the system more effective and how can affected people’s needs be met more effectively. This is beyond looking at how an individual actor can be more effective. It is rather a macro, systemic and joint perspective. This joint understanding, which is currently lacking, will enable non-humanitarians to engage in humanitarian action within a clearer conceptual framework. It also provides a framework for all actors, towards which they can gauge their contribution and comparative advantage.

Several speakers cautioned that constituencies are not necessarily homogenous. For example, among INGOs there is a high degree of variation in terms of what is considered an effective response. The same is true for host Governments and UN agencies. Second, it remains difficult to demonstrate the system’s effectiveness, as many organizations only focus on their specific programmes and mandate. As one participant noted: “The measure of whether an organization is effective depends on what the organization is”. This led to the question: “What are the common goals that define effective humanitarian response?” OCHA will look at this question through research launched in 2014.

In preparation for the forum, a survey was sent to participants to gauge their views on effectiveness. The priority element to impact humanitarian effectiveness was identified as access. A few participants were concerned that issues of access and the protection of civilians did not arise until much later in the discussion. They urged humanitarian actors not to shy away from these chronic and persistent challenges. A dedicated discussion on these issues explored how the humanitarian community can improve its access and advocacy strategies.

The lack of respect for the tenets of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), as demonstrated by increased deliberate attacks on civilians, medical facilities and aid workers, continues to be an issue. There is a need to invigorate IHL, and to prioritize the provision of humanitarian assistance, including over political and security concerns. The humanitarian community has to contend with the extent to which it supports and empowers host Governments, the tension between principled action and a State’s sovereignty, the equity and fairness of aid, and the geopolitics that surround aid.

Despite a lengthy discussion, there was no agreement on whether an over-arching single-access negotiation approach was the best way to deliver assistance in a conflict setting. Participants felt that finding a middle ground where humanitarians tried several options could drive a better response. One participant recommended the need to be more innovative when it comes to the legal frameworks of humanitarian action, and suggested the need for more efforts to further reconcile IHL and customary laws around the world.

The UN’s political involvement may be hindering its ability to advocate access, such as in cross-border operations when there is no consent of the concerned host State. And the UN can be criticized for not providing the assertive principled leadership needed in Syria, while in the past, for example in Afghanistan in 1980s, the UN had been in a better position to advocate and coordinate a framework for humanitarian access that all humanitarian actors and parties to the conflict agreed on.

“When you see a red line drawn for chemical weapons but not for deliberate targeting of medical facilities, when the second is a more well-established breach of international law than the first, then this is really stunning … and we have to ask ourselves very searching questions about why this has come about.”

Forum participant during a closed session
24. The forum recognized that mega challenges—such as global food-price hikes, climate change, demographic shifts and rapid urbanization—are causing an unprecedented rise in humanitarian needs. There is a growing agreement of the importance of a risk-based approach to humanitarian operations that focuses on building local communities’ resilience and strengthening their ability to withstand multiple shocks. The workshop identified some analyses, delivery and funding elements that should be part of a new humanitarian system better equipped to perform effective risk management.

25. One immediate step that the humanitarian system must take is recognition and action. Participants agreed that risk analysis and needs analysis must both equally inform humanitarian response. The former tries to anticipate and reduce risks, and potentially prevent crises, while the latter aims to respond and save lives when unpredictable crises hit. As with curative and preventive medicine, they both have a key role in people-centred humanitarian response.

26. It is equally important that all humanitarian, development, political and security actors should have a shared understanding of risk, including an agreement on what the priority risks are. They do not need to address the risk jointly, or even with the same tools. The workshop report shared the following example: Imagine fire was defined as the main risk. Everyone will do what they can to address this risk. The Mayor covers everything; s/he takes care of preparing for risks of fire. S/he deals with architects to build fire-resistant places. The fire brigade will prepare to deal with fire. Different actors are using different tools, but all are focusing on the risk of fire.

27. Risk-based approaches will challenge existing funding modalities. Risk mitigation is a long-term process that brings together diverse stakeholders. Prevalent funding practices are short term, require all activities to be either humanitarian or developmental, and are dedicated either towards national or international actors. These silos hinder a multi-sectoral risk-based response, which aims to help communities to build resilience to face cyclical environmental shocks. So other alternatives need to be explored.

“If there is no flexibility for those who are charged with spending public money at the level that the beneficiaries are at, if they are so bound by rules and regulations about how money can be spent then the process will come into disrepute and become illegitimate. If the officials … have no flexibility about how to respond to the articulation of local need, about priorities and practices, then the system breaks down.”

Mr. David Miliband, International Rescue Committee

“If we do a risk-informed response, mainstreaming risk assessment in our response, we shall be more effective saving lives.”

Forum participant during a closed session

“If from the programming side, there will be an increased risk-based approach, which will require us to program activities to be more anticipatory rather than reactionary.”

Mr. Misikir Tilahun, Africa Humanitarian Action
THE IDEAL HUMANITARIAN SYSTEM(S) IN 2025: A VISION

28. The ideal humanitarian system in 2025 has certain characteristics and traits, which participants identified during the two-day event.

- **Multiplicity:** It is not one system, rather multiple interconnected systems, including traditional humanitarian actors and increasingly many more actors, including from the Global South.

- **Interoperable:** These different systems work together, are in constant dialogue and understand each other’s motivations, triggers and comparative advantages in different contexts. When a crisis strikes, the actor who can help in the most efficient, economical and principled manner steps in, ensuring that affected people get the help they need as fast as possible.

- **Civilian-inclusive:** When a crisis hits, affected people receive or make the first call, identifying exactly what they need. They communicate in real time regarding the help they are getting. Communities provide real-time evaluations of the response received through social media and other methods.

- **Proactive:** An anticipatory system that is constantly thinking and adapting. Making projections and modelling with different sectors, including climate change experts, water resource-management experts and scarcity professionals, among others, would be the norm. Before a crisis, in disaster- and conflict-prone countries, humanitarian and development actors working closely with host Governments will do in-depth needs-and-risk analysis and develop a comprehensive and joint risk map that informs a multi-sectoral programme of action to build communities’ resilience to these risks and shocks.

- **Dignified:** Humanitarian assistance is more dignified. It favours mechanisms, such as cash and digital transfers, that empower affected people and reinvigorate local economies. Cash is easier to dispense, it does not require massive logistics, leading to major savings on administrative and operational overhead costs. Eventually, this could allow donors to give directly to affected communities, cutting overhead costs even further.

- **Practical and principled:** The system(s) has reviewed and reinvigorated the principles, and agreed on a framework that is principled yet practical that allows profit-seeking actors and others to align their interests when serving affected people. There are cooperation platforms to engage systematically with all those considered to be outside the traditional humanitarian system. They include the private sector, civil and defence forces and the scientific community.

- **Futuristic and forward looking:** Technological innovation and the digital revolution are central. The above-mentioned cooperation platforms allow humanitarians to absorb new technologies and ideas from various fields and customize them to humanitarian use. The system(s) is not risk averse; there is a culture that encourages risk-taking within agreed safeguards and principles. Within this area, donors could look at setting up innovation funds and launching youth grants or mentorship programmes. A “humanitarian venture” fund could be set up, which would help produce dual-use products, such as sanitation equipment, or survey unmanned aerial vehicles.

- **“DJ-ing”:** In this age of digital information flows, coordinating information flows is no longer realistic or desirable. Information needs to be mined, triangulated and, as much as possible, cross-checked. The information function in humanitarian assistance will include helping to set standards for what constitutes ethical and principled use of information and data.

- **Longer term, multisectoral and open:** There should be no short-term planning or donor support that is divided between the silos of humanitarian and development work. Humanitarians, along with developmental and other actors, are doing joint, multi-year, risk-based planning. Donors are providing multi-year funding grants, a larger portion going directly to affected people. These funds are going towards multisectoral goals and tools, such as cash transfers, and they support programming goals related to building local communities’ resilience and their ability to withstand shock. Funding policies can equally support large- and small-scale local NGOs and actors.

“There is a kind of short-termism in all of this, project by project, operation by operation, not enough long-term funding, not enough programme funding, which actually curtails the flexibility of those who operate out there.”

Mr. Claus Sørensen, Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the European Commission (ECHO)
SETTING THE HUMANITARIAN AGENDA 2014-2016: SHORT-TERM RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE HUMANITARIAN ACTION MOVING TOWARDS 2025

29. This section highlights some of the specific actions and short-term recommendations that participants raised during the workshop.

ON INNOVATION

• Map out what is taking place in different areas of innovation, including by Governments and the private sector.

• Develop a stronger community of practice around people working in different areas of humanitarian innovation to facilitate cross-fertilization of ideas, share best practices and reduce overlap of ideas.

• Develop a clearer vision of the specific ways of implementing “humanitarian innovation practices”, as opposed to innovation practices in the private sector.

• Better define “bottom-up” humanitarian innovation, including how to recognize innovation by affected people in specific contexts and how humanitarian actors can support it. There was much interest in seeing additional support, including funding or creating “innovation spaces” at the community level.

• Develop safeguards and guidelines for the responsible use of new technologies with vulnerable people, including tools for data security and privacy in digital technologies.

• Increase the awareness of first responders on the ground about available technologies and tools.

• Ensure that funding is available for monitoring, evaluation, research and development to improve the evidence base and support incremental and transformative innovation.

