Cleared by ISWG 111015

# JORDAN REFUGEE RESPONSE
# Inter-Sector Working Group

**Meeting Minutes & Action Points**
**28th September 2015 • UNHCR Office, Amman**

**Agenda**

*Update on JRP/3RP appeal*

*AOB*

This was an extraordinary meeting of the ISWG, dedicated to the JRP / 3RP inter-agency appeal.

Action points from previous meetings and other issues were deferred to the next formal ISWG, to be held on 1st November 2015.

## 1) Update on JRP/3RP appeal

The Inter-sector Coordinator presented some background to the 3RP inter-agency appeal process. The discussion then covered four main areas**: 1) Calendar; 2) Roles and Responsibilities; 3) Criteria for review; 4) Log-frame and indicators.**

### Calendar Update on JRP/3RP appeal

There are effectively four main phases to the appeal process.
- PHASE 1: Configure Activityinfo in line with JRP structure / Trainings
- PHASE 2: Open Activityinfo / Partners insert appeals
- PHASE 3: Revision of appeals in line with 3RP Criteria
- PHASE 4: Compilation into 3RP Matrices / Submission to IATF/MoPIC

Reflecting these phases, the Calendar now agreed with MoPIC and the IATF is as follows:

| Date | Task |
|---|---|
| 4th and 5th October | Activityinfo Trainings at UNHCR |
| 6th October | Activityinfo Opens online |
| 12th October | Activityinfo close and data extracted for analysis |

| 15th October | Analysis tables shared by UNHCR with refugee sectors (for refugee pillar) |
|---|---|
| 15th to 22nd October | Refugee sector chairs review appeals, discuss and revise with partners, in line with above criteria |
| 25th to 29th October | Compilation of data into 3RP Resource Matrices |
| 1st November | 3RP draft Resource Matrices shared with MoPIC for review ; IATF/MOPIC meeting |
| 7th to 15th November | If no objection, Resource Matrices shared with the Regional Level |

The format will be in line with the JRP project sheets, and reflects the Activityinfo Step-By-Step guide distributed during the meeting.

### *Roles and Responsibilities*

**Sector Chairs** are responsible for the quality and credibility of the appeal for their sector, as collated and reviewed in Activityinfo, and as presented in the final Sector Response Matrices. This implies reviewing the appeals submitted by partners during Phase 3, revising the appeals online with the partners, and 'signing-off' on the final product. During Phase 1, they also need to confirm the excel version of the structure of Activityinfo (see Log-Frame and Indicators belwo)

**Associate Coordination Officers / Other IM staff** are there to support Sector Chairs in this process. They should conduct reviews line by line in activityinfo and identify any data entry errors, and perform other tasks as required by the Sector Chairs.

**Inter-Sector Coordination/IM** will configure Activityinfo; manage the database; extract the data and produce analysis;

It was stressed that the sector chairs are the ones signing off on the partners' information as it is entered into the system, which allows them to later defend the appeal for every partner in a manner that is credible. It is important to actively engage in review.

Also, Associate Coordination Officers are available to check line by line from the partners' entries to ensure there are no mistakes or duplications. Backup in this process will come from the inter-sector coordination unit, who will follow this process through to the final compilation at the end.

In response to questions from sector chairs on whether comments can be inserted by sector chairs onto the projects, they could be inserted into the Comments box, however, it would be preferable to do this via email. On who enters the information, each appealing organization should enter the information on line, rather than the sector chair.

Cleared by ISWG 111015

### *Criteria for Review*

Agreed by the IATF, sector chairs should review appeals on the basis of the following criteria in summary (for more details see the draft Activityinfo Guide):

1. The appeal is only open to partners who are formally registered with the Government of Jordan.
2. The total combined partner appeal at the project sheet/output level has to be equal to or under the government JRP approved budget for that project sheet or output.
3. Some sectors have established targeting ceilings, for instance, that the most vulnerable 40% should be targeted with cash assistance. Should total indicator targets go past these limits, sector chairs will discuss with partners affected on how to limit the number of appeals for the same activity.
4. To avoid duplicate UN and NGO appeals, where a UN agency appealed for funds and an NGO appealed for funds for the same activity, and the NGO is an implementing partner of the UN agency, the appeal should be recorded by the UN agency, and removed from the NGO's appeal.
5. Partners may be contacted where there are significant differences in costing per beneficiary for the same activity.
6. Partners may be contacted for more information should their activities not be gender aware, or do not include disaggregated data by age and sex
7. Should the partner not have attended sector meetings or reported, they will not necessarily be included in 2016;
8. Should partner have appealed for the activity in 2014 or 2015, but was 0% funded; then including the same activity in 2016 may be questioned.

