

CALL TO ACTION ROAD MAP MEETING “LOOKING AHEAD TO 2020 AND BEYOND”

SUMMARY: On February 7, 2019, Canada and the Women’s Refugee Commission (WRC) organized a day-long brainstorming meeting on the Call to Action Road Map, “Looking Ahead to 2020 and Beyond.” With the current Road Map ending in 2020, Canada’s priority is to strategically shape the Call to Action initiative into the next phase.

This meeting was the first step of a two-year revision process. It provided partners with an initial opportunity to reflect on challenges and opportunities around several key issues, including governance and accountability, gender equality, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), field-level implementation and engaging local and women’s organizations. In addition to identifying considerations for the next Road Map, the discussions also surfaced suggestions that Call to Action partners can work on during the next two years. The ideas generated at this meeting will be presented back to the Call to Action working groups. Canada and the WRC has developed a survey for all partners that further probes points raised at this meeting about a post-2020 Road Map. And additional consultations will take place throughout 2019.

Participants included NGOs: CARE, Heartland Alliance, IPPF, IRC, Islamic Relief, Legal Action Worldwide, Oxfam, and WRC; international organizations: ELHRA, GBV AoR, IOM, OCHA, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNWomen, and WHO; and donors/states: Canada, E. U., Germany, Switzerland, U.K., and U.S.

REPORT:

The purpose of the meeting was to brainstorm ideas, reflect on progress, current needs and challenges, and propose a collective way forward. The assumption guiding the meeting was that the current Road Map will remain the foundation for the Call to Action, and will be updated as needed. The Women’s Refugee Commission gave an overview of the evolution of the Call to Action, from the creation of the Call to Action with the Communique in 2013, to the development of the 2016-2020 Road Map, to the different ways Call to Action is now being implemented in the field, and the growth and diversification of the partners of the Call to Action. Changes in the global humanitarian environment, together with developments within the Call to Action partnership, require us to take into account emerging issues and possibly review previous approaches. Partners had an opportunity to share ideas and raise concerns in breakout sessions on gender equality, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, field-level implementation, engaging local and women’s organization, governance and accountability.

The **gender equality** breakout group examined these guiding questions: How should the Call to Action position itself in relation to other initiatives with a gender equality focus and/or components? How can

CALL TO ACTION on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies

Call to Action better capture and share the work being done by partners that addresses both GBV and gender equality? How can the post-2020 Road Map focus more on the third objective on gender equality? What is missing from the current Road Map?

The breakout group identified several issues. First, there may not be common understanding and agreement on how gender equality fits into the work being done on GBV. Second, while gender equality is referenced throughout the Road Map, it does not clearly come out in the indicators or the partner reporting contributing to a lack of information on gender equality work being done. As such, it is unclear whether the problem is that gender equality work is not being implemented or whether it is more of a reporting problem.

The breakout group proposed a number of recommendations on gender equality. First, there needs to be stronger articulation in the next Road Map of the definition of gender equality and gender integration and why gender equality is a core part of the work, perhaps drawing from the theory of change that informed the original Road Map development process. This narrative should fit with the vision of the Call to Action and make clear the linkages between gender inequality and GBV. Second, in unpacking GBV prevention and risk mitigation, the importance of gender equality should be highlighted in the Road Map. Third, a stronger articulation of gender equality in the Call to Action would provide an opportunity to leverage the conversation around the humanitarian-development nexus, ensure sustainability, and help close the gaps and silos. Fourth, the Call to Action should complement and leverage existing frameworks and initiatives on gender equality, such as the IASC Gender Reference Group, Grand Bargain, and the Women, Peace and Security Agenda. Fifth, while gender equality is included in most outcomes (except outcome 4 and outcome 5), gender mainstreaming could be more explicit in key action areas and indicators where appropriate. Finally, it may be necessary to more explicitly require that members commit to addressing gender inequality as a core value of the Call to Action and as essential to addressing GBV.

The **PSEA** breakout group was given this set of questions: Should the Call to Action integrate PSEA in the post 2020 Road Map, and if yes, in what way? What are the pros and cons? Are there specific elements that lend themselves well to integration in the post 2020 Road Map? Are there components of PSEA that should not come under the Call to Action framework and why? How does Call to Action position itself in relation to other initiatives focused on PSEA (IASC, UK Safeguarding Summit, etc.)? How is the work complementary?

A number of additional questions were identified by the breakout group. Which term should be used: protection from or prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse? If PSEA is integrated into the Call to Action, does it stretch it too much? Can the Call to Action facilitate learning on PSEA? How can the Call to Action be linked to other forums and processes and what can the Call to Action add to them? Namely, to the UN SEA WG, UK technical WG, Victim's Rights Advocate (UN), DAC Group, Local and national organizations, and the Grand Bargain? What is the added value of integrating PSEA into the Call to Action initiative?

