



WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT

First High-Level Panel Grand Bargain Meeting 29 February 2016, Amsterdam Summary Report

Minister Ploumen and panel co-chair Georgieva opened the meeting calling for participants to focus on delivering concrete, actionable commitments that will improve humanitarian response delivery. Minister Ploumen stressed that in the face of financial crises and constraints alongside increasing needs, it was critical to redouble our commitment to both efficiency and effectiveness. Both emphasized the importance of designing a grand bargain that balances urgency against technical thoroughness in building a better response for people in need and the humanitarian aid workers serving them. They also acknowledged that most of the issues in the Grand Bargain were not new, but the Summit opportunity and the Grand Bargain can provide the political momentum to finally make meaningful progress in these areas.

Co-chair Georgieva outlined the process that led to the formation of the Grand Bargain sherpas group. She highlighted the difficult choices taken in an effort to ensure both efficiency and inclusiveness in the Sherpa group. She then called for participants to not think in terms of 'red lines', but to focus on overcoming obstacles to high-performance, looking first inside their own institutions to make significant changes. She echoed Minister Ploumen in emphasizing the need for courage and leadership, and identifying what can be done rather than focusing on the challenges. In laying out the path ahead, she encouraged participants to focus on ten measurable 'commitments' as outlined in the report to take forward before the summit, to prioritize, and to develop clear and ambitious indicators to measure progress on. She also called for participants to champion specific commitments. Based on the group discussions following donor and organization presentations, she proposed merging two commitments related to management efficiency and adding the humanitarian/development divide, including stabilization and peacebuilding as a commitment to be tackled by the sherpas group. More than half the participants indicated their strong support for this recommendation, and thus it has been added. Lastly she outlined possible outcome and shape of the Grand Bargain by the Summit, suggesting it could include a set of principles that underpin collaborative efficiency alongside a roadmap with clear benchmarks and indicators for ten commitments. She also encouraged participants to consider the most appropriate mechanism for monitoring commitments agreed through the Grand Bargain process and put forward suggestions by the April meeting.

Both Minister Ploumen and co-chair Georgieva highlighted their desire for greater outreach and inclusion for those who are not currently participating in the Sherpa group. Co-chair Georgieva noted the Secretariat would initiate and support outreach efforts and



link others beyond the Sherpa group to seek their contribution. Minister Ploumen's call to engage the private sector more actively in the process was echoed by other participants in the meeting, including UNICEF, ECHO and WFP.

ECHO, UK, and US made presentations on their reflections on and efforts to achieve the Grand Bargain. The UK presentation situated the Grand Bargain in the particular political moment, charting the path of growing needs, global processes in 2015, the sense of a tipping point, and the growing funding shortfall. UK also highlighted the importance of going beyond the Grand Bargain and addressing key recommendations from the other two chapters of the Panel report on shrinking the need and diversifying financing. The US gave an uplifting presentation, stressing their willingness to explore all options to achieve a Grand Bargain with meaningful impact. This included work to harmonize all non-regulatory program reporting requirements across PRM, OFDA and FFP to the fullest extent possible. The US also committed to being a change agent to improve the humanitarian system. The US and ECHO committed to improve reporting to OCHA FTS. Nonetheless, the US also noted there was more discussion needed around what proposals in the Grand Bargain will result in the biggest improvement and impact, and welcomed the opportunity to continue that conversation. ECHO broadly agreed with the US presentation, reaffirming their openness to explore all possible options and proposals in the Grand Bargain with no red lines. All donors noted the once in a generation nature of the summit, and the importance of seizing the moment to attempt bold changes that might otherwise not be possible.

UNHCR, ICRC, and WFP made presentations on the agency side. Each agency presented some best practice in collaborative efficiency as well as challenge areas where they were committed to make individual improvements that would have a positive impact on their partners and humanitarian outcomes. UNHCR highlighted their extensive efforts to reduce overheads costs at HQ, while simultaneously increasing delivery and response at the field level. With regard to supporting national front line responders, UNHCR committed to raise their level of direct support to 20% by 2020. They also reaffirmed their commitment to scale up cash-based assistance and support common services approach to reduce costs. With regard to transparency, UNHCR highlighted their individual efforts and updated participants on the various consideration they were weighing with regard to joining and regularly reporting to IATI without increasing administrative burden on their organization.

ICRC and IFRC gave a joint presentation on the work of their movement to achieve greater collaborative efficiency. This included efforts to issue joint crisis appeals for funding. ICRC also highlighted their commitment to improve on two-way community participation in their programs. ICRC also provided the group with issues to consider, including noting that joint needs assessment should still mean fewer rather than just one, that national front line responders were important, but not always the most appropriate or effective means of response, and that the notion of community engagement should be broader with an objective to also build or reinforce trust within communities. IFRC has a



special role to play as the only humanitarian agency with a mandate to build national capacity.

