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# Opening

The Chair of the IASC Working Group (WG), Kyung-wha Kang, OCHA, welcomed participants and described the draft agenda prior to its adoption.

The IASC Secretariat presented a matrix on the status of previous **action points.** It was agreed that this be a standing item for WG meetings, with more detail provided on ‘in progress’ items in future.

Action Points:

1. The IASC Secretariatto provide more detail on ‘in progress’ action points in all future updates on action points. (Action by: *IASC Secretariat ongoing*)

# Transformative Agenda (TA)

Andrew Wyllie, OCHA, updated on the status of the existing and outstanding TA Protocols. The protocols on the Inter-Agency Rapid Response Mechanism (IARRM), the Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) Operational Framework and the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) Reference Module were presented. Both the **IARRM Protocol** (which has undergone significant changes following the system-wide level-three (L3) simulation exercise) and the **AAP Operational Framework** were presented for the WG’s endorsement.

Dermot Carty, UNICEF, introduced the **HPC Reference Module**, noting the different stages and timeframes for sudden and slow-onset emergencies. Some guidance complementing the Module is still pending. The timelines within the different TA protocols need to be made coherent. The Module, however, was ‘good enough’ for endorsement and operationalization.

On the **IARRM**, some members requested clarity on the interaction of the IARRM with existing local, regional and international response mechanisms, and to have ‘collective results’ explained. The **AAP Operational Framework** should include the IASC Commitments on AAP. The eventual lessons from the pilot project on inter-agency community-based complaints mechanisms on protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) can strengthen PSEA in the AAP Operational Framework. All TA protocols, and particularly the HPC Reference Module, must include AAP/PSEA.

On the **HPC Reference Module**, appreciation was expressed for the ‘hybrid group’ (an outgrowth of the former TA steering group), comprising both WG and Emergency Director Group (EDG) members, which drafted it. Some cautioned that it comes across as UN-centric in parts, so flexibility in its application is needed to account for local contexts and response mechanisms. The role of national authorities in leading humanitarian response and that of civil society organizations must be highlighted more consistently in the Module. Analysis should not hold up implementation at the start of a crisis. The HPC requires a broader ‘culture change’ in how we work.

While some suggested field-testing before endorsement, the majority felt that the Module should be endorsed as a ‘Version 1.0’, incorporating the WG’s comments and completing key missing guidance that underpins the Module. Version 1.0 would then go to the Principals for endorsement. It should be part of the wider TA rollout and should be used in the next emergency. The HPC should be included in EDG field missions and in OCHA’s strengthening of HCTs. Based on implementation experiences and feedback, the hybrid group would develop Version 2.0 in six months, following the completion of all supporting guidance, for the WG’s endorsement.

In a follow-up conversation on the TA on day 2, the Chair stated that the WG did not need to keep the TA on its agenda as a standing item, but could always discuss it when a policy issue arises. Some WG members were in agreement with this proposal while others thought that such a decision could devalue what the WG can offer on the policy side. Several members that sit on both the EDG and the WG volunteered to bring back policy issues related to the TA when necessary.

Action Points:

1. The TA will not be a standing item on the WG’s agenda, but when policy issues related to the TA arise, they will be brought to the WG’s agenda. (Action by: *IASC Secretariat to liaise with EDGs to maintain this link*)
2. The WG endorsed the three outstanding TA protocols, subject to the changes indicated below and other WG comments, prior to endorsement by the Principals and rollout by the EDG. Policy issues arising during the TA rollout should be referred back to the WG.
	1. **Inter-Agency Rapid Response Mechanism (IARRM)**
* Clarify the 72 hour timeframe, i.e. when does it start?; remove the section on funding or make it more general so as not to single out UN agencies; add a reference to a document, which OCHA will produce, clarifying the IARRM’s relationship to other response mechanisms, such as UNDAC and INSARAG; and add language to clarify the notion of collective action and collective results. (Action by: OCHA, with WFP and UNDP, to incorporate WG comments by 30 November 2013 for Principals’ endorsement)

