



Notes: Third Burden and responsibility sharing GRF co-sponsorship group meeting

4 September 2019

Participants:

- ACT Alliance, Canada, Costa Rica, DARA/RRI, Denmark, Ecuador, European Union, Germany, ICVA, IDMC, Indonesia, Islamic Relief, Japan, OECD, Oxfam, Pakistan, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, UN-Habitat, UNHCR, World Bank.
- For UNHCR: Daniel Endres, Perveen Ali, Jaime de Bourbon-Parme, Amr Marei, Caroline Lensing-Hebben, Patrick Wall.

Agenda:

- Introduction and overview
- Identifying opportunities for pledges and contributions within each of the main outcomes – key questions for consideration
- Outcome 1: Funding and the effective and efficient use of resources
- Outcome 2: Support platforms and regional and sub-regional approaches
- Outcome 3: Reliable, comparable, and timely data
- Outcome 4: Prevention and addressing root causes
- Next steps

Introduction and overview:

Daniel Endres:

- There are 4 identified outcomes for this group:
 - **Outcome 1:** Funding and the effective and efficient use of resources through strengthening the humanitarian development nexus in refugee responses, expanding the base of financing beyond traditional donors, and identifying opportunities to continue maximizing the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of funding
 - **Outcome 2:** Support platforms and regional and sub-regional approaches to protect, assist, and find solutions for specific refugee situations and galvanize support for host communities
 - **Outcome 3:** Reliable, comparable, and timely data for evidence-based policies, programmes, and investments that improve socio-economic conditions for refugees and host communities
 - **Outcome 4:** Prevention and addressing root causes, in line with ongoing efforts in the areas of prevention, peace, security, sustainable development, migration, and peacebuilding
- We have virtually 3,5 months before the Forum, so we need to see opportunities that exists and which we want to focus on.
- How to mobilize respective contributions?

ICVA:

- Can you clarify what you mean by ‘opportunities’? Events to use to build momentum; opportunities for concrete pledges, etc.?

Perveen Ali:

- By ‘opportunities’, we mean events, mechanisms to build upon, etc. Broad perspective.



Outcome 1: Funding and the effective and efficient use of resources

Daniel Endres:

- This outcome encompasses the HDN, inclusion of refugees and host communities in development planning and funding; deepening and broadening the donor base; increasing the quality of un-earmarked humanitarian funding. Additionality is also an important factor, looking at how to galvanize support to some of the existing financing mechanism.
- In terms of thematic funding mechanisms, we can highlight the following examples:
 - Burden and responsibility sharing: IDA refugee sub-window
 - Jobs and livelihoods: Poverty Alleviation Coalition
 - Solutions: The Sustainable Resettlement and Complementary Pathways Initiative
 - Energy and Infrastructure: Green Climate Fund
 - Education: GPE, ECW, Education for All Coalition, UNHCR secondary education fund, DAFI
- This is a non-exhaustive list of tools and mechanisms that can be leveraged.
- What do we want to deepen? Are there gaps that we should identify?

Ecuador:

- On thematic funding, it would be useful to know more about each one of these. We learned about the 3-YS on RST and CPs yesterday but know less about the others.
- Our thinking in co-sponsoring burden- and responsibility-sharing is that this is the core of GCR and Forum. This should be a crosscutting issue with all other themes. We want to see outcomes that will contribute to those.

Canada:

- It is important to see what the refugee angle is. Support platforms could be a way. So far those are thought around countries, situations, but maybe those mechanisms we see can be defined as thematic platforms and could help us raise funds.

Denmark:

- Good idea to build on existing mechanisms. Like Ecuador and Canada, we think we need to look at needs and how to match.
- IDA is most important but it might also be good to add bilateral development funding. It is not a mechanism but a good practice that could be duplicated.

Daniel Endres:

- Bilateral funding is implied but can be further highlighted as this is by far the largest contribution.

Pakistan:

- This Outcome focuses on financing and, as Denmark said, there are many more avenues of financing already there. So we need to keep other options open as well.
- Concept of matching demands / needs of refugees is important. This is the essence.

Daniel Endres:

- Yes, this is almost the idea of having a mini-compact for each country/situation.

EU Delegation:

- We have not yet been able to confirm any co-sponsoring for the GRF mainly because there is not a EU Commission in place yet. We are following with great interest all groups but with particular interest on this one. All outcomes are important especially funding and platforms.
- On specific outcome 1, we wonder how it ties into broadening the support base and mobilizing. This could be defined in financial terms but also with reference to RST, etc.
- Looking at the preliminary GRF agenda, we also wonder whether we could see how those different outcomes could be better reflected. There is a lot of overlaps. We should not miss the objective of broadening the base of support.

