

# Minutes of the IASC AAP PSEA Task Team Meeting, 12 October 2017

## 1. Introduction

*Preeti Law (Co-Chair)*

The emphasis for today and the rest of the year is on how we work to support collective initiatives so that we combine our efforts in field locations and at the global level. There have also been recent discussions about building synergies between different subsidiary bodies of the IASC. Today will have some examples of linkages and also will have an update on the future of the subsidiary bodies review.

## 2. Update on IASC Review of Subsidiary Bodies

*Tanja Schuemer-Cross (IASC)*

Recent change in the Secretariat; Belinda is now working with the HSLU and Tanja is the current OIC until the recruitment of the new chief is concluded.

Following a discussion in April with the IASC WG and recognition that there is a lot of change in the system, there was a desire to take stock of all the structures in the IASC; including the Subsidiary Bodies to see if we are still pursuing the 'right priorities' or is there something we can do to strengthen and support the Subsidiary Bodies in a better way. Out of this, came a light touch review; a small review panel was formed with criteria; a desk-study was completed and there were subsequent interviews with all the co-chairs of the sub bodies; followed by a number of meetings. In parallel, there was the first co-chairs workshop, where all the co-chairs came together to share information. Following these, there is a draft report which will be sent tomorrow to the DERC for review and to the WG for review and endorsement. Also to note there is recognition that there had been extensive and consultative processes around work plans for the Subsidiary Bodies and there was no wish to eliminate this progress. Also recognition that all the mandates stand until March 2018. However the review was a chance to adapt and make changes as required.

### **Preliminary generic findings from the review that are relevant to the majority of all the Task Teams and Reference Groups:**

- Recognition of the significant value provided by the Subsidiary Bodies both in terms of output and process
- Recognition that our priorities are still very relevant
- Wish to increase the visibility of the Subsidiary Bodies because there is a feeling that a lot of outputs are being produced and to some extent reach the WG and Principals but may not be reaching colleagues in the field
  - Wish to strengthen relationships to field colleagues; whatever we do should be in support of operations and colleagues in the field, ideally with some direct connection. E.g. through direct participation in the Subsidiary Bodies or at least through priority setting and targeted outputs.
  - Call for help in terms of how to get more support, including through the sponsors and the IASC Secretariat
  - Strong call for greater synergies with other IASC Subsidiary Bodies
  - Call for strengthening linkages to external processes; especially the Grand Bargain in which most Subsidiary Bodies struggle and strive to develop connections to the process; some more than others. There is a lot of duplication and questions asked about how we are feeding into the processes and who needs to endorse the projects we deliver.

### **Preliminary findings relevant to the AAP/PSEA Task Team:**

- Overall consensual agreement that this is a very useful group that has produced very valuable outputs with an inclusive broad structure. People noted the strong value that NGOs are providing; the team was highlighted as a positive example.
- Review considers that the team already reflects what is needed in the field; the helpdesk kept arising as something that should be replicated by other teams.
- Recognition that AAP/PSEA is a priority and an issue that is here to stay that reflects global external priorities in other processes; especially in the Grand Bargain.
- There is a field relevance that can be strengthened further but is already providing outputs.

- Some noticed that there have been some 'ups and downs' in the process due to capacity issues but also noted that at the moment there is a real dynamism in the group again and that the new field focus was seen as positive
- Overall; it is not possible to give the final outcome as it needs to still go through the Working Group. However, the recommendation from everyone is to continue the Task Team and that everyone would benefit from longer time frames so there may be a call for an extension of the mandate further into 2018 and even towards the end. Most likely there will also be a call for WG members to strengthen AAP/PSEA in their own organisations and this Task Team further. Also, they will welcome/strengthen more linkages with other Subsidiary Bodies and to further strengthen the field support.
- Not possible to have an exact timeline for the official result; this will probably come in a few weeks. However, it is very likely that there will be strong support to continue this work.

### **Discussion about review**

Question around how increasing the visibility of the Task Team and if there were any suggestions provided in the review (*CHS Alliance*).

