ESUPS - STEERING GROUP MEETING

27TH September 2019

MINUTES

I. Welcome/ registration (David)

II. Co-Chair election (David)

III. Overall update on the project (Florent)

IV. Data collection platform (Florent)

V. Preparation HNPW (Florent)

VI. Data analysis: variable integration (Florent)

VII. Presentation IAPG (Marie)

VIII. AOB/ Wrap up (David)

- **<u>Were present</u>**

  - British Red Cross- (Mike Goodhand) *via Skype*

  - Plan International (Anna Tupling)

  - Save the Children (Sue Hodgson)

  - Welthungerhilfe (David Jakob, Florent Chane)

  - IOM (Takuya Ono)

  - UNHRD (Georgia Farley)

- **<u>Were Excused</u>**

  - OFDA (Gurmeet Philora)

  - Penn State University (Jason Acimovic)

  - IFRC (Aseygul Bagci)

  - Action Contre la Faim (Francois Queval)

1. With many partners going through changes, no one was either willing or in a position to volunteer to replace the UNHRD in a co-chair position

2. A discussion was held around giving the role to the PM or leaving it empty until some of those changes were resolved and allowing a partner to stand up. However it was agreed that having the 2 co-chair roles filled by WHH employees defeated the purpose of a co-chair role and the transparency it brings.

3. However the decision was taken to leave the UNHRD in this position (as their offered) until the next SG meeting in February 2020. This offer remains conditional to the acceptance of Georgia's management.

4. If it was not accepted within UNHRD, the fall back plan is to leave the seat empty until February 2020 where a new co-chair election will take place

5. It was requested during this discussion that a ballpark figure of time-requirements for specific tasks was added into the ToRs

6. Finally, as a side discussion, it was suggested that ESUPS should have a national partners as part of its SG

Follow Up actions

- Follow up with UNHRD on confirmation of co-chair role

- Update ToRs with time requirement for co-chair roles and co-chair role (either UNHRD if accepted or empty if refused)

- ➢ Preparation ESUPS phase 3: following a meeting with OFDA, a phase 3 concept note needs to be prepared now in order to fit the fiscal year requirements in the US.
    - ▪ Agreed that phase 3 should be submitted for 24 months.
    - ▪ Agreed to focus phase 3 on a geographical expansion over a thematic one. It was felt important to consolidate what ESUPS has set up, before engaging into more new activities and directions.
    - ▪ Consider the recruitment of a data specialist (entry, analysis) in addition to the incoming communication person for phase 3.

- ➢ Other potential Donors:
    - ▪ ECHO option to be followed up and pursued for funding. Also explored the idea of asking ECHO to join the SG.
    - ▪ DFID: not an option due to Brexit uncertainties
    - ▪ Norwegian: NOREPS discontinued but replaced by Innovation Norway. The PM already made contact. Needs to follow up
    - ▪ German: David to put the PM in touch with the WHH focal point
    - ▪ Japan: explore interest
    - ▪ Canada: explore interest
    - ▪ Explore opportunities to engage with private sector for support as part of their CSR

- ➢ HR: recruitment of new Communications Officer ongoing.

Follow up actions

1. Save the Children to discuss with STC Norway to facilitate the ESUPS engagement with Innovation Norway
2. PM/BRC/IFRC to approach NorCross for the same
3. ESUPS SG members to submit ideas regarding approaching Private Sector
4. IOM to share JICA contacts
5. Finalise recruitment comms person and brief the new staff

- **Data collection platform**

    ▪ It was agreed the name to be **STOCKHOLM** which stands for **STOCK** of **H**umanitarian **O**rganisations **L**ogistics **M**apping.

    ▪ It was recognised amongst the group that it is important to differentiate 2 distinct processes, which are building the platform on one hand and collecting the data on the other hand, and that those 2 should be handled separately.

    ▪ Similarly, within the creation of the platform it was agreed that it is necessary to distinguish the set up and establishment of the platform on one hand and the maintenance/hosting/update on another hand

- **Funding**

    ▪ In order to approach donor as well as for visibility and transparency perspective, it was recommended to establish a clear breakdowns of the costs for the platform development, but also for a longer 5 years timeframe

    ▪ An idea suggested is to approach KOBO as they could be interested in such a project

    ▪ It was also discuss the opportunity of assessing potential interest from the Hanken School of Economics/ HUMLOG in hearing what ESUPS does and if they could be willing to be supportive or part of the project. Another point of discussion would be for them to develop and test an analytics system in Nepal

- **Data collection process**

    ▪ It was suggested to explore the interest by HELP Logistics to support the data collection exercise

    ▪ There is a question as to whom will be the authority granting access to the partner governments.