ICVA:

- Would it not be useful to come back to the GCR text and ensure we make use of what it contains. For example, on expanding the support base, GCR para. 32 and footnote 12 call to use innovative financing schemes as recommended in the [Report of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing HLP on Humanitarian Financing](#). Are we referring enough to this report?
- With regard to the examples of thematic funding mechanisms and since we are asked to identify gaps, should we not try to think about funding mechanisms related to Protection Capacity? The examples provided cover all the co-sponsorship group themes, except Protection Capacity.

Japan:

- On broadening the base, bilateral assistance is one important aspect but private sector engagement is also important. It also has a lot to do with other co-sponsoring groups but broadening the base is linked to this.

Oxfam:

- The compact multi-stakeholder approach is also part of responsibility-sharing in the GCR structure/text. Will it be part of this group's discussion? If not where and also where to discuss refugee participation?

Daniel Endres:

- Not all will be funding through mechanisms. Bilateral contributions will remain important.
- We hear a call from you to look at the overarching mobilization of support in all co-sponsorship groups and bring HD funding discussion to all of those groups as well.
- HLP on Humanitarian Financing report is a very good document that should not be forgotten. It is referred to implicitly when we talk about the Grand Bargain. But Chapters 2 and 3 are also very important (on shared responsibility and on broadening base of donors/support).
- It is important to ensure active participation of refugees and refugee-led organizations, including as co-sponsors.

Outcome 2: Support platforms and regional and sub-regional approaches:

Daniel Endres:

- The GCR called for this new concept to be applied in new situations or in existing protracted situations in some circumstances.
- There are 4 elements : prevention by galvanizing commitments (maybe not for all platforms though); mobilizing financial and material technical assistance; bring in HD in coherent manner; multi-stakeholder approach and comprehensive policy towards easing pressure.



- This is really about how to mobilize a pool of actors, particularly States, in support of a situation.
- One potential result is that a Support Platform can lead into a solidarity conference as a galvanizing moment.
- We have a Platform already with MIRPS. We see interesting elements of displacement being addressed and MS realizing that working together they can be an efficient response to various scenarios in the region. There is also an ongoing effort underway to have this in the IGAD region.
- A number of other situations that could be considered. We need to see opportunities and elements to galvanize. If there is no specific momentum, we don't think a platform can in itself be mobilizing. We need to have particular opportunities there. If there's no funding at all for example, then a platform will not help go beyond.

Costa Rica:

- We need to make the link to outcome one.

Daniel Endres:

- Indeed, a platform should aim at sustained engagement not at points in time like a solidarity conference only.

ACT Alliance:

- Could we expand on the 'chicken and egg' question: is there momentum or a platform should be used to generate momentum? When platforms were initially discussed, there was the idea that those had to be useful to generate political support as it is what is often lacking. Could existing platforms be used to generate lessons on political support and build momentum?

Canada:

- Platforms should be key for financing and other opportunities.
- On technical details for support platforms, we could think that they could generate recommendations for UNDAF for example. How technical level issues are supposed to be addressed through Support Platforms?

Daniel Endres:

- There are many engagement points possible. Not that because it's a hopeless situation, we should not engage. But there needs to be an entry point if we are to mobilize large support.

EU Delegation:

- We agree with points made before and the EU is interested in engaging Support Platforms, particularly on the basis of our own engagement with IGAD and MIRPS so far.
- Are you suggesting that IGAD and MIRPS will be announced as Support Platforms at the GRF in the compact in action sessions?
- Looking beyond the Forum, it would be interesting to consider what other spaces are being considered and what are the obstacles? Maybe we could be thinking that in 6 months there will be a platform for the Rohingya situation, for example? How to link the reflections to activation and deactivation? Should we link to L3 activation for example?
- It would be key to bring IGAD in this group.

ICVA:

- Concurring with ACR Alliance and the EU Delegation, it would be useful to bring lessons from MIRPS and IGAD into this group? This could also be a way to bring those actors into the



group. We could invite MIRPS actors to provide a presentation on their Support Platform's experience. Same for IGAD although it would probably be too early to get lessons learned.

Spain:

- We would need to understand how, as donors, we are expected to work and engage with Support Platforms?

Daniel Endres:

- It is not yet clear whether we intend to launch a platform during the GRF as waiting to see what happens with IGAD. We would also need to have a group of friends to the platform ready to pledge.
- With MIRPS, there are already more concrete opportunities to support. There will be an event planned the day before for the MIRPS countries. There will be opportunities to provide specific support.
- On IGAD, for each country there is a plan, linked to the Nairobi Declaration, which is quite comprehensive.
- Do we want to announce a future platform? Maybe we should not overdo it with platforms as we want to showcase a model that works. If we start 5 platforms and 2 fail, then the concept is weakened by failures. But there needs to be a plan for the future.
- We could have sharing of experience by IGAD/MIRPS but we want this group to remain focused on GRF. There will be opportunities beyond the Forum to work on issues through multi-stakeholder perspectives. But feedback on key lessons should be possible.

