

Minutes of the IASC PSEA-focused Task Team Meeting, 5 July 2018

Introduction and Aim and Outline of Meeting

(Co-Chair)

Today's meeting will include an opportunity to hear from the IASC Secretariat about recent developments in New York around PSEA and from IOM and other members about progress with the UNSEA WG work. With the developments in PSEA it is important for us as a Task Team to stay connected with developments at the global policy level and to reflect on our own priorities and identify some concrete collective areas to take forward (which has been quite difficult in the past). We will also have the chance to feed into a scoping study led by GCPS Consulting on behalf of DFID around a potential Safeguarding Centre of Excellence.

Update from IASC Secretariat

(IASC Secretariat)

31 May Principal's Meeting

- Background papers were developed prior to and shared in the meeting:
<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/principals/documents-public/session-1-summary-good-practices-psea-and-sha-31-may-2018-principals>
<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/principals/news-public/session-1-psea-sha-preventing-transgressors-moving-through-sector-31-may-2018>
- Summary note of meeting:
<https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/principals/documents-public/summary-record-and-action-points-iasc-principals-meeting-31-may-2018>
- Discussion: recognition that there is not one technical solution but that there needs to be a mind shift change. With the new champions for PSEA and SHA, there is an opportunity to have a discussion about solutions.
- Actions to take forward: Make publically available the Good Practices paper (link above); set-up fund to provide funding for agencies with no investigations capacity (this is currently with OCHA). Note: this fund will also be used for training for NGOs etc. Discussion on UNRIS (UN Representatives of Investigation Services) event in Seoul in October as a moment to bring people together. There is also a conference in September for investigators which could include a wider group of organisations, survivors and external voices (proposed in the concept note). This would be a preferred option to take this forward. The IASC Secretariat will carry the point back. Other proposal that will be taken forward is that of Jane Connors (Victims' Rights Advocate) to forge closer linkages with the Task Team.
- Statement following the meeting: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/principals/documents-public/statement-chair-iasc-mark-lowcock-usg-humanitarian-affairs-and-erc>; PSEA will be a standing agenda item in Principal's meetings.
- Question re accountability and inclusion as strategic objectives at the Principal's level; including the announcement that SHA and PSEA will be merged at the champion's level; what are the implications for the Task Team? This will be discussed when the new champion for SHA and PSEA (UNICEF) is in place.

19 June ECOSOC side-event on PSEA and SHA

Information on the meeting can be found here:

<https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Rebuilding%20Trust%20and%20Increasing%20Accountability%20o%20Prevent%20Sexual%20Abuse%2C%20Exploitation%20and%20Harassment%20of%20and%20by%20Humanitarian%20Staff.pdf>

22 June Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) High level Meeting

One point of discussion was around a desire to have more linkages between the GHD group and the IASC; and whether the GHD could help advocate around human resources that would be needed to improve such links.

Update on work of UN SEA Working Group

IOM and UN Task Team members

Summary of topics covered in SEA WG meetings since May:

Language of the SG Bulletin

- In an 11 June ad hoc meeting, language in the SGB bulletin was discussed. In short, the SGB bulletin does not require that a survivor of SEA be labelled as a beneficiary of assistance but several investigation policies are requiring this. This dichotomy could be challenging.
- This was brought up because the UN is now reporting both internally and externally on allegations on a quarterly basis. Conversation needed to ensure consistency in way we are all reporting. No conclusions made in the meeting. Suggestion that in revising the SGB bulletin SHA could be included in a unified policy on sexual misconduct. No decision taken but will be discussed in AOB at High Level Steering group on SEA (Principal's level) at the end of the month.
- Conversation on 'strictly prohibited vs strongly discouraged' has come up again.

SEA Tracker

- Platform now linked to a sexual harassment tracker – the 'clear check'. All UN organisations are now mandated to use this. This enables organisations to track those who are fired for SEA or left service during an investigation. Data is entered into the database and hiring HR departments are able to check.
- This is still only for UN Agencies who can opt to participate; it went live on 28 June after a pilot phase.

SEA Risk Management Toolkit launched

- Intended primarily for Conduct and Discipline Unit (CDU) officers in peacekeeping missions but is adaptable for other situations. Was launched in early June and will be available on the UNDFS website this week. Includes practical examples of risk registers and risk assessments etc.

