2nd Grand Bargain Meeting
18 March, 2016 – Brussels – Hosted by ECHO
Summary Report

European Commission Senior Advisor Claus Sørensen and Panel member Danny Sriskandarajah opened the meeting by drawing attention to the opportunity presented by the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), calling for participants to commit to serious and ambitious change. Claus Sørensen stressed the importance of putting humanitarian aid modalities back on track, getting ahead of the curve on efficiency and financing to meet the challenges of tomorrow. He urged all participants to do their best and to work between now and the next Sherpa meeting, to be held in Washington, D.C. in mid-April, in order to come to specific commitments.

Danny Sriskandarajah recalled the Panel report title – *"Too Important to Fail"* – reminding participants of the high-stakes for those in need, the high-expectations from civil society for the Grand Bargain (GB) process, and urged participants to make this historic opportunity count. Speaking also for Panel members not present, he highlighted how incredibly important and reassuring it is for them to have this meeting. He highlighted that the Panel had thought long and hard as to how to title the report. He encouraged participants to consider the road ahead, and how progress could be monitored beyond the Summit, seeking ideas for a truly multi-stakeholder follow-up process. Panel co-chair Kristalina Georgieva encouraged participants to aim high and to be specific.

Following the Opening, participants then split into five breakout groups in order to discuss: 1) Reducing Management Costs and Functional Reviews; 2) Joint needs assessments; 3) Participation Revolution; 4) Harmonized Reporting; and 5) Humanitarian/Development Divide. As this was the first time each of these teams had met, the conversation provided a valuable starting point for further work before the next Sherpa meeting in Washington, D.C. scheduled for 15 April.

Reporting back to the plenary by the co-champions on the discussions held within the various breakout groups in the morning, each presentation stressed the strong linkages between the 10 topics of the GB.

UNHCR and Japan highlighted observations that were made during the group discussion on **reducing management costs and functional reviews**. Overall, they noted the linkages between their workstream and the other topics of the GB and the need for differentiation in recommendations based on the category of humanitarian organization in question. Specifically, the co-champions pointed out common grounds in the following areas: reducing duplication through improved efficiencies by looking closely at

procurement processes; harmonizing partnership agreements recognizing specific needs; considering a normative framework for beneficiary data (reference was made to the UNHCR/WFP model); enhancing the use of technology to quantify efficiency gains; moving towards joint regular functional performance reviews with donors; efforts to share best practices on performance and results-based management; and the importance to accelerate the move towards more harmonized cost structures allowing comparison amongst different agencies. Regarding the latter point, the USA clarified that the issue is not overhead costs per se, but underlined the need for transparency.

On **joint needs assessment** – ECHO highlighted the need of a model that allows all stakeholders, donors, UN, member of UN country teams and others to share needs assessments that are comprehensive, transparent, based on set of data, subject to quality check, rapidly available and regularly updated. These needs assessments should be context sensitive and also include development needs. They need to be designed in a way so that they could feed into prioritization process when preparing funding appeals. ECHO requested greater efforts to draw out the linkages between the 10 workstreams of the GB, and attempt to explain the net effect of the changes proposed if all are implemented. In response to the observation from ECHO that questions of quality governance connect or underpin all the dots of the GB, the World Bank suggested that participants should study models from the development community to create effective, accountable, and independent governance structures. Panel co-chair Kristalina Georgieva later requested the World Bank to prepare a presentation or paper to help participants look at best practice in governance (review from an independent entity) from the development community.

Germany suggested that other actors are required to get a full picture of needs, and proposed including climate change and stabilization actors in assessing needs of people. OCHA pointed to deficit of confidence regarding data although improvements are being made. Multiple participants also linked the quality of needs assessment and a credible prioritization process that would follow it. With regard to collective outcomes and the link to more comprehensive needs assessment, UNDP, UNICEF and others noted the importance of building upon existing processes and tools. IOM noted that burdensome existing or new processes can at times hinder rapid humanitarian response. WFP questioned whether separating the functions of needs assessment and delivery of assistance would actually result in improvement of the former. ICRC sounded a note of caution, reminding participants that while a move towards greater coherence is certainly desirable and welcome, we are not part of one system, and we need to consider how to leverage our diversity to ensure the right decisions are taken at the strategic level.

