Online Consultation Summary Report
Europe & Others Group

26 November 2014 – 10 January 2015

This report summarizes the online comments and contributions received as part of the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) global online consultation for the Europe and Others Group (EOG). The report will inform the regional consultation meeting in Budapest on 3-4 February 2015, and be integrated into the formation of priorities for the first WHS in 2016.

About the online consultation

The moderated[1] discussion forum provided an open, public forum[2] to provoke debate and stimulate thinking about how to keep humanitarian action fit for the future, in order to inform the regional consultation meeting. Participation in the forum was open to anyone who registered, from any origin or location. **More than 4000 individuals viewed the discussions and more than 350 comments were received**, representing a broad range of countries and organizations[3].

A total of eight questions were discussed, sparking lively debate around the Summit's four themes, as well as cross-cutting issues and broader, general recommendations. The discussion questions were developed by the WHS thematic teams, the Discussion Chair and Moderators in consultation with the WHS Secretariat and EOG regional steering group.

Discussion Questions

Part 1 of the discussion consisted of four initial questions focused on how to make humanitarian action fit for future challenges. In part two, four follow-up questions were posted by the Chair and Moderators.

Key issues for discussion at Budapest meeting

1. Risks and vulnerabilities facing EOG countries:
   a. Impact of migration
   b. European financial problems
   c. Ukraine crisis
2. Lack of a shared definition of "humanitarianism"
3. Classification of types of humanitarian crises
4. Need to include and support local actors and vulnerable groups
5. Importance of investing in education to prevent and mitigate crises
6. Coordination and delivery mechanisms
7. Financing and transparency
8. Aligning Humanitarianism and Development

Table 1: Number of comments received to each question[4]

Questions	Comments
Part 1 1. What do you think are the key humanitarian issues that the 'Europe and others' regional consultation must address?	86

---

[1] The discussion took place at: www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/whs_eog, chaired by Randolph Kent, Director, Planning from the Futures project, King's College London, UK, and moderated by Everett M. Ressler, KonTerra Group, USA & Every Casualty Worldwide, UK, Christine Knudsen, Director, The Sphere Project, Switzerland and Nigel Fisher, Former OCHA Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Syria Crisis.

[2] The discussion was publicized through a number of channels including humanitarian and development media and networks such as ReliefWeb, IRIN, United Nations (UN) agencies and NGOs, through UN Member States, social media and via emails to various humanitarian groups such as the International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection (PHAP) network.

[3] Comments were received from individuals, national governments, international NGOs, regional institutions, community-based organizations, research organizations, donor organizations, independent consultants and private individuals.

[4] Many participants posted more than once and responded to more than one discussion question.

2. What needs to be in place 10 years from now to meet the humanitarian challenges and capitalize on the opportunities that we expect to prevail then?	70
3. How should humanitarians and development actors deliver together, for a more effective overall result?	83
4. What needs to be done to accelerate the trend of nationally or locally-led humanitarian response, where appropriate?	39
Part 2 1. How must humanitarian action change to respond to the increasingly complex humanitarian challenges and risks?	32
2. How should those with humanitarian roles and responsibilities partner better with affected people and organisations in zones of conflict & disaster?	24
3. What might be the greatest humanitarian threats and risks facing the 'Europe & Others' group in the next 15-20 years?	14
4. To what extent are the sources of humanitarian problems around the world paralleled in the countries of the 'Europe and Others' group?	7
Total comments:	**355**

Key issues raised for the Budapest consultation

Detailed summaries of the contributions to the discussion are annexed below in the three interim summaries also available online here: Weeks 1-2 – Week 3 – Weeks 4-5. During the discussion participants highlighted the following issues as crucial for the future effectiveness of humanitarian action, meriting further discussion at the regional consultation meeting.

1. Humanitarian risks and vulnerabilities facing the Europe and Others Group countries

The Discussion Chair and Moderators highlighted serious structural, institutional, financial and governance issues affecting resilience and vulnerability in the Europe and Others Group of countries. However, while some participants in the online consultation acknowledged that the region itself is not crisis free, overall commentators did not consistently view the region as an amalgam of vulnerable countries.

The three main humanitarian issues highlighted by participants for further discussion in Budapest were the impacts of migration into and within the region, the crisis in Ukraine, and the effects of Europe's financial problems, both internal, in terms of poverty, vulnerability, inequality, alienation, and external, in terms of reduced international assistance. The moderators sought to focus the discussion on the region's own strengths and weaknesses in terms of vulnerability and resilience, in part to shift the debate from an outdated "North/South" perspective to a more global one, and in part to seek ways to share experience – threats and means to mitigate them – amongst the regions.

2. Lack of a shared "problem statement" and definition of "Humanitarian"

Consensus was not reached among participants on a shared "problem statement" or even the definition of "humanitarian." Participants in the forum used a wide range of definitions of "humanitarianism", from life-saving actions related to classic "disasters" and "emergencies", to response to any threat to well-being and rights due to poverty, inequality, conflict, human rights violations, migration, climate change, etc. A new consensus and clarity as to what is meant by "humanitarian" will be a fundamental issue underpinning all considerations of prevention and response in the discussions leading up to, and at, the World Humanitarian Summit. The humanitarian community will need to try to reconcile this tension between those who view humanitarian as specifically life-saving and those who see it as an all-inclusive approach to any assistance needed outside of a relatively normal or stable situation.

It was also pointed out that the tendency to extend and expand the limits of humanitarian assistance to upstream and downstream work, while ensuring linkages with development actors and more holistic

approaches, can also call into question how humanitarian principles apply at these edges, and potentially limit humanitarian assistance in other places.

Participants described the increasingly chaotic nature of the humanitarian system caused by this lack of clarity. Many felt that the system has become unmanageable with a proliferation of actors, coordination frameworks, action plans, consultations, etc. Several commentators recommended rationalization of actors and increased focus and specialization to increase impact, for example by grouping organizations and actors for effectiveness.

3. Classification of types of humanitarian crises

In discussing humanitarian response worldwide, participants made reference to the key international norms guiding humanitarian action globally and reflected the tension between those who called for agreeing new norms and standards and others who highlighted the need to ensure that future humanitarian responses can be adapted to local needs and specificities. It was frequently highlighted that one size does not fit all in approach, analysis or response. For example, typologies will need to include government variations as affects response, external support, transparency and roles/responsibilities.

4. Need to include and support local actors and vulnerable groups

Looking at humanitarian response globally, many participants highlighted the future importance of giving greater focus to the inclusion of vulnerable groups, including women, children, persons with disabilities, migrants and older people in humanitarian preparedness and response.

Commentators frequently emphasized frustration experienced due to the continuing problem of local exclusion and an enduring "us and them" mentality. As clear recommendations for the Budapest meeting, participants called for reforming the international humanitarian system to allow for a stronger lead role for national actors and local people, new ways of collaborating and an emphasis on building local capacities. The correct balance and coherence of international intervention and local action in addressing humanitarian needs will remain an issue to be discussed in addressing future needs.

5. Investing in education to prevent and mitigate crises

A very strong theme emerging throughout the discussion was the importance of investing in education worldwide, both as a means to address the underlying causes of conflicts globally, such as cultures of violence and intolerance, and as a way to mitigate crises, for example by developing local capacities in disaster risk reduction (DRR) in response to climate change and increasing preparedness and resilience. Participants highlighted that, while many countries and communities remain ill-equipped and underprepared for future threats, there is a continuing reluctance on the part of governments and others to put significant investment into preparedness and prevention. A key question for discussion in Budapest is how to change this.

6. Coordination and delivery mechanisms

A range of mechanisms and structures to manage and coordinate humanitarian response were recognized by participants as one issue that must be considered to address future needs (e.g. OCHA, national systems, the cluster system). The national and global mechanisms for response to Level 2 and Level 3 emergencies will be a critical issue that the World Humanitarian Summit will be expected to address.

7. Financing and transparency

Given the lack of agreement on the definition of "humanitarian" or the "problem statement" in terms of future requirements and shifts, it is difficult to address issues of financial resources, as one participant, Charlotte Lattimer, expressed, *"We don't know enough about what resources are available to support humanitarian*

objectives. Our efforts to increase transparency have focused on international resources… we also need to make the humanitarian sector more accessible and transparent to the private sector and work together to understand current and potential sources of private funding and in-kind contributions. We have even less of a clear idea about domestic government funding for crisis prevention, response and recovery. Until we can improve aid transparency across the board, it's difficult to full understand funding availability, gaps and priorities."

Several contributors noted different aspects for further discussion in Budapest: total amounts available; limits in the direct access to resources by national/local actors who providing the bulk of the delivery; the divide between humanitarian and development funds from donors.

8. Bridging the Humanitarian-Development divide

Participants were in agreement that the separation of humanitarian and development frameworks and actors remains a major issue which must be more closely aligned. It was argued that the humanitarian/development separation is meaningless, for example, DRR and preparedness also means addressing root causes, such as gender discrimination, continued population growth, poor governance, increasing inequalities and stratification. This intersection is reflected in overlaps between development aid and humanitarian assistance in terms of donor contributions.

As first steps towards alignment, it was recommended to: ensure development actors are included in WHS consultations, and to combine overlapping futures frameworks, such as the WHS, the Post-2015 DDR framework and Post-2015 development goals, which are all currently running on separate tracks.

Chair and Moderators' Analysis

The moderators identified the following critical issues as requiring further discussion in Budapest. Some are omissions from the online discussion, while others build on the above issues emerging from the discussion.

