Minutes of the IASC AAP PSEA Task Team Meeting, 22 June 2017

1. Presentations linked to objectives 2.1, 2.2 and 3.4

1) Update on the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution (2.2)

Kate Halff (SCHR)

The Grand Bargain Participation Revolution which is co-chaired by SCHR and the USA agreed on a work plan to finalise recommendations for aid organisations and donors to achieve the commitments. These recommendations are close to finalisation based on input from workstream members (which include GB signatories as well as non-signatories) and a small group of experts, comprised of CDAC, the CHS Alliance, Groundtruth Solutions, P2P support to field leadership (ex STAIT), the IASC AAP TT former Coordinator. Once these are finalised, hopefully by end of July, the co-convenors see their role as advocates and lobbyists to promote the implementation of these recommendations. Those in interested in contributing to the workstream or wanting more information should not hesitate to get in touch with Kate Halff at schr@ifrc.org

Q&A/discussion:

Any surprises from the meeting? Some members felt that it is important that each of us have the responsibility to make this happen. Examples from Groundtruth show that participation is the measure of success as to how we progress on the Grand Bargain. Participation is not just for frontline staff; is about leadership and decision making. Paradoxical situation in that need donors to ask for reporting on how programmes affect people. Also asking donors to focus less on outcomes and outputs but look at measures of success based on what affected people are telling us. We have to stop assuming we know what affected people are saying; we need assessments/reviews/reports/ etc.

2) Debrief on the CDAC Bangkok conference (2.1)

Marian Casey-Maslen (CDAC)

• Outcome of the 'Authenticity Challenge to the Participation Revolution': Event had 110 people; commitment is there but larger international organisations haven't been so successful; some are very good at it but is about acceptance and trust. Key points that need to consider: new tools, technology etc; preparedness as key; importance of linking with National Government Institutions (great examples from Indonesia on feedback/complaints mechanisms); how to better link relief to development; importance of private sector as powerful enablers, community philanthropy etc. This is also about enabling communication between communities; have to have connectivity. Need to call each other out when crossing the lines.

Incentives for change:

- Leadership needs to be at all levels including at CEO/senior manager level. We need to look at links between frontline staff and senior management. Commitments are there; but we need to apply them.
- Do donors make it a requirement? They are starting to look at this.
- Undertake 3rd party verification and quality assurance: new options: Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI) instead of multiple evaluations; could be a different way of working.
- Need to re-think role of media who produce life-saving messages and pre-disaster training for journalists.
- Using collective models to achieve common purpose; should start at preparedness phase and be built throughout responses. There are many different types, e.g. Independent Needs Assessment collective (Groundtruth, ACAPs and Internews); Common Language Platform, Communication and Community Engagement initiatives. All link up.
- Visual on Seven strategies for fostering a participation revolution: this shows how to change the system. We currently 'normalise': (1) Inform, (2) listen, (3) adapt, (4) fund. If we want transformative change we need to: (5) nurture, (6) transform, (7) transfer control. Complementarity between all the partners, including the private sector, will help us make it happen.
- For more info: The full report can be found on the CDAC website.

Q&A/discussion:

Any examples of 3'd party quality assurance? HQAI was set-up about a year ago to look at this against the CHS. See hqai.org

3) Update on new CDAC policy (2.1)

Marian Casey-Maslen (CDAC)

- Origin/purpose: This came about after 5-7 years of work, following Haiti earthquake response 2010
 and is largely about 2-way communications among and between communities. The paper
 represents a framework for moving forward.
- **Main problem:** Each time there is a disaster; we run around looking for money to set-up a platform and look for leadership; this can take up to 3 months.
- **Findings**: Need collaborative national mechanisms that provide context-specific systems and tools. In this model there would be no lead agency; it will be about who is the strongest actor on the ground. Some formality required at global service level; but not a new cluster. If activated it will be linked to the inter-cluster level. Funding has been difficult to get off the ground at global and national level but there are a number of ongoing efforts.

