

IASC Results Group 1 on Operational Response

18 September, Geneva

Results Group 1 on Operational Response met on 18 September in Geneva to review updates on the concrete deliverables under each of the OPAG-agreed priority areas of work; to brief members on key results of the second IASC Results Groups all co-Chairs meeting on 10 September; and to discuss reporting to the OPAG and possible areas of work in 2020.

The Group's discussion begun with an **update from InterAction and OCHA on protection** (ensure that protection is mainstreamed throughout the humanitarian response, beyond the actions taken by the protection cluster. Agreed, specific and measurable indicators are included within the cluster response and are reviewed within the midterm review process). The subgroup refined the previously presented deliverables for precision and to ensure a higher level of ambition. The deliverables were sequenced in such a way as to inform and feed one another and will benefit from inputs from the field and other ongoing initiatives. The subgroup requested that the IASC secretariat ensure inputs feed into upcoming opportunities, notably the Principals meeting in December 2019 and EDG Annual Review of Operations in January 2020. The IASC secretariat was also requested to facilitate feedback on the deliverables from the Group. The key deliverables presented were as follows: (i) provide relevant protection inputs to the ERC and respective Principals in advance of the IASC Principals horizon scanning on critical protection concerns in selected countries. Concise inputs to be provided to IASC Focal Points and Agency representatives prior to IASC Principals meetings and the EDG's Annual Operational Review; (ii) HCs and HCTs in selected countries to undertake reflection and exchange of lessons learned on implementation of the core requirements of the IASC Protection Policy, based on guidance provided by the Group. The critical lessons and issues emerging from these reflections will be distilled in a 2 page paper and inform agreed, specific and measurable indicators on the centrality of protection in practice. To initiate this exercise, guidance is being developed for reflection and exchange of lessons learned for HCs/HCTs in selected countries to undertake on implementation of core requirements of the IASC Protection Policy; and (iii) develop draft terms of reference, timeline and key milestones for commissioning a review on the IASC Policy on Protection Policy in 2021, five years after its adoption.

In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that in taking forward the deliverable on country-level reflections, it was important to ensure consideration of reflections and lessons learned on gender-based violence (GBV) programming. UNFPA was reaching out independently to HCs and HCTs on accountabilities and responsibilities on GBV. Members also noted the need to link this work with initiatives on PSEA indicators that was currently being undertaken by Results Group 2. Members were informed that GBV considerations would indeed be included, as well as other important areas of protection to ensure that we collectively address hurdles that HCs/HCTs are facing in mainstreaming protection. With regard to the selection of countries where relevant protection inputs would be provided, members agreed on proposed consulting the Results Group 3 who were already engaged on identifying 2-3 contexts to develop a clear humanitarian diplomacy strategy to address access and protection concerns. Members also noted the need to consider the JSC pilot countries on the nexus and countries/crises flagged by EDG during their 2019 Annual Review of Operations, allowing for range of perspectives to feed the indicators. The Group was informed that once the country-level reflections take place, the subgroup would draft indicators drawing on HCs/HCTs inputs, a desk review to be undertaken by the Global Protection Cluster, and other sources for OPAG's consideration during their meeting in Spring 2020. A suggestion was made to ensure that draft indicators take into account challenges or gaps in protection analysis. With regard to the review of the IASC policy on protection, the Group was informed that work is underway to lay out objectives and

timelines of the review while taking into account the need for a degree of flexibility on the “Independence” of the review.

The Group’s discussion then moved to an **update from InterAction and ICVA on bureaucratic impediments** (address bureaucratic impediments imposed on NGOs to curtail their access and their ability to carry out humanitarian activities - to be done in collaboration with Results Group 3 on Collective Advocacy). The Group was informed that the matrix on bureaucratic impediments and restrictive NGO law provisions, which aims to broadly categorize the impediments and restrictions experienced by field colleagues into donor-driven and host government/authority-driven types, is now being finalized after several rounds of consultations with members as well as wider constituencies. The subgroup agreed that a final draft would be circulated via the IASC secretariat for additional inputs. The Group was also informed that the next step would be the provision of two normative guiding documents for HCs/HCTs to mitigate effects of bureaucratic impediments on humanitarian operations - one capturing global trends to provide better information and to advise collective solutions for leadership both at global and country level and the other focused on country-level analysis.

In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that the contents of the matrix were already providing useful feedback. However UN members were encouraged to provide their inputs. The Group was informed of the IFRC’s 33rd International Conference where a session on ‘trust’ and a sub-session on ‘counter-terrorism’ was on the agenda. The contents of the matrix were valuable inputs to bolster these sessions. IFRC would connect its colleagues with the subgroup in this regard. In light of the lack of response from UN members of the Group, OCHA was requested to provide anecdotal information on impediments, particularly in light of OCHA’s work in maintaining a database on access and impediments challenges. The sub-group was informed that OCHA would ensure that colleagues working on access issues would link up with its work.