• Define a common set of humanitarian innovation principles.

• Agree what key humanitarian challenges the innovation agenda should aim to address.

ON HUMANITARIAN EFFECTIVENESS

• Better understand the elements of an effective response from the points of view of different constituencies in different contexts and during the different phases of a crisis (affected people, host Governments, NGOs, the private sector, etc).

• Develop a joint approach for and definition of humanitarian effectiveness. This framework would ideally connect all actors receiving and providing assistance.

• Better understand other sectors’ contributions to humanitarian action. For example, despite the long-standing recognition of the private sector’s contribution, there is no empirical base (qualitative and quantitative) for the private sector’s contribution overall.

• Humanitarian planning needs to shift to a multi-year cycle that allows for a more strategic view and could mitigate the inefficiencies and respond to the same needs year after year. Donor and other funding mechanisms need to adopt a similar cycle.

ON SERVING THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE IN CONFLICT:

• Develop context-specific access-negotiation strategies that serve advocacy and access purposes.

• Find new ways to promote collective management by humanitarian actors to manage rising security risks.

• Develop a better understanding of IHL provisions, and compile lessons on conducting cross-border operations.

• Debate if/how potential financial motivations or gain, which may be the driving forces behind some assistance providers, align with humanitarian principles.
ON MANAGING THE RISK OF HUMANITARIAN CRISSES:

- Closer work between humanitarian and development actors to develop tools and mechanisms for a shared identification of risk and alignment of planning cycles, over the short and medium term.
- Reference of risk management in the post-2015 development agenda. It should be streamlined as an essential part of humanitarian action (analysis, planning etc.) and funding.
- Empower humanitarian coordinators to provide guidance and leadership, and to be accountable for resilience-programming results.
- Use a joint needs-based and risk-based analysis to improve the fairness of fund distribution, and support countries with the potential to suffer large-scale disasters.
- Include the scientific community in humanitarian policy discussions.

TWITTER FEED

Below follows part of the twitter feed captured during discussions at the Annual Humanitarian Symposium: “Where will the international system stand in 2025?”

@jeneambrose
RT @imogenwall: why do we always ask how disaster affected communities can join our dialogue, and not how we can join theirs? #aid2025

@CodyArmoru
#aid2025 #thiric technology used through local responders will create more resilient communities by 2025

@fpenard
RT @ALNAP: Should humanitarians do resilience work, or is it fundamentally development? Where draw line? #aid2025

@DMiliband
Great discussion yesterday on #aid2025. Humanitarian goals to drive the system could be as effective as MDGs. Watch this space.

@KevinSavage11
#aid2025 Biggest take away for me is idea that Int.HumAid has gotten too involved in disaster response and drr to detriment of conflict.

@nuurist
Semantics! Should we replace #innovation with the #solutions? #aid2025

@BrunoBFigueroa
RT @GlobalAssetsNAF: @BrunoBFigueroa tech is ready there, we are just going to see the universalization of its use. #aid2025

@MayleeMaylo
RT @Jessalex811: Kill the word ‘beneficiaries!’ They are partners, experts, practitioners. Well said @imogenwall #aid2025

@danielwbaker
@gislio From #aid2025 Conclave - How do we better link humanitarian to development programs - start with data capture #OHI @NetHope_org

@PatrickMeier
My conclusion of #aid2025 conversations: humanitarian orgs are still deluded in thinking that aid doesn’t arrive until they arrive. Sigh.
PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The workshop’s purpose was to introduce OCHA’s aid-effectiveness research, test some of the underlying ideas and concepts of the research, and use the forum as a setting to get further insights and perspectives on this topic. The objectives of OCHA’s research on humanitarian aid effectiveness were explained, including assumptions on the way that effectiveness is viewed:

- The humanitarian landscape is changing. What may be considered effective in responding to humanitarian crises today may not be in the future.
- Context matters. What is most effective when providing humanitarian assistance in one context may not be in another.
- Perspective matters. Each constituency will have a different conception of what it means to be effective depending on his/her perspective and interests.
- Temporal aspect. What is considered effective in the first days of a crisis may not be considered effective three months, one year, or several years down the line.

To start the conversation, a brief analysis of a participant survey was presented. The survey asked participants to name priority elements in aid delivery (see figure below).

The workshop was split into two segments. The first segment looked at humanitarian aid effectiveness from the perspective of different constituencies. The second segment examined what is effective according to different contexts and phases of a disaster, using country scenarios as examples.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS

- Redefining the question: Questioning humanitarian-aid effectiveness may need to be clarified to ensure that the conversations are about what makes the system more effective, and how we can more effectively meet affected people’s needs. It is not about looking at how each actor can be more effective, but looking at it from a macro perspective.

- Constituency considerations: The research assumes that constituencies approach aid from varying perspectives, but this assumption is challenged for a couple of reasons. First, it is inaccurate to assume that there is homogeneity within each constituency group. For example, among INGOs there is a high degree of variation in terms of what is considered an effective response. The same is true for host Governments and UN agencies. Second, the groups were diverse in their make-up, but they generally

---
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Figure 1: Priority Elements in Aid Delivery
agreed on the priority elements. That said, it remains difficult to demonstrate the system’s effectiveness, as many organizations only focus on what they have specifically done according to their mandate. In addition, it is easier to achieve organizational goals instead of a common goal. Agencies need to work towards a common goal but still be able to demonstrate their own contribution towards it. As one participant noted: “The measure of whether an organization is effective is dependent on what the organization is. Should we measure ourselves on being able to build opportunities and ensuring local capacity is in place (which is not about “us”), but on whether people who are affected have access to assistance?”

• **Access:** The fact that “access” came out as a priority element in the survey demonstrated the mindset in which the humanitarian system operates. The humanitarian system assumes that because “it” does not have access, there is not an effective humanitarian response. This defines the system as one where international humanitarian agencies are necessary to make it effective. The work of local responders, actors and civil-society groups is not recognized, though they have access and are part of the system. Access should be redefined as people having access to assistance, not international agencies having access to people. Perhaps the international community should be supporting those people who do have access instead of securing access for itself.

• **Accountability:** In terms of accountability, there is tension between being accountable to affected people and being accountable to host Governments. Many Governments believe that the international community’s accountability should lie with them, and enable them to provide services to their people. If it is assumed that the international humanitarian system should focus on accountability to affected people without recognizing the host Government’s role, it once again marginalises an important actor. At the same time, the international community should ensure Governments are held accountable to their citizens.

• **Temporal consideration:** The temporal component by which effectiveness is analysed may need to be reconceived as, again, it reinforces assumptions about how aid is delivered. Communities do not allocate assistance by humanitarian or development sections in the way that the international community does. They see it as one continuum and the impact of all of the international interventions together on their lives and livelihoods. “Several donors are coming but not following principles. They come with money but give help and then go away. For us, effectiveness is when all of us are working together—we don’t need a lot of money, we need to help communities get strong. And allow people to use their own structures and institutions to help themselves.” (quote from participant during the closed workshop).

• **Long-term perspective:** Contextual realities matter when considering the long-term perspective. In many protracted situations, humanitarian planning is still done year to year, rather than on a multi-year basis that would allow for a more strategic view of medium-term planning. A longer-term strategic plan could have mitigated some inefficiencies and responding to the same needs year after year. On the other hand, from a pragmatic programme planning and budget perspective—as well as a conceptual one—a clear scope and boundaries of humanitarian action need to be set. Is it the humanitarians’ responsibility to tackle root causes and deal with development and advocacy? When a conflict lasts for 10 years, humanitarians need to be better equipped to address these issues.

• **The term ‘humanitarian response’:** The system needs to shift to a more anticipatory approach. Thus, the system should question its terminology—whether “humanitarian response” is still accurate, and whether terms such as “humanitarian action” or “humanitarian support” would better reflect this reality.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

• The humanitarian aid effectiveness research should include the outcomes of this workshop in the approach and areas of inquiry. For example, unpacking the accountability to affected people versus affected States could be a theme of the questions for interviewees during the research process. Talking to local civil-society actors about their ideas of effectiveness will also be important, especially during the first days of a response when they may have most access.

• OCHA will continue to liaise with this diverse group of actors, recognizing where there is and where there is not homogeneity among them as it develops a humanitarian effectiveness agenda and plans for the World Humanitarian Summit Thematic Team on humanitarian effectiveness.
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PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The workshop examined challenges that the humanitarian community is confronted with, or may be increasingly confronted with, in the next decade in providing assistance and protection in conflict settings. It explored strategic and operational avenues to ensure the humanitarian system can adapt and address these trends to better serve conflict-affected people, including options to combine improved delivery on the ground and advocacy, as well as the respective roles of international and national humanitarian actors.

The workshop was split into two segments. One comprised three presentations on assumptions about intra-State conflict in the next decade, challenges to humanitarianism in conflict situations and challenges met by national NGOs in Yemen. The workshop included breakout sessions to delve into the particular questions of operational delivery and advocacy, and to stay and deliver in conflict environments. The workshop was characterised by a free-flowing discussion and multiple points raised by participants. In practice, this meant that the discussion was not necessarily linked to previous discussions through the forum. As such, the suggestions pertained to the overall framework of humanitarian assistance rather than specifically to this workshop.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS

• **Separate versus joint mandate:** The discussion outlined two potential paths of development of the humanitarian system towards 2025. The first envisages an increasing separation between organizations that do advocacy and those that deliver humanitarian assistance. The second envisages a joint approach: organizations that do advocacy should also do programme implementation.

