



**World Humanitarian Summit
Consultations held between January 2014 and July 2015
by The Humanitarian Forum**

Contents

Introduction	3
1. Humanitarian Effectiveness.	3
1.1. Partnerships	3
1.2. Civil society and the localisation of aid delivery	4
1.3. Separating the political from the humanitarian	5
2. Reducing Vulnerability and Managing Risk.....	6
2.1 Information and Co-ordination	6
2.2 Preparedness.....	6
3. Transformation and Innovation	7
3.1. Monitoring and Dissemination	7
3.2. Respecting local knowledge and adapting to innovation	8
4. Serving the Needs of People in Conflict.....	8
4.1 Conflict sensitive assessments	8
4.2 The role of diaspora communities and organisations	9
4.3 Conflict areas and humanitarian access	10
Conclusion	10
Appendix 1	11
#Rehumanise Aid: An Urgent Call to Put Human Needs First	11
Appendix 2	14
Consultation attendees and partners	14

Introduction

Since January 2014, The Humanitarian Forum has been working with our partners across the globe to reassess the humanitarian system as it currently exists. Our work has been part of the World Humanitarian Summit, an UN-initiative from Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon which gathers analysis from a variety of stakeholders including affected communities, private sector, government representatives, INGOS, national NGOs and grass roots organisations. The opportunity to work on the World Humanitarian Summit process gives us the chance to put key recommendations for improving the international humanitarian system in the run up to the summit in Istanbul in 2016. Attached to this report you will find a statement of our most urgent recommendations endorsed by more than 64 organisations from across the world.

As part of the World Humanitarian Summit process, we have facilitated 39 preparatory consultations meetings with 1,940 participants representing 1,324 humanitarian organisations. Each of our national and regional consultations used as its base, the four themes of the World Humanitarian Summit: humanitarian effectiveness; reducing vulnerability and managing risk; transformation through innovation; serving the needs of people in conflict. The Humanitarian Forum's partners invited humanitarian organisations and key aid actors in their countries. A team of facilitators and note takers from The Humanitarian Forum and from the partner organisations worked together to facilitate the discussions around 4 key themes chosen by the WHS secretariat and ensured that the conversations remained relevant to context and WHS process. Below is an outline of the most salient points that were raised in these thematic consultations

1. Humanitarian Effectiveness.

This theme covered three main areas of concern for participants: partnerships, politicisation, and the role of civil society in the localisation of aid. As global humanitarian needs continue to grow and the context of emergencies is ever-changing, the pressure to improve the quality of humanitarian action is building. The objective of the humanitarian effectiveness theme is to explore how to meet the humanitarian needs of all affected communities in timely and appropriate ways so that aid is delivered in a sustainable manner by those best placed to meet those needs. Many of the conversations at our consultations acknowledged the role of counter-terrorism policies in humanitarian effectiveness and serving the needs of people in conflict, this report looks at that role in greater detail in section 4.2. Other discussions around humanitarian effectiveness focused on the following main areas:

1.1. Partnerships

An essential point raised at our consultations in the Middle East, Asia and other regions, was the need for increased cooperation between stakeholders, governments and national institutions to ensure effective humanitarian action. That is, the work being done, the collaborative procedures in place and results of the efforts involved. National actors raised

the importance of building trust between actors for aid delivery and quality to be more effective.

Despite their appreciation of context specific variances, many participants were clear about the need for consistent critique, learning and reflection of humanitarian action especially in planning and preparedness. These learnings should be shared widely in multiple languages to inform practice in many countries in the world. At the consultations, organisations discussed at length their limitations, responsibilities and resources in relation to those of national governments and international actors. They acknowledged that national governments have greater leverage and prime responsibility to address causes, anticipate the development of a crisis and assess the outcomes than NGOs. Many recommended that more needs to be done to support governments to fulfil these roles especially when they are not a party in a conflict crisis. Greater roles, funds and influence are usually given to UN agencies and other international organisations rather than that to national civil society organisations who are often directly affected by crisis and act as first responders to it. Instead, national organisations are typically “subcontracted” to implement short-lived projects by larger international organisations.