1. Increase efforts to identify solutions to transform the system

While the consultation highlighted problems in the humanitarian system, there was less discussion of the obstacles to change and how a theory of change could be applied. Specific design is needed to identify solutions, alternatives and options to transform the system.

A fundamental engine of change may be looking at what we measure, and how, to bring about change at all levels, for example, tracking evidence of how information from affected people is acted upon; tracking funding percentages of what is spent on capacity development of national actors; tracking percentages of national versus international staff/organizations, etc.

2. Greater focus on new threats and shifting vulnerabilities

More attention must be given to the expanding types, dynamics and dimensions of crisis threats and ways to mitigate them. It is important not only to address the ever more complex challenges of the present, but also to engage a wide variety of traditional and so-called 'non-traditional' humanitarian actors to help understand and meet the challenges of the future.

Changing demographics, as well as changing threats, are going to be critical to addressing adequate preparedness no matter the model that is agreed. Urban populations, aging populations, and youth "bubbles"

are not adequately addressed or perhaps can't be addressed well with our current approach and tools, which must be adapted.

Similarly, little comment was offered in the discussion on what humanitarian assistance will be required and what the gaps will be. An important element in establishing the humanitarian agenda for the future will involve reaching consensus on what the humanitarian response should be in response to changing demographics and threats.

3. *Reconfigure the international system to enable local leadership*

While there was strong recognition in the discussion that national and local actors can and should be in the lead in many cases, the current mechanisms, assumptions and tools need to be revised to fully enable local actors to take the lead. For example, in the current model of assistance, national or local leadership and ownership of a response is against the international system's own interests and would require agreement on what areas international actors relinquish to local actors. Empowering national and local actors to lead would require reconfiguring the current international system (INGOs and the UN) to see itself fully as facilitators, rather than implementers, with all that this would entail in terms of operations, policy, funding and monitoring.

4. *Role and function of national and regional bodies*

While the importance of local communities and local actors taking the lead was repeatedly called for in the discussion, the most glaring omission was consideration of the role and function of national and regional bodies. In considering the humanitarian agenda for the next period the issue of "who" holds responsibility and who will act will remains central issues in an ordered system.

5. *Broadening sources of financing*

Increasing future threats and challenges requires broadening the focus on assistance substantially beyond international aid into domestic (including Diaspora) financial and in-kind assistance. Further, as part of the shift towards more national-led crisis management and broader interpretation of humanitarian action, there will also be a need to consider ways for international financing to complement rather than undermine that of national and local government and address the underlying drivers of crisis.

Comments on this report are welcomed. Please post online at: www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/whs_eog or email to: eog@whsummit.org.

Detailed summaries of the contributions to the discussion can be found in the three interim summaries annexed below and available online here: Weeks 1-2 – Week 3 – Weeks 4-5.

This report was drafted by the Discussion Chair and Moderators with support from the WHS secretariat and UN Online Volunteers: John Alonso (UK), Christelle Cazabat (France), Lyndall King (Australia), Tina Mason (UK), Jennifer Lynette (USA) and Aleksandrina Mavrodieva, (Bulgaria).

Annex 1

Weekly Summary: Weeks 1-2

24 November – 7 December 2014

"Business as usual is not enough: Humanitarian action must change or risk irrelevance"

The following summarises the comments posted during the first two weeks of discussions (24 November – 7 December) in response to the three initial questions.

Q. 1. What do you think are the key humanitarian issues that the Europe and others regional consultation must address?

The 'Europe and Others' group occupies a unique place in the regional consultations for the WHS as many countries have a dual role of providing a domestic response to natural disasters, conflicts and heavy migration flows while at the same time responding to crises around the world as international donors. In the discussion, there appeared to be no notable areas of disagreement and whilst participants have contributed to both sides of the dual focus of this region, recommendations for externally facing engagement in humanitarian issues tended to dominate. The following summarises the key humanitarian issues which were highlighted by participants as key for this consultation to address, in order of the most frequently cited.

Immigration and displacement: This issue was raised in terms of the impact of immigration within Europe specifically as well as other regions generally. Affected populations warranting focus and attention by the region include refugees, Internally Displaced Persons, the stateless and migrating populations. **Vladimir Kirushev, conflict analyst, Malta**, recommended looking at the rising trend of maritime migration into Europe and procedures that are able to successfully stem the number of deaths at sea.

Aligning humanitarian interventions with longer term development: Participants' recommendations to achieve this included: investments in Disaster Risk Reduction, preparedness and resilience; establishing appropriate frameworks to enable longstanding sustainable development, and focusing on establishing peace and building civil societies. Thus, the main areas for humanitarian and development cooperation highlighted in this discussion were two-fold; 1) to address and enable the **conditions** for peace and stability; 2) to build **preparedness and resilience**. **Lucy Pearson, Advocacy Coordinator, Global Network for Disaster Reduction, UK**, suggests local resilient recovery frameworks as a possible joint venture to explore.

Ability to tackle new and more complex challenges: This pertains to the ability of the region to recognise, confront and overcome new and emerging challenges in the design and delivery of humanitarian assistance, including addressing shrinking humanitarian space and insecurity of aid workers. **Dr. Amb. Asabe Shehu**

Yar'Adua, **Nigeria** recommended that to confront the growing threat of terrorist insurgencies there should be a provision of humanitarian services that discourage youth involvement in terrorism, child conscription and encourage active involvement in political and economic development.

Women and Gender Equality: This discussion raised three main points. Firstly with regards to modern day slavery and labour exploitation occurring within the countries of the 'Europe and Others' group, the need to address the experience of women and children under these circumstances was emphasised. Secondly, the importance of understanding the particular needs of women affected by conflict and the exacerbation of exiting vulnerabilities. And finally, as **Archie Law, Executive Director, ActionAid Australia** highlights, to focus on the contribution potential of women in emergency responses – looking particularly at leadership, decision making, and feedback.

> *"Whilst women are often the first responders, they are often the last to participate in decision-making. Therefore it's important we recognize that women are not helpless victims and have an important leadership role in preparedness, response and recovery."* –
> **Archie Law, Executive Director, ActionAid Australia**

Knowledge management, communication and coordination: This overlapping discussion focused on improving these aspects of humanitarian assistance in order to: enable a shared understanding of humanitarian frameworks and principles; share information and data, and; improve responses (and systems) by ensuring that they are evidence and needs based and essentially better informed. This last point includes recognising when aid becomes an obstacle to change and resilience building.

The importance of assistance being able to see the bigger picture was also raised. This includes understanding the root causes of vulnerabilities, governance dynamics, and the global structural conditions of inequality and exploitation. **Barry Horton, UK,** advised that the consultation should discuss issues such as aid as a sticking plaster over avoidable and significant failures of basic infrastructure as well as the impact of labour exploitation in keeping poorer countries in a position of dependency.

Michael Mosselmans, Christian Aid, **UK**, advised that there needs to be a shift toward the leadership of the global south with regards to both national and local actors and to include capacity and resilience building and local level empowerment. Further, the importance of putting the voices of the affected population at the front and centre of decision making is emphasised. Michael shared specific recommendations for the realisation of these points, which will be published in a new Christian Aid report due out this month.

Finally, the following areas were also put forward by participants as key humanitarian issues the 'Europe and Others' consultation should address: Improve the understanding of people and their situations through better and on-the-ground research; focus on the importance of higher education emergency programmes in order to create opportunities for young people affected by emergencies, and; play a greater role in enabling the reconciliation of the Arab – Israeli conflict.

Q. 2. What needs to be in place 10 years from now to meet the humanitarian challenges & capitalize on the opportunities that we expect to prevail then?

To kick off the discussion, **Markus Forsberg, Membership and Communications Coordinator, Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection (PHAP), Geneva,** compiled the responses received from the live online

event introducing the regional consultation for the 'Europe and Others' group (recording available at phap.org/21Nov2014), as follows:

1. Led by local actors and the "global South"

2. Better coordination

3. Better interaction/integration of humanitarian and development work - *including by more flexible funding mechanisms*

4. Better data collection and use of evidence

5. Greater focus on prevention and mitigation

6. Better governance of humanitarian system – *at all levels*

7. Misc.: *Culture of rights for people in armed conflict; Hi-tech tools for outreach; Better address needs of IDPs; Ensure funding reaches beneficiaries.*

In the subsequent online discussion, as summarized below, a common concern of participants was the still existing gap in communication and cooperation between the private sector and NGOs on one hand, and governments on the other; but also between local actors on one hand, and international players and donors on the other. Participants frequently noted that what is of utmost importance is increasing the capacity building of local NGOs, as well as promoting education among young people and youth.

Among the comments it was also mentioned that a 'safety net' that is less dependent on donors and their demands would be beneficial when facing the new humanitarian challenges.

One contributor emphasized the need for international actors to address local needs and not simply use a "template agenda". At the same time, it was felt that aid should be used to solve the real

> *"For far too long, the international community has said 'here are our plans to help you', instead of asking, 'how can we help?'"* **– Nicole So, Global Health Advocate, Australia**

problems of people in crisis and not for the benefit of governments in gaining political advantage.

Prof. Timothy Henry Gatara, Senior Researcher in Peace, Kenya, confirmed the general opinion that decision-makers need to engage more with communities at grassroots level and assist people in disaster or conflict situations. According to Prof. Gatara, it is "embarrassing" how much time and money are spent in the wrong places, while pressing solvable issues can be tackled instead.