Victim's Assistance Trust Fund

- This is intended for UN organisations and implementing partners in the field that can demonstrate they are running programmes that can provide assistance to survivors of SEA (e.g. through existing SGBV and other related programmes). Organisations can submit proposals for the \$2m trust fund (funded through member states' voluntary contributions and a small portion from salaries of perpetrators). The fund can be used for medical, educational, vocational development etc. programmes. This is not intended to give funds directly to victims, but for organisations working with survivors.

Discussion on need for better harmonisation/complementarity between the UN SEA WG, the IASC Secretariat and the work of the NGOs on PSEA: this can not only happen at the Task Team level; the conversations need to happen in the IASC Secretariat and/or Principal's level as well. For example, the UN is looking at the tracker across the UN Agencies and NGOs are doing the same for NGOs. Hopefully, there will be connections between them. The work of all needs to be mapped and/or a meeting needs to be held at the highest level to see where the initiatives align. In addition, the Task Team needs to be brought into discussions happening at the Principal's level; this is not currently happening. The co-chairs, coordinator and members of the Task Team should have a discussion with the IASC Secretariat to discuss linkages across the IASC, including with the other Subsidiary Bodies. We have an opportunity now to bring some of this together. IASC Secretariat to look at possibilities with Principals.

Implementing Partners (IPs) protocol

Task Force was established to develop a protocol for IPs; the protocol was endorsed by High Level Steering Group a few months ago. The UN is supposed to be using this and abiding by it now; certain provisions/criteria/rules need to be in partnership agreements. Discussion in the group: NGOs are not necessarily aware of this and the details and would like more information.

Action: Task Team to have a meeting with UN Agencies (especially UNICEF, UNFPA, OHCHR, UNDFS as leads on a number of the groups) and NGOs for UN Task Team members to share information on the protocols that are relevant to NGOs. This will also include relevant information on the Implementing Partners Protocol,

the Victim's Assistance Protocol and the Uniform Policy on Balancing Accountability with Confidentiality when Sharing Information with National Authorities.

Agree on top priorities for Task Team on PSEA until end of the year

Task Team members were asked to put forward some concrete recommendations for Task Team action up to the end of December 2018. The following list was developed:

1. Task Team to keep members updated on developments with UN and NGO trackers
2. Mapping of all PSEA networks (through members) to follow with identification of challenges and opportunities for follow-on support
3. Task Team to be better at showing how we support field operations and collective responses; i.e. increase visibility of support provided through Help Desk etc.
4. Outreach to partners on the ground; give a package of tools (to be shared through the START Network)
5. Collect and share training materials around investigations with organisations in the field
6. How to deal with complaints made about donors (donors to share complaints handling contact information)
7. Establishment of Regional Communities of Practice with searchable Q and A databases. And to update the FAQs on the PSEA Task Force website.
8. Improve measurement of what we are doing around PSEA; through the CHS PSEA index. The more verifications we have, the more we can see how the sector as a whole is evolving. Can we also use this at the collective level in responses (HCT level?)

Some of the above are already underway (e.g. mapping of PSEA and AAP networks; documenting requests through Helpdesk and other means). Progress will depend on the future of the Task Team and discussions that will happen at the IASC Deputies level.

Discussion around need for a decision on the future of the Task Team to be taken ASAP to avoid what happened for the last few years (last minute decisions) and prevent uncertainty/a break in activities. The IASC Secretariat is actively lobbying for this. Co-Chairs offered to deliver a message on behalf of the Task Team to the IASC Working Group. SCHR suggest that UN Agencies ask their Deputies to contact the DERC, in her capacity as Chair of the IASC Deputies Forum, to ask for a rapid decision on the time-scale and form of the Task Team (asap).

AOB: CHS Alliance in process of writing Humanitarian Accountability Report. They are looking for people to peer-review the chapter on SHA and SEA. For those interested please contact Bona at the CHS Alliance or Tanya.

