Durable Solutions Technical Working Group (DSTWG) – Summary of Meeting
Meeting 15

9 February 2022

Co-chairs: Maanasa Reddy, Yoko Fujimura, Rene Dierkx

Members: DS advisor for RC/HC, FAO, OCHA, ICCG, UNHCR, UN-Habitat, UNMAS, TCC, IOM, WFP, NCCI, Protection Cluster, GIZ, DRC, CLCI, SEDO, Mercy Corps, Shelter Cluster & HLP Sub-cluster, DSTWG support, UNDP

Overview and Agenda

- Tour de Table
- Action Points from January
- General DSTWG Update
- ABC Update
- Presentation by FM sub-Group and CCCM
- A.O.B

Action Points from January 2022

- DSTWG co-Chair: updated activity plans from all 8 ABC's have been shared with IIC. The IIC team will provide feedback on how it can support durable solutions programming and IIC can reach out to DS actors bilaterally for program referrals specifically.

General DSTWG Update

- **DSTWG and ABC TORs:** these were discussed at DSTF (31Jan), followed by DSTF focal discussion (3Feb), specifically on the DS architecture and nexus coordination. A new set of organograms has been developed and shared with DSTF for review/approval.
- **DSTF approval DSTWG work plan:** next step will now be a retreat by ABC Focal Points (Mar7) with DSTWG co-chairs & supports. Since the bulk of the work is happening at the ABC side therefore the focus of the retreat is to ensure that it caters for their needs and interests. Once up-and-running and post-POA planning, we can have a more substantive conversation in retreat form at national level among members
- **Consolidated Coordination Tool:** In online format to gather basic information of ABC and other areas for anyone who has a link to report into it. It is still in-draft form. It has been run past the ABC FPs and we will run it past all the ABC partners who will using or reporting into it. Beside details of the report, someone's name and contact reporting into it will be recorded, as well as the referral organization in order to gain insight into the information comes from and where it is going to. Apart from this there are various drop-down menus: including sector of concern, description of gap/issue/need (specifically larger-scale gaps, issues and needs as opposed to individual-level), and geographical information (governorate – up to village level) as well as the GPS coordinates. The former is for the external side.

  For the internal side we have the ABC group responsible, the focal point referral, date assigned, agency responsible, progress and status. The flow chart shows how on the input side the information comes in and flows to district/governorate level and onwards to national level, the DSTWG would tag the relevant ABCs and send the content relevant to them to the respective focal point. In case there are no partners at the ABC level that can assist for resolve we can go to the local Government counterpart to seek assistance and if the Government has seen the gap and has plans to address the same. In case neither a partner at ABC level nor local Government is able/has plans to assist, it will be brought in during the bi-annual revision of the plans of action (POAs). If the issue is beyond the ABC level it can be scaled up to DSTWG level and other national level partners to see if we can address and resolve the issue. If not resolved, we can consolidate and scale it up to DSTF - on a monthly basis - to look into the issue and advice.

Remarks, Discussion and Q&A

- **NRC – On the input side, who is providing information?** 🗨 anyone who has information and who would like to give and report it through the online tool as long as one has the link which will be distributed widely.

- **NRC – Does information go straight to the ABC i.e., what is the flow of data-management?** 🗨 DSTWG and DSO would go through the excel and review and assess which information is relevant and for which ABC. The ABC will receive the information either in excel or another format. In this context all ABCs are done, and we are waiting for the endorsement of the TORs before we open up each of the ABCs which means any person/entity operating in the area would then become part of the ABC once they provide us (DSTWG and ABC) with their details they will be able to coordinate on all of these issues and across the other coordination mechanisms. If at ABC level a resolve cannot be found if will be scaled up to the DSTWG level and, if needed to DSTF level.

- 🗨 **DS advisor to DSRSG/RC/HC:** At the ABC level multiple options can be taken at the local level: it is all about sharing of information. If no local entity is able to respond the issue can be brought to the attention of the Governorate level as ultimately to find a resolve is the responsibility of the Government. In addition, you can go to the longer-term option such as through the DSTWG and even the DSTF for these levels to look into the issue and identify actors who will be able to respond. One additional point, the ABCs are now open to all to become members: the system will be like this that basically we will not be vetting at the entrance but there will be criteria to fulfill once you are participating in the ABC in order to maintain your focal point or membership status. There is consensus on this issue at DSTF level and once the TORs have been finalized this aspect will be captured in the clauses. We are going to do the coordination at the ABC level hence this is the time now to start expanding.

