



Jordan: Inter-Sector Working Group (ISWG) Meeting Minutes: 19th September 2013

AGENDA

1. Review of previous meeting Action Points
2. ISWG Update : Points for the IATF/HCT
3. RRP6 Launch:
 - Strategic Objectives / Planning Figures
 - Prioritization Categories
 - Templates
 - Next Steps
4. Co-Chair Proposal from the INGO Forum
5. AOB

REVIEW OF ACTION POINTS FROM 19th AUGUST ISWG MEETING

Action	Responsible	Status
Draft a ToR for the group and circulate for comments before the next meeting.	IS Coordinator	Pending
Sector survey results will be processed into a general report.	UNHCR	Completed
Compile the survey comments as a 'Lessons Learnt' document on the RRP5, and send around to the ISWG for comments, before submission to the UNHCR Regional Office.	UNHCR	Completed
Send comments on Sector monthly reporting format to Inter-Sector Co-ordinator.	Sector chairs	Completed
Attend review sessions for the IASC GBV Guidelines	Sector chairs	Completed
Sector chairs to roll out the monthly sector reporting format, noting the caveats above.	Sector chairs	Completed

The Inter-Sector Co-ordinator (IS Co-ordinator) confirmed that a draft ToR has been prepared for the group and will be circulated as soon as possible.

The sector survey results have been sent individually to sector chairs. The complete results can be found on the data portal.

The monthly reporting format was confirmed and the deadline for the monthly reporting was set as the 8th October.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

ISWG Update: Points for the IATF/HCT

ISWG update document was distributed at the beginning of the meeting.



Some parts of the ISWG update did not have current information. Sector chairs agreed to send the relevant information as soon as possible to the IS Coordinator. Sector chairs have until Monday 23rd September to add, edit, or correct the ISWG update document.

The IS Coordinator confirmed that the IATF/HCT and sector chairs were the intended audience of the update, although it is posted on the portal. Sector chairs should disseminate the update to the rest of their working group at their discretion.

Discussion focused on which issues the ISWG wishes to raise at IATF/HCT level for this month. The ISWG agreed to include one point on the RRP6 process; and a second point on the host community platform. There was not time to discuss the latter in detail. Some participants felt that it should be raised as a serious concern (lack of consultation etc); others felt that there were no major concerns with the platform. One participant suggested that Strategic objective 5 of the RRP6 should emphasize the link with the host community platform.

RRP6 Launch

The RRP6 Jordan conference on the 15th September focused on three issues:

1. Process and calendar.
2. Agreeing Planning figures - and the underlying assumptions on which these are based.
3. Agreeing Strategic objectives for Jordan.

The draft Planning projections and Strategic Objectives were presented to the ISWG. Final comments should be made by 23rd September to IS Coordinator.

Comments made in the meeting included:

- Regarding prioritization, the distinction between refugees in camps, vulnerable refugees in urban areas, resilience and development was emphasized. The meaning of 'vulnerable refugees', it was suggested, could be different to each sector.
- The logic of the objectives 2, 3 and 4, was to reflect the different approaches to assisting refugees in camps, in urban and host communities.
- On Objective 1: Several members questioned the meaning of 'participatory manner' and requested further definition of this term. It referred to beneficiary participation. Merrin Waterhouse agreed to come up with more specific wording on this objective.
- On Objective 3: To take out the list of separate sectors.
- On Objective 5: 'Ensure coordination' was not considered appropriate language; 'Strengthen Linkages' was an alternative.
- On Objective 5: What outcomes at sector level will link to this objective? The suggestion was made to incorporate language pertaining to coordination across the rest of the objectives without having a separate objective for coordination. However some members felt strongly that coordination with development initiatives is a crucial issue which deserves explicit mention in a separate objective, even if no funding is explicitly tied to this objective at the sector level.

Figures

A planning figure of 800,000 refugees by end 2014 has been proposed. An alternative figure of 1,000,000 was mooted. The limitations to the accuracy of either figure were recognized.



To reflect the evident uncertainty, a review process is being built into RRP6. The review will be triggered either on a fixed date (e.g. April 2014) or in reaction to a considerable change in numbers or the operating environment.

WASH sector requested figures on the target Jordanian population, as Lebanon has done in the past. The group then discussed the logic for estimating a number of host population to be assisted and for estimating the number of refugees who will be out of camp.

The current division of 75% out of camp and 25% in camp was maintained. For a total of 800,000 refugees by end 2014, this would mean 600,000 will be out of camp and 200,000 in camp.

For calculating the total of host population to be assisted, a conservative figure of 30% of the total refugee population out of camp (600,000) was proposed, or 180,000 persons. The logic was linked to the government requirement of 30% of total beneficiaries being Jordanians in any projects proposed.¹

It was agreed that these figures had to be discussed with the Government of Jordan (MoPIC), before confirmation. The host community population in particular is likely to be questioned.

