



## Dutch Platform on Humanitarian Action (PHA)

### **World Humanitarian Summit – the European road to and from Istanbul Humanitarian NGO Roundtable Netherlands**

Thursday 18 February 2016, 09.45 – 16.15, *followed by a drinks reception*

Venue: New World Campus, The Hague, Netherlands

#### **SUMMARY**

Following from the Dutch Humanitarian Summit and on the occasion of the Netherlands EU presidency, this Roundtable brought together NGOs active in humanitarian aid from the Netherlands and Europe with other relevant actors to take stock and discuss priorities to feed into the continuing process of the World Humanitarian Summit. 49 people participated in the event which covered an overview of the Summit and views on what should be the European Union and Dutch priorities leading up to it. A discussion on what was at stake regarding bridging between humanitarian and development aid focussed especially on refugees, displacement, LRRD and localisation, while the discussion with a focus on funding looked at the importance of simplifying funding conditions, the Dutch government's medium term changes, the Dutch Relief Alliance model and innovation.

#### **Main messages/recommendations**

##### **Panel 1: The World Humanitarian Summit (WHS): the road to Istanbul in 2016?**

###### ➤ **General:**

- Humanitarian aid cannot solve conflict. We need to address root causes and strengthen political action.
- Commitment to the Summit agenda is needed. While there is wide agreement on challenges ahead, the next step on developing solutions requires more attention.
- Humanitarian principles are included in the key documents, but more focus is needed on how to uphold them.
- Need to acknowledge and build on experiences of Southern NGOs.
- It is crucial to uphold the 1951 Refugee Convention. Current EU plans marginalise it.
- Need for more engagement with the general public on humanitarian challenges.

###### ➤ **to INGOs:**

- stay involved in the national and European preparations of the WHS.
- It is too late for new issues. Put forward concrete recommendations for implementation of the agenda.

###### ➤ **to the EU for Council conclusions**

- Call for UN reform
- highlight the importance of diversity in the humanitarian system: the roles, mandates, complementarity, partnership and subsidiarity of actors should be clear.
- include prevention of conflict and preparedness in terms of Disaster Risk Reduction. The EU should reiterate these issues and highlight where there is a need of engagement from the

development side to solicit their contributions to bridge the humanitarian - development divide.

- reflection on the scope of humanitarian aid could be useful given humanitarians broadening range of activities and resource constraints (e.g. education in emergencies).
- In term of efficiency, there is a need for simplification and harmonisation of donor conditions. The current rules for implementing partners would be a considerable obstacle to any EU attempts to increase cooperation with local actors.

## Panel 2: Bridging between humanitarian and development aid

### ➤ To Dutch government:

- pay more attention to Core Humanitarian Standards.
- Learn from locals and LRRD becomes intuitive. Crisis affected people do not make distinctions between humanitarian and development, they continue their lives during war (e.g. they expect education). Humanitarians (headquarters and institutions) make the distinction in conflict but locals tend not to.

### ➤ General

- More predictable and long-term funding for both international and local NGOs is needed with an eye on the unprecedented scale of humanitarian suffering worldwide
- Fundamental changes of the system seem necessary, but be careful to not destroy what has been achieved with the system.
- Do not undermine ODA spending by using it for reception of refugees in OECD-DAC countries. This means less is available to address needs of vulnerable people who remain in crisis-affected areas.
- Grant-making and implementation of humanitarian assistance should not be done by the same organization

## Panel 3: A focus on funding

- All relevant actors are needed to address rising humanitarian need, not only UN and INGOs. Relevant stakeholders (e.g. private sector, academia) can be included, especially for innovation, in a partnership approach
- Hope that the WHS is bringing a momentum to get humanity on the top of the international community's agenda to be able to address fundamental issues, but concerns about lack of clarity around the Summit.
- With humanitarian needs and funding growing, aid is still costing more per unit: longer-term, flexible, predictable funding is needed
- For humanitarian efficiency **trust and partnership are required**: reduce bureaucracy, simplify rules, work towards real accountability of humanitarian system (especially in the UN system).
- In the Netherlands there are interesting examples of humanitarian cooperation and innovation such as the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA), which can be shared with others as a practical example of what can work.

