Minutes of the IASC AAP PSEA Task Team Meeting, 6 December 2018

Theme: New initiatives that feature AAP and PSEA in the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)

1. Introductory Remarks

Preeta Law (Task Team co-chair)

Today we will be talking about some new initiatives that feature AAP and PSEA in the HPC. DFID will update us on their internal guidance on AAP and how this broader work is a central aspect of PSEA, and payment by results. OCHA will present on how we can strengthen AAP through the HPC. As the Task Team we have worked on this over the course of the year with some good successes; some of which have supported members to see how best to make this sustainable, structured and systematic throughout the process rather than just the HNOs and HRPs. This has been a long standing goal for the Task Team; we really want to see more advances in the area for both AAP, PSEA and the linkages between them.

Meg Sattler (OCHA)

When we look at the accountability agenda, including work through the Task Team, there is no shortage of initiatives or field work in this area but one of the biggest challenges; especially since what's transpired since the Grand Bargain discussions, is that our system is not really structured for accountability. Whilst it was good that a couple of meetings ago we looked at some of the global initiatives that have been set up to tackle this; it's also exciting, albeit challenging, to look at the system we have and some of the more systematic changes we are trying to make to address accountability and better allow for some of the ground level initiatives to start to permeate the system. Would encourage people throughout this meeting, even if you are thinking that the HPC or UN indicators etc. don't have too much to do with your day to day life, to think about what this could mean in terms of coordination and what access it may open up to the grass roots initiatives so that they impact the system in a more structured way.

2. DFID

Ben Pickering (DFID)

Very happy to be here and share some of the work within DFID on AAP and hear views and ideas on this. With thanks to Tanya and Meg for their support and inputs into this process.

New DFID AAP Internal Guidance Note
To note: This does include elements of PSEA; in the broader accountability agenda. PSEA is managed separately in the Safeguarding Unit; so whilst they have been heavily engaged in the development of the guidance note, it is not specific to PSEA.

The note recognises where DFID needs to improve on AAP to ensure DFID is absolutely clear on what is meant by AAP, what it's committed to and how to ensure best practise in programming and with partners funded by them. It is also recognition that they can do much more on AAP. The internal guidance was therefore developed to improve the overall quality of humanitarian interventions by providing DFID staff with guidance. In doing this, DFID has defined AAP, outlined the commitment to it, and provided an overview of international standards and best practise. It is intended to support both policy development, in terms of commitments to the Grand Bargain, and other broader policy areas within DFID but also as an 'aid memoire' especially for country offices where many AAP considerations will be context specific and depend on the capacity of partners.

The note itself is not mandatory, although it does speak to elements of UK commitments that are mandatory – e.g. issues related to the transparency agenda. In terms of how AAP is framed, the starting point is that AAP within DFID had generally been understood to be beneficiary feedback. This note aims to frame it in a much broader agenda; very much in line with guidance and literature on AAP; in terms of 'giving account, taking account and being held to account'. Activities are linked to enablers so it's not just about what partners do but the way in which they do them. (Please refer to graphic in presentation). Whilst it is recognised that beneficiary feedback it critical, DFID really wants to see a step-change in how

feedback is being used, collated and analysed to inform decisions; i.e. they are very keen to see demonstrable evidence of how response decisions are changing in light of feedback. This has been directly linked to outcomes because they feel very strongly that this is the basis for AAP and contributes to access, acceptance, and community-driven programmes.

Within the note there are 10 recommendations for DFID Advisers and Country Offices to consider in the context of their programmes:

- In all humanitarian responses, have to presume that a strong AAP component is needed; rather than an after-thought
- Want to see CHS adopted as a tool in which to monitor AAP and Safeguarding initiatives
- Want to see a much stronger AAP component within HNOs and HRPs and much stronger engagement on AAP with HCTs; to what extent is it a standing agenda item etc.?
- Would like to champion AAP through greater use of innovative technology; building on strong examples in terms of data collection, gathering, analysis and feedback back to communities
- Want to look at surge support through its surge platforms to support AAP capacity building particularly in responses
- Through the core funding to UN Agencies; need coherence between this funding at the global level and bilateral funding at the country-level
- There is a key role for Humanitarian 2 Humanitarian (H2H) organisations to support AAP initiatives; through funding to support 2-way communication, AAP mechanisms etc. to address critical gaps in responses
- Would like to strengthen the link between accountability mechanisms and independent monitoring mechanisms -especially real-time evaluations and third party monitoring
- Wish to support single collective mechanisms at country-level where possible rather than having individual agency mechanisms; jointly with other donors
- For protracted crises; need to better understand what AAP means in this context and how mechanisms need to adapt to them

<u>DFID's Payment by Results for core funding for UN Agencies</u>
DFID has made multi-year (4) funding available to a number of multi-lateral humanitarian agencies. Their objective is to incentivise more efficient and effective humanitarian action. The results framework to measure progress against this has been developed from commitments made through the Grand Bargain and World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and covers 7 areas including increased accountability in humanitarian action. Within this there are a number of indicators that speak to both AAP and PSEA. These are joint indicators, in that the UN agencies that receive the core funding have to work together to deliver against the joint indicators; the point being that no one UN Agency can contribute to these indicator alone; the hope is to incentivise collective action. 30% of the funding to the UN agencies is payment by results; meaning that if agencies fail to meet these targets they risk losing 30% of their funding. Now that the 2017 Annual review has concluded; the results showed that progress on system-wide reforms (agreed at the WHS) was good; and as the majority of indicators were met by all the agencies, they received the 30%; and there is evidence of increased collective action. For AAP, agencies were able to cite strong examples of collective AAP mechanisms including practical steps at the country-level. However, there are many challenges to the PBR initiative; it is still early to see the impact on the system but signs are positive and we need to build a strong evidence base. DFID is investing in independent M&E to look at the impact of PBR (by end of 2020).

Next Steps:
Following the review, DFID will tweak some components but the majority will remain as is until 2020. However, for next year, they hope to share further independent evidence of progress and impact on the ground.

Questions:
Core funding – will this take into account dedicated AAP human resources in the field as this is one of the problems small organisations face

Collective action at country level – if countries have collective mechanisms does DFID plan to fund global collectives that can support the field level?

Building AAP capacity at the country level takes time; how do we take this into account?

Are the guidelines focused on the emergency phase and to what extent has DFID looked at how AAP work gets embedded into protracted crises? This needs to be central in the system; how do we ensure the work will be sustained; in order to avoid doing harm given that people become more vulnerable and protection needs become more acute? How do we get enough National Actor engagement; as this will help with sustainability; how can DFID support this?

With thanks to DFID for being bold with PbR initiative– IFRC is benefitting from this. On the 'enablers' side of AAP – will there be a requirement from donors to recruit local people to work on this; we are still perpetuating a divide between staff and local people; we talk about localisation and community engagement but still continue to focus on international staff.

DFID welcomes the experience in the room and any ideas and recommendations that members can bring.

On the core funding and AAP human resources – DFID has made available over GBP680m within a 4 year business case to UN Agencies; including OCHA, CERF, UNHCR, IOM, WHO, UNICEF and WFP. This started in 2017 and will conclude at the end of 2020. This funding is un-earmarked and DFID does not stipulate what it is spent on. In terms of funding for increased human resources; DFID cannot stipulate what this is spent on; but UN Agencies can decide to do this if they so wish. If members feel this is a gap, they should flag this to the UN Agencies. For DFID partners, they hope there will be better scrutiny on AAP proposals; if a partner is proposing initiatives, they would want to see a sensible approach to staffing, capacity etc.

On collective action and DFID funding – DFID is looking at this carefully; funding provided at the right time to support such an initiative is a good opportunity and they will want to look at this in big responses. They are discussing this with other donors as it cannot be done by DFID alone; joined up efforts are required.

On emergency response vs protracted crises – the guidance is largely designed for humanitarian responses although within it the need to consider what this means in protracted crisis is signposted. There is a lot more work that does need to be done on this; the hope is that the work on the guidance note is the start and that overtime, they will work together with other cadre within DFID (conflict advisers etc.) to pull something together; primarily to mitigate against the risk of doing harm.

