HPG

Humanitarian Policy Group

Integrated Programme Proposal
April 2019–March 2021

Inclusivity and invisibility in humanitarian action

Contents

Introduction

This is the fourteenth Integrated Programme (IP) of work proposed for funding by the Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI). The projects presented here constitute the core of HPG's research work in 2019–21, combining policy-relevant research and engagement, humanitarian practice, academic engagement and a vigorous and extensive communications and dissemination programme of public and closed-door events, conferences and media work. HPG's overall aim is to inform and inspire principled humanitarian policy and practice and enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian action in saving lives and alleviating suffering.

The research agenda proposed here is the result of a process of horizon-scanning, consultation and scoping research. While each Integrated Programme of research aims to build upon the strengths of previous years, IPs are also designed to capture the emerging concerns of humanitarian actors and respond to new trends. The research topics contained here were selected based on the expertise of the HPG team, consultations with our Advisory Group and discussions with HPG's partners. Preliminary literature reviews were used to shape the proposals that follow below.

Inclusivity and invisibility in humanitarian action

'Leaving no one behind' has become a core development priority since the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015. While the idea of addressing suffering and need wherever it exists is enshrined in humanitarian principles of humanity and impartiality and operationalised in UN General Assembly Resolutions, the *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in disaster relief* and in the Core Humanitarian Standard, genuinely needs-based assistance has eluded the humanitarian sector for decades.

Ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), the UN Secretary-General published an *Agenda for humanity* calling on the humanitarian sector and its leaders to focus particular attention on the internally displaced, and those with specific vulnerabilities linked to age, gender, disability, religion, political opinion or social identity. The *Charter on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action* adopted at the WHS, the new Core Humanitarian Standard and other related initiatives all have inclusion as a key goal.

Despite these rhetorical commitments, the humanitarian system is still falling short in its aim to provide needs-based assistance and protection to those suffering from the effects of conflict and disasters. We are still either failing to see or choosing to neglect specific categories of need, or simply cannot adapt our ways of thinking and working to accommodate differentiated needs and vulnerabilities. The way we now think about and implement protection suggests that we have become unwilling or unable to engage with parties and groups who have responsibility for or a direct role to play in civilian protection. In 2018, both the *State of the humanitarian system* study by ALNAP and the IFRC's *World disasters report* provide ample and sobering evidence that women and girls, older people and people with disabilities, people living in besieged areas and the internally displaced are among the most notable examples of our collective deficiencies. As a result, people, even whole communities, are under-counted and underserved, and their needs misunderstood or overlooked.

This set of proposals for HPG's Integrated Programme of research for 2019–21 critically analyses the ability of the humanitarian sector to deliver on its stated commitment to impartiality. We focus on the key obstacles to – and enablers of – a more inclusive aid system, analysing why certain groups or individuals are excluded from assistance; exploring the relationships between changing gender norms and assistance and vulnerability in displacement; exploring the emerging impacts of new technology in improving or undermining the system's ability to address those furthest behind; and assessing historical and contemporary practices of humanitarian advocacy and protection on behalf of those most at risk in conflict. In doing so, we are building on research in the previous

IP on local responses to crises, which identified where and how local responses supplemented, complemented or even replaced international assistance and protection. In undertaking these four projects, we will as far as possible seek to work through and with local research partners.

The first project – 'Falling through the cracks: inclusion and exclusion in humanitarian action' – examines the contextual and systemic factors dictating how 'vulnerability' is constructed and operationalised in humanitarian assistance, why certain categories of vulnerability are consistently privileged over others and why humanitarian agencies operating in emergencies find it difficult to both understand how needs differ across groups and identities, and to incorporate those differences into their programming. Focusing on internally displaced people (IDPs) in a number of crisis contexts, the research will examine concepts of vulnerability and need, assessment and targeting, and whether a more systemic approach to greater 'inclusion' in aid delivery is desirable and possible.

Increasing policy and critical attention to gender in crises and humanitarian response has not been matched by improvements in programming. Our second project, 'How gender roles change in displacement', will explore how gender norms shift in situations of displacement, and the implications of these changes for humanitarian work. This project aims to understand the factors driving these changes; the opportunities and vulnerabilities they create for men, women, boys and girls; and what gender-aware emergency interventions should look like.

New and emerging technologies are driving far-reaching change across human society, including in the humanitarian sector. Our project on 'The humanitarian "digital divide": understanding the impact of technology on crisis response' builds on previous HPG research on humanitarian reform and ongoing work on digital technology, data, blockchain, cash transfers and financing to assess the impact of new technology-driven models of humanitarian action on inclusion and coverage. The project examines how new and maturing models for humanitarian action are more or less inclusive of different affected groups, with a view to generating specific recommendations for maximising the impact of these approaches on impartial and needs-based assistance.

Building on HPG's longstanding research on protection, the final IP project, 'Advocating for humanity: opportunities for improving protection outcomes in conflict', looks at current practice in protection advocacy, and examines the role and evolution of humanitarian organisations' engagement with parties to conflicts and other groups with responsibility for protecting civilians caught up in violence and war. The project's central proposition is that, while advocacy aimed at protecting affected populations is both necessary and should be standard practice for international humanitarian organisations, organisations are often not strategic in their approach to it, may lack the appropriate skills or resources and may be deprioritising such work in their operations.

As in previous years, the research projects described here will be accompanied by extensive policy engagement and an energetic communications and dissemination programme, with tailored communications plans designed to ensure that research findings reach key audiences in accessible and useable formats. HPG will continue to seek to further expand the team's presence and outreach beyond Europe and North America and to diversify our programme of public events in disaster- and conflict-affected countries and crisis capitals. We will seek to further consolidate the Group's reputation as an important source of expertise for journalists, editors and producers and increase and expand our engagement with the international media. We will also continue to develop multimedia products, such as podcasts, webinars, online interviews and discussions. HPG researchers participate extensively in external and overseas engagements; as in previous years, funding is sought to enable this to continue. Funds are also sought to allow rapid engagement with current or emerging issues as they arise, and the production of policy briefs to guide policy-makers and practitioners in their responses to unfolding crises. HPG will aim to compile and consider its research findings across all four IP projects by publishing a synthesis paper at the end of the research cycle.

HPG will also continue its engagement with humanitarian practitioners through the publishing and events programmes of the Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN), a global forum for policy-makers, practitioners and others working in the humanitarian sector to share and disseminate information, analysis and experience. HPN publications – *Humanitarian Exchange* magazine, commissioned Network Papers on specific subjects and Good Practice Reviews – form the heart of HPN's output. HPN also manages an active programme of public events in London and in other locations around the world.

HPG will also maintain its links with the global academic community through editorship of *Disasters* journal, and via the Senior-Level Course on Conflict and Humanitarian Response, taught in conjunction with the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE).

Table 1: Integrated Programme 2019–2021 summary budget

Inclusivity and invisibility in humanitarian action	2019–20	2020–21	Total
Research			
Falling through the cracks: inclusion and exclusion in humanitarian action	£213,050	£233,433	£446,483
How gender roles change in displacement	£241,700	£195,145	£436,845
The humanitarian 'digital divide': understanding the impact of technology on crisis response	£234,950	£208,925	£443,875
Advocating for humanity: opportunities for improving protection outcomes in humanitarian response	£222,730	£229,645	£452,375
Synthesis	£71,575	£171,215	£242,790
Total research	**£984,005**	**£1,038,363**	**£2,022,368**
Non-research			
Humanitarian Practice Network	£230,910	£235,770	£466,680
Policy engagement and representation	£218,805	£216,115	£434,920
Public affairs, rapid response and media	£164,390	£165,950	£330,340
Senior-level course on conflict and humanitarian response (LSE)	£20,000	£20,000	£40,000
Disasters	£10,000	£10,000	£20,000
Reprinting	£5,000	£5,000	£10,000
Total non-research	**£649,105**	**£652,835**	**£1,301,940**
	£1,633,110	**£1,691,198**	**£3,324,308**

Falling through the cracks: inclusion and exclusion in humanitarian action

Background and rationale

Among the outcomes of the World Humanitarian Summit have been initiatives calling for more inclusive humanitarian action, including the *Charter on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action*. This call resonates with the Sustainable Development Goals, and the UN Secretary-General's call to 'leave no one behind'. Initiatives such as the Humanitarian Charter and the Core Humanitarian Standard, and efforts to mainstream gender, disability and protection, have all made progress towards more inclusive humanitarian action. However, major challenges remain.

While the principle of impartiality is intended to ensure that humanitarian action is carried out on the basis of need alone – with no distinction of nationality, race, gender, religious belief, class or political opinion – organisations make daily decisions about who is visible and invisible, who is counted, who is perceived as 'vulnerable', and who can access the right assistance, protection and services. The inclusion of particular vulnerable groups in humanitarian programming – such as people living with disability or older people – is still a weakness, and humanitarian agencies operating in emergencies still find it difficult to address the needs of 'new' categories of 'vulnerability' – or for that matter to think outside the restrictive categories of 'vulnerability' and embrace a more holistic and flexible approach to people's needs in crises.