• **Effective advocacy and understanding of local context:** The discussion on how humanitarian actors could advocate more effectively highlighted the need to have more concrete and solid analysis on the political context, how the situation is evolving, cultural awareness, who the key stakeholders are and their motivations. Understanding those elements would help to effectively engage with relevant stakeholders on the ground.

• **Challenges of and opportunities for coordination:** The discussion highlighted a divide in whether there should be stronger coordination of advocacy efforts. Some participants raised the point about the effect that confidentiality and lack of information sharing have in some current contexts, making it harder to coordinate approaches for delivering assistance and developing advocacy messages. Some participants also called for stronger coordination and collective risk assessments when undertaking advocacy.

• **Engagement with local partners:** Participants emphasized the need to strengthen engagement with local partners, such as charity organizations, civil-society organizations and national NGOs that currently deliver and advocate at the local level. International humanitarian organizations should strengthen local actors’ capacity, especially in humanitarian principles, humanitarian coordination and humanitarian operations in which the international organizations have strong expertise. But some actors highlighted the need to preserve diverse ways of functioning, including direct intervention. To increase local engagement, partnerships could also be forged think tanks, universities and other research groups. They could bring creative ideas on how human rights and humanitarian communities can advocate for people in need.
• **UN advocacy and coordination role:** Referring to some specific contexts, the UN’s current and past role was examined. Many participants felt that political involvement hindered the UN’s ability to effectively advocate, for instance, in cross-border operations when there is no consent of the concerned sovereign State. Participants mentioned that during the crisis in Afghanistan in the 1980s, the UN was in a much better position to play an important role in advocating and coordinating a framework for humanitarian access that all the humanitarian actors and parties to the conflict agreed on.

• **Access dilemmas:** Referring to some current specific contexts, there was no consensus on whether an over-arching single-access negotiation approach was the best way to deliver assistance. It was felt that finding a middle ground where humanitarians tried several options could drive a better response. There were also discussions on whether some operations could potentially be fuelling the conflict while simultaneously alleviating the suffering of people in need, and whether this was something the humanitarian community was willing to accept and how humanitarians would strike that balance.

• **Increased data collection and use:** Participants felt that another challenge was the commensurate increase of data collection and use by humanitarian actors and the associated risk. They provided the example of an organization wanting to digitalize all biometric data of a camp’s population. Participants agreed there is an imperative need for finding the right balance between legitimate use of data (and technology) and risk aversion, developing protocols and standards to protect such data in order to avoid harming vulnerable people.

• **Risk aversity and risk transfer:** There are two dimensions of risk: one vertical, which goes from the global to the local level, and one horizontal, which goes across intergovernmental organizations. When an area did not fit an organization’s mandate, there was a really strong disincentive to act and take that risk. The international community is risk averse. The institutionalisation of humanitarian organizations has made humanitarians more risk averse. The perception was that risk takers are no longer valued. There was no consensus regarding respective risks encountered by international and national NGOs, but a majority of participants thought that the outsourcing or subcontracting of aid delivery to local NGOs, thus transferring risk, may not be the best way to deal with risk.

• **Addressing diversity of the humanitarian system:** The humanitarian system is becoming more diverse. The current system is the reflection of different interests: political, operational and ideological. But it is fragmented and needs substantial improvement to work more comprehensively. It would be good to identify some common goals and aim to achieve concrete objectives, rather than try to push for homogeneity across the whole system. When building partnerships with local organizations, these partnerships should go beyond project delivery, and they should focus on developing coordination and local partners’ technical capacities on humanitarian issues.
ANNEX III: REPORT OF WORKSHOP 3

“INNOVATION IN HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The workshop’s objectives were to help identify what challenges and innovations will have the greatest impact on the future of the humanitarian response system, and how to create an enabling environment for ethical innovation in the sector. The workshop included presentations to stimulate discussions, followed by group work on challenges requiring innovation.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS

• What is humanitarian innovation?: Innovation was best understood as a process that promoted rapid learning and development of new ideas, and was not just about technology. The concept of innovation had largely been developed within the private sector, but humanitarian innovation had some differences. First, the market for humanitarian innovation was fundamentally different from the private sector—humanitarian services were understood as public goods provided by the Government or international actors, and there were only a few suppliers who tightly regulated procurement and other processes. Innovation within the formal humanitarian system pointed the way to a business model in which demand was closely linked to the actual needs of affected people, and ideas and services were produced by a range of actors in a more transparent way. Second, many humanitarian organizations had concerns around the ethics of who it was appropriate to partner with and how to pilot innovations. Several possible key principles for humanitarian innovation were suggested: informed consent, equity, do no harm, representation, complementarity and accountability. There were also organizational challenges to adopting more innovation, including the culture of humanitarian organizations and technical issues around monitoring and evaluation or procurement. A critical area was understanding “bottom-up” innovation and how humanitarians could better promote new ideas among affected people.

• The private sector’s role: Many participants raised concerns that the innovation was too closely identified with private-sector values and approaches. Others felt that the humanitarian sector had a bias against the private sector. A particular concern was that in the countries where relief takes place, there was not a strong basis for governance, and the arrival of private-sector actors during a crisis could create complications. There were distinct challenges around engaging with local companies and businesses versus multinationals. Several participants stressed that a critical point was to evaluate the ethical issues around any potential private-sector partnership before moving ahead.

• Intellectual property and the profit motive: A “humanitarian venture” fund is needed that would help produce dual-use products that could, for example, be sold to the military or camping markets, which then subsidised humanitarian uses. Others raised concerns over whether having a private company hold the intellectual property to humanitarian products would create ethical problems. Some participants noted that some private companies offered open-source or patent-free technology if they saw it as part of a social benefit. It was important for humanitarian actors to ensure that products were open source and widely shared to help empower communities.

• Innovation as a process: It was important to understand process as the basis for innovation, with some pointing to legal innovations, such as the attempts to reconcile customary and international law. This also pointed to the importance of strengthening knowledge sharing.

• Game-changing and disruptive innovation: The system’s priority would be on truly transformative ideas, such as a major shift to cash programming. Disruptions were likely to come from outside, such as the e-transfer systems for remittances, which are being rolled out in Africa. One participant questioned whether “innovation” by affected people should be considered simple survival or livelihood strategies, or whether there was a role for humanitarian actors to foster and empower communities to innovate.

• Need-driven and bottom-up innovation: There was not enough focus on how to identify the needs of and demands from affected people, and there were calls for more examples of local innovation. There was a question on how to better engage local NGOs, and there were concerns about whether an innovation-focused system would favour larger organizations with greater R&D capacity.

• Emerging risks from technology and experimentation: More focus is needed on the potential risks of new technologies, with data security and privacy issues around digital tech and mobile communications being major emerging issues. Humanitarians
were often willing to use technologies in the field that were otherwise criticised in their home countries, such as bio-metric identification systems. There was a call to find a way to address real concerns without slowing the adoption of new technologies or approaches. The consensus was that there was a need for more failure and less risk-aversion in the sector, but it was clear that this had to be balanced with safeguards and careful consideration of how humanitarian principles applied.

**Financing innovation:** Current funding is largely through grants, which limit the ability to scale up or mainstream ideas. To create sustainable funding streams, ideas proposed included venture or private capital; providing innovation funds directly to local networks; encouraging donors to set up innovation funds or support longer-term projects; and launching youth grants or mentorship programmes.

**Promoting systematic change in humanitarian organizations:** The real challenge was to increase the pace of change within organizations and the entire system. This would require moving towards a culture that was comfortable with risk.

**Monitoring and evaluation:** Major improvements were needed on monitoring and evaluation and data collection. Baseline data was crucial to show how/whether innovations really were yielding benefits.

**Challenges requiring innovation:** Participants felt that major innovation is needed to address the following areas:

- Bridging the gap between relief and development.
- Responding in urban environments and to urban violence.
- Engaging communities in needs assessments and programme design.
- Adapting responses to the local context.
- Adapting new military innovations to humanitarian contexts.
- Compliance monitoring and reporting.
- Responding to water crises.
- Better engagement with Governments and local leaders.
- Lowering the entry barrier for new NGOs and organizations.
- Transforming financing and funding.
- Promoting multisectoral approaches and capacity for partnership.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following suggestions were made as concrete research or policy initiatives to further promote humanitarian innovation:

- Better mapping of what is happening in different areas of innovation, including by Governments and the private sector. There was a need to better understand the range of initiatives in different sectors, as well as funding opportunities, particularly those coming from outside the traditional international system.
- Develop a stronger community of practice around people working in different areas of humanitarian innovation to facilitate cross-fertilization of ideas, share best practices and reduce overlap of ideas.
- More engagement by humanitarians in meetings and workshops organized by the private-sector and other actors that touch on crisis and disaster response.
- Develop a clearer vision of the specific challenges of humanitarian innovation, as opposed to innovation in the private sector, and how it works in practice. This aims to help develop a stronger body of practice and guidance on how to promote innovation in organizations and in the wider system.
- Better define “bottom-up” humanitarian innovation, including how to recognize innovation by affected people in specific contexts and how humanitarians can support this. There was much interest in seeing how to provide more support, including funding or creating “innovation spaces” at the community level.
- Encourage different actors, private-sector companies and people working in development and other sectors to develop new ideas for humanitarian response, while still respecting humanitarian principles.
- Develop safeguards and guidelines for the responsible use of new technologies with vulnerable people, particularly including the creation of policy and practical tools for data security and privacy in digital technologies.
- Better educate first responders on the ground about the technology and tools available and their comparative advantages, and reform procurement rules to allow more flexibility at the field level in choosing appropriate solutions.
- Ensure that funding is available for monitoring, evaluation, research and development to improve the evidence base, and support incremental and transformative innovation.
ANNEX IV: REPORT OF WORKSHOP 4

“MANAGING THE RISK OF HUMANITARIAN CRISIS”

PURPOSE, BACKGROUND AND FORMAT

The workshop invited participants to imagine what a risk-based model of humanitarian assistance would look like in 2025. The objective was to identify elements within three themes (analysis, delivery and funding) that would be part of a new humanitarian system better equipped to perform effective humanitarian risk management. The workshop comprised a series of presentations and break-out sessions.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS

• **New drivers of humanitarian needs and global challenges:** Food-security crises, climate change, demographic shifts, rapid urbanization and conflict are rising. Humanitarians are being asked to do more and at a greater cost than ever before.