CALL TO ACTION on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies

It was noted that all Call to Action working groups include a PSEA item in their work plans for 2019. The Steering Committee is working to bring these threads together.

The **field-level implementation** breakout group looked at several questions. How can implementation on the ground be strengthened? Are there adjustments to be made to the Road Map? Or is the challenge more one of raising awareness, strengthening advocacy and supporting Call to Action partners in a given setting to organize collectively? If adjustments in the Road Map are needed, what would those look like? How can Call to Action partners at the global level and field level Call to Action partners engage more effectively with one another? Should the recruitment of crisis-affected and/or refugee hosting governments be a priority? If so, how can this be taken forward?

The working group discussed defining the different ways of doing field level implementation. There is an opportunity to draw on lessons learned from the Real Time Accountability Partnership (RTAP) and the Road Map field pilots in Northeast Nigeria and the DRC, and to communicate success. There is also an opportunity for the global level to stimulate involvement among their colleagues at the field level. This will require sustained communication and advocacy. One also needs to be mindful of different reporting processes that countries are already responsible for so as not to add unnecessary burdens. Finally, there was a question raised around the criteria for states' membership in the Call to Action which was discussed in more detail during the governance discussion below.

The **engaging local and women's organizations** group had discussion around these main topics: Should engagement with local and national women's organizations be more directly referenced in the Road Map? If so, where and how? What elements need to be in place for local and national organizations to benefit from Call to Action? What does Call to Action offer them? What does the initiative expect of them? Are there other processes under way that the Call to Action can leverage and should not duplicate e.g. the localization work of the GBV AoR and work on Women, Peace and Security in certain crisis-affected countries?

The breakout group identified a need to better articulate the role of local actors in the Call to Action, including the value they bring to the initiative and what the Call to Action needs to do to make membership valuable to local actors. We need to be cognizant of barriers to local engagement, for example, reporting burdens and access to funding. An option to make it more appealing for local actors is to support movements, particularly feminist movements. More thought should be given on how to better include marginalized people, including LGBT+. It was recognized that capacity building is a two way street, and when we rely on local actors for key information, it was suggested that we should pay them for their consultation and services. Participants also noted that some donors face barriers to funding local actors directly. The conclusion of the discussion was that is essential to consult directly with local actors during the post-2020 Road Map development process to better understand and address these questions.

CALL TO ACTION on Protection from Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies

The **discussion on governance and accountability** took place in plenary. It focused on the sub-topics of **structure, membership and accountability**. There was not sufficient time to discuss how we are measuring progress, but M+E was recognized as a priority issue for future consultations and will need to be discussed in conjunction with any revisions that are made to outcome or action areas.

Regarding structure, participants looked at whether the stakeholder working group mechanism is effective in promoting dialogue, learning and partner engagement. Participants asked for clarity on where decision making lies in the governance structure. They also noted the need to break down stakeholder siloing and encourage synergies across stakeholder working groups. The question was raised about whether it would be useful to consider thematic working groups in addition to stakeholder groups.

On membership, there was discussion about entities that may be partners in the pilot country Road Maps but are not global partners. The point was made that in whatever approach one takes to national and global partners, we should not develop a system that creates two-tiered membership that seems unequal or exclusionary. There was also a brief discussion about how to handle current global partners that are not actively participating in the initiative, reporting annually etc. In this session, too, several participants raised questions about the criteria for membership and whether it should be expanded to include adherence to certain core values or standards, for example, human rights or international humanitarian law. The challenges of defining and objectively applying such criteria were acknowledged, but time did not permit a more in-depth discussion.

The accountability issue came up in a couple ways. It was raised in the context of inactive members as referenced above and in the context of the commitments process. The Call to Action does not have an active mechanism in place to determine the quality of commitments—are they actionable, measurable and relevant to the key action area they are meant to support. One participant raised the idea of establishing five milestones for all partners to achieve under the new Road Map. In general, it was agreed the post-2020 Road Map presents an opportunity to renew and revise commitments and to ensure that these commitments are tangible and measurable.

Next steps: Overall, this meeting was a productive first step towards the Road Map revision process. A number of issues will require more extensive analysis and discussion with the membership. The immediate next step is to secure broader input via a survey to all Call to Action partners. Canada will also ensure that the current Road Map commitments are analyzed against outcome areas to inform additional consultations with partners in the coming months. And there will be targeted consultations with field colleagues. The current plan is to have a draft outline of the Road Map 2.0 for review and discussion at annual partner's meeting in October 2019. Based on inputs from this meeting, a revised draft will be shared for review with stakeholder working groups. The final Road Map 2.0 should be ready for endorsement at the annual partner's meeting in June 2020 and publicly at UNGA 2020.