VOICE (*Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies*) is a network representing 84 European NGOs active in humanitarian aid worldwide. VOICE is the main NGO interlocutor with the EU on emergency aid, relief, rehabilitation and disaster risk reduction. It represents and promotes the values and specific features of humanitarian NGOs.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION



*This event is supported by the European Commission through its Humanitarian Aid department.*

**Annex 1: MINUTES**, compiled from notes from CORDAID and VOICE secretariat.

## 1. Welcome

*By Annelies Claessens, Humanitarian Director Cordaid, and Nicolas Borsinger, President VOICE*

## 2. The World Humanitarian Summit (WHS): the road to Istanbul in 2016?

Chair: Jean-Michel Grand, Action against Hunger, VOICE Board

### **The EU Presidency perspective: Rene van Nes, MFA Netherlands – Special Envoy for WHS**

The Dutch government is supportive of the Secretary General's report. There is a need for a new way of working, and many challenges ahead to achieve this. This requires strong political leadership. Netherlands is committed to actively reaching out to other (European) countries to go to the summit with a strong vision.

#### **Dutch priorities:**

##### **1) Rethink humanitarian financing (referring to high-level report on humanitarian financing)**

- Working towards a more effective humanitarian system.
- Outlines Grand Bargain Sherpa meetings (incl next in Amsterdam 29 February).

##### **2) Innovation**

- Same solutions to problems does not work: more innovation is needed.
- E.g. Global Alliance Humanitarian Innovation (Dutch initiative which will be launched in Istanbul): to harness the digital revolution, to respond faster to crises.

##### **3) Protection of the most vulnerable**

- Women & Girls are key actors for change.
- Focus: how to make this happen?

The practical outcomes to the Summit that could be hoped for: safeguarding IHL, finding better answers to current global displacement crisis and funding reform.

Other priorities underlined by EU member states: IHL, Education in emergencies, stronger linkages between humanitarian and development, and concerns about pressures on ODA in budgets.

How to achieve a common European position? The Netherlands Presidency is working towards council conclusions (conclusions adopted by EU council of ministers). The process has just started, and outcomes can be expected in early May. These may also include comments on more predictable financing, increased funding to local actors while respecting humanitarian principles and accountability.

Mr. Van Nes underlined to NGOs that the Dutch priorities and agenda were set, but that they can contribute with specific and practical proposals for achievements of objectives.

### **The Commission perspective: Dominique Albert, DG ECHO**

Ms. Albert outlined the European Commission (DG ECHO)'s focus for the Summit and hopes that the Summit would be a real driver for implementation of IHL, real humanitarian reform and LRRD.

The **2 priorities of the Commission** (as seen in the Commission Communication) 'Towards the World Humanitarian Summit: A global partnership for principled and effective humanitarian action':

#### **1. Principled humanitarian action**

- Humanitarian principles/values are key and must be reinforced.
- Ensuring access to people in need, and specifically develop more EU advocacy on this.

- Put protection at the heart of action. This might require cooperation with human right organisations and a new approach will be outlined before the Summit.

## **2. Effective responses**

- Business as usual is not an option; ECHO would like to move towards result-based aid.
- Searching for ways to improve humanitarian efficiency
- Pool resources. Build outreach to new sources of funding and the linkage with the development community.
- More transparent humanitarian action (e.g. humanitarian financing). How? Needs assessment and transparency: e.g. tracking financial flow/

The Commission sees these practical issues coming up: The need to speed-up preparation of the Summit. The need to translate the Secretary General's report into practice. Work further on doing development during forced displacement crises. The need to reach out to other countries not yet that involved in the Summit process.

Ms. Albert noted that for ECHO, the WHS is not an end in itself. A monitoring mechanism established that can shape concrete recommendations for the follow up required. She noted too that more capacity development for local actors might be something achievable at EU level.

### **The Dutch NGO perspective: Ton Huijzer, representative of Dutch Humanitarian Summit**

Mr Huijzer explained the process that had led to the Dutch Humanitarian Summit and the main issues that were raised there. The five preparatory themes for the summit were: 1) roles of UN, 2) local and international actors, 3), humanitarian and development, 4) urban refugees, 5) innovation. Gender was a cross cutting issue. In the end 9 recommendations were fed into the WHS process from Dutch humanitarian stakeholders.

The main issues he noted that were raised at the Geneva global consultation:

- Strong call for localisation
- Bridging humanitarian/development divide
- Rethink humanitarian financing
- New Refugee Deal (fear that politicians want to change the refugee convention).

Mr Huijzer noted that the Summit consultation process had been very interesting. While the big meeting in Geneva was not interactive, Southern NGOs had managed to be very vocal and were well represented in panels. Despite efforts to build a strong unified NGO voice, local and international NGOs could not agree on fundamental issues.