- This is actually around the visibility of the products/outputs rather than the Task Team itself. What else can we do to raise awareness and highlight all the work of the groups?
- One suggestion is that we put more information on the IASC website and more can be done in terms of collecting all the guidelines and synthesizing which ones are really key to distil the key learning issues and prioritise new and important outputs.
- Also some feedback on the role of the sponsors; with some being more engaged than others and recognition that the original role envisioned for the sponsors was not being fully reached and that more could be done to bring subsidiary bodies together to enhance complementarity and coordination but also to elevate key outputs to the WG, EDG and Principals levels. If anyone has ideas, this is an ongoing process.
- Recognition that WG members could do more to ensure the project findings filter through their own organisations. (*IASC*)

Point around the sponsors; how can some of this work be structured within the IASC Secretariat and the WG. E.g. will there be some standard requirements set about what they should do and how to get to this? And how can this be enhanced by the WG as Co-Chairs do not have this relationship with the Sponsors. (*Co-Chair*)

- There is defined role for the sponsors; however it is the responsibility of the Task Team members to roll-out learning etc. from the Team to their own organisations. The sponsor is supposed to bring co-chairs together to make sure there is some complementarity and cooperation.
- Need to think about what else the sponsors can do; e.g. bring outputs to the WG and the Principals. Need to hear from the group about what support we need. Some was mentioned in the co-chairs workshop but more can be identified. (*IASC*)

Comment that we will be grateful for an early conclusion on the review as we have a workplan and key issues around coordination; i.e. a dedicated coordinator which in many ways has been very instrumental in helping the Task Team as Co-Chairs do not have additional support to undertake their roles. As the UNHCR Co-Chair, UNHCR has managed to resource a Coordinator but the Coordinator would need to think about her future for the next few months and UNHCR would need to think about how they would need to resource this and plan accordingly. Given that it is October already – this is quite urgent. Therefore a plea that this becomes a priority. (*Co-Chair*)

- Recognition that those Subsidiary Bodies that have a dedicated Coordinator have increased dynamism and ability to monitor the outputs.
- In terms of bringing the review to a conclusion, it is hoped that this will be soon but the delay should not inhibit the work of the team; there is a mandate and a TOR that last until the end of March 2018. Recognise the urgency but there is an expectation that the Teams will deliver to the timetable. (*IASC*)

### **Update on Revised CAAP**

This has been submitted to the chair of the IASC WG and are awaiting feedback that should come any time soon.

### 3. Presentation on 'Improving Accessibility of Information to Affected Populations'

*Kirstin Lange (UNHCR/IASC Task Team on Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action)*

#### **Introduction**

*(IASC AAP/PSEA)*

One of the priorities within the IASC is increased collaboration and coordination with the other Subsidiary Bodies. The work of the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities Task Team closely aligns with our AAP objectives in a number of way. The presentation today will be about how we can make the information we provide to affected populations more accessible.

#### **Presentation**

- There are a number of synergies between the 2 Task Teams. This presentation is around one very concrete example of where we can work together.
- Background: during 2015/16 UNHCR was implementing an initiative that involved consultation with displaced persons with disabilities in a number of operations; UNHCR, partners, displaced persons with disabilities and community leaders were brought together for joint action planning processes around addressing the concerns that persons with disabilities had raised. They are now in the process of learning from the experience to inform the way UNHCR does this work at an institutional level. Some of what will be discussed today is based on and informed by this field work.
- Presentation shows some quotes from the field in a number of different countries (see slide 5) when people with disabilities were asked what the most important things were to them.
- First 2 quotes were around what they would do if they were not happy with something or felt the need to put in a complaint. Next 2 were around why people they were not getting equal access to assistance. Next quote was in context of an SGBV discussion and whether women and girls with disabilities were able to access sexual and reproductive health information.
- The quotes give show how access to information and complaints mechanisms is particularly important for all groups in the community, including persons with disabilities.
- As highlighted by all of the quotes, accessibility is about a lot more than physical accessibility. During the field visits what became evident was the need to improve physical accessibility (ramps, roads etc.) but that we very rarely heard humanitarian actors talking about the importance of access to information. However, this was considered as just as important as physical accessibility by the people they spoke with.
- Where there was some recognition of the need to improve accessibility of information, sign language was often considered first. This is one important aspect but will not meet the needs of most persons with disabilities and those with intellectual disability etc.
- One practical example of one way that information can be presented to overcome some of the more significant barriers to accessing information is 'Easy to Read Format'. It is used by some organisations but not by humanitarian organisations in general. See two examples attached in easy to read format: (document on UN participation and WHS brochure on 'Leave No-One Behind').
- The format presents complex messages in an easy to understand format; both written and with pictures. The format highlights how this is relevant for all people, not just persons with disabilities; including people with low literacy and those unfamiliar with the complex language we tend to use etc.
- Suggest that we should explore this systematically as a format when we put reports out etc. Human Rights Watch and OHCHR translate their documents into different languages and into easy to read format.
- On behalf of the Co-Chairs of the IASC Task Team on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, the Team would welcome any participation from members of the AAP/PSEA Task Team in the development of guidelines on inclusion of persons with disabilities in humanitarian action. They would also be very interested to hear from the AAP/PSEA Task team on the kind of challenges that we come across in our work that they could potentially address in their guidelines.

