

Good Humanitarian Donorship Stocktaking Meeting New York, 12 July 2005

CHAIR'S SUMMARY

On 12 July 2005, the Government of Canada hosted a Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Meeting to take stock of progress on the Stockholm Implementation Plan, share domestic strategies and ways to measure progress on GHD follow-up, continue the dialogue about flexible funding, and agree on future directions of the initiative. Participants found the meeting to be useful and timely, providing an important opportunity to deepen dialogue on a range of key GHD issues and maintain overall momentum.

GHD Implementation Plan: GHD participants noted the important progress made in advancing the activities of the Implementation Plan to date, particularly within the OECD/DAC and on the harmonization agenda. They also agreed to continue with the following activities:

1. On the **CAP pilots**, while progress has been somewhat slower than anticipated, participants welcomed the baseline surveys that provide important information about donor behaviour, and agreed to continue with pilot activities until the end of 2005. At that time, it was agreed that the lessons learned should be consolidated and best practices rolled out to all CAPs during 2006 (thereby feeding into the 2007 CAP cycle). The lessons learned of the pilots could be discussed at Montreux 2006.
2. On **harmonization of reporting requirements and management demands**, it was agreed that a the two-pronged approach would be adopted which includes: deepening progress (e.g. management demands) with agencies with donor support group-type bodies (e.g. ICRC, OCHA, UNHCR), while at the same time, exploring the possibility of expanding work with other agencies, e.g. Rome based agencies, as appropriate.
3. On **outreach and advocacy initiatives**, the UK volunteered to take the lead on this item and make it a priority for the next phase of GHD. Inter alia, the UK will promote and coordinate activities vis à vis non-DAC donors and humanitarian partners, including at the field level.

Domestic Strategies/Accountability:

1. Participants found the sharing of **domestic strategies** to be a useful exercise. Those who have gone through the process of drafting such strategies noted the importance of the experience in inserting GHD into their respective national dialogues and as a means to measure progress on the *Principles and Good Practice*. Those who have developed national humanitarian policies also expressed the importance of such initiatives in increasing domestic awareness of the *Principles and Good Practice*. Participants planning to develop domestic strategies were encouraged to profit from best practices to date, while those with humanitarian polices were encouraged to post them on the GHD website as a means to share collective experiences and increase the coordination of donor policy. It was acknowledged that progress on the *Principles and Good Practice* should not be measured by the existence of a domestic strategy but that some means of measuring domestic progress was required.

2. With respect to the **collective indicators**, while recognizing that the proposed set of indicators was not perfect, participants agreed that the next logical step would be to test them so that they could subsequently be enhanced. As such, it was agreed that they should be integrated into the next version of Development Initiative's *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report* thereby allowing a means to track progress against them. Participants committed to including an indicator on reporting as well as to consider including one that would track commitments (pledges) versus contributions actually made in the next version of the collective indicators paper. Finally, it was agreed that the indicator on the use by agencies of the Needs Analysis Framework (NAF) would be exported to the UK benchmarking exercise currently underway.

Flexible Funding: Participants noted that the provision of adequate, flexible, timely and predictable funding remains central to the GHD agenda.

1. In the discussion on the **UN E-CERF**, participants agreed that the paper prepared for the discussion was useful in fleshing out what an enhanced CERF could potentially look like. While some donors expressed their intention to contribute to the E-CERF, others outlined important reservations about the modalities and application of such a mechanism. Most donors agreed that there were many issues still to be resolved before such a mechanism could be established, and stressed the importance of allowing sufficient time to adequately address them. In this context, the UK offered to host a meeting in September to examine the issues of concern to participants before the E-CERF proposal was raised formerly in the coming General Assembly.

2. On **pooled funding**, Development Initiatives provided a thoughtful overview of the Sudan initiative as a means to "inform" the DRC pooled funding, and the UK advised that next steps would be the following: 1) completion of the Sudan Report; 2) proceed with a similar report for the DRC; and 3) develop specific proposals on how to move forward with the humanitarian coordinators and interested donors. The latter were encouraged to participate in the DRC pooled funding initiative in order to arrive at a "critical mass" or, at a minimum, ensure inclusion of non-participants in briefings and dialogue so as not to undermine the initiative.

Governance: Participants agreed that the United Kingdom would assume the **Chair** of the initiative, including providing overall coordination on, and acting as focal point for, the the informal Implementation Group which would continue to meet on an ad hoc, as required, basis in Geneva.

Ottawa
July 19, 2005