



## GPC PROTECTION CONFERENCE 30 May-1 June 2018, Royal Orchid Sheraton Hotel, Bangkok

WEDNESDAY, 30 MAY 2018

09.00-11.00: THEMATIC SESSION - Collective Outcomes (*Ballroom 2&3*)

### **Background**

Ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit, held in Istanbul, in May 2016, The Secretary-General issued a report that aimed to lay-out an ambitious plan to transform the way humanitarian action is delivered, coordinated, and financed. One of the central themes for the report's "vision for change" was the need to transcend long-standing conventional thinking, silos, mandates and other attitudinal, institutional, and funding obstacles. To this end, the report urged "the international aid system, including the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and donors to commit to working in a new paradigm marked by three fundamental shifts: (a) reinforce, do not replace, national and local systems; (b) anticipate, do not wait, for crises; (c) transcend the humanitarian-development divide by working towards collective outcomes, based on comparative advantage and over multi-year time frames".

The IASC adopted a Protection Policy in 2016, which concretises the IASC Statement on the Centrality of Protection, 2013. A policy is not guidance: it must be followed unless there are objectively good reasons to depart from it. The IASC Protection Policy tells us that the purpose of humanitarian action is the protection of the rights of affected people, that all humanitarians have a role to play and the intended outcome is a reduction in the risk to affected people. In other words, ***the IASC Protection Policy enforces the notion that the collective outcome of humanitarian action is a reduction in the risk to affected people.*** Concrete examples are contained in the Policy itself.

Within the broader community, however, there is no globally agreed-upon definition of what a collective outcome is and how to design it, and it is not apparent that the IASC Protection Policy is referred to in all context. A consensus seem to be emerging that describes a collective outcome as a shared result-oriented objective either within or between **humanitarian, development and where relevant peace-building partners**, which:

- a. Reflects common areas of concern and strategic priorities between these pillars;
- b. Is quantifiable, measurable, and aims to decreasing vulnerabilities by striving to address root-causes;
- c. Builds on stakeholders' comparative advantages<sup>1</sup>
- d. Is based on a multi-year timeframe linked, where applicable, to the SDGs to ensure Government's ownership

---

<sup>11</sup> The current UNDAF guidance defines a comparative advantage as : the capacity to act; positioning to act; mandate to act



Agreed inter-agency guidance would certainly be helpful, however, the fact that collective outcomes are yet to be firmly designed presents an opportunity for protection actors to ensure that protection remains at the centre of the humanitarian response, including in the design of shared or collective outcomes. It is also an opportunity to build on the lessons learned from the adoption of the IASC Policy and subsequent rollout of the Centrality of protection to ensure that protection – both as a rationale for the response as well as an outcome - is incorporated in the development response as well as that of peacebuilding partners. A sound protection analysis as well as agreed and adopted HCT Protection Strategies are key to help the humanitarian community to ensure that collective outcomes take into account, and address the protection reasons and risks underlying the situation to which the humanitarian- development- peace building communities are asked to respond to ensure that the following action can be transformative in nature.

### ***Purpose of Session***

The purpose of the session is to ensure that protection actors are fully informed about the ongoing discussions on collective outcomes, and can contribute meaningfully to these discussions at the country level, with a view of ensuring the protection remains central to the international response. The session will provide an opportunity for field colleagues to help define what a “collective outcome” is and how the “humanitarian- development nexus” can realise human rights and fundamental freedoms in both modes of action.

### ***Specific Questions***

- 1) The role of protection cluster leads and AoRs in designing collective outcomes
  - Evidence based design
  - Leveraging resources
  - Analyzing the data
- 2) How to ensure that the collective outcomes acknowledges the human rights situation and protection analysis?
  - Ensuring a protection oriented narrative
  - Joined-up advocacy
  - How to ensure data from different sources
- 3) How to work in new ways without diluting accountability?
  - Working with development and peace building actors
  - Ensuring the centrality of protection within and beyond the humanitarian sphere
  - Going beyond best practices

### ***Intended outcome***

A common understanding of the purpose and relevance of protection in the design of a “collective outcome”, built on emerging trends and an inter active discussion on what is needed to achieve such outcomes.

### ***Facilitator***

Ms. Annika Sandlund, Inter-Agency Coordination Service, UNHCR, [sandlund@unhcr.org](mailto:sandlund@unhcr.org)



**WEDNESDAY, 30 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – Digital Room and engagement (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

### ***Background***

While bringing clear advantages for humanitarian and human rights action, information communication technologies introduce new risks. Moreover, in an increasingly digital and digitised world, the protection of individuals is necessarily also about the protection of their personal data and understanding the harm that can come from digital engagement.

ICTs have allowed for the development of new methodologies: crowdsourcing, for example, combines information gained through various digital tools with information collected directly from affected communities and is becoming standard good practice by humanitarian and human right organisations.

Affected communities themselves increasingly use new technologies and methodologies to communicate as they self-organise during and following crises. Nonetheless, for each opportunity there are also risks attached to digital engagement, such as vulnerability to unauthorised use, interception and surveillance of personal data and other challenges such as the use of metadata by ill-intentioned third parties. ICTs can also be used to spread hate speech and fake news, to promote violence and extremism and allow for mass surveillance and monitoring of opinions, for example during election periods. Differential access to connectivity can also cause tensions between displaced people and host communities.

### ***Purpose of the session***

To provide an opportunity for field colleagues to share experience and practice in mitigating risks associated with digital engagement, such as data protection, analysing potential harm from hate speech, countering violence and extremism and guarding against fake news.

### ***Intended outcome***

An understanding of the responsibility of protection actors in digital engagement and mitigating risk and a sharing of good practices from the field.

### ***Panellists***

- Delphine van Solinge, ICRC, [dvansolinge@icrc.org](mailto:dvansolinge@icrc.org)
- Thomas Graditzky, ICRC, [thgraditzky@icrc.org](mailto:thgraditzky@icrc.org)
- Joseph Guay, Do No Digital Harm Initiative, [joseph@dra.world](mailto:joseph@dra.world)



**WEDNESDAY, 30 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK - Mine Victim Assistance and Continuum of Services (*Riverside 5*)**

***Background***

Year after year, thousands of men, boys, women and girls are killed or injured by mines, explosive remnants of war (ERW) and Improvised Explosive Devices. The situation is particularly worrisome in Afghanistan, DRC, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Ukraine, Yemen, countries where governments lack the capacity to provide adequate victim assistance.

Victim assistance should be provided through a two-pronged approach. On the one hand, through specific victim efforts whether through funding as part of the global mine action envelop or through specific initiatives by affected states. And on the other hand, through delivery of services relevant to the needs and the geographical location of casualties<sup>2</sup> and indirect victims<sup>3</sup>, whether by donor states through their broader humanitarian and development funding for mine/ERW/IED affected states, or by affected states themselves through broader government responses to improve health, education and labour, to name only a few.

