



## Executive Summary

The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its 35th session virtually from 21 to 23 February 2022. Some 50 IASMN members, comprising organizations of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS), participated in the session, chaired by Mr. Gilles Michaud, Under-Secretary-General (USG) for Safety and Security.

During the opening session, the USG/UNDSS highlighted the department's strategic intent, as outlined in the document "Focusing on Results: 2022 and Beyond". The document plots out a shift of the department's efforts from activity-based operations to results-based programmes and services. After the opening remarks, several working groups presented updates on their progress. Notably, the Chair of the Policy Review Group presented the revised policy on applicability of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS), which was endorsed by the Network. The revisions do not represent a change of philosophy but rather offer a clearer and more accurate categorization of persons covered by the UNSMS. The revised policy will be promulgated to the UNSMS after the endorsement of the High-Level Committee for Management (HLCM). Finally, the budget for the 2023 JFA was presented to members for endorsement.

The second day's discussions focused around security communications applications and other technology-related issues, as well as training. Work on ensuring interoperability among the three applications (eTA, Everbridge and SCAAN) is ongoing.

The last day's agenda included several updates on ongoing policy and guideline reviews, including on residential security measures, the physical security of United Nations premises and fire safety. Guidance on these topics is forthcoming.

Through the contributions of specialized working groups and other ad hoc groups, the IASMN continually updates the policy framework of the UNSMS. The IASMN convenes bi-annually under the leadership of the USG for Safety and Security. IASMN membership comprises senior managers from all United Nations organizations who have oversight of the security function.

Contents

Introduction ..... 4

Opening Session..... 4

    Adoption of Agenda ..... 4

    Opening Remarks..... 4

Summary of Progress on Recommendations..... 6

Review of IASMN Working Groups ..... 6

UNSMS Results Chain..... 7

The 2023 JFA Budget..... 8

HR WG ..... 10

Policy Update ..... 10

Strategic Communications Working Group ..... 12

TESS Service ..... 14

Security apps..... 15

    COSCATG and Working Group on Guidance on SCS ..... 15

    User Groups ..... 16

TAG..... 20

Training: SCOLT ..... 21

Training: TDS ..... 24

    Armed Security / Residential Security Measures..... 25

HIM Update..... 26

Guidelines on Common Premises ..... 29

Gender Working Group..... 30

Fire Safety ..... 31

Review of SRM/SSIRS Implementation ..... 32

Close of Session..... 34

Annexure (Agenda, Participant List and List of Current Participation in IASMN working groups) ..... 37

## Introduction

1. The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its meeting via the Teams platform from 21 to 23 February 2022 over three half-day sessions. Some 50 representatives attended. The meeting was chaired by USG UNDSS and co-chaired by Mr. Lassi Kuusinen of the ICC.

## Opening Session

### Adoption of Agenda

1. The USG/UNDSS introduced the agenda, highlighting that, under AOB, the issue of IASMN co-chair would be discussed, as the current co-chair was approaching the end of his two-year term. He requested that members consider volunteering for the post prior to the discussion.
2. **The IASMN Steering Group:**
  - **Adopted the agenda as presented.**

### Opening Remarks

3. In his welcome to participants, the USG/UNDSS referred to the Strategic Intent document, which sets the strategic direction for the Department. He stressed that the focus was on programme delivery, highlighting that security does not stand on its own. He noted that, to enable this goal, the Department would be investing in its people, its systems and tools and its governance. He requested that UNSMS organizations share the (upcoming) UNDSS job postings with their personnel to encourage them to get rostered. He noted that the Department was considering several facets of HR as part of investing in its people, including coaching, mentoring, training, a focus on diversity and psychosocial wellbeing of the workforce. He added that the Department has also developed a resource mobilization strategy, which may lead to the need of additional personnel.
4. The USG also highlighted that the Department will finalize the Mission Essential task lists both for field programs and HQ based operations and would commence the implementation phase of the recent SRM and SSIRS review processes. He noted analysis would be an increasingly key component of the work, with the goal of improving planning and deployment of resources. He also noted that the Department would be considering a regional concept of operations, starting with a feasibility assessment, with a view to increasing effectiveness. He noted that UNDSS is keen to learn from the experiences of other UNSMS organizations in regionalization, and that they may request their support for some of the other initiatives mentioned in this session.
5. Mr. Paul O'Hanlon, UN Women, noted his support for the way forward but suggested that the lack of increases in the JFA may not be sustainable. He noted that there has been a substantial increase in the Locally Cost-Shared Security Budgets (LCSSBs) and that it may be preferable to put the resources through the JFA, as it would give a clearer picture of the budgets and their sources. He noted that donors frequently ask about the various security costs and that this would also facilitate their understanding of how these costs fit together.

