

**Protection Working Group Meeting  
UNHCR Country Office – Ankara  
21 February 2017**

Participants: IOM, Expertise France, UNICEF, IMC, Mercy Corps, ASAM, UNFPA, UNHCR, IMPR, WFP, TRC

**Agenda Item 1: Review and Update on the last meeting minutes/Action Points**

- The link was shared for the interactive map developed based on the 4Ws.
- Regarding the services mapping, the initial step is to decide on the taxonomy. Considering the extent of the services, it is not an easy task. A first draft has been produced with input from several organizations. After the finalization of the taxonomy, data entry will start by each organizations.
- A protection workshop had been held in Gaziantep to work on the strategy of the group using the results of the participatory assessment.
- Protection working group in Izmir continues focusing on access to registration, services, education and health.
- Protection actors in Istanbul held their first meeting with a wide participation. Local authorities, especially Provincial Directorate of Family and Social Policy (PDoFSP), will also be included in this structure.
- A *dropbox* account has been created for the protection sector as a single source of information. In that close group, all protection related materials can be shared on demand such as meeting minutes, leaflets or guidance documents. All protection partners should feel free to contribute to the PWG Dropbox, especially to share information dissemination materials and guidance tools.

Action point: All Protection Sector partners are kindly requested to provide feedback on the taxonomy, so that data entry process can begin. Draft taxonomy will be shared in the upcoming days.

**Agenda Item 2: Endorsement of Referral Hubs**

- Protection referrals are generally made on an ad-hoc basis based on personal contacts and existing info of who does what where. The main reason behind creation of the referral hubs is to identify the entry point for referrals and to make referrals easier. Depending on the will of the institutions/agencies, they can be appointed as the entry point. They do not necessarily have to deal with the case management. Simply, receiving the initial referral, taking action on it based on internal capacity or forwarding it to another organization will be the core duty.
- Deciding on a single entry point for the referrals will also facilitate the tracking of the referral patterns.
- There are many different referral forms containing similar information in different formats. We are proposing a single inter-agency referral form to ensure the harmony and limit the number of forms to be filled.
- Considering the volume of the caseload, defining the boundaries of roles and responsibilities among UN agencies and other partners is crucial. Real capacities of the State institutions should be considered and how we collectively support the increase of capacity of these institutions.
- Contact outside of working hours and/or for urgent cases needs to be indicated.

- If the system works in the South-East region, it can be extended to other regions such as Ankara and Izmir. Colleagues in South-East are working on the draft list to identify the agencies as entry points.
- The idea of the referral hubs is supported by the PWG members.

Action point: circulate the up to date Referral Hubs draft from South East.

### **Agenda Item 3: Endorsement of the Service Feedback Tool**

- Through the service feedback tool prepared by the South East group, systematic collection of obstacles/difficulties faced is aimed. By now, collection of complaints was dispersed and undocumented which prevented the identification of real bottlenecks and therefore limited the advocacy efforts in the absence of concrete elements. Through this systematic way, issues will be compiled and analyzed as a whole. Although directly reaching the responsible body might be more effective in some cases, obtaining information regarding the systematic deficiencies enhance our credibility vis-a-vis government authorities.
- Specific comments on the tool:
  - o In the intro paragraph, explain when this form should or not be used (examples shared related to cases of corruption or PSEA); make a reference to existing complaint mechanisms in line with this.
  - o Inclusion of municipal services, as opposed to state services available in provinces, was suggested.
  - o Questions were raised about the follow up based on the info collected: will it be done at the provincial/district level, and by whom? Or at the national level only? By whom? What is the feedback back to those who reported issues?
  - o What is the critical mass of respondents before we consider a problem has been identified?
  - o Will the tool be available in other languages than English?
  - o Suggest adding Civil Registry offices in the list
  - o Suggest adding a line "other" at the bottom of the list.

Action point: lead of the PWG will follow up with colleagues in Gaziantep to share and address these comments.

### **Agenda Item 4: Update on Activity Info Roll Out**

- The database for Activity Info has been created based on the sector's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. As a refresher, the M&E Framework will be re-circulated. Some agencies have already nominated focal points for Activity Info and the first training took place in the previous week. Missing focal points will be individually followed up.
- Activity Info will be wider than solely 3RP. Partners will be able to report against both appeals (3RP and RMRP) as well as on activities not included in any appeal.
- In case of any difficulty in the data entry process, Information Management or Activity Info focal points will be ready to support.

Action point: lead of the PWG to re-circulate the M&E Framework for the sector (also available in the Dropbox)

### **Agenda Item 5: Update on Case Management**

- ECHO is introducing Individual Protection Assistance (IPA) scheme in Turkey and has stopped funding Special Needs Fund (SNF). IPA aims at supporting intervention with a clear protection outcome (example: registration, fees to get official documents notarized, etc). There is no exhaustive list of such interventions.
- IPA is not another name for SNF or case management but IPA can be supportive of an intervention in case management.
- Protection partners have been invited to help define the scope of interventions of the IPA. The case management group in Gaziantep is brainstorming on this.

Action point: chair of the PWG to liaise with colleagues in Gaziantep to discuss the scope of the IPA

### **Agenda Item 6: Participatory Assessment – Initial Findings**

- Presentation on the initial results of the participatory assessments will be shared among the partners. The report will be finalized by the next month.

Action point: Presentation to be circulated to participants and report to be shared when finalized.

Next meeting: Tuesday 21 March, 14:00, at UNHCR office (Cinnah).