



Meeting Minutes & Report			
Chair person	Elisabetta Brumat	Venue	UNHCR, LEA building
Co-chair person		Date	19 March 2014
Minutes/report by	Toni Ayrouth / E. Brumat	Time	10:00AM - 12:00AM
Main Organisations attending	ALEF, HI/Help Age, IRAP, IRC, IRD, MC, MAG, MOSA, NRC, LHIF, Oxfam UK, UNHCR, UNRWA, and WRF		

Participants: (see attached annex A)

Introduction / Administrative matters
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minutes of PWG meeting on 20 February 2014 previously circulated for comments were approved ▪ Proposal considered shifting the timing of the PWG on the third Thursday of the month (in lieu of Wednesday) due to the coincident meeting in Tyre to insure the participation to both meetings. MOSA representative expressed concerns about availability of their representative due to commitments at the Ministry. Discussion with the PWG in Tyre will be undertaken to solve the overlapping before a final change of day. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TORs and Core Group ▪ The Chair proposed the endorsement of the TORs, already circulated in the new version proposed by the RRP6 Steering Committee and discussed in the PWG meeting in February. Few modifications had been included (already before the February meeting), to put the ToRs more in line with the PWG specific requirements. This includes linkages with CPIE and SGBV Task Force and the DaOAWG. ACTION → Final comments to the TORs will be accepted until Friday 28 March. ▪ The Core Group composition was presented again, with the confirmations and the requests received after the 20th February PWG meeting by some members to be included (UNICEF, IOM). At present the Core Group composition has quite a few number of actors: Sector Coordinator (Co-lead), MOSA representative (Co-lead), DRC, NRC, Oxfam, Alef, HA/HI (also representing the Disability/ Age Working Group); UNRWA, UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM; SGBV and CP Coordinators (as needed/ available). ▪ The Core Group was called to meet some three times during the past month (discussion on the Activity Info indicators, MSNA information needs, discussion on first draft report of the MSNA). Not all members could actively participate. It was decided that the structure of the Core Group will be maintained for a period of three months and then the PWG will again take stock of the functioning. As for the INGO/NGO participation in the Core Group, the possibility for rotation on a six months basis was agreed. The possibility for an NGO co-leadership remains open for expression of interest. ▪ A quick overview on the situation in the various PWGs in the Field was provided to partners. PWGs in the field did not choose to establish Core Groups, given the relatively limited number of partners. However, the NGO co-leadership was implemented in Qubayat (NRC), Tyr (NRC) and Zahle (DRC). In addition, in Tyre, Zahle and Qubayat, technical groups on legal aid have been created by specialized PWG partners to better share information on cases and discuss common approaches to legal issues. ▪ The MOSA representative followed up on a request dating back to 2013 to nominate focal points from the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Interior as referent for the PWG. The PWG participants welcomed the interest of the Government and expressed the opportunity to interact with those representatives on ad hoc

meetings or to invite them for thematic sessions of the PWG.

2. Sector Mapping

- Activity maps samples were shared based on information from sector partners who were previously invited to fill a very short information template on their protection activities per location (District level). The aim for the national PWG is to have a general overview on the presence of the partners and the coverage, while more details on services are been gathered at field level and through Activity Info. ACTION → The maps will be shared for final comments/ confirmation from the sector partners by Wednesday 26 March.

3. Activity Info

- The Chair provided a quick overview on the Activity Info progress and challenges. Some 13 sector actors are currently reporting. Continue efforts are needed to proceed towards gender disaggregation in the data, as well as age/ diversity (in the persons with specific needs indicator), as earlier agreed by the sector in the meeting of 25 February.
- The importance of a review and consultation between sector partners working through implementation agreements with agencies and the respective agencies was highlighted, to ensure consistency in the final submission in Activity Info.
- Activity info rollout training will be recirculated for additional Activity Info training if partners are still interested, the next training session (*Post meeting: as per information received from the AI team – next session on 25 April*).