Victim assistance earmarked funding dropped to an all-time low of 4% of global mine action funding in 2016, with only USD 19 million dedicated to this pillar of mine action to support over 30 states in their efforts to ensure access to services for casualties and indirect victims. The pillar of victim assistance faces a critical funding shortfall in many countries. This has a negative impact on local NGOs providing vital services and, subsequently, on the lives of casualties and indirect victims.

Over 30% of people who have an accident, do not survive it. This rate is higher for children, and arguably for women as well. Survivors are condemned to a life with life altering and often, life shattering injuries and subsequent impairments, while their families are left struggling to cope. The IASC has recognized that persons with disability have been neglected in humanitarian emergencies and is developing guidelines for inclusion of persons with disability in humanitarian assistance. This is a step in the right direction; however, there are some critical issues related to victim assistance that are not covered by the initiative to develop this guidance.

We need to create a better understanding among humanitarian workers of what victim assistance is, the sectors it is part of, and strengthen linkages with protection, health, education, labour and social protection actors to i) protect people from explosive hazards through risk education and clearance, and ii) ensure that casualties and indirect victims can access necessary services and subsequently lead lives of equal opportunities.

This session aims to highlight what colleagues are doing in their Area of Responsibility (AoR) to improve these linkages. The Child Protection and the Mine Action AoR are working together to establish a baseline of cooperation between these two AoR to improve the impact and reach of risk e

---

<sup>2</sup> 'Casualties' are people injured and killed by an accident with a mine/ERW/IED

<sup>3</sup> Indirect victims are family members of people injured and killed by an accident with a mine/ERW and people living in areas with, or displaced as a result of, mine/ERW contamination.



education and victim assistance in the context of mine and explosive remnants of war including Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs).

### ***Purpose of the session***

- Clarify what is meant by ‘victim assistance’ in the context of humanitarian mine action.
- Present the roadmap for increased collaboration between the Mine Action and Child Protection Areas of Responsibility
- Discuss good practices in integrating victim assistance in programming by other clusters/area of responsibility that have helped to reduce casualties among children through demining activities, risk education, and provision of the full range of emergency medical care etc.

### ***Intended outcome***

The session is intended for people who work in mine/ERW/IED affected countries. Protection coordinators and advisors will leave the session ready to support innovative and collaborative approaches to reduce the number of children amongst mine/ERW casualties through:

- The need to conceptualize Mine Risk Education as part of a continuum of services
- Reduction of # of children amongst mine/ERW casualties through targeted MRE and livelihood support for parents of out of school children
- Improved identification and referral<sup>4</sup> of mine/ERW child casualties to:
  - Increase survival rate by increasing availability of first aid and emergency medical transport
- Improved identification and referral<sup>5</sup> of mine/ERW child survivors to:
  - Increased level of functioning of child casualties due to access to trauma surgery, rehabilitation including prosthetic and orthotics and psychosocial support
  - Increased participation in social inclusion, whether in school, sports, leisure or cultural activities

### ***Panellists***

- Ms. Elke Hottentot, Co-coordinator, Global Mine Action Area of Responsibility, [e.hottentot@hi.org](mailto:e.hottentot@hi.org)
- Mr. David Sezikeye, UNICEF, [dsezikeye@unicef.org](mailto:dsezikeye@unicef.org)
- Ms. Caitlin Longden, UNMAS, [caitlinl@unops.org](mailto:caitlinl@unops.org)

---

<sup>4</sup> Improved referral due to mapping of services and availability of directory of services, and existence of referral path way of mine/ERW casualties

<sup>5</sup> Idem



**WEDNESDAY, 30 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – Anti-trafficking in humanitarian action (*Pompadour*)**

***Background***

Vulnerable populations in emergency contexts are at risk of being trafficked.<sup>6</sup> Trafficking prevention and response, however, have either remained unaddressed within the humanitarian cluster system, or not been addressed in a comprehensive manner, nor been perceived, in certain instances, as a life-saving intervention. Human trafficking<sup>7</sup> is a crime with serious human rights concerns and implications taking place in both ordinary times *and* in times of crisis. This is reflected in several reports<sup>8</sup> published in 2015-2016 by UN agencies, international organizations and the Special Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children. These reports establish a link between trafficking and emergency contexts, and identify a critical gap in the humanitarian response system. To address this gap, trafficking must be embedded in the humanitarian response architecture and systematically operationalized.

A coherent strategy is needed to address the trafficking risks to affected populations that arise in emergency contexts, as humanitarian emergencies exacerbate existing vulnerabilities to human trafficking. Recent analyses<sup>9</sup> indicate that survivors are often identified months into a crisis, at which time the victimization has already occurred. This finding underscores the need to build prevention and risk analysis into the beginning of humanitarian response, even when evidence is yet unavailable. For this to happen, anti-trafficking activities need a clear place in the existing humanitarian response system and should be part of the protection approach implemented before, during, and after crises.

In this context, the Global Protection Cluster (GPC) has set up an Anti-Trafficking Task Team to develop a guidance on anti-trafficking interventions in humanitarian responses and to provide recommendations on how to best mainstream it in the existing cluster activities.

***Purpose of the session***

The first part of the session will introduce the work of the GPC Anti-Trafficking Task Team to date and present an overview of the identified trends and recurring challenges drawn from the stock-taking phase performed by the Task Team. This phase aimed at ascertaining existing modalities to address trafficking in persons in cluster contexts, highlighting challenges and gaps where more guidance and/or coordination is needed to improve responses. The second part of the session will be practical and

---

<sup>6</sup> Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action Reducing Risk, Promoting Resilience and Aiding Recovery, IASC, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> “‘Trafficking in persons’” shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labour or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs”, Article 3 of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 15 November 2000.

<sup>8</sup> IOM, “Addressing human trafficking and exploitation in times of crisis,” December 2015; IOM, “MICIC Brief: Responding to Human Trafficking and Exploitation in Times of Crisis,” January 2016; ODI HPN, article from IOM: “Human trafficking in crises: a neglected protection concern,” October 2015; The Freedom Fund, “Modern Slavery and Trafficking in Conflict, the UN response”, November 2016; Report of the Special Rapporteur on Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, “Trafficking in persons, especially women and children: Report to the 71st Session of the UN General Assembly” (UN Doc A/71/303), August 2016.

<sup>9</sup> See footnote 3 above.



interactive, asking participants to join in the discussion and share their thoughts as to how the Task Team can help clusters strengthen anti-trafficking responses in times of crisis. Participants will have the opportunity to share challenges that they have experienced identifying and supporting victims of trafficking in the field, as well as to suggest what types of guidance and tools from the Task Team would improve their ability to help victims of trafficking in humanitarian situations.