- **UNHCR:** Do we have actual plans and targets in the different plans of actions in the ABCs (since once we have this, we are able to identify the gaps)?

- **UNHCR:** How to ensure that the sharing of information that comes in as gaps being identified is then reported to this structure (the humanitarian coordinator has stated clearly that the ABCs are the way forward but currently we have a humanitarian cluster system in place. Humanitarian actors are also members of the ABCs but thus far we have not de-activated the Cluster system)?

- 🗨 **DS advisor to DSRSG/RC/HC:** We are currently developing guidance and way forward for the ABCs to do the coordination in-practice and that is very much about looking at the information we have, identifying the needs/gaps as in the POAs but also looking at the type of activities that are planned to be/or being implemented, looking at the type of sectors that are not present or underserved, in order to pre-identify the potential gaps and needs. At the local level members participate in both mechanisms: cluster and ABCs and they communicate hence, they can make the link and share information and data

- **GIZ:** humanitarian system and development system often have different principles for example on how we are going to identify beneficiaries or the data that we work with, or how we rely on data. The tools & mechanisms being developed make if difficult for development partners to link up with. If the DS mechanism is linking both humanitarian and development phase, then it needs to look into how it will link well to the development side.

- 🗨 **DS advisor to DSRSG/RC/HC:** we have multiple mechanisms working with different methodologies, and where that coordination is to take place is at the ABC level. Development actors will also be able to use the tool for example, a development actor is implementing road construction

and becomes aware of cases of child labor. This can be reported using the tool and response can be sought through actors that are specialized such as protection actors to come in, examine the case and look for ways for resolve

- **IOM**: I wonder if referrals are being collected on sensitive topics such as child labor what is the data sharing protocol and data protection protocol, the DSTWG is going to undertake or information sharing protocol?
- 🗨 **DS advisor to DSRSG/RC/HC:** firstly, we do not dig into individual cases and do not seek that individual information at all. For example, protection already has a referral system that exists so the ABC system may not be needed for this. Secondly, we do not seek personal details and that is something between agencies and not under the ABC's control. The 'referral' is basically a request for support between agencies and inviting partners to look into it. There is well-developed child protection system that exists, and we are not aiming to replicate that at all.

ABC Update and DSTWG sub-Group updates

ABC Update:

ABC Hawiga   An inter-agency fact-finding mission took place on Jan 25. Meeting was held with deputy mayor and council members at the municipality building with discussion on what the local Government is doing and how partners and actors can come in and assist and complement their efforts. Furthermore, the POA partner feedback has been consolidated and an extract of the POA for Arabic translation and consultation is now available. Finally, the community consultations started in 11 locations this week and will finish coming week

ABC Sinjar   The ABC Group is awaiting to receive feedbacl by Government on the final POA

ABC Ba'aj   The location analysis is finalized and will be shared with WFP for their mapping services

ABC SAD   **Follow up is needed**

ABC Mosul: The POA is now going for a second round of comments and will be shared more widely through the respective channels. By the week of 27 Feb, the draft is to be ready for presentation. The ABC mid-Feb meeting was postponed to the week of 27 Feb to enable the DSRSG/DC/HC the opportunity to participate as the first draft of the plan of action will be presented

ABC Diyala: Follow up is needed

ABC East Anbar: Group met to discuss the roll out of the community consultations. Call for expression of interest for the 2nd Focal Point role has been shared. Submission is by Feb 21.

ABC West Anbar: Location analysis will need to be looked into

POA status update, roll out of the community consultations and the list of initial target locations are available in the PPT for reference.