• **The fairness of the system:** The current humanitarian system is not necessarily fair in the way it allocates current aid flows. Would a risk-based humanitarian system be fairer than a needs-based system? Would a risk-based system be in line with existing humanitarian principles?

• **Needs analysis and risk analysis are mutually complementary, but there is no clear division of work:** Both have strengths, and when combined they can save more lives. One tries to anticipate and potentially prevent disasters, while the other aims to respond and save lives when unpredictable crises hits. There is much room for improving our collective risk management of disasters, but even in an ideal scenario there would still be crises that fall off the radar and will require effective needs-based response on an ad hoc basis. The international humanitarian system needs to make sure it has the capacity to anticipate disasters, foster proper dialogue with development actors for their work in prevention, and engage Governments and other political stakeholders active in creating peace and avoiding conflicts. Some participants claimed that it is the humanitarian sector’s role to always be ready to respond. “If we do a risk-informed response, mainstreaming risk assessment in our response, we shall be more effective saving lives.” But there was no consensus on the division between development and humanitarian work, with many participants advising against conceptual silos that hinder an effective multidimensional response to disasters. The complex nature of risk management calls for holistic programmes that often sprout from the cooperation of all actors to prevent and mitigate risk.

• **Other risks that lead to humanitarian crises:** There are additional contextual risks that can affect humanitarian response, including those created by donor practise or political actors. Partner vetting is an example. The politicization of aid is another. All these external factors create risks. In this context, it was mentioned that risk stemming from a dysfunctional international system is one that can deeply influence the level of human suffering and lives lost in disasters.

• **Aiming for a shared understanding of risk:** Humanitarian and development actors should all agree on the priority risks. They do not need to address the risk jointly, with the same tools, but they must agree on a shared understanding of the risk. For example, imagine fire was defined as the main risk. Everyone will do what they can do to address this risk. The Mayor covers everything; s/
he takes care of preparing for risks of fire. S/he deals with architects to build fire-resistant places. The fire brigade will prepare to deal with fire. But they are all focusing on the risk of fire.

**• Preparedness, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and response—roles and responsibilities:** Preparedness is part of a comprehensive disaster risk management approach. However, it is also important to recognize the distinctive activities between preparedness and DRR and the actors involved. For example, many institutions that deal with DRR are the same institutions that deal with urban planning in a development context. The key issue is to get DRR incorporated into national development plans. Preparedness, on the other hand, means getting ready for humanitarian response. Institutions, such as the military and civil protection, are specific bodies that will be involved in the planning and response to address the risks of disasters. Participants noted that the roles of the UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), the UN Development Programme (UNDP) and OCHA are sometimes blurred, and they questioned whether the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) should have any role in DRR. The ERC should not be responsible for DRR. UNISDR should be involved with national development planning along with UNDP, and preparedness should rest with OCHA. The ERC should be ready to help Governments to be ready to respond. Humanitarians respond when disaster strikes. For example, if the water retainer walls in New Orleans were to be breached, FEMA would respond. However, the city planners and engineers would hold initial responsibility of wall design, thus reducing risks before disaster strikes. With clear roles and responsibilities, it is easier to ensure accountability and ensure comfort and complementarity between agencies. As long as the confusion is not resolved, the incentive to work together will remain small. Participants mentioned the need to work with host Governments in the first place in case of natural disasters, and to support them to get “their house in order” in times of non-crisis in order to support the response when crisis hits. Strengthening the regional civil-protection system is all part of effective risk management.

**• Post-2015 development framework:** Risk management needs a reference in the post-2015 development framework. A suggestion would be to incorporate effective risk management into a sustainable development goal. A second suggestion would be to develop a slogan for an advocacy strategy: “Not sustainable if not risk-based”.

**• Leadership in resilience coordination:** Under the cluster system, sectoral leadership and ultimate accountability rest with cluster lead agencies. Given that resilience-friendly programming requires holistic cross-sectoral approaches, an empowered Humanitarian Coordinator would be in a better position to provide guidance and leadership and be accountable for results.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Work with humanitarian and development partners to develop tools and mechanisms for a shared identification of risk and alignment of planning cycles over the short and medium term.
- Build on the momentum of the resilience approach and the post-2015 agenda to streamline risk management as an essential part of humanitarian action and funding.
ANNEX V: FACT SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND THE CHANGING HUMANITARIAN LANDSCAPE: PROJECTIONS TO 2025

The following facts and projections, quoted from reputable sources, are intended to inform the discussion on the question: “Where will the international humanitarian system stand in 2025?”

GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Population growth
- In 2013 the world population reached 7.2 billion. It is predicted to rise to 8 billion by 2025 and to 9.6 billion by 2050. Virtually all population growth will take place in less developed countries and among the poorest populations.
- The population of countries that had an inter-agency appeal in 2012 is estimated to increase by 179 per cent between 2000 and 2050.

Urbanization
- Half of the world’s population (3.5 billion) now lives in urban areas. By 2030, there will be more than 5 billion urban dwellers, with urban growth concentrated in Africa and Asia.
- More than 75 per cent of the world’s poor people live in these urban areas, including 1 billion who live in slums with no access to basic services. More than half of the world’s 10.5 million refugees live in urban areas.

Poverty and food
- As of 2010, 1.2 billion people live on less than US$1.25 a day. By 2030, up to 325 million extremely poor people will be living in the 49 most hazard-prone countries, the majority in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.
- About one in eight people in the world is estimated to be suffering from chronic hunger. High and volatile food and commodity prices have exacerbated food-and-nutrition insecurity.
- By 2050, global demand for food is expected to increase by 70 per cent.

Water
- Eleven per cent of the global population, or 783 million people, do not have access to clean drinking water.
- In developing countries, 80 per cent of illnesses are linked to poor water and sanitation.
- Today, about 700 million people in 43 countries suffer from water scarcity. By 2025, 1.8 billion people will be living in countries or regions with absolute water scarcity, and two thirds of the world’s population could be living under water-stressed conditions.

Climate change
- Projections suggest that during the twenty-first century, there will be an increase in heat waves, heavy rainfall events, droughts and the severity of tropical cyclones. There will be more extreme sea levels (e.g. those associated with storm surges).
- Nearly 634 million people—more than one tenth of the global population—live in at-risk coastal areas just a few metres above existing sea level. Taking into account sea-level rise, population growth and other factors, the number of people exposed to coastal flooding in Asia will increase by 50 per cent by 2030 over 2000 levels.

THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE: NEW OPTIONS FOR 2025

The nature of humanitarian crises and aid
- The number of people requiring humanitarian assistance, and the cost of providing it, is increasing significantly:
  - Inter-agency appeals typically target 60 to 70 million people each year, compared with 30 to 40 million 10 years ago. Funding requirements have more than doubled to over $10 billion per year.
  - At the end of 2012, 45.2 million people were in situations of displacement around the world—the highest number since 1994. From 2002 to 2012, there was an average of 320 disasters a year, compared with 290 in the past 10 years.
  - The crisis in Syria has added $4.4 billion to the amount needed for humanitarian action in major crises in 2013, which now totals an unprecedented $12.9 billion to help 73 million people in 24 affected countries.
- Today’s humanitarian crises are rarely short lived. Of countries that had an inter-agency appeal in 2012, eight had an appeal in eight or more of the previous 10 years. Crises are affecting more people. Eight appeals in 2013 were higher than the previous year.
- Humanitarian crises are increasingly instilled with high levels of political significance to Governments, the media and the public, both domestically and internationally. Governments are increasingly in the lead in determining their assistance needs.
- Humanitarian action is moving towards a new model that promotes effective crisis-risk management in addition to emergency response, and forges deeper links with longer-term development.
New donors, new actors

- In 2012, donors provided $17.9 billion of international humanitarian aid in total. OECD Governments provide the majority of funding ($11.6 billion), but other Governments are providing an increasing share ($1.4 billion). A total of $5 billion came from private sources.