### ***Intended outcome***

A shared understanding of the challenges that clusters are facing in the implementation of effective anti-trafficking interventions in humanitarian situations, and suggestions provided by the field to the Task Team about what sort of guidance and tools are needed to address trafficking in persons through the cluster response.

### **Speakers**

- Chissey Mueller, Counter-Trafficking in Humanitarian Settings, IOM, [cmueller@iom.int](mailto:cmueller@iom.int)



**WEDNESDAY, 30 MAY 2018**

**14.00-17.00: THEMATIC SESSION – Working with government and local partners in protection  
(Ballroom 2&3)**

**Q&A discussion** – Localisation in Coordination

Opening with 5min of reflections from each panellist on aspects relevant for coordination, then a facilitated 30min Q&A discussion, based around the 5 areas of the conceptual framework:

- leadership/decision making
- participation/influence
- partnerships
- funding
- institutional capacity building

The discussion will focus on learning and recommendations for coordinators as they begin preparing for the 2019 HPC.

***Orientation to Conceptual Framework and the Group Work***

***Group Work***

Breaking into regional groups, there will be 5 stations based on the Localisation in Coordination conceptual framework and assign groups to 1 of the stations.

Activities:

- Identify on the national-international continuum where the participants think their response is now and where they think it should be in the next HRP. The participants are invited to map this visually on a wall using VIPP cards.
- Identify 1-2 actions that could be taken to achieve this and place these on the wall using VIPP cards.

***Wrap up***

Highlighting some of the options and encouraging coordinators to factor in the self-assessment process into their pre-HNO/HRP preparations, as well as stressing what resources are available and where to go to access support.

***Facilitator:***

- Anthony Nolan, UNICEF, [anolan@unicef.org](mailto:anolan@unicef.org)





**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**09.00-11.00: THEMATIC SESSION – Humanitarian Program Cycle (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

09.00-10.00:               **HPC- Reflecting new and emerging priorities**  
                                  **Joint assessments, Analysis and target Indicators**  
                                  **Costing methodologies**

10.00- 11.00:           **Joint Assessments open discussion**  
                                  **Costing Methodologies open discussion**

### ***Background***

The humanitarian community and donors have acknowledged progress in improving the quality and credibility of Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) and Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs). However, the added operational value of the current process is also debated. Furthermore, there is a sense that elements and commitments of the 2016 Grand Bargain and World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) such as costing methodologies or joint needs assessments should be more formally integrated into the HPC process. Finally, in spite of the IASC Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action, the responsibility of all humanitarians to place protection at the center of humanitarian action as part of preparedness efforts, immediate and life-saving activities, and throughout the duration of a crisis and beyond, needs to be better integrated into the HPC process.

### ***Purpose of the session***

**HPC- Reflecting new and emerging priorities:** The first part of the session will present an overview of identified trends and recurring challenges drawn from the OCHA workshop on improving the humanitarian programme cycle.

Although participants concurred that the principles of the humanitarian programme cycle as agreed by the IASC in 2013 remain valid, many recognized that time was ripe to make improvements to address recurrent challenges such as: (1) perceived heaviness in the HPC related to opportunity costs of time and often limited staff capacities, (2) lack of clarity in purpose, (3) timelines and delays in production of various outputs resulting in disconnected HNOs and HRPs, (4) insufficient inter-sectoral analysis of needs and response resulting in sectoral focus, and (5) lack of continuous monitoring and (6) lack of visibility of protection. The presentation will focus on the suggested improvements coming out from the workshop and how do they affect protection outcomes.

**Joint assessments, Analysis and target Indicators:** The second part of the session will focus on Needs assessments. Significant efforts have been made in the past few years to strengthen the quality and coordination of humanitarian needs assessments used for strategic decision-making. Yet there remains a lack of shared understanding, expectations and commitment to the collective endeavour, in particular in the area of protection. We require needs assessments that are impartial, unbiased, comprehensive, context-sensitive, and protection focused. Needs assessments must provide a sound evidence to understand i) what is provoking and shaping the crisis dynamics and resultant protection situation; ii) what is triggering or will trigger threats, including potential violations; iii) who is vulnerable vis a vis these threats and why; and iv) how the foregoing impacts the coping mechanisms of all



affected persons. This will be the base for humanitarian response plans and prioritised appeals with due regard to specific protection risks and vulnerabilities of the affected population.

The first part of the HPC presentation will focus on informing the audience about ongoing initiatives aiming to achieve an efficient system for coordinated assessments that leverages capacities and knowledge. The second part will look into existing joint inter-sectoral analytical processes based on credible data, presenting best practices on the “integrated approach”.

After the presentation, participants willing to engage further will be invited to discuss the following questions;

- How to integrate protection into the ongoing grand bargain initiatives on coordination of humanitarian needs assessments?
- How can we ensure the incorporation of protection lens in the multi-sectoral analysis and inter-sectoral response approaches? (Protection mainstreaming & protection integration)
- How do we ensure collective outcomes in protection in multiyear planning/ collective outcomes?
- If in practice protection is not considered as life-saving during prioritizing exercises, how do we enhance our vulnerability and risk analyses to ensure protection is prioritized during the evidence based funding discussions?
- How to improve needs assessments so that they can better inform planning and programme design and better inform other protection activities such as protection monitoring, case management, communicating with affected communities.

**Project costing versus Unit costing:** The last part of the session will focus on project-based and unit-based costing methodologies as the bases for costing Humanitarian Response Plans, and its impact in protection.

Although there is consensus that both, project-based costing and unit-based costing, can be used by country teams at their discretion, the IASC Principals have recommended HCTs to adopt a coherent and transparent process and method for costing HRPs that is appropriate to context and capacities. In order to do so, the GCCG have agreed to develop guidance for unit-based costing, providing coherent common guidance and cluster/sector-specific adaptations as needed; and to review and improve the existing guidance on project-based costing so as to ensure increased credibility, transparency, and simplicity.

After the presentation, participants willing to engage further will be invited to discuss the following questions;

- Preferences of protection cluster regarding both costing methodologies.
- Identified challenges regarding activity-based costing for protection activities. (Protection Monitoring, referral systems, capacity building, community based protection, etc)
- How costing approaches should be contextualized to respond to field realities.



- Which protection concerns should be included in the preliminary guidance the Costing Group is preparing to inform preparation of the 2019 Humanitarian Response Plans. (i.e. preconditions, and pros and cons, of the respective methodologies)

### ***Intended outcome***

A shared understanding of the challenges Protection Clusters will be facing with the new HPC approach, and suggestions provided by the field to the GPC about what sort of guidance and tools are needed to address joint needs analysis and costing methodologies through the cluster response.