WFP provided a presentation that highlighted how they had considered and categorized the Grand Bargain topics, ultimately focusing on 1) localization and first responders; 2) collaboration for effectiveness; and 3) efficiency, transparency and accountability. WFP also stressed the importance of strong collaboration with government actors to reduce need. Building on the presentation and call by the IFRC for greater investment in capacity building, WFP proposed that development actors should be in the lead on such capacity building both due to the timeframe of their engagement as well as their unique skill sets. WFP gave examples of proliferation of platforms, different data structure, and lack of definitions that are inhibiting collaboration efficiency. They committed to work with others to address these challenges, but reiterated the importance of ensuring all harmonization efforts were undertaken with the clear priority to ensure operations were not impacted, and that the changes resulted in tangible benefits for people in need.

In response to the series of presentations, Germany stressed that many European countries could still do more to finance humanitarian action. She stressed that offering Islamic finance or greater efficiency as means to plug the humanitarian financing gap should not substitute for all nations shouldering their fair share of the burden to guarantee humanitarian response was adequately financed. UNDP highlighted efforts underway with OCHA to produce a think piece on bringing greater coherence between multi-year UN Development Assistance Framework plans and humanitarian response plans. OCHA announced a commitment to lower management costs on pooled funds from 3% to 2% as part of efforts to reduce overhead costs. UNRWA highlighted the different level of ambition around the target of earmarking; a common definition as a starting point that might lead to a higher level of ambition. UNRWA also stressed that predictability and timing of funding is crucial. WHO stressed the importance of how we measure outcomes as a key point to consider more deeply and the importance of having a differentiated approach to cash transfers across sectors, as there are different implications for the health sector.

Interaction welcomed the Panel approach and the need to “put some skin in the game”, but also cautioned that cutting overheads without carefully considering the value added or lost by doing so could be dangerous. Interaction called for looking careful at overhead practices, then have a more context specific and differentiated approach. UNICEF suggested a more focused appeal to improving private sector engagement, including raising social impact bonds and reducing procurement costs by leveraging our collective bargaining power. ICVA emphasized the need to support an ecosystem of diverse actors, with contextualised responses to crises, in which frontline and national responders receive adequate and timely resources. To this end he urged participants to focus on support for frontline actors, harmonized and simplified reporting, more transparency and multi-year funding.



In the afternoon participants broke up into five groups to look in greater depth at specific topics and identify ideas for reform, depending on how easily consensus could be found and reform brought forward.

1. On transparency, participants suggested there was a need to break down the workstream further. They proposed three areas of work, including contributing to common data platforms and financial transparency, harmonized/standardized reporting, and Comprehensive assessment of people's needs.
2. On first responders, participants reported back from the afternoon discussion. They proposed more support and funding to national first responders, the need to include a commitment on increased capacity building, a shared approach to partner assessment, and greater application of the principles of partnership. Workstream participants debated the virtues of the charter for change, and in particular the 20% target for national NGOs.
3. On cash-based programming, the group reaffirmed their commitment to scale up cash, but cautioned that it cannot be a panacea. They proposed monitoring cash-based programming more consistently, and welcomed to opportunity to work together for bold pilots. The group suggested referring back to the various working groups actively engaged on cash, including within the IASC and the GHD, to look at the critical issues of data, platforms, and best practices on scaling cash-based response.
4. On multi-year funding and planning, participants agreed the importance of taking it forward. UNICEF stressed the potential efficiency gains from multi-year funding. Participants debated the merits of moving closer to joint plans between humanitarian, development, and stabilization actors to facilitate common outcomes linked to multi-year funding. Dissenting opinions were raised noting the importance of safeguarding humanitarian principles, and recognizing that different actors may have divergent motivations for engaging in protracted or multi-year response and funding.
5. On less earmarking, workstream participants noted the importance of ensuring a way forward that balances justified operational exigencies and priorities against donors' obligations to tax payers. They also highlighted the strong link between lack of confidence in organizational transparency, greater government scrutiny, and higher-levels of earmarking. Sweden volunteered to get back to sherpas within 10 days with more specific examples of good and less desirable practice with regard to earmarking, and its impact on operational response.



Throughout the discussion, participants repeatedly came back to the need for sharper definitions for pivotal terms such as “impartial needs assessments”, “unearmarked or softly earmarked funding” and “national frontline responders”. After reflecting on the breakout sessions and the workstreams, participants suggested further modifications. A number of proposals were put forward to better integrate the private sector in the overall process as a participant to the Grand Bargain, with WFP suggesting engaging private sector in each of the relevant commitments, noting their role was pertinent to a variety of topics. Other proposals focused on weaving aspects of the donor letter to the IASC principals such as system wide leadership, improved appeals, and better evidence of outcomes into the existing workstreams.

