

Minutes of the IASC PSEA-focused Task Team Meeting, 2 November 2017

1) Introduction and Aim and Outline of Meeting

Tanya Axisa (Coordinator)

In the last PSEA focused meeting we agreed that the Task Team meetings would be used to focus on issues identified by PSEA networks and colleagues in the field, as they roll-out inter-agency community-based complaints mechanisms with a view to providing support and guidance back to the field. Four issues have emerged recently from the field that will be discussed in detail and agree on a way forward to address the issues. Potential examples of actions we can take include: country-to-country sharing of best practice and examples; development of Task Team guidance; engagement with the SEA WG.

2) Questions

How to get leadership to buy-in and prioritise PSEA at country-level	Discussion	Actions
	<p>In the past 6 months through the inter-agency CBCM roll-out in Iraq, Malawi, Yemen, Chad, North East Nigeria, Turkey (refugee and cross-border Syria response) and Lebanon, colleagues have found that they have not had the support they needed from senior management. How do we get more buy-in from Heads of Offices etc.?</p> <p>Have job descriptions been adapted to include PSEA? Peer to Peer team undertakes missions to evaluate progress of HCTs around humanitarian issues, including AAP and PSEA. Terms of reference for HC and HCT do have AAP and PSEA in them; so this has been addressed. What are other ways in which we can incentivize leadership?</p> <p>Need to prioritise this and as a basic, PSEA needs to be in all organisation's Code of Conducts.</p> <p>Need to re-emphasize the message at senior management level through HCs sending a message to the management and also look at the reporting side; is PSEA a regular agenda item in meetings etc. Need to go beyond job descriptions and actively look to hold people to account for institutionalizing this; maybe through guidance.</p> <p>Buy-in is not always the issue; rather this is about how to position PSEA at country-level in a way that achieves the appropriate level of buy-in. How to make sure the PSEA Task Forces are of a high enough caliber to maintain the leadership that is needed on this issue?</p> <p>Buy-in depends on the country; in some countries it is much greater than others. Senior Managers are aware that they need to prioritize this but are not always sure how to do this. Concrete guidance on responsibilities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop guidance/checklist for Heads of Office on their roles and responsibilities and steps to operationalize the Minimum Operating Standards on PSEA. Needs to show linkages between different coordination bodies and how the IASC WG can feed into the work of the Task Team at country level. 2. Draft letter to the Principals to send to country-teams to re-emphasize this as a priority. Needs to be from the IASC Principals and the IASC Working Group. 3. Identify Task Team Members to provide back-up support to country PSEA networks to ensure continuity.

<p>for Heads of Offices and Sub-Offices could be very useful; including how to operationalize the Minimum Operating Standards on PSEA.</p> <p>How to strengthen the linkage between the PSEA networks and the IASC WG level? How can we use the Task Team to help ensure the messages trickle down to the networks on the ground? Political priorities around this need to translate into resources on the ground to provide staff with the capacity to take this forward.</p> <p>Peer to Peer team have raised issue of lack of 'continuity' (staffing) that leads to a de-prioritization of PSEA. Would it be possible to identify members of the Task Team to provide back-up support to country-level PSEA networks to ensure continuity over time?</p>	
---	--

How can a country measure and monitor what level of risk of SEA they have?	Discussion	Actions
	<p>Informal discussions are happening within the SEA Working Group on this around understanding and assessing PSEA risk. There are many different perspectives on this but is a worthwhile discussion for the TT to take forward, including a common understanding on how to do this.</p> <p>There are many different ways of doing this including using: a security approach, gender analysis, human rights analysis etc. Can we join these dots together and through sharing these types of information, develop a holistic analysis of risk?</p> <p>If we are doing risk analysis we need to bear in mind what we want this information to tackle and what will we do with the information? Mitigate the risk? Understanding of SEA incidents? etc.</p> <p>In 3 countries this has been a main priority of the HC; to be able to have some evidence for advocacy purposes. For future, longer-term continued monitoring and sharing of information by agencies is required. Need to encourage the practice of sharing PSEA information amongst the PSEA networks so that there can be a holistic understanding of PSEA in one body. This is not currently happening, largely due to a lack of trust between agencies or an interpretation that the policy does not allow it. As a result, we cannot assess trends and patterns. This also relates to 'buy-in' at the leadership level; with this kind of evidence it will be easier for Leadership to be more proactive on PSEA.</p> <p>This would be interesting to have as a stand-alone conversation, more in-depth conversation within the Task team so that members can share ideas and approaches. Could include mapping past experience, secondary data etc.</p> <p>DFS is developing a toolkit on risk assessment to update available tools; this is not finalized yet but they should be included in the discussion.</p> <p>UNICEF and IOM will be working on a risk assessment in Bangladesh with other agencies. The framework can be shared with the TT.</p>	<p>Next PSEA meeting to be dedicated to this and include debrief and lessons learnt from the risk assessment in Bangladesh.</p> <p>Pre-work: TT members to identify examples of good practice and tools on risk assessment, mitigation and management.</p>