Prioritisation categories

The group reviewed the three 'prioritization' categories – Most Critical / life-saving; Critical to prevent deterioration of vulnerabilities, and Capacity Building / Resilience - and there was a largely favourable response. There was a recommendation by some in the group to guide donors into allocating funds, primarily into the 3rd category. Others felt that there should be the greatest proportion of funds in categories 2 and 3, with category 1 reserved for emergency response. Some members raised the possibility of having some capacity-building activities across all three categories.

It was agreed that sectors could work out the interpretation of the 3 categories at the sector level. However, during the sector plan review process after 15th October, broad consistency between sectors will be encouraged.

A concern was raised over whether the government and the humanitarian community have the same understanding of the term 'resilience'. The IS Coordinator will raise the definition of resilience with the government.

Review of tables for inputting information

The two primary tools for inputting data at partner and sector level were presented. The first is the Sector Matrix at output level, which will be published in the RRP6. The second is a Sector level input matrix at activity level, which partners will fill in. Both are tools which Lebanon will also be using.

For Jordan, under the targeted population there will also be a breakdown of boys, men, women, and girls. The IS Coordinator suggested that this data was available for most project planning, sometimes based on demographic assumptions. The layout of the table was discussed, with some suggestions for altering the order of outputs and inputs.

The Sector Level Input Matrix will be an on-line tool. Sector members will access the tool through ActivityInfo, and submit their project details. The sector chairs will then review and send comments back

¹ NB During the meeting, figures of 550,000 out of camp; and 165,000 Jordanian pop were used.



to sector members. UNHCR Information Management will set up a technical support call line, and provide training to partners on how to access ActivityInfo. The agreed list of objectives, outputs and indicators for each sector will be pre-populated in the on-line form in ActivityInfo.

Several participants were concerned that using an on-line tool will be too complicated for submission by members and review by chairs. However, it was agreed that the on-line approach will be attempted.

UNHCR Information Management staff committed to attending all sector meetings to explain the on-line submission process, to provide training, and technical support.

Regarding sector-specific objectives, it was confirmed that while the objectives, outputs and indicators discussed at the RRP6 Regional workshop were a useful guide, they did not have to be strictly followed. IS Co-ordinator to send around the regional objectives etc.

Next steps

The sectors are to hold meetings on objectives, outputs and inputs this week, and send to Edouard Legoupil (legoupil@unhcr.org) for uploading into ActivityInfo. IS Co-ordinator to send around a calendar of RRP6 events and a revised time-line.

KEY ACTION POINTS: 19th September

Action	Responsible	By When
Draft new wording of 'participatory manner' for Strategic Objective 1.	Merrin Waterhouse	Monday 23 rd September
IS Coordinator to discuss planning figures, objectives with MoPIC; to clarify definition of 'resilience'.	Inter-Sector Coordinator	Before next ISWG
IM officers to attend all the sector meetings and demonstrate use of ActivityInfo; provide technical support	UNHCR Information Management	By 30 th September
Sectors to send a list of objectives, outputs and indicators to UNHCR IM officers (Legoupil@unhcr.org)	Sector chairs/co-chairs	By 30 th September
IS Coordinator to send revised calendar; get copies of objectives, outputs and indicators discussed at the Regional RRP6 meeting.	Inter-sector Coordinator	By 23 rd September
Send draft a ToR for ISWG for comments before the next meeting.	IS Coordinator	By 22 nd September

ATTENDANCE: 19th September, at UNHCR Office, Amman, Jordan.

Name	Role	Organization	Contact
Alex Tyler	Inter-Sector Co-ordinator	UNHCR	Tyler@unhcr.org
Hugh Earp	NFIs	NRC	hugh.earp@nrc.no



Giulia Ricciarelli-Ranawat	Protection	UNHCR	ricciare@unhcr.org
Mary Jo Baca	MHPSS	IMC	mjbaca@internationalmedicalcorp.org
Farah El-Zubi	Food	WFP	Farah.elzubi@wfp.org
Karen Whiting	CP / GBV	UNHCR	Whiting@unhcr.org
Edouard Legoupil	Info Management	UNHCR	Legoupil@unhcr.org
Ann Burton	Health	UNHCR	Burton@unhcr.org
Imam Bambouk	Health	WHO	bambouki@jor.emro.who.int
Mariann Aase	Child Protection	UNICEF	gaase@unicef.org
Merrin Waterhouse	Gender Advisor	UN Women	merrin.waterhouse@unwomen.org
Jamal Shah	WASH	UNICEF	jshah@unicef.org
Maria Margherita Maglietti	GBV	UNFPA	maglietti@unfpa.org
Eugene Ha	Education	UNICEF	eha@unicef.org
Volker Schimmel	Cash	UNHCR	Schimmel@unhcr.org
Maurice Bisau	NFIs	UNHCR	Bisaum@unhcr.org
Werner Schellenberg	Shelter	UNHCR	Schellen@unhcr.org
Julie Steiger	INGO Forum	IMC	jsteiger@internationalmedicalcorps.org
Jack Byrne	INGO Forum	IRC	jack.byrne@rescue.org
Uma Kandalayeva	Protection	IRD	uma.kandalayeva@ird-jo.org
Connie Vaughan	Inter-Sector Co-ordination	UNHCR	Vaughanc@unhcr.org