



Inter-Agency
Coordination
Turkey



**Protection Working Group Meeting
Ankara
21 March 2017**

Participants: UNFPA, GiZ, ASAM, UNDP, UNICEF, IOM, CARE, NRC, UNHCR

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

- The taxonomy for the service mapping has been finalised and has been translated in Arabic, Turkish and other languages. Data entry will be piloted in Istanbul for Government services. Then NGO service providers will be approached to include their data.
- ECHO Individual Protection Assistance (IPA): partners are trying to harmonize what the IPA can mean in the context of Turkey; need to harmonize the different approaches to case management as well between partners. Case Management Group in Gaziantep is looking into this.
- CARE is developing its model that can be shared with others.
- ECHO has developed a protection framework that will be an annex to the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP); can leave room for interpretation, hence the need to exchange more with ECHO and to harmonize amongst partners;
- Based on the discussion and different elements brought by partners, we could develop an Inter-Agency common approach/model.

Action point:

- CARE to share their model for IPA and Case management;
- Invite ECHO to the next PWG

Agenda Item 2: ActivityInfo update

- First round of data entry covering January and February
- Good level of data entry from partners
- Feedback from partners on what indicators work or not, those that need clarification, is important so we can improve the M&E framework for the sector.
- Some issues reported:
 - o lack of harmonization on age breakdown, including for ECHO reporting
 - o all language activities are to be reported under the Education sector, even if conducted in Community Centers
 - o households vs families reporting is confusing
- We will review the M&E Framework after the first round and once the first dashboard is published.
- The first dashboard will include January and February
- Quarterly dashboard is to be published in April with some narrative; request will be sent out to partners to send some contribution; data on progress will be extracted from Activity Info
- Visibility on dashboard is optional; partners to confirm whether they are ok with their logo to be put on the dashboard

Action point: Protection partners to inform about their wish for visibility or not on the sector dashboards.

Agenda Item 3: Priority areas for harmonization of activities

- Case management is understood and implemented differently; case management is not Special Needs Funds. This could be an area for harmonization, especially in light of the Individual Protection Assistance (IPA) promoted by ECHO.
- No guidance exist from the Government on case management; at the municipal level, there is more exchange and referrals can work.
- UNICEF experience shows that MoU (or something in writing) is necessary to have at the local level to make referrals
- Outreach work: different modalities are used but mainly Refugee Outreach Volunteers (ROVs) and mobile teams doing either door to door visits, organizing group sessions, making interventions in schools, etc
- The objectives can differ but it is mainly about making public information available to refugees
- Messages are not necessarily harmonized and most organizations have developed their own; risk that the messages are not the same and not in line with existing system in Turkey which would add to the confusion
- Refugees rely heavily on social media but there is also a lot of misinformation
- It would be useful to harmonize the models and to develop methodology for the different models
- For instance, CARE has 9 modules on different thematic areas for messages to be passed to the community but the messages need contextualization
- Agree on minimum standards, common principles and standard messages to be passed
- Communication with Communities (CwC) task force being set up in the SE to look into the messages and to collect different information material being used currently
- We need to refer also to messages developed by the Government, even if there are only a few (DGMM, MoFSP)
- Difference in the use of ROVs and their status is creating difficulties for NGOs when being audited by GoT administration; although volunteering a few hours per week, they are considered by the administration as working and therefore it is expected that their paper work, benefits, etc are in line with Turkish labor legislation.
- The position of DGMM and MoFSP needs to be better understood in these areas of work

Action point:

- CARE, UNHCR and ASAM to share their model for outreach work to see if a common approach or minimum standards can be extracted from those
- Link closely with CwC task force in Gaziantep about information dissemination and standardization of messages
- Look into the status of Refugee Outreach Volunteers

Next meeting: **Tuesday 16 May**, 14:00, at UNHCR office (Cinnah).