On International vs National staff - DFID has built on the work of ICRC and IFRC in their guidance note to inform their own position. The divide between international and national staff is clear; a key indicator is the extent to which national staff are involved in AAP work. DFID is heavily behind localisation but there are challenges to how much DFID can push this to avoid being too prescriptive; they would welcome a UN lead on this and would like a better understanding of what role that National NGOs and staff have in the initiatives and what capacity is provided to them through the partnership arrangements. This goes beyond work on AAP.

3. HPC
Meg Sattler (OCHA)

This is an interesting time for OCHA in terms of accountability. Previously, the way OCHA was structured, the accountability/community engagement function sat within communications and then corporate programme. Last year it was moved into the inter-cluster team; and now, post-restructure, is sitting within the SWAPs section; fully embedded in the coordination division, looking at how to improve community engagement among a suite of other thematic areas – e.g. cash, protection, gender, inter-cluster coordination and private sector etc. Because of the Grand Bargain and discussions around a move to collective action, OCHA's role historically was a advocacy role; but now, rather than advocacy what is needed now is coordination of these activities. On the one hand, global pressure such as PbR is helping but there are a whole ranges of activities that OCHA now needs to coordinate; including different accountability initiatives at field level that need to coordinated to ensure communities are not inundated and so that data can be more systematically used to inform response. OCHA is trying to get AAP to the

state that cash is in now; which took approximately 4 years. They are trying to capacity build the entire organisation to integrate AAP as key coordination function; this year there has been a heavy focus on the HPC, as an easy way to house various AAP coordination initiatives.

<u>New guidance for HNOs and HRPs on AAP and PSEA</u>
This guidance was released this year. There is now clear information on what to do before you write an HNO – i.e. need to go through a coordination process that identified communities information needs etc. leading to what to include in the document when you write it. This has now been shared with Inter-cluster teams and will soon be available on the website. At the moment, it is being translated into Spanish and French; with more to come later. Whilst this is only guidance it is way to systemise AAP and make it much more practical. In addition, HNOs and HRPs are scored; in line with initiatives that came out of the Grand Bargain and DFID's PbR they are now scoring these much more rigidly on accountability; including how community voices are reflected in these plans but also how community engagement barriers are reflected. Lack of AAP in the documents will result in much lower scores.

CERF integration: OCHA is trying to look at how to rely less on big donor projects that may take a long time to set-up – e.g. in DRC, the CERF funded, for the first time, a coordinated AAP mechanism quite early on; this has become a precedent. OCHA has been working with the CERF team to make this more systematic and include criteria on how community engagement mechanisms would meet CERF criteria and how much funding could be released.

HPC data: A lot of Information Management teams have not had experience of working with AAP data; and data can get ignored because there is not a 'field' that says community feedback data etc. OCHA is therefore working with the HPC team to try and embed AAP into existing systems.

<u>Process to review how the HPC is monitored</u>

Earlier this year, an Inter-Agency process started to review how we monitor the HPC; as part of this there is a workstream including ALNAP, OCHA, WFP, IRC and others. The way we monitor HPCs now is just at the activity level – e.g. we distributed 100 tents. Now, looking to change this to see how can use HPC monitoring to inform the response as it evolves and how it can be much more accountable to affected populations. They are working on a new monitoring framework and accountability framework which will include new outcomes and indicators; including looking at strategic objectives that will be much more outcome based; this will mean that to monitor them we will have to talk more to communities to find out exactly what happened in terms of the activity rather than what the activity was. There will be an indicators registry which will hopefully link to the Grand Bargain workstreams and include unintended outcomes monitoring and outcome harvesting via community engagement. The monitoring will happen more frequently and will be 3-tiered and a cyclical approach in which we not only monitor the response but evolving needs and community feedback; to provide an evolving picture of the response.