### ***Format***

The HPC session will involve a panel with four presenters followed up by two separate discussions on Joint Assessments and Costing Methodologies. Panellists will make short presentations (15m) related to their theme drawing on their expertise and experience. Participants will be able to interact with the panel through Slido10. After the presentations, panellists will break down the audience in two groups to lead focused discussions on the above topics.

### ***Panellists***

- HPC- Reflecting new and emerging priorities: David Murphy, OCHA, [murphyd@un.org](mailto:murphyd@un.org)
- Joint assessments, Analysis and target Indicators: Assanke Koedam, UNFPA, [koedam@unfpa.org](mailto:koedam@unfpa.org); Boris Aristin, UNICEF, [baristingonzalez@unicef.org](mailto:baristingonzalez@unicef.org)
- Costing methodologies: Ms. Annika Sandlund, UNHCR, [sandlund@unhcr.org](mailto:sandlund@unhcr.org)

---

10 Slido is an award-winning web-based audience interaction tool for meetings and events. Slido enables users to crowdsource top questions to drive meaningful conversations, engage participants with live polls and collect valuable interaction insights. It focuses on simplicity, both for meeting planners who can create an event in less than a minute, as well as for participants who can join via any device with a simple code.



**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – MENA (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

***Background:***

On-going conflicts characterised by grave breaches of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and its effects on the affected population in Syria and Yemen will most likely continue to affect these countries negatively in the immediate time to come. There is a high probability that political stalemates will persist, with all parties lacking commitment to peace negotiations, along with active fighting. Although Iraq has entered into a post-conflict stage, many IDPs remain in displacement and continue to be subject to rights violations, while large numbers are returning to their areas of origin, sometimes voluntarily but often forcibly as well.

Humanitarian access and the delivery of humanitarian and protection services in many parts of Syria and Yemen remains a major challenge. The on-going conflict in these countries have had a massive impact on the conflict-affected population resulting in civilian casualties, new waves of displacement, and rights violations.

There are also significant barriers to return in all three countries, including ongoing insecurity, non-restoration of basic services and critical infrastructure, HLP damage or destruction, secondary occupation, explosive hazard contamination, tribal disputes or perceived affiliation to extremists. Furthermore, a substantial reduction in humanitarian funding has hampered the protection response in Iraq, and is gradually becoming a challenge in Syria in view of other crises worldwide.

The Hard Talk session will bring to the floor select challenges/issues for coordination faced by field protection clusters in the three operations and lessons learnt.

**Needs assessment, protection monitoring and protection analysis**

- Protection Needs Assessments in highly scrutinised environments in Syria and Yemen, where the independent nature of an assessment is a red line for the cluster. What can this mean in practice?
- Rapid protection assessments (RPA) in Iraq and mobilising appropriate responses by relevant clusters: how does the RPA facilitate collective protection outcomes?
- Civilian Impact Monitoring Project in Yemen: how can the generation of real time information ensure updated analysis, timely response and prevention?
- How can Critical Protection Issues Notes in the context of Iraq support HC/HCT analysis and decision-making to achieve protection outcomes?
- Incident monitoring and protection risks/needs analysis: how to operationalise it within a cluster and in a complex environment?

**Advocacy on International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and protection principles:**

- The thirst for information to fuel advocacy versus little manoeuvrability/traction? What are the alternatives to public advocacy?
- Coordination through the chain of humanitarian and political decision-making: from clusters to HCs and political and military stakeholders?
- Promoting protection leadership in decision-making through for example the HCT and how to best reinforce ownership around the centrality of protection?



- How to meaningfully engage with donors on advocacy and on the prioritisation of protection?

### **Interaction and coordination with authorities and other parties to the conflict**

- Engagement with authorities and non-state actors, including at the local level in Syria: How to work as a cluster where operational space needs to be preserved but where humanitarian and protection principles are challenged by duty bearers?
- Civil-military communication and information sharing: When, and how to engage with military and stabilisation actors to better protect civilians in armed conflict? What about new military actors? What are the potential red lines, as well as how to engage and promote Do No Harm (DNH)?

### **Durable Solutions**

- Affected populations who return to areas that have been retaken by the Iraqi authorities face serious protection risks: how does the Principled Returns Framework in Iraq address challenges associated with return?
  - Forced Evictions and Return Tracking
  - Governorate Return Profiles & Thematic Return Assessments
  - Rapid Protection Assessments in prioritised return areas
  - Returns procedures mapping
  - 'Know Before You Go' messaging for IDPs contemplating return, and accompanying guidance for partners on the delivery of such messaging

### ***Purpose of the session:***

This regional 'hard talk' provides an opportunity for field colleagues to discuss lessons learnt from coordination in challenging operational contexts and possibly pave the way for further dialogue and reflection at global and regional levels. Humanitarian actors need to adjust, adapt and respond in new ways to protect the affected population: Are the current tools and frameworks adequate? How can we do better? Where do field operations need support and guidance?

### ***Intended outcome:***

Clear lessons learnt on how to coordinate in challenging operational contexts are outlined and what factors should be considered.



**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – Asia-Pacific (*Pompadour*)**

**Beyond Women’s Protection to Women’s Empowerment and Leadership in Humanitarian Action**

***Background***

While crises do not discriminate, their impacts do not fall equally in society and certain social groups, such as women, girls, the poorest, vulnerable and marginalized groups, are hit harder and have lower resilience in adapting to and recovering from crises. Across the world, women and girls face discrimination and violence every day due to gender inequality, and these conditions are further exacerbated and perpetuated in crisis contexts. With women and girls making up an estimated 50 per cent of the over 65 million forcibly displaced populations worldwide and being disproportionately impacted by crises and disasters worldwide, it is necessary to ensure that States, the international community and civil society, not only address their specific needs and aspirations, but also seek out and utilize their capacity and contributions in a manner that is informed and aimed at facilitating positive transformation and empowerment.

The importance of gender equality and women’s empowerment and leadership as a central element of both humanitarian action as well as across the humanitarian-development nexus has been recognized in international normative frameworks. These include the World Humanitarian Summit Agenda for Humanity and the Grand Bargain commitments, the Sustainable Development Goals, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action and the UN Security Council Resolutions on Women, Peace and Security 1325 and 1820. The new 2017 IASC Policy and Accountability Framework on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women and Girls in Humanitarian Action<sup>11</sup>, as well as the new 2017 IASC Gender in Humanitarian Action Handbook<sup>12</sup> further harnesses progressive thinking on humanitarian preparedness and response, peace building, and development, to be transformative, inclusive and uncompromising towards achieving the goals of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action. Implementation of this policy and related guidance will lead to humanitarian action which is more just, coherent, effective and cost efficient, and thus will save more lives.