Discussion then ensued around the **participation revolution** workstream. UNICEF briefed participants, highlighting the decision to reframe the topic, acknowledging the need for a paradigm shift to ensure greater accountability to affected people. UNICEF then presented the main areas of systemic change needed – at the leadership, programmatic, and funding decision-making processes. Sweden supplemented the presentation, stressing that the humanitarian system cannot be led by force, and needs to

be guided instead by the voices of affected communities to salvage credibility. While this workstream does not have a donor co-champion, Sweden volunteered to prepare a paper on the topic.

ICVA and Germany presented on the **harmonized reporting** discussion, noting the group agreement to focus on what is needed and to convene a group meeting in mid-April in order to take stock of existing best practice, and to chart a way forward on harmonization. ICVA noted that while the workstream participants plan to present analysis on the most burdensome parts of reporting, and ambitious ideas to simplify and harmonize, they agreed that a collective commitment to a process and a timetable for achieving these changes was just as important. Thus far, the group identified three main principles – proportionality, simplification and harmonization – on which potential commitments could be built.

Claus Sørensen stressed the importance of ensuring that any effort to harmonize should still allow for greater detail to be available for parliaments and others upon demand. Sweden reminded that parliaments are part of a political process, and this process and the Summit are opportunities to make political change. It should allow for us to change the discourse to focus more on accountability to affected people, greater efficiency, and other priorities in exchange for less reporting. The USA reiterated how seriously they were taking the GB process, and their willingness to consider proposals coming out of it. VOICE offered to support ECHO and other donors to approach parliaments together in order to make any necessary legislative changes. The Netherlands and Germany echoed the calls to ensure reporting is fit-for-purpose, and no more than the minimum needed to support humanitarian decision-making and parliamentary oversight.

Denmark and UNDP presented on the **humanitarian development divide**. Workstream participants agreed that the WHS is a window of opportunity to define how donors and aid organizations will work over the next 15 years to bridge the divide. They considered that the topic is cross-cutting to the GB discussion. Participants aimed to unpack the many interwoven topics of the development-humanitarian nexus. They agreed to develop concrete commitments to really achieve a paradigm shift to transcend the humanitarian development gap. They also noted the links to the multi-year planning and funding workstream. They stressed the need to agree on a results-based framework. This should not just be about the humanitarian actors reforming towards incorporating development assistance, but also the development actors opening up towards the humanitarian space. Finally, noting the participants of this workstream are mostly humanitarian, they suggested it is important to involve the multilateral development banks, possibly in a teleconference before next Sherpa meeting. In considering the presentation and the links to the SG report's call to move towards more joint outcomes, ICRC highlighted the tension between shared goals and principled action. Germany reiterated the call to think more broadly in linking response, stating there are four communities, not two, if one considers climate change and stabilization as another two that are hugely linked to development and humanitarian action. Germany called for much more detail and specificity around what we want to achieve, who we want to work with, and why in order

to guarantee success in this workstream. Turkey called on participants to prepare a matrix capturing all relevant entities' capacities. UNDP reminded participants there were 30 or so specific recommendations in their draft paper that could be further grouped, refined, and form the basis of concrete action. The co-chair Claus Sørensen stressed the importance of risk-informed development programming.

Participants then discussed the five topics from Amsterdam in breakout groups, and came back to the plenary to present their progress.

On **frontline responders**, IFRC pointed out that initially the group came up with a set of commitments. The group, however, ultimately chose to focus on the following overarching approach with the aim to have three commitments: 1) increase funding available for frontline responders; 2) improved access to funding mechanisms; and 3) investments in capacity strengthening. IFRC also recalled UNHCR's commitment announced in Amsterdam to increase from 12% to 20%, the percentage of its programe costs directly transferred to national NGOs, and asked the group about establishing similar measurable targets. Switzerland refereed to the 2030 agenda and how affected communities themselves could be part of the overall process.