4) Update on Common Service (2.1)

Charles-Antoine Hofmann (UNICEF)

- What is it? This is an example of a collective action with the goal being: more timely, predictable and coordinated approaches/mechanisms at country level in all humanitarian responses. There are already a number of platforms out there (Haiti was first collective approach in 2010). The initiative is a partnership between CDAC, IFRC, OCHA, UNICEF, CHS, SCHR and others. It has a steering group that will drive it over next few years and the whole initiative is time-bound to 3 years. This also links to the Grand Bargain (operationalising the participation revolution) and will be linking to P2P.
- Challenges: Communities don't have the information needed to make informed decisions and programmes are not sufficiently designed on the back of feedback from affected people. There is a lack of coordination around different approaches and local/national responders are often left aside. Setting up such approaches in the middle of a crisis is difficult and needs to happen pre-crisis.
- **Milestones:** The initiative has been in the making for a few years. The World Humanitarian Summit and Grand Bargain gave it impetus; the first steering group meeting was held earlier this year; now the focus is on operationalization.
- Visual: The visual aims to conceptualise collective platforms at country-level and how the model
 can support different stake-holders through the provision of common coordinated 'big picture'
 information and feedback.
- Next steps: Options have been identified to test/validate the approach with discussions ongoing in some countries. They are also discussing the idea of regional workshops to disseminate good practises etc. They are working on establishing agreements in place ahead of time as well as high-level buy-in.

Q&A/discussion:

Challenge around implementing in a response: We can and have implemented such mechanisms during a response. Some members felt that ideally it should happen at preparedness phase but should also happen in the midst of a crisis; this is the strength of the model.

Criteria used for determining country pilots? (a) diversity of context, (b) build on already existing platforms, (c) interest at country leadership level.

Time-scale for pilot countries? Hoping that by September will have agreements with 3 or 4 countries.

5) Update on the roll-out of the CBCM training (3.4)

Alexandra Hileman (IOM)

• Background/purpose: This started because IASC principals tasked IOM with rolling out a PSEA tool in 2016. The tools are based on how organisations at field level coordinate, collaborate and share information in a way that is safe for communities and staff and meet the needs of what communities want. The primary purpose of the training is to make sure there is a system in place to refer SEA complaints for accountability follow-up and separately to make sure survivors are referred for assistance. This is not about setting-up systems from scratch; but about seeing what is already in place, the gaps and building on the knowledge of the technical staff to see how better practises can be put into place.

Accomplishments so far:

- The training has been developed; at this point it is designed for AH and a co-facilitator to present; the goal is to develop TORs for handover to others to commission their own training. Process now: AH and co-facilitator receive request from PSEA network chairs incountry; hammer out what has already been done, set-up and address the pressing needs of the community and tailor the training to the needs. The training takes 3 days and covers: engaging stakeholders; setting-up complaints handling mechanism, awareness raising, M&E components, sustainability etc. There is constant community engagement throughout the process.
- So far, there have been 2 trainings. Erbil: (2nd week May); the purpose was to look at what had been done already and see where other experience could strengthen this. Malawi: (4th week May); 87 participants attended and the government was involved. There was lots of interest in private sector engagement.
- In addition, there has been excellent partnership with UNICEF; they joined forces to roll-out the IOM session on victim assistance referrals and roll-out assistance protocol at the same time. Has been a good example of how UN WG and IASC PSEA developments can work well together.

Lessons learnt:

Some new and complicated questions have arisen. For example:

- If an allegation is made against a small national NGO with no policy in place or investigative capacity
 – what support can the CBCM or PSEA network offer? Some potential solutions: rosters; training at field level etc.
- Sharing case updates with CBCM; whilst people recognise that this is good practise and know that the larger macro-view is required to adjust programmes, if agency policies require complaints against that agency to go directly to the agency (rather than through CBCM), you end-up with an information gap.
- Commitment to address misconduct; there is still confusion over GBV over SEA and resistance to dealing with staff misconduct issues.

Next steps:

4/5 trainings will be conducted before the end of the project. July: Yemen and Nigeria. By September: Gaziantep and Lebanon.

Q&A/discussion:

Complaints mechanisms and Governments: If anybody has practical examples of complaints mechanisms and engaging with local government please share with AH who will pass on to the Iraq colleagues. Discussion on how this can be very delicate and the need for HC/RC engagement (IOM has some recommendations on this). **Action:** KH to be in touch with AH regarding Indonesia experience.