The Group’s discussion then moved on to an **update from OCHA on humanitarian leadership** (pursue activities to strengthen humanitarian leadership for a more effective and inclusive humanitarian response, while fostering synergies and complementarity with the reinvigorated Resident Coordinator system). The subgroup presented four deliverables, namely: updating the “Introduction to Humanitarian Action” handbook; convening an inter-agency advisory team to support the development of and contribution to the first RC Induction Briefing; reviewing and providing guidance on the identification, development and accountability of DHCs to the HCs/HCTs; and developing a communication and outreach campaign in support of broadening, deepening and diversifying the pool of candidates for inter-agency senior field coordination leadership functions. The co-Chairs welcomed the subgroup’s efforts particularly in regard to diversifying the leadership pool and supporting the roles of DHCs. Members noted the need for a longer-term engagement in this workstream beyond 2019 with an expanded subgroup, to ensure diversity which NGOs can provide.

The Group’s discussion then moved to an **update from WFP on IASC Early Warning and Early Action analysis and the ERP guidance** (determine how to strengthen the IASC Early Warning and Early Action Analysis and ensure that the “early action” aspect is prioritized by the various IASC structures, including the IASC and the EDG; Finalize the revision of the ERP guidance, publish and disseminate the revised ERP guidance upon consideration and endorsement by OPAG.) WFP noted that the EWEAR group will be composed of two subgroups: the Early Warning group to continue to identify, analyze and prioritize emerging risks and publish biannual EWEAR analysis report, and the Preparedness, Early Action and Readiness group which would be oriented more towards strengthening early action elements. Co-Chairs noted the need to continue bilateral discussions with the subgroup to finetune the direction per OPAG’s

ask to consider how best to capitalize on the work of the Early Warning group of analysts responsible for the production of the IASC EWEA report to ensure strengthened early warning analysis and improved early action, including by the Principals and the EDG. WFP informed that the revision of ERP guidance was foreseen to be actioned in 2020.

In the following session, co-Chairs **briefed the Group on key results of the all Results Groups co-Chairs meeting on 10 September**, one of which was to explore additional areas of collaboration between various Results Groups as well as with entities associated with the IASC and key non-IASC partners. Results Groups 1 and 2 acknowledged linkages around protection and humanitarian leadership (particularly considering the PSEA, AAP and GBV commonality). The subgroup leads of both workstreams in Results Group 1 were requested to liaise with Results Group 2 in this regard. The IASC secretariat would facilitate linkages in this regard. Co-Chairs also held an initial collective reflection on how best to capitalize on the IASC-Grand Bargain linkages. The Group was informed that the mapping of the potential IASC-Grand Bargain linkages produced by both secretariats served as a good starting point and the liaison will continue between the two secretariats to facilitate further concretization and updates of the linkages and the IASC secretariat would share with members the initial mapping document after consulting the Grand Bargain secretariat. Co-Chairs noted an opportunity in 2020 for the Group to strengthen collaboration with the Grand Bargain on localization and cash workstreams, while recognizing the need for independence of both groups. IFRC noted that the localization agenda was an important priority that should be taken up by the Group in 2020, considering that HCTs are key decision-making fora to involve local actors and the Group's mandate on operational response.

The leads of each subgroup were requested to submit a draft progress report on their respective work using the attached template to the IASC secretariat focal points (Yasin Samatar samatar@un.org and Jione Park jione.park@un.org) by 11 October who will collate and finalize the report on behalf of the co-Chairs. The Group was informed that the OPAG would be interested to see how the work of each Results Group would meet the priorities set by the IASC Principals and also support field effectiveness. As was the case in the first OPAG meeting, all RG co-Chairs are invited to the OPAG meeting to present progress made against the OPAG-agreed priority areas of work, identify 1 to 2 substantive issues for a deep-dive discussion with the OPAG, and also obtain a visual of the priorities being considered for 2020. Members agreed on "Counter Terrorism measures and provisions in humanitarian settings" as the theme for a deep-dive discussion during the OPAG session. With regard to the 2020 priorities for the Group to take forward, co-Chairs and members expressed concern over the tight timelines, considering the 2019 priorities that have sequential elements to be followed up in 2020, which was also a common issue experienced by other RGs. Co-Chairs proposed to bring this issue to the attention of the OPAG co-Chairs prior to the OPAG meeting to ensure expectations on the group were being met.

The meeting between co-Chairs and subgroup leads is planned for 17 October from 16:30 to 17:30 GVA and the Results Group's next face-to-face meeting is tentatively planned for 22 October (to be confirmed via IASC secretariat).

The co-Chairs ended the meeting by recognizing the considerable efforts of all members, particularly leads of each subgroup, that have invested considerable time and energy, above and beyond their regular day-to-day work, to facilitate and drive the IASC work forward.
