Summary notes:

Online meeting on consultations with IDPs & Host Communities on behalf of the High-Level Panel on Internal Displacement – 26 May (9:30-11:00)


Meeting Objectives:
- Exchange with stakeholders interested in collaborating with the HLP Secretariat on the organization of consultations with IDPs and host communities.
- Reflect on where and how to hold such consultations.
- Move towards a work plan.

Selection of countries:
- Aim is to select 10-15 countries, trying to cover all regions and different types of displacement.
- Countries to be assigned ideally among actors on this call, through a discussion process and based on experience, expertise, existing channels and balancing urban and camps contexts, protracted and non-protracted crisis, people affected by natural disasters, etc.
- Preliminary tentative list:
  - Africa: Ethiopia, Cameroon, Nigeria, Somalia, Burkina, Sudan, CAR, South Sudan, DRC, Mozambique,
  - MENA: Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya,
  - Asia: Pakistan, Afghanistan, Philippines, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Fiji, Sri Lanka
  - LAC: El Salvador, Colombia, Haiti,
  - Europe: Ukraine.
- HLP Secretariat particularly interested in covering four countries of which the Panel members are from and involve those members in the discussions: Ethiopia, South Sudan, Afghanistan, Colombia.
- Not a final list and additional suggestions are welcome, specifically in countries where stakeholders have capacity to consult.
- On suggestion to include countries which experienced Durable Solutions with IDPS: Interesting idea although there may be concern about residual capacities in those countries.

Timeline:
- The timeline is to be discussed with partners but the aim is to start as soon as possible.
- Ultimate deadline is September as the intention is to have the results of those consultations feed into the HLP meeting of October 2020.
- So we could think of a 2 months’ timeframe for the consultations to happen from the moment we agree on an approach.

Overall methodology for the consultations:
- HLP Secretariat aiming for high level of flexibility, and detailed methodology to be determined with stakeholders.
- Modalities may vary from country to country, including the various formats that can be used (e.g. digital, online survey, Focus Group Discussion where possible).
• Consultation to be undertaken on the basis of already existing connections, not needing to create new channels of communication.
• The approach is also linked to the workstreams.
• Once it is clear where consultations will be done and by whom, the HLP Secretariat will inform the UN HCT and the RC at country level.
• About avoiding duplications on the ground and filling gaps: actors involved at country level would be expected to go through due diligence process, work on deconfliction among their efforts and of questions asked to affected populations, that the various groups and subgroups are consulted, etc.
• On point the importance of avoiding ‘extractive’ consultations and developing feedback mechanisms so that populations consulted know what is done with their information: At global level, HLP Secretariat will not be in a position to provide this type of feedback to all consulted populations, however feedback to IDPs and Host communities at country level would be important. This topic should be further discussed.
• It would be useful to have further clarifications on the minimum number of people in each age/gender category we would want to be consulted in each country. To be further discussed.

Consultation Guide for Discussions with Affected Communities:
• The HLP Secretariat Questions Guide document provides a broad overview.
• Questions flagged in this document can be translated at least in Spanish and French by the Secretariat.
• Themes covered by the questions are focused on Durable solutions; Prevention; Participation & accountability; Coordination; Nexus; Specific needs and capacities (including AGD); COVID-19; Others
• No obligation to cover everything. There might different levels of appropriateness.
• Open to adaptation for the questions and suggestions/language on this should be sent asap to Caelin (e.g. if there is a feeling that the focus on Protection risks for IDPs, rights violations and assistance needs during displacement, Protection in emergency situations could be strengthened).
• Further disaggregation of questions by AGD is welcome. let Giovanni and Caelin know.
• Questions should be contextualized and this would be done at country level by stakeholders involved in organizing the consultations.

Feedback to HLP Secretariat after consultations:
• Stakeholders organizing consultations are expected to send a summary to the HLP Secretariat reflecting the inputs from the consultations, without summarizing too much.
• Notes/summary would need to be cleared at country level so as to ensure they do not contain inaccurate/misleading information.
• If new/emerging issues come up in the consultations, it should be flagged in the summary.
• HLP Secretariat did not share a template to conduct the consultations and report because more importance is given to content/substance. If the consultations and reporting follow the agreed questions, the format is not that important (e.g. 74 written submissions were received in different formats, with good content and it is the work of the Secretariat then to summarize it). Although the HLP Secretariat is happy to look into this if stakeholders believe a template is needed (e.g. suggestion that qualitative data requires a framework to record data).
• On the question ownership and use of consultations data/results beyond the Panel’s work: delicate question requiring further internal discussions. HLP Secretariat will revert back later.
Coordination:

- It will be important to ensure clarity on how coordination is being done between the various stakeholders involved, how we build on complementarities and avoid overlaps. This may require reflection on leadership and division of labour when more than one stakeholder is involved.
- This type of coordination will have to take place at country level and the HLP Secretariat will not be in a position to intervene.
- Secretariat does not have capacity to ensure this type of coordination and actually it is more appropriate if this happens at country level based on agreement between actors.
- However, at global level, the HLP Secretariat and stakeholders will work to establish a mapping of who is involved in which country and for what purpose. This should then help establish a light coordination approach at country level.

Involving local partners and refugee-led organizations:

- Open to involving local partners as the close to populations the process is, the better.
- On motivating local actors and making sure they feel the importance of the exercise: HLP Secretariat can make the objectives of the consultations clearer in the Questions Guide document. Suggestions welcome.
- Open to have look at involving refugee-led organizations that might have contact with IDPs.
- Also interesting to engage with refugees who have been IDPs.

Resources:

- HLP Secretariat does not have a dedicated person for communications with communities. Caelin and Giovanni can be reached for questions related to communication with communities.
- HLP Secretariat is in a position to provide resources but could consider supporting dedicated fundraising efforts.

Next steps:

- All stakeholders on the call are encouraged to send to Giovanni and Caelin an e-mail with a list of countries (even tentative) where they may be in a position to organize consultations, with information on the proposed methodology and group(s) of focus. (DEADLINE: June 2nd CoB GVA)
- This will be used to start a mapping of the countries to be covered and by whom. This mapping/table will help in identifying synergies, partnerships on geographical/groups coverage, coordination and rationalization of work.
- The mapping will be discussed at a second meeting. ICVA happy to help organize it. HLP Secretariat and ICVA to discuss timing.
- ICVA to draft an NFF and share with stakeholders with the invitation for the next meeting.
- Asylum Access and Christian Aid could not attend the meeting but may also be willing to support the Secretariat on consultations and get in touch for that purpose. They will receive the notes and invitation for the next meeting.

Tentative a list of countries and methodology by stakeholder, as captured by note-takers:

**Act Alliance**

- ACT Members have presence in most countries listed and would be able to support in El Salvador, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Colombia, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Burkina Faso and Somalia, and in Iraq.
- Still waiting for information from Asia Pacific.
ICVA
- Happy to continue helping in convening this type of global level exchange and strategizing.
- Not well-place to organize direct consultations with affected populations.

IOM
- Can provide a list of countries where we can engage, which will be expanding as we receive further feedback from colleagues at the field level.

NRC
- Happy to discuss with the Secretariat where NRC has country offices. On the current list Ethiopia, Cameroon, Nigeria, Somalia, Burkina Faso, CAR, South Sudan, DRC, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, El Salvador, Colombia, Ukraine + Mozambique for disaster displacement.
- Will need to discuss more in detail as the selection is getting clearer.
- Georgia could be added, where durable solutions have been achieved. Uganda is not listed, and it could be useful to add it too.

Plan International
- Could support consultations in Sudan and Colombia.

PDD
- Not operational on the ground but we can support where we have networks and where displacement is linked to natural disasters, e.g. Fiji and countries in the Americas.
- Happy to collaborate with organizations which would like to partner with PDD.

UNHCR
- Positive feedback received from field level from 8/9 countries.
- UNHCR will be happy to partner with stakeholders on the call.
- Countries with positive feedback:
  - Ethiopia: via phone and small consultation with 2,3 persons.
  - Burkina Faso: have Focal Points in six regions and could have small Focus Group Discussion.
  - South Sudan: via Phone, and/or Focus Group Discussion.
  - DRC: in several regions and linkages with existing community groups.
  - Mozambique, except in Gabo Delgado.
  - Iraq: have large community-based structures. Through telephones as well as households’ interviews, and/or small Focus Group Discussion.
  - Afghanistan.
  - Philippines: in Mindanao, via mobile or virtual engagement.
  - Colombia.
- Ukraine: hesitation
- Not possible in: Sudan, Yemen, and Libya.

WRC
- Organization focusing on advocacy; no operations at the field level, but could support by linking with local partners.