Research framework and methodology

This project revisits key – and still unresolved – questions of assessment, impartiality and inclusion raised by HPG 15 years ago in *According to need? Needs assessment and decision-making in the humanitarian sector*.[1] Through a focus on needs in internal displacement settings, we will explore how vulnerability is conceived and operationalised, and therefore how needs are perceived and understood. The research aims to understand the concept of vulnerability in humanitarian action, and explore why material assistance, service delivery and protection programmes often fail to consider certain groups or individuals that end up being excluded from humanitarian action. The research is therefore both about who is excluded and included and why, and why particular needs are addressed and others are not. As such, the research will examine concepts of vulnerability and need, assessments (needs assessments and context analysis) and targeting decisions and practices, as well as the practical business of aid delivery. Issues of power, interests and incentives will feature throughout (including the interests of governments and armed groups in humanitarian action, the implications of using intermediaries, donor policies, the policies and interests of aid agencies and the role of the media.

The two central research questions for this study are:

* What and whose needs are included and excluded and by whom in humanitarian action?
* What does an inclusive approach to humanitarian action look like?

Additional research questions include:

* How has the concept of vulnerability and inclusive humanitarian action evolved? How are vulnerability and inclusion perceived differently by different humanitarian organisations and by communities (including national and local actors as well as institutions)?
* How are vulnerabilities and needs assessed and addressed? How is the concept of

---

1   See https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/285.pdf.

'intersectionality' operationalised in humanitarian action?[2]

- What are the barriers to addressing people's individual and collective needs during emergencies (including priority setting, organisational structures, partnerships, donor policies and funding)? How are different interests and incentives influencing decisions and practices of exclusion and inclusion?
- How have past and current efforts (gender, protection mainstreaming) contributed to more inclusive humanitarian action? What are good practices in policies, approaches, assessments, targeting and programme design and implementation to improve inclusion in humanitarian action?

Project activities

The project will start with a conceptual study looking at vulnerability within the humanitarian system, based on a review of the literature and practice on concepts of vulnerability, needs and inclusion and their use in policy frameworks, assessments, targeting and programming. Case studies will concentrate on internal displacement settings (focusing on internally displaced persons, returnees and individuals in communities hosting IDPs and returnees) in selected humanitarian contexts, looking at policies and practices of inclusion and exclusion, including who is counted and not counted, who is perceived as vulnerable and how the multiplicity of perspectives on vulnerability impacts on response and whether those considered vulnerable can access the assistance and services they need.

IDP contexts that have experienced peaks of violence may be most illuminating, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the Central African Republic (CAR), Nigeria, South Sudan, Myanmar and Pakistan, and will be considered for the two central case studies. Resources permitting, we will also consider issues of vulnerability and inclusion in disasters in the Pacific and Asia. A third case study could align with one case study country in the IP project on 'How gender roles change in displacement crises', to link HPG's analysis of gender-responsive programming to wider, systemic issues of inclusion.

The methodology will include workshops with academics/experts in the case study countries, local organisations, in particular those working with isolated or marginalised people (indigenous people, ethnic minorities, people living with disability, the elderly) and human rights organisations; an analysis of humanitarian organisations' targeting approaches; focus group discussions and qualitative interviews with individuals from affected populations, field staff and assessment teams, both as key informants and research subjects.

Two main streams of work and analysis will contribute to the final report. One will focus on understanding how and to what extent the humanitarian sector, both international and local, is supporting more inclusive humanitarian action. The second will use the case studies and wider consultations to identify practices from both the humanitarian and development spheres that could be scaled up, and policies that could enable more inclusive humanitarian action. These will be examined through comparative analysis of the case studies, as well as research workshops and desk reviews. The research will link to ongoing global policy debates on independent needs assessments as part of the Grand Bargain, and will inform not only how to better join up assessments but also how to improve the quality of assessments and response. More generally, the research will explore current debates on the quality of aid and accountability to affected populations, as well as how the focus on value for money and aid effectiveness is affecting inclusion and coverage in humanitarian action.

Project timeline and deliverables

The project will run between April 2019 and March 2021. It will include the following phases:

- **Phase 1** (April–September 2019). In this phase, the project team will carry out a review of relevant literature and draft an initial paper reflecting on the concepts of vulnerability and inclusion, and how they have been applied within the aid sector. The team will also finalise the methodology and case study countries during this phase.
- **Phase 2** (September 2019–September 2020). In this phase, HPG will conduct the fieldwork, documenting and analysing findings in two or

---

2   The concept of intersectionality is predicated on the notion that 'various dimensions of social stratification – including socioeconomic status, sex, gender, ethnicity, race, age and others – can add up, or cumulate, to great disadvantage for some groups of people' (Hankivsky et al., 2010, p. 8).

three working papers and publishing initial findings in a policy brief.

- **Phase 3** (September 2020–March 2021). In this phase, we will conduct research workshops and desk reviews to look at good practice in inclusion, and how it might be more broadly applied. An initial policy brief will provide a preliminary cross-case study analysis highlighting the central policy issues to be examined in the final report. This policy brief and the additional desk reviews and research workshops will inform a final report based on the findings of the case studies. A policy brief on a specific policy theme will be published as a final output of the project.

How gender roles change in displacement

Background and rationale

Gender-sensitive programming and gender mainstreaming have been topics of debate for years. In 2007, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) established the Gender Standby Capacity Project (GenCap) to promote gender-equality programming. In 2010, the UN reiterated the need 'to mainstream a gender perspective into humanitarian assistance, including by addressing the specific needs of women, girls, boys and men in a comprehensive and consistent manner'. Five of the 32 core commitments endorsed by the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit refer to gender, including the commitment to 'ensure that humanitarian programming is gender responsive'. Recent work by HPG has highlighted the need to take gender into account when thinking about how to make aid more dignified in the Rohingya response. Donors including Canada, Norway and Sweden are pursuing 'feminist' aid policies, and aid agencies are putting gender-responsive programming at the core of their operations. A series of consultations and donor conferences related to gender-responsive programming will culminate in the Women Deliver conference in Vancouver in 2019.

Despite this global attention to gender in crises and humanitarian response, gender programming is often poor, and driven by preconceptions of women and vulnerability. Gender roles and gender inequalities are often treated as a technical issue, to be addressed by targeting women with goods or training: they are rarely seen as the outcome of established power relations, religion, culture, social factors and economic determinants. It is hard to find examples where humanitarian interventions, which include among their objectives the promotion of greater gender equality, have been based on any study of how gender roles and norms have changed during the crisis.

There is an abundance of literature detailing the relationship between gender, conflict and forced displacement, but this work has rarely made an impact on humanitarian policy and programming because it is often difficult to see how to use theoretical analysis to improve practice. There are understandable challenges, for humanitarian and emergency actors in particular. Gender norms are the creation of power relations in society which it takes time for outsiders to adequately understand. Addressing power relations within a society may also be perceived as a threat to the smooth running of humanitarian operations, and a problem outside the mandate of humanitarian agencies, which feel more comfortable in dealing with the technical symptoms of unequal power relations. There is also no consensus over the ethical question of how far international organisations in particular should see crises as an opportunity to use their resources to drive changes in the cultural norms and values of affected societies.

These challenges are rarely discussed explicitly; this research project aims to give concrete illustrations of how gender dynamics are changing, to analyse some of the implications for humanitarian and emergency action and to foster an open discussion on the challenges and ethics of incorporating gender understanding in programming in meaningful ways.

Research framework and methodology

HPG will undertake a two-year research project exploring how gender norms change in displacement crises, and the implications of these changes for humanitarian work. The project aims to understand the underlying factors that shape gender norms and roles in particular crisis contexts, and to explore how crises create changes in these underlying factors and in gender dynamics, leading in turn to changes in gender norms and roles. The project will analyse how a dynamic understanding of gender relations helps identify opportunities and vulnerabilities in displacement settings, for men, women, boys and girls,

and what gender-responsive emergency interventions could and should look like.[3]

Although these themes are relevant for all crises, the project will use displacement settings as the focus of analysis because changes in gender roles are likely to be more apparent in contexts where people's material lives and social organisation have undergone significant change. The study will also look at one situation of return, to see how far gender norms reverted back to the status quo ante for both displaced and host populations, or whether changes to gender norms and roles occurring in displacement endured.

Three broad research areas are proposed, as set out below.

- How have gender power relations, roles and norms changed in and after the crisis?
  – What were the factors shaping gender roles before the crisis?
  – How and why have these factors and gender power relations changed as a result of the crisis?
  – What changes have occurred in gender norms and roles – and for whom?
  – How do the hopes and aspirations of men, women, boys and girls change over time, and how far has the displacement crisis contributed to these changes?
  – Has aid programming or the presence of aid organisations had any influence on gender relations, norms and roles?
  – What new opportunities and problems do such changes create for men, women, boys and girls?
  – What other factors (e.g. education, age) affect how roles and norms change for men, women, boys and girls as a result of crisis?
- What are the implications for humanitarian agencies of changes in gender roles and norms?
  – What gender research and analysis (e.g. assessments, tools, frameworks, etc.) have been used or undertaken by humanitarian agencies? What issues were identified by these approaches? How far have changes in gender relations, norms and roles been identified?
  – In what ways are agencies incorporating gender issues into their programming? Are there issues arising in their assessments or analysis that have not been taken on board in the design and implementation of their activities?

