

## JORDAN REFUGEE RESPONSE Inter-Sector Working Group

Meeting Minutes & Action Points  
7<sup>th</sup> June 2015 • UNHCR Office, Amman



### Agenda

Education – inter-sector linkages discussion (40 mins)

Review of Action Points

Minimum Expenditure Basket

Common Advocacy Messages and Programme Priorities

3RP Mid-Year Reporting; FTS

JRP Update: IATF/MoPIC meeting; Needs Assessments.

AOB

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE	Progress
Sectors should discuss 'Advocacy' common theme at next Sector meeting and draft Common Messages. Results of discussions should be sent to Alex Tyler before next ISWG meeting in early May.	Sector Chairs	Completed
Sector chairs should look at VAF findings and perform a data check for their sector.	Sector Chairs	Completed
Remaining sectors to identify and invite government counterparts.	Food Security	Completed (waiting on response from Ministries)
The sector chairs to revert through the ISWG, to OCHA to provide their urgent sector priorities (one or two priorities) in order to include it in the call for proposal. Calls for proposals will be launched in the last week of April.	Sector Chairs	Completed (Now waiting on clarification from OCHA)
Sector chairs need to review their targets and do a sense check on the caps inserted by the Coordination unit are reasonable.	Sector Chairs	Pending some sectors

## 1. Inter-Sector Linkages: Education

The presentation began with a brief description of the structure of the Education Working Group (Education WG). There are three levels of operation (Amman, Azraq and Zaatari); a youth task force and a strategic advisory group (SAG). There are currently 56 active organizations that are members of the WG.

### Population in concern:

The presentation included a breakdown of the children eligible for education and who are either: in formal education; in informal education or are not in education at all. The figures are based on a standardized ratio taking the population of school-aged children (children ages 5-17) calculated in accordance with the Ministry of Education criteria. Please note: different data was used for the figures encompassing those children receiving education compared to the out-of-school children. From the total, there is a gap of around 40,000 students still eligible to enroll. There is also a need to sustain the number of children enrolled so that they remain in education.

### Sector Strategies:

Description	Percentage	Value
Total Population (28 May 2015)		628,160
School aged Children	36%	226,138
Formal Education	25%	157,040
Informal Education (IFE)	11%	69,098
Enrollment (Nov 2014)		129,354
Out-of-School children (OOSC)		96,784
Eligible for formal Education from OOSC	49%	47,424
Eligible for alternative education	51%	49,360

Investment is required to improve the quality of education received. According to the Jordanian standard, there should be a ratio of 1 teacher for every 17 children. The current ratio in the camps is 1 teacher for around every 100 children. Whilst the Jordanian standard is not a realistic target, it is hoped that the camp ratio will be reduced drastically. More classrooms are also required in the camps, at an average of 10 classrooms per district in Zaatari. This is to make space for the number of children enrolling whilst also reducing the distance children currently have to walk in order to reach the schools.

## Approved by ISWG

### Sector Priorities:

The sector priorities are listed in detail in the attached presentation. A key focus for this year is sustaining the existing enrolled children. The current rate of drop-out is around 25% of children per year. The WG seeks to encourage partners to work on expanding informal education opportunities. There is also a movement to improve the number of children moving from secondary education to tertiary education.

Whilst there is higher demand for formal education, the Ministry of Education have specified that they only have the capacity to enroll 130,000 Syrian children in Jordanian public schools. It is for this reason that the sector has chosen to adopt this figure as their target.

### Financial Requirements:

There has been a significant drop in the amount of funding received compared to last year. The WG is asking for a slightly higher amount this year but the difference is not big enough to account for the large difference seen. So far on 30% of the total funds requested by the sector have been received, compared to around 70% at the same time last year.

### Sector Work Plan:

The presentation also included a brief outline of the sector work plan. A key area of focus is reporting and information management. The accumulative data collected by the WG is not effectively displayed on the dashboards through ActivityInfo. The WG is working with the Coordination Unit to improve this issue. There is also a focus on making sure that data is entered into ActivityInfo on time and accurately.

