

# FOCUS

## EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

Today's crises are increasingly complex and the number of people in need worldwide is rising as a consequence of man-made and natural disasters.

The EU is focusing on finding a response to these crises and the humanitarian-development nexus is seen as the tool for reinforcing the links between the two sectors, increasing the complementarity of their actions in order to address the root causes of the crises and reduce needs. But what are the challenges and the opportunities of this approach? We have asked our NGO members to contribute to the debate on this important topic.

After a quick overview of the history and the key definitions to introduce the nexus approach, ADRA Denmark opens this edition by writing about the Danish Strategy for development policy and humanitarian action, identifying the positive elements that could inspire the EU approach while also highlighting its limits. Several of our members analyse the nexus from a different perspective: Tearfund writes about localisation as a key strategy in connecting humanitarian and development programming while World Vision analyses the financial aspect of the nexus and the importance of multi-year planning and funding. The International Rescue Committee explains their view on cash-based assistance as a way to bridge humanitarian and development programmes.

For the 'View on the EU', Care EU and Care France question whether EU trust funds represent the best modality for the humanitarian-development nexus.

To better understand the EU's work on the nexus, we have interviewed Ms Cabral, Head of the Unit for Fragility and Resilience in the Directorate General for International Cooperation and Development of the European Commission. Together we discussed the nexus, the EU's new Strategic Approach to Resilience, and the 6 pilot countries chosen to start the operationalisation of the nexus.

Finally, the "Field focus" is written by Norwegian Church Aid and concerns Darfur and the critical situation of this protracted crisis.






### VOICE

VOICE stands for 'Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies'. VOICE is a network of 84 non-governmental organisations (NGOs) active in humanitarian aid worldwide. VOICE is the main NGO interlocutor on EU humanitarian affairs and disaster risk reduction and it promotes the values of humanitarian NGOs.

AUSTRIA	
	
	
	

DENMARK	
	
	
	

GERMANY	
	
	
	
	
	
	



SWITZERLAND	
	
	

THE NETHERLANDS	
	
	
	

BELGIUM	
	
	
	

FINLAND	
	

GREECE	
	

IRELAND	
	

UNITED KINGDOM	
	
	
	
	
	


	
	
	

LUXEMBOURG	
	

NORWAY	
	

CZECH REPUBLIC	
	

FRANCE	
	
	
	
	
	

POLAND	
	

SPAIN	
	
	

SWEDEN	
	
	

ITALY	
	
	
	

SLOVAKIA	
	

## EDITORIAL

*Nicolas Borsinger, VOICE President* ..... page 5

## THE ISSUE

### EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

The humanitarian-development nexus infographic  
*VOICE* ..... page 6

The experience of Danish CSOs  
with the humanitarian-development nexus  
*Helene Ellemann-Jensen, Programme Director, ADRA Denmark* ..... page 7

Localisation: the key to connecting humanitarian  
and development programming  
*Lauren Kejeh, Humanitarian Impact & Learning Officer, TearFund* ..... page 8

Humanitarian-Development Nexus: NGO solutions in the transition  
period towards flexible, predictable, multi-year funding  
*Ludovic Wahis, Policy and Communication Officer, World Vision* ..... page 9

Taking cash to scale: a longer term impact of humanitarian  
response to crises?  
*Daphne Jayasinghe, Senior Policy and Advocacy Advisor –  
Economic Programmes, International Rescue Committee* ..... page 10

## VIEWS FROM THE FIELD

Darfur crisis: Where life-saving needs are alarmingly high  
but funding critically low  
*Gudrun Bertinussen, Head of Humanitarian Division, Norwegian Church Aid* .... page 11

## VIEWS ON THE EU

EU Trust Funds: the best modality for the humanitarian-development nexus?  
*Inge Brees, Senior EU Advocacy Officer and Claire Rouffineau,  
Senior EU Partnership Advisor, CARE International EU –  
Fanny Petitbon, Advocacy Manager, CARE France* ..... page 12

Interview with Ms. Maria-Manuela Cabral, Head of Unit for Fragility  
and Resilience, DG DEVCO, European Commission ..... page 14

Ten years of the Consensus for humanitarian aid:  
Joint messages of the Event ..... page 16

## VOICE AT WORK

..... page 18





## FROM THE VOICE PRESIDENT

Under the World Humanitarian Summit commitment “Changing People’s Lives: From Delivering Aid to Ending Need”, humanitarian actors and donors have committed to transcend the humanitarian-development divides; one outcome is the so-called “New Way of Working” for the UN and World Bank. The EU has also started to translate this commitment into concrete policy initiatives especially in protracted and long-term crisis. Together with the member states, the European Commission is indeed now working on six pilot countries to implement the humanitarian-development nexus. The Commission’s operational approach, and the tools planned to do so, will tell how serious and ready the EU is about the different international commitments it has taken. What is sure however, is that the political momentum is there, especially among member states. Expectations vis-à-vis the EU are high because of its three-fold role: important donor, policy-maker and field actor. Hence, the EU’s positioning on such a hot topic will be particularly significant.

The humanitarian-development nexus answers a genuine need for better synergies in the field but also signals a rasping reality. Indeed, the issue is not new to NGOs. Even less so since many NGOs are multi-mandated and do both humanitarian assistance and development projects.

The nexus is a genuine opportunity for organisations to work better together, build resilience, increase the participation of crisis affected population and to multiply activities on disaster risk reduction and preparedness. It is also the right time for donors to finally provide more flexibility at the implementation level: adaptation mechanisms able to answer more effectively to rapidly changing environments and more flexible financing mechanisms are sorely required. The humanitarian-development nexus is meant to go beyond Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) which has been on the NGO’s agenda for a long time. However, the approach lacked decisive political will from the EU to make a considerable difference. May the pilot countries be a turning point prior to rolling out an ambitious and in depth change of EU working methods.

The EU’s engagement in operationalising the nexus is welcome by NGOs. It is clear that the EU can count on and with NGOs, but must include them early in the process: avoid starting from scratch where there is already a lot of experience and expertise, as well as being mindful of lessons that can be learnt, must be common goals. A top down and over-institutional approach would certainly fail to reach the objectives of the Agenda for Humanity.

While the “Leave no one behind” motto can represent a point of convergence for humanitarian and development actors, the increasing complexity of crises enhances the importance of humanitarian principles and their implementation. Context-specificity is a crucial attribute in operationalising the nexus, in particular when it comes to conflict situations. The fundamental operational constraint posed by armed conflicts cannot be ignored by policy makers otherwise the nexus will be no more than another change of wording. It is therefore essential that the EU offers equal political attention to greater respect for humanitarian principles and needs based humanitarian aid on the one hand, and to the operationalisation of the nexus on the other hand.