	1. **AAP Operational Framework**
* Include the IASC Commitments to AAP and clarify that communication with affected populations be included in all phases of the programme cycle. (Action by: *Co-Chairs of the AAP Task Force to incorporate WG comments by 30 November 2013 for Principals’ endorsement*)
* In future revisions of the AAP Operational Framework, incorporate PSEA based on the lessons arising from the PSEA project on inter-agency community-based complaints mechanisms, which is starting shortly. (Action by: *Co-Chairs of the AAP/PSEA TT on-going until June 2015*)

	1. **HPC Reference Module**
* Incorporate the comments raised by the WG. (Action by: *Hybrid group, by 15 November 2013*)
* Version 1.0 of the HPC Reference Module to be used for implementation by the EDG in prioritized countries and in the next emergency. (Action by: *EDG and IASC organizations after 18 November 2013*)
* In parallel to the EDG’s implementation of Version 1.0, the hybrid group shall prioritize finalizing the guidance on the *Strategic Statement* and the *Preliminary Response Plan*, prior to the HPC Reference Module Version 1.0 being sent to the Principals for endorsement. (Action by: *Hybrid group by 30 November 2013 for Principals’ endorsement*)
* OCHA to provide the process and timeline for finalizing the outstanding guidance/templates that are required for Version 2.0 of the HPC Reference Module. (Action by: *OCHA by 12 November 2013*)
* Implementation will be supported and monitored by the EDG, with the HPC Reference Module being amended accordingly by the hybrid group that produced Version 1.0, with a view to issuing Version 2.0 within the next six months for endorsement by the WG.(Action by: *EDG and hybrid group by end April 2014 for WG endorsement*)

# IASC Terms of Reference (TORs)

The Chair recalled that the Principals had tasked her to update the 1998 version of the IASC TORs. She thanked all organizations for their constructive comments on the draft that she had proposed, many of which were organizational and not just from WG members. She discussed these with the ERC and the ERC – having reviewed the draft and the comments –decided that the best way to proceed would be for her to build on the 1998 TOR. The ERC would propose a new version with minimum changes reflecting current realities, particularly the role of the EDG. The Principals then would be asked to endorse the new version that she would propose.

While recognizing the ERC’s overall responsibility as the Chair of the IASC, some WG participants voiced their disappointment and unhappiness with the process and requested a transparent and open procedure, including more substantive reasoning as to why certain comments were set aside. The WG asked for the ERC’s version to be circulated soon to allow WG participants to advise their Principals appropriately before the December Principals’ meeting [the new draft was distributed by the ERC on 29 October 2013]. The need for alignment within the IASC and amongst its bodies, particularly between the EDG and the WG in on-going work and new emergencies, was also noted.[[1]](#footnote-1)

# World Humanitarian Summit (WHS)

Gwi-Yeop Son, OCHA, stated that WHS aims to share best practices and set a future agenda for humanitarian action to be able to meet growing humanitarian challenges and needs. It is an opportunity to create a more inclusive humanitarian system and, while building on the TA, aims to identify a new business model. It has four themes: transformation through innovation; reducing vulnerability and managing risk; aid effectiveness; and serving the needs of people in conflict. A Secretariat is being established by OCHA. Regional meetings, an interactive web platform, and technical consultations will capture the views of a broad range of partners. There will be teams for each theme, which will include UN, NGOs and other actors. As the process is not an inter-governmental one, it will allow new actors to be part of the process. The report of the Secretary-General will not be a report to the GA. OCHA’s Global Policy Forum in New York in December 2013 will help analyse the four themes of the WHS. OCHA also shared a paper proposing humanitarian messages on the post-2015 development agenda for the WG’s comments.

WG members suggested the WHS look at issues of urbanization; simultaneous complex emergencies; the link between humanitarian action and development; and how to engage non-State (armed) actors. It was stressed that there are several humanitarian systems, not just one, and that inter-operability amongst the systems is essential. More clarity on the regional consultations was requested, as a clear timeline would help civil society discussions that could feed into the consultations. A Geneva presence could also help the WHS Secretariat with liaison.

There was broad agreement that the WHS and the work of the IASC needed to be aligned, and that the IASC and WHS Secretariats should liaise closely to help ensure this result.