Caroline Lensing-Hebben:

- Support Platforms are to be state-led and facilitated by UHCR. So it very much depends on States for initiatives to start.
- In IGAD, MS have made progressive policy commitments and a Support Platform would aim to support the implementation of those commitments especially in education and livelihood (i.e. Djibouti Declaration on Refugee Education and Kampala Declaration on Jobs, Livelihood and Self-reliance). At national level for example, Uganda has costed plans for education and for health, which are not funded yet, not supported. But those are already concrete plans owned by government on specific sectors, that can be supported by a variety of actors.

Costa Rica:

- Support Platform and MIRPS is of high importance. Refugee crises often have a sub-regional focus, spread, and impact. Each country has its own reality to deal with the situation. Many times it is important to have a region and a group of friends/supporters that can help move beyond national problem-solving approach into the regional problem-solving dynamics, promoting cooperation (e.g. issue of transboundary movements is important).
- We have seen that decisions of a country to close borders have impacted others around. We need outside support to keep positive communication, dialogue, etc. engaged. This could be a good contribution.

Daniel Endres:

- Yes, establishing such dialogue would be useful through platforms and this is already a lesson from MIRPS.
- Thanks for suggestions and comments. We will refine the slides and work with colleagues on platforms to look at how we can present it at the forum itself and in the lead-up, seek concrete cooperation and mobilize you as friends of platforms, consult with this and expand the group on e.g. MIRPS event the day before on what to showcase, etc.

- Important when we launch the platforms that we engage host countries. We should not launch numerous platforms without a clear way forward. We have this in the MIRPS, looks like it in IGAD. Myanmar, we tried but stalled a bit but surely there will be something in the future.

Outcome 3: Reliable, comparable, and timely data

Daniel Endres:

- This is a critical and overarching issue. We felt it had to have a home somewhere.
- Definitely, for better planning we need better supported evidence. We need to see how to strengthen data collection, and how it can help with solutions and protection.
- Opportunities:
 - UNHCR Data strategy will be presented at ExCom.
 - This is not just about identity management. Digital identity is linked to enhanced protection and access to services, better monitoring and reporting.
 - All this cannot be done without partners and need for interoperability of data. Difficult but necessary. The World Bank JDC will be key in this perspective.
 - National / regional arrangements, and Supports Platforms are also important. This is a given.
- One of the overarching issues for all co-sponsorship groups is: What other opportunities are there and what to take into account?

Oxfam:

- There is a lot of evidence on how data strategy is important but how to reflect on how refugees can be integrated in better programming, how to use this experiential evidence, etc.? Could this be showcased and not just rely on statistics.

World Bank:

- Indeed this would be extremely important to have the perspectives from refugees.
- We hope the JDC will be able to be showcased at the Forum, for more reliable data. We could also showcase results in side-events or marketplace. It may fit neatly in UNHCR strategy.
- There is a lot of interest in trying to build good work. UK and UNHCR and Bank have invested in evidence building program. This could also be showcased.

Daniel Endres:

- There could also be advocacy toward host countries.
- Based on what the WB just said, we can revise the slides and launch the JDC with importance that it has at the Forum.

Outcome 4: Prevention and addressing root causes

Daniel Endres:

- This is a large issue and we need to zoom in on what could be brought to Forum.
- We won't be able to address all drivers and triggers.
- We need to look at key ways to collaborate on this:
 - The H-D-P agenda and we have good examples and concepts to use, such as human security.
 - Better knowledge of what interventions do, so data again, analysis, shared learning.

- Engagement of many different actors required, from grassroots to national, regional, global engagement.
- Look at risk of climate impact, environment, natural disasters on communities and how to build resilience.
- Invest in prevention and peacebuilding.
- Selection of many opportunities mapped already includes:
 - DAC recommendations on HDP Nexus.
 - Egypt suggested using the Aswan Forum of AU.
 - Human security concept is even beyond HDP
 - Women, Peace and security Agenda
- What can we as humanitarians do to mobilize on all this?
- Best example in the Compact is to include refugees not to generate tensions. Peace education, the key issue of leaving no one behind given how disadvantaged refugees are and also others like IDPs and others on the move.
- We know from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) that it would be ready to hold a workshop where such issue could be further elaborated.
- How do you suggest we move forward, not drowning ourselves?

Germany:

- The relationship between HDP actors is important. Often, we speak about HD but less about peace. There are ways to showcase what UNHCR does on rule of law, Community-Based Protection work, IDP laws, etc.
- Examples such as IDP law in South Sudan would be good, as well as on work on maintaining civilian character of IDP/Refugee camps.
- We need also to include key UN entities. Often, we see these programs are developed in isolation.

