PROTECTION WORKING GROUP – Southeast Turkey

Meeting Minutes - December 14, 2016

Meeting subject:	Case Management System
Time & location:	**Wednesday December 14, 10:00-12:00** UNHCR Gaziantep
Chaired by:	Terra MacKinnon
Minutes prepared by:	Basak Boyoglu and Terra MacKinnon
Participants:	ABA ROLI, ASAM, CARE, Concern, DRC, GIZ, CRS, UTBA, HI, IBC, IMC, IMPR, IOM, RI, TRC, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNHCR, WHH, YUVA
Agenda:	1. Objectives for the meeting 2. Administrative follow up (minutes, action points, announcements) 3. Key characteristics of the case management system 4. Rationalizing the system with 'hubs' and 'leads' 5. Next steps for task forces or national PWG 6. AoB

MEETING HIGH LEVEL ISSUES

• Agreed that the main activities currently taking place in southeast Turkey under the term 'case management' are:
  1. Facilitating access to national services (ex. transport, translation, accompaniment)
  2. Support to national service providers (ex. training, secondments, supplying translators)
  3. Direct implementation (ex. when extra capacity or technical expertise are needed)
• Agreed to use the following geographic divisions ('hubs')as a framework to help organize the case management system:
  1. Adana & Osmaniye
  2. Gaziantep
  3. Hatay
  4. Kilis
  5. Malatya, Adiyaman & K.maras
  6. Mardin
  7. Sanliurfa
• Agreed to further refine idea of 'lead' or 'focal point' case management organizations. To be taken up by the PWG core group.
• The four rotating members of the PWG core group were nominated without contest: DRC, IMC, IOM and the Gaziantep Bar Association. The three permanent members are: UNICEF, co-chair of the CP SWG; UNFPA, co-chair of the SGBV SWG; and UNHCR, as global refugee mandate holder.

	AGENDA POINT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1.	Objectives for the meeting	• Establish a shared understanding of the current case management system • Agree on a revised structure • Identify priority tasks to be completed before January meeting	
2.	Administrative follow up (minutes, action points, announcements)	• Announcement of higher education grants available for non-Syrians. For more information, follow up with the chair directly. • No further inputs on November meeting minutes, considered endorsed. • No further inputs on PWG terms of reference (ToR), considered endorsed. • Results of the PWG core group nominations are: DRC, IOM, IMC and Gaziantep Bar Association. Since this matches the number of seats, including the one seat reserved for an organization with legal expertise, there is no need for an election. No further inputs or objections by the group, considered endorsed for the first six month rotation. The meeting will be held on the Wednesday after the PWG at 10am. First meeting will be on December 21. • Review of action points since November (see below). No red items. • IOM FAP leaflets available for pick up for those that ordered them in the last meeting.	
3.	Key characteristics of the case management system	**Review of case management process**: 1. Identify vulnerable individual, including raising awareness among affected communities. 2. Assess the needs of the individual and the family. 3. Develop an individual case plan for each individual addressing the needs identified. Set time-bound, measureable objectives 4. Start the case plan, including direct support and referral services such as: legal assistance, health services, TP registration etc. 5. Follow up, monitor, and regularly review progress towards case plan objectives. 6. Close case (or re-assess needs and continue cycle) **Main activities taking place as part of the case management system in southeast Turkey**: 1. Facilitating access to national services (ex. transport, translation, accompaniment) 2. Support to national service providers (ex. training, secondments, supplying translators)	

		3. Direct implementation (ex. when extra capacity or technical expertise are needed)	
		Main case types:	
		• Medical assistance	
		• Legal assistance	
		• Material assistance (including CBIs)	
		• Protection	
		Current use of case management tools:	
		• Inter-agency referral forms (every agency has own)	
		• Assessment forms (every agency has own)	
		• High risk identification criteria (not standardized)	
		• Confidentiality SOPs (not standardized)	
		• Service mapping (many agencies have own)	
		• Referral pathways (not clear)	
4.	Rationalizing the system with 'hubs' and 'leads'	A **model was presented to the group as a starting point** to improve clarity, predictability and efficiency of the case management system. It was proposed to: • Divide the geography according to number of refugees and reasonable catchment areas for services (one catchment area is a 'hub') • For each hub, identify an actor that can take the lead for referrals for specific case types (this is a 'lead' agency) • This model can help simplify referral pathways, especially for non-protection actors, and allow deepening of specialized knowledge The group worked in small teams to develop **suggestions on how to divide the territory**, followed by discussion in plenary of the various options and rationales. The outcome was a tentative agreement start with the following hubs: 1. Adana & Osmaniye 2. Gaziantep 3. Hatay 4. Kilis 5. Malatya, Adiyaman & K.maras 6. Mardin 7. Sanliurfa	

	The **concept of lead agency** was presented as having responsibility to: • Act as <u>primary point of referral</u>, especially referrals from non-protection actors • <u>Dispatch referrals</u> to other actors according to geography, relative caseload or case specific factors • Participate in the local <u>case management group</u> • Commit to <u>international standards</u> & humanitarian principles • Provide honest feedback to PWG on <u>capacity</u> to manage caseload • <u>Provider of last resort</u> for the hub The members were asked to work in groups according to area of operation (Gaziantep, Sanliurfa and Hatay) and make recommendations for the below, noting the type of activity for each (i.e. facilitating access, direct implementation, or both): • Lead **protection** case management agency • Lead **medical** case management agency • Lead **legal** case management agency Much discussion and debate followed, with an agreement to **further develop the model** and look for alternatives for consideration. Key points raised include: • 'Focal point' agency may be a more accurate term than 'lead' • Provider of last resort is too heavy of a responsibility and would limit which organizations could act as a lead • How does the model include CBOs and other national organizations? • How to connect to the national system? • Would the lead monopolize all referrals? Could organizations keep their existing referral networks?	*Protection Core Group to follow up in their Dec. 21 meeting and develop a revised model based on the PWG feedback.*
5. Next steps for task forces or national PWG	In addition to the model, it was acknowledged that specific tools need to be created or adapted to be used nationally. The group identified common tools needed to build the case management system: • Inter-agency referral form • Protection assessment form • Heightened risk identification tool	*The national PWG will be requested to create a standardized inter-agency referral form, protection assessment form and heightened risk identification tool. The Hatay Case Management*