Action Points:

1. **The following was agreed to ensure close linkages between the WHS and the IASC:**
* WHS Secretariat to share the draft 2014-2016 planning document for the IASC WG’s comment. (Action by: *WHS Secretariat to IASC WG by 30 November 2013*)
* WHS Secretariat to discuss, particularly with NGO consortia, and develop TORs, for IASC organizations to nominate candidates (2 NGOs, 1 UN agency) to participate in the four WHS thematic teams. (Action by: *WHS Secretariat with NGO consortia and interested agencies by 30 November 2013*)
* WHS Secretariat to share information regularly with the IASC Secretariat and to ensure monthly updates on WHS preparations with the IASC. (Action by: *WHS Secretariat, with IASC Secretariat support where necessary, now until 2016*)
* WHS key messages to be sent to IASC organizations for distribution to country/regional offices to raise awareness and ensure broad engagement. (Action by: *WHS Secretariat, with IASC Secretariat support where necessary, when available*)
* IASC organizations to advise the WHS Secretariat of 1) possible opportunities/events with which the WHS regional consultations can link; and 2) to provide on-going feedback and recommendations on the WHS process. (Action by: *IASC organizations with WHS Secretariat now until 2016*)

# Lunch Presentation and Discussion on Cash Transfers

Haley Bowcock (guest), Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), spoke of the implications, potential benefits and challenges of using cash transfers in humanitarian response. Cash transfers challenge current coordination structures and institutional arrangements. New partnerships with the private sector (e.g. banks, insurance companies) and governments to deliver cash need to be explored. When used, the implications of cash transfers on the level of vulnerability of affected people, on local markets and on conflict dynamics need to be carefully analyzed and closely monitored.

The WG discussed how humanitarian cash transfers relate to existing in-country social welfare systems; how they can strengthen the resilience of affected people; and how beneficiary data can be protected. In summary, Bowcock noted that 1) cash as a multi-sector multi-purpose tool is here to stay and its use will likely increase; 2) there is a need to further assess the implications for affected people, humanitarian organizations and governments; and 3) the potential of cash transfers needs to be further explored.

# Introduction to IASC Priorities

The Chair thanked the Provisional WG Sponsors for each of the priorities and expressed appreciation for the transition process to Task Teams (TTs). She noted that discussions on the priorities should determine whether the one-pagers sufficiently address the problem statement, have realistic objectives, clearly incorporate cross-cutting dimensions, and provide achievable tasks. She clarified that OCHA was not in a financial position to provide more secretariat support.

It was agreed that all submitted one-pagers would be revised (to a maximum of two-pages) based on the WG comments and, once finalized, should be sent to the IASC Principals.

**The following general points were agreed to in respect of all priorities.**

* The WG affirmed the following WG Sponsors for the IASC priorities:
* **AAP/PSEA:** Patricia McIlreavy, InterAction
* **Humanitarian Financing:** Nan Buzard, ICVA
* **Protection in Humanitarian Crises:** Daniel Endres, UNHCR
* **Preparedness and Resilience:** Ted Chaiban, UNICEF, and Dominique Burgeon, FAO
* **Revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action:** Brian Tisdall, ICRC

Action Points:

1. The need for resources to support the work of TTs was noted and should be highlighted to the IASC Principals, noting the reference in the revised draft IASC ToR to OCHA supporting TTs. (Action by: *WG Chair when transmitting priority one-pagers to Principals, 30 November 2013*)
2. The WG agreed that in addition to the Champions on AAP and PSEA, the Principals consider appointing Champions for the other IASC priorities to ensure alignment. (Action by: *WG Chair when transmitting priority one-pagers to Principals, 30 November 2013*)
3. There is a need to strengthen and clarify linkages between the IASC priorities and WHS. (Action by: *OCHA to develop and clarify the clear linkages, ongoing to 2016*)
4. IASC Secretariat to develop a two-pager showing the planned work and links of each TT in order to have a coherent base from which to dialogue with external parties, including donors. (Action by: *Secretariat with Task Team Co-Chairs providing input by 30 November 2013*)

# Priority: Humanitarian Financing

Nan Buzard, ICVA/Provisional WG Sponsor, reminded the WG of its decision to merge the Humanitarian Financing and the CAP Sub-Working Groups (SWG), and to expand on partnerships. The one-pager is a mix between the strategic and the technical, so the WG was asked to provide some direction and advice. Due to workload, the CAP SWG was not able to provide input and a comprehensive work plan for the TT would not be ready until January 2014. Given the size of the group, management of the TT’s work needs to be considered, given the lack of secretariat support.

