IASC RG2 Meeting Minutes  
*(Meeting for RG2 Members and Leads of Deliverables)*  
**Monday October 7th, 2019**

**PARTICIPANTS**

Meritxell Relaño (RG2 Co-Chair/UNICEF), Tanya Axisa (RG2), Stewart Davies (OCHA), Isabelle De Muys-Boucher (IASC); Wendy Cue (IASC), Anna Jaffe (Interaction), Ashley Augsburger (Interaction), Katie Wepplo (UNICEF), Mariska Dekeers (IOM), Marian Casey-Maslen (CDAC), Marina Fernandez Buil (UNICEF), Greta Gamberini (IDA), Sien Andries (HI), Miranda brown (CHS Alliance), Bonaventure Sokpoh (CHS Alliance), Jaqueline Carlson (UNDP), Adelheid Marschang (WHO), Paolo Tartaglia (Intersos), Charles-Antoine Hofmann (UNICEF), Tanya Wood (CHS Alliance), Meghan Sullivan (WFP), Amit Sen (UNHCR), Lina Aggernaes (UNFPA), Alon Plato (ICVA), Yasmine Elbehiery (GPC).

**AGENDA**

1. Meeting Introduction  
2. Review of IASC RG2 2019 Report prior to OPAG Presentation *(due 11th October)*  
4. AoB

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Meeting Introduction**

   *Aim of the meeting:*
   - Discuss the **2019 progress component of the OPAG Report** draft and seek any **changes or additions** from leads of deliverables.
   - Present the **2020 component of the report with proposed indicators** to be discussed and present the **next steps** for finalizing the 2020 workplan.

2. **Review of IASC RG2 2019 Report**

   *Discussion:*
   - **Pag. 10, ‘Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities’:** To be noted that the Guidelines are ‘under endorsement process’.
   - **Point 3, under PSEA Section:** To be noted that discussions, work around Implementing and Acceleration plans, and Interagency Technical Support with PSEA Technical Specialists are ‘ongoing’.
     - *In addition to bringing together technical expertise, there is a need to ensure adequate NGO and INGO participation and contribution of expertise.*
   - **Point 5:** The term ‘outstanding’ needs to be reconsidered. There is ongoing discussion and work to develop a common tool to harmonize standards, to be used by both UN partners to assess their protocols and those of their partners, and for NGO self-assessment. While **expectations might need to be clarified**, the tool is expected to be finalized in the next cycle. At present, a small task team is working to find a **methodology** with which to accept agencies’ assessments based on different tools to the greatest degree possible so as to avoid duplication of labor and effort, and working towards the creation of a **common tool** to facilitate the process in a close future.
• The **final draft** of the report will be finalized on the **9th of October** based on outstanding inputs raised and then shared with the co-chairs and IASC Secretariat to refine any outstanding areas. It will be shared with **OPAG on Friday the 11th of October**, and discussing and presented in the **OPAG Meeting of 7th- 8th November**.

**Action Points:**

• **UNICEF** will provide some additional information regarding field missions.

• (**Point 5**) **UNCHR** will provide a line regarding the ongoing process of developing a common tool to harmonize standards.


• The **2020 IASC RG2 vision**, which focuses on **3 priority areas** to sustain a more integrated approach than that of 2019, brings on board **feedback received** from ERC, OPAG and the IASC Secretariat, which noted:

  ▪ A need to show **transformative change**
  ▪ A need for more **coherence**
  ▪ A need for more **integration** between activities and more integrated plans
  ▪ A need to show the **added value of RG2**
  ▪ A need for **greater focus towards targeted audiences** *(predominantly HCs and HCTs)*

**Discussion:**

The **2020 Priority Areas of Work** and their **Concrete Deliverables** *(problem statement + collective change needed)* have been outlined in an internal document for IASC RG2 members’ operational needs.

• **Point 2, first section, last bullet point:** The **expertise of GBV AOR** in engaging with victims and survivors of PSEA should be further captured. GBV AOR is important at service delivery but also an important point of critical reflection on victim/survivor-centred policies and processes.

• Regarding **‘Quality and Actionable Complaints’**, the **entry point for change or strengthening needs to be clarified**: Is it the reporting mechanism and the humanitarian personnel recording the disclosure (in the sense that they are capacitated and trained to gather the right amount of information optimally, sensitively and successfully); is it the building trust among affected people and encouraging them to make actionable disclosures by proving real zero tolerance towards SEA; or is it both?

• Regarding the **objective ‘Risk of SEA reduced’**: Tools like the IP Protocol approach SEA as a structural phenomenon. To ensure coherence, it should be clearer that the point refers to **what it is done** in a certain environment, not the environment per se.

• **Point 3:** Need for additional discussion with/regarding the **Global Protection Cluster**.

• **Point 2, ‘Accountability and Inclusion’**: Need to expand language on **Inclusion**.

• **Point 1, Ultimate Goal**: Specific and actionable activities and deliverables need to be devised.

• Need to consider **how to approach and engage other actors** while addressing the OPAG/IASC feedback of ‘greater focus towards targeted audiences’.

• **Point 3.3:** Modify ‘response level’ to include ‘**organizational** and response level’

The **parts that specific organizations come to play** in the 2020 Workplan Framework *(colored in red in the shared document)* and **gaps to be yet filled** have been outlined.

• **Point 2.2:** Rewording of ‘investigations funds’ to ‘**investigations pools**’. 
• Reflect in the working plan decisions and processes made at IASC Principal’s level, particularly regarding the implementation and acceleration plan on PSEA, including support to HC and HCTs.
• It is key to operationalize standards into a policy or common approach towards provision of assistance to victims or survivors of SEA.
• Need to ensure compliance with Grand Bargain Indicators to avoid a multiplicity of indicators.
• Rerwording of ‘CFMs’ to ‘Functioning CFMs’, since there can be optimally structured CBCMs and yet very different actual processes of receiving and dealing with information.
• Need to consider data sharing agreements.
• Need to consider a common language in information provision campaigns to ensure they are timely and relevant.
• Attention has been raised towards reducing accountability to accountability mechanisms in RG2 Meetings. There is a need to lift the language and re-engage with concepts framing the Participation Revolution such as participation, engagement, and safeguarding, despite the constraints to concretize them in action plans.

Action Points:
• UNFPA’s Humanitarian Office will review the language used in the ‘Risk of SEA Reduced’ point
• CHS Alliance will send some wording for point 2.2

4. AoB

A small working group will develop an initial draft of the 2020 workplan, including indicators, for sharing with the RG2 group ahead of the next meeting on the 6th November (UNHCR 3-5pm). If anyone would like to join the group please contact Tanya.

Additions and/or changes will be requested before release of its final version at the end of November/start of December.