	- Service mapping per hub - Easy reference referral pathways (4Ws & templates) - Information sharing protocol or confidentiality SOPs - Formal connection between CMGs and PWG - Case management information management system There were concerns expressed regarding duplication of effort, creating things that already exist, but general agreement that standardized national (not just southeast) tools would be beneficial and could be done using existing tools as a foundation. Others expressed concern over creating a standardized system for managing case management information. Additional points for future steps include: - An ad hoc meeting on the utility/necessity/legality of a system to manage information (including UNHCR Sr Data Manager, Case Management Task Force, PWG members, UNICEF) - An ad hoc meeting of legal actors to explore best ways to manage the legal cases across hubs (including UNHCR, ABA ROLI, UNICEF and the Gaziantep Bar Association) - An ad hoc meeting between the PWG and Health WG chairs to explore how to manage medical cases - Creation of local level information sheet on how to refer to local national services	*Group has collected IA referral form samples to be shared with the national PWG for reference. The Case Management Task Force has guidance on protection assessment form content and risk identification that it will also share with national PWG for reference.* *Collecting existing service mappings for the three main hubs (Gaziantep, Sanliurfa and Hatay) is requested from the respective case management groups. Support for collating will be sought form the IMWG.* *Confidentiality SOPs for the case management groups are currently being drafted and will be shared for review with the PWG.* *The Case Management Task Force will hold an ad hoc meeting on the possible creation of a case management IMS to determine if the group wants to pursue this.*
6. Next meeting	Strategy planning workshop in January to set strategy and workplan for 2017. Key points: - Three part process: PA findings, protection risk analysis, strategy workshop - Possible dates: January 11, 12, 13? - PWG members to share info in advance for desk review	*PWG members to share info so a desk review can be completed in advance of January workshop.*

ACTION POINTS SUMMARY				
No.	**Action**	**Responsible**	**Deadline**	**Status**
1.	*Protection Core Group to follow up in their Dec. 21 meeting and develop a revised model based on the PWG feedback.*	**PWG core group**	**Dec. 21**	**Planned**
2.	*National PWG to create a standardized inter-agency referral form, protection assessment form and heightened risk identification tool. IA referral form samples collected by the Hatay Case Management Group have been shared with the national PWG for reference.*	**National PWG**	**TBD**	
3.	*Case Management Task Force to share with the national PWG guidance on protection assessment form content and risk identification for reference.*	**CM TF**	**Jan. 2**	
4.	*Collecting existing service mappings for the three main hubs (Gaziantep, Sanliurfa and Hatay) is requested from the respective case management groups. Support for collating will be sought from the IMWG.*	**CMGs**	**Jan. 9**	**In process**
5.	*Creation of confidentiality SOPs for the case management groups. Draft to be shared on Dec. 19 with PWG for feedback.*	**CMGs**	**Jan. 9**	**In process**
6.	*An ad hoc meeting on the utility/necessity/legality of a system to manage information and whether or not the group wants to pursue creating this (including UNHCR Sr. Data Manager, Case Management Task Force, PWG members, UNICEF).*	**CM TF**	**TBD**	
7.	*Ad hoc meeting of legal actors to explore best ways to manage the legal cases across hubs (including UNHCR, ABA ROLI, UNICEF and the Gaziantep Bar Association).*	**PWG Chair**	**Second week of January**	
8.	*An ad hoc meeting between the PWG and Health WG chairs to explore how to manage medical cases*	**PWG Chair**	**Dec. 20**	
9.	*PWG members to share info so a desk review can be completed in advance of January workshop. Info collection plan to be created by PWG core group.*	**PWG core group & PWG members**	**Dec 21 and TBD**	
10.	*Creation of local level information sheet on how to refer to local national services.*	**PWG**	**TBD**	

November Action Point Status

ACTION POINT	DESCRIPTION	STATUS
4Ws matrix	16 organizations submitted completed matrices for a total of over 5,000 activities (!)	🟩
Disability report guidance note	Submitted to PDU on time, waiting for their response (promised for today).	🟧
Community Centre Report	Revisions completed. Formatting issue delay. PDF to be posted this weekend on the Google drive.	🟧
Google drive for PWG	Up and active! Can find folders for 4Ws, ESSN, verification, leaflets, legislative updates, meeting minutes & hand outs, contacts lists, etc.	🟩
Glossary of terms	Found in the PWG Google drive and also a form for submitting addition requests.	🟩
IOM leaflets	Available for pick up by those who ordered. Also available on the Google drive.	🟩
Legislative updates	Shared monthly with ISWG. Also on the Google drive. Feedback welcome.	🟩
CC mapping	Online tool no longer being used. Matrix & map on Google drive	🟩
ESSN & verification updates	On-going. Look in respective Google drive folders for latest FAQs and other documents. Feedback on roll out welcome.	🟩
'Nomination for support' form	Feedback form on government services that are unwilling or unable to provide services for refugees	🟩