- What should the role of the humanitarian sector be in the face of unequal gender norms?
  – To what extent do the existing structures and procedures of humanitarian interventions guarantee gender-sensitive design?
  – What are the possible unintended negative impacts of addressing gender norms and roles? How can they be addressed?
  – What good practice exists (including in development), and how might current humanitarian interventions best be adjusted in the light of a more detailed understanding of changing gender roles?
  – What kinds of objectives are appropriate for humanitarian agencies around gender norms? Is gender equality possible or desirable as a humanitarian outcome?

Project activities

The research will be undertaken in three phases. The project will first review the rich body of theoretical and operational literature on addressing gender and humanitarian crises, so as to build on existing analysis and identify new research gaps. This will include an examination of the extensive literature on how gender norms change in displacement, and how gender-aware programming has developed over the past decades – from gender-sensitive and gender-responsive to gender mainstreaming and gender-transformative. Comparisons will be made between the literature in the development and humanitarian worlds.

In the second phase, a case study methodology will be used to get at the in-depth empirical evidence needed to explore culturally-specific gender norms. Detailed empirical research with displaced populations will help in understanding what gender roles look like in practice and how they are changing, including as a result of the displacement crisis. The main tool will be individual interviews rather than focus group discussions, although FGDs may be used initially to tease out the idealised norms that will then be tested in the individual interviews. Where possible, other methodologies will be used to hear displaced people's voices directly, for example through the collection of audio diaries. In order to understand the impact of the displacement crisis on gender roles, the research will also explore two other processes of change: changes in people's lives as their age or status changes; and

---

3   There is growing acceptance in many areas that gender identity is not necessarily binary. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to consider non-binary gender identity in displacement crises. Whatever the limitations of a binary approach, this research project will be discussed in terms of men/women and boys/girls, partly because such binary categories dominate how people are defined in such situations.

inter-generational changes unrelated to displacement. A variety of interview tools and analytical steps will be used, including time-mapping of a single day, collecting life stories focusing on the periods immediately before, during and since the displacement and asking people to compare their lives with those of previous and future generations (e.g. a woman will compare her life with her mother's and with the life she expects her daughter to have when she has children). We will also seek to compare gender norms and roles with those in the host population, and look for exceptions to norms and how gender norms are 'enforced' or can be evaded.

These and further methodologies will be developed in consultation with colleagues in ODI who specialise in gender, including the Gender and Adolescence: Global Evidence (GAGE) and Advancing Learning and Innovation on Gender Norms (ALIGN) programmes.

Two case studies will be undertaken, one of which will look at a return situation, and will focus on how far changes to gender roles and norms during displacement have continued on return. Possible case studies include refugees from CAR in Cameroon or from South Sudan or DRC in Uganda, based on HPG's established research links. Where possible, HPG will work with both local research and operational partners. The proposed return case study will look at returnees to Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) in Pakistan. If resources allow, a third case study in another ongoing displacement context will be undertaken. Researchers will work with the IP project 'Falling through the cracks: inclusion and exclusion in humanitarian action', to allow for collaboration and analysis of findings across the two projects.

The third phase of the project will use existing literature and case study findings to discuss the ethics and practicalities of gender-responsive or gender-transformative humanitarian action. Researchers will interview international and local aid agencies and hold workshops and roundtables in several countries to generate a direct dialogue between refugee and returnee men and women, operational humanitarian actors, and policy-makers and academics working on these questions. A summary of the discussion at each roundtable will be published.

Project timeline and deliverables

The project will take place between April 2019 and March 2021. It will include the following phases:

- **Phase 1** (April–September 2019). The project team will publish the literature review, finalise the case studies and begin forming relationships with local research and operational partners.
- **Phase 2** (October 2019–September 2020). The project team, along with local partners, will carry out the case studies and write two or three working papers and policy briefs, alongside ongoing engagement activities, including in case study countries.
- **Phase 3** (October 2020–March 2021). The project team will conduct a series of roundtables for refugees, practitioners, donors and academics, and summaries will be written and published. The project will conclude with a final report, and one or more policy briefs on topics emerging from the research.

The humanitarian 'digital divide': understanding the impact of technology on crisis response

Rapid technological change is affecting every aspect of society, including humanitarian action. The way aid is delivered and the form it takes has changed in key ways over the past decade, often underpinned by technology such as mobile phones, social media and data analytics. Digital technologies are leading to new approaches to humanitarian action, such as crowd-mapping and crowdfunded social movements, often driven by dissatisfaction with the shortcomings of the 'traditional' humanitarian system and a generation that expects a more socially engaged corporate sector. This proliferation of technology-driven approaches to delivering and financing humanitarian action has the potential to transform, democratise and disrupt the current international system.

For many humanitarian actors on the ground, and many people affected by crisis, it is not clear how significant a difference these advances have really made in increasing the coverage and inclusivity of humanitarian assistance. Are these changes enabling assistance to reach more people more equitably, or are they reinforcing ingrained sectoral biases and blind spots, or creating a humanitarian 'digital divide' by favouring those affected populations able to access technology? Are those technologies lauded for improving the agency of and accountability to affected populations having that effect at all?

As we move into the 'fourth industrial revolution',[4] this project aims to assess the impacts of technology-driven approaches on humanitarian aid and outcomes. Through detailed case studies and analysis, the research will look at different types of technology-driven approaches. It will focus on those initiatives that represent a breakthrough or have significant scale and investment, with a view to assessing their impact on inclusion and coverage. It then draws out lessons for emerging, nascent approaches that are currently being piloted. The analysis will be used to assess the ways in which humanitarians should engage with established and emerging approaches, to ensure a focus on inclusion. The aim will be both to improve humanitarian practice and to inform future engagement with technology-driven approaches.

The research will explore the following themes:

- Data collection and information exchange: using digital tools to gather data, process it and apply it to improving aid distribution. This could include established approaches such as crowd-mapping (for example the volunteer mapping networks Ushahidi and Open Street Map, which aggregate relevant data on crises from multiple open sources), and emerging approaches including artificial intelligence, blockchain and drones.
- Collaboration and coordination: the role of social media and crowdfunding approaches in new forms of operational relationships and partnerships. This is well established in the growth of grassroots movements such Worldwide Tribe, working with European refugees, CanDo crowdfunding for Syrian grassroots organisations and Southern volunteer movements such as Humanitarian Aid International in India. The emerging counterpart might be sharing economy approaches such as Airbnb for refugee hosting.
- Accountability: including initiatives that prioritise the agency of and accountability to affected populations, or that enable performance- or outcome-based funding through digital tools. Established initiatives include humanitarian 'call centres' or hotlines, while emerging approaches might include Ground Truth Solutions' Humanitarian Voice Index or ReliefWatch, a proposed peer review rating system for humanitarian services.

---

4   Klaus Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution* (London: Penguin, 2017) (https://www.weforum.org/about/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab).

Research framework and methodology

Building on HPG's previous IP research on reimagining the humanitarian system, which explored the possibilities of alternative forms of humanitarian action, and ongoing HPG work on digital technology, blockchain, cash transfers and new forms of financing, this research will address the question: 'What has been the impact of new technology-driven approaches to humanitarian action on inclusion?'. A number of sub-questions will be explored in analysing this overarching research question:

- How has new technology changed the humanitarian sector?
- Who has been included as a result of these technologies? Who has been excluded?
- What do these technologies mean for the humanitarian sector moving forward?
    – What do they tell us about the future of accountability?
    – What do they tell us about the future of information/data-gathering?
    – What do they tell us about the future of organisational culture?
- How might the sector adapt its approaches to digital technologies in the future?

The research will take a thematic case study approach to consider issues of information, organisation and accountability across different technologies, and with improved inclusion and coverage as objectives. The research will have a global focus, including perspectives from local, national and regional humanitarian actors. Data from practitioners and crisis contexts will be used to analyse the impact of technologies in responding to disaster and conflict/protracted crises respectively. Comparative analysis of different technologies in the same or similar contexts may also be useful to the analysis.

The case studies will focus on specific technology areas, such as social media, biometrics and spatial mapping, to explore the following questions:

- What is the technology, what was it meant to do and what has it actually achieved? What mature and emerging examples of the technology are in use?
- What factors contributed to the success/failure of this technology?

- Who has it succeeded for, i.e. who has been included/ excluded, and what are the implications for gender, age, disability, ethnicity and income level?
- What were the challenges and unforeseen consequences of this technology?
- What were the risks in its use and how were they mitigated?
- What are the future implications of this technology for the humanitarian sector?

In particular, the research will consider how humanitarians should address privacy, data ethics and protection issues and other unintended negative impacts due to the misuse of data and technology, and what implications there might be for humanitarian actors due to new partnerships (e.g. with the private sector) as a result of applying digital solutions.