Remarks, Discussion and Q&A

- **UNHCR**: do you share any update on the proposed expansion of the ABC Hawiga? 🗨 the FPs of the ABC Hawiga will have a conversation with the DSTWG in the last week of Feb on how to make that transition. We will need some more guidance from the DSTF and hope to be fully on its way by Mar

DSTWG sub-Group updates:

Housing and HLP: we have presented the work plan on what we will be working on. A guidance note is being prepared on HLP to look into the various types of housing, what is adequate housing, what are the housing and property rights, international principles re HLP and Iraqi Law, Iraqi constitution, and Iraqi Civil Code. The guidance note will also highlight the various categories of properties and we have studied the Civil Code to identify some other sub-categories and we will make linkages to the Durable Solutions and how to achieve DS in Iraq. On

housing, we have also reached out to Shelters actors and are preparing a guidance note on housing as well. Finally, the members' list and their contacts will be shared.

Facilitated Movement: updates will be shared during the presentation by the CCCM Cluster

Monitoring & Assessment: the presentation will be given in the next DSTWG meeting after we have received all comments and feedback from sub-group members re the output level indicators.

Social Cohesion: there was discussion on a plan for a round table on screening, rehabilitation, and reintegration process in Iraq. Update on the situation in NE Syria, and Jedda Al1, and Returns. Since May there were four waves of Returns from Al-Hol and we have drafted some advocacy points on that and proposing a coordination structure between NE Syria and Iraq on Returnees by end of this month. We had a presentation on various cases of Return from West-Anbar on cases of Return Families. We had invited the Focal Points of the ABC West and East Anbar to the meeting that was being held with the Government Committee that is leading on Al-Hol return and with community leaders of Anbar. The first meeting was for all areas and the second one we had IOM and the ABC FPs participating as well to strengthen coordination efforts among the different actors

Presentation by FM sub-Group and CCCM Cluster and Discussion

Presentation on: Informal Sites: Supporting Linkages to Resolve Displacement.

- Today we present some of the work that the Facilitated Movement sub-Group has been doing to compile information on the preferences and barriers of IDPs in informal sites for resolving their displacement. Our goal is how this information can be integrated into durable solutions
- Therefore, the objective is to engage DS actors in an initiative to integrate informal site level information into programming and coordination aimed at supporting access to durable solutions pathways by:
  - o Share ongoing work to compile info on DS preferences & barriers for IDPs living in informal sites
  - o Discuss if/how this info can be integrated into DS coordination & planning
  - o Agree how this info can be used to link informal site populations with DS actors and activities
- Informal site overview:
  - o 477 informal sites/17.416 HHs/ 103,005 individuals
  - o Sites dispersed across 44 districts in 17 Governorates
  - o Population living in informal sites increased in 2021 in Ninewa. Primarily 2ndary displacement due to returns, camp closure and secondary displacement
  - o Characteristics: sub-standard, share facilities & services, 5+ HHs living together, displaced post-2014, lack of informal management, locations not developed to host IDPs
- Background: Informal site populations typically vulnerable with mixed barriers to return; risk factors to poor living conditions and risk of re-displacement; CCCM partners in informal sites in Ninewa, SAD, Anbar, Baghdad, and Kirkuk; CCCM is well-positioned with community engagement and data collection functions, incl AoO and intentions
- Approach: Facilitated Voluntary Return (FVR) prepared a **Prioritization Matrix** to share CCCM, solutions-oriented data with DS actors. 36 sites/areas profiled so far (8 districts/11 sub-districts); CCCM cluster also developing site level **Response Profiles** for priority sites, basic site & population outline, eviction context, needs, intentions and preferences to return, integrate or relocate and assistance required to enable this
  - o Prioritization Matrix has 3 components: site info, DS profile (preferences, return potential, potential for local integration, relocation potential) and, reporting contact details/follow up
  - o Site information: each site is facing regular threats of (high) eviction) risk
  - o DS profile – **site preferences** are broken down in a majority preference and secondary preference for example the group where 50% is interested in integration and 50% interested in return (return potential, local integration potential and relocation potential) with integration for

example preferred when assistance is being provided. Also, re relocation potential, there are drivers and impediments to facilitate relocation such as rehabilitation of the access road to a village and the construction of houses