6. Responding to a question on resource mobilization, the USG noted that funds are not sought for day-to-day operations, but rather for specialized support, such as emergency response or information management tools. He added that UNDSS would welcome a revisiting of the budget if IASMN members suggested this. In response to a question from UNOPS, the USG noted the Service Charter was still in the process of being finalized.
7. Ms. Maria Victoria Montalvo, WFP, welcomed the document and the Department's goals, suggesting that it be socialized with UNSMS organizations. The USG agreed, highlighting communications on these plans with principals from UNSMS organizations was essential.
8. Mr. Michael Dell'Amico, UNHCR, expressed appreciation for the USG's defining success benchmarks around programme delivery and the document as a whole. He noted that, structurally speaking, it would be important to address incentives for security personnel in order to ensure that these were aligned with programme delivery aims. This would include performance evaluations and, particularly, whether there should be more input on whether programmes had indeed been enabled as a result of someone's actions, and from whom. Such feedback would help ensure a balancing of concerns for safety and security with those of delivery. He added that UNHCR appreciated the focus on building the surge capacity to ensure the right people are deployed to emergency situations. Finally, he commended UNDSS for seeking extra-budgetary support, noting the importance of good governance and inclusion through the IASMN, and offered to share UNHCR's experiences with regionalization.
9. The USG/UNDSS noted that performance evaluations were indeed being considered, with DOs giving additional comments on these, and that it was also important to ensure that security personnel are able to provide the correct advice and are not subject to (undue) pressure to deliver. He agreed that surge capacity requires the right combination of skills and experience and that it has on occasion been difficult to find an appropriate candidate to deploy to humanitarian crisis situations.
10. Mr. Paul Farrell, UNICEF, noted engagement with Executive Directors of UNSMS organizations was critical to ensure they understand the UNSMS and the strategic implications of its work. He offered assistance with the staff selection process in the Secretariat, to the extent it is allowed, to assist UNDSS. He added that the decision-making criteria for the location of JFA posts still seemed unclear and enquired whether it would be possible to have agreed criteria on where posts are placed. He added that the issue of correctly incentivizing UNDSS personnel, in a system without true competition, would be a leadership challenge and highlighted the desire of UNSMS members to work together.
11. Mr. Luc Vandamme, IOM, noted that, as UNDSS seeks to hire security personnel from other UNSMS organizations, those organizations are also open to recruiting staffers from UNDSS, which ensures cross-fertilization. The USG noted that he would encourage UNDSS personnel to work with agencies, funds and programmes, which would increase their experience and skillsets.
12. Mr. Valentin Aldea, DPPA, stated that in addition to work in humanitarian crisis settings, security support to missions (SPMs and PKOs) was also essential. The USG agreed, noting that the

Integrated Security Workforce (ISW) continues to be a focus and that discussions are at an early stage with relevant departments on a review of the ISW and further improvements will be sought.