HPG's proposed research will go beyond the often positive coverage of technology-driven initiatives in the media and 'innovation literature' to document key trends and consider the evidence for impact from secondary sources and field research on established approaches. It will analyse the positives, negatives and risks of selected emerging approaches, and consider the potential for them to bring about truly transformative change – but also where they might not live up to the hype.

Project activities

The research will start with a literature review and initial consultations to define what we consider to be established and emerging approaches based on existing research and practice on technological change and innovation in humanitarian action. We will develop a methodology for analysing the impact of these approaches on coverage and inclusivity using qualitative interviews, focus group discussions and secondary desk research with practitioners, policy and technology experts and, where appropriate, affected people and local/national actors in crisis-affected countries.

We will select two or three in-depth case technology areas to inform analysis of the research themes – data gathering/information exchange; collaboration and coordination; and accountability – to build a contrasting picture from different perspectives. These may be complemented by smaller case studies on other technologies that can usefully contribute towards answering the research questions.

The final report will analyse the case studies and bring together global- and crisis-level perspectives on technology and inclusion to develop insights into the policy and practitioner implications of the research. This will be complemented by further desk research and consultations.

Project timeline and deliverables

The project will take place between April 2019 and March 2021. It will include the following phases:

- **Phase 1** (April–September 2019). In this phase, the project team will undertake a rapid initial mapping of existing approaches and a literature review, in order to define the scope of new approaches, develop the research methodology and prioritise case studies, to inform a first working paper and policy brief. The team will engage with academics, experts and practitioners, and relevant initiatives such as the World Economic Forum workstreams on humanitarian investing and digital technologies.

- **Phase 2** (September 2019–September 2020). In this phase, the case study and technology choices and methodology will be finalised, and fieldwork conducted. Two/three working papers will document findings and analysis from each case study.

- **Phase 3** (September 2020–March 2021). In this phase, research workshops, interviews and desk reviews will synthesise findings on how inclusivity is addressed by both mature and emerging technology approaches, and how practitioners and policy-makers should engage differently. This will inform a final report and policy brief.

Advocating for humanity: opportunities for improving protection outcomes in conflict

Background and rationale

International humanitarian organisations have long engaged in advocacy aimed at securing the protection of conflict-affected populations. Based on the relevant bodies of humanitarian, human rights and refugee law, such advocacy[5] has taken multiple forms, from quiet diplomacy to public condemnation. While the humanitarian imperative and legal bases are clear, analysis suggests that humanitarian actors may be deprioritising this traditional advocacy role.[6] But in the face of today's ever-more complex conflicts, and given the evolving global geopolitical climate, are international humanitarian organisations advocating strategically and effectively to alleviate the suffering and displacement that mar the lives of millions of civilians in Yemen, Syria, the DRC, South Sudan and elsewhere? Where they are, are such efforts working? Have approaches to protection advocacy changed, and if so how and to what extent?

Advocacy for better protection outcomes for affected populations is being thwarted by a number of factors – both internal and external to the humanitarian sector. In recent years, states including Syria, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Israel, Russia, Nigeria and Pakistan have disregarded international law and their responsibilities therein by creating a pattern of 'acceptable' practice, often justified as efforts to counter terrorist threats. The US, UK and other Western states responsible for creating the international protection architecture have been – including through their own behaviour in overseas conflicts – rolling back the international norms and standards that they helped to negotiate, or are showing increasing reluctance to challenge others due to political, economic or other interests. Repeated deadlock at the UN Security Council has effectively afforded impunity to those states that violate international law. As a result, the high-level political support that humanitarian organisations require to bolster their protection advocacy has been either ineffective or simply absent. Meanwhile, there are major challenges related to understanding the shifting agendas of non-state actors and navigating the complex network of legal and political counter-terrorism measures to mitigate the physical and reputational risks involved.

Many international humanitarian organisations seem at a loss as to how to respond to these complex challenges; appear to be increasingly emphasising protection as a technical approach and a separate area of specialisation; or have seemingly consciously downgraded their protection advocacy efforts for fear of the risks – physical, financial and reputational – involved. This may be contributing to an overall confusion regarding how organisations conceptualise protection, and a sense among some humanitarian actors that protection advocacy should be left to protection experts or the handful of protection-mandated organisations. For those undertaking such advocacy, it is unclear to what extent their messages are based on the priorities identified by affected populations. Overall, advocacy on protection concerns appears increasingly weak at a time when it is more important than ever.

---

5 Different organisations use different terms – humanitarian diplomacy, advocacy, negotiation and engagement – to describe the interaction of humanitarian actors with parties to a conflict and others with access to and control over crisis-affected populations. The research will aim to define what these terms mean to – and how their meaning is interpreted and perceived by – different groups in different response contexts. We use the term 'advocacy' for the purposes of this proposal.

6 Inter-Agency Standing Committee, *Independent Whole of System Review of Protection in the Context of Humanitarian Action*, 2015.

Research framework and methodology

The central proposition of this project is that, in its many forms, advocacy aimed at protecting affected populations is both necessary and should be standard practice for international humanitarian organisations. While advocacy on protection concerns remains critical in humanitarian responses, evidence suggests that organisations are often not strategic in their approach, may lack the appropriate skills or resources and may have deprioritised such work in their operations.[7] Although such advocacy is important in all situations of humanitarian crisis, this project assumes that such efforts are particularly critical in armed conflicts or situations of generalised violence because of the gravity of threats to civilians and the challenges in advocating for their protection. The project also recognises the critical role that national and local humanitarian organisations play in advocating for better protection outcomes for affected populations, and the risks these organisations face.

This project will take a constructive, solutions-oriented approach, asking critical questions about the different kinds of advocacy on protection that international humanitarian organisations are undertaking today; exploring the challenges, risks and obstacles they face in doing so; and formulating realistic proposals for how to mitigate them. It will also consider opportunities for advocacy that are as yet unexploited, including how humanitarian actors can best support the efforts of local and national organisations and affected populations. Crucially, taking a pragmatic approach, the project will explore the potential and actual impact of this engagement, what tactics or strategies work, what capacities or skills are required or need to be augmented, what strategic collaborations or partnerships could magnify current efforts, and what results can be achieved.

Central research questions include:

- What is the current purpose and practice of protection advocacy by humanitarian organisations, and what do they consider their role to be? What are the expected outputs and outcomes? What tactics work, and what don't?
- Where and how does protection advocacy fit within the priorities of the broader institutional or inter-agency humanitarian response?
- To what extent is advocacy by humanitarian organisations informed by the priorities of affected populations?
- What are the key challenges to and risks in engaging on protection concerns in conflicts? How can they be better prepared for and mitigated?
- What opportunities and partnerships – within and outside the humanitarian system and at national, regional and global levels – can be formulated or drawn upon to maximise impact?

Project activities

Building on previous HPG research,[8] this project aims to distil learning from both the past and the present to inform better practice today. Through an iterative process, the project team will work in close collaboration with humanitarian organisations. These partnerships are intended to be mutually beneficial – enabling the project team to document and analyse experience, and enabling project partners to draw on the analysis and learning in real time. Three case studies will explore a historical example, a current and evolving humanitarian context, and an institutional case.

The project team will seek to engage a variety of stakeholders throughout the project at global, regional and national levels, including 'traditional' protection-mandated organisations and protection specialists, key experts in mediation, diplomacy and advocacy in conflict contexts, as well as other disciplines such as human rights, political affairs and peacebuilding and academia. These senior stakeholders will be invited to engage with the project through specific activities including participation in a steering group, in a series of roundtables and consultations and, where willing and interested, through authorship of publications including blogs and policy briefs.

Project timeline and deliverables

The project will take place between April 2019 and March 2021. It will include the following phases:

---

7   Global Protection Cluster, *Centrality of protection in humanitarian action: GPC 2017 review*, 2017; ALNAP, *Evaluation of protection in humanitarian action*, 2018.

8   This includes HPG research on protection advocacy (2006), civil–military coordination on protection (2010–12), humanitarian negotiations with non-state armed actors (2011–13), access in conflict (2015–17) and local protection strategies (2017–19).

- **Phase 1** (April 2019–September 2019). In this phase, the research team will convene the project steering group and conduct a preliminary desk review, including a literature review complemented by stakeholder interviews. An opening roundtable discussion will be convened, and the team will determine case studies and establish partnerships for delivering them. This phase of work will conclude with the publication of a desk review synthesising existing analysis and learning on this theme.

- **Phase 2** (September 2019–September 2020). In this phase case study work will begin with initial field visits. The historical case study will be published, alongside a second roundtable to discuss emerging findings. The team also plans to publish a blog or think-piece based on learning so far.

- **Phase 3** (September 2020–March 2021). In this final phase the project team will conclude the two remaining studies on a current humanitarian crisis and the institutional case study, convene a final roundtable and publish the final project report.

Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN)

Humanitarian Practice Network (HPN) is a global forum for policy-makers, practitioners and others working in the humanitarian sector to share and disseminate information, analysis and experience. Its specialised resources – *Humanitarian Exchange* magazine, Network Papers and Good Practice Reviews (GPRs) – aim to contribute to improving the performance of humanitarian action by encouraging and facilitating knowledge sharing and contributing to individual and institutional learning. HPN publications and online articles and blogs are written by and for practitioners, and play a unique role in examining policy developments and distilling and disseminating practice. HPN is valued for its objectivity, analysis, accessibility and relevance; its print and online activities provide an important resource to support improved practice and learning in the sector. To maximise efficiency and minimise costs, HPN is run by an experienced but part-time team consisting of a dedicated HPN Coordinator supported by HPG's Managing Editor and the communications team.

HPN's members are part of a network of several thousand policy-makers and practitioners around the world. To build on the strength of HPN's membership and add value to the network, over the next IP cycle HPN will:

- Encourage increased member engagement with the network, including opportunities for debate at targeted events and online.
- Continue to increase and diversify network membership. Activities will include promoting the network during visits to the field and at key global events and regional conferences. Partnerships with regional and sector-wide networks, academic and training institutions and online information/media groups will also be strengthened, and new partnerships forged.

- Continue to explore and expand the use of media techniques – such as online streaming, webinars, whiteboard videos and infographics – to ensure that HPN's analysis and learning reaches members in formats that meet their preferences and needs.

During 2019–21 HPN will maintain a focus on publishing as its core activity. Potential topics for *Humanitarian Exchange* include making humanitarian action work for girls and women, the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen, responding to Ebola in the DRC and the humanitarian crisis in Venezuela. Future Network Paper topics we are interested in exploring with potential authors include consolidating the findings from a range of research on addressing the needs of disabled people during humanitarian crises, and a compilation of the experiences and lessons from the work of the Local to Global Protection Initiative. HPN and ALNAP will complete and disseminate a new joint GPR on humanitarian practice in urban areas, including commissioning a whiteboard animation and the development of a dedicated microsite.

The HPN website (www.odihpn.org), which was revamped in 2016, provides an archive of HPN publications, a microsite for GPR 9 on Disaster Risk Reduction, and other key documents and reports. Because most editions of *Humanitarian Exchange* are now devoted to particular themes, we publish articles on other aspects of humanitarian practice on our website. These articles enable us to interact with more practitioners, cover a wider range of topics and maintain interest in and engagement with the website. HPN also maintains links with other humanitarian websites, including AlertNet and ReliefWeb, and we will continue sending regular e-alerts to members to notify them of new publications, products and events.

Policy engagement and representation

HPG's international influence is reflected in the range of its policy advice and engagement, providing expertise to governments, foreign affairs departments, policy-makers, legislative committees, NGOs and international multilateral organisations. HPG's expertise has been sought on a wide range of issues, including cash programming, the private sector in humanitarian assistance, and migration and displacement, and we regularly provide advice, analysis and guidance on a range of humanitarian crises in which the group has particular expertise, including Syria, Yemen, CAR and Sudan and South Sudan.

During the 2019–21 IP, HPG will focus on such engagement in two ways. First, as part of strategic engagement activities within each IP research project, HPG will convene different groups of external stakeholders to provide high-level steerage to the project, to validate findings in case study countries and to help derive wider analysis and recommendations in the final phase of the research. For example, for the 'Advocating for humanity' project, HPG will aim to convene senior-level negotiators to better understand the trade-offs involved in engaging with parties and other groups on access and protection. In the 'humanitarian

"digital divide"' project, this will involve engagement with the technology community to keep pace with the fast-moving application of new technologies to humanitarian action.

Second, HPG will continue its policy engagement on topics related to its Integrated Programme 2017–19, 'From the ground up: understanding local humanitarian action'. Previous IPs, and topics where we have considerable research and expertise, for example on international humanitarian law and its application, markets in crises and market-based interventions, private finance and humanitarian investing, counter-terrorism and bank de-risking, non-traditional donorship and system reform. In each of these cases, we will offer advice and guidance to communities of practice, and engage with global conferences and networks including the World Economic Forum, the World Humanitarian Action Forum and the Regional Organisations Humanitarian Action Network (ROHAN).

The cost of the annual Advisory Group meeting will also be included as part of the policy engagement budget, instead of splitting it among the different projects in the Integrated Programme.

Academic engagement and learning

Disasters

Disasters journal constitutes one of HPG's most important links with the international academic community. The journal has continued to perform strongly, with more than 100,000 downloads over 2018, including notable increases in countries including Kenya, Uganda, Bangladesh and Jordan. The journal's Impact Factor has continued to increase year-on-year (from 0.742 in 2014 to 1.596 currently). During 2017–18, the journal published eight regular issues and four virtual ones, including a special issue marking the journal's fortieth anniversary. Issues planned for 2019 include collections on humanitarian governance, the future of disaster studies and resilience.

Senior-Level Course on Conflict and Humanitarian Response (with LSE)

The past decade has seen a surge in efforts to support countries affected by and recovering from conflict – and consequently a growth in the number of professionals working in humanitarian aid, development and post-conflict recovery. These professionals are faced with a myriad of challenges associated with the transition from conflict to peace, yet rarely have the opportunity to reflect on the critical concepts and policy dilemmas involved.

To address this gap, HPG, in partnership with the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), teaches an annual Senior-Level Course on Conflict and Humanitarian Response in London. Intended for mid-career and senior professionals, the course provides an opportunity for people in the sector to learn and reflect on critical issues in humanitarian response. Designed to foster peer-to-peer learning, the course features lectures by distinguished, senior academics and practitioners, alongside group discussions and exercises. Participants include NGO country directors, senior UN and donor staff, experienced consultants and former military personnel.

HPG researchers also teach several segments as part of a Masters Course run by the Center for Conflict and Humanitarian Studies at the Doha Institute in Qatar.

Public affairs and rapid response

HPG's public affairs strategy aims to influence debates on a range of humanitarian issues by communicating research and analysis to policy-makers, practitioners, the media and the general public. Our public affairs work seeks to proactively shape the debate through targeted dissemination of our research findings and responding to key humanitarian issues and events that emerge in the external environment. The key components of this engagement are our events programme, innovative communications tools, such as podcasts and multimedia, and engagement with specialist, local and global media.

We run a vibrant and diverse programme of events, well-attended in person and online, available in recordings and covered by national, regional and international media. The Group's research projects for the next stage of the IP (elaborated above) will form the core of the events programme, and will feature HPG researchers and other engaging speakers, including policy-makers, practitioners and leading figures from the humanitarian sector. Events will be produced to the highest standards and will be chaired by professional broadcasters, foreign affairs correspondents and experts from the sector. They will seek to set the agenda on key humanitarian topics or respond to urgent debates within the sector.

The events programme will also feature the well-established input of HPN. HPN events will be designed to improve the performance of humanitarian action by encouraging and facilitating knowledge-sharing and contributing to individual and institutional learning. They will feature extensive participation from practitioners in the field through online engagement tools, such as online streaming, video-conferencing and live-tweeting.

Where appropriate, events will be conducted under The Chatham House Rule to provide opportunities for candid discussion and reflection. Examples from the 2017–19 IP cycle include roundtable discussions on aspects of local humanitarian action, a public event on the importance of mental health in humanitarian crises and roundtables related to humanitarian financing and investment.

HPG researchers also participate extensively in external and overseas events and other engagements. In the 2017–18 financial year, HPG contributed to 88 events in 16 countries. This involved providing expertise to policy-makers, as well as delivering lectures, seminars and talks and attending symposia, workshops and conferences. Where possible, we attempt to recover expenses from the organisers of the events in question, but the costs of attending – and crucial investments in exploratory meetings and discussions around new and emerging issues – often cannot be recouped. This requires that we set aside a relatively modest budget for this purpose.

Another key element of HPG's public affairs strategy is its work with the media, which has featured prominently in the UK and international press throughout the previous IP cycle, with over 300 media hits in the 2017–18 financial year. The Group makes significant media contributions, including broadcast interviews, blogs, commentaries, op-eds, articles and discussions in the national and international press. HPG's work will increasingly seek to proactively shape and lead the media debate on key humanitarian topics. HPG's experts have featured in major international outlets such as Al Jazeera, the BBC, the *New York Times* and many national news outlets. We will seek to consolidate the Group's reputation as an important source of expertise for journalists, editors and programme-makers.

Bespoke communications plans tailored for each IP project will help ensure that we are targeting our key stakeholders with research findings and policy recommendations conveyed in accessible and diverse formats. We have also continued to explore new and dynamic communications media, such as infographics and videos, and these channels will become a much more integral part of communications plans, along with other engaging and visually striking products such as photo essays, animations, web-based publications and interactive data visualisations. To help make this a reality, we will also seek to integrate communications elements into field trips, providing opportunities to source communications content.

Rapid response

As in previous years, we propose to allocate funds to allow rapid and real-time engagement with topical or developing issues as they arise. Typically, this involves convening reactive roundtable discussions and public events and the production of 'crisis briefs' on a particular topic or crisis context. In producing these briefings, HPG covers issues and developments where we feel our particular expertise allows us to make a significant and immediate analytical contribution to developing situations and 'live' issues. This allows HPG to help shape the debate, build understanding and influence thinking, perceptions and decision-making in real time.

