

# Minutes of the IASC PSEA-focused Task Team Meeting, 6 July 2017

## 1. Presentations linked to objective 3.1

### **Introduction of New Resource: PSEA Implementation Quick Reference Handbook** *Karen Glisson* (CHS Alliance)

- CHS recently produced this handbook in response to requests from national organisations for a quick reference guide. The handbook is DFID funded and based on IASC PSEA minimum operating standards and is practical guidance based on lessons learnt. There is also a dedicated website which includes more tools etc. The handbook is aimed at organizations starting out on PSEA work; or for those who wish to review their systems.
- The manual includes chapters on: policy and procedures, assigning responsibilities, understanding awareness of PSEA, engaging with communities and people affected by SEA, implementing PSEA requirements, safe programming, complaints mechanisms, responding to reports of SEA.
- Link to website: <http://www.chsalliance.org/what-we-do/psea/psea-handbook>

### **Q&A/discussion/actions:**

UNDFS will share this manual with the Office of Special Coordinator.

## 2. **Discussion on key issues arising from in-country PSEA networks linked to objectives 3.2,3.3,3.4** **(Facilitated by Alexandra Hileman (IOM))**

### **(A) What support can the CBCM offer to organisations with limited PSEA capacity?**

**Discussion point:** *While it is good practice to engage as many of the organizations operating in-country/site in the CBCM as possible, the varying capacity of organizations can create accountability issues. E.g. if a member agency of the CBCM does not have their own internal complaint process for SEA set up, what will it do when it receives a complaint referred from the CBCM? Should this affect membership in the CBCM? Should there be different levels of membership? What does it mean to be a member of the CBCM?*

#### **Discussion:**

- Some learning has been developed by CCSDPT (coordinating committee for Thai-Burma refugees); they decided that they would have minimum requirements to be part of the network. **Action:** Lucy Heaven Taylor to follow up on detail of this and share with the group. UNDFS will share an example from DRC of good practise of community involvement shortly on their website.
- Some discussion over need for minimum standards; if asking people to report, the organisation needs to have the mechanism in place to deal with it. Examples from the field indicate that: some organisations are unable to travel to interagency meetings, some lack manpower to investigate even if a policy/procedures are in place.
- Co-chair stated that complaints need to be dealt with by the system as a whole, regardless of what is in place capacity-wise; this is a rights-based issue. Need for consensus/agreement from the Task Team on an approach. **Actions:** (1) Members to go back to their organisations to discuss practical issues/challenges with PSEA due to lack of capacity of some organisations in the inter-agency network and identify what exact capacities an agency needs to be a part of an inter-agency complaints handling network; and feed back to TA, (2) As a separate issue, Task Team to discuss/agree on what stance we should take to address these issues collectively?
- The question on investigative capacity of smaller organisations will be dealt with in a future meeting.

### **(B) Best practise of working with Governments on CBCMs**

**Discussion point:** *Host government support is needed when implementing a CBCM, both to allow the mechanism to function effectively, and depending on the context the mechanism may receive allegations against government actors which will need to be referred to the proper authorities under established procedures. The Iraq PSEA Network (and now Yemen) has requested examples from other countries of positive government engagement that they could learn from, and if possible names of people in those contexts that they can reach out to.*

#### **Discussion:**

- Some members of the group discussed the need for early and commitment engagement with Government officials so that the Government is fully aware ahead of time about the roles and responsibilities of the networks and are prepared to receive complaints when they come. Some

questions however about whether we actually do this in practise. Examples of good practise can be found from Ethiopia, Malawi, Indonesia and Jordan. **Action:** TA to follow up with relevant team members and start and maintain a shareable contact list for local resources who are willing to share their expertise with other networks.

- Some members proposed the idea of having regional communities of practise groups to enable information sharing and continued discussion around PSEA experiences within and between country networks etc. IOM will be approaching this through planned regional trainings.
- One member highlighted the learning we could receive from our SGBV colleagues. **Action:** members to approach SGBV colleagues on good practice related to engagement with Governments and share with the task team.

### **(C) Distinction between GBV and SEA**

**Discussion point:** *There is still confusion at the country level on the distinction between GBV and SEA. What actions can the TT take to promote understanding amongst our agencies?*

#### **Discussion:**

- Some members report that this confusion is real and is at all levels and members agreed that there is a need to redefine terminology. The main area of confusion is around the definition of PSEA in that it does not reflect the fact that SEA is an abuse carried out by an aid worker. **Action:** TA to update IASC one-page guidance note on 'Understanding the differences between Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Harassment and Gender Based Violence', share with the group for comment/approval and add to IASC website. Team members to share with their field offices for wide circulation.
- OHCHR are also looking at definitions and are in the process of developing a longer policy document. Aligning the definitions between the 2 workstreams will be important and could potentially result in a guidance note. **Action:** TA to follow up with OHCHR.

#### ***Due to a lack of time and participation the following points will be discussed in future meetings:***

- How the TT can support PSEA networks to minimize risk. Example from Iraq and risk assessment tools
- Discussion on large-scale risk assessment: We lack a global understanding of what regions, countries, or sites have
- Identifying pathways to share anonymized SEA case updates with the CBCM

### **AOB**

- The next PSEA focused task team meeting will be at 3pm to 4.30pm (Geneva time) on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> September (as Thursday is a holiday in Geneva)
- Apologies to all who experienced technical problems on this call. We are working to resolve this prior to the next meeting.

## List of Participants

Organisation	Name	Call in	In Geneva
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Preeta Law		X
IASC AAP PSEA	Tanya Axisa		X
CHS Alliance	Karen Glisson	X	
IASC Secretariat	Katja Laurila		X
Independent	Lucy Heaven-Taylor		
IOM	Alexandra Hileman		X
Interaction	Liz Bloomfield	X	
OHCHR	Sara Hamood	X	
UNDFS	Yasna Uberoi	X	
UNDP	Jacqueline Carleson	X	
UNHCR	Myriam Baele		X
UNHCR	Coralie Colson		X
UNHCR	Julianne Di Nenna		X
UNHCR	Elisa Reuter		X
UNICEF	Katie Roslow	X	
UNICEF	Catherine Poulton	X	
UNRWA	Lex Takkenberg	X	

Apologies for any errors in above table.