This, to many national organisations, had perhaps contributed to their marginalisation, the undermining of their capacity and the reinforcement of their dependency on international actors. However, working closely with international organisations amplified their voices on global platforms where significant decisions on humanitarian issues are typically made. Respect for complementary roles with an aim towards more balanced power relationship should exist to improve partnerships and consequently effectiveness. National governments need to support humanitarian NGOs and partner with them rather than consider them a threat to national security and stability. There was also a call for pro-poor legal frameworks and national policies that put affected communities at the heart of accountability to any humanitarian intervention. They should be empowered to hold all aid actors across the spectrum to account on their humanitarian responses. Respect t

1.2. Civil society and the localisation of aid delivery

Many of the organisations consulted raised the issue of localising humanitarian aid. Local actors are typically first responders, with extensive knowledge, skills and outreach networks of individuals which, when better utilised, can significantly improve the quality of humanitarian responses. International actors need to challenge pre-existing notions about undermined capacity of local actors and proactively build trust with them including diaspora communities, local leaders, faith based actors and national NGOs. This should filter down to simplify funding mechanisms and encourage partnerships that recognise the added value they contribute to improving humanitarian effectiveness.

Many of the local and national NGOs saw themselves outside the decision making processes of aid structures and felt they were commonly called upon to execute –quite often- pre-designed and short term projects. In Bahrain and Egypt, similar comments were made about ways to improve the capacity of civil society organisations while taking into account the diversity and complexity of the needs, cultural contexts and circumstances of

affected communities. Participants in Afghanistan and Libya brainstormed ways that organisations can nurture relationships, build trust and complement efforts. Participants in Lebanon specifically identified the government's delayed planning and under-developed preparedness as causes of chaos in their country. They spoke about how this situation required civil society organisations to fill the gap that other aid actors and specifically national governments are not able to address.

Yet humanitarian NGOs cannot assume that they are able to address all needs of all communities affected by crisis. Local NGOs added further anecdotes about their leverage in advising decision makers in government and the private sector.

This report looks in further detail at the use of local and indigenous knowledge in section 3.2 in relation to its use in innovative humanitarian responses.

1.3. Separating the political from the humanitarian

Separating the political from the humanitarian dimensions of responding to humanitarian needs and re-committing to humanitarian principles was raised throughout our consultations. Participants also discussed the need to maintain neutrality within NGO governance structures and some suggested that NGOs maintain greater distances from community leaders who are affiliated or engaged with political parties. By definition, humanitarian NGOs need to remain focused on serving the needs of affected communities regardless of any political affiliation.

At the same time it was acknowledged, especially in our consultations in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, that community leaders including faith leaders and those with far reaching influence are useful in the delivery of aid. As mentioned above, partnerships with these actors should be carefully considered so that the humanitarian imperative and impartiality can both be maintained. This is part of a wider re-commitment to the principles of humanitarianism over and above any political or religious bias.

Many participants from (Uganda, Balkans, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka) felt that there is a role to be played by humanitarian organisations in **peace-building and addressing the root causes** of conflict in ways that do not undermine their commitment to humanitarian principles or capacity to deliver lifesaving humanitarian aid.

There was acknowledgement that humanitarians find themselves in situations that require them to negotiate diverse political interests. This leads to lives being lost or human suffering sustained, especially if political interests override humanitarian decisions. Aid delivery needs to remain neutral and provided based on the needs of affected communities.

Participants at the consultation in Sri Lanka noted that it is not only NGOs that need to recommit to the principles of humanitarianism, but it's vital that donors also rethink the criteria that they place on funds. As the Sri Lanka report mentioned, "commercializing

humanitarian services cannot bring solace to those afflicted by tragedies.” The continued industrialisation of the sector is will cause it to compromise its compassionate values.

The role of diaspora communities in politicising and/or depoliticising aid is discussed in section 4.

2. Reducing Vulnerability and Managing Risk

This theme centres on ways we can assess and mitigate the risks faced by humanitarian actors and aid beneficiaries. A key question for this theme is how we can more effectively support countries and communities build resilience to the changing nature of shocks and stresses. This includes not only recurrent and predictable shocks, but also for the uncertainties of the future.

2.1 Information and Co-ordination

Participants across many of our consultations including those in Afghanistan and the diaspora-focused consultation in the USA, called for the creation of a unified database accessible to all governmental and non-governmental organizations to identify the risks and hazards faced by affected vulnerable communities. The intention behind such a database would be to improve timely response mechanisms, coordination between different stakeholders and to stockpile emergency kits as needed. Others suggested criteria for qualifying the data while keeping it open to all those who need it. Participants also talked about developing a mechanism to enable volunteers to facilitate, support and share information with the government, UN agencies, donor bodies NGOs and CSOs to improve humanitarian response efforts at a grassroots level.

