



SHF Advisory Board Meeting Minutes FINAL 26 April 2018

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

Action Points:

1. SHF TU start asking partners to report on people with disabilities
2. SHF TU to plan informal meeting with DFID to brainstorm/discuss a methodology to reduce double counting of beneficiaries.

2017 Annual Report	<p>The first presentation highlighted the results of the 2017 Annual Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID commended the SHF TU for the upward trend on improvement. As DFID is now bound by UK legislation to report on people with disabilities, they requested to start reporting on people with disabilities. The SHF TU confirmed that it has started this year with the Education sector by including indicators for children with disabilities, and that we then can see how to build on this. • DFID also requested to develop a standard methodology that aims to limit the duplication of beneficiary counting as the numbers are aggregated upwards from project level to overall reach. HC responded that although she understood the issue, this is a common challenge even in the HRP. However she suggested that SHF TU and DFID have a meeting to further discuss this issue. • Switzerland commented that the report states 32% of UN agencies have outstanding performance and questioned what that meant exactly and which indicators were used to give this result. SHF TU responded that UN agencies do not get scored on audit and financial reporting, and therefore are scored against fewer indicators. However, INGOs have fewer outstanding but more projects with good performance. • Switzerland recommends the report to focus more on the life-saving, alleviating suffering and restoring dignity components. For taxpayers, the current content does give enough focus on alleviating the suffering of people and restoring dignity. HC acknowledged that maybe it's possible to slightly amend that in the future. The SHF TU further explained that the sector pages do focus on results and impact, but encouraged Switzerland to raise this at HQ level. • Sweden questioned whether with the reduced funding for SHF, this is the right forum for discussion of the nexus. The HC responded that the point was taken and that with the decreased funding, there is an increased need for prioritisation.
2018 Common Performance	The second presentation highlighted one key indicator and target from each of the five common performance framework principles.

Framework targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFID mentioned that it was satisfied with the preparatory work done. DFID also argued that maybe the targets set in the framework should correspond to the outstanding scale, so that the SHF would aim at outstanding. HC replied that this the first year of reporting and that there is room to improve on the document. SHF TU added that the working group had reviewed each indicator and that the targets set were ambitious but achievable.
AOB	
1. Operational modalities – NGO financial spot checks	<p>HC explained that there are some slight changes to the operational modalities requested that will be added to the operational manual. The SHF TU presented the suggested revised modalities to the board and they were approved.</p> <p>DFID noted that the table needs to be amended also for projects less than 400,000 and between 7-12 months.</p>
2. Rotation of Advisory Board members	<p>HC reminded the board that at the last meeting the issue of UN membership in the board and annual rotation was raised. The relevant UN agencies were contacted accordingly, but unfortunately there was no answer.</p> <p>Last year, rotation of UN representation started where a larger UN agency rotated out, namely UNICEF. For 2018, it was suggested that a smaller UN agency be rotated out, namely WHO and include UNFPA. This means that a three-year rotation system is now in place for UN agencies.</p> <p>UNFPA has kindly accepted to join the board. The HC thanked WHO for their time contributions to the board.</p>
3. Reserve for Emergencies case for funding - Geissan, Blue Nile	<p>HC invited UNHCR to explain their arguments with regards to the proposed case for funding in Geissan, Blue Nile.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNHCR explained that the information in the proposal and report is minimal on the status of the concerned people. The issue of returns from Ethiopia is a recurring issue in the government media. UNHCR has been following up with its office in Ethiopia which has not reported any departures from the refugee camps nor a reduction of the WFP food ration distributions. It could be that people are moving back and forth. Overall, UNHCR proposed a more detailed verification of these people. UNHCR concluded that they were ready to support a response with NFIs if the numbers can be verified, but discouraged setting up a reception centre. The HC agreed that although the needs are there and the response should go ahead, the Reserve project can be put on hold for two weeks to allow for a verification mission of UNHCR and partners. The HC agreed that a community based approach is a more appropriate response at the moment.