On **transparency**, participants noted common platforms, shared standards, clear mapping of transaction chains, adequate information for the public to hold organizations to account, and enough data for rapid decision making as priorities for consideration. Participants identified the importance of agreeing a standard format for data sharing before Istanbul as one key target. IATI could be the standard format. To make this work, all actors involved need solid information on how to use IATI. Participants also agreed that a focused discussion is necessary on the comparative advantage of FTS and IATI and ideally clear ideas whether and how to link the two up need to be presented at the next Sherpa meeting in Washington, D.C. Co-chairs agreed to contact IATI and FTS to allow for an informed decision on what to recommend or where to invest. Duplications of reporting needs to be avoided. Participants also noted risks and limitations to transparency, and the need to adhere to principle of confidentiality and do no harm to limit sharing of sensitive data.

The USA and FAO presented on **multi-year planning and funding**, noting it is mostly a tool linked to better needs assessment/prioritization, humanitarian development divide, and transparency. They noted that clear definitions are needed regarding what constitutes multi-year funding. The group agreed to hold further discussions via teleconference in order to have commitments ready by the next Sherpa meeting in Washington DC.

Sweden and ICRC presented on **earmarking**, noting it is at the heart of the question of whether to finance results or collective outcomes. Sweden reiterated the suggestion of a minimum of 30% in unearmarked humanitarian funding by all donors by 2020. Participants noted the importance of recognizing progress, and of incentivizing this move

with greater recognition for donors providing such funding. They once again reiterated the links to success in this workstream and confidence from actions taken in other workstreams.

On **cash,** the UK reported back noting a remarkable degree of consensus in the group discussions. Participants praised the preparatory work done by the co-champions, and the effort to build on existing work in this area. In brief, UK noted agreement in five areas: general scaling up of the use of cash; continued trialing/piloting to take best practices to scale; monitoring/reporting/tracking effectiveness of cash programming; results and impact at outcome level; and explore collective risk management and ownership.

In wrapping up and closing the meeting, Panel co-chair Kristalina Georgieva asked participants to share their inputs and suggested language for the GB document with the HLP Secretariat by 1st of April. Furthermore, she requested the World Bank to produce a paper or presentation by the next meeting on leadership and governance models in the development financing world that could be relevant to this group. She also welcomed inputs from the group regarding potential follow-up mechanisms pertaining to the agreed upon GB commitments, i.e. whether the Sherpa group, a subset of this group or champions should continue to meet after the WHS twice a year.

Finally she circulated a table with workstreams of the Panel beyond the GB, and encouraged those who are interested to get engaged in them (see annex 3). She invited those who will be in Washington, D.C. for the next Sherpa meeting to an European Union/World Bank event, to be held on Thursday, 14 April from 10:30–12:00, focusing on budget and results. Claus Sørensen encouraged participants to connect the dots, and to rebuild the bargain approach in the final Istanbul document, drawing out the links between the various GB parts. Co-chair Kristalina Georgieva also encouraged participants to think about how a signing ceremony at the Summit might look like, and to offer suggestions on the choreography at or before the next Sherpa meeting on 15 April.

Annex 1

Agenda
2nd Grand Bargain Meeting

0815 – 0900 Registration / coffee
0900 – 0915 Opening by Claus Sorensen (European Commission, Senior Advisor) and Danny Sriskandarajah (HLP member)
0915 – 0930 Process explanation by the Secretariat
0930 – 1130 Group Discussion – the 5 new topics. Champions agencies and donors as below facilitating discussions.

Reduce management costs, functional reviews	**Joint Needs Assessment**	**Participation Revolution**	**Harmonized Reporting**	**Humanitarian Dev Divide**
UNHCR (2)	OCHA (2)	UNICEF (2)	Germany (2)	UNDP (2)
Japan	ECHO (2)	SCHR	ICVA (2)	Denmark (2)
Canada	USA	Switzerland	Belgium	Belgium
UNRWA	Australia	Sweden	Switzerland	UK
WFP	Netherlands	UAE	Netherlands	Norway
InterAction/VOICE	Sweden	Australia	UK	Turkey
IFRC	Canada	IFRC	IOM	InterAction/VOICE
	ICRC		ICRC	IOM
	WFP			WB
	WHO			FAO
	WB			USA
	FAO			

1130 – 1145 Coffee break
1145 – 1320 Plenary discussion facilitated by Claus Sorensen and Danny Sriskandarajah on feedback from morning sessions.
1320 – 1420 Lunch
1420 – 1500 Plenary discussion on morning topics continued, facilitated by Claus Sorensen.
1500 – 1545 5 topics/groups from Amsterdam continue discussions.
By the end of the session, each group to have suggested language [not final] for concrete commitments for Istanbul. The grouping from Amsterdam to be kept, with slight modifications, to ensure it builds on previous discussions/progress.