He was encouraged that the synthesis report and subsequent UN reports had focussed more on people and dignity than effectiveness but notes that the SG's report goes far beyond the humanitarian sector. But he was concerned that this will not lead anywhere, especially in the areas of conflict and breaches of IHL (e.g.; attack on MSF medical facility in Kunduz). He set NGOs a challenge: with global norms eroding so fast 'at home' (e.g.; the refugee convention) how were they to achieve something credible on upholding global norms at the Summit.

### **The INGOs perspective: Kathrin Schick, VOICE Director**

Ms. Schick outlined VOICE's formal role in the WHS preparation process and work with ICVA and InterAction to ensure recognition of NGOs' added value and as main implementers in the field. The networks had also pushed strongly on the issue of the humanitarian principles, which for VOICE at EU level meant the EU Consensus on Humanitarian aid.

Ms. Schick then commented on the main achievements, strengths and weaknesses in the consultation process and the Secretary General's report. She noted that the global vision provided by the Secretary General's report and the HLP report on humanitarian financing are complementary but that Member States/donors appear more interested in the financing report. Gender, protection, and prevention are among important issues that were addressed in the report.

- **Conflict:** thanks to one and a half years of collective work between NGOs the issues related conflicts and humanitarian assistance are included in the reports. Even if concrete solutions are missing at least conflict is on the table for discussion.
- **Humanitarian Principles** are part of all discussions. However, the implementation of those principles is not included and should be given attention by the committed states and donors. This issue should be addressed in the EU Council conclusions. This is a long term process to develop a shared understanding of the principles.
- **UN reform:** This has been pushed by NGOs and EU member states but is not included on the agenda for the Summit, except a suggestion that might mean abandoning the clusters (which work well). The minimum would be to continue with the roll out of the Transformative agenda.
- **Bridging the Humanitarian and Development divide:** This issue is moving forward at EU level in relation to challenges presented by protracted crises and forced displacement. There is more trust and understanding between the different actors after lengthy discussions and after the Summit we can expect further progress. At EU level implementation may be hampered by the existing lifespan of funding instruments (until 2020).
- **NGOs, Localisation and civil society space:** The localisation debate has moved from: *all power to local actors to the first respondents have to be supported whoever is the best suited*. The question of complementarity of actors is missing from the strong lobby for local actors' role; this shouldn't be an either/or question. VOICE sees among its membership the complexity of the issue and the heterogeneity of NGOs' views and ways of working. Capacity –building to work towards local actors being the best responders is still required. NGOs provide 80% of humanitarian aid but are not mentioned in the report. A lack of recognition for those who are risking their life is a shame. In the context of shrinking civil society space, it is important for the whole civil society to stand together to not lose out. This needs to be managed at the WHS.
- **Counter-terrorism:** dealing with the difficulties to deliver humanitarian assistance arising from counter-terrorism policies and measures will be crucial for supporting local actors too.

Ms. Schick concluded with recommendations to the EU and Council Presidency for Council conclusions:

- Call for **UN reform**
- highlight the importance of **diversity** in the humanitarian system: the roles, mandates, complementarity, partnership and subsidiarity of actors should be clear.
- include **prevention** of conflict and preparedness in terms of Disaster Risk Reduction. The EU should reiterate these issues and highlight where there is a need of engagement from the development side to solicit their contributions to bridge the humanitarian - development divide.
- reflection on the **scope of humanitarian aid** could be useful given humanitarians broadening range of activities and resource constraints (e.g. education in emergencies).
- In term of efficiency, there is a need for **simplification** and harmonisation of donor conditions. The current rules for implementing partners would be a considerable obstacle to any EU attempts to increase cooperation with local actors.

## Q&A

- Concerns were raised:
    - o about the localisation agenda and global counter-terrorism initiatives (eg FATF) pulling in opposite directions,
    - o that the discussion about global displacement at the Summit would be driven by an 'EU' centric agenda.
    - o that the drive in the SG's report for 'collective outcomes' was synonymous with the 'comprehensive approach' seen at EU level, the 'integrated approach' at UN level and the '3Ds's approach at Netherlands level. Was this just another way of blurring humanitarianism?
    - o that 'commitments' made at the UN would not be binding enough.
  - What could be expected in terms of UN reform? Eg. Leadership changes, improvement of clusters, implementation of the Principles of Partnership (PoPs), donors' holding the UN to similar levels of scrutiny and accountability as NGOs, the multiple roles of the UN as humanitarian, political and military actor.
- 

### **3. Bridging between humanitarian and development aid**

#### **Chair: Marek Stys, People in Need, VOICE Board**

Mr. Stys introduced the session, underlining that the current scale of global displacement and pressures on humanitarian financing were leading to interesting dynamics between the humanitarian and development sectors in an attempt to explore and use bridges between the two sectors better. Where 4/5 of humanitarian assistance was going to protracted crises there was ample scope for exploring new ways of working. The SG report and the HLP report on Humanitarian Financing both call for more common approaches.

