

GBV Sub-Sector Meeting Minutes

Warsaw, Poland

21/06/2022

Chairpersons: Ms Loretta Jesudoss (UNHCR) & Ms Malgorzata Rogulska (CPK)

Agencies present:

Association for Legal Intervention (SIP), ASAM, Autonomia, Boat Refugee Foundation (BRF) Medco, CARE, Centrum Praw Kobiet, Clear Global, CORE, DRC, Federa, Feminoteka, Fundacja dla Somalii, IFRC, IOM, IPPF, IMC, INTERSOS, HIAS, LWF, Plan International, Project HOPE, PUI, UNHCR, UNICEF, VOICE, WHO

Agenda:

- Introduction
- Review of the previous action points
- Open discussion (all members)
 - Resources
 - Possible areas of cooperation between organizations
 - Participation of refugee women/refugee groups in this forum
- AoB

The meeting was conducted with simultaneous interpretation (in English & Polish)

Agenda items	Discussion	Action points
<p>1. Introduction of new participants</p> <p>2. Review of the previous action points</p>	<p>Draft Inter-Agency GBV SOPs</p> <p>There are 8 agencies that are currently involved in the process of drafting SOPs. These include: Autonomia, CPK, PUI, IFRC, FDDS, WHO, IRC, UNHCR</p> <p>The new lead of the SOP Reference Group is Malgorzata Rogulska from Centrum Praw Kobiet (CPK). The new lead will be assisted by Zelinda Aromorach, GBV Officer (Rzeszow) at UNHCR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contributions to the draft SOPs to be provided at the link previously shared amongst members of the Reference Group. ● For any queries on the draft SOPs, please contact Malgorzata Rogulska (CPK) malgorzata.rogulska@cpk.org.pl and Zelinda Aromorach (UNHCR) aromorac@unhcr.org
<p>3. Open Discussion</p>	<p>The co-chair, Loretta, invited all participants to an open discussion about resources, possible areas of cooperation between organisations and participation of refugee women in this forum.</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To create Calendar of Training- to be put in Google Drive and be accessible to all

	<p>The following challenges were raised by different members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Contingency Plan <p>The co-chair, Małgorzata, proposed the changes in the Scenario of Contingency Plan. Bearing in mind that Russia can win the war, we cannot exclude a greater influx of Ukrainian refugees to Europe, especially eastern Europe. She paid the attention to increase the amount of inputs in the Sector Assumptions in GBV Sub-Sector by the risk of deficiency of the long-term plan for Ukrainian refugees from the side of Eastern-Europe governments which may make difficult to conduct anti-discrimination prevention.</p> <p>Co-chair, Lorett, shared an overview of the contents of the draft Contingency Plan (planning figures, sectoral interventions and actors). In the absence of inputs from members of the GBV Sub-Sector, the co-chairs discussed and prepared draft inputs on behalf of the Sub-Sector for the Refugee Coordination Forum (RCF) meeting to meet the deadline. Government representatives were invited to attend the Contingency Planning meeting.</p> <p>PUI requested to be added into the matrix of GBV responders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Coordination <p>A member had highlighted that the coordination structures were not clear to her and present multiple demands through meetings and request for inputs etc. The co-chair acknowledged that the coordination structure is demanding particularly for organizations with limited resources as well as for those new to the humanitarian coordination forums. While providing a general overview of the inter-linkages between some of the coordination and working groups, she added that a representative from the Refugee Coordination Forum had recently delivered a presentation on it in Polish at the NGO Forum. The co-chair will request a similar presentation at this forum for those who may not have attended that session at the NGO Forum. PSEA Coordinator, Estefania, shared a chart depicting the various coordination groups in the chat box.</p>	<p>members of the group (to share this proposal with the Protection Sector and Refugee Coordination Forum).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To add PUI in the next draft of the Contingency Plan. ● The link to the draft Contingency Planning-Response Framework was re-shared during the meeting). Co-leads to provide feedback to the forum on the Contingency Planning exercise. <p>Action: Co-chairs to invite a representative from the RCF for a presentation/Q & A session.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Carina from WHO highlighted the need for area-based coordination and proposed to have regular meetings and taking turns in chairing the meetings in area-based coordination forums.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Communication <p>Fundacja Autonomia expressed the need for clearer communication on the contents of emails as the subject-matter is general/does not correspond with the contents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GBV Referral Pathway <p>Fundacja Autonomia expressed concern that her organization’s expertise was not recognized as it was not mentioned in the GBV referral pathway. The co-chair explained that in a prior bilateral communication, the co-chair was informed that the organization was dedicated to GBV <i>prevention</i> interventions and did not directly provide GBV <i>response</i> services. As the GBV referral pathway is limited to service providers that could provide GBV <i>response</i> services to survivors, this WRO was not included in it. This was not due to the lack of recognition of the WRO’s expertise but simply because the focus was on GBV <i>response</i> service-providers – all of whom were national WRO/WLOs.</p> <p>Members were encouraged to provide their support in developing and updating the GBV referral pathway. The development of both the public and confidential referral pathways (by location) has been challenging and resource intensive for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Protection Response Service Mapping was carried out at the end of March- April 2022 (as an expedited “Who does What Where (3Ws) mapping. It was a joint mapping of Protection, GBV, Child Protection and MHPSS services and response. The results were shared via a Power BI link. However upon verification, many of those who had responded either did <i>not</i> have a presence in the locations cited because they were merely planning to do or had changed their plans. - Members were asked on several occasions to share their inputs to the co-chairs on the confidential GBV referral pathway by location but inputs were not forthcoming. 	<p>Action: Co-chairs to reflect the contents of messages in the subject-headings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The link to Data Operational Portal was shared during the meeting for new members for the updated GBV Referral Pathway Poland GBV Sub-Sector Portal
--	--	---

- Bilateral communication with national women-led/rights organizations for guidance on survivor-centred GBV service providers that were available in the country were carried out. International NGOs were also consulted. The public GBV referral pathway is intended for posting at various locations, including government-managed facilities.

- In some countries, a dedicated GBV Referral Task Team is set up to facilitate the development of confidential GBV referral pathways by location. Nevertheless, due to the constraints voiced by members including WROs at this stage of the response, the co-chairs have refrained from creating yet another working group but to ensure that the GBV Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) Reference Group includes collective efforts on this.

- **Funding**

Fundacja Autonomia expressed that many WROs & WLOs were stretched as donors were focused on *project-based* funding. This fails to address core funding needs. As such, WROs & WLOs were not in a position to build/expand their management team. This in turn places a strain on them as their workload has increased exponentially and rests on a few, while they have to continue catering to their existing clients without neglecting them.

IPPF flagged out the importance of flexible funding which they were able to provide and so did **CARE**.

The co-chair acknowledged that many sources of funding are project-based. Access to funding by WLOs, WROS and CSOs often entails complicated processes. Advocacy for flexible funding in addressing GBV must continue as a collective responsibility by all members of the forum.

Funding and proposals should also refer to both refugee and host communities. This was the approach taken in the Refugee Response Plan (RRP).

- **Engagement of Ukrainian organisations based in Poland**

	<p>The co-chair highlighted the importance of engaging Ukrainian organizations including CSOs in this forum as flagged out by Agata from Fundacja Autonomia. Members were invited to share their recommendations/suggestions. The co-chair will look into arranging simultaneous interpretation into the Ukrainian language.</p>	
--	---	--

Next Meeting: Tuesday, 05/07/2022 @ 10am