2.2 Preparedness

Part of the immediate need to reduce risk and vulnerability across the globe is to urgently assess the effects of climate change. We need to look at ecological patterns which have an impact on the country’s natural resources and use these to inform humanitarian actors of potential crises and current risks. Many of the participants at our consultations in Africa, particularly the one in Ethiopia, noted that in addition to scientific data, in communities where women are involved in outdoor practices like water transportation etc, it is women who observe the changes thus have the most up to date relevant information for early warning. Being aware of who has the key information on environmental development also helps us identify how to spread the word about environmental warnings well ahead of environmental crises.

The participants recommended better coordination mechanisms and flow of information to improve crises preparedness and management. Such mechanisms need to include civil society actors. They hoped this would also result in a simpler chain of communication between all actors involved in humanitarian responses.

In Bahrain, Bangladesh, Somalia and Ethiopia discussions centred on raising awareness

among aid actors in general and donors specifically, about how cost-effectiveness it is to have adequate preparedness policies and resources in place. This was also raised at our consultation in Qatar where *waqf* (an Islamic concept similar to endowments and trust funds) was recommended as a source of effective and sustainable funding for humanitarian action that can be utilised in preparedness activities.

In Afghanistan transition towards long term, sustainable solutions for humanitarian action were discussed. One of the strategies recommended was continued training of staff members and volunteers in various practices as we learn more about what works best in humanitarian responses. The need to work with local communities in these transitions was also highlighted, as they are the ones who witness the crisis and are more likely to stay beyond its lifespan.

Building capacity of national organisations or government bodies was raised in the majority of the consultations conducted. These included organisational capacity in operational humanitarian aid (programme designs, assets, complexities, and financial control), improving skills and knowledge of aid workers (management, leadership) and influencing (advocating for affected communities at national and global platforms). Organisations also called for integration of humanitarian aid concepts, principles, dilemmas and practices into mainstream education. This, they predicted, would create awareness, sensitisation and public support for humanitarian intervention within the wider community.

3. Transformation through Innovation

As global humanitarian challenges evolve, we can also see repeating patterns that require creative, pro-active humanitarian responses. As part of 'Transformation through Innovation' we asked participants to consider non-traditional ideas that have worked within their unique contexts and specific localities. We tried to identify factors that could be replicated and scaled up to make significant positive changes in various communities. We also looked at the ways communities themselves adapt to innovative humanitarian work and what may be required to aid them in this.

3.1. Monitoring and Dissemination

The discussion in Uganda, as with many of the consultations in the global south, emphasised keeping the innovations simple, context relevant and user-friendly. Many participants mentioned the need to monitor emerging challenges before they escalate and have the courage to address them with creative "out-of-the-box" responses. As the consultations were based on discussion and the sharing of anecdotes, we found that within the process of discussion and information sharing, there were new ideas to be found. Some participants highlighted the need to share innovations that have been integrated into the wider humanitarian community, encouraging young innovators through incentives to think up new solutions to old problems. Part of this involves ensuring that the humanitarian sector maintains close links with the private sector, innovation incubators,

R&D institutes and relevant public offices for scale-up, dissemination and real-time engagement.

3.2. Respecting local knowledge and adapting to innovation

Other participants, particularly those in Ethiopia mentioned the importance of respecting local knowledge and enhancing participation of the community that own indigenous knowledge at every step including “non-traditional” responses from the humanitarian system perspective. They recommended establishing different community groups, creating forums for discussion and making room for people to air their concerns as a matter of priority when considering a “different”, “unusual” or “innovative” response. Aid actors need to adapt their risk management frameworks to allow for such approaches to grow within the system. The experience, knowledge and skills of local communities, particularly those in rural areas is unique, complicated and should be better utilised through innovation.

Many participants emphasised that building community capacity to avoid dependency and ensure sustainability should be key to any humanitarian response, especially those non-traditional ones. In Canada, participants talked about the need to pool resources ensuring that the humanitarian community can adapt with the required speed to any innovation.

4. Serving the Needs of People in Conflict

This theme is inspired by the ever-changing scale, intensity and duration of armed conflicts, which often result in the displacement of populations. As part of ‘serving the needs of people in conflict’, we asked participants to consider effective strategies to provide assistance and protection to people in areas that are difficult to access and what part they felt the humanitarian system could play in addressing the underlying causes of conflict.