#### **Arco van Wessels, ZOA**

Mr. van Wessels commented on donors' reactions to the current scale of displacement, its arrival on Europe's doorstep and its impact on ways of working together in the development and humanitarian sectors:

- Increase in funds: Donors are experimenting and increasing ODA in some cases (e.g. Dutch foreign ministry support of Dutch Relief Alliance). Nonetheless gap between UN appeals and funding grows.
- But, decreasing ODA spending to countries of origin: Dutch budget 0.56%. Some concerns about the orientation of the ODA that is being spent in countries of origin – is it now for migration control? There is too little advocacy and political debate about this.
- More ODA spending is going to destination/receiving countries (close to 1 billion).

He spoke about the different mandates organisations have, and how these can facilitate or not collaboration between different aid organisations, including across the development and humanitarian spectrum. An example was the closer collaboration through the Dutch Relief Alliance. The easiest way to cooperate was when organisations had mandates that were closely aligned but worked in different sectors. He noted the similarities with the localisation debate: in the end funds should go to the best responder to address the needs.

#### **Thea Hilhorst, International Institute of Social Studies (ISS)**

On Linking relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD), she noted that while there is renewed attention to this issue at policy level, the field never stopped. She noted that it goes in and out of fashion and has been linked to 'resilience', the 'contiguum' or now working on 'protracted crises' and

'bridging'. She cited examples of long-ongoing experiments and pilots looking at e.g. cash, or the relations between refugees and host communities.

LRRD is not about sequential steps but about how to organise relief and ensure it links to development processes and solutions in the first phase of response, such as paying attention to who is doing what (community involvement) and when. It is closely linked to (social) accountability which goes beyond development to peacebuilding and justice building institutions and different understandings of security and human security. As a consequence, in her view, a challenge to effective LRRD that lies ahead, includes accommodating that, due to humanitarian principles, humanitarian actors cannot be involved in politics. Yet she noted growing humanitarian diplomacy which is done in the framework of IHL and humanitarian principles, demonstrating that there are ways for humanitarians to work with politics.

Recommendations to Dutch government:

- pay more attention to Core Humanitarian Standards, this will help with delivering on LRRD
- LRRD is an intuitive thing. People continue their lives and expectations during war (e.g. education). Humanitarians and donors (headquarters/institutions) make distinctions in conflict, locals don't.

### **Nienke Smidtman, Oxfam Novib**

Ms. Smidtman spoke about longer-term displacement and the localisation agenda.

- What?
  - Long-term and forced displacement is rising and becoming more protracted.
  - The humanitarian system is overstretched and strong arguments for looking at humanitarian and development differently.
  - Bridging or LRRD is important and urgent. Its about making effective use of resources.
- But:
  - There are different focuses from a development and humanitarian perspective about how to target populations or aid provision.
  - Humanitarian principles and aid is a life-saving activity and nothing more.
  - Political will is necessary, it is the cause that keeps people in forced migration.
  - How do we include development considerations in relief?
  - Examples from Uganda show that taking care of the needs of host communities is essential to a development approach to supporting refugees.
  - Project-based, short-term funding is hampering LRRD
- What do NGOs need from donors to have an LRRD approach to displacement?
  - more predicable funding.

*On Localisation of humanitarian aid:*

- Local actors are first responders and remain – often doing development before and after.
- they need sufficient capacity and to have the space, mandate, voice and to be part of the systems.
- Ideally INGOs should complement local actors. There has been too much emphasis in the debate on one taking over from another. With the money and the power comes responsibility and the aid must aim to be sufficient, timely and predictable.

