Meeting two – Wednesday 9th December

Co-chairs/Facilitators: Bradley Mellicker, IOM, Zulfiye Kazim IOM, Nick Lacey, NRC (absent: Hilary Murphy, UNDP, Ismael Frioud, DS advisor for RC/HC office

Attendees: Selected representatives from UN agencies, clusters, working groups and other entities: UNDP, UNMAS, IOM, OCHA, National Protection Cluster (NPC), Shelter/HLP cluster, Technical Coordination Committee for DS for families with a perceived affiliation (TCC), ICRC, UNICEF, UNHCR, CCI, ICCG, UN-Habitat, GIZ, Oxfam, Mercy Corps, REACH Initiative, Sahara Economic Development Organization, Al Tadhamum Iraqi League for Youth, Secours Islamique France

Overview and Agenda

Objective of the meeting, outline outcomes of break-out sessions (see previous meeting), as well as agree on way forward to finalise framework and area-selection. Agenda as follows:

- Introduction – 15 minutes
    - Recap
    - Intro of NGO co-lead and NGO members
- Recap of breakout sessions and next steps– 60 minutes
- Discussion on how groups that are members of DSTWG interact with their membership – 10 minutes
- AOB – 5 minutes

Action Points

1. Framework finalization:
    - Inputs from discussions to be incorporated into framework by Tuesday
    - Will be circulated for feedback/inputs from members (including, as needed, their associated groups), within 1 week
2. Catch up session for NGOs
    - DSTWG chairs to schedule a 'catch up session' for NGOs – Monday
3. Area-based groups
    - Draft ToR to be shared with members for feedback, inputs by Tuesday
    - Initial list of proposed locations and potential focal points to be shared by Monday for comments/finalization
4. Agreed technical discussions:
    - Members to upload relevant technical guidelines to teams, will be reviewed to agree on which to be adjusted for DS objectives or simply reframed/articulated around DS objectives
    - Area based planning guidelines to be prepared by Wednesday (by chairs) for wider discussion
    - Facilitated movements – group to be organized including NPC, IOM, (CCCM also expressed interest) for 'time-bound' task group– can build on guidelines previously prepared by DSN
    - On-going exercise, development of indicators and analysis framework for monitoring progress towards achieving DS outcomes and objectives. Discussions to take place with REACH on way forward– other interested members of the group, please let us know e.g. IOM and NPC. Noted potential linkages with existing groups such as M&E, will first kick-off initial small group discussion with interested DSTWG members

Introduction to new members and co-chair

- Nick Lacey introduced as interim cover for NRC who are now selected co-chairs. Dedicated focal point to be hired as soon as possible.
- NGO reps from selected NGOs introduced (some late arrivals with technical difficulties)
- 'Catch up session' for NGOs to be arranged – was due to take place prior to second meeting but delays in NGO voting process meant it was not feasible.
- Note that new DSTWG teams group set up for ease of sharing documentation and scheduling calls

Outline of Break-Out sessions and Related Discussions

5 break-out sessions convened with groups of 3-4 reps of DSTWG, with other members of DSTWG invited to join depending on availability. Guiding questions provided to each group based on content of operational framework:

- o Group 1: Discussion on individual and area-level support for returnee/areas of return
- o Group 2: Discussion on individual and area-level support for those relocating/integrating
- o Group 3: Discussion on facilitated voluntary movements
- o Group 4: Discussion on area-based planning and coordination
- o Group 5: Discussion on linkages between Humanitarian, DS and Development

Outcomes and summary of each discussion detailed in separate summary document. Key points raised and presented based on discussions are below (while each group had a focused area of discussion, some themes are applicable to all groups and were mentioned in multiple discussions)

Overarching comments:

- Government/local authorities
    - o Need for more details on how components of the framework link with government national planning, specific government entities that can support e.g. compensation committee
    - o Greater emphasis on national ownership of government
    - o Importance of identifying ways to meaningfully engage government counterparts during discussions at area-level
- Need to identify criteria and indicators to measure outcomes and progress towards objectives
- Importance of articulating how each activity specifically addresses a DS objective e.g. what does it mean to do a DS shelter project vs a humanitarian project or development project?
- Need to ensure the framework quantifies and identifies priority groups
- More details needed on prioritization criteria for area-based projects and planning
- Need to explain linkages between objectives given overlap.
- Need more on HLP issues when outlining activities

Additional points per group and linked discussions:

1. *Returns and return areas:* Note on need to acknowledge the shift from one category of group to another e.g. 'support to IDPs in camps' if involving a supported return, would be 'support to IDPs in camps, who will soon become returnees, who will be part of objective 3 (facilitated movement) and objective 1 (support to areas of return) – i.e. as point above, need to note linkages between objectives

2. *Integrating/relocating:*

    a.   Need to emphasise advocacy, awareness, outreach activities that foster social cohesion.