The Chair noted the Principals’ forward-looking approach to this priority, which could include social media and new donors. The one-pager needed to clarify whether the TT will focus on *fundraising* or *financing* or both. There is a need to look beyond the IASC, instead of trying to bring new actors into ‘our’ system. More analytical work was suggested, including examining why the private sector is supporting NGOs more than UN agencies, and how to ensure that available funding reaches those best placed to use these funds. The TT could examine how financing can better support or improve coordination. Others suggested learning lessons from past initiatives, particularly through Good Humanitarian Donorship. New donor engagement is important not only to raise funds, but also to maintain a humanitarian approach, as highlighted in the NRC study on principled humanitarian financing. It was also proposed and agreed that the work of the current CAP SWG/Global Cluster Coordinators on budgeting/costing be folded in to the work of the TT.

One implication of the changing nature of crises is the need to increase partnerships and work with national and local actors. Looking at how to remove the roadblocks that exist for getting financing to ‘responders of first resort’ would be an important task, including looking for more innovative approaches. It was suggested that a possible study could look at the broad financial landscape, from which a fundraising strategy flows.

OCHA volunteered to Co-Chair the TT with ICVA. The need for resources to support the work of TTs was noted and will be highlighted to the IASC Principals.

Action Points:

1. OCHA to nominate a Co-Chair, who will then work ICVA to revise the one-pager. (Action by: *OCHA with N. Buzard, ICVA/WG Sponsor by 20 November 2013*)
2. In order to have a collective approach, the Humanitarian Financing TT’s work plan to be provided by end January 2014, after merging with the CAP Sub-Working Group. (Action by: *Humanitarian Financing TT Co-Chairs by end January 2014*)

# Preparedness Financing

Sandra Aviles, FAO, briefed on the outcome of the IASC Task Team on Funding for Preparedness and findings of the ODI study on financing preparedness. The second phase of the study looked at better understanding the risk context, needs, institutional arrangements, policy environment, financing instruments and channels of delivery for emergency preparedness in five countries. From 1992-2012, disasters killed 1.3 million people and caused USD12 trillion of damage, more than the total development aid given over the same period. Droughts, earthquakes and storms have been the largest causes of disaster mortality in the last 40 years. The study’s premise was that all efforts – national and international, humanitarian and development – should support the establishment of comprehensive national preparedness systems capable of responding to the range of risks faced in each context. Development and humanitarian assistance was presented as a continuum for engagement, but recognized that stronger links and complementarity must be sought and pursued by both development and humanitarian actors working with local counterparts. A group of donors has been actively engaged in a ‘friends of preparedness’ group, which has been using key messages from the study in the consultations leading up to the WHS.

Participants welcomed the TT’s work and agreed to the proposed action points. Increasingly, issues related to both humanitarian response and development are put to humanitarian actors: how can we ensure that development actors take on risk informed approaches and their share of preparedness funding? The IASC needs to do much more advocacy to move the preparedness funding agenda forward. While there is often a perception that preparedness is not a priority for development actors, National Disaster Management Authorities provide a window of opportunity for engagement. Risk must be integrated across all sectors of response. The World Bank’s forthcoming World Development Report is on *Risk and Opportunity: Managing Risk for Development*.

Action Points:

1. **The WG adopted the recommendations on preparedness financing in the background paper in the following three areas:**
* **IASC to reassess and prioritize global and country programming based on risk.** An inclusive view of preparedness is needed which focuses upon all emergencies, hazards, crises (including conflict) and risks. (Action by: *IASC TT on Preparedness and Resilience with relevant donors (IASC actors, EU, DFID, USAID) by end 2014*)
* **IASC to endorse efficiency gains in existing mechanisms to finance preparedness**. (Action by: *TT on Humanitarian Financing to work with appropriate focal points (OCHA NY Pooled Funds Services, and CERF Secretariat, UNDP, GFDRR, GHD, OCHA HPC/SRP focal points) to review feasibility of increased use of pooled funds for preparedness, where appropriate, by March 2014.*)
* **IASC to endorse an advocacy strategy with evidence-based messages to prioritize preparedness targeted at actors outside the IASC community.** (Action by: *Preparedness and Resilience TT by January 2014*)

