SGBV SWG Minutes 27th Oct 2020

Location: online Webex link

Agencies present: ACF, AIDOS, ARCS, ARDD, AWO, CRP, CVT, HelpAge, IFH-NHF, IMC, Intersos, IOM, JNCW, JRF, NRC, OCHA, TDH-Italy, UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR, Vento di Terra, WFP.



Agenda

- 1. Coordination updates; JRP updates, IM updates and SGBV WG strategy.
- 2. 16 days of activism.
- 3. 10 minutes break.
- 4. Learning session: Strengthening resilience lens session by UNDP.

Agenda items	Discussion	Action points
Introduction and welcoming	- Welcoming participants and provide a brief on the agenda.	MoM will be uploaded in the portal http://data2.unhcr.org/en/working-group/72?sv=4&geo=36
Coordination updates; JRP updates, IM updates and	- JRP updates : the JRP review for 2021-2023 has started. Partners were requested to review their activities and send their feedback to be shared with MoSD. Deadline for submissions was on the 22 nd of October 2020.	 Will check with MoSD if there is a room for modifications.

SGBV WG strategy

- JRP main instructions: all Sector Task Forces shall review the PSS for the three years (2021 2023) based on the existing 2020-2022 JRP. The Task Forces should include one representative for all critical task force members, task force secretariat and the line/TF lead ministry which is the MoSD in protection.
- The review shall take into consideration priorities as defined by the respective line ministry.
- The annual budget cannot be increased by more than 10% of the existing yearly budget. Furthermore, the increase in budget is only allowed when all activities and projects are deemed necessary and cannot be modified, postponed or removed.
- The PSS review needs to be undertaken in the context of COVID-19:
 Review of projects and activities in the PSS and amend, in case of deleting a project, specify why deleted, projects/ activities which were explicitly created or amended because of COVID-19 should be flagged, it is recommended that sector members follow the guidelines.
- The ratio remains as previous years with no changes.
- If you are an agency who is appealing for the first time please remember this is an appealing exercise, it means that you are telling us which needs are to support your GBV program for 2021-2023.
- Presence in the JRP is a condition for us for accessing pooled humanitarian funding as OCHA JHF.
- Feedback from the frequently Asked Questions:
- The JRP 2021-2023 remains like previous years a three- year rolling plan that is updated and reviewed annually.
- Agencies who already appealed need to confirm if nothing changed and what is their appeal for 2023. It might be same level of 2022.
- The priority needs interventions that are provided by the line ministry and should be the core focus of the sectors.

Co-chairs will reach agencies who misreported on indicators and have a session with them.

- If conditions of COVID-19 and limitation on social gatherings were lifted projects will be modified accordingly.
- JRP components: Refugee (REF), Host Community (H.C) and Infrastructure and Institutional Development (IC). We added COVID-19 response.
- Note: for next round, the COVID-19 pillar is in the government document (PSS) and its easier for agencies to submit accordingly. Before when COVID-19 started it was not added in the government's document and that caused a confusion while appealing for GBV COVID-19 projects.
- **IM updates:** for data and Budget Summary, there are 15 partners reporting on 5 indicators for refugee pillar and 5 for resilience pillar covering 27 locations in Jordan. The number of reached beneficiaries is 70651.
- Budget gap for refugee pillar is 78% while t is 93% for resilience pillar as only 7% of the budget is reported as received. Another problem is the low reporting under monitoring.
- Progress of indicators: the first and forth indicators are aligned with the plan. However, the fourth and fifth indicators show a big gap.
- Agencies should report a percentage for the fifth indicator as it shows that only 67 % is covered. The percentage should be higher as some values are entered as numbers not percentages.
- For resilience pillar there are 5 indicators but till now no achievements.
- There are 3 Mani issues: not all partners who appealed during JRP are updating data. Indicator 5 needs to be reported in percentage not numbers. For resilience, there ae no records entered under

activism	established based on TF discussions. The theme is domestic violence on both international and national levels. - It is important to engage the SGBV WG and receive their feedback regarding planned activities. - The 16 days TF worked on developing key messages in consultation of WGBM in camps and Urban for both refugees and host	calendar to map all activities.
16 days of	monitoring database, the purpose is to come up with lessons learned for next year to avoid the gaps. Q: can the record be modified retroactively in order to be fixed? Yes, each month the system is re-opened to fix mistakes. - SGBV WG strategy: having a strategy that is aligned to the JRP that goes from 2020-2022, giving a space to narrative part and add qualitative information. There is a GBV gap analysis for Jordan, we can develop the strategy based on the gap analysis and the JRP. Strategic document can be a useful guidance. The gap analysis document is on the UNHCR portal: https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/details/78683 - Proposal to members: in November there is a meeting instead of the SGBV WG, to have the strategy development session. Proposal to do it in mid-November before the 16 days of activism. Members agreed and welcomed the idea; therefore, invitation will be circulated with other documents that can be useful. The final document might be ready by the end of the year and will be launching it accordingly. - IOM: with the raise of COVID-19 cases might postpone the process of the risk assessment. Will try to have the preliminary results and will use these results for the development of the strategy.	- The TF will circulate the

- The idea of including resilience applies to all sectors, refuges and resilience components. It focuses on how to improve resilience building. It is a qualitative assessment not a measurement tool.
- Resilience lens provides Sector Working Groups with a set of four key criteria that they can use as they develop or monitor sector response plans. The Lens requires stakeholders to score outputs but it is more relevant to look at score projects themselves, the project scores can then be aggregated in order to come up with an overall score per output.
- Resilience programming are targeting the following 3 areas: localization, individual and contribute to social cohesion.
- Each sector is requested to analyse the outputs against Resilience lens and assess how the program is contributing to building resilience.
- Resilience Programming in the JRP (2020-2022) is a medium to long term approach, refugee-resilience pillars are no longer population "category" based.
- SGBV is under Social Protection and Justice Sector which addresses SDG 5, 10 and 16.
- Partner MoL; private sector involved as well as banks; income generation; both local and Syrian
- Resilience vs the concept of sustainability: sustainability is more of a long running situation, financing is difficult, we need a special training on fund raising and how to access donor's money.
- Q: how is resilience emphasized in the funding especially under JRP/3RP?
- A: resilience funding increased; most funding goes to humanitarian funding.
- Responsibility that refugee work goes through resilience lens as it is important to contribute to the system.

	- SGBV sub-sector will make sure that the strategy applies to resilience lens using the tool. UNDP to review the document once done for feedback.
AOB	- Session for strategy review mid of November instead of the SGBV SWG.