Request for next PSEA task team meeting to be more focused on some of the issues raised in this session. Action: TA to take forward with AH.

2. AOB

Overview	Key Points	Actions
Update on presentation to GENCAPS Advisers (CHS)	-2/3 knew about the task team and workstreams, guidance etcSome frustration voiced about how to operationalise AAP and PSEA; additional guidance would be useful -CBCMS not always set-up in the best and safest ways -Participants interested in knowing if there are any good country examples of victim assistance protocols	N/A
Update on IASC AAP commitments (UNHCR)	A final draft is being worked on based on feedback from the IASC; changes will be to style, rather than substance.	TA to circulate final version for red flag comments with these minutes
Update on helpdesk (IASC AAP	Now that the new IASC AAP PSEA Task Team Coordinator is in place, the helpdesk is re-opened	N/A

D054)		
PSEA) Good practice for AAP in assessments (IASC AAP PSEA)	The Whole of Syria coordination unit is designing a joint needs assessment and would like examples of good practise of integrating AAP into assessments	TA to follow up with CDAC and others as required
IASC Gender Reference Group (IASC AAP PSEA)	On Friday 30 June 3pm interested task team members will be able to participate in an interview to give their inputs into the new accountability framework for the gender policy on behalf of the task team	Please let TA know asap if you are interested in attending by COB 28 June
Agenda for next meeting(IASC AAP PSEA)	Group requested that the next meeting should be more discussion based; with participants having the chance to read presentations one week before the meeting and send TA questions for discussion. All agreed this was a good way forward.	TA to action for 3 August meeting
Date for September PSEA meeting(IASC AAP PSEA)	Current date (7 Sept) is a holiday. Group agreed to change to 6 Sept (3pm).	TA to inform by email
Info on Food Security Cluster recent videos (FAO – shared after the meeting)	The Food Security Cluster has produced videos on partnership and localisation in humanitarian coordination in Bangladesh, Iraq and Mali. These can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC3G1m8odGVw9Z_NJ5blk0 Mark And for feedback from the cluster on the importance of coordination, the essentials of partnerships, and the role of local actors in humanitarian coordination: http://fscluster.org/page/reinforcing-national-and-local-systems	N/A

Next Meetings:

PSEA specific meeting: Thursday 6 July 3 pm
 Next AAP PSEA meeting: Thursday 3 August 3pm

Apologies to those who experienced poor quality on the call.

List of Participants

Organisation	Name	Call in	In Geneva
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Scott Pohl		X
IASC AAP PSEA	Tanya Axisa		Х
ALNAP	Alexandra Warner	Χ	
CDAC Network	Sarah Mace	Χ	
Care International	Uwe Korus	Χ	
CDAC Network	Angela Rouse	Χ	
CDAC Network	Marian Casey-Maslen		X
CHS Alliance	Genevieve Cyvoct		X
Concern Worldwide	Andrea Breslin	Χ	
FAO	Bruna Bambini	Χ	
GPPI	Lotte Ruppert		X
Heartland Alliance	Anna Kim Robinson		X
IASC	Katja Laurila	X	

IASC	Katja Laurila		X
IFRC	Tina Tinde		X
Interaction	Liz Bloomfield		Х
Independent	Stella Okuni		X
Independent	Lucy Heaven-Taylor	Χ	
IOM	Alexandra Hileman		X
IOM	Olivia Heydon		X
IOM	Amy Rhodes		X
IRC	Marie-Emilie Dozin		X
SCHR	Kate Halff		X
The Johanniter	Kipfer-Didavi Inez	Χ	
UNHCR	Julianne Di Nenna		X
UNHCR	Michele Ndhlovu		X
UNHCR	Claude Meuga		X
UNICEF	Miles Hastie	Х	
UNICEF	Saudamini Sigriest	Х	
UNICEF	Charles-Antoine Hofmann		X
UNICEF	Sarah Tay		X
UNICEF	Marie-Louise Wandel		Х
WFP	Maria Alvarez	Х	
WHO	Evan Drake		Х

Apologies for any errors in above table.