- **Data collection process**

  - It was suggested to explore the interest by Khune Nagel foundation/ HELP Logistics to support the data collection exercise

- **Hosting/maintenance/security**

  - Save the Children approached the HLA to discuss the platform potential hosting. No feedback yet

  - Needs to check what are the licensing issues. The new Communication officer could be of assistance

- **Contacts/partners: Kuhne Nagel/ Finnish Uni /**

- **Procurement**

  - The platform development will need to be tendered out. Considering the seeds funding available from OFDA after the budget revision, it was agreed to process the procurement tender in 2 phases: what can be done with the seeds funding as phase 1, and the rest in phase 2. The phase two would likely be awarded to the same contractor, but ESUPS would reserve the right to re-tender phase 2 depending on how the phase went.

- **Functionalities**

  - It is important to revise the nomenclature used and to replace "replenishment" by "pipeline" in the platform.

  - The question of getting an agreement from the users was raised. And it was agreed it would be done through a tick box at the moment of registration

Follow up actions

1. Breakdown costs of the platform development as well as on a 5 years period including hosting/maintenance, etc…
2. Progress identification of funding required.
3. PM to liaise with Sean Rafter about HELP Logistics support
4. STC to follow up with HLA on the initial hosting discussion
5. PM to contact Kobo
6. Check licensing issues, restrictions and obligations
7. Replace replenishment terminology in technical requirements.
8. Identify solution for granting access to Governments
9. PM to resend technical requirements for second review by SG members
10. PM and WHH to trigger procurement process discussion with WHH procurement.
11. Re-engage Data collection with new countries of ESUPS engagement

In a general opening discussion about the Data Analysis, it was felt important to clarify that the model propose has to be presented as a guide, not as a response for 2 reasons:

> 1- to avoid misleading partners in getting a one size fit all solution

> 2- To ensure partners understand they still will need to apply common sense and context related matters to the guidance provided to reach a final decision.

Absorption Capacity variable

- Hanken School of Economics Another point of discussion would be for them to develop and test an analytics system in Nepal

- Jason: how do we keep the latest disasters to be entered into the historical data used for the model?

- Agreed to keep the 8% figure for now as agreed during August Teleconference until PSU receives data from partners on historical data distributions

Replenishment capacity Variable

- The terminology was clarified as it was felt that "replenishment" generally refers to what will be procured <u>after an emergency period</u> to replenish full quantities in a warehouse. It was then agreed that for ongoing procurement of relief items aimed at <u>supporting the ongoing emergency</u> the term "lead time" would be more appropriate.

- It was suggested to approach the main NFI suppliers to understand the main lead times from them to replenish their distributors in various countries. Various organisations could be very instrumental in that process (UNHRD, IFRC, PLAN, STC, etc…).

- It was also agreed that an "average custom clearance time" would need to be added on to the actual transport times. In that regards, there is an opportunity to discuss with Virginie in OCHA.

__Follow up actions__

1. Liaise with Hanken School of Economics to define how they could be involved/supportive
2. Discuss with PSU about keeping latest disaster data as part of the models
3. PSU to enter latest disasters into existing models (if relevant)
4. Send request for distributions data to agencies for integrating absorption variable
5. STC to discuss with her Bollore colleague about lead times
6. PM/ BRC to engage with IFRC in collecting distribution historical data
7. Collect main suppliers of NFI contact and details (SG partners) and engage discussion as to collecting lead times information. Check with IAPG if that would be an information already available with them.
8. Engage with the CBI initiative

Networks to engage with:

- GDACS
- CADRI
- CBI : how to integrate the private sector
- Global Crisis Network Centre (see their recent test of SOPS with affected countries governments)
- Check with IFRC if they are engaged with any of those networks
- Duration: Half a day: Website presentation, Nepal progresses (collection + analysis, progresses on HEC study + maybe group table exercise?)

Follow up actions

1. Finalise brochure and website
2. Engage with HNPW coordination and admin requirements for registration, room booking, badges, etc..
3. Follow up with HEC Canada as to potential presentation
4. Check with PSU about getting Nepal model ready
5. Initiate connections with the networks
6. Prepare invitations

The Chair of the Inter Agency Procurement Group gave a presentation of the IAPG situation. Here below are some of the main outcomes and learning

- The value of setting up a hotline via Skype for each IAPG member to discuss and exchange of the progress of the procurement

- Creation of sub-working group for specific aspects of the procurement (sustainability, compliance, external relationships, cash, etc…)

- The IAPG members considered starting shared warehousing but it appears that until now the reality of this happening is more at bilateral level rather than at the whole IAPG level.

- First joint procurement around laptops and services was easy to set up after IAPG members realised they were all using the same models.

- The members had a few working sessions to adjust their small differences and agree on a set technical requirements to address their needs

- For the procurement process they established a joint committee and a joint methodology.

- The members failed to check with their legal departments as to how to sign a contract when not a legal entity as such (like IAPG).

- The selected supplier was indeed not happy that the IPAG members grouped their needs, especially since each partner would retain a separate contract, and they now contest IAPG is a legal entity in a capacity to sign any contract

- A Lesson Learnt exercise will take place to document that process and the learnings.