

Action points

OCHA

- Finalize the Chikungunya Outbreak proposal submissions and transfer funds (20 December 2018)
- Request the health sector to include donors in the mailing list for the weekly health updates
- Re-send the link for SHF 2018 After Action Review survey for completion by mid-January (17 December 2018)
- Share the revised AAR Report dashboard (17 January 2019)
- Develop timeliness analysis of the Standard Allocation and Reserve for Emergencies (for presentation in the next AB meeting)
- Present SHF prioritisation process for the Standard Allocation (next AB meeting)
- Present the standardisation of technical review and accountability of SHF cycle (next AB meeting)
- Re-send preparatory documents for the Advisory Board meeting (13 December 2018)
 - Presentation
 - SHF 2018 After Action Review (AAR) Dashboard
 - Draft SHF Positioning Paper 2019
 - Draft 2018 Common Performance Framework Report
 - Draft note on donor field mission to Blue Nile

Advisory Board members

- Respond to the SHF 2018 After-Action Review survey (17 December 2018 - 15 January 2019)
- Provide feedback on the draft note regarding the donor mission to Blue Nile (20 December 2018)
- Provide feedback and endorsement by email on the draft SHF 2019 structure and budget (20 December 2018)
- Provide feedback on the draft SHF Positioning Paper 2019 (15 January 2019)

Topic	Summary main discussions
Reserve for Emergencies: Chikungunya Outbreak, Red Sea, \$1 million	<p>SHF apologized for the delayed sharing of preparatory documents owing to an issue with the mailing system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID expressed concerns that the proposed response to the Chikungunya Outbreak is operating outside a response plan and indicated that there is a disconnect between the humanitarian health coordination, data sharing, and communication with donors. The HC indicated that this is a larger issue. The HTC/DCG had requested a comprehensive review of disease outbreaks, including Chikungunya. The Health Sector is working on a comprehensive communicable disease and response plan. Further, there are weekly health updates provided. • WHO indicated that there have been 2,500 cases in the previous four weeks in three localities in Red Sea. The Ministry of Health presented that the total requirement to respond to Chikungunya Outbreak in Red Sea is SDG 18 million. WHO has developed an Integrated Outbreak Control and Response Plan for six months (October 2018-March 2019) with a total requirement of US\$ 1.4 million, including the \$700,000 requested under the Reserve for Emergencies. • USAID requested a clarification whether the proposed response was gap filing or a continuation of programs as the response is continuing. WHO indicated that there is low health system coverage and teams are being mobilized. • ECHO asked whether the response is to Chikungunya only, noting that does not result in mortality rate unless there is co-infection. WHO indicated that they do not respond because there is a high mortality rate, but because there is a threat. • Given no objections, other than DFID, the case for funding was approved. The Advisory Board urged early disbursement of funds. • Result: endorsed

