IASC Results Group 1 on Operational Response met on 16 September 2020 to discuss (i) debrief from the 29 October OPAG meeting and next steps; (ii) next steps on the Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility, (iii) country selection for bureaucratic and administrative case study selection; and (iv) any other business.

Action points:

1. Circulate finalized ToRs for the IASC Protection Policy Review to RG1 **[CoP sub-group with support from IASC Secretariat]**
2. Finalize the administrative and resource mobilization aspects of the IASC Protection Policy Review **[CoP sub-group]**
3. Develop criteria for the OPAG committee selection and bring a proposal forward to the RG1 co-chairs [**CoP sub-group]**
4. Finalize revised protection integration proposal by end November and share with RG1 for information **[UNHCR]**
5. RG1 members to share any objections by 13 November on elevating the draft Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility to OPAG directly skipping the RG1 review step [**RG1 members]**
6. RG1 members to flag key issues/themes coming from non-formal sub-groups as well as other aspects of operational response to RG1 co-chairs and OPAG for discussion. **[RG1 members]**
7. RG1 members to share any redline feedback on the selection of Afghanistan, Venezuela, and Nigeria for BAI case studies by 13 November **[RG1 members]**

1. **Debrief from the 29 October OPAG meeting on Protection**

RG1 co-chairs welcomed participants and expressed their appreciation to the Centrality of Protection (CoP) sub-group co-chairs and UNHCR for their presentation to OPAG. RG1 co-chair Mr Rein Paulsen noted the strong support from OPAG on the timeliness and need for the IASC Protection Policy review and highlighted OPAG's interest in continuing to elevate protection across IASC structures.

The CoP sub-group co-chairs debriefed RG1 members on the discussion noting the strong support from OPAG members for the review. Key outcomes of the meeting included the endorsement of the ToRs of IASC Protection Policy review as well as widespread support for the formation of a small OPAG advisory committee to oversee and guide the review process, and development of a management action plan. The latter two outcomes would facilitate individual and collective buy-in and support to the review process and implementation of the review recommendations. The co-chairs maintained that the development of a management action plan would facilitate consequential and meaningful action on the findings and recommendations of the review.

In terms of next steps, the sub-group co-chairs noted that they would incorporate light edits based on feedback received from two OPAG members as well as reflect the development of the management action plan in the ToRs.

A budget and resource mobilization strategy would be developed while also identifying a host organization to house the consultant for the administration of the review in coming weeks. The co-chairs noted that the review, pending confirmation

of resources, would be commissioned in the first quarter of 2021 and is expected to conclude before the end of 2021.

UNHCR debriefed members on the OPAG discussion around integrating protection across IASC structures as well as the subsequent CoP sub-group meeting. Following OPAG's June meeting, UNHCR drafted a proposal that rested on three pillars; i) OPAG+ quarterly briefings, ii) Results Groups adopt a specific objective and indicators on protection; and iii) utilization of OPAG + quarterly briefings to report back on progress and challenges. UNHCR received constructive feedback on the proposal before the OPAG meeting and OPAG members expressed support to elevating protection across IASC structures. Some members noted the need to make sure the proposal was field focused while others highlighted the need to avoid creating parallel structures but breaking siloes. UNHCR noted that while OPAG broadly supported the objectives, there was a request to further flesh out the proposal and revise the proposal following consultations with other groups. UNHCR noted the consultations with the CoP sub-group have been valuable as the integration of protection proposal now is approached from the lens of developing an HCT strategy. Similar to an HCT protection strategy, a few key issues where tangible results could be achieved would be identified to be addressed by all. This would facilitate a field and results-oriented approach and help break siloes. UNHCR noted it will further flesh out the proposal and then use the revised proposal to engage with other Results Groups co-chairs.

In the ensuing discussion, ICVA inquired about the sequencing of the IASC Protection Policy review and UNHCR's proposal while the RG1 co-chairs asked about the timeline of next steps for the revision of the UNHCR proposal. UNHCR noted that the revised proposal would be ready by end November and highlighted that UNHCR's proposal would elevate protection across the IASC and the revised proposal would complement the review.

2. Next Steps on the Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility

RG1 co-chairs welcomed the opportunity to take stock of the progress made under the Data Responsibility sub-group. They noted that as discussed in the previous RG1 meeting and endorsed by the OPAG, the Data Responsibility sub-group was no longer formally linked with RG1, but the RG co-chairs and IASC Secretariat would continue to provide support as needed. As the sub-group has made progress towards finalization of the Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility, the objective of the presentation was to inform where the sub-group stands and receive any feedback on the substantive and process aspects of the guidance.

Co-led by OCHA, IOM and UNHCR, the primary objective of the sub-group was to develop joint, system-wide guidance on data responsibility for endorsement by the IASC. This guidance would serve as the key system-wide reference document on principles, actions, and accountabilities for data responsibility in humanitarian action. 20 humanitarian organizations, the majority of which are RG1 members, have contributed to the development of the guidance since January 2020. The Operational Guidance was developed using a phased approach with a desk review and consultations taking place in the first quarter of the year followed by an initial round of drafting and review by key stakeholders including field-based organizations and colleagues. Over the summer, the sub-group presented its work to OPAG where it received constructive and useful feedback. The sub-group is currently finalizing the drafting process to seek OPAG endorsement by end 2020.