A few commentators mentioned that discrimination against certain groups in society is one of the problems that need to be addressed if there is to be progress in the next ten years. **Dr. Amb. Asabe Shehu Yar'Adua, Nigeria** outlined three main issues that need to be resolved in the next few years: 1. Corruption, which she cited as destructive economically and the cause of slow development in a number of countries; 2. Youth should be given opportunities to participate in the political and economic development of their respective countries, rather than youth militarization, 3. Illiteracy should be reduced through the establishment and promotion of new, strong education systems.

Priscilla, DRR, Kenya, suggested proposed a joint information/knowledge management system that interacts from the bottom to the top (local to global level), to provide a framework for humanitarian workers at all levels, and create common criteria and parametres. It is important to develop an evaluation mechanism that will pinpoint outstanding issues and best practices. Those examples that have proved to be positive ones, then, need to be scaled-up. In this regard, **Winston Chang, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, UN OCHA, Geneva,** gave as an

example of international standards the INSARAG network, which sets a framework for international urban search and rescue (USAR) teams.

Michael Mosselmans, Christian Aid, UK, shared a list of proposals for improving the humanitarian assistance system, namely:

1. Donors must reform centralized and risk-averse programmatic requirements and procedures that inhibit the ability of the humanitarian system to work with and reinforce local indigenous capacities;
2. Preparedness and DRR funding needs to increase to 10% of humanitarian aid;
3. OCHA should deploy a senior staff member to each L3 emergency to focus on ensuring that NNGOs and LNGOs are maximally included in coordination structures;
4. Donors, UN agencies and INGOs should provide a minimum of 15% of their funding direct to NNGOs and LNGOs;
5. Adoption of the Core Humanitarian Standard, including verification and an independent certification mechanism accessible to NNGOs as well as INGOs should be maximized;
6. In order to channel funding more rapidly into the hands of national and local actors, including in under-funded crises, new independent multi-donor NGO-led response funds at national level are needed, with membership from both NNGOs and INGOs, and that are building on the Start Fund model;
7. The WHS should prioritize the participation of disaster affected communities, their representative bodies, NNGOs and Southern actors in the consultation, and agreement of key outcomes.

The remainder of the discussion was dominated by the opinion that the need for humanitarian response should be led by local actors and in consultation with the affected stakeholders. As an example, **Nicole So, Global Health Advocate, Australia**, mentioned the case of Sarah Tenoi who has suffered female genital mutilation (FGM) and has become an advocate for promoting change. She has been successful because she comes from the same cultural background and speaks the same language and the people she was trying to reach. The case underlined the importance of taking into consideration local traditions and engaging in conversation with community leaders and local actors.

Another example was provided by **Lyndall King, UN Online volunteer, UK,** who explained both the positive and the negative effects of the Band Aid 30 single, "Do they know it's Christmas" campaign currently collecting funds for tackling the Ebola crisis. While raising an enormous amount of money, the campaign has also received criticism for perpetuating a stereotypical image of countries in Africa, which risks hindering investment and tourism in the continent as a whole. In this case the opinion of the affected communities was not asked for.

Finally, a positive remark was given by **Tina, Human Security MSc Student, Denmark,** who believes that in ten years' time such policies will have proved to be unsuccessful and stereotypes will not be the driving force in humanitarian action. With such an unprecedented level of declared emergencies, together with the resulting factors of im/migration and the need for increased financial assistance, it is extremely important to look at how populations in the 'Europe and others' group are engaged in a productive way, not only in terms of how to generate public funding, but how to stave off 'compassion fatigue' and growing hostilities.

Q. 3. How should humanitarians & development actors deliver together, for a more effective overall result?

During the first two weeks of discussions participants were unanimous on the need for increased interaction between humanitarian and development actors in crisis preparedness, response and recovery, highlighting that less developed communities are more severely and lastingly impacted by disasters, while development projects build resilience. **Susan Michele Kopecky, USA**, compared humanitarian and development actors to different fingers of the same hand.

Three examples of successful collaborations were shared during the discussion. One participant in the live online event introducing the 'Europe and Others' regional consultation on 21 November mentioned that development actors are critical for providing solutions for international displaced persons, particularly in Europe. Another example was shared from the 2010 cholera outbreak in Cameroon, where the emergency response built on the existing network of local development volunteers to inform the affected communities on ways to avoid contamination, effectively preventing reoccurrence of the disease in 2011. **Anu Pillay, IASC GenCap Project, Switzerland** highlighted the potential of gender mainstreaming as a link between development and humanitarian work, citing a UN Women project training older women as solar engineers in the Pacific Islands to prevent power shortage in case of disaster, at the same time raising the status of women, improving security and expanding educational opportunities with night courses.

Participants are however aware of the challenges of such interaction, including the competition which sometimes exists between humanitarian and development actors to mobilize resources or keep the lead on their projects. The differences in their approaches can also create obstacles.

> *"The core focus should be on collaboration and not on competition"* –
> **Kirthi Jayakumar, The Red Elephant Foundation, India**

Several comments recommended joint planning to identify overlaps and gaps, build upon existing initiatives and include longer-term components in humanitarian interventions. Better coordination can reduce costs, increase the capacity to respond quickly and efficiently to an emergency and ensure the sustainability of the interventions as well as the resilience of the communities to future crisis. The **Asabe Shehu Yar'Adua Foundation, Nigeria,** recommends strong synergy between humanitarian and development actors, and exchange of information and expertise to deliver more effectively. **Maggie Ibrahim, World Vision, UK**, shared the findings of a World Vision analysis on institutionalizing resilience which emphasizes the importance of ensuring that development programming is risk smart. This includes conducting holistic, participatory vulnerability and capacity assessments to guide programming, developing informed scenarios to allow for flexible programming and implementing early warning and action systems linking into contingency planning.

Finally, **Priscilla from Kenya** highlighted the existence of global frameworks such as the Millennium Development Goals and the Hyogo Framework of action, which should be used as the basis of joint interventions under the coordination of a multi-stakeholder body.

Annex 2

Weekly Summary: Week 3

8 – 15 December 2014

"The essence of humanitarian development is not in isolating the masses,
but in making them the owners of the solution that they determine as acceptable
and appropriate for their needs." - Kirthi Jayakumar, Online UNV and Peace and Conflict Researcher,
India

The following summarises the comments posted during the third week of discussions (8-15 December) in response to the three initial questions, plus a new question, Question 4. Four new questions were posted in the discussion forum for part two of the discussion.

Q. 1. What do you think are the key humanitarian issues that the Europe and others regional consultation must address?

At the end of the third week of discussions in response to question one several new topics emerged and some previous discussions were explored in more depth. The discussion on immigration and displacement continued with the emerging recommendation that the onus of responsibility for immigration within Europe should be on the whole region, not only one or two countries.

With regards to women and gender equality concerns, **Inge Brees, EU Advocacy Officer, Care International, Belgium** made the point that, *"Women's empowerment approaches that promote women's and girl's control over their own lives from the early stage of a response are important as increased gender equality leads to better recovery and in the long term increases resilience of populations."* She also recommended the use of gender markers, gender disaggregated data, and community based protection strategies. Another participant added that not only women but other vulnerable groups, such as children with special needs and the elderly, should also be prioritised.

'A greater focus is […] needed on the preparedness and response efforts cognisant of the systems through which cities function, based on adaptive and agile approaches and involving sensitive adoption of new partnerships and technologies.' – **Samuel Carpenter, Humanitarian Policy Advisor, UK on Urbanisation**

Further to the initial weeks' discussions on the ability to tackle new and more complex challenges, **Samuel Carpenter, Humanitarian Policy Advisor, British Red Cross, UK** argued that the EOG regional summit needs to reflect on the continued operational relevance of the Fundamental Principles, recommending that discussions in Budapest should address the particularities of conflict without only focusing on 'ideal' type situations.

Maria Lensu, Policy Officer, European Commission (ECHO), Belgium added the importance of addressing access and protection constraints, both of access of populations to assistance and access of humanitarians to people in need. Maria recommended looking at how humanitarians can advocate toward other actors that hold influence

(e.g. regional powers, multi-national companies, use of sanctions, arms regulations.) through which there may be improved chances to negotiate access and protection assurances.

The recommendations for improved communication expanded to include the strengthening of both internal and external communications. **Rubeliza Castañeda, Online UNV, the Philippines** gave the example of Typhoon Haiyan, where lack of emergency communication hampered local response capacity. Regarding knowledge management, **Priscilla from Kenya** raised the need for joint risk analysis in order to identify vulnerable groups, and further recommended that joined-up systems should be developed that specifically address the outcomes of actions in order to inform the way forward for all actors. **Ismail Ustel, an Innovation Value Chain Management Consultant from Turkey,** added that the use of structured information gathering and consensus building methodology, such as the 'Delphi Technique' could add value to the quality of execution of the outputs.

> *'We need to bring the urban issue into the WHS discussion as to fail to do so would miss a key aspect of the future of humanitarian action.'* – **Amanda Gray, IRC, UK**

The discussion surrounding the leadership of the global South developed a cautionary note. **Samuel Carpenter, British Red Cross, UK** questioned the incentive for this to happen if an open and honest discussion on the subject does not occur. He advised that in order to properly address this subject, the discussion should outline actual implications by clarifying roles and comparative advantages. **Sudhanshu Shekhar Singh, independent Humanitarian Aid Advisor, Switzerland,** also agreed with the importance of the discussion and similarly advised to look at how this shift can happen in reality, by translating it into practice. The point was made that affected communities understand better both the problems and the solutions and so should be supported to ensure they are at the forefront of policy making.

