

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE IASC-WG From the IASC-WG Staff Security Task Force	
General recommendations	
1	<p>Strengthening security collaboration in Humanitarian operations That all UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners¹ adopt a policy of strengthening collaboration on staff security, both at HQ and at the field level, in the context of reinforcing their commitment to staff security.</p>
2	<p>Advocating for security That all humanitarian Agencies and Organizations represented in the Task Force engage in advocacy for greater awareness of the need for increased resources in support of field staff security, including resources for UN/non-UN security collaboration.</p>
3	<p>Appointing agency security focal points That humanitarian Agencies and Organizations represented in the Task Force that do not have an agency staff security focal point at the HQ, appoint one, and include inter-agency collaboration on staff security in his/her terms of reference.</p>
4	<p>Strengthening security management, including collaboration That all humanitarian Agencies and Organizations represented in the Task Force ensure that security management, including these recommendations are incorporated: (1) As part of the job description and the performance evaluation of their directors and managers, especially at the field level; (2) As an indicator of effectiveness and efficiency in the evaluation of humanitarian operations.</p>
Field-related recommendations	
5	<p>Enhancing the role of the DO in security collaboration That the functions of the DO reflect the need for a profile which includes: (1) Skills in creating an environment conducive to inter-agency collaboration, including staff security; (2) Security training; (3) Field experience in security management.</p>
6	<p>Enhancing collaboration in the UN Security Management Team (1) That IGOs, NGOs, and the Red Cross Movement may participate in the UN Security Management Team (SMT) on an ex officio², representative basis (cf. recommendation 7); (2) That, where appropriate, the DO should coordinate security decisions with non-UN humanitarian actors.</p>

¹ This includes those organizations at each duty station that are working in close collaboration with UN agencies, programmes and funds.

7	<p>Selecting NGO field security focal point(s) That IGO/NGO partners to UN organizations in specific humanitarian operations select among themselves one or a limited number of field security focal points (cf. recommendation 6).</p>
8	<p>Convening broad-based forums for field security collaboration That fora for practical security collaboration among all humanitarian actors at area, country and sub-office level be convened, at regular intervals, in order to address practical security issues of common concern, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Identifying, from a menu of options on security collaboration, those fitting into the specific field situation (see appendix); (2) Implementing and updating such practical collaboration in its various forms on a regular basis. <p>The fora may include the following regular participants: DO / FSO / Area Security Coordinator or other DO Designee; members of the SMT as appropriate; NGO field security focal point(s); representatives of IGOs; representatives of the Red Cross Movement. The chairperson may be chosen on a rotating basis.</p>
9	<p>Including staff security concerns in the CAPs That the CAPs include a project to cover the additional resources potentially required by enhanced collaboration on staff security by Agencies and Organizations represented in the Task Force such as telecommunication (cf. rec. 12) and security training (cf. rec.13).</p>
10	<p>Meeting common, security-related needs That UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners, committed to security collaboration in each specific humanitarian operation participate, to the extent feasible, in meeting the uncovered₂ security-related needs of the humanitarian community³, including costs, according to the scope of their respective involvement.</p>
11	<p>Sharing resources That UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners cooperating in humanitarian field operations develop a local inventory for the sharing of their specialized, security-related human and material resources.</p>

² Ex officio here refers to the fact that representatives of non-UN organizations are not bound by, nor participate formally in, SMT decisions on UN security policy.

³ Humanitarian community in this report refers to the totality of humanitarian actors in a given place, addressing the same humanitarian crisis.

12	<p>Facilitating inter-agency telecommunication</p> <p>That telecommunication among UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners at field level be facilitated by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The DO advocating with the relevant authorities for the use of telecommunication equipment within the framework of existing international agreements; (2) The relevant UN body negotiating with the authorities a common frequency for security collaboration for UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners operating in the same area; (3) Humanitarian actors committed to security collaboration using standard communication procedures and, to the extent possible, providing staff with compatible communication systems.
13	<p>Collaborating and consulting in security training</p> <p>That all UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners at HQ and at field level:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Carry out security training in collaboration and/or consultation with other agencies to the extent possible; (2) Seek to increase their own capacity for security training at all levels.
14	<p>Sharing information</p> <p>That security-related information be shared among UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners while respecting the humanitarian character of the participants as well as the confidentiality required when dealing with sensitive information.</p>
15	<p>Identifying minimum security standards</p> <p>That UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners jointly identify and agree how to apply minimum security standards adapted to local circumstances. In so doing, humanitarian actors will take into consideration already existing standards, for example the UN M.O.S.S. (minimum operational security standards) that are binding for the members of the UN system.</p>
16	<p>Seeking adherence to common humanitarian ground-rules</p> <p>That the security collaboration of UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in specific field operations, to the extent possible, rest on respect for common, locally developed ground-rules for humanitarian action.</p>
<p>Recommendations on follow-up</p>	
17	<p>Disseminating and evaluating</p> <p>That the members of the UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Disseminate the recommendations on security collaboration within their respective agencies and organizations, especially at the field level; (2) Ensure that the utility of the recommendations is evaluated within their respective agencies and organizations.

18

Learning lessons

That the UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners:

- (1) Disseminate the recommendations on staff security collaboration;
- (2) Review the implementation of the present recommendations;
- (3) Prepare and disseminate regular Lessons Learnt reports on security collaboration, based on reports from their agencies and organizations.

Appendix

PROPOSAL FOR A MENU OF OPTIONS for security collaboration in the field between UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners

The participants in the two consultations organized by the IASC-WG Staff Security Task Force in Geneva and Washington DC recommended that UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in specific field contexts adopt a pragmatic and flexible approach to security collaboration.

Thus, UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in specific field contexts might organise their collaborative efforts in field security by:

- (1) Identifying, from a “menu of options” on security collaboration, those fitting into the specific field situation;
- (2) Choosing in which options for security collaboration, and at which degree, they would commit themselves to participate, according to the agency’s or organization’s mandate/mission and the scope of its operational involvement;
- (3) Implementing, and updating on a regular basis, such practical collaboration in its various forms.

The participants identified the following list of areas of common security concerns (“options”), which may serve as a “menu of options” for security collaboration between UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in the field:

- 1: Convening fora for field security collaboration between UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners
- 2: Including staff security concerns of UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in the CAP
- 3: Meeting common security-related needs
- 4: Sharing resources
- 5: Collaborating in security planning between UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners
- 6: Facilitating inter-agency telecommunication
- 7: Sharing information
- 8: Collaborating and consulting in security training
- 9: Identifying minimum security standards
- 10: Seeking adherence to common humanitarian ground-rules

A more detailed version of the proposed menu of options, containing ideas for checklists for each option based on input from the Geneva and Washington DC consultations, is attached to the Task Force Consultant’s Final Report. These checklists may serve as a starting point for UN organizations and their IGO/NGO partners in their implementation of the present recommendations in specific field situations.