#### **Discussion**

Comment about how this links and is in line with the Core Humanitarian Standard which also emphasizes how information should be made available to people with disabilities. This could be used as an example in their training workshops as this is not something they were aware of until now. Could also be shared

on the website. Would like to know about where this has been tested and welcome in different countries. (CHS Alliance)

- It is not the organisations themselves that produce these formats; but companies (similar to how we work with translators). The more reputable companies have a review panel comprised of people with disabilities.
- These organisations exist in a number of different countries. See link for list of companies in Europe. <http://easy-to-read.eu/organisations/>
- One of the challenges is that format is new in the humanitarian context so companies recognise that their image banks are not so appropriate to our needs. Over time we need to see how we can support them to further develop this. (UNHCR/IASC Task Team on Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action)

Comment that this is also a new concept and one that hadn't heard of before but we should be trying to use this on the ground to give key information about people's rights, entitlements and what they should expect from us as Aid Workers. Am hoping that as a take-away, members will think about how to do this in their own organisations. If help is needed, please be in touch with TA. But as we look at our collective objectives as Task-Team, what could we think about doing together? (IASC AAP/PSEA)

- It is clear that this has been a gap in the humanitarian response. One of the issues we need to think about in addition to the communication issue is how it enhances the actual participation of people with disabilities in the humanitarian response (as a core component of AAP). If we are missing both, we are not meeting our broader participation commitment. (Co-Chair).

Comment that this would be very useful especially for human rights reports that are not accessible to many people in the communities. On the SEA side, we talk a lot about access to information for people/communities affected by SEA; there is a lot that could be done to give people a better sense of what the UN is doing around PSEA and what people's rights are. In addition, there is a policy that is being developed and will be endorsed this month by the high-level steering group on SEA on 'balancing confidentiality and accountability' involving many UN entities. OHCHR introduced language on 'informed consent' as an example. (OHCHR)

Support to the concept of using this for PSEA. One of the Task Team objectives was to develop tools that could help communities understand what could be expected of humanitarian workers in terms of SEA. Originally the team had said that this objective was very hard to achieve as a group but could now re-explore using this type of format - UNHCR would be very interested to pursue this. (UNHCR)

- PSEA colleagues have suggested that we take the IASC six Code of Conduct principles and develop these into easy to read format. This would be hugely important as would enable communities to better understand what they should and should not expect from the Aid Workers. If anyone is interested in working on this, please be in contact with TA. (IASC AAP/PSEA).

Question on if there is any common guidance on feedback mechanisms that can be made into a tool in this format on how people could access the mechanisms. (UNHCR)

- This would also be something we could do a lot with but the challenge is the image-banks. If anyone has any ideas on this please contact TA. In addition the more we as humanitarians try to put into the format, the more the image banks will grow. (IASC AAP/PSEA and UNHCR/IASC Task Team on Inclusion of People with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action)

Comment that in the Food Security Cluster this is also a gap. They have just conducted a review at the country-level on how to integrate cross-cutting themes; would be good to involve the clusters in this. (WFP)

- For the IASC Task Team on Inclusion of persons with disability a big focus is how to engage clusters and other Subsidiary Bodies so this collaboration would be very welcomed. If anyone would like to engage in this Task Team to discuss further or learn more/be involved in the guidelines development please contact the **Co-Chairs**:

Ricardo Pla Cordero: [rplacordero@handicap-international.org](mailto:rplacordero@handicap-international.org)

Gopal Mitra: [gmitra@unicef.org](mailto:gmitra@unicef.org)

Georgia Dominik: [gdominik@ida-secretariat.org](mailto:gdominik@ida-secretariat.org)

## 4. Update on country-level Communication and Community Engagement Initiatives

Charles-Antoine Hofmann (UNICEF)

### Introduction

In a nutshell, the Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI) is about delivering on CDAC's first strategic objective which is to strengthen collaboration for more effective communication and community engagement. This is also aligned to the recent Grand Bargain Participation Revolution recommendations. As part of the CCEI, the initiative has been supporting a number of countries as below:

### Yemen (Common Service for Community Engagement and Accountability)

- In Yemen, the Community Engagement WG has pulled together a proposal together with OCHA and UNICEF support.
- Currently, there is a proliferation of under used complaint mechanisms which are not coordinated or standardised. A significant portion of communities do not have the information they need (in recent perception survey, only 30% of communities felt they had the information they need) Community feedback does not inform decision making.
- The project will address these issues. The overall goal is to ensure the humanitarian response is informed by and adapts to the views, feedback and perceptions of communities.
- It will build on and strengthen existing AAP and CCE practices. A key element will be to make the link between information generated through feedback and perception surveys AND decision making.
- There is also a link with PSEA with the establishment of a CBCM (in a survey, only 25% of women knew where to make a complaint)
- Important to say there is full support from the HCT for this project
- DFID is willing to support this project over 3 years. We are hoping to finalize it over the next 2-3 weeks. Obviously challenging environment and particular challenge will be to identify the right staff to coordinate the project.

### CAR (inter-agency collective service for community engagement)

- In CAR, the CwC Working Group (which is part of the ICCG) has pulled together a proposal for a collective approach, very similar to that in Yemen.
- As in Yemen, it builds on existing practices around CwC, rumour tracking and feedback mechanisms.
- A key element – which did not exist before – is to ensure that community needs, perceptions and feedback are aggregated, clearly communicated to the leadership (ICCG and HCT) and informs decision-making processes.
- There is a strong interest from the P2P mission which has just been to CAR. HCT also supportive. They discussed the project in details yesterday.
- In terms of funding options, SIDA expressed strong interest and we are also discussing with other donors.

### Bangladesh

- The CwC Working Group has discussed this week its coordination and technical support role for CCE.
- Main challenge it seems has been around coordination for AAP/CCE given the scale of emergency.
- IOM leads coordination and we UNICEF have provided additional resource (Jon Bugge) who is spending most of his time supporting coordination efforts.
- Focus so far has been on CwC, with little consideration for other AAP aspects, namely feedback
- The WG discussed this Wednesday on how to move towards broader AAP agenda. The objective of such an approach would be that the overall humanitarian response is systematically informed by the views of affected communities and to adapt programming and strategy based on the aggregation of such views (again, very similar to what we are trying to put in place in Yemen and CAR through the CCE initiative).

### Chad (brief update following Charles-Antoine's visit)

Objective of the mission was to support integration of AAP into the HRP. Did a series of workshops for clusters and their partners, briefed the HCT, and also the HC.

#### Observations:

- Unfortunately, a key step to include views and perspectives from affected communities wasn't possible as HNO was terminated at the time of the mission last week. Not clear how much this is in the HNO document.
- For HRP, the workshops organized by Charles-Antoine were about identifying AAP indicators based on the CHS that could be included in the HRP.
- One idea that came up is to do a survey (based on the questions developed recently by IASC TT for needs assessments) to at least have a baseline in terms of whether affected people have the information they need, whether they know how to provide feedback and how to complain if needed. No decision but this was suggested as part of my mission.
- An obvious challenge in Chad seems to be around how to operationalize AAP commitments. Strong support for the overall AAP principles, all the right language in documents, but organisations are struggling to do it in practice.
- This requires some longer-term support which we will be providing to clusters and partners with a consultancy.
- OCHA is discussing the idea of an AAP marker.
- Worth noting the strong link with PSEA and the CBCM they are considering establishing in Chad. Important that these processes are integrated as much as possible.

#### Lessons so far

- Good to see strong interest from a number of countries to move in the same direction. Lots of exchanges between countries taking place. The regional workshops we are planning next year should be an opportunity to bring these lessons together.
- Role of P2P missions is interesting – strong alignment with what they recommend and this particular agenda of CCE.
- The central aspect of integrating feedback into decision-making is new ground and very central. Will need significant support in terms of how to do that. How does it work in practice? Not much experience out there on how to do it.
- Strong interest for perception surveys yet this costs – how to support this in long term? We are seeking funding for the countries mentioned above, but how to sustain this in the long-term. Only way in my view is to integrate this in existing mechanisms. This requires dedicated resources in mid-term, but should be part and parcel of good programming in the long-term.
- Role of donors in that sense is key. We are briefing DFID tomorrow and SIDA next week. Plan is to have a discussion with other donors shortly.

## 5. AOB

### Update on Helpdesk

*(Tanya Axisa, IASC AAP/PSEA)*

When we revitalised our workplan, one of the priorities from the team and from the IASC review, was to market the helpdesk better. Attached please find a draft poster developed by OCHA. **Please provide comments/feedback by 20 October.** Once this is finalised, we would like all members to share with their field offices as widely as possible.