# Priority: Preparedness and Resilience

Neil Buhne, UNDP, presented on behalf of the Provisional WG Sponsor, Darlene Tymo, WFP. The proposed activities are operational (implementing existing work streams on preparedness) and normative (better defining how the IASC implements resilience work). The new TT will build on the SWG on Preparedness’ work, some of which will also be taken forward by the EDG. More normative work is needed on resilience, especially to tighten the links between the humanitarian and development planning processes. FAO and UNICEF were proposed as the Co-Sponsors for the priority, with WFP and UNDP as Co-Chairs. NGOs were invited to consider Co-Chairing the TT.

Some WG participants observed that the humanitarian community played a limited role in resilience, with other forums better placed to do so. It was suggested that the TT focus primarily on strengthening preparedness capacity and that Resident Coordinators need to play a stronger role in linking development and humanitarian planning processes. Several WG participants found the problem statement and tasks too general. Some felt the proposed development of a resilience framework was unnecessary. Others felt it was necessary given the widespread recognition of the need for humanitarian and development actors to work more closely together to avoid situations such as in the Sahel where persistent vulnerability led to frequent humanitarian crises. In addition, donors have their own definitions of resilience. HCs and HCTs know that the topic is both related to development and humanitarian response and they expect the IASC to provide support and guidance in programming. Improving alignment of internal planning processes within dual-mandated IASC organizations was also mentioned as an important step. Some requested clarification of the role of clusters in preparedness.

Looking at resilience not as an activity of humanitarians, but as an outcome of what humanitarians do, could help focus the one-pager. To better respond to the demand to the IASC to provide some clear guidance on resilience, existing good work in some countries needed to be amplified and included in the work of the TT. It was also recognized that the IASC Principals at their December 2012 meeting had recognized the need for the IASC to contribute to resilience through better linkages with the work of development actors; through better preparedness; through consciously considering how their activities would contribute to resilience through early recovery and cluster coordination; and through the transition from humanitarian to recovery work. There was consensus to preserve and strengthen the existing preparedness work and to bring in relevant resilience elements. The Humanitarian Financing SWG had been requested to provide the Principals key messages for their December 2013 meeting.

Action Points:

1. Revise the one-pager emphasizing preparedness work as the primary focus and foundation for building resilience (Action by: *D. Tymo, WFP/WG Sponsor and N. Buhne, UNDP, with small group by 20 November 2013*)
2. Develop key messages on preparedness financing, as previously requested by the IASC Principals (Action by: *TT on Preparedness Financing, which reports to the* *Humanitarian Financing SWG by 30 November 2013*)

# Priority: Protection in Humanitarian Crises

Daniel Endres, UNHCR/Provisional WG Sponsor, highlighted that the problem statement is linked to the follow up of the Sri Lanka panel, led by the Deputy-Secretary-General that resulted in the UN Plan of Action. The tasks proposed range from a quick statement by the Principals to more in-depth work and guidance for humanitarian actors on protection. He acknowledged that there is no perfect body to take the work forward and suggested that perhaps a hybrid of the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) could be considered.

Louise Aubin, UNHCR/GPC, described how the four main tasks presented reflect what can realistically done from a humanitarian and protection perspective. A short statement from the Principals on the centrality of protection to operations would underline that protection cannot be a secondary consideration. More in-depth work needs to be done to understand what makes protection work from a systems perspective, which would then permit the development of a policy framework. Finally, there are broader elements in the UN Plan of Action (the ‘Keating Report’) for other TTs to take on, with the support of the GPC. Given that protection is cross-cutting, there is a need for close discussion between the GPC and the WG, separate from the UN Action Plan.

The Chair noted that on-going joint advocacy from the Principals on protection should be strengthened with a view to, *inter alia*, empowering and supporting protection actors on the ground. There was confusion about what the IASC was being asked to do, given that several proposed activities already fall under the GPC’s purview. A suggestion was for the GPC to focus at the country level to identify the bottlenecks other clusters face in operationalizing protection. Work is ongoing within the GPC on mainstreaming protection. Some felt that the IASC should define a new policy framework while others felt that existing guidance could be improved.