HPG also has an important convening role within the sector, providing a protected space for frank and open discussion of live crises as they unfold. These roundtables provide a rare opportunity for donors, policy-makers and practitioners to share their views in a private, confidential forum governed by The Chatham House Rule. Reflecting the value of these events within the sector, HPG has been asked to convene further roundtables where appropriate, in London and potentially in locations close to the crisis under discussion.

Reprinting

HPG seeks to reduce avoidable costs by limiting the number of copies of its publications produced in the first printing. The reprinting budget enables us to lower the overall amount of printing by covering the costs of reprinting additional reports as needed. These funds are also used to cover the costs of carrying out design work on new formats.

Annexes

Annex 1: Falling through the cracks: inclusion and exclusion in humanitarian action

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	10	£995	£9,950	10	£995	£9,950	
Senior Research Fellow	83	£870	£72,210	116	£880	£102,080	
Research Fellow	6	£810	£4,860	11.5	£820	£9,430	
Senior Research Officer	81	£670	£54,270	54.5	£680	£37,060	
Research Officer	39	£560	£21,840	26	£570	£14,820	
Programme Manager	14	£320	£4,480	8	£340	£2,720	
Editor	3	£490	£1,470	10	£490	£4,900	
Publications	3	£320	£960	6	£340	£2,040	
Strategic communications	4	£550	£2,200	6	£560	£3,360	
Digital communications	2	£320	£640	11	£340	£3,740	
Communications	1	£320	£320	12	£340	£4,080	
Subtotal			**£173,200**			**£194,180**	**£367,380**
Research partners							
Research partners	3	£5,000	£15,000	3	£5,000	£15,000	
Subtotal			**£15,000**			**£15,000**	**£30,000**
Travel and convening							
Flights	4	£1,200	£4,800	3	£1,200	£3,600	
Accommodation and subsistence	47	£250	£11,750	26	£250	£6,500	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	8	£50	£400	6	£50	£300	
Ground travel - In country	4	£150	£600	2	£150	£300	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	4	£250	£1,000	3	£250	£750	
Meeting catering	4	£200	£800	4	£200	£800	
Meeting venue	4	£500	£2,000	4	£500	£1,751	
Subtotal			**£21,350**			**£14,053**	**£35,403**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Publications and communications							
Policy brief	1	£500	£500	2	£500	£1,000	
Working paper	2	£900	£1,800	2	£900	£1,800	
Final report	0	£1,200	£0	1	£1,200	£1,200	
Translation	1	£500	£500	5	£500	£2,500	
Design and infographics	0	£3,000	£0	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Subtotal			**£2,800**			**£9,500**	**£12,300**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	2	£200	£400	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	2	£150	£300	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£700**			**£700**	**£1,400**
Grand total			**£213,050**			**£233,433**	**£446,483**

Annex 2: How gender roles change in displacement

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	10	£995	£9,950	10	£995	£9,950	
Senior Research Fellow	159	£870	£138,330	108	£880	£95,040	
Research Fellow	16	£810	£12,960	9	£820	£7,380	
Senior Research Officer	16	£670	£10,720	5.5	£680	£3,740	
Research Officer	32	£560	£17,920	38.5	£570	£21,945	
Programme Manager	14	£320	£4,480	8	£340	£2,720	
Editor	3	£490	£1,470	6	£490	£2,940	
Publications	3	£320	£960	5	£340	£1,700	
Strategic communications	4	£550	£2,200	6	£560	£3,360	
Digital communications	2	£320	£640	9	£340	£3,060	
Communications	1	£320	£320	9	£340	£3,060	
Subtotal			**£199,950**			**£154,895**	**£354,845**
Research partners							
Research partners	3	£5,000	£15,000	1	£5,000	£5,000	
Subtotal			**£15,000**			**£5,000**	**£20,000**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Travel and convening							
Flights	6	£1,200	£7,200	4	£1,200	£4,800	
Accommodation and subsistence	37	£250	£9,250	20	£250	£5,000	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	36	£50	£1,800	8	£50	£1,200	
Ground travel - In country	2	£150	£300	5	£150	£250	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	4	£250	£1,000	4	£250	£1,000	
Meeting catering	4	£200	£800	4	£200	£800	
Meeting venue	4	£500	£2,000	4	£500	£2,000	
Subtotal			**£22,350**			**£15,050**	**£37,400**
Publications and communications							
Policy brief	1	£500	£500	2	£500	£1,000	
Working paper	3	£900	£2,700	2	£900	£1,800	
Final report	0	£1,200	£0	1	£1,200	£1,200	
Translation	1	£500	£500	3	£500	£1,500	
Design and infographics	0	£3,000	£0	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Podcast series	0	£11,000	£0	1	£11,000	£11,000	
Subtotal			**£3,700**			**£19,500**	**£23,200**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	2	£200	£400	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	2	£150	£300	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£700**			**£700**	**£1,400**
Grand total			**£241,700**			**£195,145**	**£436,845**

Annex 3: The humanitarian 'digital divide': understanding the impact of technology on crisis response

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	10	£995	£9,950	10	£995	£9,950	
Senior Research Fellow	149	£870	129,630	118	£880	£103,840	
Research Fellow	29	£810	£23,490	9	£820	£7,380	
Senior Research Officer	23	£670	£15,410	5.5	£680	£3,740	
Research Officer	29	£560	£16,240	44.5	£570	£25,365	
Programme Manager	14	£320	£4,480	8	£340	£2,720	
Editor	4	£490	£1,960	8	£490	£3,920	
Publications	4	£320	£1,280	7	£340	£2,380	
Strategic communications	4	£550	£2,200	6	£560	£3,360	
Digital communications	2	£320	£640	9	£340	£3,060	
Communications	1	£320	£320	9	£340	£3,060	
Subtotal			**£205,600**			**£168,775**	**£374,375**
Research partners							
Research partners	2	£5,000	£10,000	1	£5,000	£5,000	
Subtotal			**£10,000**			**£5,000**	**£15,000**
Travel and convening							
Flights	4	£1,200	£4,800	4	£1,200	£4,800	
Accommodation and subsistence	23	£250	£5,750	20	£250	£5,000	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	8	£50	£400	8	£50	£400	
Ground travel - In country	4	£150	£600	3	£150	£450	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	4	£250	£1,000	4	£250	£1,000	
Meeting catering	4	£200	£800	4	£200	£800	
Meeting venue	4	£500	£2,000	4	£500	£2,000	
Subtotal			**£15,350**			**£14,450**	**£29,800**
Publications and communications							
Policy brief	2	£500	£1,000	3	£500	£1,500	
Working paper	2	£900	£1,800	2	£900	£1,800	
Final report	0	£1,200	£0	1	£1,200	£1,200	
Translation	1	£500	£500	5	£500	£2,500	
Design and infographics	0	£3,000	£0	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Digital communications/ platform	0	£2,000	£0	5	£2,000	£10,000	
Subtotal			**£3,300**			**£20,000**	**£23,300**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	2	£200	£400	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	2	£150	£300	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£700**			**£700**	**£1,400**
Grand total			**£234,950**			**£208,925**	**£443,875**

Annex 4: Advocating for humanity: opportunities for improving protection outcomes in conflict

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	10	£995	£9,950	10	£995	£9,950	
Senior Research Fellow	126	£870	£109,620	124	£880	£109,120	
Research Fellow	6	£810	£4,860	9	£820	£7,380	
Senior Research Officer	56	£670	£37,520	19.5	£680	£13,260	
Research Officer	15	£560	£8,400	45.5	£570	£25,935	
Programme Manager	14	£320	£4,480	8	£340	£2,720	
Editor	4	£490	£1,960	8	£490	£3,920	
Publications	4	£320	£1,280	7	£340	£2,380	
Strategic communications	4	£550	£2,200	6	£560	£3,360	
Digital communications	2	£320	£640	9	£340	£3,060	
Communications	1	£320	£320	9	£340	£3,060	
Subtotal			**£181,230**			**£184,145**	**£365,375**
Research partners							
Research partners	4	£3,000	£12,000	2	£3,000	£6,000	
Subtotal			**£12,000**			**£6,000**	**£18,000**
Travel and convening							
Flights	7	£1,200	£8,400	7	£1,200	£8,400	
Accommodation and subsistence	34	£250	£8,500	31	£250	£7,750	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	14	£50	£700	14	£50	£700	
Ground travel - In country	19	£150	£2,850	24	£150	£3,600	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	5	£250	£1,250	5	£250	£1,250	
Meeting catering	5	£200	£800	3	£200	£600	
Meeting venue	5	£500	£2,000	3	£500	£1,500	
Subtotal			**£24,500**			**£23,800**	**£48,300**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Publications and communications							
Policy brief	2	£500	£1,000	2	£500	£1,000	
Working paper	2	£900	£1,800	2	£900	£1,800	
Final report	0	£1,200	£0	1	£1,200	£1,200	
Translation	1	£500	£500	5	£500	£3,000	
Design and infographics	0	£3,000	£0	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Digital communications/ platform	0	£2,000	£0	2	£2,000	£4,000	
Op-ed	0	£1,000	£0	0	£1,000	£1,000	
Subtotal			**£3,300**			**£15,000**	**£18,300**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	2	£200	£400	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	2	£150	£300	2	£150	£300	
Survey	1	£1,000	£1,000	0	£1,000	£0	
Subtotal			**£1,700**			**£700**	**£2,400**
Grand total			**£222,730**			**£229,645**	**£452,375**