<p>SHF 2018 After Action Review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns were expressed regarding the low AB members and donor response rate as the results were not representative of all stakeholders. The HC requested OCHA to re-send the survey link to AB members for their response by mid-January. The AAR dashboard will be amended to reflect the input of all stakeholders and will feed into the Positioning Paper. UNHCR suggested that the questionnaire should have been shared with the Advisory Board. UNHCR indicated that prioritization and strategic developments of allocations are the roles of the Advisory Board and expressed concern with timeliness. She also noted that the prioritization based on severity ranking is challenging as concerns refugee caseload as for UNHCR all refugees are considered in need of protection. DFID requested to receive a better understanding of the prioritization process of the previous standard allocation. OCHA indicated that the timeliness of the SHF third standard allocation and CERF allocations were affected by the transition of the HC and OCHA leadership. Regarding the prioritization, more systematic needs and response monitoring is needed. OCHA is committed to work on this.
<p>Positioning Paper 2019</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The HC indicated that the draft Positioning Paper 2019 will be revised in light of the AAR and shared for comments. USAID requested how SHF is managing the multi-year projects and whether this approach is not against the original spirit of SHF. SHF clarified that only a portion of projects will be multi-year considering the nature of the response, for example, the current multi-sector projects to respond to malnutrition in Kassala. SHF has some sustained donors and funding is disbursed in tranches. DFID mentioned that they support the focus of multi-year projects for certain sectors, including malnutrition. They requested more clarity on what to achieve with multi-year planning and stressed to be cautious not to accommodate a restrictive bureaucracy. DFID recommended to include the planning of allocations in the draft Positioning Paper 2019 as well as the timeliness. Switzerland stressed that the humanitarian response and results should be underlined – not necessarily processes and agreed with the multi-year planning considering the Sudan humanitarian operating environment. UNHCR indicated that the draft Positioning Paper focused on protection mainstreaming, not the centrality of protection. All the three elements should be taken into consideration. <i>De facto</i> allocations should be needs based. The HC indicated that traditionally prioritization has been status based. Result: Revised Positioning Paper will be shared for comments in mid-January 2019
<p>SHF 2019 structure and budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed budget has increased from US\$1.4 million to \$1.6 million largely due to increased field monitoring activities and additional support staff. The unspent balance of 2018 will be returned to the Fund. Comments will be shared electronically. Result: endorsement pending electronic feedback from the Advisory Board members
<p>AOB</p>	<p><i>Common Performance Framework (CPF) (for information)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFID requested SHF to consider bringing the CPF reporting forward to impact the strategy for next year. SHF mentioned that not all information is available by the end of the year, but an interim draft update has been provided for input from the Advisory Board members. The draft indicators for 2019 CPF will be shared at the first Advisory Board meeting in 2019. <p><i>Donor Field Mission to Blue Nile (for discussion)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donors expressed concerns on the use of military escorts during the mission and indicated that this had not been communicated prior to the mission. OCHA explained that – a few days before the departure of the mission – local authorities insisted on both police and military escorts a pre-condition to grant the permission for the field visit. Donors indicated that they use their own security procedures/protocols when conducting field missions. OCHA explained that UN security procedures/protocols are applied during UN-led missions. The donors also expressed concerns on heavy presence of local authorities during the field mission - especially during the first day of the field visit. OCHA clarified that their presence

was beyond OCHA's direct control. Once the issue was raised with the local authorities, NGO partners were able to take the lead during the project site visits from the second day.

- The donors recommended having a pre-mission briefing to clarify logistic arrangements, itinerary etc. They also expected to have a longer time to visit projects. OCHA clarified that due to the UNHAS flight schedule, the mission had to be shortened from five to four days.
- OCHA clarified that the donor field visit is not meant to conduct project-level monitoring, but mainly to provide a broad picture on fund allocations in Blue Nile, and to provide opportunities for donors to have discussions with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Short project sheets were included in the briefing pack to provide a brief picture of each project.
- ECHO expressed concerns regarding the technical quality of the project implementation and requested whether sufficient technical support is provided to partners during monitoring missions. OCHA requested ECHO to provide detailed input for follow-up with the partners.
- OCHA will share a complete report that includes more analysis after receiving input on the note as shared with mission participants.
- Donor requested an update on the Blue Nile needs assessment. OCHA indicated that the Blue Nile needs assessment illustrated the challenge in conducting independent needs assessment and welcomed donors' support in promoting independent needs assessment. OCHA is following with HAC and NISS at Khartoum level as well as advocating for the release of preliminary results at the local level.
- Donors advocated sharing a summary of the mission report with HAC.

The result of 3rd Standard Allocation (for information)

- SHF indicated that the projects of the Third Standard Allocation will be finalized next week. DFID expressed concerns regarding the timeliness of the allocation as the strategy had been endorsed by the Advisory Board in August. Double workload with CERF and consortia approaches should be taken into consideration – also for the Positioning Paper for 2019. UNHCR mentioned that the Reserve for Emergencies for the Khartoum Open Areas was very slow, and the disbursements had been only made a few weeks ago. OCHA indicated that SHF will develop a bottleneck analysis.

Current funding balance (for information)

- DFID requested an update on the impact of the economic situation and whether this is reflected in the number of no-cost-extensions. The HC indicated that this is a wider issue and could be reflected in the bottleneck analysis. The INGOs have shared an assessment with OCHA.

ATTENDANCE LIST	
Advisory Board members	Present
Humanitarian Coordinator a.i. (HC)	x
SHF Technical Unit (OCHA/UNDP)	x
FPDO (NNGO)	
DFID	x
ECHO (observer)	x
Germany	
INGO Steering Committee	x
Norway	x
OCHA	x
Sweden	x
Switzerland	x
UNHCR	x
WFP	
USAID/OFDA	x
WHO	x
UNFPA	
UN DF (observer)	
DCPSF (observer)	