Topic of the Month: MAG activities in Lebanon		Presenter: Bekim Shala - MAG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAG provided an overview of their activities in Lebanon, with presence in the South, Bekaa and Mount Lebanon. The presentation included an overview of the extension of the areas that have been cleared or that are still contaminated by cluster munitions and land mines, highlighting the good progress made in the South of the country. It also included examples of contaminated areas found in the proximity of locations where refugees have settled in the West Bekaa (a mapping overlaying contaminated areas and refugee settlement areas was presented). MAG also provided an overview on the incidents from 2000 to 2013, showing the high incidence in 2006 but also an increase of incidents between 2012 and 2013. According to the organisation, the increase is largely due to the lowering of attention on MRE issues, from the peak of the post 2006 events; the fact that MRE may not be reaching all areas; the arrival of refugees to new areas. MAG informed the PWG that their activities are undertaken in coordination with the Lebanese Armed Forces and within the Lebanon Mine Action Centre. The LMAC has a Steering Committee on MRE, gathering NGOs who are at present conducting MRE at field level. There is no mapping on the coverage, and the PWG requested the possibility to have the list of NGOs currently conducting MRE activities to be disseminated amongst partners for possible contacts at field level for MRE sessions. 		
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	For PWG national	Maintain contacts with MAG for possible dissemination of the information of the NGOs part of the MRE Steering Committee and further dissemination amongst partners.

1) Access to Territory (new arrivals, border monitoring)

Follow up on previous action point	
New Issues & trends Action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports from the field PWG in Qubayat and in Bekaa continue to highlight trends of cases of refusal of entry due to damaged documents. Even if not systematically tracked, this has been observed by UNHCR as well as by UNRWA monitors. At Masnaa border rejections are also reportedly connected to transfer of data / loss of individual records and it is believed that cases involve refugees who have returned to Syria simply to renew their residency card, and are subsequently prevented from re-entering due to the loss of records.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNRWA continues to maintain their presence at the Masnaa border, while UNHCR is progressing towards the establishment of a stable presence in Masnaa. ▪ The PWG highlighted the importance of a continuous dialogue and advocacy with the GSO, through PWGs in the field and through the PWG and mandated agencies at central level, to maintain consistency in access to territory. The support of the Government Co-lead was asked to highlight to the GSO the negative repercussions of rejection at the border (e.g. increase of irregular crossings with heightened security risks; flourishing of illegal and exploitative activities around the use of the irregular border crossing; increased presence of refugees with irregular status in the country). 	
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	For PWG Zahle and Qubayat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to provide information to support evidence-based advocacy.
	For PWG national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue the advocacy with the GSO, also with the support of the government PWG Co-lead.

2) Access to Registration (UNHCR, Municipalities, others)

Follow up on previous action point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upon request, the complete set of registration material (leaflets, videos) was shared with PWG members, to further contribute to dissemination of updated information on registration access and procedures, especially at field level (e.g. through frontline workers, community focal points etc.).
New Issues & trends Action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ According to UNHCR, 924,111 Syrian refugees have been registered, and 48,347 are awaiting registration. 62,081 appointments have been requested in February, with a minor 7% decrease from the previous month. The registration waiting period is 21 days. The verification of the registered refugees continues, with 53,278 individuals cumulatively verified since 2014. ▪ UNHCR briefed on mobile registration exercise in Wadi Khaled area, undertaken during the first week of March to improve access to registration in areas where refugees are known to be affected by challenges in freedom of movement. The initiative was undertaken based on information and family lists received by partners. The number of appointments provided (49), the number of families appearing at the registration (34% no-show rate) and eventually being registered (25 cases/ 92 individuals) was just a fraction of the initial list submitted. Numerous cases of Lebanese returnees and Lebanese citizens were identified, who are not eligible for registration under UNHCR. As lessons learnt, pre-verification of the lists before mobile missions remains a critical step. ▪ After the mission, the PWG Chairs in Qubayat and in Beirut alerted IOM on the identified presence of Lebanese returnees, and called for strengthened communication and possibly increase presence to serve this population. Contacts are ongoing at field level in Akkar between UNHCR and IOM. ▪ Sheild/ UNHCR continue the transport support for registrants in the South and information awareness on registration. ▪ UNRWA highlighted the challenge of Syrian refugees currently residing in closed Palestinian Camps to be informed on the UNHCR registration and have access to services. Some of the PWG partners highlighted their regular presence in Palestinian Camps and their commitment in sharing information. Through partners, UNRWA can also facilitate information sharing on registration of Syrian refugees. ▪ The registration survey covering some 1,381 families indicated that 83% did not face problems registering with UNHCR; 5% had trouble accessing phone lines in Bekaa ; 4% found