### Challenges:

The challenges faced by the Education WG were outlined in brief before a discussion occurred on how the different sectors can support Education in combatting these difficulties. The challenges listed were:

- 1 Lack of sufficient funding to continue with the existing number of students
- 2 Access for children living in hard to reach areas
- 3 Policy level barriers to enhance the access
- 4 Retention and quality education
- 5 Mainstreaming of CWD in formal education system
- 6 Low attendance
- 7 Parents involvement in school governance

The discussion was split between two groups comprised of:

1. Shelter, Food Security, Protection
2. Health, Wash, Education

The focus of the discussion was on challenges 2, 4, 6, 7, and how the other sectors could support Education to tackle these challenges.

### **Group 1: -**

- A referral system could be set up that agencies working in all sectors can refer cases of children having difficulties accessing education onto the Education sector.

## Approved by ISWG

- Conditional Assistance – this could be rather complicated both in terms of implementation and monitoring. Issues could arise where children are enrolled in education but then proceed to work at night, rather than during the day. This would link in with the Protection sector.
- Food Security suggested the idea of kitchen gardens, especially for secondary school children. This will allow children to take home the produce and will provide the opportunity to give nutrition education. The pursuit of this scheme would also involve the Health sector.
- The Education sector could draft key messages that could then be disseminated by all sectors when distributing information.
- Setting up links with Community Protection Committees could help to identify problems at a local level, as well as getting the community involved.
- Further thought is required on how to engage parents with schools. Issue arise when parents are scared or nervous to approach teachers and/or the teachers themselves appear hostile. A variety of actors is needed to sort this.

### Group 2: -

- Access – the suggestion was made that it would perhaps be better to first focus on the areas where children are more accessible in order to improve quality of education. Once improvements have been established, focus can then be shifted to the challenge of accessibility.
- Child protection – this is to be assessed through the establishment of a task force that will address various protection needs, such as combatting violence in schools. The question was raised as to whether transport could be funded so that children feel safe travelling to and from school.
- Regional differences should be looked at in more detail and learnt from. For example, the Ministry of Education in Lebanon offers certain payments that could be emanated.
- Concerns about gender – one feature hindering female enrollment in education is the worry that the school environment is not safe for girls, or that the journey to and from school is too dangerous. Another factor influencing the enrollment of girls in education is the desire of some families for their daughters to marry early. All sectors should work together to encourage families to educate their daughters and offer solutions for their safety concerns.
- The Wash sector is working on giving provisions to schools. An issue that still needs to be addressed is how to approach water distribution within the schools.
- Children with special needs – this needs further attention and discussion.

**Action Point: Follow up bilateral meeting on how to target assistance effectively for children with special needs. Education is to take the initiative on arranging this meeting with the Health and Protection sectors.**

### 2. Review of Action Points

Action Points from last meeting:

1. *Sectors should discuss 'Advocacy' common theme at next Sector meeting and draft Common Messages. Results of discussions should be sent to Alex Tyler before next ISWG meeting in early May.*

Within current agenda.

2. *Sector Chairs should look at VAF findings and perform a data check for their sector.*

Approved by ISWG

Completed.

3. *Remaining sectors to identify and invite government counterparts.*

Food Security has now reached out to the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Agriculture. Responses are yet to be received, and therefore the sector chairs will inform Alex separately.

4. *The sector chairs to revert through the ISWG, to OCHA to provide their urgent sector priorities (one or two priorities) in order to include it in the call for proposal. Calls for proposals will be launched in the last week of April.*

The priorities have now been outlined and sent to OCHA for review. The HC took a decision to focus ERF funding on priorities linked to Ramadan and the Summer. There were concerns that these are not grounded on the recommendation of the sectors. Health sector received information that the call would focus on Health and Wash, and would comply with the priorities developed for these sectors. The belief is that all sectors can send in proposals but the ERF will prioritize Health and Wash projects.

**Action Point: a reminder is to be sent to OCHA requesting a clarity on the next Call for Proposals.**

5. *Sector chairs need to review their targets and do a sense check on the caps inserted by the Coordination unit are reasonable.*

Some sectors have done this, and queries have been submitted with regards to change in structuring or the addition of new indicators. However, there remain a few sectors that have not responded.