    b.   Recognition that may not be wise to merge the two objectives

    c.   Importance of considering ways to support host community due to potential risk of tension, i.e support to services to absorb increased population numbers

3.   *Facilitated Movements:*

    a.   Two key principles, to be better emphasized in framework: (1) voluntariness (especially in light of camp closures and (2) safety (also linked to security and security clearances, points that has been discussed at length in the context of DS) and dignity

    b.   Could better emphasise the importance of different types of scenarios and categories, rather than just the simplest cases:

        i.   *Scenario: IDPs in a nearby camp, from different and widespread areas of origin*

        ii.   *Scenario: IDPs in a group of nearby camps, all from the same area of origin*

        iii.   *Scenario: IDPs out of camps, spread across the host community, from very different areas of origin/with different intentions of areas they would like to relocate to*

        iv.   *Scenario: IDPs out of camp, in settlements/clusters, from similar areas of origin*

    c.   Range of interpretations of different activites i.e. 'information provision ahead of movements' may be considered differently per org –need more detailed guidelines?

4.   *Area-based planning and coordination – (was discussed in multiple groups):*

    a)   Importance of being focused on the need for area-based *planning,* which subsequently requires some form of *coordination* – objective is not to set up a new area-based coordination mechanism but to link with action/projects - bring together actors who can work jointly on programmes, plan together, work with authorities and 'steer' at area level

    b)   Needs to be accountability to DSTWG and ensure there is guidance from DSTWG on parameters of these groups so they do not all operate very differently and also to ensure they feed info up.

    c)   Important to keep ToR/guidance flexible and non-prescriptive – areas may not be perfectly defined e.g. a project for Sinjar may need actors in dohuk and Sinjar if facilitated returns also

    d)   Scope of work- ensure there is a joint plan, potentially joint approaches as part of the plan e.g. coordinated community sensitization on activities

    e)   Importance of engaging authorities in a meaningful way, recognizing their leadership role – potentially through existing committees or newly established committees who are part of initial planning workshops, who can regularly join meetings, who can outline their commitments. Could conduct stakeholder mapping as part of one of the implementation steps of area-based planning

    f)   Do need response mapping but may need to start with 'quick and dirty' approaches as otherwise this type of work needs dedicated IM –good to have guidelines from DSTWG

    g)   Discussion over proposed 'humanitarian and DS' lead put forward. Was noted that, DS is supposed to be encompassing of all, including humanitarian so may be challenged as to why we need a specific humanitarian co-lead rather than, say, a development co-lead who are also not as well represented. Point made that it is the most established coordination mechanism so this would limit duplication, while at the same time ensure humanitarian voice represented. Proposed that it is kept more flexible, can also simply be humanitarians included in the group, rather than strictly co-leading although was noted that this was a directive of HC and needs to be discussed further.

h) Challenges of engaging development actors noted – often centralized decision making and not often easy for them to engage at area-level, need more engagement with development actors to agree on how best to include.

5. *Linkages with Humanitarian, DS and development*
   a) Continuum of response from humanitarian to durable solutions to development, with each overlapping and not necessarily sequential (moving out of idea of phases)
   b) Aligning priority population groups simplifies the process of bridging humanitarian and DS
   c) Useful to consider how to share info/conduct referrals across 'spectrum of actors'
   d) Need to define the 'transitional approach' to specific activities – links to discussion point above about need for more guidelines to explain, concretely, what it means to have a DS approach to, for example, social cohesion – given it has a time-bound, specific objective of resolving displacement, rather than the broader objectives that social cohesion
   e) Need for more discussion at DSTF level on funding mechanisms
   f) Importance of identifying ways to better link development – cooperation framework is UN specific, what other mechanisms? At very least need more formal link with UNSDCF

DISCUSSION ON WAY FORWARD

Key points to finalise framework and pending discussions:

- Inclusion of all feedback above in framework e.g. More on government role, specific bodies, ministries. Specific points of inclusion e.g. more data on priority groups and targeting, emphasis on voluntariness for movements, more on HLP, distinguishing experiences and challenges of those relocating vs integrating, expansion of notes on transition etc.
- Guideline on scope of work of area groups, details of area-based planning - how to take forward?
- More details on how activities link with DS objectives - need for technical guidelines?
- How to define progress towards/indicators of when DS achieved in Iraq - need to have focused workstream on development of DS indicators?
- More on criteria for area-prioritization/when DS programming conducive- how to agree on areas? (discussed in detail, see next section)

Agreed Next Steps:

1. *Guidelines on scope of work of area groups:* Will develop a ToR with general parameters, noting need for flexibility and adaptability. OCHA had provided a suggestion so that can be adjusted based on the discussion and shared back with the group for finalization