	<p>that the registration center was far and the travel costly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue of unregistered refugees was again discussed. The PWG noted that there is still no possibility to provide some evidence-based estimates on the size of this population. UNHCR is finalizing some procedures to be proposed to humanitarian partners at field level to try and capture quantitative information on unregistered population for possible follow-up action by registration teams. The initiative will be brought at inter-agency level, as it will need the cooperation of actors across sectors. Protection monitoring agencies can also play a significant role. It will be important that submissions from partners are streamlined, once the system is in place. 	
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	For PWG ALL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue the dissemination of information on the registration and the current verification process, including through outreach mechanisms such as Refugee Outreach Volunteers, community focal points etc. ▪ Maintain linkages with IOM on reported presence of Lebanese returnees in the field.
	For PWG national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain linkages with IOM on reported presence of Lebanese returnees in the field.

3) Civil status documentation (birth registration, statelessness, residency permit)

Follow up on previous action point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The protection sector is following the works of the Cash Task force. All sectors have been asked to contribute to the Minimum expenditure Basket (MEB), a socio-economic exercise aimed at detecting the minimum cost for refugee families to live in Lebanon. The protection sector suggested including the payment for legal stay in the calculation of the MEB, to signal its impact in the everyday life of the families. However, this inclusion does not impact on the continuous advocacy to waive – or at least reduce - these fees, which continues. 	
New Issues & trends Action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PWG in Tripoli reported that the Director of the Personal Status Department of the North Governorate (Head of Nofous) in Tripoli informed that refugees would be able to approach any of the 13 Nofous offices in the T5 area and regularization of the legal status of the parents is not a precondition to register the birth at the Mukhtars' level. This positive development is shared with beneficiaries through the ROVs and awareness raising sessions and should be considered as a useful precedent. ▪ Mount Lebanon PWG reported different cases of refugees having problems with GSO with regards to their legal status (renewal of residencies) reported either directly to UNHCR or through the protection monitoring partner. ▪ UNHCR presented the results of periodical thematic surveys undertaken at registration and verification stage. The consultation with 3,170 families renewing their registration showed – amongst other - that 63% had valid residencies, while 35% had expired residencies (2% mix). The main reason for expired residencies were the payment of fees (57%), the entry through unofficial border (21%), the reluctance to approach the authorities (12%), the lack of awareness on the procedure (2%), or other combinations of reasons (8%). 	
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	For PWG	
	For PWG national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuous advocacy to waive – or at least reduce - these fees of the renewal of the Legal stay documentation and continue to document the negative impact.

4) Freedom of Movement / Detention (curfew, check points, arbitrary detention)

Follow up on previous action point	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNRWA is reporting an increase of arrests and detentions of PRSs by the GSO in the Southern region (Saida). Although the practice does not lead to deportation, confiscation of
---------------------------------------	---

	<p>documents is reported until the 200 USD fee is paid. In a meeting with the GSO, UNRWA has managed to advocate with the GSO to provide the refugees with certified copies of their personal document instead of a slip, to retain a better proof of identity. This may become a useful precedent to ease the challenge to freedom of movement. UNRWA is also developing a PRS detention hotline to ease the restriction of PRS movement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The current detention records of UNHCR, based on sector partners' information/referrals and self-referrals from families or detainees, indicate the presence of 253 Syrian refugees in detention. Only a minority (less than 9%) are detained as a consequence of illegal entry or stay, while the majority of the arrests are motivated by normal criminality. However, these data do not consider arrests and detention at the Police stations, including of temporary nature. Such situations are far more difficult to detect and at present there is no systematic monitoring. 	
New Issues & trends Action taken		
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	<u>For PWG</u>	
	For PWG national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The precedent by the GSO to provide refugees with a certified copy of the identity documents if they are confiscated pending renewal of the residency permit may be a useful basis for negotiation to mitigate the challenges to freedom of movement.