## Summary of Progress on Recommendations

13. Ms. Justyna Pietralik, UNDSS/SPPS and IASMN Secretariat, briefed on the outstanding IASMN recommendations (**CRP 1 Annex B**). She noted that, as per regular procedure, expanded updates would be provided on the major recommendations during this session of the IASMN.
14. Ms. Maria Montalvo recommended that different 'statuses' be introduced to track the progress made under each CRP. Mr. Paul Farrell added that these ought to be linked with the seven priorities from the previous IASMN. Ms. Pietralik noted these concerns and said they would be addressed in the next iteration of the CRP, for the IASMN's following session.
15. **The IASMN:**
  - **Took note of the progress made in the implementation of the outstanding IASMN recommendations;**
  - **Requested that each recommendation be linked to the UNSMS priorities to facilitate the tracking of progress on these.**

## Review of IASMN Working Groups

16. Mr. Kuusinen introduced the session on IASMN working groups, which also sought to identify a way forward on lessons learned (**CRP2**).

### ***Working Groups***

17. Mr. Kuusinen then presented on CRP 2, which was a review of the IASMN Working Groups and the lessons learned process. He updated the group on the progress of the tasks identified at the previous meeting of the IASMN and noted that there are 10 working groups currently meeting. These are divided based on the topic they are focused on and their goals. Mr. Kuusinen also noted that the working groups should be reviewed so as to be results-oriented and to ensure that there is a streamlined process to follow for the creation of working groups in the future. Mr. Mark Richmond, UNDP, expressed his appreciation for the work done on this subject, and noted that the proposal to categorize the working groups into three with specific timelines may minimize representation. More so, it might be difficult to define the scope of a working group that will be working for two or more years. Instead, he proposed two groups: 1) standing committees which would handle continuous and long term work, and 2) working groups, which could contain project groups or task forces (similar to sub-working groups).
18. Mr. Aldea expressed his concern that introducing more categories for the working groups might overcomplicate the system. Instead, he proposed to better structure the working groups and how they are established and monitored. Mr. Farrell added that it is difficult to gauge the level of participation because it depends on everyone's availability and level of work. He concurred on not overcomplicating things. Mr. Lassi explained that the duration of a group's work would

obviously be difficult to predict in advance, but the IASMN did want to insist on defining the scope of the project, e.g., is this going to be a major project? If so, the timeline will reflect that.

19. Ms. Florence Poussin, UNDSS/DRO, encouraged agility in how the IASMN operates, and noted the importance of bringing field experience to the work of the working groups, citing the policy review group as an example. Mr. Aldea concurred. Mr. Kuusinen explained that there are working groups that get little done or do not report progress, others that focus on strategic issues, others that focus on policy issues, so the motivation behind the proposed changes was to make them more efficient and result oriented. The USG/UNDSS added to this, explaining that it is important to align the work of the IASMN with its priorities. Mr. Angelito Bermudez, WHO, noted that the working groups should support the work of the IASMN and therefore be closely aligned with their TORs.
20. Mr. Kuusinen noted that at this time there was no need to rename or define working groups, but when a new working group is formed it will have TORs and a definition of the task it aims to accomplish. Moving on to the lessons learned process, Ms. Suchada Kulawat, UNDSS/SPPS, reminded the group that in the last steering group meeting in November, there was a request for inputs on how to proceed on lessons learned. The USG/UNDSS expressed his hope that the lessons learned process would be launched as soon as possible.

### ***Lessons Learned***

21. Mr. Farrell noted that the lessons learned were only scoped out via email, which did not give UNICEF sufficient time to respond. In the future, he recommended a more comprehensive process to compile as many lessons as possible. On a related note, Mr. Vandamme requested that all working groups use the same platform, Microsoft Teams, and use the same tools to store their data to make cooperation easier. The USG noted that lessons learned should go beyond security and Mr. Farrell concurred, adding that there are many variables that should be considered.
22. **The IASMN:**
  - **Agreed it would not be possible to merge or otherwise rationalize certain working (and other) groups, given that each group had a distinct focus;**
  - **Requested that each group ensure that its work, plan of deliverables and, where relevant, a timeline, be included in its TORs, and that the groups brief on their plans at the next IASMN session;**
  - **Noted that, on lessons learned, UNDSS would put together a proposal based on the three submissions received from UNSMS members, circulate the document and call for a meeting of interested organizations to further refine it.**