Furthering the discussion of identifying root causes such as governance, **Rezzan Katilmis, Humanitarian Worker, Turkish Red Crescent, Turkey,** highlighted the importance of doing more than trying to challenge the results of rapidly increasing conflicts and vulnerabilities. She argued that using the weight that the EOG region holds as donors, more should be done to address political decision-making processes in the countries of concern.

The impact of Urbanisation was added as a new discussion. **Amanda Gray, Urban Displacement Advisor, International Rescue Committee, UK,** highlighted that more than 50% of the world's population (a rising figure) live in urban areas, which are increasingly the spaces in which humanitarian response takes place. Amanda recommended that, while humanitarian assistance typically prioritises camp and rural settings, appropriate responses should also be made available to urban settings, which currently face challenges of operational effectiveness, efficiency, coordination, impact at scale and ensuring sustainability. **Samuel Carpenter** recommended that adapting assistance to the urban operational environment should be more than simply including urbanisation in the discussion within a 'driver of crisis' context. Another participant added that urbanisation should be considered in regards to climate impact.

The terminology of humanitarian architecture was raised as an opportunity to overcome hierarchy and inequality within the humanitarian system. **Rezzan Katilmis, Turkey,** cautioned that we should consider the implications and effect of language and seek to create a system and culture that promotes a "one team – one world" understanding.

Finally, the following areas of concern were recommended for further discussion: Access to safe water; environmental conservation; improved housing, and; addressing unmet sexual and reproductive health needs.

Q. 2. What needs to be in place 10 years from now to meet the humanitarian challenges & capitalize on the opportunities that we expect to prevail then?

During the third week of discussions on Question 2, participants coalesced around three main issues that should receive focus over the next ten years. First, the need for supporting innovation and the application of new, creative ideas and solutions in solving humanitarian problems. Second, it was generally agreed that international organizations and donors need to engage more efficiently with local actors and empower them, if they are to

> *"The essence of humanitarian development is not in isolating the masses, but in making them the owners of the solution that they determine as acceptable and appropriate for their needs."* **- Kirthi Jayakumar, Peace and Conflict Researcher, India**

provide for sustainable development. Third, education was mentioned as one of the main issues to be addressed by 2024 as a factor that could assist in increasing economic development, fighting corruption and decreasing violence. One commentator suggested that basic education should be accessible and free to everyone, while another participant broadened the scope of the term 'education' to include teaching people how to live together and respect one another. Another participant suggested that entrepreneurs should be supported to start businesses that create new jobs, as a means to reduce crime and violence.

Ralf Otto, Facilitator, MomoLogue, Belgium, proposed that by 2014 humanitarian aid should be fully aligned with the needs of those most in need, rather than with the policies, interests and agendas of private and institutional donors. Furthermore, organizations should be flexible, decentralized and constantly adapting to the new contexts. Humanitarian aid should be a global movement driven by local actors, guided by a global network of like-minded individuals and organizations who share common values and ideas. Ralf believes that these goals will be achieved through innovation and transformation, and through the creation of space for dedicated people to discuss and exchange their vision, ideas and inspiration.

One commentator highlighted that the capacities of "victim communities and systems" are often under-valued by outsiders, something that needs to be addressed in the next ten years. **Ismail Ustel, Innovation Value Chain Management Consultant, Turkey**, recommended that the private sector should be included in humanitarian action using a "Strategic Management Toolbox", with special emphasis on scenario building, forecasting, etc., in order to create the "Learning Humanitarian Organization".

Susan Michele Kopecky, Mother/BSc Social Work, USA, proposed creating a global management response to determine and monitor the level of crises and decide measures to be taken, comprised of representatives from each country and including an ethics/morals committee to review the validity of the response.

Ifidon Omokhomion, Change Management Officer, Nigeria, commented that humanitarian action should be focused on empowering affected populations, rather than simply providing aid. Humanitarians and development actors alike need to institute more programmes that provide guidance to beneficiaries, who can then act as front line support to others in the same or similar crisis situations. Ifidon argued that this can greatly improve the effectiveness of humanitarian work while also expanding the reach and acceptance of such programmes.

Finally, **Priscilla, Kenya** highlighted the need for monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of the humanitarian organizations, commenting that as Europe is a significant actor given the number of donors and organisations from the region, European countries have an obligation to review the actions of humanitarian actors to ensure public accountability.

Q. 3. How should humanitarians and development actors deliver together, for a more effective overall result?

During the third week of discussion on Question 3, participants confirmed the added value of using existing development initiatives and networks to improve humanitarian action, and the need for better joint planning and monitoring of humanitarian initiatives to ensure their impact. They suggested other areas for improvement, such as structured governance bodies to increase cluster efficiency and face-to-face meetings between all stakeholders to develop relationships and foster good collaboration.

> *"Delivering together works better if at one point you come together physically. […] Even within the biggest organizations it is about people in the end."* **– Ralf Otto, Facilitator, MomoLogue, Belgium**

Farrukh, Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF, Pakistan, recommended that governments should take the lead on coordination with the support of donors, while development and humanitarian actors should each define specific standard operating procedures for emergencies. **Ai Sumihira, Online UN Volunteer, New Zealand**, suggested working with local governments as an intermediary between communities and national authorities as well as humanitarian and developmental levels.

Lucy Earle, Urban Adviser, DfID, UK, discussed the specificities of humanitarian action in urban areas, which is becoming increasingly common as urban populations increases globally. Lucy suggests that as humanitarian workers have more experience working in rural areas or refugee camps, they need to adapt to urban settings and can use the experience of development workers already there. They should also plan their actions in order to prepare a city's resilience to future crises. New approaches, tools and collaboration mechanisms to address this new reality need to be developed, with the participation of both development and humanitarian actors.

The discussion moderators invited further comments and ideas from participants on issues and solutions in the areas of governance, coordination and role definition for humanitarian and development actors over the next decade. Suggestions are also welcome on ways to adapt tools, procedures, standards and ways of working in urban environments, and on how to improve preparedness and risk management in high risk urban areas.

Q. 4. What needs to be done to accelerate the trend of nationally or locally-led humanitarian response, where appropriate?

In response to Question 4, at the close of the third week several key issues were raised by participants which should be prioritized in order to accelerate the trend of nationally or locally-led humanitarian response. Recommendations and methods to expand the strength and acceptance of humanitarian response at the local and national levels dominated the conversation.

The discussion highlighted that the circulation, adaption and expansion of current disaster response plans that have proven their effectiveness can be utilized by regions who may not have effective (or any) plans. A

component of an effective plan includes the ability to be flexible and adaptable to various types and scales of disasters. Effective resource management, identification of strengths and weaknesses, and the coordinated efforts of multiple organizations are key elements of an effective plan.

The type of disaster, whether a man-made conflict or a natural disaster, needs to be taken into strong consideration when determining the kind of response effort and key players required. The appropriate players are partially determined by the type of emergency at hand, meaning who or what is causing the initial situation.

In order to minimize the chance of reoccurrences, it's necessary to inspect the core of any trending issues. Mitigation plays a vital role in reducing the impact of disasters, but there should also be a shift to address the underlying causes behind the incidence of reoccurring events.

Participants noted the importance of increasing cross-sector coordination through cooperation and engagement in various committees and platforms. Another recommendation was to reform approaches that undermine local and national capacity. Participants shared examples of several areas where procedures and controls inadvertently inhibit the strengthening and empowerment of local capacities. These areas include the unintended consequences of donor administrations cost constraints; stifling innovation and risk through linear thinking; distortion of capacity-building by compliance requirements; barriers to entry and unequal playing fields, as well as access to funding being blocked by simple practicalities.

Understanding the impact of risks can be better achieved through the use of an information system which can detect trends. Databases that provide information on expected losses provide actionable incentives for potentially impacted local and national actors. Participants suggested that the lack of such information systems has likely had a negative effect on response efforts. As noted by **Priscilla, Kenya**, *"At times, the local levels are not even aware of the magnitude of the humanitarian crisis in terms of losses or resources required, or even what they could do to prevent/prepare for such crises in the future..."*

The issue of motivating people to prepare effectively prior to a disaster emerged as an important means of increasing local and national response efforts, with strong leaders to motivate people cited as having the potential to make or break a disaster situation. As noted by **Jaimie, lab manager and student, USA**, *"Finding leaders that are prepared to work hard to effectively prepare, respond, and put themselves out there in the face of a potential problem is also extremely important."* Just as important are motivated local people who are directly impacted by conflicts and disasters. Participants emphasized that it is the responsibility of the individual to be prepared and self-reliant to a certain degree. Response efforts come from the local level first, before government and international groups are called upon for assistance.

> *"It would be valuable if donors, UN and INGOs looked into the scope for reforming centralized and risk-averse programmatic requirements and procedures that inhibit the ability of the humanitarian system to work with and reinforce local indigenous capacities."* **– Michael Mosselmans, Christian Aid, UK**

Participants also mentioned the capacity of local and national organizations to prepare their workers for disaster situations of various scales. This can be done by training employees with existing technical skills on how to utilize those skills in a disaster setting. Key leaders within companies are necessary to acknowledge the skill sets of their employees and provide appropriate response training.

Annex 3

Weekly Summary: Weeks 4-7

16 December 2014 – 10 January 2015

The following is a summary of the final 4 weeks of discussion (16 December 2014 – 10 January 2015) in response to the four initial questions, as well as four new questions constituting part 2 of the discussion.