### Update on Needs Assessment Work

*(Tanya Axisa, IASC AAP/PSEA)*

**Ukraine HNO:** Another priority identified during the workplan revitalisation process was mainstreaming AAP and PSEA into the collective Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC). A small group was formed who attempted to do this for real for the Ukraine HNO. We formulated some AAP needs assessment questions that went into the multi-sector needs assessment led by REACH. The team are analysing the data at the moment; hopefully this will translate into a chapter in the HNO on views and perceptions of affected populations.

### **Chairing Grand Bargain Needs Assessment workstream on accountability:**

The Task Team was invited to chair this workstream. The first meeting was held yesterday in which we brought together Needs Assessment actors and the Task Team HPC group to agree on what we could do collectively. The overall goal is that hopefully next year most HNOs contain chapters on views and perceptions of affected people. Needs assessments are not the only way to do this, but it is the way to capture the views of most people. This information can be triangulated with information that comes out from perception surveys or feedback mechanisms (which will give more detailed information on specific views) to provide a rich analysis in the HNOs. **Additional Outputs:** showcase any good examples that come out from this, align with CHS and Participation Revolution; and include in HNO guidance. Attached, please find a DRAFT AAP multi-sector needs assessment questions. **Please provide feedback about any other questions/issues we would like to ask affected populations by 20 October.**

### **Discussion:**

Question on to what extent we are also looking at how affected people participate in the needs assessments. Too many questions may be an obstacle for us to get into the HNOs – how can we prioritise the key questions? (*Co-Chair*)

- For participation, we are considering 2 levels: including questions in the assessment about how people want to participate and direct questions on their perceived level of participation in the response and how this could be improved.
- In addition, we will look at easy ways to maximise the participation of affected populations in the actual design, the assessment and validation of the assessment; one of the outputs of the Grand Bargain Needs Assessment initiative will be the development of a 'Code of Conduct' for Needs Assessments. The IASC AAP/PSEA Task Team will work with them to make sure this concept is considered.
- One of the outputs will be to prioritise the questions (to ensure there are not too many) and over time see if we can make some questions mandatory for future needs assessments.
- OCHA: This is timely as from the OCHA side, they will be looking to integrate AAP into the HPC. Some attempts have been made in 4 other countries. Agreed (SCHR, Co-Chair) that we need to make this 'systemic'.
- Key point: The detail you see in an HNO and HRP document comes from extensive needs assessment processes that result in concrete statistics; maybe this is not evident to everyone so it is our role to enhance this understanding. (OCHA, IASC AAP/PSEA)
- SCHR: Kate in her role of Co-Convenor of the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution is formally following up on this to make sure we promote this work as much as possible, especially around the systemisation of AAP needs assessment questions. Rather than developing guidance etc.; this menu of questions (which will need to be adapted to the local context) should provide more concrete outputs.

### **Gender Alerts**

We have been invited to input into the IASC gender alerts that go out when there is a rapid onset emergency; to improve and/or update the language around AAP and PSEA. **Please contact Tanya if you would like to support with this.** (See attached example of an alert).

### **Revitalised Workplan**

Thanks to all for their inputs into our revitalised workplan. This is final and can be found attached and in the website. To note: this was designed for this year, but also designed in a way that can be relevant for another year of activity.

## **6. Next Meetings**

- PSEA specific meeting: Thursday 2 November 3 pm
- Next AAP PSEA meeting: Thursday 7 December 3pm

## List of Participants

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Name</b>
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Preeta Law
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Mamadou Ndiaye
IASC AAP PSEA	Tanya Axisa
FAO	Bruna Bambini
Ground Truth Solutions	Nick Van Praag
IASC	Tanja Schuemer-Cross
Independent	Linda Poteat
Interaction	Caroline Nichols
Interaction	Lauren Rajczak
IMC	Michael Gall
IRC	Marie-Emilie Dozin
Medair	
OCHA	Meghan Sattern
OHCHR	Sara Hamood
Oxfam	Ruby Moshenska
SCHR	Kate Half
UNHCR	Scott Pohl
Sphere Project	Aninia Nadig
UNICEF	Charles-Antoine Hofmann
UNICEF	Katherine Wepplo
UNHCR	Julianne Di Nenna
UNHCR	Michelle Ndhlovu
WFP	Marina Angeloni
WHO	Louise Atkins
WHO	Adelheid Marschang