- o Reporting contact details and follow up

- **Response** – for example: **Balad Train Station, SAD**
  - o General site context: 101 HHs/432 Individuals. All residents were 2ndary displaces from previous camp closure; 1st wave Feb 2018 previously living in camp in Baghdad; 2nd wave Sep 2020, displaced in from Al Eshaqi Camp (SAD) when it closed. AoO – Al Farhatea village (SAD)
  - o Shelter types: caravan, train station buildings (2), school, tent, houses
  - o Land agreement & eviction: verbal agreement only between IDPs and various landowners – longstanding eviction threat most seriously targeting families in railway station
  - o Areas of Origin: 17 HHs (Mahata Balad, blocked); 5 HHs (Tal Al Thahab, blocked); 40 HHs (Al Farhateaa, open); 39 HHS (Said Gareeb, open), total 101 HHs
  - o Intentions, Barriers to Return: 31 HHs want to return but require shelter, livelihoods assistance, and basic services; 4 HHs want to local integrate but require livelihoods and shelter assistance
  - o Key Service Provision Needs / Concerns: income generation, shelter improvement; 44 HHs, uncertain but would relocate not return if forced; 22 HHs from blocked areas
  - o Hum. Action Plan: contingency planning those a high risk of eviction, link with DS assistance
  - o Durable Solutions Linkages: No ABC mechanism, UNHCR planning to support Said Gareeb with water, irrigation, electrical

Remarks, Discussion and Q&A

- **DS advisor to DSRSG/RC/HC:** on point 4: in locations without an ABC how can information sharing on informal site take place between humanitarian and DS actors? The ABCs will be focusing on locations that are in the plans of action, we are working on opening up the discussion at The Governorate level so those are locations that can be brought to the ABCs
- **IOM:** Some of the informal sites have a mixed population and the ABCs currently break down the categories between IDPs, vulnerable host communities, and vulnerable returnees. Does the data in the matrix also flag these other populations in a site? 🗨 The goal has been for now to obtain the basic data on the preferences of the people to leave the site, but this could be something for further consideration we have not looked at host community populations as of yet because of this overarching goal of the tool
- **OCHA**: Question for DS actors: how do you see from the durable solutions side the level of coordination between the Areas of Displacement and the ABCs that are in the Areas of Return? 🗨 We very much understand that partners do feed into and are aligned to the ABCs and with the POAs but as organisations they have independent mechanisms for defining and identifying their priority programs and their priority target areas, so we are really keen to understand to what extend and how the organisations have the fluidity to integrate these needs or referrals. We are conscious of the risks of establishing new mechanisms and sharing more information without a clear understanding for the sort of demonstrated need and use as confirmed by partners that are actually expected to respond to all these needs kind of thrown out there. So, we understand the ABCs and the POAs are key elements of the DS structure but from partners as well we would love to get some feedback. Hope we can get some inputs from partners
- **ICRC:** I am not sure if we need an additional mechanism, but definitely, if we are aware that for example Balad Station we are involved or we are close by, I think if the information is available, we can maybe discuss it with the DS, with the Group and then maybe include in some project or activities that are going

on for example. Based on such information, it is feasible, but than to be seen with others. Point taken, in terms of the area-level engagement that already happens between a lot of partners who are already implementing in different sectors in these areas. The solutions are definitely at the area level with partners that have a history of engagement in the area whether in the IDP location or the potential Return Areas. We hope that this initial presentation will trigger some bilateral connections and sharing of information that previously did not exist and with the DSTWG we can discuss how this information is best shared regularly for identification of common areas and the ABC is maybe a mechanism for that.

- **UNHCR:** (to the DSTWG co-chairs) how can we move forward, and with the mechanisms - so it will be wonderful to have your feedback on this? This may require some more bilateral discussions and these may start with the individual Clusters and I can imagine that we will be check in with the FM as well to see how we can either request for certain types of data or data that is available to support the ABCs and to what extend we can have more substantive conversations here but I do think it is important to reflect that there are only 5 operational actors in this group so we prefer to have the operational discussions at the ABC level but we can discuss the actors that come to certain types of meetings or have ad-hoc meetings and look more at the operational arms of the organisations that are represented here. I also think that it requires a bit of negotiation between us and the negotiators of the various sub-Groups, Cluster and ABC to really think about on how these populations are integrated at the ABC level and if it is entirely possibly given that the ABC are limited in geographic scope

AOB

- N/A

Action Points

- The minutes will be shared along the Informal Sites presentation, the DSTWG presentation, and the Consolidated Coordination Tool