Front-line responders	Transparency	Multi-year funding	Earmarking	Cash-based assistance
Australia (2)	Japan	US (2)	EC	UK (2)
Turkey (2)	Netherlands (2)	Belgium	Sweden (2)	Germany
Switzerland	Denmark	Norway	UAE	Canada
ICVA	World Bank	FAO (2)	ICRC (2)	UNHCR
IFRC	SCHR	InterAction	OCHA	WFP (2)
WHO	IOM	UNDP	UNRWA	UNICEF
Belgium				

1545 – 1645 Plenary discussion on afternoon session and the way forward with Panel co-chair Kristalina Georgieva and Claus Sorensen.

1645 – 1715 Wrap-up

WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT

Annex 2
Attendance List

	Org.	Name	Title	Plus 1	Org.	Name	Title	Plus 1
1	**USA**	Anita L. Menghetti	Sr. Humanitarian Assistance Advisor	Lev Turner	**WFP**	Gordana JERGER		James HARVEY
2	**European Union**	Jean-Louis De Brouwer	Director (Operations), Directorate-General Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), European Commission	Henrike Trautmann, Head of Unit (Specific Thematic Policies)	**UNHCR**	Daniel ENDRES	Director, External Relations	Dona Tarpey, Director Donor Relations and Resource Mobilisation
3	**United Kingdom**	Ruth Andreyeva	Deputy Director, CHASE	Dylan Winder	**UNICEF**	Afshan Khan	Director, Emergency Programmes	Sibi Lawson-Marriott
4	**Germany**	Eltje Aderhold	Head of the Humanitarian Division in the Federal Foreign Office	Bjoern, Hofmann	**ICRC**	Helen Alderson	Director of Financial Resources and Logistics	Clare Dalton, Diplomatic Adviser
5	**Japan**	Tsukasa HIROTA	Director of Humanitarian Assistance and Emergency Relief Division, MOFA		**UNRWA**	Richard Wright	Director, Representative Office NY	

6	**Sweden**	Per Orneus	Swedish Ambassador for Humanitarian Affairs	Sofia CALLTORP	**IOM**	Peter VAN DER AUWERAERT		Jordan MENKVELD
7	**Canada**	Christina Buchan	Director, Humanitarian Organizations and Food Assistance	Joshua Tabah	**OCHA**	John Ging	Director, Operations	Hansjoerg Strohmeyer and Karuna Hermann
8	**Netherlands**	Joost Andriessen	Former Director Department of Stabilization and Humanitarian Aid	Jaap VAN DIGGELE	**FAO**	Sandra Aviles	Senior Advisor	Patrick JACQUESON
9	**Switzerland**	Arno Wicki	Head of Multilateral Humanitarian Affairs Division	Adrienne Schnyder	**WHO**	Rudi Coninx		
10	**Norway**	Reidun Otterøy	Senior Advisor, Section for Humanitarian Affairs Norwegian MOFA		**UNDP**	Izumi Nakamitsu	Assistant Administrator, Crisis Response Unit	Tija Kontinen-Sharp
11	**Australia**	Stephen Scott		Tristen Slade	**IFRC**	Dr. Jemilah Mahmood	Under Secretary General - Partnerships	Ivana Mrdja Nikolic
12	**Denmark**	Stephan Schønemann	Head of the Department for Humanitarian Affairs, Civil	Jette Michelsen	**WB**	Colin Bruce	Senior Adviser, the Office of the President of the World Bank Group	Maria Dimitriadou