However, despite the plethora of international commitments calling for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in crisis and humanitarian settings, significant gaps remain in translating these commitments into action. Gaps continue to impede the realisation of effective gender-responsive policies and programmes in humanitarian and crisis response, such as lack of sex and age-disaggregated data and understanding of the gendered impacts of crisis, lack of substantive women’s participation and leadership in humanitarian response, lack of targeted livelihood opportunities for women and insufficient protection mechanisms for women. Humanitarian action is lagging in its efforts to develop mechanisms and modalities that enable and empower women and girls to mitigate real or perceived risks; to monitor and address rights violation issues; and to strengthen their roles as first responders, leaders and decision makers. Such interventions in humanitarian preparedness, response and recovery efforts build women and girls’ participation and empowerment and ultimately their community’s resilience.

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/gender-and-humanitarian-action/documents-public/iasc-policy-gender-equality-and-empowerment-women> , <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/gender-and-humanitarian-action/documents-public/accountability-framework-iasc-policy-gender-equality>

<sup>12</sup> <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/iasc-gender-handbook-humanitarian-action-2017>



Humanitarian responses often miss opportunities to transform harmful gender relations through the participation and empowerment of women and girls in their role as decision makers, first responders and economic actors — notwithstanding the fact that these are key to response effectiveness and to communities' longer-term resilience and social cohesion. Despite being disproportionately impacted, women's actual and potential contributions to crisis response, prevention and emergency response preparedness are often overlooked and women's leadership in building community resilience disregarded. Central to this must be the development of women's self-reliance, empowerment and leadership – allowing them to build a future of their own choosing and freeing them from dependence and vulnerability. In many cases, ensuring women's contributions and increased self-reliance has proven to lead to positive outcomes not only for themselves, but for their families and communities, meaning more effective and cost-efficient service delivery.

If women and their advocates are absent in humanitarian planning and decision-making processes, there will never be a complete understanding of the gendered vulnerabilities and impact of crises to design and inform crisis management policy, planning and humanitarian programmes that are effective, accountable and based on sound evidence. Local and national women's movements and groups, and gender equality advocates, are the stakeholders the most knowledgeable on the specific needs and issues for women in crisis affected regions and can come up with local solutions to the problems in consultation with women in local populations to promote their voice and influence on decision-making, if given opportunities and resources. The Grand Bargain commits donors and aid organizations to providing 25 per cent of global humanitarian funding to local and national responders by 2020. For this commitment to be effective and gender-responsive, it must prioritise engagement, funding and capacity development support to local women's groups and other local networks and civil society groups working with women as first responders and community resilience builders<sup>13</sup>.

### ***Purpose of the session***

To provide colleagues with the opportunity to consider the imperative of gender equality and empowerment of women and girls in effective and accountable humanitarian action, as complimentary to the central role of protection in humanitarian action (and addressing gender based violence in emergencies). The session will begin with an introductory presentation including interactive questions to the floor throughout to set the scene on: What is gender equality and women's empowerment (GEEW) in humanitarian action (and how does it differ from protection/GBV); Why promoting GEEW in humanitarian action is relevant and complimentary to promoting the centrality of protection in humanitarian action (and addressing GBV in emergencies); and examples from the field of promoting GEEW in humanitarian action (beyond protection and GBV). The session will then be opened up for a plenary discussion on the way forward where contributions from participants will be particularly welcomed to share and highlight challenges, gaps and opportunities to promoting GEWE in humanitarian action (moving beyond protection and GBV) using examples of experiences from the field.

### ***Intended outcome***

A shared understanding and interactive discussion among experts and practitioners of the challenges and opportunities of promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in humanitarian action, from the perspective of the global policy/normative frameworks to

---

<sup>13</sup> <http://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/news-and-events/events/2017/02/giha-brief-on-asia-pacific-regional-dialogue#desc>





implementation experiences from the field in Asia-Pacific, and concluding collective suggestions from the facilitators and participants on the way forward to further strengthen gender-responsive implementation of the centrality of protection principle and of cross-sectoral humanitarian action overall.

### ***Facilitators***

- Marie Sophie Sandberg Pettersson, Programme Specialist Humanitarian Action and Resilience Building, Asia & Pacific (UN Women), [marie.pettersson@unwomen.org](mailto:marie.pettersson@unwomen.org)
- Rochelle Braaf, Programme Specialist, Gender and Protection, Pacific (UN Women), [rochelle.braaf@unwomen.org](mailto:rochelle.braaf@unwomen.org)





**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – Natural disaster Situations (*Riverside 5*)**

### ***Background***

Every year around the world millions of people are displaced by disasters associated with natural hazards, such as earthquakes, landslides, windstorms, droughts, tsunamis, flooding, tornadoes, monsoons, and volcanic eruptions. According to the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, out of the 30,6 million persons newly displaced in 2017, 61% were displaced by disasters, compared to 39% displaced by conflict. The former represents 18,8 million persons in 135 countries, displaced by weather-related causes such as droughts, wildfires and landslides, but mainly by floods and storms that displaced, respectively, 8,6 million and 7,5 million people. The remaining people were displaced by earthquakes (589'000 people) and volcanic eruptions (169'000 people). At the same time, national and international responses to such disaster-related displacement remain insufficient, while the needs and vulnerabilities faced by the affected communities remain high.

Disasters are a result of multiple man-made variables that can exacerbate the destructive impacts of natural hazards. In some cases, the intricate inter-relations between conflict and natural disaster settings create an even more complex crisis that poses particular challenges for humanitarian response.

Disasters can have devastating impacts with protracted effects even more so in areas where capacities of preparedness were inexistent or weak. Furthermore, in areas where situations of tensions or vulnerabilities within the population were pre-existing and limiting full access and enjoyment of human rights, tensions and limitations are often exacerbated whilst new risks to the population take form during the emergency. These threats and risks can consist of displacement, forced relocation, weak law enforcement, breakdown of social safety nets, family separation, human trafficking, gender-based violence, exploitation, discrimination or unequal access to aid, as well as land disputes and the loss of property rights and personal legal documentation. In such settings, populations in situation of vulnerability may also tend to resort to negative coping mechanisms.

In the response in natural disasters, protection can be delivered by a range of actors in addition to traditional protection actors, through context relevant, appropriate and pragmatic protective measures. Indeed, through the mainstreaming of protection into their different sectors of response, organizations can ensure that the most vulnerable are not excluded and the persons with specific needs are considered. Thus, it is important to integrate a protection approach in the response to natural disasters or to mainstream protection to ensure the overall effectiveness and efficiency of all sectors and that assistance reaches every disaster-affected person. Such an approach is consistent with global standards and key global policy frameworks<sup>14</sup> that have increasingly been calling for a

---

<sup>14</sup> In particular, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, the Agenda for Humanity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Nansen Initiative Agenda for the Protection of People Displaced Across Borders in the Context of Disasters and Climate Change



more coherent and holistic approach to managing disaster induced displacement and addressing the needs of populations displaced by disasters.