Q. 1. What do you think are the key humanitarian issues that the Europe and others regional consultation must address?

Calls for the WHS to focus on <u>displacement</u> continued during the discussion's final four weeks. **Acil Durum Merkezi, Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), Turkey** noted that this should include long-term humanitarian planning for repatriation. **May Huntington, Retired Administrator, USA** called for the provision of, *"immediate and sustained assistance"* for *"displaced population in terms of safe passage to a safer place, security, food and sleeping quarters."* **Jane Zimmerman, Executive Director, International Policy and External Affairs, American Red Cross, USA** advised that, *"Balancing domestic immigration and security laws and regulations with humanitarian need require effective communication between governments, civil society, and the migrants themselves."* She further notes the challenges posed by international borders to effective humanitarian action.

Furthering the theme of displacement, **Serdar Tüney, Legal Specialist, AFAD, Turkey,** raised the importance of the <u>role of other actors</u> in humanitarian assistance, noting the Government of Turkey's large scale provision of assistance for Syrian refugees, and highlighted the critical importance of cooperation with related ministries and state institutions to improving the overall response. **Celia Cranfield, Advocacy and Communication Officer, VOICE, Belgium,** also highlighted the need for engagement with different actors in crisis, emphasizing the need to distinguish roles and activities.

Challenging the "Eurocentric humanitarian order", **Sid Peruvemba, Program Director, Malteser International, Germany** asked, *"How can we accommodate new actors and rising powers in the humanitarian system? How can we ensure that countries such as Turkey, China, Russia, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil, the Emirates, Saudi-Arabia have their say?"* Instead of the EOG region considering itself the reference for humanitarian action, he recommended opening up to different cultures and ways of doing things in order to learn global best practices. **Mark Harvey, Urban DRR and Resilience Support, Resurgence, UK,** in the context of the urbanisation discussion but in response to the concern of Western dominance, suggested the facilitation of peer-to-peer knowledge exchange between city actors as a step towards overcoming the dynamics of mistrust.

Gosia Pearson, Policy Officer, European Commission, Belgium, at the same time reminded the consultation that the EOG region's expertise and response capacity should also be capitalised on, while **Celia Cranfield** called for the role and value of NGOs to be recognised by the region.

<u>Advocacy for access and protection</u> was revisited by **Csaba Gyimesi, Policy Officer, European Commission**

(ECHO), Belgium, who recommended showcasing proven best practices developed and implemented by organisations such as the ICRC, MSF and other humanitarian NGOs. Examples identified by a GPPi study on access include: working with non-Western implementing organisations and building a more robust networking ability of partners, in addition to ECHO's findings that *"creating NGO security platforms is also a tried and tested way of improving access and protection."*

The importance of addressing the needs of vulnerable groups – including women, children, the elderly and people with disabilities – continued to be emphasized during weeks 4-7, with participants recommending that more than an *"add on consideration"*, the needs of vulnerable groups should be the very first step and consideration. **Howard Mollett, Senior Policy Advisor, CARE, UK,** suggested building on the new IASC global evaluation of Gender Markers for the development of a globally aligned approach and improved accountability.

Fred Smith, Policy Advisor, Sightsavers, UK, highlighted factors that contribute to the heightened vulnerability of people with disabilities during a crisis, including obstacles and barriers to accessing appropriate assistance. **Astrid Jenkinson, Motivation, UK,** added concerns regarding mobility disabilities and the provision of appropriate equipment, e.g. wheelchairs that adhere to standards and are supplied with training.

C. Gosselin, Humanitarian Advocacy Manager, Handicap International, France, stated, *"vulnerable groups are often neglected in the assessment, collection of data, design and delivery of humanitarian relief, making them 'invisible' to relief operations".* Listing the obstacles to the survival, safety and protection of vulnerable groups caused by these systematic oversights, C. Gosselin calls for the humanitarian community to set strong goals for full inclusion of vulnerable groups.

Regarding the experience of children and their particular vulnerabilities, **Solène Edouard, Global Child Protection Advisor, ChildFund Alliance, France,** recommends that the consultation look beyond humanitarian issues to DRR and preparedness approaches, including: prevention and response to violence against children before, during and after disasters; integrating child protection from the onset of response; investments in prevention and preparedness activities; tackling root causes of disasters by addressing poverty, vulnerability and inequality; supporting meaningful participation of children and youth; and increasing support for programmes addressing violence against children in emergencies. **War Child, Netherlands**, recommended that child-specific interventions of education and child protection should be embedded in first-phase interventions and that the Sphere Guidelines should recognise child protection and education activities as lifesaving.

> *"There is (..) a lack of knowledge of how to systematically ensure the inclusion of people with disabilities in humanitarian response"* – **Fred Smith, Policy Advisor, Sightsavers, UK**

Burcu, Engineer, AFAD, Turkey added that child psychology is a critical area requiring greater focus by the region. Highlighting the impact of traumatic experiences of war and displacement, it requires addressing more than immediate basic needs in order to address emotional and psychological wounds. For children this means looking at mental health services and innovatively addressing concerns regarding their futures.

The discussion on urbanisation continued throughout the final four weeks of the discussion. **Paul Currion, Array,** described the different networks available to urban residents, affecting how they see their lives and their own needs, in comparison to their rural counterparts that both complicate humanitarian response yet empower

residents. He recommends agencies take on specialists; adopts tools, planning methods, analytical and data collection tools appropriately, including the incorporation of a market analysis as a baseline and prioritising the provision of information as an aid resource for affected communities. **Mark Harvey,** recommended that frameworks for dealing with urbanisation should recognise the interdependent nature of infrastructure; the impact of extreme climate events alongside rapid urban change; varying degrees of city capacities; smart cities and the risk of cyber insecurity; key actors such as the city authorities, utilities and telecommunications. Further recommendations focused on how the WHS could <u>learn from the findings of other sectors</u> in order to combat urban vulnerability, including liaison with city leaders, journalist and major urban resilience networks.

Nigel Fisher, Discussion Moderator, in response to Priscilla's earlier questions on Vulnerability and Risk Assessments, advised that gaps and disagreements remain regarding how to undertake such assessments and what indicators to use, noting that learning from experience remains a challenge as humanitarian responders are often too busy to build on lessons.

A number of participants commented on <u>Natural Disasters</u> affecting the region, noting the frequency of such disasters in places leading to frequent loss of life and property. Preparedness and the division of roles and responsibilities by the region were raised as important discussions regarding the response to unexpected disasters.

Regarding <u>bridging the gap between humanitarian and development</u> work, **War Child, Netherlands**, advised that the key areas to address are: continuity of support; the right kind of support and; a re-evaluation of the cluster system. Regarding the continuity of support, and echoed by other participants, War Child recommended that <u>the gap between emergency and development be addressed through longer term funding streams</u> and advocated for the use of multi-year humanitarian aid funding models by all donors.

Sid Peruvemba questioned, *"Are the instruments of distinction between humanitarian relief and development well placed or could they be organised in a better way?"* Adding to the earlier discussion on taking a longer-term perspective, and particularly with regards to children affected by crisis, he argued that the continuity of aid and investing in children's futures would have a significant benefit on these longer-term consequences as well as cost benefits.

<u>Good Humanitarian Donorship</u> was raised as a priority issue. **Celia Cranfield** reiterated the need to look at <u>funding issues</u>, including mechanisms that are timely and predictable and donors fulfilling their commitments. This might build on existing initiatives such as the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative (GHDI). **Lori Heninger, Plan International, USA** suggested flexible mechanisms that can move easily from development to humanitarian and back to development. Suggested recommendations from **Howard Mollett** included: commitment to sector-wide adoption of the new Core Humanitarian Standard, and, initiate a new global good humanitarian donorship agenda, building on the GHDI and wider processes involving other donors.

The issue of perceived independence between ECHO and EU-based donors and their recipients was also raised, in the context of military involvement in affected states. **Csaba Gyimesi, Policy Officer, EC (ECHO), Belgium,** questioned what could be done to address this.

Celia Cranfield added <u>upholding and promoting international humanitarian law and principles</u> as core issues for

the discussion. **Inge Brees, EU Advocacy Officer, Care International, Belgium,** agreed, recommending that the consultation should recognise what works and avoid reinventing the wheel. **Gosia Pearson** added that the principles represent values enshrined in all cultures and are an operational necessity that ensures access and protection, something that could usefully be demonstrated by the region.

For Gosia, addressing the effectiveness of the global architecture for aid delivery includes discussion of needs-based allocations of aid, cost efficiency, measuring response and accountability to both affected populations as well as donors. For Sid Peruvemba, the issue is also about emergency response capacity, asking "*How can we set up a emergency response capacity that overcomes the current complexity and sluggishness of the system?*"

The provision of education in emergencies was also raised as a critical discussion, including for stateless peoples, undocumented immigrants and refugees, highlighted by **M.H. Oliai, Prof., Global Studies and Development Sociology, Foundation University, Netherlands**. **Lisa Butenhoff, Humanitarian Advisor, Save the Children, Norway** recommended ensuring adequate funding and prioritizing education at all stages of humanitarian response, beginning by acknowledging the right to education.

A new dimension was added to previous discussion on communication, namely the role of the media and journalism. **Inna Dubinsky, Development and International Media Training Officer, Broadcasting Board of Governors, USA,** cautioned about the harmful effects of sensational stories in the absence of efficient communication and public information. Inna highlighted the value of media training programmes, both for relief workers in their handling of journalists, as well as for journalists themselves to learn how to protect themselves in dangerous situations.