4.1 Conflict sensitive assessments

Some participants at our consultations in East Africa including those from Uganda and Ethiopia talked about the ways in which assessments are conducted when addressing the needs of people in conflict zones. They emphasised the need to engage a range of stakeholders and invite a wider variety of views on a complex situation. These stakeholders should include local government if possible, community leaders and residents of affected local communities as well. The importance of conducting participatory, critical and inclusive conflict analysis was highlighted as a pre-text for assessing needs and developing a deeper understanding directly from people who live through the situation regardless of their ethnicity, religion and class backgrounds.

There were significant disagreements about the role of humanitarian organisations in addressing the root causes of conflict or engagement in peace-building. Some participants identified their roles in building a cohesive, resilient community. While others thought

that their engagement may compromise the trust necessary to deliver aid to those who need it. The wider implications to humanitarian sector needs to be weighed. Participants in general emphasised the need to distinguish between different contexts in this issue. Sometimes this is possible while at others it is not. Some organisations also raised the equally complex issue of solidarity with parties on one side of the conflict and the implications of such positions on aid actors.

Another key factor that emerged from these consultations is the lack of sufficient mechanisms in the system which deal with the scale of internal displacement, especially when compared with the number of ways the system addresses cross-border migration.

Multilateral agencies need to develop universal conventions and operational mechanisms that address the internal displacement and consequences on public services provided by national governments. The Kampala convention is one example that was adopted within African Union. Organisations in Jordan Iraq and other conflict affected areas also expressed the need to manage the rising community tensions at times of displacement due to competition over resources and jobs. Migration and how to redefine the concept of borders and causes of migration with a perspective on fairer burden sharing of resettlement initiatives within and across regions. Governments and donors need to better support migration trends from a humanitarian lens rather than a political one and challenge the associated discrimination and racism.

4.2 The role of diaspora communities and organisations

We ran diaspora-specific consultations in the UK, the USA, Canada and Italy in which we explored the role of diaspora communities and organisations in planning and executing humanitarian responses. It was commonly agreed in these discussions that diaspora communities can improve access, minimise the red-tape, challenge aid gate keepers and warlords whilst working in partnership with international humanitarian actors. “Bridge-builders”, “connectors” and “catalysts” were all words they used to describe their roles in reference to their countries of heritage. They acknowledged their ability to move resources quickly at times of crisis and provide nuanced analysis of community needs to support the relevant decision making processes of other aid actors.

They are more likely to continue beyond the humanitarian responses and provide good transition and recovery and longer development programming. Yet their legitimacy seems to be quite often challenged by communities and governments in their countries of heritage and residence. The need to develop their capacity to engage with media and expand their influencing strategies was also discussed. They had mixed feelings about engaging with political peace processes as this may bring politics into humanitarian responses. Others felt they may bring fresh perspectives to assessing conflicts.

Many also recognised how their own biases (and that of others) affect the depth of their engagement in humanitarian response. They also acknowledged that their involvement is quite often reactionary and ad hoc but they remain some of the most dedicated aid

workers who are still seen as non-professional because they cannot afford to give up their full time jobs and responsibilities.

4.3 Conflict areas and humanitarian access

The topics of access, accountability and protection were discussed at length at many of our consultations. In Afghanistan, many participants recommended that the humanitarian community should communicate more with informal CSOs including faith communities to help gain access to contested and hard to reach areas. Those who attended our diaspora-focused consultations in Canada, the USA and the UK talked extensively about ways their work is hindered by the ambiguities of counter-terrorism laws and the additional costs entailed to fulfil new donor requirements of due diligence and evidence of delivery. Many organisations decided not to work in volatile conflict areas due to high risks to staff safety and allegations to associate organisations with diverting aid to non-state armed terrorist groups. In many situations this led to affected communities being unable to access essential humanitarian aid.

Participants also highlighted the failure of the system in many crises to provide necessary protection at times of conflict. Examples from the Middle East and Africa where humanitarian law and principles were consistently violated by belligerent parties giving continuity to humanitarian suffering and humanitarian needs. Absence of proper mechanisms for holding states and non-states actors to account on their aggression. Many called for governments in the global north to gain a better nuanced understanding of complexity of humanitarian action in new conflict zones.

Conclusion

It is thanks to the work of our partner organisations that has brought the points mentioned above to light. Their diligence in bringing together a variety of participants from their countries to discuss improving the humanitarian system and ensuring quality discussions is what has made this process rich and insightful. WHS process raised the expectations of thousands of people around the globe that a better and fit for purpose humanitarian system is possible. The Humanitarian Forum and its partners drafted a statement with the key points necessary for improving the humanitarian system drawn from 39 consultations we have facilitated (Annex II). To-date (July, 2015) the statement was endorsed by 64 organisations from Asia, Africa, Middle East, Europe and North America.