Moreover, the broader European context might also be challenging for the success of the nexus approach. The EU is still struggling to provide a common, united and human response to the arrival of thousands of asylum seekers. The recent trend to divert development aid for migration management objectives undermines the EU objective of poverty eradication. It is thus more than likely (and rightly so) to have an impact on the “buy in” from development and humanitarian actors and partner countries in the implementation of the nexus.

Besides this political issue, the EU has put at the heart of its external policy the concept of resilience, enlarged to include state resilience. The Global Strategy aims at bringing all external policy actors including security to the table to “increase the impact of the EU external action and sustain progress towards EU development, humanitarian, foreign and security policy objectives”. The legitimacy of the EU aiming to increase the impact of its external policy cannot be disputed. At the same time, one could argue that humanitarian needs, conflict related ones in particular, are precisely a consequence (sometimes even THE consequence) of the failure of development, foreign and security policies. In this case, can humanitarian action respond to the results of these policies’ failures and at the same time be aligned with the cannons (note the double n) of those same policies? It is a reasonable question to ask.

Therefore, aiming at closer cooperation between humanitarian assistance and development activities potentially also comprise risks regarding the implementation of the humanitarian principles. The latter are not merely a doctrinal mantra of humanitarians, but quite simply the pragmatic guidelines for survival and continuity of humanitarian action in conflicts and complex contexts. Each actor’s mandate and role has therefore to be well grasped, in order to be then respected, if complementarity of interventions is to be ensured.

**Nicolas Borsinger**  
VOICE President



# The humanitarian-development nexus

## From the international frameworks to the EU implementation



### World Humanitarian Summit (WHS)

In the first WHS in 2016 humanitarian actors and donors have committed to transcend the humanitarian-development divide, to ensure that humanitarian needs are met, while at the same time risks and vulnerabilities are being reduced over multiple years, based on the comparative advantage of a diverse range of actors.



### Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

By focusing on supporting the most vulnerable people in order to Leave No One Behind, the SDGs offer new opportunities for the humanitarian aid and development communities to work better together. Many of the 169 targets (from the 17 Goals) provide potential for the nexus to be implemented. Approaches like Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience are integrated into the various goals of the SDGs.



### The UN New Way of Working

The New Way of Working (NWoW) name made its first appearance at the WHS in May 2016 under the Commitment to Action: Transcending humanitarian-development divides. It is described as a method of working encouraging partnership between humanitarian, development and peace actors. The concept of 'collective outcomes' is at the heart of the NWoW and can be described as the result that the involved actors want to have achieved at the end of a 3-5 years period in order to reduce needs, risks, and vulnerabilities.

### The Grand Bargain

Endorsed at the WHS by major aid organisations and humanitarian donors, the Grand Bargain commits its signatories to 53 engagements grouped around 10 work streams. The last work stream directly refers to the humanitarian-development nexus. Through five commitments it suggests ways forward to enhance the engagement between humanitarian and development actors notably by strengthening investment in prevention, mitigation and preparedness; performing joint multi-hazard risk and vulnerability analysis and exploring new partnerships.



The six pilot countries:  
Chad, Uganda, Sudan,  
Nigeria, Myanmar, Iraq

### A chronology of the EU policy framework

**April 2001:** European Commission (EC) Communication on Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD)  
**December 2007:** European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, (Chapter 5 on LRRD and Disaster Risk Reduction 'Continuum and contiguum')  
**October 2012:** EC Communication on the EU Approach to Resilience  
**June 2013:** Action Plan for Resilience in Crisis Prone Countries 2013-2020  
**April 2016:** EC Communication on Lives in Dignity: from Aid-dependence to Self-reliance  
**May 2017:** Council Conclusions on Operationalising the Humanitarian-Development Nexus  
**May 2017:** New European Consensus on Development  
**June 2017:** EC and European External Action Service Joint Communication on a Strategic Approach to Resilience



### Unpacking the Nexus

The complexity of today's crises, especially in the protracted, requires both development and humanitarian assistance, together with more flexible funding mechanisms and programmatic approaches. The humanitarian-development nexus is now on the EU agenda and is seen as a key tool for addressing complex and protracted crises. The nexus calls for increased coordination, joint humanitarian-development approaches and collaborative implementation, monitoring and progress tracking. In the Council conclusions on operationalising the humanitarian-development nexus, the Council recommend that the Commission and the EU Member States reinforce the links between humanitarian and development actors. They also recommend that they take forward their work in a number of pilot countries, starting with joint analyses and implementing it through coherent multi-year programming while respecting their distinctive mandates.

## THE EXPERIENCE OF DANISH CSOs WITH THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

THE ISSUE – EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

*‘As the number of displaced people in the world grows and humanitarian crises become more and more protracted, working across the humanitarian-development nexus seems more and more relevant.’*

★ In January 2017, for the first time the Danish Parliament endorsed a strategy that sets the direction for Denmark’s development and humanitarian assistance. Unlike previous strategies, ‘The World 2030 – Denmark’s new strategy for development cooperation and humanitarian action’ integrates development cooperation, foreign policy, security policy and business into one strategic framework. In addition, the strategy seeks to ensure that the Danish government and its partners live up to the commitments outlined in the Grand Bargain.

From now on, Denmark will concentrate its efforts “where Danish security and migration policy interests are involved and where our engagements can add value”. Although it may be understandable that a government decides to focus on national interests, it comes at the expense of the poverty focus of the previous strategies. As a consequence, some of Africa’s poorest countries such as Burundi and Malawi are unfortunately not prioritised in the new strategy.

### ★ CSOs AND THE DANISH NEXUS STRATEGY: A STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP?

The strategy acknowledges Danish civil society organisations as strategic high-priority partners in Denmark’s development cooperation and humanitarian action. It launches a new modality for cooperation between the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Danish CSOs engaged in long-term partnerships. This is “to ensure strong strategic partnerships that support Danish development policy and humanitarian priorities”.

In practical terms, this means that the cooperation between the Ministry and the organisations, which was previously covered by separate funding modalities (development cooperation by ‘Framework Agreements’ and humanitarian assistance by ‘Humanitarian Partnership Agreements’), has been merged into one Strategic Partnership with each selected organisation. In political terms, it means that Danish CSOs who wish to receive government funding for international activities (i.e. to be strategic partners of the Ministry) must align their work with the priorities reflected in the strategy.

### ★ BREAKING DOWN THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT BARRIER

It is an explicit intention behind the strategy to break down the barrier between short-term humanitarian interventions and long-term development cooperation. However, the Strategic Partnerships with the Danish CSOs who are supposed to operationalise this intention are still divided into separate lots – ‘Lot HUM’ (humanitarian action) and Lot CIV: (Civil society development), due to the structure of the Finance Bill, which has

to be passed in Parliament. But both Lot HUM and Lot CIV interventions may include activities that reach across the humanitarian-development nexus. This is attractive for an organisation like ADRA Denmark that is present in countries facing protracted crises, which have large populations of IDPs and/or refugees, such as Sudan, South Sudan, Yemen, Ethiopia and Uganda.