### **Marco Rotelli, INTERSOS, VOICE Board Member**

Mr. Rotelli explained that there is a unique opportunity for Italy as a donor at the moment having just created a new humanitarian and development agency. He added further elements on LRRD to the discussion: Firstly, he pointed out that the 'continuum' is often missing in debate. In other words that development does not start after emergencies, but is there before emergencies. Development does not even pull out during emergencies. He gave the example of Somalia where Italian agencies had long been present even without institutions/governmental actors, there are still developmental processes ongoing. Yet in Italy, humanitarian was under the responsibility of the foreign ministry while the rest was under the responsibility of the development agency. Trying to agree minimum criteria for eligibility of humanitarian funding was always challenging. Secondly, he also noted that from the perspective of the general public, there is little or no difference between a humanitarian and development mandate. It would be important to express this difference louder to contribute to a better understanding of humanitarian. Perceptions of different actors became even more blurred through the Afghanistan and Iraq military campaigns. Basic humanitarian concepts were questioned.

At EU level, he was concerned that new instruments that seek to bridge humanitarian and development, like the new EU trust funds, were in fact in need of further scrutiny to ensure that humanitarian aid and concepts could be protected.

Longer-term he noted that LRRD as a topic it is prominent in policy discussion but that institutional barriers (funding, multi/single year contracting etc) and cultural barriers (humanitarian/development) remain. There is always the risk from a humanitarian perspective that development activities become politicized. Cultural factors within organisations need to be factored in too: on a practical level, humanitarian workers are not necessarily the best at building partnerships and working on community development. Sometimes you need different staff for LRRD

He agreed with Ms. Hillhorst that often the LRRD happens from needs on the ground, rather than being a question of what organisations' mandates are.

### **Q&A**

- The usefulness of LRRD and resilience concepts at EU level was highlighted as it had 'helped move beyond the idea of development taking over'. Resilience in particular created a common goal across institutional divides.
- It was noted that preparedness and DRR are too often sidelined.

### **Recommendations:**

#### ➤ **To Dutch government:**

- pay more attention to Core Humanitarian Standards.
- Learn from locals and LRRD becomes intuitive. Crisis affected people do not make distinctions between humanitarian and development, they continue their lives during war (e.g. they expect education). Humanitarians (headquarters and institutions) make the distinction in conflict but locals tend not to.

#### ➤ **General**

- More and more predictable and long-term funding for both international and local NGOs is needed with an eye on the unprecedented scale of humanitarian suffering worldwide
- Fundamental changes of the system seem necessary, but be careful to not destroy what has been achieved with the system.
- Do not undermine ODA spending by using it for reception of refugees in OECD-DAC countries. This means less is available to address needs of vulnerable people who remain in crisis-affected areas.



- Grant-making and implementation of humanitarian assistance should not be done by the same organization

---

#### **4. A focus on funding**

*Chair: Magali Mourlon, VOICE Programme Manager*

##### **Christine Pirenne, MFA Netherlands**

Ms. Pirenne highlighted some of the outcomes of a recent evaluation of Dutch humanitarian assistance covering 2009-2016.

Positive:

- Dutch government is flexible in providing funds: 60% of budget is not earmarked.
- Aid is principled.
- There is multi-year programming for the UN and bigger INGOs.
- Doing more via INGO channels, with new ways of collaboration (DRA= 12 NGOs) and multi-year allocations to Red Cross and MSF with shorter lighter procedures. This gives power to the implementers who know best where the needs are.

Critical:

- More oversight is needed on UN agencies' work: better use of embassies and field network.
- Need to respond and adapt more quickly to emergencies and change.
- There is a need to take humanitarian aid out of isolation. E.g: refugees displaced for 17 years, should be less about humanitarian aid and more focus on longer term development.

Recommendations:

- Make sure quality of aid and accountability. Accountability should be towards affected people as well as towards funders.

##### **Florence Daunis, Handicap International (HI), VOICE Board member**

Ms. Daunis underlined that the view that the humanitarian system is not broken, but is broke is overly simple. However, from her perspective while the lack of funding is a problem other conditions are even more fundamental.

For instance, the ECHO budget is a crucial part of EU humanitarian funding, but the VOICE report on funding conditions shows key divergences in donor practices. The devil is often in the detail:

- Decisions: There is potential for faster decisions but this requires trust and good processes: she compared SIDA's 8-hour decision versus ECHO 1 month decisions. Donors can be too slow when urgent action is needed (e.g. after Haiti).
- Simplification of administrative conditions is more than audit: eg. humanitarian organisations have requirements placed on them to be financially audited 10 times more than private firms. Half of HI's finance team works on audit.
- Needs assessments: UN documents take two weeks to fill in, French government and SIDA accept letters of intent.
- Time and resources spent on filling in forms before humanitarian action can be approved or funded is disproportionate.
- Local actors: The burden in terms of these processes is even higher for local actors, e.g. In Syria in 2013 local organisations in Aleppo were new, but partnering with them with UN funds, or working in Damascus/government controlled areas, required unrealistic levels of documentation and registration.