The sub-group would define data responsibility in humanitarian action as the safe, ethical, and effective management of personal and non-personal data for operational response, per established frameworks for personal data protection. The guidance would establish the rationale; key principles and actions for data responsibility at different levels (system level, cluster level, and organization level) as well as key definitions, templates, tools and references. The guidance would allow a Humanitarian Country Team and relevant coordination bodies to understand the opportunities and challenges related to data management in a given setting map while also minimizing risks particularly around privacy and personal data and maximizing benefits for analysis by humanitarian actors.

In the ensuing discussion, OHCHR inquired how the guidance addresses risks, particularly those related to the protection of personal data. Given that the majority of RG1 members were also represented in the sub-group, members were asked as to whether RG1 needed to review the guidance and whether the RG1 review could be skipped. Concerning OHCHR's query, sub-group co-chairs noted that this point was raised by OPAG as well and as a result, the sub-group has clearly articulated how risks can be minimized, including through references to relevant frameworks and policies. The personal data aspect is also addressed clearly through data responsibility principles and actions vis- à-vis organizational policy and legal requirements. Likewise, other risks and challenges such as targeting of affected populations and exacerbation of existing vulnerabilities can be further compounded if data is not managed responsibly, and the guidance provides clear advice, tools and principles to minimize such risks and challenges. Hence, personal data related principles and actions are anchored in the legal and normative frameworks that exist. In terms of next steps, there was agreement, if no organization disagrees by 13 November, the RG1 review step would be skipped and the Operational Guidance would be presented to OPAG directly for endorsement.

ICVA inquired about where the work of sub-groups that are no longer formally linked with RG1 sit. RG1 co-chairs explained that RG1 had most sub-groups since the beginning and while these sub-groups are no longer formally linked with RG1, the co-chairs would continue to guide these sub-groups when they need guidance and the IASC Secretariat would continue to support them as needed. Likewise, they maintained that as RG1's scope of work was broad, there was not necessarily a need to have a sub-group for each issue and members could bring forward proposals for discussion.

3. <u>Country Selection for BAI Case Studies</u>

RG1 co-chairs noted that bureaucratic and administrative impediments remain high on the agenda of IASC Principals as visa issues continue to affect humanitarian actors' operations. The Bureaucratic and Administrative Impediments sub-group co-chairs updated the group on their work and sought RG1 endorsement on the proposed countries for case studies. They expressed appreciation for the renewed commitment and support from UN agencies including WFP, UNICEF, and IOM in the subgroup's work. They stated that their priority remains to develop normative guidance for HCs and HCTs to mitigate risks and impact bureaucratic and administrative impediments, as outlined in the RG1 workplan.

The sub-group was about to finalize the draft case study on Myanmar which provides a light framework to analyze bureaucratic impediments and examines the Myanmar context. Given that the case study was completed around the time a global pandemic was declared, COVID-19 related feedback was being incorporated with support from sub-group members including OCHA. Against this backdrop, the sub-group held consultations with its members on the selection of countries for future case studies. Several countries were considered for future case studies including Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Iraq, Mozambique, Venezuela and Yemen as potential countries of interest. The sub-group co-chairs consulted INGO Forums in these contexts to understand the situation and gauge interest in and resources to support case studies while sub-group members also contacted their in-country counterparts to receive their feedback. Based on these consultations which demonstrated great interest, availability of resources and feasibility of discussing BAI in an inter-agency space, the sub-group was proposing to undertake case studies on Afghanistan and Venezuela. At the same time, the sub-group considered geographic diversity of the case studies and based on some quick feedback from the in-country counterparts, Nigeria was proposed as a third country where a case study would be developed. The sub- group co-chairs requested endorsement from RG1 members and welcomed expressions of support in undertaking the case studies.

In the ensuing discussion, members discussed the timeline of the case studies, the way forward on the case studies, and linkages with other IASC structures including the EDG. Sub-group co-chairs noted that while the details of the timeline and modalities will be discussed in the next sub-group meeting, there was potential for the case studies to be undertaken

simultaneously. The sub-group would aim to conclude the case studies by mid-2021 which would then help develop a synthesis based on all case studies. There was agreement that if there was no objection to the proposed countries by end week, the sub-group would proceed with the proposed case studies. There was discussion around how to solidify and/or closely link the sub-group's work to EDG's work. The sub-group co-chairs noted that they welcomed the increased interest in the BAI and have discussed such linkages with the EDG in the sub-group. They maintained that while harmonization with EDGs was important and should be followed and in sub-group discussions, there was agreement that the focus of the sub-group should remain on the deliverables established in the workplan. There was agreement that the sub-group will continue its work on the case studies while ensuring linkages with the EDGs, as appropriate.

4. AOB

The co-chairs encouraged sub-groups to consider practical ways to increase synergies and collaboration with other Results Groups. They also informed members that the next RG1 meeting will take place in mid-January 2021. The exact date and agenda would be communicated later.