5) Physical safety (treats violation, security incidents, minorities, exploitation not covered under SGBV and Child Protection)		
Follow up on previous action point		
New Issues & trends Action taken		
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	<u>For PWG</u>	
	For PWG national level	

6) Sexual and Gender Based Violence (update form SGBV Task Force)		
Follow up on previous action point		
New Issues & trends Action taken		
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	<u>For PWG</u>	
	For PWG national level	

7) Child Protection in Emergency (update from Child Protection in Emergency Task Force)		
Follow up on previous action point		
New Issues & trends Action taken		
Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy	<u>For PWG</u>	
	For PWG national level	

8) House, land and property		
Follow up on previous action point		

<p>New Issues & trends Action taken</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The thematic periodical assessment conducted by UNHCR in February during the registration process team included some specific questions on the accommodation status in Lebanon. The survey indicated that 73% of the families have verbal agreement with land lord in Lebanon while only 10% had a written agreement (lease). In addition, 24% of the sample did not think a written agreement was useful; 12.5% did not know procedures to conclude a proper agreement; 13.5% reported the unwillingness of the landlord to enter into a formal agreement. As for the type of accommodation, 58% of respondents reported to be are living in rented accommodations; 12% were hosted by families; 11% of the interviewed refugees lived in tented settlements. Almost 20% of the respondents reported to be living in garages, collective shelters, and unfinished houses. 	
<p>Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy</p>	<p>For PWG</p>	
	<p>For PWG national level</p>	

<p>9) Relation with host community</p>		
<p>Follow up on previous action point</p>		
<p>New Issues & trends Action taken</p>		
<p>Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy</p>	<p>For PWG</p>	
	<p>For PWG national level</p>	

<p>10) Access to services and assistances (discriminatory practices, access information, PWSN)</p>		
<p>Follow up on previous action point</p>		
<p>New Issues & trends Action taken</p>		
<p>Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy</p>	<p>For PWG</p>	
	<p>For PWG national level</p>	

<p>11) Refugee outreach</p>		
<p>Follow up on previous action point</p>		
<p>New Issues & trends Action taken</p>		
<p>Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy</p>	<p>For PWG</p>	
	<p>For PWG national level</p>	

<p>12) Protection mainstreaming, capacity building, Assessments</p>		
<p>Follow up on previous action point</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the start of the MSNA process, and the call for secondary data analysis to all partners at the beginning of March, the available participants of the PWG Core Group met to identify key information needs (3rd March) and were called again to discuss the first draft of the MSNA Report shared by the MSNA technical team (13 March). For the protection sector (CP and SGBV are separately considered), to date about 12 reports/ 	

	<p>assessments (including with protection mainstreamed) have been collected. They are largely qualitative (FGD) and area-based. It is hoped that more partners can contribute to fill the gaps in the overall evidence-gathering. It is believed that there is a good amount of knowledge derived from field presence and constant interaction with persons of concern, but this may not be sufficiently systematized.</p>	
<p>New Issues & trends Action taken</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the material so far received and possible new material that will be sent by partners, the MSNA team will call for a workshop to further validate and complement the report. A meeting of the Core Group may be called in the upcoming week (tentatively on Monday) to provide further comments on needs and priorities. <i>(On the day after the PWG meeting, given time constraints and availability of the participants, it was communicated that only the MSNA workshop would be eventually organised, open to the Core Group but also to other members of the sector).</i> 	
<p>Follow up required: Concrete Intervention Advocacy</p>	<p>For PWG _____</p>	<p>The PWG in the field, through their chairs, will be invited to share comments to the MSNA draft.</p>
	<p>For PWG national level</p>	<p>Members of the sector to contribute to the MSNA report by sharing further assessments/ secondary data with the MSNA team. The Sector members will also be called to comment and validate the MSNA report and to contribute to other parts of the report, including the summary of assessment, the key needs, the operational constraints.</p>