##### **Stan Klinkenberg, Save the Children**

Mr. Klinkenberg outlined the creation and assets of the Dutch Relief Alliance. NGOs started the Dutch Relief Alliance by preparing a joint humanitarian response programme for Southern Sudan to

complement development programmes and presenting it informally to the ministry, once it had learned the ministry did not have the capacity to deal with many smaller projects. Informal discussions built on what each side (NGOs and ministry) could manage. In the end, 12 NGOs were involved, and the ministry was happy enough with the model that it later requested the same model be applied for Iraq/Ebola and others.

The goal of the Dutch Relief Alliance (DRA) is more timely, efficient and effective aid, by working together, combining strengths and reducing competition. The criteria for the NGOs in DRA regard the UN, their FPAs with the EU and that NGOs take care of the administration. NGOs propose an annual plan of activities. The DRA is a partnership between the NGOs and the ministry. The experience is positive and is due a mid-term evaluation in May 2016.

### **Perry Heijne, CARE Nederland**

Mr. Heijne outlined a new Dutch Coalition on humanitarian innovation. The context for it is that the cost of humanitarian aid has tripled. Normally when sectors grow, cost per unit becomes cheaper, but this hasn't happened in humanitarian aid. Partly this is to do with a need for more innovation. For instance, technology can solve some problems, businesses have some expert staff... Innovation is about bringing these elements together in a good context-specific way. How to scale-up innovation? e.g. in a refugee camp.

The Dutch coalition started last year with three focus teams. Soon they will hold an acceleration session to see what next steps are in each of their focus areas. They plan to present the initiative in Istanbul. Local NGOs are involved, and the partnership includes business and universities. All actors can join and get access to information. The focus is on: i) making smart use of data (how to apply it to benefit of people in need). ii) People's ownership (building solutions that are accepted and wanted by people) and iii) logistics to meet requirements.

### **Q&A**

The discussion with the audience focused on the panel's reaction to the HLP report and on expectations for the WHS:

High-level panel (HLP) report on humanitarian financing: the report has had a positive impact on preparations for the WHS. There are three main approaches to filling the funding gap: looking at needs assessments, develop the emerging donor landscape and the Grand Bargain.

- The Grand Bargain (GB): In addition to discussing the process to develop the Grand Bargain, amongst the 15 biggest agencies and donors, the panel and audience shared different perspectives on what it should achieve. It should find new and better ways for donors and implementers to work together. The bargain should involve simplification of donors' requirements in return for better evidence on costs and more results based reporting. The GB is also an opportunity for donors to change from 'more demand and control' to getting better insights about how money helps beneficiaries.
- There were concerns that the Grand Bargain by focusing on the biggest agencies and donors and by involving so few implementing actors, (especially when seen in the context of the various WHS reports which increase the role of the UN while not mentioning the roles played by NGOs), will decrease equity and fairness in the system. Will it just end with bigger contracts and more money to the UN?
- The DRA is a good example of a 'bargain' where everyone 'loses a little' but it actually results in an overall gain for everyone. Working together does not have to be a real sacrifice, but has to be

based on total transparency, acceptance of a % administrative costs and providing donors with a real alternative to funding the UN.

Expectations for the WHS:

- A legacy that humanitarian assistance is the business of many more people than the UN and NGOs
- That the message of humanity and urgency of the scale of global crisis is heard
- A commitment from donors to long term, flexible and predictable funding
- Hope that the level of participation by heads of state and government will not be disappointing
- A commitment to an inclusive humanitarian aid system
- An understanding that accountability is not just towards donors and taxpayers, but also affected people and the agencies that serve them
- Further reform of the humanitarian system(s).
- A reinforced understanding of the value of dialogue and partnership between donors , agencies and NGOs.

## 5. Conclusions & closing

Paul van den Berg, Cordaid, Chair of PHA and Nicolas Borsinger, VOICE President

VOICE (*Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies*) is a network representing 84 European NGOs active in humanitarian aid worldwide. VOICE is the main NGO interlocutor with the EU on emergency aid, relief, rehabilitation and disaster risk reduction. It represents and promotes the values and specific features of humanitarian NGOs.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION



*This event is supported by the European Commission through its Humanitarian Aid department.*