### ★ ADRA DENMARK’S APPROACH

Many of ADRA Denmark’s development interventions focus on supporting people to be more resilient in times of crisis. Most of our humanitarian interventions integrate long-term development ideas.

Working on Education in Emergencies in South Sudan, ADRA Denmark not only provides a Temporary Learning Space for children and ensures that voluntary teachers are available but also trains the surrounding communities and Parents-Teachers Associations to promote girls’ education and ensure a stronger civil society to build on in the future.

In supporting Somali refugees in Yemen, we combine emergency assistance with training in human rights and advocacy. When working in Darfur, Sudan, we facilitate Community Action Planning sessions that not only enable IDPs to prioritise humanitarian assistance to their communities here and now, but also empower them in the long run and strengthen their civil society.

### ★ STRIKING A BALANCE

As the number of displaced people in the world grows and humanitarian crises become more and more protracted, working across the humanitarian-development nexus seems more and more relevant. It is positive that initiatives like The New Way of Working are being promoted in countries with widespread poverty like Sudan, where the IDP and refugee situation appears to be never-ending.

However, not all work should take place through the “nexus”. Some of the crises that we see today could probably have been prevented if people had equal access to education, health care, livelihood opportunities, etc. – and more influence on their own development. We should, therefore, also maintain more traditional long-term development efforts focusing on civil society mobilisation, influence and democracy. In the constant search for funds to cover the humanitarian needs of today, we should not sacrifice the efforts for more equality and fulfilment of rights tomorrow.

Helene Ellemann-Jensen,  
Programme Director, ADRA Denmark  
[www.adra.dk](http://www.adra.dk)



# LOCALISATION: THE KEY TO CONNECTING HUMANITARIAN AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING

THE ISSUE – EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

*'We were here before the disaster, we were here during the disaster and we are here after the disaster. Agencies like yours will come and go, but the church will always be here.'*

Church Pastor  
(Honduras)



The transition between humanitarian and development programming has long been recognised as a key struggle for the sector. Based on our experience with local partners, within both humanitarian and development programmes but also as they move between these interventions, we have seen the important role played by local actors in bridging this gap. Whilst the international community has a tendency to separate both humanitarian and development activities, local partners are well placed to “marry short and long-term perspectives”.<sup>1</sup>



## SHARE THE JOURNEY: FROM RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO LONGER TERM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Defining humanitarian and development programmes is a widely recognised challenge, particularly in relation to preparedness and disaster risk reduction (DRR) activities. When distinctions are made (typically due to funding streams) local players are pivotal in supporting the fluid transition between such interventions. For example, during the Ebola Crisis, Tearfund worked with local partners to move from their development initiatives to humanitarian relief and then recovery. Whilst international humanitarian assistance may be scaled down after such crises, local actors are more likely to remain in the community to rebuild, restore and shape their surroundings. During the response to Typhoon Haiyan, “assistance received from INGOs and UN agencies was most frequently described as providing ‘help’ while NNGOs were considered to be ‘on a journey’ with the community.”<sup>2</sup> It is this ‘journey’ and transition into longer-term development activities that can support communities to become more resilient to shocks and stresses caused by disasters.<sup>3</sup>



## INVEST IN LOCAL FACTORS OF STRENGTHS

Whilst there is a need to bridge the gap between these two sectors, both programming landscapes have distinct areas of expertise. Although NNGOs have greater agility to move between humanitarian and development activities, this is not always a smooth process, and requires the skills and knowledge to deliver in both types of intervention. INGOs

often invest resources (financial, time etc.) to strengthen the technical capabilities of local partners, which can be lost or undermined by high levels of staff turnover. However, this issue can be mitigated in faith-based organisations, where religious leaders often hold long-term leadership positions<sup>4</sup>. There is also a growing investment in online capacity development tools and platforms, which provide an opportunity to support local partners remotely. E-learning platforms, such as [DisasterReady.org](http://DisasterReady.org), provide a breadth of courses and tools that can be accessible to local partners.

## SPECIFIC CHALLENGES IN CONFLICT SITUATIONS

The transition between humanitarian and development interventions is made more challenging in conflict situations, where risks can compel local partners to abandon their activities altogether. Moreover, the complexity of the environment can make it difficult for national actors to bridge the gap. For example, the cycle of conflict in South Sudan undermines any long-term progress and can deter donors from investing in development programmes. The unpredictable nature of conflict and sudden shifts in humanitarian funding can make it difficult to align rapid relief with longer-term priorities such as preparedness, mitigation and peacebuilding.<sup>5</sup>

Whilst it's not always a smooth process, local actors have an important role to play in bridging the gap between short and longer-term interventions. Some systematic issues still need to be addressed, such as the gaps in funding for preparedness and DRR.<sup>6</sup> Nonetheless, the value offered by local partners, particularly as they ‘journey’ with local communities, probably is a crucial link in supporting greater connectedness between humanitarian and development programmes.

Lauren Kejeh

Humanitarian Impact & Learning Officer,  
Tearfund

[www.tearfund.org](http://www.tearfund.org)

1. Mosel, I & Simon Levine, S (2014). *Remaking the case for linking relief, rehabilitation and development: How LRRD can become a practically useful concept for assistance in difficult places*. London: Overseas Development Institute (ODI). p13.
2. Featherstone, A & Antequisa, C. (2014). *Missed Again: making space for partnership in the Typhoon Haiyan response*. p16.
3. Hansford, B (2011). *Disasters and the local Church: Guidelines for church leaders in disaster-prone areas*. London: Tearfund. p32.
4. Featherstone, A (2015). *Keeping the Faith: The Role of Faith Leaders in the Ebola Response*. London. p51
5. Tanner, L & Moro, L. (2016). *Missed Out: The role of local actors in the humanitarian response in the South Sudan conflict*. p21.
6. Hinds, R. (2015). *Relationship between humanitarian and development aid*. GSDRC. p5.



# HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS: NGO SOLUTIONS IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD TOWARDS FLEXIBLE, PREDICTABLE, MULTI-YEAR FUNDING

THE ISSUE – EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

## Extract from the 2017 Global Humanitarian Assistance Report

“An estimated 88% of official humanitarian assistance went to medium- or long-term recipients in 2015. Moreover, of the 20 largest recipients of international humanitarian assistance in 2015, 18 were medium- or long-term recipients facing recurrent or protracted crises. The importance of timely and predictable funding for saving lives, livelihoods and costs is widely accepted. Still there is not yet significant evidence of a major shift towards multi-year humanitarian financing; nor, despite some good practice, is there systematic provision of early financing to mitigate the most severe impacts of recurrent and predictable disasters”.