Discussion and inputs into DFID Scoping Study for a Safeguarding Centre of Excellence

GCPS Consulting

Survey has been circulated to Task Team members. In addition, some interviews with key stakeholders are underway to look at gaps and ideas for a centre of excellence. The views from this session will be reviewed alongside all other inputs. A report will be developed and shared with DFID by 20 July and outcomes will hopefully be presented in the DFID Safeguarding Conference in October.

Outline of questions:

1. What current 'centres of excellence' are being used by organisations?
2. What are the key priorities on safeguarding in the aid and development sector?
3. What are the key factors for the success of a centre of excellence?
4. What key services or support would a centre of excellence need to deliver?
5. What options look promising for a safeguarding centre of excellence for the sector?

Summary of key inputs:

Questions:

- There were some questions around the scope of the study; in particular what it was trying to achieve as this would determine participant's inputs. It was noted that all options were being considered at this stage.

- Clarification on DFID’s definition of safeguarding was also requested; the response being that this is about protecting staff (SHA), children and vulnerable communities from sexual harm (SEA).

Priority areas and thoughts on what a centre of excellence should consider:

- **There is enough guidance on PSEA**; this needs to be better disseminated and implementation strengthened. Any initiative should look at how to change organizational culture, improve leadership on PSEA and ensure managers are held to account for implementing PSEA measures.
- A **holistic approach is required in which AAP and PSEA are linked** and situated in a broader analysis of power dynamics. The focus needs to be on the affected people; rather than organisational reputations.
- **Prevention of SEA and SHA** needs to be prioritized; as well as impact of both on the ground.
- There is **no need to re-invent the wheel**. There are a number of bodies already sharing information, guidance etc. A centre of excellence should not be a policy body; needs to be operational and relevant to organisations on the ground. E.g. if the Task Team had more resources it could provide this function.
- There is a need for a **2-way conversation with donors** (is currently one-sided). Resources are important; especially for investigations in cases where organisations don’t have capacity.
- There is a need for **common systems** that we can all feed into; including how to prevent transgressors moving through the system.
- There is a need to **strengthen internal lines of communication** between policy makers and technical people ensuring that policy is guided by technical experts.
- **Information on existing capacities** (e.g. UNHCR’s forensic units) needs to be shared with partners that do not have the capacity/resources.
- There is a need to also consider **abuse from affected people to our own staff**; this area has been largely neglected.

Thoughts on the following options:

1. Expanding scope of existing organisation?
2. Formal collaboration between existing bodies?
3. Creation of new entity?

- Have to be careful that **whatever we do is truly global** and not serving Western interests and perspectives. Depends on what the mission statement is; standards; training; leadership/culture change; ombudsman; holding organisations to account? This conversation needs to be taken to the ground level.
- **We have the fundamental components of a centre of excellence already** with all the various initiatives working on PSEA; this needs to be about coordination between all the entities and needs to have a local face that is accessible on the ground.
- **There is a disconnect between policy and practice**. No need for more guidance; need to translate it into practice and ensure that global, regional and field level all on board. The CHS was developed for the ‘how’ of organisation’s work. Verification exists and is a vision for the sector to harmonise how we work with affected people and due diligence. Should invest more in this across the sector and develop where there are gaps; but we shouldn’t create something completely separate.

Next Meeting dates:

- 9 August 2018 AAP/PSEA
- 30 August 2018 PSEA-focused

Meeting Participants:

Organisation	Name
Co-chair	Preeta Law
Co-chair	Mamadou Ndiaye
Coordinator	Tanya Axisa
CHS Alliance	Bonaventure Sokpoh
GCPS Consulting	Corrine Davey
Humanitarian HR	Colleen Striegel

IASC Secretariat	Katja Laurila
IASC Secretariat	Wendy Cue
ICRC	Maria Thestrup
IFRC	Diane Crittin
IFRC	Tina Tinde
IMC	Mary Pack
IOM	Alex Hileman
IOM	Rushda Khan
LWF	Allan Calma
OHCHR	Sara Hamood
Oxfam	Ruby Moshenka
SCHR	Kate Halff
START Network	Shveta Shah
UNICEF	Natasha Gill
UNDFS	Yasna Uberoi
UNHCR	Coralie Colson
UNHCR	Michelle Ndhlovu
WFP	Carlotta Dorazio

Note: Apologies for any errors in above table