Participants agreed a set of follow-up actions, including championing specific workstreams, working actively between Sherpa meetings and holding three additional meetings – the next one in mid-March in Europe [confirmed after the meeting – 18 March in Brussels], then 15 April in Washington D.C., and finally in NY in early May. The Netherlands thanked participants for their active engagement, and welcomed other participants to take over as hosts for future Grand Bargain meetings. In line with recommendations for clear transparency on the process, the Secretariat proposed to place all Grand Bargain related documents and report notes up on the WHS website as soon as possible, and to provide a generic email address to solicit inputs from those who are not in the Sherpa group. The Secretariat will also provide some FAQ and common messages to facilitate further consistent engagement and outreach beyond the Sherpas group on the Grand Bargain process.

Agenda
29 February, 2016 - Amsterdam

0900 – 0915 Opening by Minister Ploumen

0915 – 0930 Remark and guidance from VP Georgieva

The main key objectives of today's meeting are to:

- To form the Sherpa group
- To agree on the process
- To set the ambition as high as possible for the Grand Bargain deliverables for the summit

0930 – 1030 Case studies from donors – 10 minutes x 3 + 30 minutes discussion

US	by Ms. Anita Menghetti
ECHO	by Mr. Jean-Louis De Brower
UK	by Ruth Andreyeva

1030 – 1100 Coffee break

1100 – 1200 Case studies from the organizations – 10 minutes x 3 + 30 minutes discussion

ICRC	by Helen Alderson (Jemilah Mahmood from IFRC will supplement ICRC presentation)
UNHCR	by Kelly Clements
WFP	by Amir Abdulla

1200 – 1300 Group Photo followed by Lunch

1300 – 1500 The secretariat to explain the modalities of the group session
Break out in 5 groups

1. Front line responders
2. Transparency
3. Multi-year funding
4. Earmarking
5. Cash-based assistance



Front-line responders	Transparency	Multi-year funding	Earmarking	Cash-transfer programming
Australia	Japan	US	EC	UK
Turkey	Netherlands	Belgium	Sweden	Germany
Switzerland	Denmark	Norway	UAE	Canada
ICVA	World Bank	FAO	ICRC	UNHCR
IFRC	SCHR	InterAction	OCHA	IOM
WHO	WFP	UNDP	UNRWA	UNICEF
Note taker: WHSS	Note taker: NL	Note taker: WFP	Note taker: ICRC	Note taker: UK

1500 – 1530 Coffee Break

1530 – 1630 Plenary for the group discussion facilitated by Jelte van Wieren. 5 groups to report back – 5 minutes each presentation

1630 – 1700 Wrap up discussion and next steps chaired by Jelte van Wieren

First High-Level Panel Grand Bargain Meeting 29 February 2016, Amsterdam Guidance for afternoon sessions

The HLP Secretariat has drawn on the research done during the Panel report elaboration process, the input of the IASC discussion starter paper, the SG report One Humanity and the feedback of the GHD humanitarian financing workstream to identify a set of potential commitments to be discussed in the afternoon of 29 February at the first Grand Bargain meeting in Amsterdam.

Some guiding questions:

- **Is there a common understanding on the changes needed in our collective effort to achieve this result?**
- **Which of the potential commitments below resonate with participants for follow-up outside the meeting?**
- **What other potential commitments are missing?**
- **Which commitment is the most challenging?**
- **Which commitment do you think has the highest potential impact for your organization or the collective effort?**
- **How can each of you invest in the short, medium, long term to achieve this action?**
- **What incentives, investments and cultural changes are required to achieve these?**

The following topics from the Grand Bargain were seen as having a potential high-impact, and a high likelihood of success, and participants have been assigned to these afternoon breakout groups below.

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

Front-line responders

More support to national first responders, thereby promoting more local ownership and local expertise is harnessed in providing assistance

Potential commitments:

- More support and funding tools to national first responders (orgs + donors)
- More harmonized and simplified reporting requirements (org + donors)
- Charter for Change (20% of funding to national NGOs by 2020) and long-term capacity building
- A shared approach to partner assessments
- Increased support to UN-managed country-based pooled funds
- Donors should require United Nations and international humanitarian partners to engage with local actors in a spirit of equality, transparency and respect, in line with the Humanitarian Partnership Principles



Transparency

Committing to more financial transparency including reliable, real-time, prioritized, and comparable open data on the needs; reporting needs and all funding data in a timely manner to a global common data platform

Potential commitments:

- Needs should be identified objectively and holistically, and in a transparent manner across the system rather than limited by sector or status. Assessments should be systematically validated with communities and shared transparently to enhance accountability.
- Periodic functional expenditure reviews (orgs) – use of financial institutions’ expertise
- More joint and impartial needs assessments (orgs)
- Greater transparency on value for money and efficiency measures. Partnering models need to ensure cost-efficient and streamlined “flow- through” procedures to those on the front lines
- Increase transparency and visibility in the process used to determine funding requirements, costing, availability of resources and accomplishments
- Existing reporting mechanisms, such as the Financial Tracking Service, should have a compulsory and comprehensive reporting system similar to that employed by the OECD-DAC

