

GLOBAL PROTECTION CLUSTER | STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK 2016-19

Consultations with the International Rescue Committee/TT-Protection Mainstreaming

Skype, Geneva-Brighton, 2 December 2015

1. Provision of generic guidance has been the work of the Task Team so far but what has been better received has been the sharing of experience of other field clusters, e.g. Central African Republic, which has clear indicators. The TT needs to be a better information-sharing platform.
2. The TT has expanded its participation this year to include more local actors and this work needs to continue into next year. A bottom-up approach needs to be prioritized to expand reach beyond INGOs.
3. The TT has been reaching out to Asia-Pacific and Latin America in order to ensure preparedness is prioritized in those regions. The TT now has a huge pool of trainers in the field on protection mainstreaming and this is a resource not only for mainstreaming but protection in general. The pool can be used for other capacity-building initiatives and can be shared.
4. The work on AAP has been successful in terms of streamlining terminology. There has not been a discussion on merging the work with TT-L or setting benchmarks for ending the TT. However, the TT is systematically reviewing the progress of its work and whether it is still needed. The TT has not yet seen a TT which is time-bound and maybe we should think about working groups instead, especially as the objectives of the TT-PM are so broad.
5. The amount of time the TTs take up in the support work of the GPC is becoming an issue, given the strategic objectives of the cluster. The GPC has often been acting more as a secretariat for Geneva-based processes than focusing on providing support to the field or building a network.
6. The priorities for the TT in the GPC are field support, global coordination and learning. The rapid response mechanism of the GPC needs strengthening, e.g. the ProCap element.
7. The GPC could play more of a coordination role in bringing together global initiatives in protection, e.g. Results-Based Protection. The donor dialogue is important to ensure that all elements of protection are funded.
8. The composition of the GPC support cell, which includes NGO members, has been important to communication. The structure of the SAG needs to be looked at and there needs to be more clarity on decision-making, e.g. the approval of TT work-plans. The TORs are unclear, so is the functioning.
9. Oxfam/IRC/World Vision has funding from DfID on capacity-building of local partners and the results of this will be interesting for the work of the GPC. One of the issues will be the inclusion of national NGOs in global coordination mechanisms.