## UNSMS Results Chain

23. Mr. Michael Center, UNRWA and UNDSS/DRO, provided an update on the UNSMS Results Chain (**CRP 3**). He noted that the spreadsheet the sub-working group is working on had been shared with the IASMN, and he provided a brief overview of it. He noted that the working group

moved away from a task-oriented approach and towards an outcome-oriented one. Mr. Center explained that all the activities are mapped to the desired goals, outcomes, and impacts on the ground.

24. Phase One was identifying the specific outcomes, outputs, and activities that are required in a designated area. In Phase Two, the group has mapped the activities and outputs done in the field to activities at the HQ level. Phase Three, which has been started recently, focuses on results indicators to measure the success of achieving those outcomes identified in previous phases. Lastly, Phase Four would look at outcomes going from the field back up to HQ, rather than vice-versa. Mr. Center also stressed the need for outreach and training sessions to sensitize all staff to these changes. The USG thanked Mr. Center for his work and concurred on the actions that needed to be taken.
25. Mr. Butt expressed his appreciation for the working group's progress. He stressed the importance of the results chain being focused on enabling program delivery through taking processes and making them results-oriented. He also referenced quantitative and qualitative indicators and noted that the latter will be more important in determining whether we are achieving the results we want to achieve. Ms. Montalvo also expressed her agreement and appreciation for the work done.
26. Mr. Richmond noted his worry that the sensitization might fail to reach all relevant personnel, especially security professionals from the agencies, funds and programmes, as in recent years even regional workshops have become more exclusive. He proposed using security cells as one method of sensitization. Mr Richmond also inquired on how the results will be implemented or used, suggesting the development of a toolkit to aid sensitization. Mr. Bill Miller, UNDSS/DRO, agreed that tools need to be developed to ensure that the information reaches everyone. Mr. Center also agreed and explained that the results chain serves as a foundation for the work of the organization – everything that is done flows into it.
27. **The IASMN:**
  - **Took note of the progress of the sub-Working Group of the Strategic Review Working Group to date;**
  - **Endorsed the proposed next steps.**

## The 2023 JFA Budget

28. The USG/UNDSS introduced the session, indicating that UNDSS was seeking endorsement of the JFA, ahead of the FBN session scheduled for 9 March 2022. Ms. Renu Bhatia, UNDSS/EO, summarized the main elements of the budget as presented in **CPR 4**. For the 2022 budget, while the initial approved budget was \$144 million, UNDSS had committed to a \$130.6 million budget to the FBN. Increases related to TESS costs and post costs, which UNDSS does not control, subsequently brought the budget to \$132.3 million. That figure provides the baseline for the 2023 budget, which, when factoring in the 5% re-costing applied to all budgets, results in a final figure of \$138.5 million. She specified that the 2023 budget does not include any changes to posts. She then provided further details regarding the DRO budget, emphasizing that a large portion (80%)



is dedicated posts and providing the breakdown for the \$28.5 million in operational expenditures, which includes the \$13 million ASLs for field level operations, \$1 million for TESS and \$13 million for other costs (UNDP SLA, GTA, travel and surge, and equipment). Finally, she provided information on the new post requests to the Regular Budget, some of which will be transferred out of the GTA/JFA budget.