The humanitarian work of NGOs is normally funded by a series of short-term grants that need to be won annually or every few months. However, the current Global Humanitarian Assistance report estimated that “nearly 88% of official humanitarian assistance went to long- and medium-term recipient countries [...]. Over two-thirds (67%) went to long-term recipients who have received [...] humanitarian assistance annually for eight years or more.” NGOs working with these grants are tackling challenges that really call for more stable, multiyear funding. Recognising this changing reality on the ground, signatories to the Grand Bargain committed in 2016 to increase multi-year collaborative and flexible planning and multi-year funding instruments. Whilst progress has been made on such instruments since the World Humanitarian Summit, exponential growth in humanitarian need continues to surpass the availability of such funding. To continue implementing successful tools that meet the real needs of communities and implement the humanitarian development nexus more multi-year funding instruments have to be established.



## THE NEED FOR TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMMING

World Vision is a multi-mandated NGO that works both in development and humanitarian response. World Vision development programmes are geographically focused, coordinating resources from multiple sources (for example private sponsorship and bilateral grant funding) to achieve outcomes in three to five year cycles against plans defined with the local community. In Somalia World Vision is part of the SOMREP consortium, a resilience consortium of seven partners (World Vision, Oxfam, DRC, COOPI, CARE, ADRA and ACF) that have coordinated together to answer humanitarian needs and building resilience and development projects. The SOMREP model allowed implementing agencies to contribute to the humanitarian-development nexus, including by flexibly shifting to disaster risk reduction and the transition to recovery. The consortium follows the Graduation Model where communities work along a ‘pathway’ of interventions, starting with more classically humanitarian interventions and ‘graduating’ towards programming focused on building

resilience and development. In these areas of work, Food for Work (FFW) is the principal ‘entry level’ livelihoods intervention. Communities participating in FFW activities are encouraged to begin ‘savings clubs’ i.e. saving cash and other assets to build resilience to future shocks, a starting point on the resilience pathway.



## CONSORTIUMS: A TOOL TO BRIDGING FLEXIBILITY AND PREDICTABILITY GAPS

SOMREP receives funding from multiple donors (including EuropeAid) and a mixture of single and multi-year funding. Although little of the funding to the SOMREP platform is both multi-year and flexible, the consortium has facilitated a platform for coordinated planning and funding that provides many benefits and complementary activities. Through the consortium's planning, implementing agencies were able to programme interventions with a multi-year perspective despite having limited flexible and long term funding available from donors.

For example, Food for Peace, the principal donor for the FFW component, does not provide multi-year funding, nor does it allow funding for savings clubs and other such transitional activities. These activities are picked up by other donors to the platform. This success can be seen as deriving from the availability of a predictable and flexible platform of financial support, which in the case of SOMREP comes from the collective consortium bringing different sources of flexible and predictable funding to a common programming approach.



## KEY LEARNING

Multiyear planning and funding represents a critical tool towards realisation of the humanitarian-development nexus. In the short-term when flexible, predictable multi-year funding is in small supply, transitional programming approaches can be a key method to meet the needs of communities in protracted crises. Civil society coalitions working towards such a common approach can together attract a mixture of flexible, predictable funding to support programming goals.

Ludovic Wahis  
Policy and Communication Officer  
World Vision  
[www.wvi.org/eu](http://www.wvi.org/eu)

## TAKING CASH TO SCALE: GETTING AHEAD OF HUMANITARIAN CRISES

THE ISSUE – EXPLORING THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

### THE GRAND BARGAIN COMMITMENT ON CASH-BASED PROGRAMMING

Signatories to the Grand Bargain committed to increase the use and coordination of cash-based programming. This has resulted in an uptake in cash relief across the humanitarian sector including a commitment by ECHO to deliver 35% of humanitarian assistance via cash by the end of 2017.



Global commitments to bridge the humanitarian-development divide have prompted the humanitarian sector to think long and hard about the practical implications for the way we work and our longer term impact. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) is bridging this divide by scaling-up cash transfers and by ensuring the necessary preconditions for fast, efficient cash relief are in place before a crisis hits. The IRC has committed to deliver 25% of its aid as cash relief by 2020.



#### CASH RELIEF: A SOLUTION IF THE NECESSARY PRECONDITIONS ARE IN PLACE

Cash relief, via payments made to people uprooted by conflict or natural disaster, is increasingly pervasive in the sector. Giving people whose lives are devastated by crisis cash instead of buckets or blankets makes sense: it offers them a choice, reaches the people who need it most, and can be more cost-efficient. The IRC has made considerable progress towards the 25% target, having delivered at approximately 16% in 2017.

The process of institutionalising cash has forced the IRC to think beyond the emergency response alone and rather get ahead of the crisis and become more ready to respond. This is a concrete example of the necessity of bridging emergency response and longer-term development efforts in a nonlinear way. Financial inclusion, particularly digital financial inclusion of refugees and migrants, is a necessary precondition for the success of humanitarian electronic payments when a crisis hits.

IRC's organisational ambition is to deliver survival assistance including cash relief within 72 hours of an emergency. To realise this ambition, it is crucial that the mechanisms are in place to deliver cash fast – these include having agreements with financial providers already in place, capacity building, as well as guidance and tools to assess whether cash relief is appropriate, and ongoing research to measure and improve the efficiency of programming.



#### PARTNERING TO TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES IN EMERGENCY RESPONSE

Taking advantage of new technologies to achieve this ambition of rapid cash relief at scale is also an important aspect. IRC is partnering with a range of digital financial service providers with expertise in delivering prepaid debit cards or mobile money with the goal that 75% of the IRC's cash relief will be delivered through digital transfer mechanisms by 2020.

While incredible progress has been made in bringing last mile connectivity and digital financial services to low income countries, investments and donor initiatives tend to be confined to

development contexts and neglect high risk disaster prone areas. For example, IRC's research found that only four of 13 high risk countries facing a severe humanitarian crisis have a digital government-to-person (G2P) system in place to deliver safety net payments. Such a system can have both long-term development impacts as well as the potential for leveraging in the event of a humanitarian emergency.



#### LESSONS LEARNED AND ADAPTATION TO DELIVER ON A TRANSFORMATIONAL AGENDA

IRC's outcome driven approach to effective programming has also led to a reflection on the impact of humanitarian work including the longer term, knock on effects. Shrinking budgets combined with protracted crises and growing needs demand that we find ways to measure the effectiveness of our programming, including the cost efficiency and the transformative potential. Benchmarking specific program quality metrics – such as cost-efficiency of cash relief, time to delivery, or beneficiary satisfaction with the program – are key components of ensuring that humanitarian aid, particularly cash relief, is not only delivered well, but also responsive to the needs of the greatest number of people in a crisis. By delivering cash faster and more efficiently, humanitarians are able to achieve better outcomes and reach more people.