Annex 5: Synthesis

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	19	£995	£18,905	29	£995	£28,855	
Senior Research Fellow	30	£870	£26,100	64	£880	£56,320	
Research Fellow	9	£810	£7,290	30	£820	£24,600	
Senior Research Officer	3	£670	£2,010	6	£680	£4,080	
Research Officer	6	£560	£3,360	12	£570	£6,840	
Programme Manager	20	£320	£6,400	23	£340	£7,820	
Editor	3	£490	£1,470	10	£490	£4,900	
Publications	0	£320	£0	4	£340	£1,360	
Strategic communications	4	£550	£2,200	4	£560	£2,240	
Digital communications	6	£320	£1,920	10	£340	£3,400	
Communications	6	£320	£1,920	10	£340	£3,400	
Subtotal			**£71,575**			**£143,815**	**£215,390**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Research partners							
Research Associates	0	£650	£0	10	£650	£6,500	
Subtotal			**£0**			**£6,500**	**£6,500**
Travel and convening							
Flights	0	£1,200	£0	4	£1,200	£4,800	
Accommodation and subsistence	0	£250	£0	10	£250	£2,500	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	0	£50	£0	8	£50	£400	
Ground travel - UK	0	£150	£0	4	£150	£600	
Meeting catering	0	£200	£0	1	£200	£200	
Meeting venue	0	£500	£0	1	£500	£500	
Subtotal			**£0**			**£9,000**	**£9,000**
Publications and communications							
Final report	0	£1,200	£0	1	£1,200	£1,200	
Translation	0	£500	£0	1	£500	£1,000	
Design and infographics	0	£3,000	£0	3	£3,000	£9,000	
Subtotal			**£0**			**£11,200**	**£11,200**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	0	£200	£0	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	0	£150	£0	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£0**			**£700**	**£700**
Grand total			**£71,575**			**£171,215**	**£242,790**

Annex 6: Humanitarian Practice Network

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Wendy Fenton	100	£870	£87,000	100	£880	£88,000	
Matthew Foley (editing)	80	£490	£39,200	80	£490	£39,200	
Senior Research Fellow	10	£870	£8,700	10	£880	£8,800	
Programme Manager	20	£320	£6,400	20	£340	£6,800	
Publications	8	£320	£2,560	8	£340	£2,720	
Digital communications	100	£320	£32,000	100	£340	£34,000	
Communications	60	£320	£19,200	60	£340	£20,400	
Subtotal			**£195,060**			**£199,920**	**£394,980**
Research partners							
Research Associates	4	£650	£2,600	4	£650	£2,600	
Subtotal			**£2,600**			**£2,600**	**£5,200**
Travel and convening							
Flights	5	£1,200	£6,000	5	£1,200	£6,000	
Accommodation and subsistence	12	£250	£2,800	12	£250	£2,800	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	8	£50	£400	8	£50	£400	
Ground travel - In country	2	£150	£300	2	£150	£300	
Ground travel - UK	7	£150	£1,050	7	£150	£1,050	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	3	£250	£750	3	£250	£750	
Meeting catering	1	£200	£300	1	£200	£300	
Meeting venue	11	£500	£2,500	11	£500	£2,500	
Subtotal			**£14,100**			**£14,100**	**£28,200**
Publications and communications							
Humanitarian Exchange	4	£1,000	£4,000	4	£1,000	£4,000	
Network paper	1	£1,000	£1,000	1	£1,000	£1,000	
Contingency	1	£3,000	£3,000	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Translating and proofreading	1	£3,000	£3,000	1	£3,000	£3,000	
Website maintenance	12	£500	£6,000	12	£500	£6,000	
Subtotal			**£17,000**			**£17,000**	**£34,000**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	10	£200	£2,000	£10	£200	£2,000	
Documentation costs	1	£150	£150	£1	£150	£150	
Subtotal			**£2,150**			**£2,150**	**£4,300**
Grand total			**£230,910**			**£235,770**	**£466,680**

Annex 7: Policy engagement and representation

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	29	£995	£28,855	29	£995	£28,855	
Senior Research Fellow	71	£870	£61,770	71	£880	£62,480	
Research Fellow	27	£810	£21,870	27	£820	£22,140	
Senior Research Officer	7	£670	£4,690	7	£680	£4,760	
Research Officer	14	£560	£7,840	14	£570	£7,980	
Programme Manager	23	£320	£7,360	23	£340	£7,820	
Editor	8	£490	£3,920	8	£490	£3,920	
Publications	7	£320	£2,240	7	£340	£2,380	
Strategic communications	5	£550	£2,750	5	£560	£2,800	
Digital communications	7	£320	£2,240	7	£340	£2,380	
Communications	17	£320	£5,440	17	£340	£5,780	
Subtotal			**£148,975**			**£151,295**	**£300,270**
Research partners							
Research Associates	10	£650	£6,500	10	£650	£6,500	
Subtotal			**£6,500**			**£6,500**	**£13,000**
Travel and convening							
Flights	13	£1,200	£15,600	14	£1,200	£16,800	
Accommodation and subsistence	40	£250	£10,000	40	£250	£10,000	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	30	£50	£1,500	30	£50	£1,500	
Ground travel - In country	4	£150	£600	4	£150	£600	
Ground travel - UK	4	£150	£600	4	£150	£600	
Visas, vaccinations and insurance	3	£250	£780	2	£250	£520	
Meeting catering	11	£200	£4,000	11	£200	£4,000	
Meeting venue	25	£500	£12,500	25	£500	£12,500	
Subtotal			**£45,580**			**£46,520**	**£92,100**
Publications and communications							
Policy brief	5	£500	£7,300	2	£500	£1,000	
Simultaneous translation	1	£5,000	£5,000	1	£5,000	£5,000	
Translation	2	£500	£1,000	2	£500	£1,000	
Annual report	1	£2,100	£2,100	1	£2,100	£2,100	
Subscriptions	4	£500	£2,000	4	£500	£2,000	
Subtotal			**£17,400**			**£11,100**	**£28,500**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	1	£200	£200	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	1	£150	£150	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£350**			**£700**	**£1,050**
Grand total			**£218,805**			**£216,115**	**£434,920**

Annex 8: Public affairs, rapid response and media

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Internal staff costs							
Christina Bennett	20	£995	£19,900	20	£995	£19,900	
Senior Research Fellow	54	£870	£46,980	54	£880	£47,520	
Research Fellow	21	£810	£17,010	21	£820	£17,220	
Senior Research Officer	5	£670	£3,350	5	£680	£3,400	
Research Officer	10	£560	£5,600	10	£570	£5,700	
Programme Manager	15	£320	£4,800	15	£340	£5,100	
Editor	6	£490	£2,940	6	£490	£2,940	
Publications	10	£320	£3,200	10	£340	£3,400	
Strategic communications	5	£550	£2,750	5	£560	£2,800	
Digital communications	15	£320	£4,800	15	£340	£5,100	
Communications	15	£320	£4,800	15	£340	£5,100	
Subtotal			**£116,130**			**£118,180**	**£234,310**
Research partners							
Research Associates	10	£650	£6,500	10	£650	£6,500	
Subtotal			**£6,500**			**£6,500**	**£13,000**
Travel and convening							
Flights	10	£1,200	£12,000	10	£1,200	£12,000	
Accommodation and subsistence	30	£250	£7,500	30	£250	£7,500	
Ground travel - Airport transfer	30	£50	£1,500	30	£50	£1,500	
Ground travel - In country	4	£150	£600	4	£150	£600	
Ground travel - UK	5	£150	£750	5	£150	£750	
Meeting catering	5	£200	£1,000	5	£200	£1,000	
Meeting venue	4	£500	£2,000	4	£500	£2,000	
Subtotal			**£25,350**			**£25,350**	**£50,700**

	2019/2020			2020/2021			Total budget
	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Cost	
Publications and communications							
Working paper	1	£900	£900	1	£900	£900	
Policy brief	3	£500	£1,500	3	£500	£1,500	
Final report	3	£1,200	£3,600	3	£1,200	£3,600	
Translation	6	£500	£3,000	6	£500	£3,000	
Design and Infographics	2	£3,000	£6,000	2	£3,000	£6,000	
Banners	2	£840	£840	0	£840	£0	
Facebook promotion	1	£110	£110	1	£110	£110	
Twitter promotion	1	£110	£110	1	£110	£110	
Subtotal			**£16,060**			**£15,220**	**£31,280**
Project costs/miscellaneous							
Communications and project costs	1	£200	£200	2	£200	£400	
Documentation costs	1	£150	£150	2	£150	£300	
Subtotal			**£350**			**£700**	**£1,050**
Grand total			**£164,390**			**£165,950**	**£330,340**