- Turkey was the fourth largest humanitarian donor in 2012, Saudi Arabia was the twentieth, United Arab Emirates was the twenty-fifth and Qatar the twenty-seventh. Turkey (+$775 million), Brazil (+$31 million) and Qatar (+$25 million) were in the top four donors ranked according to aid increases between 2011 and 2012.

- The proliferation of new donors may affect funding modalities. Emerging donors, for example, may opt for more fluid and expedient approaches rather than long-standing arrangements and ties to traditional humanitarian coordination mechanisms. Regional organizations may also increasingly be seen as conduits and filters for international assistance.

- On the part of western donors, there is likely to be a decline in resources due to economic constraints and greater domestic scrutiny. For example, Australia, the eighth largest aid donor, recently announced a reduction of $4.1 billion over four years to its foreign-aid budget.

- A wider range of new actors will bring different perspectives that may change the dominant perception of who is a humanitarian actor. These new actors include non-western NGOs, national and local private sector, State capitalists, militaries, diaspora groups, regional organizations, non-state actors and new donors. This can enrich the scope of humanitarian action but also result in challenges, such as potentially conflicting applications of global humanitarian principles.

Cash-transfer programmes

- Cash transfers are expected to become a standard humanitarian approach, and their use may increasingly rely on financial infrastructure and private-sector capacities where these are well placed to reach people in need.

  ~ Pakistan distributed cash grants to over 1.3 million households following the flooding in 2010-2011.

  ~ By 2015, the World Food Programme aims to have 30 to 40 per cent of all programming in the form of cash transfers (over $1 billion).

  ~ UNHCR stated in 2012 that “where infrastructure allows, UNHCR is agreed that programming cash in urban environments is preferable to providing in-kind.”

  ~ The International Federation of the Red Cross is redesigning its logistics-and-support systems to be able to consider cash equally to in-kind programming.

Technology

- Today, the world has more mobile-connected devices than it has people. Eighty-eight per cent of those devices are basic handsets. In 2012, Africa had 753 million mobile phone subscribers. In 105 countries, there are more mobile subscriptions than people.

  ~ By 2015, 50 per cent of the people in developing countries will be using the Internet. By 2015, 6 per cent of people in Least Developed Countries will be using the Internet.

  ~ Technology is expected to change the balance of power within the humanitarian system, allowing many more actors, including those affected by crises, to become more vocal and to connect with each other.

  ~ The rapid evolution of technology is making manufacturing and design cheaper and more available. For example, the advent of 3D printers is creating a new opportunity to be able to develop tools, engine parts, sanitation and medical equipment in the field.

Advanced technologies are being rapidly rolled out, but there are many concerns about privacy and ethical use. For example, biometric identification systems are already used to record and identify social-protection beneficiaries in at least 15 cash-transfer programmes in humanitarian and development contexts, but there are many concerns around data security, privacy and reliability.
ANNEX VI: OVERVIEW OF REGIONAL FORUMS

BACKGROUND

Since 2011, OCHA has convened five Global and Regional Humanitarian Policy Forums in New York, Dakar, Cairo, Bangkok and Cape Town in order to:

- Foster a global humanitarian policy network, with special focus on national and regional NGOs, humanitarian practitioners and academics/think tanks.
- Identify key policy trends and concerns that affect humanitarian work.
- Promote a more coordinated policy agenda that encourages coherence between national, regional and global policy analysis.

The forums have brought together hundreds of people from over 60 countries from national and regional humanitarian organizations, national academic institutions, civil-society groups, the private sector and international organizations.

ANALYSIS

Rethinking the Humanitarian System

Many key issues and common concerns emerged during the forums from different regions. One important commonality was a broad agreement of the need to fundamentally revisit the structure of the formal international humanitarian system and find ways to make it more inclusive of non-traditional humanitarian actors (e.g. militaries, the private sector, diaspora community networks and new types of local NGOs).

The need for change was recognized, but there was no clear consensus on the shape of a future system, with different regions emphasizing different elements. Therefore, the 2014 forum will assess this theme.

In addition to this overarching question, the main recommendations heard during the forums fell into four categories:

- Humanitarian Innovation
  A recurrent theme was the need for a more open, risk-tolerant approach to developing new approaches, particularly to intractable problems.
  - More support for a framework for risk-taking and accountability: It was repeatedly suggested that many good ideas were available, but the system does not have the ability to take a chance on new approaches. There was great interest in the use of new and emerging technologies, particularly around information and communications, but participants emphasized the need to look to innovation in process, finance, organizational design and other areas as critical to strengthening the system, as well as for the international sector to draw more from the experiences of local and national groups.

- Improved coordination and engagement with the private sector and new actors: A theme that came up in several regions, particularly Southern and Eastern Africa and Asia, was the need to better engage with private-sector actors as a source of ideas and answers, and as critical stakeholders who can benefit from faster recovery and improved mitigation measures. It was recognized that humanitarians had a great deal to learn from the private sector, but there was a need to create platforms that matched private-sector capacities with gaps in humanitarian response. Several participants also cited the need to look at emerging models, such as youth or religious groups, and the use of social media and other factors that were changing the way communities organized themselves.

- Humanitarian Effectiveness
  Many issues were raised on how to improve the overall effectiveness and impact of a humanitarian response, regardless of whether it was primarily being carried out by the international system.
  - Work better with Governments and regional organizations: Many participants emphasized that the international community needs to find better ways to support and
develop Governments’ capacities to respond, and to better work with local authorities. There was consensus on Governments’ centrality to humanitarian response, but a key regional difference was seen in the State’s capacity to lead responses in future crises, with greater confidence seen in Asia and Southern Africa, and more scepticism in West and Central Africa, the Middle East and North Africa.

~ Improve coordination and engagement with partners:
Participants agreed on the need to work better with the range of new actors, particularly religious and civil-society groups. Many participants felt the international community has a role in promoting basic standards and humanitarian principles. There was a need to find ways to work with groups that may be uninterested in coordinating their efforts. Many groups from the Middle East and North and West Africa stressed that there was a lack of trust that needed to be overcome, but there was interest in real partnerships if both parties were engaged as equals.

~ Strengthen accountability to affected people:
There is no overall framework for accountability in the humanitarian system, and there are tensions between the need to be accountable to donors and affected communities. Development actors also need to be more accountable for reducing vulnerability and increasing the resilience of people affected by humanitarian crises.

• Managing Risk and Vulnerability
~ More support for resilience and DRR:
Despite some concern over the expanding scope of what was considered humanitarian activities, participants largely saw the need for more focus on analysing and managing risk, and more support for resilience and DRR. The lack of funding for resilience, DRR and preparedness activities was a broad concern, with participants emphasizing that neither traditional nor non-traditional donors had really been prepared to support these activities. There was a call for greater investment in early warning/early action and analysis and information systems, with a focus on new approaches to bringing information to local communities. This was a particular interest in Dakar, where participants saw the greatest gap between the sophistication of monitoring systems and the information actually available on the ground.

~ Invest in local knowledge and capacities:
A related area of concern was the need for international actors to work better with local knowledge and capacities. This was a particular concern in Asia and the Pacific, where local NGOs were often large and well established. This had three key aspects: ensuring that international actors fully understood the local context they were engaging with; more support for intra-regional and South-South cooperation to share lessons and good practices; and more support for local capacity-building and better inclusion of national NGOs in coordination mechanisms. Strengthening local communities also required better training for local government, and streamlined procedures for linking national and local government agencies in a crisis.

~ Develop stronger legal frameworks at the national and regional levels: The legal frameworks for managing disaster aid and response need to be clarified. This includes the need for wider adoption of national disaster management laws, with clear frameworks governing international actors; streamlining domestic coordination structures, as well as improved inter-ministerial cooperation; and better education at all levels on existing rules and legislation.

• People in Conflict
The changing nature of conflicts was a point of major concern, including the increase in urban warfare, the political and financial impact of anti-terrorism legislation, and the continuing importance of neutral humanitarian actors in intra-State conflicts.

~ Humanitarian principles and space: Participants had a robust discussion on the role of humanitarian principles and how to maintain what many see as an erosion of humanitarian space in conflict settings. There was also a discussion of bias in humanitarian groups—both the perceived bias of international actors and the bias of national and regional groups that were formally or informally aligned with Government policies.

~ Humanitarian access: A second key issue was broad agreement gaining acceptance and consent. This was seen as central to achieving humanitarian access, with participants noting that these needed to be earned. This required consistent negotiation with all necessary stakeholders and understanding different stakeholders’ interests. There was particular concern about many international actors’ overly cautious approach to security and how this limits the ability to gain timely access.
ANNEX VII: VISUAL FACILITATION

During the forum, discussions were captured live by a graphic illustrator.

Figure 1: Humanitarian Symposium

Figure 2: Humanitarian Symposium (continued)
Figure 3: Policy Conclave

Figure 4: Policy Conclave (continued)
Figure 5: Reception

**AGE OF TRANSFORMATION**

- Talking to people is a really great thing and we should do it all the time. - Raha
- We must always be prepared for black swans while rare we know they are in our future.
- Humanitarians do not have a moral monopoly on moral bravery.
- Humanitarians must work together to achieve true dialogue and improve coordination.
- We need to take into consideration the cultural uniqueness of local communities.
- We need more evidence-based policy making.
- We need a system that is connected to evidence that allows interoperability.
- If we can’t secure our data, we can’t trust our decisions.
- We invite new ideas, learning, and social innovation.
**ANNEX VIII: AGENDA**

**OCHA Global Humanitarian Policy Forum 2013**
**12 – 13 December, UNHQ Secretariat, New York**

**ANNOTATED AGENDA**

**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**
On 12-13 December, OCHA will be hosting its third annual Global Humanitarian Policy Forum, with the objectives of:

- Building a broader, more inclusive policy community;
- Identifying recommendations for how the formal international humanitarian system needs to change; including by showcasing new research and analysis of a changing humanitarian landscape;
- Fostering a coordinated policy and research agenda among the participants for 2014 by identifying key policy questions around which the humanitarian community can rally and advance the thinking towards the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (www.worldhumanitariansummit.org).