They are also looking at a separate accountability framework that will include who we are accountable to (donors and affected populations) and different types of monitoring we would need to do to get there. At the moment, this is still draft; once finalised it will be aligned with existing priorities e.g. the Task Team, the Grand Bargain Participation Revolution etc. to ensure we are not all trying to do the same thing. This is informally being led at the moment by UNDP but Meg is available for any questions.

Questions/comments:
Is there a timeline for the AAP indicator registry; this is key as there are so many different frameworks and interpretations between organisations and if we are going to work together we need to have a common way of measuring our success.
These have not been agreed yet as they are pulling together existing ones (starting with the Participation Revolution) and other areas - e.g. CHS and Ground Truth work in Chad. It is difficult as we don't have a lot of precedent and they haven't really been used at the response level yet. In the countries with HRPs, there are only 2 countries with AAP indicators across the response– Syria and Chad. If anyone has good examples of where indicators have been useful in improving AAP at the response level please feel free to share.

4. CHS Alliance –Case study from Chad
Tanya Wood (CHS Alliance)

Overview of CHS/Ground Truth Solutions (GTS) Chad project
This is the start of a concrete project aiming to bring AAP indicators into the HPC. For those who don't know, one of the aims of the core humanitarian standard is to inform people of their rights and to be able to hold organisations to account. This is built on the premise of AAP and has a number of indicators that are related to AAP. To note: We need to get better at aligning our indicators; we do have the CHS indicators which were agreed to by the humanitarian community.

With the CHS, as organisations hold themselves to account, and measure themselves against the standard, we know we are not able to take this to the scale intended if we only work at the organisational level. We therefore need to start taking it to a collective level in countries. The way to do this is through the HCTs and HPC. They will be starting this project soon and see how we can take it to scale.

What does the project look like? The HCT in Chad has taken this approach to look at how we monitor the views of affected people in a systematic way. It is a common platform to track the views of affected people and uses the findings to monitor the progress against the Chad 2017-19 HRP and using the CHS. On the theoretical planning side, it is trying to align indicators with community perceptions; noting that the perceptions are also being fed into the CHS commitments process as well. Pragmatically, GTS does one-on-one surveys with people; (quite labour intensive) and focus group discussions in some cases. It also asks the humanitarian staff for their perceptions.

It is at an early stage; but some initial results:
- Information sharing – when people were asked 'do you feel informed'; 60% of affected people said yes versus 90% from the staff. Doing this systematically will help us see evidence on whether we think this difference is ok or not.
- Differences between the 3 regions and different answers; this should remind us that AAP is not easy; it is about people and differences; until we do this kind of work in different regions; we won't know if we are getting the right information across in the right way and have the right feedback systems in place.
- Code of conduct – we can't separate AAP from PSEA; when people were asked if they were treated with respect by aid workers 76% said yes; but when look at what behaviour they should expect it went down to 16%. This shows the challenge we have.

One of the issues we still face in the humanitarian community is around complaints and response mechanisms; we know from organisations CHS verification that this is our weakest area; people still don't know how to make suggestions/complaints.

Lessons learnt:
- Ownership and cultural change; we need to look at our challenges in a new way. This project was only possible because they received the buy-in from the Humanitarian Coordinator in Chad and fantastic support from OCHA.
- We need to keep questioning the need to use independent organisations doing this through intensive interviews; can we take this to scale? This will be looked at next year.

Next steps:
- With the support of SIDA the project will continue until the end of 2019 so that the next HPC can be influenced. We then need to see what impact this had on the programme; this will happen next year.
- For the Task Team – we need to see how we can take this to scale.

Questions:
There may be a need to sharpen some of the questions asked to the affected people
The slides actually represent the indicators; rather than the actual questions. The questions are delivered in French and were designed with OCHA and the Accountability Working Group in Chad.

It seems that the 88% of people who feel safe making a complaint are making complaints of any nature. It is much easier to make a complaint about something other than SGBV issues. We need to keep this in mind; and need to separate out issues around SGBV; and of course the referral systems in place.
In Chad the protection cluster is conducting a protection survey which includes such questions.