> *"We know that education programs addressing children's holistic well-being can save and sustain lives, address the urgent and specific psychosocial needs of children and create stronger, healthier communities. In addition, we know that loss of education can have disastrous and lasting impacts on the lives of both individuals and society as a whole. Despite this, education is consistently underfunded in emergencies."* – **Lisa Butenhoff, Humanitarian Advisor, Save the Children, Norway**

Two participants added the Ukraine conflict to list of issues the region should focus on. **Jacek Gancarson, Web developer, Sweden** lamented the lack of sustainable solutions to date and called for efforts to effectively communicate humanitarian requirements to the parties to the conflict. **Inna Dubinsky** also called for a concerted European effort to stop the humanitarian catastrophe, including its potential overspill in the region.

Given the amount and range of issues raised in the discussion, **Michael Mosselmans, Care, UK** queried, *"What do the Moderators realistically anticipate that the Summit should be expected to deliver?"* **Everett Ressler, Discussion Moderator,** responded that the process is indeed open, rich and diverse, and that the inputs across the breadth of topics will continue to be reviewed and inform the final Summit agenda.

Final contributions included suggestions to review: the impact of the Euro crisis on aid; general health care and immunization awareness in Europe, particularly for infectious and highly contagious diseases and the role of airport and border security in preventing their spread; wasteful and inefficient projects; vague targets, budgets and timeframes and ambiguous and unbound recommendations; and targeting, ensuring assistance prioritizes areas in need, rather than political or media considerations.

Q. 2. What needs to be in place 10 years from now to meet the humanitarian challenges and capitalize on the opportunities that we expect to prevail then?

During the final four weeks of the online consultation, as during part 1, participants highlighted the importance of good quality education, knowledge sharing, innovation, and qualified staff. Other recurring themes were the need for accountability of humanitarian actors and organizations, and the need to identify and address the root causes of humanitarian issues.

War Child [War Child Holland and War Child UK] from the Netherlands outlined five proposals to help secure better preparedness to meet future humanitarian challenges:

> *"The system in 10 years should be prepared to take risks more than it is now willing to do. Leadership of the system (donors, control units, NGOs) should allow failure tolerance and overcome risk averse behaviour and funding restrictions."*
>
> *- Sid Peruvemba, Program Director, Malteser International, Germany*

1. **Child protection emergency trigger:** A new UN mechanism to declare a conflict as a 'Child Protection Emergency', with specific implications for the responsible member states and non-state actors, triggering an appropriate, commensurate response. Crucial given the growing trend of children being targeted in conflict.
2. **A 'neglected crises' monitoring body:** A new mechanism to track crises which have failed to gain international attention or are no longer an international priority; must ensure that aid is delivered on the basis of need, in line with the core humanitarian principles.
3. **Immediate response structure:** A comprehensive global system needs to be in place with the ability to respond on the ground within 72 hours of the outset of a crisis; should build upon recently development models such as the Start Network.
4. **Universal documentation system:** A fully operational documentation system that has universal recognition, signed up to by all UN member states must be in place; should include mobile birth registration in refugee/IDP contexts and 'UN schooling certificates' that are valid across contexts/countries.
5. **Transparent funding streams:** A mechanism that tracks global expenditure on child protection and education in emergencies should be in place, to ensure appeals in this area are fulfilled predictably and consistently in every emergency.

Howard Mollett, Senior Policy Advisor, CARE, UK, highlighted the importance of a community-based approach to resilience and disaster risk reduction. For example, to address **climate change**, CARE is working in Ethiopia using a community-based approach with pastoralist communities in the Afar, Oromia and Somali regions. Using 'social analysis and action' methods to identify the underlying drivers of vulnerability to climate change they are exploring issues such as how building a culture of saving in pastoral communities, or reducing social pressure to maximize and maintain the size of herds until a crisis occurs, can strengthen resilience.

Community-based approaches are also important in **urban areas**, where the specific vulnerabilities, needs and opportunities facing displaced people dispersed across urban settings are inevitably harder to address than those of people relocated to a camp. Howard recommends that the international humanitarian system and agencies should prepare to deliver assistance and protection to those affected by disasters and crisis in urban areas.

Howard also raised the need to factor **gender** more deliberately into actions to <u>strengthen resilience</u>. For example, between 2009 and 2011, only 8 out of 70 national progress reports to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction collected gender-disaggregated information on disaster vulnerability and capacity. The measures used in the 62 other surveys ignore the loss of women's assets, as well as the impacts on assets that are much more difficult to quantify, such as education, health and especially human lives. This issue needs to be addressed over the next ten years.

Kate Hofstra, Research and Communications Consultant, Every Casualty, USA, raised the issue of the systematic identification, documentation and acknowledgement of all victims of armed violence, arguing that in addition to public acknowledgement of every victim, <u>casualty recording</u> can also contribute to peace-building, truth and reconciliation efforts, and traditional justice procedures (by providing evidence in trials). Above all, it could be used to map the dynamics of violence and thus directly inform humanitarian aid and improve the protection of civilians.

Kate highlighted that **local ownership** of both the process and the data can help ensure that the purposes of the data collected match the requirements of a specific environment, while allowing victim communities to engage directly with the issues that affect them. Every Casualty is currently in the process of [developing the first set of standards](#) to harmonize practice worldwide and help casualty recording practitioners produce the highest quality data possible within the varying contexts in which they work.

One contributor suggested that the [Principles of Partnership](#) should be recognized and promoted, and the UN held accountable to them. Adherence to these principles should be reflected in cluster coordination and management, and should prioritise the improved <u>engagement of local and national NGOs</u> in the coordination mechanisms.

Fred Smith, Policy Advisor, Sightsavers, UK, advocated for recognizing the <u>needs of people with disabilities and other marginalized groups</u> in DRR and climate change adaptation initiatives, as well as their more meaningful inclusion in addressing those issues. This will require organizations to commit to developing <u>inclusive practices</u> so that their staff is aware how to support people with disabilities before, during and after disasters. This would not require whole new processes, but adding disability-inclusion into what organizations are already doing. This shift would require donors and governments to also recognize the importance of inclusion, and introduce the funding and reporting conditions needed to change the way humanitarian actors operate.

A number of respondents proposed increasing the <u>dialogue with non-traditional actors</u>, such as **faith-based organizations**, as they are independent from donors and linked with local grassroots communities.

Another recommendation was to <u>harmonize and simplify funding application processes</u> to facilitate providing faster response. In addition, respondents recommended that the system in 10 years should be prepared to take more risks than it is currently willing to do. Leadership (donors, control units, NGOs) should allow failure tolerance and overcome funding restrictions.

Acil Durum Merkezi, Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), Turkey, recommended increasing the operations budgets of countries and international organizations, while at the same

time encouraging civil society's contribution to budgets and countries' support to the UN budget to increase international commitment and burden sharing.

To increase preparedness, the **Lions Club International Foundation, USA**, proposed raising public awareness about the importance of preparedness and the cost of poor coordination through, for example, public service campaigns to discuss local solutions; setting a core list of 5-10 key thematic areas and goals, similar to the model of the Millennium Development Goals, that cross between disaster relief, humanitarian aid, crisis and conflict; and developing criteria for local communities to achieve 'preparedness' certification incorporating preparedness/coordination plans and publicly available ratings for NGOs, local government and businesses. For example, an index or award could reward best corporate citizens and local government, or NGO coordination plans.

> *"There should be all-inclusive educational and employment policies where persons living with disabilities can be given significant recognition."*
>
> *- Dr. Amb. Asabe Shehu Yar'Adua, Asabe Shehu Yar'Adua Foundation, Ghana*

An engineer posting from Turkey proposed several steps to meet current humanitarian challenges, namely: establish a common scientific language; secure effective and equitable <u>distribution of roles between actors</u>; make <u>education accessible to all</u>; secure appropriate funds for the "war-disease-disaster" situations; allocate significant <u>funding to risk reduction activities</u>; use water and agricultural areas effectively to prevent hunger; save energy.

May Huntington, Retired Administrator, USA, proposed establishing a highly sophisticated alert system and improve infrastructure to control arms and financial transactions, as the enablers conflicts and crises.

Finally, **Priscilla, Kenya,** proposed establishing humanitarian desks at embassies, separate from the political offices to ensure independence from political operations that might hinder humanitarian work. These desks would enjoy direct linkages with powerful networks locally, nationally and internationally, and would thereby be able to influence the decision/policy making level of the humanitarian bodies.

Q. 3. How should humanitarians and development actors deliver together, for a more effective overall result?

During the final four weeks of the discussion, 27 participants from 15 different countries responded to the Moderators' request to share concrete examples of best practices and lessons learnt, as well as suggestions to improve joint delivery by humanitarian and development actors. Most prevalent among the comments were recommendations to <u>strengthen the involvement of local communities, improve funding mechanisms, encourage innovative ideas and gather better information before crises occur.</u>

Everett Ressler, one of the Moderators, raised the issue of developing stronger locally-based research, evaluation and academically-rooted programmes oriented towards humanitarian concerns. **Nigel Fisher**, another Moderator, also highlighted the

> *"Disaster risk assessment needs to be integrated more effectively into development planning. [...] You should prepare BEFORE a disaster happens, not after." – Inge Brees, EU Advocacy Officer, Care International, Belgium*

importance of supporting local capacities and ensuring their resilience to crises.

Florence Mawanda, Country Manager (a.i.), Christian Aid, South Sudan, emphasized the importance of considering national development priorities when planning and discussed funding issues, as development funds are often more modest and more long-term than humanitarian funds. **Erling Kvernevik, Senior Advisor, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation, Directorate for Civil Protection, Norway,** calls upon donors to stop earmarking their donations too strictly. **Mia Ngombe, Program Assistant, Sahel Research Group, USA,** highlighted the inadequacy of short-term, localized projects when development should be comprehensive and often takes years. She cited the Ebola crisis to illustrate the consequences of neglecting long-term investment in the health sector.