#### IMPLEMENTING THE GRAND BARGAIN COMMITMENT ON CASHED BASED PROGRAMMING: A MATTER OF PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN DONORS AND OPERATIONAL AGENCIES

The IRC is striving to fulfil its Grand Bargain commitment to increase cash-based programming along with agencies and donor signatories alike. ECHO's ambitious target to deliver 35% of humanitarian assistance in the form of cash by the end of 2017 is welcome and their efforts to change the rules of the game and drive efficiency in cash programming as part of a forthcoming Cash Guidance on the Delivery of Large Scale Cash Transfers is also positive, in particular because it also included a consultation of ECHO's partners. The success of Grand Bargain commitments and the increased use of cash relies on an institutional framework for delivery – or 'cash preparedness'. It also requires further research to find ways to improve and measure the scale, speed and efficiency of cash relief, and the adequate policy and regulatory environment to facilitate innovation and financial inclusion in humanitarian settings.

Daphne Jayasinghe  
Senior Policy and Advocacy Advisor – Economic  
Programmes – International Rescue Committee

<https://www.rescue.org/>

## DARFUR CRISIS: WHERE LIFE-SAVING NEEDS ARE ALARMINGLY HIGH BUT FUNDING CRITICALLY LOW

### VIEWS FROM THE FIELD

*'Nowhere should discussing and applying the linking of relief with development and peace efforts be more relevant than in Darfur, where the complexity of the Nexus is apparent.'*



The protracted situation of IDPs, refugees and underdeveloped host communities in Darfur is a crisis hidden from global media attention. The humanitarian needs in Sudan sparked the issuing of emergency funding by UNOCHA this summer who argue that "life-saving needs are alarmingly high, but funding critically low". In Darfur, Norwegian Church Aid is looking for signs of hope and for more sustainable ways to address basic needs. Humanitarian funding is not expected to increase, and it appears that some donors have turned their attention to other humanitarian disasters. Funds were cut down for combatting the seemingly endless needs in Darfur in the hope that the decline in violence is for the long term. However, the humanitarian indicators are alarming with regard to food security and nutrition, and this situation calls for our organization's continuous presence in Darfur.

The population in greater Darfur is estimated to be around 7.5 million people, and according to UNOCHA, 3 million people are in need (as of 1 October 2017). Malnutrition rates, acute malnutrition rates of children below 5, and acute watery diarrhea numbers are all contested, but it is widely agreed that they are alarmingly high.

Many IDPs have experienced multiple displacements but hope to return to their villages to farm their land and take a step away from vulnerability. At the same time, new peaks in humanitarian need arise with the steady arrival of refugees fleeing South Sudan. Darfur hosts more than 150,000 South Sudanese refugees in already congested camps and in host communities.

Nowhere should discussing and applying the linking of relief with development and peace efforts be more relevant than in Darfur, where the complexity of the Nexus is apparent.



#### LINKING RELIEF WITH DEVELOPMENT

Norwegian Church Aid is one of the 100 registered INGOs present in Darfur and is supported by our sister agencies in the Caritas movement and the ACT Alliance in its work in the country. It is engaged in humanitarian assistance in water, sanitation, hygiene (WASH), in primary health care, and NFI distribution in South and central Darfur, and in particular in locations like Zangilei and Bilal IDP locations and in newly opened areas in Jabel Marra. NCA's action is characterised by service provision and reaches more than 400,000 people per year. After more than 13 years in the IDP locations, resources and funding for continuing the level of services are getting harder to obtain. Many agencies, including INGOs and UN agencies seek a transition towards more sustainable approaches to meet needs, to link relief with development through livelihood programs and capacity building. Efforts have been made in order to create more environmental friendly

solutions such as solar driven water pumps and investment in water committees.

There are 55 local NGOs in Darfur. NCA is developing working with the local partner "Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation and Development Agency" (ERRADA) which works on livelihoods and education. NCA has explored partnerships with a number of other local NGOs however in the WASH sector identifying these partners has proven difficult. There is a limited number of NGOs to engage with, and there are administrative hurdles faced by national Khartoum-based agencies in efforts to expand to Darfur, as well as cultural differences and distance. To grow the civil society community with community-based organizations would be a step towards more sustainable development. There is a need for social actors to play a role in building peace and defusing conflict.

#### PEACE BUILDING PART OF THE NEXUS

In our analysis, when WASH activities are integrated with health, education, livelihoods and peacebuilding, health and WASH outcomes are most fully achieved. Food insecurity, malnutrition and disease outbreak are indicators of inequality and underdevelopment, and is best battled holistically. To create social capital through people's networks and representation in community groups, civil community-based organisations need to be encouraged.

Insecurity has kept the IDPs in camps for over 13 years. Statistics show that numbers of IDPs have remained unchanged over the last few years, indicating the low number of returns. There are, however, so-called seasonal returns taking place during the cultivation season. Returning is made difficult in many areas where land is occupied by newcomers. People do not consider the situation secure enough for a permanent return or to take family along. The harsh environment and drought contributes negatively to the return rate, as does increased criminality and tribalism that cause conflict even in urban centers.

To enable a more significant number to return to their land, initiatives to shrink the protection gap are needed. The cut in the peace building force needs to be compensated by other initiatives to provide a sense of increased security for a more significant number of people to seek a way out of vulnerability by returning to their land. To convince IDPs that return is safe, and to change perceptions, a lot has to be done. Fear does not go away after a few months of calm in one area while violence peak in other areas.

**Gudrun Bertinussen**  
Head of Humanitarian Division  
Norwegian Church Aid

<https://www.kirkensnodhjelp.no/en/>



## EU TRUST FUNDS: THE BEST MODALITY FOR THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS?

### A VIEW ON THE EU



Established in 2013, EU Trust Funds (TFs) are meant to leverage financial contributions from the European Commission and at least one Member State, for emergency, post-emergency or thematic actions. The Bêkou TF for the Central African Republic, first EU TF managed by the European Commission launched in July 2014, was welcomed by NGOs as a way to link relief and development in a forgotten crisis where little funding for resilience work is typically available.

The European Commission sees EU TFs as interesting instruments providing an important source of flexibility for EU financing efforts, complementing the EU budget. In the course of two years, the EU established three other TFs: for Syrian refugees and their hosts in the neighbouring countries of Syria (Madad TF), for African regions most affected by migration (Emergency Trust Fund for Africa), and in support of post-conflict peacebuilding efforts in Colombia (EUTF for Colombia). In addition, the Fund for Syrian refugees in Turkey (Refugee Facility for Turkey), which has a different legal basis, also aims at coordinating aid. All these Funds together amount to more than 8.5 billion euro.

EU TFs are meant to strengthen the visibility and increase the efficiency of EU external action, enhance the flexibility and speed of decision-making, and ensure complementarity with existing funding instruments. Have they delivered?



#### A NEW FINANCIAL INSTRUMENT TO FILL THE GAP

CARE's experience indicates that the TFs are filling a gap between short term humanitarian response and the longer-term development cycle, making funding available for building community resilience and improve livelihoods. It provides flexibility in terms of thematic priorities and operations in a way that existing instruments do not always allow - because of a lack of political will to fully make use of possibilities within current regulations. With funding from the Africa TF, CARE was able to set up a longer-term response, following on from EU humanitarian funding, to address the effects of the El Niño drought emergency

in 2016. Madad funding has supported CARE livelihoods and resilience programming with Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan (in consortium with other INGOs). In addition, as TFs generate funding for investment in countries of origin and transit of migrants and refugees, they attract additional funding from states that might not otherwise provide extra support to development cooperation budgets.