**Action Point: Those sectors pending are asked to approach Kaleem within the next few weeks with any questions they may have.**

**Action Point 2: Sectors are asked to monitor the data being entered by agencies, making sure to check the quality as well. In their next WG meetings, each sector should have an agenda item on data management to inform agencies of the checks taking place and encourage them to submit their data.**

### 3. Minimum Expenditure Basket

The Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) task force was formed to analyse expenditure patterns amongst the refugee population, correlated to targeting assistance. The MEB has been designed to calculate what is the 'minimum' required by a refugee needs in order to live a "dignified life". It was agreed that there would be two MEBs. A Minimum Expenditure Basket that focuses on the requirements for a "dignified life" and a Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket (SMEB) that focuses on only food, water and shelter.

The methodology was based on secondary data analysis with inputs from sectors for their numbers. It was agreed that the analysis would be based on family size from 1-7. The cost per sector was determined by: existing sectorial standard; sectorial convention; or assessment data. The agreement was made not to disaggregate by region for 2 main reasons:

- Stating that it costs more to live in one area than another and offering different levels of assistance in accordance with that could have negative results e.g. refugee movement to seek the most help.

## Approved by ISWG

- Shelter was the only sector where a significant differences between the regions was observed. All other sectors were similar across all regions.

### Comments:

- It was noted that 65JOD per month per family size of 7 was quite high. This is under review, as the Wash sector needs to discuss exactly what items they would like to include under this expenditure-type.
- Questions were raised regarding the difference in rental prices between urban and rural areas. Whilst there may not have been a significant difference noted between regions, what about the variation that occurs within the governorates themselves? For example, urban Mafrq is significantly more expensive than rural Mafrq. In response to this, Nicole from WFP explained that the methodology made use of the average for each governorate, and that the aim is to discourage beneficiaries from moving location in order to acquire more assistance. More information about the methodology and the aims of the MEB will be included in a covering document.

Actions remaining: Based on all of the methodology mentioned above, the final draft is soon to be completed. There is some additional data that needs to be included from Education before the final draft can then be sent out to sectors for discussion and endorsement.

## 4. Common Advocacy Messages

A document has been drafted outlining the Common Advocacy Messages following sector contribution and key advocacy points discussed at the heads of agency level.

**Action Point: any other messages to be sent in on a sector level should be submitted by Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 by COB.**

## 5. Programme Priorities:

Focused on resource mobilization, these priorities have been drawn up under the assumption that the current context will not dramatically change. A document outlining both inter-sector priorities and sector-specific priorities was distributed in the meeting and discussed. It was agreed that a few changes needed to be made in order to clarify some of the priorities listed:

- Priorities are to be added under Food Security
- Protection is to remove priority numbers 2 and 3 and to coordinate with Health about priority number 8.
- Education should either edit priority number 6 to make it more specific, or move it to the inter-sector priorities with a specific mention of the Education sector.

**Action point: sectors should add a sentence to each of their listed priorities, explaining why it is important. Sectors are asked to look at the entire document, offering comments and track changes by Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.**

Approved by ISWG

## **6. 3RP Mid-Year Reporting; FTS**

3RP mid-year reporting: this is currently in progress. The regional offices are seeking information from the sectors regarding the consequences of underfunding and the actions of lead agencies in light of this.

**Action Point: the online dashboard must be updated by Monday 8<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.**

**Action Point 2: agencies should enter data into ActivityInfo by Monday 8<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.**

FTS: a request has already been circulated and the deadline was Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2015.

## **7. JRP Update: IATF/MoPIC meeting; Needs Assessments.**

There is now more clarity on the JRP process and a workshop is to be held on Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2015 to outline the methodology on needs assessment. An agreement has been made with MoPIC that UNHCR will formulate population projections, which could then inform JRP planning.