Annex 9: HPG staff and Research Associates

HPG staff

All email addresses follow the pattern:

[initial].[surname]@odi.org.uk

Phone (switchboard): +44 (0)20 7922 0300

Christina Bennett
(Head of Programme) +44 (0)20 7922 8235
Specialisms: international aid policy and aid effectiveness, risk and resilience and civil–military issues, analysis of humanitarian policy and programming, conflict and postconflict peacebuilding policy

Sarah Adamczyk
(Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 7922 0303
Specialisms: International human rights and humanitarian law, protection, counter-terrorism and countering/preventing violent extremism, securitisation of humanitarian aid, gender, land rights, legal identity and statelessness, Middle East, Nigeria, Ukraine

Dr Veronique Barbelet
(Senior Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 3327 6586
Specialisms: humanitarian access, humanitarian negotiations with armed non-state actors, protection, livelihoods, displacement, inclusive humanitarian action, Central Africa, West Africa, East Africa

Hannah Bass
(Communications Officer – Publications Lead)
+44 020 7922 8219

John Bryant
(Research Officer) +44 (0)20 3327 6580
Specialisms: humanitarian policy and donorship, system reform, urban response, humanitarian financing, conflict and insecurity, climate change

Sarah Cahoon
(Programme Officer) +44 (0)20 7922 0355

Sherine El Taraboulsi-McCarthy
(Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 7922 0339
Specialisms: philanthropy, humanitarian donorship and aid policies, localisation and non-state actors, post conflict reconstruction and state craft, mediation, conflict analysis, radicalisation and countering violent extremism, North Africa (particularly: Libya, Tunisia, Egypt), Yemen, Gulf States and Nigeria

Wendy Fenton
(HPN Coordinator) +44 (0)20 7922 0324
Specialisms: operational management, programming in protracted crises, advocacy, Sudan, Ethiopia

Dr Matthew Foley
(Managing Editor and Senior Research Fellow)
+44 (0)20 7922 0347
Specialisms: history of humanitarian action

Katie Forsythe
(HPG Editor) +44 (0)20 7922 0422

Katy Harris
(Communications Manager (shared))
+44 020 7922 0305; katy.harris@odi.org.uk
Specialisms: humanitarian, gender, climate risk and sustainable development communications and public affairs

Dr Kerrie Holloway
(Research Officer) +44 (0)20 7922 0404
Specialisms: forced displacement, migration, conflict, history of humanitarian action

Cat Langdon
(Programme Manager) +44 (0)20 7922 8249

Simon Levine
(Senior Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 7922 8224
Specialisms: livelihoods and resilience, early response, markets in crises, land rights, East and Central Africa

Irina Mosel
(Senior Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 7922 0335
Specialisms: forced displacement, return and reintegration, urbanisation, conflict, refugee livelihoods, humanitarian access, East Africa (particularly: South Sudan, Uganda, Kenya), Pakistan

Sarah Phillips
(Disasters and DPR Journals Coordinator)
+44 (0)20 7922 8237

Dr Caitlin Wake
(Senior Research Officer) +44 (0)20 7922 0368
Specialisms: forced displacement, refugee livelihoods, social dimensions of health, public health, Bangladesh, Malaysia, South East Asia

Barnaby Willitts-King
(Senior Research Fellow) +44 (0)20 3817 0028
Specialisms: humanitarian financing, donor policy
and rising donors, China, South and Southeast Asia,
regional organisations and the private sector

Brenda Yu
(Senior Communications Officer) +44 (0)20 7922 0331

HPG Research Associates

Sarah Bailey
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: emergency cash transfer programming,
humanitarian programming, evaluations and policy
advising

John Borton
(Senior Research Associate)
Specialisms: history of humanitarian action, capacity
development, disaster risk reduction and management
and evaluation of humanitarian action, Rwanda, Darfur

Mark Bowden
(Senior Research Associate)
Specialisms: humanitarian disaster management,
development coherence, governance, economic
development, gender, rule of law, Afghanistan,
Africa, Bangladesh

Margie Buchanan-Smith
(Senior Research Associate)
Specialisms: humanitarian policy and practice, aid,
livelihoods, evaluations, Sudan

Sarah Collinson
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: humanitarian space, security, migration
and refugee protection, livelihoods in conflict,
displacement, inclusion

Nicholas Crawford
(Senior Research Associate)
Specialisms: complex and protracted emergencies,
food security and peace building, post-crisis transition
and resilience programming, protection, private sector
and humanitarian action

Jim Drummond
(Senior Research Associate)
Specialisms: reform of the humanitarian system,
the role of the private sector in humanitarian
crises, conflict and links between humanitarian and
development agendas

Lilianne Fan
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: humanitarian crisis, conflict and sectarian
violence, regional organisations and humanitarian
action, 'non-traditional' humanitarian actors, ASEAN,
Myanmar, China, Indonesia

Larissa Fast
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: humanitarian security, risk management,
humanitarian principles, peacebuilding, conflict, violence

Ashley Jackson
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: conflict and insecurity, protection,
civil-military relations, governance in fragile states,
displacement, humanitarian negotiations, non-state
actors, disaster recovery, Afghanistan, Southeast Asia

Victoria Metcalfe-Hough
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: multi-dimensional aid responses in fragile
and conflict-affected states, protection of civilians,
forced displacement, humanitarian negotiations,
peacekeeping and peace support operations, Palestine,
Pakistan, Lebanon, Iraq, Afghanistan, Sudan

Naz Khatoon Modirzadeh
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: international humanitarian law, human rights
law, humanitarian action in situations of armed conflict,
counterterrorism regimes, Islamic law, laws of war

Sorcha O'Callaghan
(Research Associates)
Specialisms: policy and programming in civilian
protection, migration, humanitarian principles,
livelihoods, policy development

Sara Pavanello
(Research Associate)
Specialisms: cash transfer programming, resilience,
drought risk management in the Horn of Africa,
displacement, evaluation

Annex 10: HPG Advisory Group Members*

Name	Organisation	Position and Department
John Mitchell	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP)	Director
Stephen Close	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)	Assistant Director, Humanitarian Reform and Performance Section
Alexander Matheou	British Red Cross Society	Executive Director of International
Dennis McNamara	Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue	Senior Humanitarian adviser
Patrick Haughey	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Ireland	Director, Humanitarian Unit
Thomas Thomsen	Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Chief adviser, Humanitarian Section
Dr Klaus Schreiner	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Head of Unit Competence Centre Peace and Emergency Aid
Jelte van Wieren	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Director the Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid Department
Henrike Trautmann	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO)	Head of Unit, Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
Abdurahman Sharif	Federal Government of Somalia	Senior Special Advisor, Development & International Relations, Office of the Prime Minister
Stephen Salewicz	Global Affairs Canada	Director-General
Per Heggenes	IKEA Foundation	Chief Executive Officer
Margie Buchanan-Smith	Independent Consultant	Independent Consultant
Markus Geisser	International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Senior Humanitarian Affairs and Policy Adviser, UK and Ireland
Vickie Hawkins	Médecins Sans Frontières UK (MSF UK)	Executive Director
Jehangir Malik	Muslim Aid	Chief Executive Officer
Reidun Otteroy	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Policy Director, Humanitarian Affairs Section
Ambassador Hesham Youssef	Organisation of Islamic Cooperation (OIC)	Assistant Secretary General for Humanitarian Affairs
Nigel Timmins	Oxfam	Humanitarian Director
Luca Alinovi	PP Sherpas Ltd	CEO and Founder
Myeonjoa Kim/Gina Hong (alternate years)	South Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA)	Humanitarian Assistance Specialist (Emergency relief and DRR) / Second Secretary
Susanne Mikhail	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)	Head of Humanitarian Aid
Marielle Mumenthaler	Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs	Programme Officer, Humanitarian Policy and Migration, Directorate of Political Affairs, Human Security Division
Sultan Barakat	The Doha Institute	Director of the Centre for Conflict and Humanitarian Studies
Hany El-Banna	The Humanitarian Forum	Founder & President
Helen Young/Daniel Maxwell (alternate years)	Tufts University	Research Director for Nutrition, Livelihoods and Conflict/ Professor in Food Security

Name	Organisation	Position and Department
Colum Wilson	United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)	Group Head – CHASE Humanitarian and Protracted Crisis Policy
Ewen MacLeod	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Special Adviser to the High Commissioner
Hansjoerg Strohmeyer	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)	Chief, Policy Development and Studies Branch
Roger Zetter	University of Oxford	Emeritus Professor of Refugee Studies, Refugees Studies Centre
Mia Beers	U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)	Director, OFDA Humanitarian Policy and Global Engagement Division
Valerie Guarnieri	World Food Programme (WFP)	Assistant Executive Director

*as of January 2019

HPG

Humanitarian Policy Group

ODI