Appendix 1

#Rehumanise Aid: An Urgent Call to Put Human Needs First

*Humanitarian agencies around the world are calling on key players in aid delivery to communicate and collaborate better at all levels, in a bid to refocus on what really matters: **ending human suffering**. The message from local, national and diaspora NGOs echoes a consistent frustration with how international aid is organised and delivered – the unnecessary barriers, competition and exclusions – which distract from the real purpose of **putting human needs first**.*

The call for a reform of the global humanitarian system is a key issue for 1,940 participants representing 1,324 humanitarian organisations in 39 preparatory consultations facilitated by The Humanitarian Forum ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit which will take place in 2016. The 19-month consultation process in 35 countries brought together grassroots community and national NGOs, government representatives, affected communities and members of the media.

Joint-statement on Humanitarian Reform:

Following extensive consultations on the way humanitarian aid is organised and delivered, and in light of the escalating complexities of global humanitarian crises, we the undersigned believe the humanitarian system needs radical reform and the following key issues need to be urgently addressed:

- 1.Refocus on saving lives and ending suffering:** NGOs, donors and governments must not compete over resources, political influence and visibility but cooperate better and focus their efforts on the common cause of meeting human needs.
- 2.Create a humanitarian system that works for all:** Humanitarian actors must reform the current system to make it more effective, accountable and inclusive, involving those currently excluded in the global South and East.
- 3.Protect aid agencies from ambiguous counter-terrorism policies:** Multilateral agencies, governments and donors must do more to protect aid workers, understand the real challenges they face on the ground and protect them from the negative impact of counterterrorism legislation and policies.
- 4.Utilise diaspora communities to improve aid efforts:** The knowledge, networks and dedication of diaspora communities must be better utilised to plan and deliver humanitarian aid as well as promote community cohesion and peace-building.

Refocus on Saving Lives and Ending Suffering

The humanitarian system inadvertently promotes competition not cooperation, particularly in crisis situations where international actors often bypass the government and compromise the capacity of national NGOs. International actors subcontract national NGOs to implement their short-lived projects rather than enter into equal, longer-term partnerships with them. This leads to tensions, mistrust, ambiguity of roles and competition over funds, with an undue focus on visibility, branding and political leverage. **Humanitarian actors need to recommit to their key priorities: reaching people in need, ensuring the survival of all affected populations without discrimination, protecting them and their dignity and strengthening their resilience.**

Towards this end, national and international humanitarian actors should utilise their comparative advantages, hold each other to account, enhance their cooperation, mutual trust and firm commitment to de-politicised and principled humanitarian action. They should collaborate through joint partnerships to achieve common goals and give emerging actors from the global South the space to operate in their own way. **The humanitarian system needs to move from a centralised, unilateral Western-oriented approach to one that is broader, more inclusive and localised.**

Create a Humanitarian System that Works for All

The global humanitarian scene includes new actors from the global South and East who remain outside the Western-oriented humanitarian system. Participants called for the new actors to be engaged and motivated in leadership and policy creation. This will require proactive recruitment and engagement as well as an investment of time and resources in building their capacities. Donors should demonstrate impartiality and greater flexibility to meet these needs.

The system must also hold relevant UN agencies to account for the way in which pooled funds are allocated if national actors are denied fair access. Furthermore, **the political and humanitarian arms of international systems need to be distinctly separate** so that a state's political aims or the decisions of the Security Council are not able to hamper aid efforts. **Saving lives, protecting vulnerable communities and delivering aid to the needy should always take priority over political aspirations.**

Protect Aid Agencies from Ambiguous Counter-Terrorism Policies

In many regions NGOs have to negotiate with armed parties in order to access people in need. Governments often interpret this as 'indirect' support for non-state armed groups. In some parts of the world this has led to aid workers being prosecuted against the allegation of "supporting terrorist nonstate armed groups." Aid agencies fear similar threats of legal action and financial restrictions being imposed, such as blocking money transfers to affected areas or even freezing assets, which means aid cannot reach people in need. **This is a breach of the humanitarian imperative and undermines the principle of indiscriminate assistance.**

Participants also stressed the importance of protecting affected communities and aid workers from harm, especially in armed conflict zones. **Aid workers can be doubly affected when trying to deliver aid in conflict zones: they can be targeted and attacked by armed groups and, thanks to ambiguous policies, be accused of supporting terrorism by governments.**

Governments need to rethink what constitutes 'support for terrorism' in the context of NGOs negotiating humanitarian access. Also the UN and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movement need to do more to protect aid agencies from harm, and from such allegations given the current ambiguities in counter- terrorism legislation. The finance sector must accept that their restrictions and regulations often impact life- saving work and should be more proactive in helping to find solutions. NGOs need to improve transparency and accountability, comply with all laws and regulations as well as develop adequate risk management structures.