ACT Alliance:

- You mentioned climate induced displacement: would you see this group as one that would address this issue? We might see this in the Solutions group, or with Energy and Infrastructure but would be useful to work on the root causes angle as well.
- Would you look into reaching out to actors such as PDD and how it could link to pledging?

EU Delegation:

- This is THE most important issue. Many things are happening regardless of the GRF. What do we want to achieve? This angle does not link to specific session. Would we work on a spotlight session? Maybe SIPRI workshop could help in this.

Turkey:

- During the thematic discussions in 2017, you provided past examples. Maybe as our expectations are not so high on this for the Forum, looking at past prevention, common action, addressing root causes could be a way.
- We could showcase that the GCR gives a role to prevention and root causes. Difficult to address existing situations at the Forum but maybe look at past experience on a side event.

Daniel Endres:

- Addressing root causes fits here. When it comes to innovation and response, it probably fits well in energy.
- Looking at the past is a helpful suggestion. Germany also suggested to look at what the UN is doing, on identifying root causes and looking at possible ways to address these; Programs that can help foster stronger community cohesion and prevent displacement.



- Examples could be brought to the Forum, even recent ones, that are not too controversial, maybe through a spotlight session.
- We will bring 2-3 elements of this to the Forum. No magic solutions probably to present in December but can work on broad ideas.

Canada:

- This is a critical issue. It is easy to fall into the sentiment that we have low expectations but the Forum should also be an opportunity to advocate for the need for political action on peace agenda and resolution. The need for political action has to be an ongoing theme throughout. Maybe there are opportunities.
- We could look into local solutions for peace, etc.

Denmark:

- We are happy to see DAC recommendations on top of the list. There are important recommendations and processes to showcase and use as framework for other aspects.
- Maybe we could ask the OECD to organize something.
- Would link to need for political dialogue, prevention, early action mechanisms, etc.
- Concrete proposal: let's do something on showcasing DAC recommendations.

Daniel Endres:

- DAC Chair, Ms. Susanna Moorehead, would want to be involved in this discussion.
- DAC could now work to include refugees into DAC programs.

OECD:

- We work on some principles that could be developed to commit on financing for refugees.
- Susanna Moorehead interested to be involved.
- OECD will make commitments on Data on ODA / Aid sent to hosts.

Japan:

- We agree that although this is a key and important aspect, it is such a widespread and gigantic, difficult theme to tackle. Yet showcasing past practices would have good meaning.
- There are examples we could showcase. As we are on humanitarian side of discussion, Community-Based education, very steady examples are useful would be good and don't necessarily go into politics.

Daniel Endres:

- Prevention and peace advocacy should be the red thread throughout the forum. We will want this included in all statements.
- We suggest that we include proposals we received: OECD/DAC Recommendations, SIPRI workshop, Aswan forum, including all this in advocacy and plans for what it means for post forum engagement, how we approach programming, conflict sensitive programming.

Next steps:

Perveen Ali:

- We heard useful points that we can take back with relevant focal points in other groups to see if we can identify areas for contributions from this group.
- We can go into more details at our next group meeting on what each members can / want to do.



- Communications on priority areas: our communication team has been working on this and need key communication points.
- Broadening the base of support and comprehensive action plans will be important in opening and need to think about spotlights.

Daniel Endres:

- How to mobilize other MS also came out of this meeting and will look at that aspect as well.

EU Delegation:

- Suggest adding identifying best practices which could then help identify pledges based on those. The Forum is not just about pledges. It is important but it is also about best practices. Should be on equal footing for priorities.

Indonesia:

- It would be useful to share with a wider group of States the discussions of this group. We mentioned that we need to expand reach. Would be good to still have them in the loop in case interest or availability materialize. Info might be missed in the middle.
- This is about raising awareness about future meetings and that it is overarching, informing even if not in the mailing list. They might not be interested to come but good to alert them and at least they are kept informed

Oxfam:

- How do this link to pledges at national level? Could it be shared with those consultations in country/regions?

Denmark:

- We do encourage targeted outreach with large host not here today.
- We also want to flag that AGD is important as a cross-cutting theme
- Inclusion of refugees: is this possible for this group?

Daniel Endres:

- Good point as we need to include refugees.
- Happy to get suggestions on which countries to connect, outreach to.
- On national/regional processes, indeed there are 2 tracks: those and the Global Geneva one. All need to come together at some point.
- We need to see co-sponsoring groups as opportunities for States needing support to get it through groups or to use groups to voice needs.
- We want capitals to be in lead of contributions to the Forum.

⇒ Next meeting: **Tuesday 24 September 2019, 15:00-17:00** (Geneva time)