But have the TFs contributed to faster decision-making in emergency settings? While the average duration of contracting went down from 250 to 180 days in the case of the Sahel window of the Africa TF, the promised simplified and reactive tool is not fulfilling initial expectations of humanitarian stakeholders. CARE organisations have noticed a lack of communication between technical and financial partners, which directly and negatively impacts the capacities of consortium members to provide an adequate and timely response vis-à-vis local populations and authorities.



#### MORE FLEXIBILITY: FOR WHOM AND FOR WHAT?

The most worrying development related to TFs remains the 'political flexibility' of several of the Funds, in particular the Africa TF and the Refugee Facility for Turkey. Though funded by official development assistance, these funds were not established with a vision to reduce poverty or meet humanitarian needs or human rights, but to stem migration flows to the EU. In this sense, TFs are a symptom of a larger trend, whereby a larger percentage of EU development and humanitarian funding is being spent in migration-producing countries and regions, with the primary purpose to address the internal EU political challenge of migration, rather than necessarily helping the people most in need. Funding is partly disbursed based on the assumption that those who migrate are mostly young men, not the poorest people or women. Above all, the discrepancy with the EU's commitments to 'leaving no one behind' in the Sustainable Development Goals and the World Humanitarian Summit is stark, to say the least.

Stemming from the strong link with the EU migration control agenda, the success of EU TFs is being measured in terms of the number of



## A VIEW ON THE EU

*'Trust Funds are a symptom of a larger trend, whereby a larger percentage of EU development and humanitarian funding is being spent in migration-producing countries and regions, with the primary purpose to address the internal EU political challenge of migration, rather than necessarily helping the people most in need.'*

people stopped from entering the EU. Projects financed by the Africa TF must report against a set of indicators developed by the European Commission, including the number of (potential) migrants reached out to by information campaigns on migration and the risks linked to irregular migration. For humanitarian and development organisations such as CARE, these reporting requirements are highly problematic and contrary to their fundamental principles and mandate of reducing suffering and poverty. Preventing people from migrating to the EU is not part of their mandate. Moreover, due to EU Member States' pressure on Brussels to deliver on this agenda, TFs are expected to deliver quickly and the EU to communicate visibly on these results. For organisations in the field, it means a greater pressure to regularly share data on beneficiaries for visibility purposes. Again, this is clearly unacceptable, given that data protection is crucial for the actual protection of the people NGOs aim to assist.

On top of these issues, bigger questions must be asked around the use of EU development funding for border management and control, such as the Africa TF 46 million euro awarded to the Libyan Coast Guard knowingly involved in human rights abuses. How can such use of EU development funding be justified, on an ethical or legal basis?

### ★ IS THE EU GETTING AROUND ITS OWN RULES WITH TRUST FUNDS?

And what about EU Member States in the implementation of TFs? Is financing Member States' development agencies with (mostly) European Commission funding, which itself comes from Member States, really the most efficient way of working? As a study from the Belgian platform 11.11.11 on the EU TF in Niger pointed out, the development relevance of project proposals is hardly ever debated in the TF Board as Member States are afraid the projects tabled by their own development agencies will get blocked. Transparency has been an issue in all EU TFs: lack of clarity on funding criteria, limited alignment with development countries' own priorities, little oversight from the European Parliament (it was only offered observer status in the Board of the Africa TF in July 2017), and inclusion of civil society

organisations in the analysis underpinning EU TF programming is not systematic. It is also questionable to what extent EU TFs respect the Rules and Regulations of the EC instruments that feed into them. Until a recent European Court of Auditors' evaluation of the Bêkou TF, there had not been any evaluation of the use of TFs as a modality.

In a nutshell, Trust Funds are specifically available to address the humanitarian-development nexus and as such have made important contributions to an under-resourced area. But the more politicised TFs become, serving an internal EU agenda in external action, the less relevant and legitimate they are, as they do not sufficiently address the real needs on the ground. Moreover, given the issues with transparency and speed observed with EU TFs, one question must be asked: in order to achieve better results, is it necessary to create new instruments like EU TFs, or should the EU simply increase the flexibility of existing instruments that fund humanitarian and development operations? Food for thought...

Inge Brees  
Senior EU Advocacy Officer  
and Claire Rouffineau  
Senior EU Partnership Advisor,  
CARE International EU  
Fanny Petitbon  
Advocacy Manager CARE France  
[www.care.org/](http://www.care.org/)

## A VIEW ON THE EU:

Interview with Ms. Maria-Manuela Cabral, Head of Unit for Fragility and Resilience, DG DEVCO, European Commission

### A VIEW ON THE EU

**1. How should we define the humanitarian-development nexus? In a way, we have seen the scope of humanitarian aid extending, so do you think the Nexus also will impact the focus of EU Development aid? What would you see as the main challenges and limits in the humanitarian-development nexus?**

We are moving away from the simple concept of linking relief, rehabilitation and development towards integrating a much broader contextual analysis that includes political, security, and conflict analysis.

This might not impact humanitarian affairs strictly speaking but more the link between humanitarian aid and development, since we will also be trying to tackle the root causes of disasters and conflicts, creating resilience not only to conflicts but to all the environmental, climatic, agricultural, and food security challenges. This will go beyond the "Lives in Dignity" Communication on refugees, giving it a longer term prospective.

For example, as explained at the 3rd edition of the World Reconstruction Conference this June, Iraq government prepared everything in advance for Mosul so that the humanitarians entered with a plan to deliver emergency aid and then quickly passed onto development actors. This ensured that areas of Mosul, as soon as declared safe, were able to resume as much as possible to 'normal life' and avoided the prospect of turning the city into a huge humanitarian relief camp.

**2. The Communication on the strategic approach to resilience underlines that cooperation should be enhanced between development and humanitarian actors while respecting the distinct mandates established by the Treaties, and the humanitarian principles. What is the path to follow in order to reach this closer cooperation, especially considering the increased linkages between EU development policy and measures designed to control migration flows to Europe?**

The aim of development itself is not to reduce migrant flows; it is to fight against poverty and inequalities and thus create the conditions limiting these migration flows. Otherwise it is normal that people try to move from areas of conflict to areas of stability, from places of poverty and food insecurity to places where they can have a better life.

Controlling is not in the development mandate, that is the responsibility of other authorities. Instead, we concentrate on the Treaty's development objective to create jobs to avoid potential migration flows, or in the more complex cases of conflicts where development actors cannot act alone, work hand-in-hand with our EEAS colleagues.