### ***Purpose of the session***

The session aims at giving an overview of current approaches and policies in the response to disaster induced displacement, showcasing how protection is a central dimension to working in natural disasters across all sectors. The session also aims at sharing experiences and lessons learned in the field, while looking at remaining challenges and complexities and discussing how coordination mechanisms, amongst others, could contribute to tackle them.

### ***Intended outcome***

Share current approaches and experiences to protection in natural disasters, and tackle persistent remaining issues such as coordination during response to natural disasters occurring in conflict areas or when natural disasters exacerbate existing tensions.

### ***Format of the session***

Introduction to the breadth of the phenomenon and its effects, followed by presentations on the different approaches and experiences (case studies) to protection in the response in natural disasters.

25minutes per panellist x4 (includes 10-15 minutes presentations and 10-15 minutes dialogue and questions from the audience. Presentation of approach or field case study; Lessons learned and challenges identified; Questions and dialogue with the audience.

### ***Background reading***

- Global Protection Cluster - [Protection in Natural Disasters](#)
- [IASC Operational Guidelines on the Protection of Persons in Situations of Natural Disasters](#)
- Brookings Bern Project on Internal Displacement - [Human Rights and Natural Disasters – Operational Guidelines and Field Manual on Human Rights Protection in Situations of Natural Disasters](#)
- [IDMC Global Report 2017](#)
- IFRC - [International Disaster Response Law, Rules and Principles \(IDRL\)](#)
- The Nansen Initiative – [Global Consultations and Protection Agenda](#)
- [Platform on Disaster Displacement](#) – Follow-up to the Nansen Initiative
- MICIC - [Guidelines to Protect Migrants in Countries Experiencing Conflict or Natural Disaster](#)
- MEND Guide - [Comprehensive Guide for Planning Mass Evacuations in Natural Disasters](#)
- FAO Land Tenure Manual - [Assessing and Responding to Land Tenure in Disaster Risk Management](#)
- UNHABITAT - [Land and Natural Disaster – Guidance for Practitioners](#)
- [IOM Emergency manual](#)



- [IOM publications on Migration, Environment and Climate Change](#)

### ***Speakers***

- Ezekiel Simperingham, IFRC, [ezekiel.simperingham@ifrc.org](mailto:ezekiel.simperingham@ifrc.org)
- Christy Marfil, IOM, [cmarfil@iom.int](mailto:cmarfil@iom.int)
- Ibere Lopez, IOM, [ilopes@iom.int](mailto:ilopes@iom.int)
- Jessica Gorham, UNFPA, [gorham@unfpa.org](mailto:gorham@unfpa.org)



**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**14.00-17.00: THEMATIC SESSION – Programming in detention settings, current environment, promising practice and red lines (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

### ***Background***

The landscape of conflict is changing, with most settings now no longer involving state sponsored armies on a battlefield but rather non-state actors and extremist groups, increasingly blurring the lines between combatants and non-combatants. Conflicts are also increasingly shifting from inter-state to intra state or Non-International Armed Conflict, which IHL was never designed to regulate, creating a gap in legal guidance for States to refer to when dealing with individuals detained for association with /participating in hostilities.

Common Article 3 and Additional Protocol II provide guidance on protections while in detention (prohibition of torture and summary executions) though do not provide recommendations on how to determine who can be detained or what length / duration of detention is deemed acceptable or what minimum conditions are required in detention settings.<sup>15</sup> International human rights law does provide guidance on conditions for detention, and protections regarding acceptable periods of detention in criminal justice proceedings, particularly for vulnerable groups, but National Security legislation often provides for exceptional detention regimes even in countries where these standards are respected.

In humanitarian settings, aid agencies are increasingly confronted with challenges of providing protective services in detention settings or to individuals in settings that deprive them of their liberty for reasons concerning national security. Conscious of the lack of legal guidance, operational challenges that can arise when programming alongside security actors as well as the risk of setting negative precedents, protection agencies are calling for greater guidance on minimum standards and greater clarity on the legal and ethical implications of programming with populations deprived of liberty, particularly in situations where detention is being used as a national security measure.

### ***Purpose of the session***

The purpose of the session is twofold: i) to identify and debate the specific dilemmas and challenges that humanitarian agencies are facing when trying to respond to the protection needs of civilian populations in securitized environments; and ii) to discuss how our collective response to such issues should be articulated in the broader humanitarian protection sector response strategies

### ***Intended outcome***

Specific and actionable recommendations are agreed upon, including around technical guidance and resources needed, to advance sector's work around this agenda in line with int'l standards and humanitarian principles.

---

<sup>15</sup> Under GCIV, Article 78, civilians can be interned only if the Occupying Power "considers it necessary, for imperative reasons of security," and only for so long as they remain a threat. Furthermore, unlike POWs, their cases must be reviewed by a court or administrative board at least twice a year. (See also GCIII, Article 42). Thus, States are faced with adopting status-based criteria or a threat-based criteria, or perhaps some combination of both, for individuals detained in NIACs. <http://intercrossblog.icrc.org/blog/contemporary-ihl-challenges-use-of-force-and-non-international-armed-conflicts>



**Background reading:**

- [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#)
- [UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment](#) and its [Optional Protocol](#)
- [UN Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance](#)
- [UN Convention on the Rights of the Child](#)
- [UN Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under any Form of Detention or Imprisonment](#)
- [UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners](#)
- [UN Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders](#) ('the Bangkok Rules').
- [United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice](#) ("the Beijing Rules")
- [United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty](#)
- [UN Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures](#) (the 'Tokyo Rules').
- [https://www.unicef.org/protection/Administrative\\_detention\\_discussion\\_paper\\_April2011.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/protection/Administrative_detention_discussion_paper_April2011.pdf)

**Facilitator**

Tiarnach Mooney, UNICEF, [tmooney@unicef.org](mailto:tmooney@unicef.org)



**THURSDAY, 31 MAY 2018**

**17.00-18.00 Theme 1: MHPSS (*Riverside 5*)**

***Purpose of the session***

To clarify the links and roles of the Protection Cluster and MHPSS technical working groups in clusterised humanitarian settings.

***Intended outcome***

Clarification of the relationship between the Protection Cluster and MHPSS technical working groups.

Increased knowledge of the MHPSS technical working groups in humanitarian settings.

Improved coordination between the Protection Cluster and MHPSS technical working groups.

***Speakers***

Sarah Harrison, IASC MHPSS RG Co-Chair and Technical MHPSS Advisor for the IFRC, [sahar@rodekors.dk](mailto:sahar@rodekors.dk)



**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2018**

**09.00-11.00: THEMATIC SESSION – Gender-based violence, children and adolescents (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

### **Background**

Protection actors play a central role in preventing and responding to sexual abuse by integrating mitigation measures and supporting child friendly services. Response interventions which connect child and adolescent survivors of sexual abuse to specialized services are critical and lifesaving activities.