2. *Technical Guidelines:*
   a. Was agreed that we want to avoid creating guidelines unnecessarily, particularly given wealth of information and guidelines that exist on certain topics. Instead, we have three situations:
      i. Instances where we have guidelines in place and applicable to DS as to other objectives e.g. guidelines on supporting replacement of civil documentation
      ii. Cases where we have specific guidelines already but we do need to outline/reframe (as relevant) to explain which components are more geared towards DS objectives e.g. we have shelter guidelines, maybe we need a few paragraphs referring to these

guidelines and explaining how specific activities that are included in shelter programming link with durable solutions.

       iii.   Other cases where the guidelines could be expanded and may not exist e.g. spelling out what we mean by area-based planning in the context of DS (how authorities will be engaged in that process, what the steps entail – particularly with the view to guide area-based groups). Other examples are existing tool kit from DSN on facilitated movements, possibility to adapt and adjust as part of group work.

    b. Agreed that members would share guidelines that may exist/are seen to be relevant, we'll review the material to see which ones we could extract from to outline how they contribute to specific DS objectives and which ones can simply be referenced. Separate smaller group discussions will take place on Facilitated movements, and developing guidelines for area-based planning.

3. *Developing DS indicators/monitoring framework:* Will need to be an on-going workstream as a big task. There are indicator libraries available online, existing data collection tools such as DS questions mainstreamed, in coordination with RWG and DSN, into NPC protection monitoring, DTM Return Index, REACH-RWG Returns and Durable Solutions assessments etc – need to look at existing exercise, look at activities, develop specific indicators. REACH confirmed interest in supporting this activity, as well as NPC and IOM. Others welcome to support, was noted that M&E WG may be able support. Separate discussions will be arranged to move forward.

Area Prioritisation

- General agreement by all groups on broad criteria for 'consideration'
  - Data driven- areas of high return/severity- looking at existing data and how this informs area focus
  - Security and access – is it feasible and safe to work in these locations?
  - Government engagement - how committed are local authorities and government actors as they have a leading role? What is the capacity?
  - Presence/number of actors 'across spectrum'- are there enough actors who are not just humanitarian, not just development and so forth – i.e. to be able to fulfil DS objectives?
- Nevertheless, agreement that we cannot tick all boxes always and can't be too scientific – i.e. how do we measure 'level of government support to DS', need to exercise judgement and look at combination of factors.
- Key note two separate tracks:
  - Track 1: Deciding where we can quickly begin – where we have actors on the ground ready to go, commitment from authorities, access etc
  - Track 2: Defining broad areas that fit general criteria - as we want to ensure we are also advocating for under-served areas, mobilizing to support places in need
- Also noted challenges in data availability – good structured approach to understanding 'severity in return locations' but for objectives which relate to local integration or relocation we do not have a specific index – a lot of research and insights but not the same as a systematic process for identifying locations most in need, except for general numbers of IDPs
- With above in mind, locations were presented from return index, also highlighted according to a previous list OCHA suggested. Based on this list, a table was presented outlining specific 'Track 1' locations and potential focal points

Agreed Next Steps:

- Location list to be circulated for inputs/feedback, as well as for interest to become focal points

Group Representation

Request was made to add this point to the agenda item i.e. how do people who are attending as representatives of groups e.g. ICCG, CCI, TCC, ensure they can 'speak as group representatives'.

Discussion:

- Useful to ensure agenda of meetings shared in advance in case reps can discuss with their group
- Can ensure information flow, forwarding minutes, updating at groups
- For specific activities, can include time/step to ensure group reps can go back to wider group for feedback and inputs e.g. once framework is nearly finalized by DSTWG can be shared out more widely for comments, not just for group reps but other channels, e.g. RWG
- However, was noted that it may need to be limited to key issues, otherwise would significantly delay work of technical group, assumption is that there is some level of empowerment for group reps to be able to speak to issues relating to their group
- Was noted that, for example, if there are discussions on technical guidelines, it would be useful to be able to go to ICCG where there are a lot of clusters who have inputs/available guidelines. Was also noted that the DSWTG does currently have 2 cluster and ICCG so, in this case, it would be most relevant for anything cluster related to go through ICCG, rather than privileging two clusters when others may have related work (e.g. CCCM on facilitated movements).
- Was also noted that some tasks undertaken from the groups can be brought forward to DSTWG as relevant e.g. TCC developing guidelines around reconciliation efforts at local level, can be brought to the group for linkages to DSTWG effort to ensure two-way dialogue

Agreed Next Steps

- Group reps to flag when it is necessary or useful to seek inputs from their group – recognizing need to also ensure group reps feel empowered to represent needs/interests/perspectives of group without consultation for every decision/opinion expressed
- Agendas can be shared in advance to give more opportunity to do so
- Group reps can update own groups, including through more systematic sharing of minutes/ability to forward minutes and outcomes of the DSTWG