

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

### Meeting three – Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup>

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

Attendees: 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, Oxfam, Mercy Corps, REACH Initiative, Al Tadamum Iraqi League for Youth, Secours Islamique France

### Overview and Agenda

Following sharing of a) ToRs for area-based groups b) initial priority locations for discussions c) draft area-level planning guidelines, the meeting was focused on a more in-depth discussion on the processes involved in area-level planning i.e. what area-level groups will be doing in the agreed locations.

- Review of Action Points & Update
- Area-Level Planning
- Initial Area prioritisation
- AOB

### Action Points

1. Will share updated framework for inputs – by early next week
2. Area-based groups – extended deadline for review of ToR Monday COB
3. Inputs on additional areas to target for area-based approaches are welcome
4. Area based planning guidelines to be updated and shared based on discussion
5. Will recirculate link for technical discussion on facilitated movements

### Re-cap of previous action points

1. Framework finalization: Inputs from discussions to be incorporated into framework by Tuesday by chairs/group lead. Will be circulated for feedback/inputs from members (including, as needed, their associated groups), within 1 week –**PENDING**
2. Catch up session for NGOs – **COMPLETE**
3. Area-based groups. Draft ToR to be shared with members for feedback. Initial list of proposed locations and potential focal points to be shared by Monday for comments/finalization **CIRCULATE**
4. Agreed technical discussions:
  - Members to upload relevant technical guidelines to teams – will then review - **PENDING**
  - Area based planning guidelines to be prepared by Wednesday (by chairs) for wider discussion in group -**COMPLETE**
  - Facilitated movements – group to be organized including NPC, IOM, (CCCM also) for ‘time-bound’ task - can build on guidelines previously prepared by DSN –**SUNDAY 2PM**
  - On-going exercise, development of indicators and analysis framework for monitoring progress towards achieving DS outcomes and objectives – **ON-GOING**

### Area- Level Planning

See presentation for full break-down – overview of draft guidelines on area-level planning shared. Discussion summarized below.

General comments:

- No major comments on the steps/process – agreed it will need to be adjusted slightly by area
- Need for more details and guidance on IM, response mapping – currently not clear how this will be completed, especially for volunteer focal points. Need DSTWG to have IM capacity and for this capacity to be able to provide support/guidance of general templates for area-level groups if they are doing any response mapping.
- Discussion over what info/IM needs there would be at area-level – e.g. IM system is a national effort, at area level we need to build on data that exists from other working groups at area level and compliment rather than duplicate
- Generally need to add more on level of support DSTWG will be able to provide to certain steps:
  - o Including sensitizing stakeholders/training on DS
  - o IM
  - o Engagement with authorities
  - o Provision of templates for things such as response mapping
- Was noted that much of this work will build on previous lessons learned, approaches adopted, and general efforts to develop governorate level plans of action, including support from RWG team members who have been doing a lot of related work on roundtables etc i.e. this team will increasingly support as RWG *and* DSTWG collectively (particularly as some of this work has now been formally brought under DSTWG) – currently the RWG has focal points in KRI, Ninewa/Kirkuk and Centre south, as well as the teams they oversee.

Comments on specific steps:

1. Assigning Focal Points to chair groups: Was noted that this could be a lot of work for focal points, need to look at support they could receive and what we can realistically expect from them. A key factor in where we can realistically begin these processes is where we have focal points to engage. Was noted that it may be appropriate to have government co-chairs in some situations, we need to decide on a case-by case basis where this may be suitable but should not exclude this option. Focal points do not need to be from organisations sitting in the DSTWG, may need to actively reach out based on awareness of active partners on the ground.
2. Stakeholder identification –including members of the group: In terms of members of area-level groups, was noted that these are not necessarily all actors that contribute to DS, more like a steering/coordination group that will work with existing bodies and government counterparts. Whether government actors included in the group or separate committee will depend on the location and identified stakeholders. In some locations, which are smaller, all stakeholders may sit within these groups i.e. no need for identifying who to engage when limited actors. Was noted that we generally need to adjust to government ways of working e.g. need to ensure government counterparts that can steer, influence, guide other key stakeholders, issue directives. Need to also mirror certain government approaches, i.e. use letters to summarise key decisions that are stamped/endorsed by local authority counterparts.
3. Developing a common understanding of DS scope of work and planning approach: Will need to also consider the many local actors that could benefit from general sensitization to DS approaches, while also balancing with the need to have more focused efforts on working with local authorities and key decision makers (rather than all possible stakeholders) to agree on ‘what we mean by a DS plan’.
4. Context analysis: Importance of drawing upon existing information rather than gathering information that exists.

5. Community consultations: Agreed that we should build on information that exists rather than consulting again on issues such as obstacles etc if known. However, useful to build in a step for 'validation' of targets approaches to achieving DS – definitely need general community engagement and participation in development of individual activities but for overall plan also. If gaps identified through context analysis, can have focused efforts to consult community/gather new information.
6. Identifying Targets, developing plan and monitoring: Question of how would define indicators – is this linked to work conducted by DSTWG to define indicators for measuring progress towards durable solutions vs indicators required to measure progress of specific activities within the plan e.g 'target for rehabilitation of key infrastructure and associated mile-stones/monitoring approaches'.
7. Reporting and Communication: Reiteration of point on need for clarity on IM, not just general reporting and communication on progress. Unlikely to have dedicated IM for each group.

Agreed that these points would be reflected in updated version of an area-planning document. Also recognize that we will need to try out approaches and feedback on lessons learned.

### Area Prioritization

List of locations previously shared were presented again for any comments. Discussion:

- Areas chosen not exhaustive, the proposed list presented was based just on where we have some actors who can support area-level approaches, where we can proceed. Noted that we could better articulate rationale for choices
- Could still have a longer list of locations we think are priorities based on data – i.e. not just where we can begin but where else are important
- List shared by HC previously largely reflected, if missing, simply as awaiting any potential focal points to drive processes in those areas
- Clarification that in one or two locations which state OCHA as a focal point, this is based on a list provided by OCHA on potential priority locations but agreed would need a DS partner to 'co-chair' or lead DS driven conversations.
- Distinction between area-level coordination groups that have been highlighted by OCHA recently as existing already and where there is potential to move forwards with localized approaches vs reduced list of locations identified where there is potential to steer/guide/lead area-based DS plans

Agreed to reshare list for further inputs and will be kept 'live', but ready to proceed in some areas based on pre-existing work e.g. example of roundtables in Ninewa and KRI and linkages to Sinjar area-group noted.

### Wrap Up

- Action points stated above
- Frequency of meetings will reduce in new year – have pushed through several meetings prior to 'quiet Dec/Jan' period – i.e. 3 meetings in 4 weeks for this reason
- New year priorities to continue with defining aspects of above – including IM system, indicator development on progress towards DS and clarifying level of support DSTWG can/should provide to area-level processes
- Framework will also be finalized as soon as possible but will still be space in new year in case any pending comments/issues after circulation in next week