

## GHDI Work Plan 2014-2016: CAN-US Co-Chairs

Key Goals		
1.	<p><b>Humanitarian Aid Effectiveness Enhanced: Establishing best practices in Donorship at a system level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed by inputs received from implementing partners, GHDI will seek to identify and agree upon a set of good practice regarding: funding, reporting standards, needs assessment and institutional assessments.</li> <li>• GHD will initiate a dialogue with other major donors to humanitarian action about how they ensure principled Donorship, including CERF, UN Agencies, and State donors outside the GHDI.</li> </ul>	
2.	<p><b>People in Need Better Served: Incentivizing an enabling environment for effective field action</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GHD will seek to improve donor coordination at the onset of a crisis.</li> <li>• GHD will strike the appropriate balance between support for the global coordination platforms, including safety and security, and delivery at field level.</li> </ul>	
3.	<p><b>Humanitarian Solidarity Strengthened: Interface between GHDI, humanitarian principles, and the WHS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a link between humanitarian donorship and the WHS's priority themes with a view to establishing common messages as required.</li> <li>• Engender new donor partnerships and improve dissemination of key GHD messages to broader humanitarian community.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Adapting GHDI to evolving humanitarian landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GHDI membership and tools</li> </ul>	
Activity		Work-stream membership
<b>1.0 Humanitarian Aid Effectiveness Enhanced: Establishing best practices in Donorship at a system level</b>		
1.1	<p><b>Reporting, Information and Accountability Requirements:</b> Identify common core areas of reporting and clarify donor priorities and requirements to identify possibilities for convergence around best practices. Issues to be considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contractual agreements: Identifying good practice and model clauses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Incorporation of accountability to affected populations and other priority cross-cutting issues (gender equality, environmental sustainability, use of innovative programming tools (cash, vouchers)).</li> <li>○ Risk-sharing and flexibility.</li> <li>○ Informal reporting (expected but not required)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Cascading requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Understanding how GHD member requirements of multilateral agencies flow through to impose additional control mechanisms on NGO partners</li> <li>○ Initiate a dialogue with UN agencies and the CERF on their principles for partnership to understand and encourage principled donorship to implementing partners</li> <li>○ Incorporate discussion on requirements for pooled funding mechanisms</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Canada, ECHO  <b>Members:</b> Australia, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, US</p>

**GHDI Work Plan 2014-2016: CAN-US Co-Chairs**

...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reporting:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use and quality of annual reports from UN and Red Cross for core funding</li> <li>○ Other required donor reports, both on program results and financial accountability for core, project and program funding</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Evidence-based decision-making: Information, Needs Assessments and Analysis.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Explore further the actual and potential uses of Risk Information for Agencies, Donors and others.</li> <li>○ Informal exchange of relevant institutional assessment/monitoring information</li> <li>○ Clarify understanding of current use of needs assessment information by donors, including the Humanitarian Needs Overview as part of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle</li> <li>○ Information-share on donor-support to needs assessment capacities, methodologies and tools.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
1.2	<p><b>Funding Modalities:</b> Funding to UN and other partners (NGOs, RC/RC, local governments) - modalities, conditionalities, timeliness and operational impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build a shared analysis of the current range of humanitarian financing instruments and test whether they are fit for purpose;</li> <li>• Identify good practice with regard to multi-year finance;</li> <li>• Provide a platform for discussion of humanitarian financing issues with other relevant initiatives, including the UN panel, WHS and the IASC working groups on improving the linkages between relief and development finance</li> <li>• Update of <i>Review of Humanitarian Financing Mechanisms</i> (April 2008) with annex on donor modalities</li> <li>• Annual review with OCHA on status of funding for crises.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Germany, Sweden, UK  <b>Members:</b> Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, ECHO, Ireland, Luxemburg, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, US</p>
<p><b>2.0 People in Need Better Served: Incentivizing an enabling environment for effective field action</b></p>		
2.1	<p><b>Managing Risk &amp; Crisis Coordination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore potential for simple information exchange at onset of crisis via Twitter or other internal tool</li> <li>• Needs assessment usage for decision-making and alignment with SRPs</li> </ul>	<p><b>Co-lead:</b> US  <b>Members:</b> Canada, Denmark, ECHO, Finland, France, Germany, Mexico, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, UK</p>

## GHDI Work Plan 2014-2016: CAN-US Co-Chairs

...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk sharing – information exchange with partners on risk tolerance among donors               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current practice, best practice, need for an ongoing discussion platform with partners</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Safety and security:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Establish set of agreed data for safety and security reporting.</li> <li>○ Consider most effective funding channel for supporting effective security/safety management.</li> <li>○ Best practice on donor expectations/requirements and advocacy on safety and security</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>3.0 Humanitarian Solidarity Strengthened: Interface between GHDI, humanitarian principles, and the WHS</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<p><b>Aligning positions for WHS and aid effectiveness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and position GHD messaging on humanitarian aid effectiveness, innovation, and other WHS thematic pillars, as appropriate               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify opportunities to communicate to WHS working groups</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Review and consider recommendations from WHS regional consultations regarding GHD</li> <li>• As appropriate, engage with other relevant stakeholders regarding WHS preparatory work</li> </ul>	<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Switzerland</p> <p><b>Members:</b> Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, US</p>
<b>3.2</b>	<p><b>Outreach and Engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Host side events on GHD (ECOSOC, Affected States, Private Sector, SHARE/Non-GHD Members)</li> <li>• GHD SHARE</li> <li>• Coordination with non-GHD countries on humanitarian aid effectiveness / principled action / GHD principles</li> <li>• Identify opportunities to encourage collective and individual re-affirmation of the GHD principles</li> </ul>	<p><b>Co-lead:</b> Canada, Mexico, US</p>

## GHD Work Plan 2014-2016: CAN-US Co-Chairs

<b>4.0 Adapting GHD to evolving humanitarian landscape</b>		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Membership and Communication</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage GHD Website and Twitter account</li> <li>• Manage GHD policy tools</li> <li>• Establish key messages on centrality of GHD principles for donor decision-making</li> </ul>	<b>Co-lead:</b> Canada, US
<b>4.2</b>	<b>Internal Tools on GHD engagement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual review of donor practice / Indicators work / Survey</li> <li>• Information exchange on DAC Peer Reviews</li> </ul>	<b>Co-lead:</b> Belgium, Czech Republic <b>Members:</b> Estonia, European Union

### **Management of Work Plan/Work-Streams**

- Frame the requirements for leading each work stream to feed into the identified goals, in coordination with work stream chairs
- Each work-stream should include a problem statement based on existing evidence and field reviews:
  - Year One: Map current practice, identify and define best practices
  - Year Two: Consultation and deliberation on each best practice for plenary
- IASC may join meetings on a case-by-case basis as determined by co-chairs
- E-mail and Communication: Updates through plenary distribution list - two Geneva, one capital
- Meetings for GHD
  - Two to three plenary meetings per year
  - Work-Stream meetings are ongoing, with management by work stream chair following consultation with co-chairs
  - Co-chairs to participate in work stream meetings (either Canada or US)