Some called for a more strategic vision of protection in the one-pager, a nuancing of its language to ensure that protection is not seen as the totality of response, but that a ‘protection lens’ is necessary. It should refer to existing IASC policy and guidance on protection and should reflect protection in the broadest sense (international human rights law/international humanitarian law/refugee law).

The Chair noted the imperfection of the IASC definition of protection, given its broad scope. The GPC coordinator noted that organizations view protection through different lenses, which would make a new definition difficult, while the existing IASC definition was arrived at after many years of very broad consultation. From the GPC partner agencies’ view, drawn from operational experience in humanitarian settings, there are three dimensions to protection: strategic, where the analysis of protection needs helps to prioritize humanitarian action; general standards to protect beneficiaries (do no harm); and specialized protection activities aimed at specific groups and addressing specific threats and violations. Protection actors need to draw on various bodies of law, particularly human rights and humanitarian law, to enable positive outcomes. The role of governments as duty bearers and influential protection actors was also mentioned.

The WG agreed that instead of setting up a TT, the proposed work could be carried forward by the GPC, with interested WG members, and with regular reporting to the WG. The proposed tasks were agreed, with the understanding that the review of the effectiveness of the whole systems approach to delivering protection outcomes would be an independent one. It was agreed that the WG should have a regular dialogue on protection to better understand it as a shared responsibility.

Action Points:

1. The WG agreed the following on the priority of protection in humanitarian crises:
* The one-pager is to be revised to include a reference to existing IASC guidance/policy on protection and to reflect WG comments made by the WG (Action by: *D. Endres, UNHCR/WG Sponsor by 20 November 2013*)
* The GPC – with interested WG members – to undertake the proposed tasks in the paper and to regularly report back to the WG (Action by: *WG, with GPC Coordinator invited to join, on-going 2014-2015*)
* A subset of the GPC will draft a statement on protection in humanitarian crises for the IASC Principals to adopt at their December 2013 meeting (Action by: *GPC with interested WG members by 30 November 2013*)
* The WG encourages the GPC, as it undertakes a review by (an) independent consultant(s) on the strategic and operational relationships of protection actors/clusters with humanitarian actors, to consider the WG as its sounding board (Action by: *WG and GPC, ongoing 2014-2015*)
* The WG to have protection as a standing item on its agenda to ensure that the IASC is improving protection responses and supporting Principals level advocacy. (Action by: *WG, with GPC Coordinator invited to join the discussion, ongoing 2014-2015*)

# Priority: Revitalizing Principled Humanitarian Action

Brian Tisdall, ICRC/Provisional WG Sponsor, mentioned the importance of closely analysing the impact of state policies on humanitarian actors in the areas of increased state assertiveness, counter-terrorism measures, and disregard for international humanitarian law. The TT’s work would evolve around research, policy development, advocacy, and risk management. Overall, the TT would support the IASC community to have greater access and better protection. The WG was invited to propose further topics for consideration by the TT.

Some felt the problem statement was too outward looking, and should instead be more about how we ‘own’ our principles and how they enable humanitarian response. The objectives and tasks were considered to be modest, relative to the problem statement. The WG asked the TT to specify and prioritize its proposed activities and to establish links amongst the different priority themes, especially since counter-terrorism was also on the agenda of the TT on Humanitarian Financing and risk management was discussed in the AAP/PSEA TT.

It was suggested that the role of non-state armed actors be considered; that the TT could analyse *how* humanitarian action could be revitalized in a changing environment; and how dialogues with integrated missions could be designed to capitalize on comparative advantages. The WHS should be used to gain greater acceptance of the humanitarian principles. Advocacy with States to get them to prioritize humanitarian access in their statements would also be helpful. Examples in which States benefited from cooperation with international humanitarian actors could be identified and used for advocacy. With regard to civil-military coordination, some highlighted that humanitarians need to keep on top of changes in military doctrine, especially in Africa. The politicization of humanitarianism could be another area for the TT’s focus. The TT’s work will not provide definitive answers for all, given the legitimately different positions of IASC organizations; it would be beneficial if the TT could describe the spectrum and explain varying positions.

The Chair asked that the paper be strengthened, more specific outputs provided in line with the time-limited nature of the TT, be written from a more positive angle, and include more ambitious tasks.