## **AOB**

**Winterization:** plans for this year's winter season are starting to be drawn up. It is important to have a reconfirmation of the standards from last year, therefore a task force meeting is to be held on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> June 2015. Any sector seeking to get involved should inform Volker Schimmel ([schimmel@unhcr.org](mailto:schimmel@unhcr.org)), copying Claire Stephens ([stephecl@unhcr.org](mailto:stephecl@unhcr.org))

**Sector Gender focal points network (SGFPN):** With the support of UNHCR, the SGFPN and the Snr GenCap Advisor to the IATF conducted a three day workshop on Gender in humanitarian action (GIHA) on 31 May, 1 and 2 June. Each sector was represented through their focal points. By the end of the workshop, the focal points were trained:

- 1) to support the sectors in incorporating gender into their sectoral assessments, analysis and strategies;
- 2) to facilitate coordination processes that meaningfully integrate critical dimensions of vulnerability based on gender and age analyses;
- 3) to articulate clearly the imperative for gender equality programming in the humanitarian legal and architecture frameworks and demonstrate an understanding of gender equality which is operational and applicable at the field level;
- 4) to identify opportunities to advocate for gender and contribute to systematically integrate gender analysis through the programming cycle;
- 5) to use a gender lens to assist in making advocacy and communication materials/processes more relevant in articulating the distinct needs of women, girls, boys and men.

For any additional information, please contact the SGFPN chairs: Ms Maaïke van Adrichem ([mvadrichem@unicef.org](mailto:mvadrichem@unicef.org)) and M. Bertrand Blanc ([blanc@unhcr.org](mailto:blanc@unhcr.org)).

Approved by ISWG

ACTION POINT	RESPONSIBLE	By When?
A reminder is to be sent to OCHA requesting clarity on ERF proposals.	Alex Tyler	ASAP
A meeting is to be arranged between the Education, Health and Protection sectors to draft recommendations for how to target assistance effectively for children with special needs.	Education	ASAP
Sectors to submit any other Common Advocacy Messages on a sector level.	Sector Chairs	Thursday 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2015
Sectors to review the document on inter-sector and sector-level priorities. A sentence should be added to each sector-level priority, explaining why the priority is important.	Sector Chairs	Thursday 11 <sup>th</sup> June, 2015
In WG meetings, sector chairs are to include an agenda point on data management to inform agencies of the checks taking place and encourage them to submit their data on time.	Sector Chairs	Next individual Sector WG meetings
Sector chairs to go through the data on their monthly dashboards with Kaleem Ur Rehman.	Sector Chairs	ASAP

List of Participants:

Name	Sector / Position	Email
Alex Tyler	Inter Sector	<a href="mailto:Tyler@unhcr.org">Tyler@unhcr.org</a>
Jennifer Gulbrandson	Protection	<a href="mailto:Jennifer.gulbrandson@drc-jordan.org">Jennifer.gulbrandson@drc-jordan.org</a>
Ann Burton	Health	<a href="mailto:burton@unhcr.org">burton@unhcr.org</a>
Jamal Shah	WASH	<a href="mailto:jshah@unicef.org">jshah@unicef.org</a>
Kaleem ur Rehman	Inter Sector	<a href="mailto:rehmank@unhcr.org">rehmank@unhcr.org</a>
Mohammed Abdel-Al	Shelter	<a href="mailto:abdelal@unhcr.org">abdelal@unhcr.org</a>
Faeza Abo Al Jalo	Health	<a href="mailto:Abual-jalo@unfpa.org">Abual-jalo@unfpa.org</a>
Karen Whiting	Protection	<a href="mailto:whiting@unhcr.org">whiting@unhcr.org</a>
Farrukh Mirza	Education	<a href="mailto:fmirza@unicef.org">fmirza@unicef.org</a>
Paul Fean	Youth	<a href="mailto:paul.fean@nrc.no">paul.fean@nrc.no</a>
Byron Pakula	Cash	<a href="mailto:byron.pakula@acted.org">byron.pakula@acted.org</a>
Pilar Romero	WASH	<a href="mailto:pilar.romero-ardoy@acted.org">pilar.romero-ardoy@acted.org</a>
Ilham Abdullayev	Snr. Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:abdullai@unhcr.org">abdullai@unhcr.org</a>
Bertrand Blanc	CPSWG	<a href="mailto:blanc@unhcr.org">blanc@unhcr.org</a>
Rafiq Khan	CPSWG	<a href="mailto:mrkhan@unicef.org">mrkhan@unicef.org</a>
Maya Logo	Protection / Education	<a href="mailto:logo@unhcr.org">logo@unhcr.org</a>