Multi-year funding

More multi-year funding to maximize agility and appropriateness of response

Potential commitments:

- Commit to more multi-year funding, ensuring that partners budgeting and planning systems are also multi-year (orgs + donors)
- Donors should provide all funding to humanitarian crises with an appropriate time-frame of implementation, not limited by financial or calendar years
- Build greater coherence with multi-year funding and development cooperation

Earmarking

More multi-year and unearmarked funding to maximize agility and appropriateness of response

Potential commitments:

- Less earmarks to humanitarian aid organisations (donors) – an initial target for donors to remove earmarks for 30 per cent of their funds provided to humanitarian agencies by 2020.
- Reduce donor earmarking of assistance, with a significant reduction of funds earmarked below country level with an increased use of country-based pooled funds
- Increase support to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), with a target of meeting an expansion of the grant element target to 1 billion US-dollars

Cash-based assistance

Support more cash-based assistance to offer more choices to people in need while ensuring more transparent and efficient response where it is feasible

Potential commitments:

- Scale up the use of unconditional, cash-based assistance and programming linked to long-term development programming (orgs + donors)
- Develop new and appropriate mechanisms to coordinate cash (orgs + donors)
- Flexibility in cash-based funding (donors)



	Org.	Name	Title	Support	Org.	Name	Title	Support
1	USA	Anita L. Menghetti	Sr. Humanitarian Assistance Advisor		WFP	Amir Abudulla	Deputy Executive Director	Robert Opp
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	Kelly Clements	Deputy High Commissioner	Dona Tarpey, Director Donor Relations and Resource Mobilisation
3	United Kingdom	Ruth Andreyeva	Deputy Director, CHASE	Joanna Macrae, Head of Humanitarian Policy Team	UNICEF	Afshan Khan	Director, Emergency Programmes	
4	Germany	Eltje Aderhold	Head of the Humanitarian Division in the Federal Foreign Office		ICRC	Helen Alderson	Director of Financial Resources and Logistics	Clare Dalton, Diplomatic Adviser
5	Japan	Setsuko Kawahara	Minister/Chargé d'affaires, Netherlands		UNRWA	Richard Wright	Director, Representative Office NY	



6	Sweden	Per Orneus	Swedish Ambassador for Humanitarian Affairs		IOM	Mohammed Abdiker	Director, Department of Operations and Emergencies	
7	Canada	Christina Buchan	Director, Humanitarian Organizations and Food Assistance		OCHA	Gwi-Yeop Son	Director, Corporate Programs Division	
8	Netherlands	Joost Andriessen	Former Director Department of Stabilization and Humanitarian Aid		FAO	Daniel Gustafson	Deputy Director General (Operations)	
9	Switzerland	Edouard Jay	Deputy Head of Multilateral Humanitarian Affairs Division		WHO	Dr. Richard J. Brennan	Director, Emergency Risk Management and Humanitarian Response	
10	Norway	Reidun Otterøy	Senior Advisor, Section for Humanitarian Affairs Norwegian MOFA		UNDP	Izumi Nakamitsu	Assistant Administrator, Crisis Response Unit	
11	Australia	Tristan Slade	Counsellor (Humanitarian)		IFRC	Dr. Jemilah Mahmood	Under Secretary General - Partnerships	
12	Denmark	Stephan Schønemann	Head of the Department for Humanitarian Affairs, Civil Society and Migration		WB	Colin Bruce	Senior Adviser, the Office of the President of the World Bank Group	



13	United Arab Emirates	Sultan Al Shamsi	Assistant Undersecretary for International Development		ICVA	Faizal Perdaus	Board President	Melissa Pitotti, Senior Policy Officer
14	Belgium	Peter van Acker	Head of Humanitarian Aid		InterAction	Patricia McIlreavy	Vice President, a.i., Humanitarian Policy and Practice	
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 Member	Kristalina Georgieva	Vice President of the European Commission and HLP co-chair	Daniel Giorev, Member of Cabinet	Secretariat	Hiroko Araki	Head of Secretariat	
	Hosts, Netherlands	Jelte van Wieren	Director, MOFA	Janin Rooijackers, MOFA	Secretariat	Tensai Asfaw	Secretariat Team Member	
	Hosts, Netherlands	René van Nes	Envoy for the World Humanitarian Summit	Joost Andriessen, Program Director, MOFA	Secretariat	Nishani Jayamaha	WHS Secretariat supporting HLP	
	Hosts, Netherlands	Meyndert van der Kolk	Advisor, MOFA		Secretariat	Heiko Knoch	Secretariat Team Member	