How often do we write (women, men, boys and girls) into HNO and HRP processes without thinking about the differential needs of adolescent girls and boys? How can we engage them and listen to their voice, so that we can shape the response and programs together?

Protection actors at national and sub-national levels need knowledge on how to improve assessments, incorporate the voices of adolescents/children so as to better support them. Effective coordination mechanisms in emergencies need to be in place to ensure a timely response. Available resources need to be shared among humanitarian actors to support a more targeted response.

Purpose of the session:

- To gain a better understanding of adolescents- that they are not a heterogeneous group.
- Reflect on unique concerns of child survivors and reflect on how to better respond within the humanitarian context.
- Reflect on the agency of adolescents and how to engage them in the humanitarian planning process – case study, Whole of Syria.
- Work in mixed small groups to discuss among Protection, Child Protection and GBV Coordinators about ways you can improve your methods of engaging adolescents in the HNO/HRP process to meet prevention and response needs more effectively.
- Conclude with learning about global initiatives to improve coordination; Child Survivor Initiative and Coordination Training and available resources for all protection actors.

### ***Intended outcome***

Protection Actors have:

- Increased knowledge of specific needs of child survivors
- Better understanding on referrals for child survivors
- New ideas on how to engage adolescent/children in voicing their own needs and participating in programs.
- Have developed two or more indicators that can be incorporated into the HRP for 2019
- Knowledge of available resources



### ***Facilitators***

- Jennifer Chase, GBV AoR Global Coordinator, [chase@unfpa.org](mailto:chase@unfpa.org)
- Michael Copland, CP Global Coordinator, [mcpoland@unicef.org](mailto:mcopland@unicef.org)

### ***Speakers***

- Sarah Mosely- Senior Technical Advisor Women's Protection and Empowerment, IRC, [Sarah.Mosely@rescue.org](mailto:Sarah.Mosely@rescue.org)
- Local Partner - TBC
- Jennifer Miquel –Head of Regional Syria response Hub a.i, UNFPA, [Miquel@unfpa.org](mailto:Miquel@unfpa.org)
- Child Survivor Initiative, TBD

### ***Support Team***

- Alexandra Shaphren - Plan International, [Alexandra.Shaphren@plan-international.org](mailto:Alexandra.Shaphren@plan-international.org)
- Irene Quizon, Megan Lind, Jennifer Lee- Child Survivor Initiative, [iquizon@unicef.org](mailto:iquizon@unicef.org), [mlind@unicef.org](mailto:mlind@unicef.org), [jennifer.lee@rescue.org](mailto:jennifer.lee@rescue.org)





**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – Northern and Central America (*Ballroom 2&3*)**

***Background***

Other situations of violence have become one of the most serious forms of violence in Northern Central America (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras) and Mexico, but also in other cities and regions of the world such as in Brazil, Colombia, Jamaica, South Africa, USA, Venezuela and other countries. Conventional distinctions between violence caused by armed conflict or war and that caused by criminal violence has become blurred in terms of its humanitarian impact on children and communities. These impacts can be hard to measure: e.g. whereas conventional conflicts often provoke mass displacement, the forced displacement that occurs in other situations of violence often takes place on an individual or family basis, leading to under-reporting of the level of humanitarian needs. Children and their families are living among the armed actors are exposed to numerous risks such as sexual exploitation, child recruitment, child labor, and risks related to a new contamination of explosive remnants of violence.

**Purpose of the session**

This regional 'hard talk' provides an opportunity for field colleagues to discuss lessons learnt from coordination in other situations of violence. Humanitarian actors need to adapt and respond in new ways to these situations of violence to protect children and their families. What can we learn from the NCA?

**Intended outcome**

Clear lessons learned on how to coordinate in other situations of violence are outlined and what factors should be considered.

***Format***

The session will be kicked-off with some basic Q&A (via a simple polling software) to understand how the participants in the room understand various concepts on the different elements to be discussed. Subsequently, an outline of the legal framework underlying other situations of violence will be given by ICRC. Practitioners will then present coordination challenges from the field, followed by a discussion about situations of generalized violence in other regions, with focus on the most pressing issues for coordination and lessons learnt.

***Speakers***

- Fiona Barnaby, Regional Legal Advisor, ICRC - Bangkok (12min)
- Lorena Nieto, Protection Officer, UNHCR – Honduras (via Skype) (12min)
- Jorge Alvarez, Protection Officer, UNHCR – El Salvador (via Skype) (12min)
- David Garcia, Cluster Co-Coordinator, NRC (via Skype) (12min)



### ***Background reading***

- Annysa Bellal, The War Report - Armed Conflicts in 2017, Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights, March 2018: [www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/The%20War%20Report%202017.pdf](http://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/The%20War%20Report%202017.pdf)
- 'Gang Violence as a Cause of Forced Migration in the Northern Triangle of Central America', Book Chapter in D.J. Cantor and N. Rodríguez (eds.), The New Refugees: Organised Crime and Displacement in Latin America (ILAS Book Series, University of London): <http://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/6623/1/03cantor.pdf>
- JIPS/ACAPS, Other Situations of Violence in the Northern Triangle of Central America, Humanitarian Impact, 2014: [www.jips.org/system/cms/attachments/845/original\\_other\\_situations\\_of\\_violence\\_in\\_the\\_northern\\_triangle\\_of\\_central\\_america\\_humanitarian\\_impact\\_jul\\_2014.pdf](http://www.jips.org/system/cms/attachments/845/original_other_situations_of_violence_in_the_northern_triangle_of_central_america_humanitarian_impact_jul_2014.pdf)
- Marguerite Cawley, Is Central America's Gang Violence a Humanitarian Crisis? 18 July 2014: [www.insightcrime.org/news/analysis/is-central-americas-gang-violence-a-humanitarian-crisis](http://www.insightcrime.org/news/analysis/is-central-americas-gang-violence-a-humanitarian-crisis)
- 'Protecting Persons Fleeing Organized Crime: The 2014 Brazil Declaration and Plan of Action': [www.acnur.org/fileadmin/scripts/doc.php?file=fileadmin/Documentos/BDL/2014/9865](http://www.acnur.org/fileadmin/scripts/doc.php?file=fileadmin/Documentos/BDL/2014/9865)



**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – East Africa/Great Lakes/Horn situation (*Pompadour*)**  
**Red lines in situations of active conflict**

***Background:***

Humanitarian organisations operating in conflict zones and related severe food insecurity are forced to navigate complex power dynamics while providing assistance. Challenges include :

- Denial of access of humanitarian actors to affected populations;
- Denial of access of affected populations to assistance ;
- How to ensure the response across the humanitarian system avoids doing harm by, for example, ensuring that assistance does not force population groups to cross front-lines where they may be exposed to looting, harassment and/or arbitrary detention, or by not reinforcing power imbalances between population groups, and
- interference in humanitarian action by authorities through exorbitant taxation, registration fees, and screening and restrictions on hiring procedures.