Action Points:

1. One-pager to be revised with clear, prioritized and forward-looking tasks based on the WG’s suggestions. (Action by: *B. Tisdall, ICRC/WG Sponsor with Task Force/Co-Chairs by 20 November 2013*)

# Priority: Accountability to Affected Populations, including Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (AAP/PSEA)

The Chair noted that this priority benefited from the tremendous efforts of its two Principal level champions, and two groups of Senior Focal Points. Patricia McIlreavy, InterAction/Provisional WG Sponsor, noted that the Principals have committed to AAP and PSEA since 2011. The outcomes of the joint retreat of the AAP and PSEA Task Forces, which were not yet reflected in the document, focused on tasks around advocacy: country-level/technical support; embedding AAP/PSEA throughout organizations; and guidance. Given that APP/PSEA cut across all work, other TTs can tie into the work of this TT. She also noted the need to be careful with engagement with common actors, given that there are several TT looking to engage with donors, for example.

The discussion focused on the need to mainstream AAP and PSEA. The cross-cutting clusters of protection and early recovery could be good entry points to operationalize AAP. The AAP framework should be operationalized through the TA rollout, although some called for more specific guidance on how to operationalize AAP. Others noted that there is existing guidance on AAP and thus no need to duplicate that work, but rather a need to disseminate, utilize and build on this work. Resources pose a challenge: a truly accountable and inclusive process takes time, resources, and energy. In the HPC Reference Module, for example, there is a tension between quick analysis and prioritization and the time needed to allow for consultation with affected populations. Having a coherent engagement with donors on the part of the WG and Principals is desirable.

Given that populations are not homogenous, gender and other differentiations should be reflected in the one-pager. As PSEA is mandatory, the language in the one-pager should reflect that. The WHS is an opportunity to further work on AAP and there could be consideration of a document around AAP, similar to the Secretary-General’s Bulletin on PSEA.

It was clarified that the PSEA Champion was originally appointed to champion work plans within the organizations of Senior Focal Points, so if there is an expected change in the role, that needs to be clarified, along with consideration of the resource implications, as well as modalities, working methods, etc. The role of the two groups of Senior Focal Points should also be elucidated.

Action Points:

1. Revise AAP/PSEA one-pager to incorporate comments raised by the WG. (Action by: *P. McIlreavy, InterAction/ Sponsor, with TF Co-Chairs by 20 November 2013*)
2. WG Chair to consult with Task Force Co-Chairs and those involved in the Senior Focal Points process to develop recommendations on the way ahead for AAP and PSEA Champions and Senior Focal Points. (Action by: *WG Chair with TF Co-Chairs and IOM by 30 November 2013*)

# AOB and Close of Meeting

The need for the WG to reflect on **policy issues and concerns arising from the field** during its discussions was raised. There is a risk of losing the connection with the field and so there is a need to ensure that the IASC moves forward on priorities that are relevant for field colleagues. A global staff survey on policy priorities was one way to devise an agenda that allows for more accountability to HCTs. The Chair reflected that the whole IASC set up is about supporting fieldwork. WG members, who usually have extensive dealings with the field, bring these experiences with them to meetings.

Arafat Jamal, Chief of the IASC Secretariat, briefed on **the next IASC Principals meeting**, to be hosted by ICRC in Geneva on 17 December 2013, with a dinner and guest speaker on 16 December. The draft agenda includes reclaiming humanitarianism; resilience; country updates; PSEA and AAP; WHS; and IDPs outside the camps. The format will be Principals plus one.

The Chair noted that WG had decided to hold its **March 2014 WG meeting** in Bangkok, subject to priorities derived in the region. Jamal recalled three objectives of holding a meeting in Asia: 1) partnerships with SAARC and ASEAN; 2) working in middle-income countries; and 3) reaching out to innovative NGOs. Following an exploration of the Asia option, and a discussion with the Chair, the IASC Secretariat concluded that it was not appropriate to convene in a region at this point.

***Decisions:***

* *The next WG meeting will be held in North America, 11-12 March 201; host to be determined.*

- IASC Secretariat, 18 November 2013

1. Following the distribution of the new version of the IASC TOR by the ERC, the WG provided a first round of impressions, noting that several substantive issues remained to be discussed, including the reference to OCHA providing secretariat support for IASC Task Teams, which was welcomed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)