5. AOB

Update from UNICEF on Communication and Community Engagement Initiative (CCEI) (Charles-Antoine Hofmann)
- Workshops were held in Nairobi and Panama this year; in which countries were brought together and they promoted moves towards collective approaches. Similar workshops are planned for next year.
- On evidence and added value of these approaches; in February next year a special edition of the Humanitarian Exchange will look at examples of collective approaches from approx. 18 countries; this will showcase some of the work that is out there.
- Considering some operational research (potentially with HPG) looking at added value and benefit of collective approaches.
- They will host a session at the Humanitarian Networks and Partnership Week (HNPW) in Geneva in February (for the 3rd time).
- Surge capacity: we need to agree on profiles that need to be promoted following from the CDAC network review this year; we need to move forward as we don't have the capacity at the moment.
- In discussions about a collective approach in Syria.

Update from P2P on PSEA guidance note for HCs and HCTs (Alice Chatelet)
Thanks to all the Task Team members who provide comments so far. If people still want to input – please let Alice and Tanya know asap. Once the first round of comments are taken on, the document will be circulated once more for final approval and endorsement by the Task Team.

Update on Future of Task Team (Preeta Law)
As in previous years, we are in mid-December without a clear sense from the IASC as to its future structure and shape. We don't yet know whether the Task Team, or some version of it will continue or not. We have however done some good work over the course of the year; the workplan that we agreed; some of the results we have seen; as well as how we have contributed to the development of the overarching IASC workplan. This is good work and should strengthen the collective provided collective actions remain the underlying objective of the global forum. That's going to be something that is not just dependent on the IASC Secretariat but on each of us. Our struggle in the Task Team; we don't want our meetings to be about information sharing as much as bringing our collective experiences and expertise to actually work for people in the field. We have made some good progress on this and I would like to thank the coordinator for her work on this and for keeping on track the work of the Task Team. We will keep you informed in the coming weeks on how things are progressing; from our various sources at this stage - this is still unclear.

6. Next Meetings

TBD – pending IASC decisions on structure and workplan.

List of Participants

Organisation	Name
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Preeta Law
IASC AAP PSEA TT Co-Chair	Mamadou Ndiaye
IASC AAP PSEA	Tanya Axisa
Action Aid	Andrew May
ALNAP	Alice Obrecht
CAFOD, CRS etc	Laura Purves

CHS Alliance	Tanya Wood
CHS Alliance	Genevieve Cyvoct
DFID	Ben Pickering
Ground Truth Solutions	Alexandra Walker
Ground Truth Solutions	Isabella
HIAS	Simone Walton
HIAS	Mulu Hunegnaw
HIAS	Carly Hicks
Humanitarian HR	Colleen Striegel
IASC Secretariat	Isabelle de Muyser-Boucher
ICVA	Jeremy Plato
IFAD	Sylvie Martin
IFRC	Tina Tinde
Independent	Asmita Naik
Independent	Lucy Heaven-Taylor
IMC	Mary Pack
Impact Initiatives	Katya Ivanova
Intersos	Miro Modrusan
Justice Rapid Response	Margaux Tordoir
LWF	Lennart Hernander
OCHA	Meg Sattler
Peer 2 Peer Project	Alice Chatelet
Plan International	Tholakele Ndhlovu
Relief International	Ian Plaskett
Save the Children	Cat Carter
Terre des Hommes	Nadege Porta
Translators without Borders	Alice Castillejo
Translators without Borders	Marianthi Eliodorou
UNESCO	Emanuele Dominici
UNHCR	Michelle Ndhlovu
UNHCR	Machtelt DE Vriese
UNICEF	Katie Wepplo
UNICEF	Sarah Mace
UNICEF	Charles-Antoine Hofmann
USAID	Sarah Fuhrman
Welthungerhilfe	Peter Doerr
WFP	Marta Conconi
WFP	Meghan Sullivan
WFP	Jacqueline Cavalcante
World Vision	Shirley Lo

Apologies for any mistakes in the above table. We are aware that others may have joined this meeting but are not represented here. Please inform the Coordinator at axisa@unhcr.org so that the minutes can be adjusted accordingly.