**OVERVIEW**
The morning of the first day of the Forum will feature the launch of OCHA’s Annual Humanitarian Symposium Series. The 2013 Humanitarian Symposium will be a moderated panel debating the future of the international humanitarian system. In the afternoon, Forum participants will gather in a Policy Conclave to further discuss the key points emerging from the morning debate and to identify the main policy questions that require further research and analysis by the global policy community.

On the second day, participants will have a choice of attending two workshops. Each workshop will cover one of the following topics: humanitarian innovation, humanitarian aid effectiveness, serving the needs of people in conflict and managing risk of humanitarian crisis. These themes have emerged as key areas of interest for the humanitarian policy community following last year’s Global Forum and the four Regional Forums held in 2012-2013 and also build into the themes of the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit.

**12 DECEMBER**
- **8:00 – 8:45**
  **ARRIVAL AND SECURITY CHECK-IN**
  **LOCATION:** UNHQ Entrance, 1st Avenue and 47th street
- **9:00 – 12:30**
  **2013 HUMANITARIAN SYMPOSIUM:**
  “Where will the international humanitarian system stand in 2025?”
  **LOCATION:** UNHQ Secretariat, 3rd Floor, ECOSOC Chamber

The formal international humanitarian system (as enshrined in General Assembly Resolution 46/182 and subsequent resolutions) should be working to put itself out of business. In an ideal world communities are resilient and able to withstand shocks, national governments are able to address all humanitarian needs within their own borders with minimal external help. Today, there is greater awareness that civil society, governments, local NGOs and private sector actors are demonstrating increased ability to provide sustainable, context-specific, cost-efficient and effective solutions to humanitarian crises. Yet the formal international humanitarian system remains the custodian of the humanitarian principles, reminding us that humanitarian assistance should be provided to all in need, regardless of ethnicity, political affiliation etc. The international system plays an important role, when other actors are unable or unwilling to be impartial. So where does this leave us?

The Symposium will begin with three short “flash talks” exploring factors that have the potential to transform the international humanitarian system. Following the talks, the debate panelists will present their views on whether the formal international response system will remain relevant in 2025. The panel debate will be followed by a Q&A, with questions from the floor and also from the live twitter audience (#aid2025), who will be following the panel through UN Webcast.

**DEBATE PANELISTS**
- **Dr. Ahmed Mohammed Almeraikhi**, Director-General, Qatar Development Fund;
- **Ambassador Bruno Figueroa**, Director-General for Technical and Scientific Cooperation; Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation;
- **[Additional names]**
• Mr. David Miliband,
    President and CEO, International Rescue Committee;
• Mr. Claus Sørensen,
    Director-General, Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection of the EU Commission (ECHO);
• Mr. Misikir Tilahun,
    Head of Programmes, Africa Humanitarian Action.

The panel will be moderated by Ms. Hannah Pool,
    Journalist, The Guardian

FLASH TALKS
• The impact of the digital revolution and technology
  Dr. Patrick Meier, Director of Social Innovation, Qatar Computing Research Institute;
• The growth of cash transfer programming
  Ms. Jamie Zimmerman, Director of the Global Assets Project, New America Foundation;
• The role of the private sector
  Mr. Daniel W. Baker, Global Lead, Program Innovation, Accenture Development Partnerships.

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

14:00 – 18:00
THE POLICY CONCLAVE
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room

The Conclave will convene select humanitarian experts and practitioners to discuss the main outcomes and findings that emerged during the morning Symposium and will review the main policy outcomes from the 2012-13 Global and Regional Humanitarian Policy Forums. The Conclave’s main objective is to identify the key policy and research questions around which the humanitarian policy community should coalesce in the next few years.

15:00 COFFEE BREAK, UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room

18:00 – 20:00
COCKTAIL RECEPTION HOSTED BY OCHA
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, West Side Terrace

Exit through UNHQ Main Lobby

13 DECEMBER
9:00 – 12:00
POLICY WORKSHOPS
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 1 B Floor, Conference Rooms A and B

9:00 – 12:00
WORKSHOP 1: HUMANITARIAN AID EFFECTIVENESS,
    Conference Room A
 Consultations with affected people and their governments, donors, humanitarian organizations, and other partners as well evidence from evaluations and performance monitoring suggest that the effectiveness of the overall emergency response to people in need must further improve. The workshop will explore the concept of humanitarian effectiveness from a future perspective and will ask participants to think about how we may need to reconceptualize effectiveness given the changing landscape of humanitarian aid. It will also seek to determine the varying priorities of constituents in attendance; determine where there is agreement on the key principles of effectiveness; demonstrate where there are divergences; and how, if possible, the system can adapt. The session will ask respondents to think critically about how their own constituency group might need to think differently about how they operate and contribute to an effective humanitarian response.

11:00 COFFEE BREAK, South-end of 1 B Corridor of the Conference Building

12:00 – 14:00
LUNCH
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 4th Floor, South Delegates Dining Room
14:00 – 17:00
WORKSHOP 3: HUMANITARIAN INNOVATION, Conference Room A
The workshop will briefly introduce the current thinking on what humanitarian innovation is and how different organizations are approaching it. The workshop will ask participants to help identify the emerging challenges that require the development of new approaches. It will introduce new thinking on integrating novel technology and approaches into humanitarian response; and invite participants to share their own vision for how humanitarian response will work in the future. Participants will discuss options for promoting new ideas and creating an enabling environment for innovation within the formal international humanitarian system.

14:00 – 17:00
WORKSHOP 4: MANAGING THE RISK OF HUMANITARIAN CRISIS, Conference Room B
This workshop will explore the concept of a risk-based approach to humanitarian crises and what a future, risk-based model of aid would look like. In particular, it will examine changes required in analysis, delivery and funding to move towards a risk-based model. It will take into account the trends and ideas discussed on day one of the forum. Participants will be encouraged to think and talk creatively and freely on this topic. The objective of the workshop is to envision the main features and principles of a risk-based model of humanitarian assistance, suitable for the world of 2025.

