



OCHA

GFDRR
Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery

GPP – Resource Mobilisation Planning

Final Draft – October 10, 2017

Overview of Current Funding

Contributions to support the GPP will be channelled through a Multi-Partner Trust Fund, overseen by a Steering Committee and managed by the MPTF Office. Currently the GFDRR/WB can be approached to support initial diagnostics in sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific Islands. This funding would be overseen by GFDRR and managed by a World Bank task team leader. The GFDRR funds are intended to ‘kick start’ the process. The indicative budget for fifty countries is in the order of three hundred million dollars for diagnostics and follow-up investments in preparedness.

Actions the Subcommittee will take to mobilise MPTF resources

Joint letter

A joint letter was drafted in 2016 from then V20 President Philippines and the Senior Administrators or Executive Directors of all other core partners. It was then sent to 22 donor countries and institutions; only 3 replies were received. There does not appear to have been any follow up to the letter to discuss its contents, also the request was to ‘join’ the partnership, rather than an explicit funding request. A second joint letter was drafted by multilateral partners in April 2017, it remains available as an agreed basis.

Option 1 – the Subcommittee updates the existing draft, signs and shares it with key donor Member States. Two distinctions to the previous letter: it should explicitly request financial support, and **must** be followed up with individual contacts of donors, both written and in person. These can be orchestrated by the Secretariat.

Donor briefing

A previous donor briefing was held in Geneva, with six key donors and GPP core partners. It was a very interesting discussion but failed to generate any resources; there were several reasons but one key point - the humanitarian / development split among several key donors.

Option 2 – the V20 members of the Subcommittee call a donor briefing; selecting 10-15 key donor Member States to approach with a request from the V20 members for support. Several distinctions should be made to the previous briefing; it should be 100% led by Member States, with multilateral partners taking a backseat, it should specifically target development and humanitarian technical staff, with the invitation pitched at ambassadorial level.

Bilateral donor meetings and contacts

Many bilateral donor meetings have been held between the GPP Secretariat and donor representatives. These have generally been with technical level staff, who may pass the message on, but who are generally not decision-makers.

Option 3 – V20 members team up with multilateral agencies to work together to follow up directly with donor Member States. For example, ten donor Member States are targeted (based on past support for preparedness specifically or development/emergency response generally) and five V20 countries partner with the five multilateral agencies to approach donor states at the highest levels possible (ultimately the message should go from Finance Minister to Finance Minister). GPP Secretariat could assist with developing a common message.

Linking to V20 processes

The V20 has processes – such as the G20¹ / V20 dialogues as part of the V20 Ministerial Meetings – where Subcommittee members could inform both the official agenda and the conversations between attendees.

Option 4 – V20 Subcommittee members provide input to the G20/V20 dialogue agenda (as well as other V20 agendas), to include a request for support to this V20 initiative by G20 countries. Furthermore, V20 Subcommittee members provide briefing notes and talking points to their national counterparts who attend V20 meetings, keeping them informed and up to date, and ensuring they push for donor support in side meetings and other bilateral discussions. GPP Secretariat could assist with developing a common message.

Linking to internal agency resource mobilisation

The multilateral partners have internal resource mobilisation mechanisms and teams working closely with donors all the time. Also, the senior leaders of UN agencies and the WB are often in contact with donor bodies and could promote the GPP more effectively.

Option 5 – Subcommittee members from FAO, GFDRR, OCHA, UNDP and WFP prepare a message for sharing upwards through their organisations with two objectives; to alert senior management to latest events in the GPP and highlight that with country applications now open there will be a need for resource mobilisation efforts by senior staff in the near future, and to alert internal resource mobilisation departments of the same.

MPTF event

It is possible to link the establishment of the MPTF with the ‘Opening of Applications’ from 7 September onward. A briefing or resource mobilisation event could be held in New York (where the bulk of development donors have decision-making staff) in tandem with an event in Washington DC, and followed by an event in Geneva. The difference to the donor briefing would be that this is an ‘all partner’ event including the UN and WB, rather than member state to member state event.

Option 6 – Discussions are opened with a few key donors to find who has immediate interest in the concept of the GPP, and who might be interested in co-hosting an informational event with a V20 member state, including the details most relevant to donors; nature of expenditure, possibilities of earmarking funding, accountabilities, etc. An event is organised in NYC the week leading up to the V20 Ministerial, with a follow up event in Washington in the margins of the WB fall meetings.

Country Specific Fundraising

A principle of the GPP has been to provide a predictable preparedness funding instrument, however in the event of a failure to mobilise resources, a final option for fundraising is to focus country by country, rather

¹ Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, the USA, and the European Union.

than capitalising a central fund; the MPTF.

Option 7 - The GPP with national governments could undertake some initial diagnostics, prove the concept, generate follow-up preparedness programmes and budgets, and then seek financing for programme implementation from country-based donor representatives.

Option 8 – If the MPTF remains with limited funding, it could be used only for the diagnostic reviews to lead to preparedness programme proposals including the capacity building components which could then be offered bilateral government donors that have a geo-political interest in the recipient country. The capacity building should be undertaken in partnership with existing in-country programmes to leverage additional funding channels.

Humanitarian Development Nexus

Bearing in mind the comments from the donors regarding the humanitarian / development split the GPP could promote the added value of the GPP in terms of integrated planning across both the response and recovery phases, thereby bridging the humanitarian - development divide. This would lead to increased effectiveness and reduced cost for both phases.

Option 9 – Develop agreed language around the GPP and its relation to the Humanitarian Development Nexus. Link with relevant 'Nexus' working groups via the core partner representatives to these groups to promote the GPP as a Nexus relevant initiative.