Questions included on whether organizations who had not been part of the refugee sectors or the recent JRP formulation process should be allowed to appeal. Reference was made to the above criteria, including points 7 and 8. In short, new partners can appeal on an exceptional basis, if they are meeting a need not already covered. However, this still has to be within the total JRP budget for that project sheet/output (point 2 above).

On the requirement of whether partners are formally registered with the Government, concern was expressed over how sector chairs could be sure of this. It was agreed that UNHCR Inter-Sector Coordination would conduct this checking for sector chairs, based on previous appeals and checking with MoPIC.

On population projections, the Government figure of 700,000 by end 2016 will be used.[1]

### *Log-Frame / Indicators*

An excel file showing the draft structure of the appeal – in line with the JRP projects – was presented. UNHCR Information Management provided some comments on the number and type of indicators, encouraging sector chairs to review the number and appropriateness of indicators. A decision should be taken on whether to disaggregate, and whether this disaggregation made sense.

The Protection sector noted the importance of disaggregating data, especially in relation to age and sex.

---

[1] NB On 4th October, the Government confirmed that the planning figure had been reduced to 630,000 by end 2016.

**Action Point:** By **Wednesday, September 30th**, sector chairs are to look through the structure of the Activityinfo in excel, revise the indicators, and outline how these indicators should be disaggregated.

## AOB

Noting that the Resilience pillar is under UNDP, questions were raised about the relationship between Resilience and Refugees. UNICEF underlined that the Resilience pillar was largely a Government budget. UNHCR noted that while this was the case for WASH, other sectors did have agency activities under Resilience. Also, the terminology differences between agencies were highlighted: an example of this issue is using "host communities" versus "urban" as a category in data collection. For the purpose of Activityinfo, the population disaggregation will be "Syrians in Camps"; "Syrians in Urban"; and "Host Communities (Jordanians or other non-Syrian nationals)"

| ACTION POINT | RESPONSIBLE | By When? |
|---|---|---|
| **Verify that partners are registered with MoPIC** | Alex Tyler | By 15th October |
| **Look through the structure of table and decide what and how information should be aggregated** | Sector Chairs | By 30th September |

**List of Participants:**

| Name | Sector / Position | Email |
|---|---|---|
| Bertrand Blanc | CP | Blanc@unhcr.org |
| Alex Tyler | Inter Sector | Tyler@unhcr.org |
| Pilar Romero | WASH | pilar.romero-ardoy@acted.org |
| Ayub Ahmed | WASH/Shelter | ahmeda@unhcr.org |
| Volker Schimmel | Basic Needs | schimmel@unhcr.org |
| Stacy Christopher | Food Security | Stacy.christopher@wfo.org |
| Esmaeil Ibrahim | WASH | eibrahim@unicef.org |
| Mohammed Abdel-Al | Shelter | abdelal@unhcr.org |
| Josiane Bizimana Dyson | RH/UNFPA | Jbizimana@unfpa.org |
| Bara'ah Keilani | Child Protection/ IM | bkeilani@unicef.org |
| Leana Islam | Youth | lislam@unfpa.org |
| Jean- Laurent Martin | Inter- Sector | martin@unhcr.org |
| Karen Whiting | Protection | whiting@unhcr.org |
| Lamia Rantissi | WHO/Health | lamiarantissi@yahoo.com |
| Maya Logo | Protection/Education | Logo@unhcr.org |
| Ann Burton | UNHCR/Health | burton@unhcr.org |
| Maaike Van Adrichem | UNICEF | mvadrichem@unicef.org |
| Noha Gibreel | Health/ Food Security | gibreel@unhcr.org |
| Ana Belen Anguita Arjona | UNHCR/SGBV SWG | anguita@unhcr.org |