The political nature of conflicts makes them difficult to resolve. The Global Strategy of the Union speaks of both internal and external resilience and an integrated approach to conflicts and crises. In some

countries it is necessary to work hand-in-hand between political, diplomatic, stabilisation and humanitarian services

**3. The funding instruments and mechanisms for EU development policy and for EU humanitarian assistance are very different. How do you think the EU can close this gap and enable greater flexibility at the operational level? Could crisis modifiers be useful and could they be established in the current framework?**

The EU works on the basis of quite strict financial rules. Thanks to the creation of Trust Funds, we have achieved greater flexibility. This allows us to react quicker and to sometimes enable the financing of situations on the borderline between humanitarian aid and development, creating greater flexibility in our support to investment in these countries.

On the link between Humanitarian and Development and as highlighted in the Resilience Communication, the neutral character of humanitarian interventions, needs to be strictly respected, mainly in conflict-affected areas.

The other side of the coin is to work with the hosting countries to improve their resilience, because if we do not work with both affected populations and hosting communities at the same time we may risk to be faced with situations where refugees or Internally Displaced People (IDPs) may have better conditions than the host population.

**4. In the joint communication, the role of communities is emphasised in terms of strengthening people's ability to recover from disasters or conflicts. What are the actions planned by the EU to strengthen local capabilities for disaster management and conflict prevention?**

For a number of years, we have been trying to support countries in focusing on better reconstruction after a disasters hits, helping them to be better prepared, and also to be prepared with a business continuity plan.

We also encourage partner countries to invest more in preparedness, notably through insurance policies. As highlighted by the 2013 communication on Resilience, the European Commission has also focused and will continue to focus on agriculture and preparation for environmental change

Today we recognize we need to do more on early action. Our early warning systems are in place but we need to improve also our early response in coordination with other donors.

Local communities need to be involved. No one knows the situation on the ground as well as they do and they are the first layer of intervention against natural disasters. Local authorities, local populations and local businesses should engage in developing the business continuity plan together. Food crises are more complex and more coordination with these is thus necessary.

## A VIEW ON THE EU

Reconstruction after the Nepal earthquake was a good example of positive and constructive collaboration between humanitarian and development actors. Reconstruction has been a steady, long-term process, involving rebuilding not just houses but also the state in terms of increasing governance and participation.

When it comes to conflicts, prevention and recovery are more complex and consist of three main stages: pre-conflict, the conflict itself, and post-conflict. As mentioned in the EU Global Strategy, an integrated approach is necessary involving conflict prevention, early action, mediation, stabilisation, and – coming increasingly under the spotlight – questions of reconciliation such as transitional justice.

### **5. What lessons can be drawn from the joint work on Disaster Risk Reduction between ECHO and DEVCO so far? What is the potential of DG DEVCO's engagement with the 'Lives in Dignity' Communication for the operationalisation of the nexus and future collaboration with DG ECHO?**

It is important to move away from the idea that ECHO and DEVCO alone should solve the root causes of the problems. DEVCO will endeavour to continue with its work preparing for the long term while ECHO will continue to support populations in humanitarian need but other actors (political, diplomatic, security) must engage and help resolving a situation that is not under the responsibility nor in the mandate of ECHO or DEVCO.

There will not be a lot of change in how ECHO or DEVCO are working. With DRR and LRRD approaches, we learned the limits of our respective capacities. While we can keep a situation sustainable and allow people to live in dignity, we cannot completely solve the situation ourselves.

### **6. The operationalisation of the humanitarian-development nexus will be tested in six pilot countries. How will DG ECHO and DG DEVCO establish the objectives to be achieved and work together for concrete outcomes in these countries? Each country context is very different, so do you think that a common methodology for the Nexus can be developed based on these pilots?**

The process has already been launched in a first country, Sudan. Evaluations and assessments of each country need to be carried out. A methodology is being developed by ECHO, DEVCO, the Heads of Delegations and their political sections, ECHO field officers, and Member States present in the country, assessing the situation, defining the priorities and needs that must be addressed. It is context driven and there is not "one solution fits all", however the methodology across all countries will be similar. If it proves a success, then it will be mainstreamed in other countries.

For each pilot country there will be a joint analysis with Member States to examine how a vision of

development can be created. The EU with the UN will try to synchronise their efforts to coordinate all donors.

The role of humanitarian actors in this will be the same as always, to take care of the first crises and to deal with humanitarian needs, hopefully for shorter periods.

After the joint analysis, a coordinated plan will be created. For this, interventions will be mapped, determining what needs to be done and how we can improve the synergies of ECHO and DEVCO in the response to bring a certain level of integration

State resilience is very much emphasised in the EU communication. How can the EU ensure that civil society organisations are taking part in the resilience decision making process? How do you see the role of local, national and international NGOs? In whose hands should be the leadership of building community resilience lie?

Civil society organisations will be involved in the process through consultation.

The process will be similar to the one we are trying to apply in the early warning system. In the conflict analyses during the stabilization process, together with the member states, we will try also to conduct consultations with the Civil Society organizations of the countries.

Since the decision-making process will be based on a wide range of factors, from the way we programme the interventions, to political decision or political statements, it is very important to access the voices of local actors.

In the countries where it is not possible to consult the local civil society we have to find the organizations that are closer to the population and, it goes without saying, the NGOs that are closer to the population are normally the humanitarian ones.

This is the purpose of the early warning workshops, such as the one organised for Mali where we met the NGOs on the ground in the country to have their report on the situation.

### **7. Early warning must meet early action to ensure that crisis affected people are better protected against natural disasters and conflicts. What could the EU and its member states do differently to make sure that early warning is followed more often by early action?**

Several examples show the importance of early warning and therefore we will endeavour to make further progress on early action.

Nonetheless, there is the issue that in some cases early action can only be political, which means that the international community as a whole must act, and not just the EU.

Early action is important in anticipating famine crises and more work should be done to improve coordination and minimise the consequences of these crisis.



## TEN YEARS OF THE EUROPEAN CONSENSUS ON HUMANITARIAN AID: A POINT OF REFERENCE IN A CHALLENGING WORLD

*UN, ICRC, EU Red Cross office and VOICE joint messages at the occasion of the ten years of the Consensus*

### A VIEW ON THE EU

The European Consensus shows EU's commitment to fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, creating a common and unbiased framework to deliver humanitarian aid.

- **The management and delivery of humanitarian aid needs to remain principled, unconditional and based on assessed needs. EU's strategies, policies and action plans need to fully respect the principled nature of humanitarian aid, and define clear actions to ensure upholding international law.**

The Consensus has laid the ground to a strong EU humanitarian architecture: a specific article in the Lisbon Treaty, the establishment of the Council Working Group on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid (COHAFA), a Standing Rapporteur in the European Parliament and a Commissioner portfolio.

