



**Minutes of Meeting**  
Date: March 15, 2021

Chair Co-Chair:	Jess Garana, UNDP	
Participating agencies	UNICEF, UN RCO, IFRC, UNDP, WFP/Food Security WG, UNDP/ERWG, IOM, Armenian Caritas, HDIF A total of 18 participants. 6 participants did not sign the attendance list.	Action Required
Matters arising from last meeting:	None -	
Agenda item and Action points:	The meeting started at 11:05 am	
I. ERWG Operational presence	Based on January/February 2021 5W, there are 4 partner organizations with ongoing activities out of 19 organizations registered with the ERWG. ERWG partners are present in a total of 10 Marzes (30 Administrative level 3 communities). 3,796 individuals were reached, out of a total of 13,647. Except Armavir where UNDP is the only partner present, at least 2 partners are present in the other 9 Marzes. There are about 20 donor/financial partners reported. No major operational issues reported. For details of ERWG operational coverage by partner and donor/funding source, please refer to Annex I.	
II. Evaluation of ERWG Coordination	Following the launch of the Inter-agency Response Plan in October 2020, the Coordination Steering Group (CSG) was formed, and subsequently, five Working Groups, and three sub working groups were also formed to coordinate and guide partners' operations. <sup>1</sup> Recently the CSG conducted a general evaluation of CSG and Working Group/Sub-working Groups' coordination functions.  There were 14 respondents to the questionnaire. The tabulated results and feedback of the evaluation are presented below and were discussed in detail during the ERWG meeting, as follows:	

<sup>1</sup> Working Groups: Information Management, Early Recovery, Shelter and NFI, Protection, Health, and Food Security and Nutrition. Cash Sub-Working Group: Cash; Child Protection, and Education. <https://bit.ly/3twFj0W>.



No.	Coordination Functions	Dissatisfied	Neutral/Undecided	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Grand Total
1	Effectively coordinates the WG by holding regular meetings and providing relevant updates on the evolving context		1	10	3	14
2	Provides technical guidance and documentation relevant to the WG	1	3	7	3	14
3	Provides relevant and timely information to WG members through online platform(s), emails and other correspondence	1	1	7	5	14
4	Identifies gaps in service delivery, coordinates between agencies and follows up on agreed actions		4	7	3	14
5	Coordinates with relevant government ministries and counterparts to ensure effective delivery of assistance and services		3	10	1	14
6	Ensures the inclusion of WG members in the Inter-Agency Response Plan, CERF and other funding mechanisms	1	1	9	3	14
7	Provides a clear reporting structure for the WG through appropriate templates	1	2	8	3	14

What is working well in the WG?		What can be improved in the WG?	
1	Hold meetings regularly.	1	Work with other WG to mainstream ER.
2	Information sharing, participatory approach.	2	5W reporting slow/delayed.
3	Activities and processes are coordinated very effectively.	3	The WG is a bit too UNDP centric and should
4	Members Cooperate.	4	Need to make coordination more useful.
		5	More clarity on scope of work, way forward, joint activities.
		6	Participation of government representatives will help to gain more information on state

**Overall results:**

Of the four categories of responses, 80% are "satisfied" and "very satisfied" while about one-fifth percent are neutral/undecided (15%) and dissatisfied (4%). The high number of "neutral/undecided" responses may reflect a high participation rate of new partners or representatives. There were at least 73 individual email addresses registered in the email system of the ERWG in 2020, in contrast to only 48 in March 2021 based on actual membership confirmation received by the ERWG, indicating a significant turnover of participants and the potentially entry of new members that were yet to be familiarized with the ERWG. In March 2021, therefore, the ToR of the ERWG was widely circulated to partners. The high rate (80%) of "satisfied" and "very satisfied" category of responses may have come from the "old" members of the ERWG who were already familiar with the sector.

**What is working well in the Working Groups:**

Respondents mentioned that meetings were held regularly. There was sharing of information and was participatory in overall coordination. Members cooperated very effectively in the tasks of the ERWG, these include preparation of 5W and Situation Report.

**What can be improved in the Working Group?**

There was a consensus that the findings of the evaluation reflect the overall perspectives of partners about early recovery that should go beyond the current partners' activities and moving towards long term development across all working groups.