To ensure consistent adherence to humanitarian principles, how and to what extent should red lines be established and enforced? What is the role of the Protection Cluster within the broader humanitarian landscape?

***Purpose of the session:***

The panellists from South Sudan and Somalia will present an overview of opportunities and challenges in establishing red lines in situations of armed conflict with a focus on the role of the protection cluster in the broader humanitarian landscape.

***Intended outcome:***

Clear lessons learnt are outlined and what factors should be considered.



**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2018**

**11.15-13.00: HARDTALK – West Africa/Sahel situation (*Riverside 5*)**

### ***Background***

In statement issued in December 2013, the Principals of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) affirmed that all humanitarian actors have a responsibility to place protection at the center of humanitarian action as part of preparedness efforts, immediate and life-saving activities, and throughout the duration of a crisis and beyond. The role of Humanitarian Coordinators, Humanitarian Country Teams and Clusters to ensure that protection informs humanitarian decision-making has been reinforced after the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Policy on Protection in Humanitarian Action was published.

The Policy defines the centrality of protection in humanitarian action, as per the above December 2013 statement of the IASC Principals, as well as the process for its implementation at country level. In doing so, it seeks to reinforce complementary roles, mandates and expertise of all relevant actors.

Specifically, this policy emphasizes an IASC commitment to prioritize protection and contribute to collective protection outcomes, including through the development of an HCT protection strategy to address the most critical and urgent risks and violations. It also underlines the need to implement this commitment in all aspects of humanitarian action and across the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC).

### ***Purpose of the session***

The panellists will present an overview of the opportunities and recurring challenges faced in Mali, Chad and Niger when placing protection at the center of humanitarian action. In particular, they would look at two things: The first would be whether a protection lens is systematically incorporated into operations through Protection Mainstreaming so protection principles, meaningful access, safety and dignity are an integral part of the overall humanitarian response; the second will focus on how protection objectives are incorporated into the programming of other sector-specific responses (i.e. beyond the protection sector response) to achieve protection outcomes.

Panellists will present good practices and specific examples from the field on the two areas of discussion. (i.e. showing how the four elements of protection mainstreaming will actually be implemented, showing how vulnerability criteria are developed and then used in practice, including as part of advocacy with all stakeholders, supporting the target of 1% of each cluster's total HRP budget to achieving protection mainstreaming aims (including training, setting up accountability mechanisms, establishing community volunteer networks, conducting regular focus group discussions, establishing representative committees, providing sensitisation/information, etc.)

After the presentations a Q& A session will follow.



### ***Intended outcome***

A shared understanding of the opportunities and challenges that Protection Clusters are facing with the implementation of the IASC Protection Strategy, in the areas of Protection Mainstreaming and Protection Integration, and some key practical ways of achieving Protection outcomes.

### ***Speakers***

- Sarah Pallesen, Protection Cluster Coordinator Chad, [pallesen@unhcr.org](mailto:pallesen@unhcr.org)
- Valerie Svobodova, Protection Cluster Coordinator Niger, [svobodov@unhcr.org](mailto:svobodov@unhcr.org)
- Nianga Matho Dore, Cluster Protection Officer Mali, [doren@unhcr.org](mailto:doren@unhcr.org)



**FRIDAY, 1 JUNE 2018**

**14.00-17.00: THEMATIC SESSION – Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement at 20 (Ballroom 2&3)**

### ***Background***

As crises around the globe multiply and uproot millions of people, the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in 2018 is an important and unique opportunity to step up efforts for the protection of IDPs. Driven by the mandate of the UN Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights of IDPs, UNHCR and OCHA, a multi-stakeholder Plan of Action was launched in Geneva in April to contribute to resolving and reducing internal displacement through prevention, protection and solutions for IDPs from 2018 to 2020.

National and local authorities, IDPs, host communities, UN entities, NGOs, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, academia, development finance institutions, human rights bodies and the private sector are called to rally around the goal and objectives of the Plan of Action and take action in support of it. Action is being encouraged primarily at the national level, but also at the regional and global levels on four priority themes: participation of IDPs, laws and policies on internal displacement, data and analysis on internal displacement and addressing protracted displacement.

The Plan of Action applies to all contexts of internal displacement. Action to celebrate GP20 and advance the Plan of Action may be most easily galvanized in contexts where governments are inclined to or not opposed to protecting their displaced, as has been the case in Niger, Ukraine and Colombia. However, implementation of this Plan of Action will not shy away from addressing situations where protection and humanitarian access are major issues. The knowledge and advice of field protection colleagues is key for designing and mobilizing that work in an appropriate manner.

### ***Purpose of the session***

The purpose of this session is to inform protection colleagues about the GP20 Plan of Action, share information on completed or planned initiatives that contribute to meeting the Plan of Action's objectives, and to brainstorm how to step up efforts at the national level in support of the objectives in the GP20 Plan of Action, especially in contexts with significant protection issues and limited humanitarian access.

Following a short introduction to the GP20 Plan of Action, three protection colleagues will briefly present the initiatives they anticipate or have planned to commemorate GP20 and implementation of the Plan of Action. The last and main part of the session will be a panel interview with protection colleagues from challenging humanitarian emergency contexts followed by a Q&A brainstorm on how to step up efforts for protection of IDPs in those settings.

### ***Intended outcome***

Increased awareness of the GP20 Plan of Action and initiatives being planned in support of it among national and global level actors on IDP protection, concrete action points for galvanizing further action



at the national level to enhance protection of IDPs, and direct links made between GP20 coordination staff at the global level and protection field staff at the national level working to address internal displacement.

### ***Speakers***

- Elizabeth Eyster, Chief of IDP section, [eyster@unhcr.org](mailto:eyster@unhcr.org)
- Aurelien Buffler, Chief of Policy Advice and Planning Section, OHCA New York, [buffler@un.org](mailto:buffler@un.org)
- Valerie Svobodova, Protection Cluster Coordinator Niger, [svobodov@unhcr.org](mailto:svobodov@unhcr.org)
- Rosalie Fournier, Protection Cluster Coordinator Colombia, [Fournier@unhcr.org](mailto:Fournier@unhcr.org)
- Samuel Cheung, Senior Protection Cluster Coordinator Yemen, [cheung@unhcr.org](mailto:cheung@unhcr.org)
- Mohammed Khan, National Protection Cluster Coordinator Iraq, [khanmo@unhcr.org](mailto:khanmo@unhcr.org)