16:00 COFFEE BREAK, South-end of 1 B Corridor of the Conference Building

17:00 – 18:00
OFFICIAL CLOSING
LOCATION: UNHQ Secretariat, 1 B Floor, Conference Room 1
Exit through UNHQ Main Lobby
# ANNEX IX: PARTICIPANTS LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbas Zabarah</td>
<td>The Humanitarian Forum Yemen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abbaszabara@gmail.com">abbaszabara@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Stoddard</td>
<td>Humanitarian Outcomes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abby.stoddard@gmail.com">abby.stoddard@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aine Fay</td>
<td>Concern worldwide</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aine.fay@concern.net">aine.fay@concern.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Betts</td>
<td>Oxford University Humanitarian Innovation Project</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexander.betts@qeh.ox.ac.uk">alexander.betts@qeh.ox.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kesper</td>
<td>The European Network of Implementing Development Agencies (EUNIDA)/ The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.kesper@gmail.com">alex.kesper@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegra Baiocchi</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Baiocchi@un.org">Baiocchi@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amadou Tahirou Diaw</td>
<td>Laboratoire d’Enseignement et Recherche en Géomatique (LERG)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tahirou_diaw@yahoo.fr">tahirou_diaw@yahoo.fr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Torres Camara</td>
<td>UN Department of Political Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:torrescamara@un.org">torrescamara@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anm Muniruzzaman</td>
<td>Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muniruzzaman@gmail.com">muniruzzaman@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalisa Conte</td>
<td>United Nations World Food Program (WFP)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:annalisa.conte@wfp.org">annalisa.conte@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Donini</td>
<td>Feinstein International Center (FIC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Antonio.donini@tufts.edu">Antonio.donini@tufts.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arafat Jamal</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamal3@un.org">jamal3@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Jackson</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute (ODI)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.jackson@odi.org.uk">a.jackson@odi.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Wei</td>
<td>One Growth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwei@onegrowth.org">bwei@onegrowth.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsterns George Mulume</td>
<td>CADECOM (Caritas Malawi)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nutfoodsec@ecmmw.org">nutfoodsec@ecmmw.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciarán Donnelly</td>
<td>International Rescue Committee (IRC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ciaran.Donnelly@rescue.org">Ciaran.Donnelly@rescue.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Tymo</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darlene.tymo@wfp.org">Darlene.tymo@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Loquercio</td>
<td>Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dloquercio@hapinternational.org">dloquercio@hapinternational.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pearson</td>
<td>Deloitte Touche Tomatsu Services</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dpearson@deltotouch.com">dpearson@deltotouch.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayna Brown</td>
<td>CDA Collaborative Learning Projects</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbrown@cdainc.com">dbrown@cdainc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Salomons</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dirk.salomons@sipa.columbia.edu">dirk.salomons@sipa.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dody Ruswandi</td>
<td>National Agency for Disaster Management of Indonesia (NDMA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dodyruswandi@gmail.com">dodyruswandi@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Reimer</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reimer@un.org">reimer@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Schenkenberg van Mierop</td>
<td>DARA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eschenkenberg@daraint.org">eschenkenberg@daraint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Iguisi</td>
<td>Centre for Disaster Risk Mangt. and Devt. Studies, Ahmadu Bello University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ediguisi@yahoo.com">ediguisi@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Grünewald</td>
<td>Groupe URD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanebonamy@me.com">stephanebonamy@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genevieve Boutin</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gboutin@unicef.org">gboutin@unicef.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisli Olafsson</td>
<td>NetHope</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gisli.olafsson@nethope.org">gisli.olafsson@nethope.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Muthungu</td>
<td>National Council of Churches of Kenya</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmuethungu@nccck.org">gmuethungu@nccck.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Le Duc</td>
<td>Alima</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gld@alima-ngo.org">gld@alima-ngo.org</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>Ignacio Leon</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leoni@un.org">leoni@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imogen Wall</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wall@un.org">wall@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobus Cilliers</td>
<td>Institute for Security Studies - Pretoria</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcilliers@issafrika.org">jcilliers@issafrika.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Claude Kazadi</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community Secretariat (SADC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkazadi@sadc.int">jkazadi@sadc.int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemilah Mahmood</td>
<td>King’s College London</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jemilah.m@gmail.com">jemilah.m@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jérémie Labbé</td>
<td>International Peace Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:labbe@ipinst.org">labbe@ipinst.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scott-Railton</td>
<td>Citizen Lab</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ralton@ucla.edu">ralton@ucla.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joost Herman</td>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.herman@rug.nl">j.herman@rug.nl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliano Fiori</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td><a href="mailto:J.Fiori@savethechildren.org.uk">J.Fiori@savethechildren.org.uk</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>Kyla Reid</td>
<td>GSMA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:krey@gsma.com">krey@gsma.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Savage</td>
<td>World Vision International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kevin_savage@wvi.org">kevin_savage@wvi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Scriven</td>
<td>Humanitarian Innovation Fund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:K.Scriven@savethechildren.org.uk">K.Scriven@savethechildren.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa Fast</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Larissa.A.Fast.1@nd.edu">Larissa.A.Fast.1@nd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Maramis</td>
<td>The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Secretariat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larry.maramis@ASEAN.org">larry.maramis@ASEAN.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Frey</td>
<td>The Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:advocacy.usa@cashlearning.org">advocacy.usa@cashlearning.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamadou Ndiaye</td>
<td>L’Office Africaine pour le Développement et la Coopération (OFADEC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mndiaye@ofadec.org">mndiaye@ofadec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margarita Marin Jaramillo</td>
<td>Centro de Recursos de Análisis de Conflictos (CERAC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:margarita.marin@cerac.org.co">margarita.marin@cerac.org.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna Olinger</td>
<td>Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marianna.olienger@gmail.com">marianna.olienger@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marieke Hounjet</td>
<td>Start Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:M.Hounjet@savethechildren.org.uk">M.Hounjet@savethechildren.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Foran</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.Foran@nyumc.org">Mark.Foran@nyumc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marzia Montemurro</td>
<td>International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Marzia@icva.ch">Marzia@icva.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcel Vaessen</td>
<td>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vaessen@un.org">vaessen@un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Barber</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjpbaber@btinternet.com">mjpbaber@btinternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Yarow</td>
<td>African Energy Commission (AFREC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myarow@afrec.org">myarow@afrec.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustakim Waid</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs &amp; International Cooperation, Government of Somalia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mustakim.waid@gmail.com">mustakim.waid@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan Buzard</td>
<td>International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nan.buzard@icvanetwork.org">nan.buzard@icvanetwork.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuur Mohamud Sheekh</td>
<td>Rift Valley Institute</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nuursheekh@yahoo.com">nuursheekh@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Özlem Sila Talay</td>
<td>Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency of Turkey (AFAD)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sila.talay@afad.gov.tr">sila.talay@afad.gov.tr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Komujuni</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister, Uganda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pammumis@yahoo.com">pammumis@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Gibbons</td>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.gibbons@ucd.ie">p.gibbons@ucd.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia McIreavy</td>
<td>InterAction</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmcireavy@interaction.org">pmcireavy@interaction.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Howe</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paul.howe@wfp.org">paul.howe@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Knox Clarke</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.knox-clarke@ainap.org">p.knox-clarke@ainap.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walker</td>
<td>Feinstein International Center (FIC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peter.walker@tufts.edu">peter.walker@tufts.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Tamminga</td>
<td>Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philip.tamminga@schr.info">philip.tamminga@schr.info</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Scott</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.scott@oecd.org">rachel.scott@oecd.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmawati Husein</td>
<td>Disaster Management Center (MDMC)/Univ. Muhammadiyah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amahusein@umy.ac.id">amahusein@umy.ac.id</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Akbari</td>
<td>Dimagi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rakbari@dimagi.com">rakbari@dimagi.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Chin</td>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sally.Chin@oxfaminternational.org">Sally.Chin@oxfaminternational.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Aviles</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandra.aviles@fao.org">sandra.aviles@fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandrine Tiller</td>
<td>Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) International</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sandrine.Tiller@london.msf.org">Sandrine.Tiller@london.msf.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bailey</td>
<td>Consultant on Humanitarian Issues</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarahbaileyk@gmail.com">sarahbaileyk@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cechvala</td>
<td>CDA Collaborative Learning Projects</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scechvala@cdainc.com">scechvala@cdainc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sema Genel</td>
<td>Support to Life</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgenel@supporttolife.org">sgenel@supporttolife.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semhar Araia</td>
<td>Diaspora African Women’s Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:semhar@dawners.org">semhar@dawners.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sezin Tuna</td>
<td>Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency of Turkey (AFAD)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sezin.tuna@afad.gov.tr">sezin.tuna@afad.gov.tr</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivanka Dhanapala</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhanapal@unhcr.org">dhanapal@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Swithern</td>
<td>Development Initiatives</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sophia.swithern@devinit.org">sophia.swithern@devinit.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Ndhlouvu</td>
<td>International Federation of the Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stanley.ndhlouvu@ifrc.org">stanley.ndhlouvu@ifrc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern Kita</td>
<td>Department of Disaster Management Affairs, Malawi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stenkita@gmail.com">stenkita@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephane Bonamy</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanebonamy@me.com">stephanebonamy@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Yanga</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.yanga@wfp.org">thomas.yanga@wfp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udo Janz</td>
<td>Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janz@unhcr.org">janz@unhcr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvashi Aneja</td>
<td>Jindal Global University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uaneja@jgu.edu.in">uaneja@jgu.edu.in</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPEAKERS AND PANELISTS, DECEMBER 12 SYMPOSIUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ahmed Mohammed Almeraikhi</td>
<td>Qatar Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassador Bruno Figueroa</td>
<td>Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Claus Sørensen</td>
<td>European Community Humanitarian Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Daniel W. Baker</td>
<td>Accenture Development Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Miliband</td>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hannah Pool</td>
<td>Talks &amp; Debates, Southbank Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jamie Zimmerman</td>
<td>New America Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Misikir Tilahun</td>
<td>Africa Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patrick Meier</td>
<td>Qatar Computing Research Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ORGANIZERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hansjoerg Strohmeyer</td>
<td>Chief, Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) (UNOCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Gelsdorf</td>
<td>Chief, Policy Analysis and Innovation Section Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) (UNOCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rania Hadra</td>
<td>Policy Development and Studies Branch (PDSB) (UNOCHA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX X: SPEAKER BIOGRAPHIES

PANELISTS

Ambassador Bruno Figueroa
Ambassador Bruno Figueroa is the Director General for International Development Cooperation at the Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID).

Mr. Figueroa has been a member of the Mexican Foreign Service since 1987. In his last postings abroad he was Deputy Permanent Representative to the OECD (2007-2010) and Consul General of Mexico in San Jose, California (2004-2007). He has been Chief of Staff and Deputy Representative at the Mexican Embassy in Austria, and Press Attaché at the Mexican Embassy in France. He was Counsellor to the Minister of Foreign Affairs (2001–2004).

Mr. Figueroa holds a degree in International Relations from El Colegio de Mexico and a Master’s degree from the National School of Administration in France. He holds diplomas from the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna and The Hague Academy of International Law. He has given courses and conferences at several universities and is the author of articles on international affairs.

He is now Director General for AMEXCID, whose main responsibility is to promote bilateral and multilateral cooperation in technical and scientific matters, as well as academic mobility from and to Mexico. Prior to this posting, Mr. Figueroa was Chief of Staff of the Executive Director of AMEXCID (2010-2013).

Dr. Ahmed Mohammed Almeraikhi
Dr. Ahmed Almeraikhi is the Director of International Development Department, at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Qatar. He also serves as the Director-General of Qatar Development Fund, as well as Chief Executive Officer for Social and Sports Activities Support Fund.

Dr. Almeraikhi has a PhD in Project Management and an MSc. in engineering management from Sheffield Hallam University in the UK, and a B.Sc. in Mechanical Engineering from Qatar University.