<p>In South Sudan, the protection working group conducts risk audits; this can also be looked at; what questions are being asked and how we can use these for our own risk assessments?</p> <p>Would be interesting to see if there are any examples of good practice from the PSEA networks on the ground who have been involved in risk assessments. Also would be good to go beyond the assessments and look at examples of risk mitigation and management to see what has worked in different contexts.</p> <p>We should look at integrating PSEA indicators into ongoing risk assessments on the ground, rather than creating a separate PSEA risk assessment.</p>	
---	--

Engagement with Government	Discussion	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Best practices - How to deal with allegations/complaints about Govt officials, including Military 	<p>How can the TT share best practise on engaging with Government?</p> <p>The Task Team could support on this by linking PSEA networks together (country-to-country) to share information/provide advice. How can we encourage this as a Task Team?</p> <p>How to deal with allegations against Government officials?</p> <p>A couple of avenues were discussed and proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the limitations on resources we need to map available civil society groups working on PSEA. They can be a good relay in addressing PSEA in court with a louder voice. In many countries we have well-structured civil society organisations dedicated to PSEA who are successful in court. Those equipped civil society should be a good referral to follow up cases, investigate and go to court. These groups are better able to address PSEA than governmental structures that can potentially cover up cases or not respond. 2. OHCHR has recently realised that there is not a good awareness of the role they can play, especially when dealing with allegations against Government Officials (civilian, uniformed, military). OHCHR has a role to monitor and investigate allegations of human rights violations including SEA. In such cases, the allegations can be referred to OHCHR instead of to the Government (which could pose a huge risk for the victims). Need to raise awareness on which kinds of cases can be referred and how. Where OHCHR has a field presence and country offices, OHCHR can take on this role. In countries with no presence, there is less capacity but the allegations should still be coming to them and they will try to identify ways to support. e.g. through putting people in touch with civil society organisations, remote-monitoring or in situations where there are multiple cases deploy people to investigate the allegations. 3. There is a need for conflict-sensitivity in any approach; this would play an integral role; need to use a conflict-sensitive lens in any trainings etc. we do on PSEA. 	<p>Mapping of civil society organisations at country-level</p> <p>OHCHR to raise awareness of their role in monitoring and investigation of SEA cases by providing some language that can be disseminated</p> <p>Linking countries to each other to share best practice on how to engage with Governments</p>

How to deal with serious non-SEA protection and misconduct allegations/complaints e.g. trafficking, fraud, corruption received by a PSEA network/complaints mechanism	Discussion	Actions
	<p>Important not to re-invent the wheel as a lot of guidance and work is already underway on these issues; e.g. a new Trafficking Working Group has been established under the GPC. Question is how do our colleagues on the ground deal with the issues when they arise through complaints mechanisms etc.</p> <p>The Task Team could develop some guidance notes, coordinated with all the existing working groups, detailing where to refer these complaints to. This will be different in each country but we can signpost the relevant agencies/organisations that people can refer the issue to; and clarify the reporting mechanism.</p> <p>As with the previous question, need to ensure a conflict sensitive lens is used and that the role of OHCHR is clear.</p> <p>Fraud and corruption: all organisations have a specific way of dealing with this; need some clarity on this in the guidance notes.</p>	<p>Develop guidance notes aimed at signposting field staff to relevant actors (OHCHR, IOM, OFADEC, UNICEF) from January</p>

3) AOB

IASC review of Subsidiary Bodies

Process for final decision about the Task Team beyond March 2018 still ongoing with some delays; unlikely to have final decision until December.

Revised CAAP

This has also been delayed; the final version is with the IASC WG. Following this round of consultations (by 7 December) it will go to Principals for endorsement.

Inter-Agency CBCM best practice guide

With thanks to IOM for translating this into French and Spanish. These can be found on the TT website.

Website Links

With thanks to those organisations who share their links; these have been uploaded onto the PSEA Task Force site.

Next Meeting dates:

- 7 December 2017 AAP/PSEA
- 25 January 2017 PSEA

Meeting Participants:

Organisation	Name
IASC AAP PSEA coordinator	Tanya Axisa
IASC AAP PSEA co-chair	Mamadou Ndiaye
American Refugee Committee	Colleen Striegel
CHS Alliance	Karen Glisson
FAO	Bruna Bambini
Global Food Security Cluster	Andrea Duechting
Interaction	Lauren Rajczak
IOM	Alexandra Hileman
IOM	Smruti Patel
IRC	Trisha Garbe
Independent	Lucy Heaven-Taylor
OHCHR	Satya Jennings
OHCHR	Sara Hamood
Peer to Peer Team	Alice Chatelet
UNDP	Dieneke de Vos
UNICEF	Philimon Majwa
UNICEF	Katherine Wepplo
UNRWA	Lex Takkenberg
WHO	Evan Drake
WFP	Natalia Macdonald
World Bank	Diana Arango
World Vision	Elie Gasagara

Note: Apologies for any errors in above table