NGO Member Participants included:
FCA, HI, ICVA, NRC, Oxfam, Plan, SCI

1. Inputs towards the GB annual meeting - any common NGO message?
   - The GB annual meeting happens once a year at the Sherpa level, so high-level. The meeting will happen this year on 27 June in Geneva.
   - The NGOs have been represented currently by InterAction in the Grand Bargain Facilitation Group, but after this year’s meeting this will switch to SCHR.
   - All signatories to the GB are invited.
   - The agenda starts with opening words from Kristalina Georgyeva, the outgoing Eminent Person and will be followed by the new Eminent Person (EP), Sigrid, Kaag, a Dutch minister, which has a 2-year vision for the GB.
   - The day of the meeting goes quickly and is quite packed and as there are about 60 signatories this year there will be no reading of statements.
   - As we go into the meeting it is good to have common understanding on key messages from the NGO side. IA will do some work to collect messages this week, but it is good to also raise during this HFWG meeting.
   - As was the case for the past year, there is continued commitment to implement the GB at the field level. There will be a discussion on where the implementation can be pushed.
   - If you haven’t received an invite from IA to a call on inputs, you can write to Jeremy Rempel.
   - Apparently, the new EP committed to 2 years, but is there information regarding extending the timeline.
     - The fact the she is committed to 2 years means that at least during her tenure there will not be sun-setting or transitioning the GB. If anything, there is a look into what kind of transition into something more permanent.

2. Inputs on PFWG - any common NGO message?
   - Next week we will have two meetings – the OCHA-NRC PF dialogue platform, on 26 June, followed by a PFWG meeting on 28 June.
   - NRC has taken the lead on gathering input. It would be good to have points about Somalia to share at the meeting on the 28th.
• Both agendas are still in draft form. But a couple of points to highlight for the PFWG meeting.
• Somalia will be the highlighted country for this meeting.
• There will also be sessions on unearmarked and MYF, and on the new Ukrainian CBFP.
• There will be an update on the global OCHA-NRC evaluation study.
• For the 26 June platform meeting – the focus will be on the OCHA-NRC study on how to improve CBPFs.
• The Wednesday meeting is reserved for NGOs, while the PFWG is the main coordination body for PFs, and includes donors, UN agencies and some NGOs. On Wednesday we will concentrate on the study and the ongoing evaluation.
• The study will be shared widely once it is ready, but it is done with OCHA and won’t be ready for the meetings, but an executive summary will be shared ahead of it.
• Regarding the alignment of the NGOs on the NGO core group and those in the PFWG, the initial reaction to the idea from OCHA and Germany is positive, but we will need to advocate on the extra NGO seat that it requires.
• Regarding CERF, it remains accessible by UN agencies only despite attempts to open it up to NGOs. There was an analysis done 2 years ago, but it was shut down for now. We can push on this point on informal channels. NGOs will try to argue that since NGOs don’t have access to CERF, then CBPFs should be reserved to NGOs only.
• An update on the Evaluation – it is a very long document and we understand it will be available externally. 5 countries were selected for in-depth analysis, South Sudan, Somalia, oPT, Iraq and Afghanistan. By the Geneva meetings all 5 country visits should have taken place.
• The Evaluation board is talking with all stakeholders and not only NGOs. NRC is trying to increase engagement of the Evaluators with NGOs.
• Some donors such as ECHO are looking at CBPF as a means to make more direct local funding, maybe Ukraine or South Sudan donations.
• While CBPF is a good way to bridge gaps in local funding, it seems that OCHA doesn’t favor specifically local actors, but claims to choose the best placed actor to carry the work. Is there some warming up on their side to a more targeted giving to local actors? This is hard to answer because there has not been anyone heading CBPF in the last months. This might still be a long process until there is someone.
• ICVA will look into OCHA’s GB self-reporting about the topic.

3. Update IASC RG5 on Humanitarian Financing + discussion on what priorities NGO will help co-lead

• Many of you have been following the IASC transition int Results Groups and OPAG.
• One of the challenges is setting the priorities and activities for the coming year for the RG5. We have created a detailed matrix that we brought before the OPAG.
• There was some back and forth between the co-chairs, OPAG and the IASC Secretariat, and so far, there are no agreed upon priorities and activities.
• This is quite a confusing process, where it is not clear who has the authority to approve the priorities. In the last meeting with the IASC Secretariat, it was understood that the OPAG wants to see more details and some more specific examples of activities for the year.
• The list of priorities from OPAG has some mixing of levels between priorities, outputs and activities. There is sensitivity on items that were previously on the HFTT workplan or listing things that are almost done. They want to see new pieces to carry forward. For example, they would want to see the group going beyond Islamic Social Financing and looking at anticipatory financing (insurance).
• It is unclear what is the role of the IASC Secretariat as the link between the RG and the OPAG.
• ICVA will meet with the IASC Secretariat this week. On one of key items is understanding better what the Secretariat’s role is and how the communication should be.
• Membership continues to be an issue for the Secretariat, even regarding who’s on the mailing list. Each NGO network has 2 extra seats and another extra seat for national NGOs. In our view, it is important to have the right person in the organization that will contribute the most to the meetings.
• There are different views in the OPAG regarding what role should the Secretariat play, how strong it should be etc.
• The IASC deputies meeting is also upcoming, and one point is how the deputies can support the work of OPAG. Geir Olav, co-chair of OPAG will be present and it will be another opportunity to share concerns and points.
• It is important to get the RG5 working quickly, as the deadline for deliverables is approaching quickly. It would be important to identify at least one key deliverable.
• ICVA to send a reminder note on when there are opportunities to engage with the OPAG or IASC Secretariat.

4. UN partnership agreements harmonization - next steps for engagement and identifying priority concerns for NGOs

• The UN contract analysis had been shared with the UN agencies and have had by now time to read and process it.
• The question now is regarding the next steps.
• The agreement in the March meeting was that there will be a yearly face to face meeting and a quarterly thematic meeting. We do have 4 broad topic areas in the analysis – data protection etc. This gives the opportunity to bring the right people to the room – technical, legal.
• We need to identify a timeline to for this process and decide on the topics.
• There is agreement that we could start with data protection issue as this could be low-hanging fruit if we bring the right people
• Timing wise, there is agreement that we could start in July or later.
• ICVA will be having individual calls with the UN agencies to get their inputs on timing.
• There is a question regarding whether the UN agencies will provide a formal response. It seems at least UNHCR will reply.
• ICVA will update regarding the timing in July or later pending responses from the UN agencies.
• ICVA will revive the DCTF mailing list as separate from the HFWG list for the UN contract analysis matters. Those that were not engaged so far can send us a note and we will add them.

Next Meeting: Monday 22 July 2019 TBC