Dr. Almeraikhi has managed key strategic international projects for the State of Qatar. He has memberships in key strategic committees nationally, regionally and internationally. He has represented the State of Qatar in international conferences related to international development and charitable work.
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Dr. Almeraikhi has managed key strategic international projects for the State of Qatar. He has memberships in key strategic committees nationally, regionally and internationally. He has represented the State of Qatar in international conferences related to international development and charitable work.
Mr. Claus Sørensen

Mr. Claus Sørensen is the Director-General of the Directorate-General of Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), a position he has held since August 2011. From 2006 to 2011, he served as Director-General of the Directorate-General for Communication.

Other positions held by Mr. Sørensen include Head of Cabinet for European Commissioner Fischer Boel (agriculture and rural development) and Head of Cabinet for Commissioner Poul Nielson’s Cabinet (development). He was also a member of Commissioner Anita Gradin’s Cabinet (Fight against fraud, organized crime, corruption, IGC-96, foreign relations, enlargement, social & labour market policy, agriculture, fisheries) and a member of Commissioner Henning Christophersen’s Cabinet (Maastricht Treaty, Financial Institutions, International Economic Affairs, Environment, Internal Market, Social & Labour Market Policy).

He served as Director for the Directorate-General of Environment of the European Commission, where he also previously served as Head of Unit for International Affairs.

Mr. Sørensen has held the positions of Counsellor at the Danish Permanent Representation in Brussels and served at the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Copenhagen. He was the First Secretary at the Danish Delegation to OECD, Paris: Chairman of the W.P. of the Trade Committee, Representative to the Economic and Development Review Committee, UNCTAD V & VI (Belgrade, Geneva, New York).

Mr. Sørensen holds a Masters of Economic Science from the University of Aarhus, where he has also served as a lecturer at the Aarhus School of Architecture. He has held the position of lecturer at the University of Copenhagen.

Mr. Sørensen is married and has two children.

Mr. David Miliband

Mr. David Miliband is the President and CEO of the International Rescue Committee. He assumed this role on 1 September 2013. Mr. Miliband has had a distinguished political career in the United Kingdom over the last 15 years, and he resigned as Member of Parliament for South Shields on 27 March 2013. From 2007 to 2010, he served as the youngest UK Foreign Secretary in three decades, driving advancements in human rights and representing the United Kingdom throughout the world. As Secretary of State for the Environment, he pioneered the world’s first legally binding emissions-reduction requirements.

He was Minister for Communities and Local Government (2005–2006); Minister for Schools (2002–2004); and Head of Downing Street’s Number 10 Policy Unit (1997–2001). He is Co-Chair of the Global Ocean Commission.

Mr. Miliband graduated from Oxford University in 1987 with a first-class degree in philosophy, politics and economics, and received his Master’s degree in political science in 1989 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which he attended as a Kennedy Scholar.

He is married to the violinist Louise Shackleton, and they have two sons.
Mr. Misikir Tilahun

Mr. Misikir Tilahun is the Head of Programmes for Africa Humani-
tarian Action (AHA), a continental non-governmental humanitarian
organization based in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

AHA was founded in 1994 to provide primary health-care
assistance to displaced communities and survivors of genocide
in Rwanda. Since its founding, AHA has worked in various conflict
and post-conflict zones of Africa, in partnership with national,
regional and international bodies, providing life-saving services to
millions of vulnerable, displaced and crisis-affected communities.
To date, AHA has reached displaced populations and host com-
munities in as many as 19 countries. It is currently a recognized
continental humanitarian organization providing health care,
shelter, nutrition, WASH, livelihoods and other vital services to
refugees and IDPs in Africa.

Mr. Tilahun joined AHA’s head office in 2008 to strengthen the
organization’s policy and advocacy work. Currently, he provides
support and oversight to AHA’s 11 country offices. He leads AHA’s
advocacy work with national Governments, as well as regional,
continental and international bodies such as the African Union and
the United Nations. He serves on the governing board of the In-
ternational Council of Voluntary Agencies, a Geneva-based global
coalition of humanitarian NGOs.

Prior to joining AHA, Mr. Tilahun practiced law as a business
litigation attorney in Phoenix, Arizona. He has a Doctor of Juris-
prudence (2005) and a B.A. in Political Science and International
Relations (2001) from the University of Kansas, USA.
Dr. Patrick Meier

Dr. Patrick Meier is an internationally recognized thought leader on the application of new technologies for positive social change. Dr. Meier is Director of Social Innovation at the Qatar Computing Research Institute (QCRI) where he develops and prototypes Next Generation Humanitarian Technologies using social computing, big-data analytics, artificial intelligence and machine learning.

He co-founded and co-directed Harvard’s Program on Crisis Mapping & Early Warning and served as Director of Crisis Mapping at Ushahidi. Mr. Meier co-founded CrisisMappers, Digital Humanitarians and Standby Task Force. He has consulted extensively for several international organizations including the United Nations and the World Bank.

Mr. Meier is an accomplished speaker, having given talks at the White House, the UN, Google, Harvard, Stanford and MIT. He has presented at major international conferences, including the Skoll World Forum, Club de Madrid, Mobile World Congress, PopTech, Where 2.0, TTI/Vanguard, SXSW and several TEDx’s.

He is a distinguished scholar, holding a PhD from The Fletcher School, a Pre-Doctoral Fellowship from Stanford University, an MA from Columbia University and EAP from UC Berkeley. Patrick has given numerous guest lectures and taught several professional, graduate and undergraduate courses. He writes the widely respected iRevolution blog and tweets at @patrickmeier.

Mr. Daniel W. Baker

Mr. Dan Baker is the Global Lead for Program Innovation at Accenture Development Partnerships (ADP), a ring-fenced not-for-profit consulting group within Accenture. ADP’s main focus is bringing affordable business and technology expertise to the international development sector and promoting private-sector engagement in sustainable development. Dan has over 15 years’ experience at Accenture delivering projects including business strategy, change management and technology. During his time with ADP, Dan has brokered, delivered or managed numerous projects ranging from programme strategy, private-sector engagement, ICT for development and disaster response.

In addition to his programme innovation role, Mr. Baker has drawn upon his experience working in south-east Asia after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami to coordinate Accenture’s contributions to Haiti’s recovery and development following the 2010 earthquake. This has included the design and delivery of 12 projects with the Government of Haiti, multilateral donors and NGOs, totalling over 2,400 consulting days; representing Accenture in the Clinton Global Initiative Haiti Action Network; providing input to the World Economic Forum report: “Private Sector Development in Haiti: Opportunities for Investment, Job Creation and Growth”; and leading a CEO roundtable on recovery and economic development in Haiti.
**Ms. Jamie Zimmerman**

Ms. Jamie M. Zimmerman is Director of the Global Assets Project at the New America Foundation. The project, which launched in 2006, aims to inform, advance and stimulate new thinking and innovations in policy and practice towards global poverty reduction. Her current areas of focus include, but are not limited to, social protection policy, child and youth savings policies, foreign aid reform, financial inclusion of the poor, asset building among excluded and marginalized populations, gender issues, and the role of technology in global development.

Ms. Zimmerman is a leading voice on open-data sharing for development innovations with the design and launch of the Saving for the Poor Innovation and Knowledge Network (SPINNAKER) in 2010 and, more recently, the Global Savings & Social Protection (GSSP) Initiative in 2011. GSSP is the largest global data platform evaluating opportunities for financial inclusion through government-to-person (G2P) cash transfers. Her work on G2P has inspired a global movement toward cashless payment systems, the United Nation’s Better than Cash Alliance.

Ms. Zimmerman speaks frequently and advises on asset building and global development, both domestically and abroad. Her writing has appeared in outlets such as *CNN*, *The Daily Beast*, *Yale Global*, *Enterprise Development & Microfinance*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, *Foreign Policy Magazine* and *AOL News*.

Ms. Zimmerman was the Associate Director of Globalization Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill’s Kenan Institute of Private Enterprise, where she conducted research on the relationship between international trade, human rights and corporate social responsibility. That research lead to the 2007 co-authored book *Trade Imbalance: the Struggle to Weigh Human Rights Concerns in Trade Policymaking*, published by Cambridge University Press.

Ms. Zimmerman has worked as an international trade consultant in São Paulo, Brazil, and with non-profit micro-enterprise development groups in Urubamba, Peru. She is a graduate of the University of Kentucky, where she also earned a Master’s degree in international political economy and international development from the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce.

---

**MODERATOR**

**Ms. Hannah Pool**

Journalist, author and commentator Hannah Pool writes regularly in the national and international media.

Ms. Pool has written features, interviews and comment for *The Guardian* for over a decade. Ms. Pool’s work also appears in *The Times*, *Grazia*, *ARISE* magazine and others.

Ms. Pool is a curator of talks and debates at Africa Utopia and WOW festivals at the Southbank Centre and Chair of UKFeminista.

Ms. Pool’s book, *My Fathers’ Daughter: A story of family and belonging*, is a memoir of her journey back to Eritrea to find her birth family. Published in the UK (Penguin), the US (Free Press), France and Holland to critical acclaim, *My Fathers’ Daughter* was described by the *Washington Post* as “a significant and moving book.”

A regular contributor to BBC Radio, a speaker at TedxEuston, *Africa Writes* and *Africa Gathering*, Ms. Pool was recently the subject of CNN’s African Voices, a 30-minute interview looking at her writing career to date.