There was also a general consensus to increasingly engage the government into the ERWG and to understand government's plans and programs thus providing space for partners to align their priorities with government priorities.

To make ERWG relevant and useful, partners shared their observations and recommendations as follows:

1. Partners are ready to collaborate and coordinate with the ERWG keeping in view the respective vision, regulations (etc.) of their organizations.

Action to the recommendations will be tracked and reported:

ERWG  
Coordination  
and UNDP



<p><b>III. Updates from partners</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Need to clarify the scope of ERWG and criteria for reporting activities in the ERWG 5W, for instance, between old and new projects (e.g., HSTF-funded activities prior to the conflict) and scope (e.g. HSTF-funded human security vs development work).</li> <li>3. Need to involve government representatives in ERWG meetings where government can share update about their plans and programs and WG partners to gain understanding of national and state programs and capacities of government and how best partners can fill in or support.</li> <li>4. Need to understand early recovery way forward, and the roles and contributions of government and partners.</li> <li>5. It was also discussed that the ERWG is a flexible platform for coordination of early recovery activities, that gives partners the opportunity to co-lead (experiences from other contexts cited), and is open for partners to can present important issues and updates beyond the routine “updates from partners” portion of reporting provided in every meeting.</li> </ol> <p>All the recommendations are taken forward by coordinating team.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Armenuhi, Cash Sub Working Group lead <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cash Sub-working Group has established partnership with government (MoLSA, and others) at national, state, and municipal level, has been working jointly in shape-ng the whole cash response.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2) Fernando, OCHA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to identify who ERWG counterpart and start inviting to the ERWG meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3) Karine, UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government engagement is at the core of UNDP action. On the ground, government representatives greatly facilitated implementation of beneficiary selection, jobs creation, collection of field data, and project monitoring. Identification of project beneficiaries can be a challenge. Working with government has made identification of target beneficiaries (e.g., community members with special needs, displaced people) effective as well as monitoring the progress of implementation of project activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4) Arman, UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has been working with local governors, municipalities, and heads of communities in implementing projects. Example with Ministry of Territorial Administration on rehabilitation of kindergarten center, job creation (start-up funding for new ideas), development of seed production, storage, processing, and logistics facility in Gegharkunik and other places.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5) Ivory, WFP/Food Security/Nutrition Coordinator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WFP is implementing a small-grant to support livestock re-stocking and supply of farm-inputs in the NK.</li> <li>- Project aims to complete within one year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>6) Garik, UNDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Announced the Capacity and Vulnerability Assessment, to be conducted in Yerevan, Kotayk, and Syunik, where more RL populations are registered.</li> <li>- CVA builds from existing secondary data analysis to look at data gaps in needs, capacities, access to services such as housing, energy,</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
--	---	--



	<p>health, social security, justice, etc. It will cover 1,800 sampled individuals and 300 service providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consultation to begin on 29<sup>th</sup> March (2021).</li> <li>- The CVA is commissioned to IMPACT.</li> </ul> <p>Meeting adjourned 12:10 pm</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- End of Minutes -</p>	
IV. Announcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity and Vulnerability Assessment (pls see above).</li> <li>- 5W and SitRep are due to CSG by first week of the month.</li> <li>- 5W information is being revised to reflect specific early recovery information (draft attached, already shared to partners Managers and partners' staff in charge).</li> </ul>	
V. Participants	<p>Participants who signed the Chatbox Attendance:</p> <p>Armenuhi Hovakimyan, UNICEF          Babken DerGrigorian, Country Economist, UN RCO          David Campfens, Manager Operations, IFRC          Dianna Areyan, UNDP          Garik Khachikyan, UNDP          Ivory Hacket-Evans, WFP          Jess Garana, ERWG/UNDP          Karine Khojayan, IOM          Karine Simonyan, Jobs lead, UNDP          Louise Skarvall, SDG integration officer, UNDP          Lusine Stepanyan, PM, Armenian Caritas          Tim Straight, Founder / Executive Director, HDIF</p>	

For questions, please contact:  
 Jess Garana, Coordinator  
 Early Recovery Working Group  
 E-mail : [jessie.garana@undp.org](mailto:jessie.garana@undp.org); +374 954 50026