- **These elements are not only central to ensure coordination, accountability and needs-based humanitarian aid but also must be instrumental in making sure that humanitarian aid remains distinct from political objectives of the EU's external action and internal interests.**

The Consensus has played a fundamental role in acknowledging the importance of the different humanitarian organisations. It stresses the added value of NGOs and the comparative advantages of the UN, the International Movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent as partners. The plurality and diversity of ECHO's partners is crucial to respond to the variety of crises and needs of affected populations worldwide.

- **The EU must ensure that plurality and diversity will be safeguarded in the future and are not negatively affected by other objectives of the EU's humanitarian policy.**

The Consensus enhanced the coordination and harmonization of European as well as international cooperation in humanitarian actions. One of the EU focus of attention should be to ensure better coherence, coordination and complementarity of various actors.

- **To avoid the duplication of existing international mechanisms, sharing information and developing a joint approach is crucial.**
- **Joint planning between EU and UN at country level must be strengthened to build on each other's comparative advantage.**



## A VIEW ON THE EU

The Consensus has underlined the importance to respond adequately to protracted crisis.

- **The EU and its Member States are encouraged to consider long-term strategic humanitarian investments supported by predictable and flexible multi-year finance in situations of protracted conflict and chronic crisis.**

The Consensus supports capacity building activities to strengthen local disaster response and encourages humanitarian actors to foster partnership with local organisations in affected communities.

- **The EU is encouraged to effectively implement the Grand Bargain's commitment to localization which recognizes the essential role of local actors in humanitarian response. To be successful in capacity strengthening, investments, including through development funding and policy, must be focused on disaster prone contexts well before an emergency strikes, and should be part of an overall strategy to reduce and manage risks at the national and community level.**

The Consensus recognizes the link between humanitarian aid and development cooperation to guarantee the achievement of long-term development objectives.

- **Tangible targets for linkages between humanitarian and development effort must be clearly set by the EU while retaining the unconditional and principled rule of humanitarian aid.**
- **Despite the necessary joint approach with development partners, it is crucial that humanitarian aid retains its specificity and remains needs-based.**
- **This joint approach must refrain from becoming politicized, transforming humanitarian aid into a crisis management tool.**

The commitments taken by the EU at the World Humanitarian Summit in the Agenda for Humanity are largely reflect the Consensus.

- **The European Union, its Member States and the European Parliament must ensure adequate and timely follow up of the WHS commitments and use them as a direction for action in the next years for a continued implementation of the Consensus.**

## HUMANITARIAN ISSUES AT EU LEVEL

## VOICE AT WORK

★ **VOICE Grand Bargain (GB) Task Force for more effectiveness and efficiency in the humanitarian ecosystem**

One year after the signing of the Grand Bargain, VOICE brought the GB to the European Development Days where the topic was the implementation of this important humanitarian deal that aims to reform the humanitarian system in terms of transparency, inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency. The VOICE Task Force continues its dynamic engagement at European level focussing on the themes of multi-year planning and funding, localisation and the simplification of funding conditions.

★ **VOICE celebrates 10 years of the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid**

The network together with the Red Cross family, the UN and MSF organised a high level event at the European Parliament in October. Among the achievements of the Consensus, VOICE highlighted the strengthening of EU's humanitarian architecture, the acknowledgment of the essential role played by NGOs and the commitment to diversity and quality in partnership, a coherent approach to humanitarian aid guided by the humanitarian principles. The reasons that led to the elaboration of this document are more relevant than ever. Therefore, the network stresses the continued importance of this unique EU policy framework guiding EU and Members states in their approach to humanitarian aid. Ensuring the respect of humanitarian principles and that aid is delivered effectively, rapidly and impartially by a diversity of humanitarian actors, is key to reaching those that are most in need.

★ **VOICE and the EU Strategic Approach to Resilience**

VOICE members have been engaged in strengthening crisis-affected people's resilience whenever possible. In 2016, the EEAS wrote the EU's Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy. The EU is widening the scope of resilience to also include state resilience, which alerted members to re-inforce their efforts to call for a people-centred approach and to recall the important role NGOs and civil society organisations play in that respect.

In view of the adoption of Council Conclusions, VOICE believes that the Strategic Approach to resilience is a key opportunity for the EU to meet its international commitments under the World Humanitarian Summit, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement.

★ **VOICE advocacy on the EU Budget 2018; timely, predictable and flexible funding**

In 2017, more than 101.2 million people are targeted to receive humanitarian aid and 65.6 million are forcibly displaced. Therefore, VOICE members have engaged strongly in order to have an EU budget 2018 in line with the EU's financial commitments and increase the support provided to crises affected people.

The budget campaign showed the wide outreach collective action of VOICE members can have: the twitter action received great support and letters to finance ministers were sent in 11 countries.

★ **VOICE study on Disaster Risk Reduction; prevention is the key to reduce vulnerabilities.**

On the international day for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) VOICE presented its study 'EU Member States policies and practices: DRR in humanitarian assistance and development cooperation'. It analyses how 8 EU Member States deal with DRR and makes the following recommendations:

- make more effort to make DRR a visible, strategic and integral part of development and humanitarian policies and programming.
- increase the funding available for DRR under both humanitarian and development budget lines.
- implement their commitment to a multi-stakeholder approach to DRR via engaging in regular dialogue with NGOs and other DRR stakeholders.

★ **The VOICE Network grows**

COOPI joined the network in May bringing the total membership to 84 NGOs from 19 European countries.



## HUMANITARIAN ISSUES AT EU LEVEL

## VOICE AT WORK

## ★ Members' publications

- With the support of ECHO, NRC conducted a study on [Principled humanitarian assistance of ECHO partners in Iraq](#). This review takes an in-depth look at the extent to which humanitarian organisations that receive ECHO funding have incorporated the humanitarian principles in their strategy, decision-making, and practice in Iraq.
- Oxfam published the report "[Beyond 'Fortress Europe': Principles for a humane EU migration policy](#)", outlining their proposal for a new and balanced approach to managing migration – one that protects people and promotes the benefits associated with migration for European host countries, people on the move and their countries of origin.
- CONCERN Worldwide and Welthungerhilfe published the [The Global Hunger Index \(GHI\)](#), designed to comprehensively measure and track hunger globally and by country and region. Calculated each year by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), the GHI highlights successes and failures in hunger reduction and provides insights into the drivers of hunger. By raising awareness and understanding of regional and country differences in hunger, the GHI aims to trigger actions to reduce hunger.



Funded by  
European Union  
Humanitarian Aid

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Commission through its Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Commission, which is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

**VOICE out loud**

Magazine published by VOICE asbl

Editor: Kathrin Schick - Co-Editor: Roberta Fadda

VOICE wishes to thank the contributors of this Issue. Views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the VOICE network.

**VOICE asbl (Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies)**

71, Rue Royale, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 (0)2 - 541.13.60

E-mail: [voice@ngovoice.org](mailto:voice@ngovoice.org)

Website: [www.ngovoice.org](http://www.ngovoice.org)

Twitter: @ngoVOICEeu