> *"Actions must be guided and monitored by the people affected."* – **Aceng, Developent Worker, Obaya Community Association, Uganda**

Regarding bridging the gap between development and humanitarian actors, **Ifidon Omokhomion, Programme Management, Nigeria** advocated joint planning between development and humanitarian actors around shared goals and objectives, such as avoiding violence by improving education. **War Child, Netherlands,** also recommended child education and protection as a shared priority between development and humanitarian work. **Rosemary Forest, Disaster Project Coordinator, World Animal Protection, UK** suggested DRR activities that strengthen the protection of livelihoods as a common ground for humanitarian and development actors to intervene, citing a pilot typhoon-resistant farm model tested in the Philippines. **Priscilla, Kenya** shares an initiative from the Horn of Africa, Ending Drought Emergency, as a good example of inter-sector collaboration at regional and national levels, for which government leadership is key. **Gosia Pearson, Policy Officer, EC, Belgium,** highlighted the EU *Resilience Communication and Action Plan* and the *Joint Humanitarian-Development Framework*, the science-based humanitarian risk index INFORM, the NASAN programme and the EU RESET programme in Ethiopia, as examples aligning humanitarian and development work.

Comments also highlighted challenges related to vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities or refugees. **Fred Smith, Policy Advisor, Sightsavers, UK,** recommended including people with disabilities in humanitarian interventions, where development organizations working in this area can have an added value. **Amanda Gray, Urban Displacement Advisor, IRC, UK,** recommended including refugees in development plans while discussion moderators pointed out that host countries sometimes deny refugees employment or legal rights. **Inge Brees, EU Advocacy Officer, Care International, Belgium,** shared the example of Burmese people who were entitled to temporary work in Thailand only if they declared themselves migrants rather than refugees.

Q. 4. What needs to be done to accelerate the trend of nationally or locally-led humanitarian response, where appropriate?

In response to Question 4, several ideas were shared concerning the importance of improving targeting of funding resources. Some participants argued that funding should be given directly to local organizations and community-based groups. Others noted that relief funding should be longer term to allow more time to

> *"Invest more resources in building the capacity of governments to develop sustainable policies to reduce risk and vulnerability and be prepared for emergencies."* –*Inge Brees, EU Advocacy Officer, Care International, Belgium*

build and sustain resilience and reduce vulnerability, as Inge Brees argued (right).

Participants noted that development and strengthening of partnership groups and working directly with local people is beneficial to all parties involved in response situations. However, though beneficial, building a partnership is not always a simple task. The relationships take time to grow and evolve with resources and experience, as Silvia Sanz-Ramos notes (right).

> *"If we want to promote locally led effective humanitarian actions, it is crucial to invest in building and strengthening the capacities of local partners." – Silvia Sanz-Ramos, Institutional Donors Adviser, German Red Cross, Germany*

Additional ideas mentioned during this discussion include, *inter alia,* giving recognition to local and national response groups, increasing public awareness, reporting on casualties, the strong impact of local, faith-based organizations, transparency and accountability, smoothing the transition between elements of the response cycle, increasing communication, and transparency of the international operational response process.

Part 2

Part 2: Q.1 How must humanitarian action change to respond to the increasingly complex humanitarian challenges & risks?

> **"A re-examination of future aid models needs to better reflect on the universality of aid, beyond just preserving the aid businesses' status quo". - Patrick Michel Ulrich, Stabilization and Humanitarian Contractor, Avocat, Canada**

During the final four weeks of discussion, all participants agreed on the need for the humanitarian system to change in the face of increased complexity of challenges and risks – a theme summed up by **Randolph Kent, Discussion Chair and Director, Planning from the Futures project, King's College London, UK,** as a *"growing awareness that 'the past will not be like the future'"* – and many discussed the reasons for this, from increased urbanisation and climate change, to internal conflict, emergence of BRIC powers and general distrust of Western INGOs and greater security risks for humanitarian workers, as well as economic systems that cement inequity.

Following the trend of other WHS discussions, there was a strong feeling there **should be much more inclusion and consultation with recipient communities**, enabling them to direct humanitarian and development activities in their community and increase their own capacity for coping and thriving in the future. **Aceng, Development Worker, Obaya Community Association, Uganda**, supported this view – along with many other participants – and outlined how humanitarian action must be more participatory and organic in order to be more effective at tackling increasingly complex situations, adding, *"Actions must be guided and monitored by the people affected."*

Practical suggestions for strengthening local capacity and participation included increasing or implementing local and government level accountability – and with that, better assessment, which should be standardised and extended into humanitarian organisations themselves, from **Nicholas van Praag, Humanitarian and Development Specialist, Ground Truth, UK –** who adds that putting those receiving aid at the forefront of decision-making will *"eventually create a self-correcting process of humanitarian intervention as the various players respond in a way that takes the perceptions of the affected people into account."*

In this vein, honesty and sensitivity should be upheld – in accordance with the Red Cross Code of Conduct – regarding donor requests, from **Prof. Ian Davis, Visiting Professor in Disaster Risk Management at the Universities of Copenhagen, Lund, Kyoto and Oxford Brookes, UK,** who pointed out that failure to do so undermines the affected communities' existing coping abilities and successes.

Patrice Sepulveda, WHS online UNV and Political Scientist and Peacemaker, USA, highlighted the need for increased focus on the economic empowerment of people living in poverty – by humanitarian actors – in order to decrease their reliance on ongoing external support.

Priscilla, Kenya and **Rosemary Forest, Disaster Project Coordinator, World Animal Protection, UK,** agreed that education is key to empowering affected communities and increasing local resilience. **Priscilla** recommended introducing disaster management education for *every* citizen in threat-prone areas prone, as well as the introduction of a specific system to monitor, support and test local response and prevention plans. **Rosemary** shared how, in the Philippines, following Typhoon Haiyan, local veterinarians were trained to work with early warning systems and community risk mapping – a lateral, and long-term approach – as losing livestock has dramatic economic consequences for small-scale farmers.

Another recurring theme was the need for better research and planning and also **more effective information sharing and indiscriminate communication** between all actors in areas of involvement.

Charlotte Lattimer, Senior Humanitarian Advisor, Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme/Development Initiatives, Italy highlighted the critical importance of financial transparency, which is woefully lacking. She argued that achieving humanitarian objectives requires awareness of the financial resources available, be they domestic and donor country government revenues, remittances, peacekeeping and/or private funds.

Too little synergy, too much competition for donor funding, says **Kadi Metsandi, Strategy and Implementation Unit, Directorate of Global Affairs, Development and Partnership, France,** adding that, *"Collaboration needs to be based on common goals, but not necessarily shared values and methods of implementation."*

One participant, **Policy Officer, Belgium,** pointed out the disparity in the distribution of agencies – some areas are oversubscribed while others lack any support, and this imbalance remains unresolved. The existence of "no-go areas" also needs to be tackled, says **Prof. Ian Davis, UK.**

Ankush Vengurleka, via Twitter, recommended better use of mobile and open platform technologies – both by humanitarian actors and affected communities – to allow better information sharing and enable early warning systems and coordination, even in remote areas.

Unprecedented changes in demographics worldwide, and the resulting need for change in humanitarian response was discussed. Increasing urbanisation, and the specific humanitarian challenges faced by people in towns and cities was highlighted by **Filiep Decorte, Chief Technical Advisor, UN-Habitat, New York,** who called for better consideration and reform when responding to crises in cities – one suggestion was to, *"create an urban Humanitarian Innovation Fund in partnership with the private sector to develop and test the new approaches and tools."*

An aging population is another major demographic shift that requires much more attention, from **Frances Stevenson, Head of the Humanitarian Team, HelpAge International, UK –** who pointed out that by 2050, projections show 22% of the global population will be over 60, and that 80% of these people will be in

developing countries. HelpAge International found that, *"less than 1% of projects submitted for funding in CAP appeals in 2010-11 included even one activity targeting older people and fewer than half of them were funded."* **Christine Knudsen, Discussion Moderator,** pointed out the overlap of growing urbanisation and aging populations and the humanitarian implications of these two trends. **Frances, HelpAge International** confirmed just how vulnerable aging populations in urban environments are, with some unsettling numbers, *"In Hurricane Katrina in 2005, 75% of those who died were aged over 60 yet only constituted 16% of the populations; in Japan in the 2011 earthquake and tsunami, over 56% of those who died were aged 65 and over, although this age group comprised only 23% of the population. Some analysis by HelpAge has also found that many of the countries in the highest climatic risk category on the Dara Climate Change Vulnerability Monitor to 2030 are also the countries that face the most rapid ageing of their societies. These include Vietnam, Nicaragua, Thailand, Cambodia, Bangladesh and India - countries where rapid urbanisation is taking place."*

The nature and extent of the change needed to the humanitarian system varied greatly in this discussion, but the forum was unanimous that change needs to happen in some form.

Part 2: Q.2 How should those with humanitarian roles & responsibilities partner better with affected people & organizations in zones of conflict & disaster?

One of the main recommendations expressed by a number of participants in the discussion, was the importance of assisting communities in becoming resilient, decreasing their dependence on external aid, instead enabling their participation and taking into consideration their specific needs in all humanitarian action. This would require consultations with all stakeholders, at all levels of leadership, from government to community leaders, with their intimate knowledge of the specific complexities of their communities.