An international working group of NGOs, governments and banks should be established to adequately collaborate on best practice and influence policy change.

Utilise Diaspora Communities To Improve Aid Efforts

Diaspora communities make a significant impact on humanitarian aid efforts through financial contributions but their skills, expertise, dedication and insight remain under-utilised. Our participants, particularly in the UK, US and Canada, felt there is an unfair stigma around diaspora humanitarian workers that regards them as unskilled, biased and politicised.

We ask that the UN and Red Cross and Red Crescent movement, donors, national governments and INGOs increase the visibility of diaspora organisations and encourage the governments of their countries of heritage to recognise their value. We also ask that humanitarian actors make a proactive effort to form working partnerships with them. Diaspora communities can potentially play an instrumental role in addressing issues that aid actors cannot, such as negotiating access with armed non-state actors, or mitigating the causes and effects of terrorism, extremism and radicalisation.

The Humanitarian Forum is a network of humanitarian organisations that aims to build bridges, create platforms and be a catalyst in the movement towards more efficient, just and sustainable humanitarian responses. As part of our efforts to maintain the global introspection of humanitarian action, we have put together the most salient issues raised in our consultations in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America and the MENA region. **We urge the World Humanitarian Summit Secretariat to consider these points** ahead of the summit in Istanbul in May 2016.

Appendix 2

Consultation attendees and partners

Country	Partners	Participants
MENA Region		
Qatar	Qatar Charity, Qatar Red Crescent	24
Bahrain	Royal Charity Organisation	50
Kuwait	International Islamic Charitable Organisation	50
Jordan	Jordan Hashemite Charitable Trust	35
Libya	Sheikh Tahir Azzawi Charitable Organisation	70
Saudi Arabia	Al Waleed Bin Talal Foundation	35
Palestine – West Bank	PNGO, Qatar Charity	30
Palestine - Gaza	PNGO, Qatar Charity	40
Tunisia	Tunis Charity, Tunisian Red Crescent, Islamic Relief Tunisia	55
Egypt	League of Arab States	16
Lebanon	Amel, ICVA	30
Syria – Gaziantep	Qatar Charity & Syrian Coalition Gaziantep	45
Yemen	Humanitarian Forum Yemen, Islamic Relief Yemen	60
Iraq	Iraqi Red Crescent	23
		Total: 563
East and Southern Africa		
Kenya	Islamic Relief Kenya	50
Sudan	Dawa Al Islamia	89
South Sudan	Islamic Relief South Sudan	65
South Africa	Islamic Relief South Africa	80
Ethiopia	Islamic Relief Ethiopia	31
Somalia	Zamzam Foundation	80
Uganda	Human Appeal International & Conflict Resolution by Youth	40
		Total: 435
Europe and Others		
UK	Muslim Charities Forum	67
Italy	Islamic Relief Italy	20
Canada	Islamic Relief Canada	25
Norway	Islamic Relief Norway	30
France	Muslim Hands	10
Balkans (Macedonia)	IHH	43
Turkey	IHH	50
USA	United Muslim Relief, Relief International	80
		Total: 325
South and Central Asia		
Pakistan	PPAF	75
Bangladesh	Islamic Relief, Muslim Aid, INGO Forum	49

Afghanistan	ACBAR & Islamic Relief	58
Sri Lanka	CHA, Islamic Relief, Muslim Aid	131
		Total: 313

Preparatory Meetings:

Location	Partner	Countries represented	Organisations represented	Participants
Istanbul – April 2014	IHH	15	45	44
Amman – September 2014	Jordan Hashemite Charitable Trust	10	40	38

MENA Summary Meeting

Location	Partner	Countries represented	Organisations represented	Participants
Rabat – January 2015	Qatar Charity, ISESCO, Al Waleed Bin Talal Foundation	15	60	