			Society and Migration					
13	**United Arab Emirates**	Sultan Al Shamsi	Assistant Undersecretary for International Development		**ICVA**	Nan Buzzard	Board President	Melissa Pitotti, Senior Policy Officer
14	**Belgium**	Peter van Acker	Head of Humanitarian Aid	Sandrine Vanhamme	**InterAction/VOICE**	Kathrin SCHICK		Magali MOURLON
15	**Turkey**	Ambassador Hasan Ulusoy	Director General of Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Gökçe Gül Yılmaz, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	**SCHR**	Kate Halff	Executive Secretary	
	Panel Co-Chair	Kristalina Georgieva	Vice President of the European Commision and HLP co-chair	Daniel Giorev, Member of Cabinet	**Secretariat**	Hiroko Araki	Head of Secretariat	
	Panel Member	Danny Sriskandarajah	Secretary General, CIVICUS		**Secretariat**	Tensai Asfaw	Secretariat Team Member	
	Hosts, ECHO	Sorensen Claus	Senior Advisor, European Commission		**Secretariat**	Nishani Jayamaha	WHS Secretariat supporting HLP	
	Hosts, ECHO	Florika Fink-Hooijer		Joachime Nason	**Secretariat**	Heiko Knoch	Secretariat Team Member	

Annex 3

HLP Work Streams Beyond Grand Bargain

RECOMENDATIONS	Stakeholders	Champions in Panel & HLP Secretariat		State of Play/Comment
GRAND BARGAIN	15 top donors + Turkey + 15 top agencies/IASC members	Kristalina Danny Margot	Hiroko Tensai	1st meeting of Sherpas in Amsterdam (29th February) with broad principles and champions set-up 2nd meeting in Brussels 18 March 3rd meeting in DS on 14-15 April 4th final meeting in NY in 9-12 May period
GENEROSITY INDEX	Brookings – ready to help Netherlands – working on it OECD – confirmed interest	Danny Kristalina	Tensai	• Brookings and OECD ready to help • NL and Danny working on concept
ISLAMIC SOCIAL FINANCE	World Bank, Norwegian Refugee Council	HRH	Cammy	• Sukuk and Zakat pilots to be presented at WHS
IDA REFORM AND REPLENISHMENT	World Bank President, World Bank Board, IDA WB Vice-President, Member States	Kristalina Trevor	Hiroko	• Presentation at board of WB by KG. Conversations on-going. Further push at Spring Meetings
WORLD BANK BOARD HUMANITARIAN REPRESENTATION	World Bank, OCHA	Kristalina Trevor	Hiroko	• Need to understand how would happen. Who decides. UN SG to write to WB President?
GLOBAL COMPACT HA SEGMENT	Global Compact	Badr	Hiroko Tensai	• SMEs4H – proposal of concept and possible event at WHS • Need to link with Global Compact
INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL INSTUMENTS (e.g. Impact Bond style)	ICRC Belgium EU, UK, US UNICEF, OCHA	Kristalina Walt	Tensai	• Invitation for KG and Panel to take part in specific session at WHS • Discussions with EU and BE to see how EU and other MS can join Impact Bond type approaches
MICRO-LEVIES	FIFA (?); FACEBOOK, SPOTIFY, TWITTER, UBER OECD Germany (?)	Kristalina HRH	Tensai	• Several conversations with FIFA. Letter sent to new President. Waiting feedback • No reaction from other companies • OECD interested to help with study if needed
PARTNERSHIP WITH PRIVATE SECTOR/MEDIA	Indiegogo DEC & Global Alliance UK Gordon Brown	Badr Hadeel Kristalina	Tensai David	• Work on-going for a pilot between Indiegogo and Global Alliance for joint appeals. Ideally need to find donor to match appeals + media to multiply • Conversations with Gordon Brown and UK on education in emergencies platform
INSURANCE AND FISCAL SPACE	China G20	Linah	Hiroko	• China Presidency G20 priority. See if can deliver by WHS ; UNISDR showcase

PERCENTAGE TARGET OF ODA DEDICATED TO FRAGILE COUNTRIES/SITUATIONS	UK, EU, Norway (?), Sweden (?) SDG Special Rep Nabarro, The Elders	Kristalina Hadeel Margot	Hiroko David	• Need to get donor commitment at WHS to dedicate X% of ODA to situations of fragility/fragile countries.