In order to build trust with local communities, **Ifidon Omokhomion, Program Management, Nigeria**, proposed that humanitarian workers should seek out and identify individuals with key roles/responsibilities within the community/locality, who hold local good will and are credible sources of information. Ifidon recommended that when planning humanitarian interventions, key roles and responsibilities should be assigned to such individuals, if

> *"Give them key role. Give them ownership of the prog response. Buy-in from local leaderships. Strengthen local institutions. Think global, act local."* – **William Barriga, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Japan**

willing, in order to ensure ownership. Regular meetings (face-to-face, phone calls, etc.) should be organized and reporting responsibilities assigned.

Priscilla, Kenya, added that "Rules of Partnership" should be established between actors involved, to secure meaningful local community participation, while cost benefit and cost effectiveness analyses should be undertaken after an agreed period to learn from and improve the partnership. Lessons learnt and good practices, identified through communication between community representatives and the humanitarian actors, should be derived and scaled up.

Inge Brees, Care International, noted how important it is to see the entire picture. If everyone's losses are to be addressed, they must be made visible and accounted for, measuring the human impacts of disasters, rather than focusing on economic losses alone. Gender-equitable efforts are needed to build people's resilience in the face of disasters, addressing the structural inequalities which lead to the unequal risks that people face. A way to

assist this effort would be the collection of gender-disaggregated data on disaster vulnerability and capacity; information which 62 out of 70 national progress reports to the Hyogo Framework for Action in 2009-2011 did not collect.

Priscilla added that it is important to work with politicians to ensure they are well informed when disasters occur, and can inform and direct their constituents. At the same time, it is essential that communities themselves receive **accurate information**, as it is possible that organized groups, including politicians, or even some religious groups, would try to take advantage of the situation and influence the communities for their own interests.

Ai Sumihira, Online UNV and Medical Social Worker, New Zealand, suggested power dynamics between humanitarian actors and affected people should change to be more equal. A strong rapport and trust between the parties should be built through clear communication and sharing of information immediately after the disaster (1-3 weeks), if not prior to the crisis; accountability is the key.

One successful example is the involvement of the local community in Hiroshima, Japan, after a large landslide in August 2014, where the majority of recovery work was led by the local community members (through good teamwork between the local government, media, NGOs and individuals). The recovery workers (whether humanitarians, local government officers, or volunteers) paired up with affected households or smaller groups in the community, and asked "clients" how they wanted to be assisted - whether supplying food and water, or searching for family members, needing shelter, etc. Even though such practice would be difficult to apply in the context of larger disasters, it could still be replicated in terms of building trust between all participants at a grassroots level. Moreover, the case demonstrated a good transition phase from recovery to community development, because involvement of the affected population was present from the beginning.

Ms. Gosia Pearson, Policy Officer, EC, Belgium, emphasized increasing the role of regional organizations in humanitarian action, as a regional approach could help address the "sovereignty challenge", where the states who are the primary duty bearers for victims of humanitarian emergencies under international law refuse humanitarian access where it is needed, either due to lack of government capacity or political will. This approach has proved successful on several occasions, for example EU's cooperation with the OIC.

A number of commentators called for donors, humanitarian organizations, UN agencies, national partners, civil society and government to engage more with research into solutions for the types of conflicts and disasters, and share knowledge the gained. It is essential to capitalize on lessons learnt, and to partner to improve communication between all actors.

In terms of innovation, **Cat Graham, Vice President – Operations, Humanity Road, USA**. Recommended that the humanitarian sector establish links and develop partnerships with information and technology organizations. Through collaborative partnerships, focused on rapidly restoring or improving communications, and harnessing information through technology, humanitarian workers could empower local populations to "help themselves" and support local action. New information aid agencies such as Humanity Road, Translators without Borders and Statistics without Borders are collaborating with partners such as CISCO, ITDRC, Microsoft, and Nethope, and other digital humanitarian aid providers, to assist the local aid agencies and response teams. They are

identifying communications and information gaps, providing rapid social media situation reports, and translations. These innovative approaches provide a springboard for recovery by restoring communications.

By the end of the discussion, participants also recommended providing more funds to local NGOs, as well as increasing cooperation between international organizations and local NGOs. International bodies, such as UN OCHA, could also provide training, communication and support to government representatives and national NGOs, thus increasing the number of prepared local people, instead of only bringing international personnel when crisis occurs.

Finally, it was suggested that the humanitarian sector should focus more on advocacy and mediation with governments, in order to prevent conflict or disasters in the first place. The focus should be on prevention, and not only, or entirely, on response.

Part 2: Q.3 What might be the greatest humanitarian threats & risks facing the 'Europe & Others' group in the next 15-20 years?

On understanding risk, vulnerability and future threats, participants felt that future major humanitarian threats and risks will happen outside the EOG region. In this regard, **Anne Hammerstad, Academic from India/University of Kent, UK,** enumerated two main areas of concern for the region, namely, involvement in the root cause generating a humanitarian crisis, and becoming hosts to the influx of migrants and victims of humanitarian disasters.

Likewise, **William Barriga, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Japan,** highlighted, *"nationalistic tendencies, radicalization, fundamentalism, proliferation of cheap arms, international paralysis, competing national agendas and uneven distribution of wealth".*

However, other participants like **Randolph Kent, Discussion Chair and Director, Planning from the Futures project, King's College London, UK,** argued that human security in the Europe and Others region will also become subject to ever more complex and integrated factors, e.g. access to clean water, the implications of a cybernetic failure, climate change, etc. Any single humanitarian crisis will have the potential to trigger a range of others, with cumulative consequences.

> *"Cascading crises will increasingly be a characteristic of crises in the future, and they may well blur the divide that has separated – artificially – so-called natural disasters from complex emergencies".* – **Randolph Kent, Discussion Chair and Director, Planning from the Futures project, King's College London**

Priscilla, Kenya, suggested the creation of effective early warning systems with the participation of all stakeholders at all levels, recommending that any early warning system should integrate geographical administrative boundaries.

On principles and standards, both **Akou Robert, Deputy Country Director, Medair, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC),** and **Anne Hammerstad** discussed the mistrust of Western-dominated aid caused by nationalism and confronted political and economic agendas, which undermined the credibility of Western humanitarian aid. **Inge Brees, Care International,** suggested that how Western governments communicate their actions in conflict areas is sometimes wrongly called humanitarian interventions, when actually sending military forces.

In this regard, it was suggested that a dialogue should be established between traditional and emerging donors for better coordination and security of finance.

Priscilla highlighted how humanitarian crises perpetuate without adequate long term investment and government-level involvement in infrastructure and DRM.

Furthermore, and as a long term solution, there should be investment in <u>education</u> and public awareness globally, to increase the implantation of humanitarian values. In this regard, **Susan Michele, Kopecky Mother/Bachelor of Science/Social Work, USA** suggested that, *"Innovations and education contains the component for continual advancement of ideas and technology, education for public awareness"*.

Another key aspect discussed was the fact that insecurity and uneven wealth distribution are contributing to the numbers of refugees seeking safe haven in developed countries, where they find limited acceptance from local governments. **Kirthi Jayakumar, online UNV and Peace and Conflict Researcher, India,** stated that Europe is perceived as a safe destination for refugees from wart-torn nations. A further complication is the often divergent policies on refugees followed by stakeholders. Suggested solutions were the <u>development of rapid and effective responses</u>, with anticipatory capacities and a high level of adaptability.

Part 2: Q.4 To what extent are the sources of humanitarian problems around the world paralleled in the countries of the 'Europe & Others' group?

"[In] an increasingly mobile world the effects of conflict can be felt worldwide and […] activities to meet the needs of people affected by conflict can spread far beyond the country itself". **- Kim Harper, an International Programme Officer, Médecins du Monde, UK,**

Only seven responses in total were received to this question. Initial comments were more concerned with the <u>lack of awareness among the population in developed countries</u> regarding international crisis or disaster risk reduction. For example, **Ai Sumihira, an Online Volunteer for WHS and Medical Social Worker, New Zealand,** was surprised by the fact that *"the majority of local communities in Europe feel that natural and man-made crisis are something that happens somewhere remote"*. Similarly, **William Barriga, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Japan,** highlighted the lack of empathy and sensibility towards helpless people. This was further supported by **May Huntington, retired administrator, USA,** who expressed that there seems to be limited concern or at least not long-term dedication to humanitarian crisis.

On <u>how the Europe and Others Group may be affected</u>, participants highlighted how, particularly in Europe, migrants are living in extremely difficult circumstances with temporary or precarious housing, insufficient funds, physical and mental health. In this regard, **Akou Robert, Deputy Country Director, Medair, DRC,** suggested that the main factors for migration could be found in socio-economic crises and unemployment, as there are limited social policies in developing countries of origin.

Finally, discussing the <u>effectiveness of humanitarian actions</u>, **Ai Sumihira** suggested that humanitarian actors' understanding of affected populations is limited. In this regard, **Priscilla, Kenya** believes that reports and impact assessments are not being fully reviewed by decision makers, which she argues is essential to address recurring crises.

Discussion Chair: *Randolph Kent, Director, Planning from the Futures project, King's College London, UK.* *Discussion Moderators:* *Nigel Fisher, Former OCHA Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Syria Crisis; Christine Knudsen, Director, The Sphere Project, Switzerland; Everett M. Ressler, KonTerra Group, USA and Every Casualty Worldwide, UK.*

The summaries were prepared with support from UN Online Volunteers: John Alonso (UK), Christelle Cazabat (France), Lyndall King (UK), Tina Mason (UK), Jennifer Lynette (USA) and Aleksandrina Mavrodieva, (Bulgaria).

Disclaimer: the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this discussion summary are those of the participants and do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNOCHA, the United Nations or the participants' organizations.