29. Mr. Richmond asked about the rationale for the increase in travel budget in light of the Secretary-General's commitment to a lighter carbon footprint for the organization. He also requested more information on the TDS expenditures, stressing that the shift in roles and responsibilities was expected to reduce the TDS budget.
30. Mr. Vandamme noted the increase in LCSSBs and asked whether UNDSS could provide a trend analysis of LCSBs over time to better understand these increases.
31. Mr. Bermudez asked whether the strategic intent related to decentralization was reflected in the 2023 budget. USG Michaud responded that it was not, as it first requires a feasibility study to determine, inter alia, the budget implications. If decentralization were to be implemented, the budget implications would more likely be reflected in the 2024 budget.
32. In response to some of the questions, Ms. Bhatia indicated that UNDSS/EO would need to prepare a trend analysis of the LCSB budget in collaboration with DRO. She also explained that the travel budget for 2023 was on par with pre-Covid averages. She also indicated that the training budget was aligned to the approved training calendar.
33. Mr. Butt stressed that the increase in LCSSBs was problematic since contributions came out of entity programmatic budgets. He asked if UNDSS could explore ways to better attribute costs and whether some could be transferred to the JFA instead. He also noted that the actual overall LCSB was larger than what had been presented since the list omits several countries. He also concurred with a previous observation on the TDS budget, noting that agencies were now doing more, which was expected to lead to a reduction in the TDS budget.
34. The USG responded by indicating that LCSSBs may need to be reviewed, but that the increase also spoke to the changing threat environments. He also emphasized that this was not about questioning the needs, but rather about reflecting on what it costs to deliver security services now, in comparison with 5 or 10 years ago. He indicated his willingness to pursue this dialogue, including with Member States.
35. Mr. O'Hanlon emphasized that the no cost increase is not sustainable, and that continuing to 'do more with less' is not a practical approach. He asked if the USG could convene a specific IASMN discussion on the JFA, emphasizing that the discussion should be on resourcing requirements rather than just budget figures which belongs in the FBN.
36. Ms. Bhatia stressed that IASMN members could help the process by engaging with and sensitizing their respective Comptrollers ahead of the FBN.
37. The USG/UNDSS reiterated the call for IASMN support and engagement with FBN representatives and concluded by indicating that UNDSS would circulate the conclusions of this discussion.

### 38. The IASMN:

- **Supported the 2023 JFA budget;**
- **Requested that IASMN members engage with their FBN representatives ahead of the FBN meeting.**

## HR WG

39. Ms. Bhatia presented **CRP 5**, summarizing the steps taken with since the endorsement in 2021 by the IASMN of a common roster. She emphasized the establishment of the Working Group and the consultations held with several Human Resource departments to see if various rosters can be brought under one platform and stressed the further need to socialize the concept and secure commitment from the top leadership of the IASMN entities. She indicated that the Working Group is now working on concrete steps, including the identification of potential administrative barriers. She emphasized the need to manage expectations with regards to the level of ambition, considering the differences in rules and regulations amongst entities. She also updated the IASMN on the ongoing GJO campaign.

40. Mr. Farrell emphasized the link between the USG/UNDSS strategic intent and the current GJO campaign and indicated that it may be useful to have IASMN entities on the recruitment panels. USG Michaud welcomed the idea, especially considering the need to diversify profiles through this campaign.

41. Mr. Farrell further indicated the need for UNSMS organizations to both support UNDSS in this campaign and benefit from the outcome of the process, notably in terms of identification of good candidates by participating in the recruitment panels for UNDSS GJOs. He also stressed that the UN needs to get better at written/technical testing, to avoid exclusion through false negatives, and reiterated the offer for UNSMS organizations to be part of the testing phase.

42. Mr. O'Hanlon highlighted a risk with shared rosters, noting the potential for failure to bring in new talent into the UN system. He also noted the challenges related to the G to P process in the Secretariat and asked if UNDSS could resume efforts to obtain waivers. The USG responded that a recent request for a one-year waiver for the current GJO campaign was denied by DMSPC, which lacks the authority to grant such waivers, and he stressed that the GA remained adamant on this issue.

### 43. The IASMN:

- **Took note of progress made towards the establishment of a common roster.**

## Policy Update

44. Ms. Kulawat presented the update on policies (**CRP 7**), highlighting that the Policy Review Group had completed its revision of the Applicability Policy, which was being submitted for the IASMN's endorsement. She provided some background on the Group's work, recalling the recent promulgation of the Framework of Accountability, following the HLCM's approval, and its current work on revising the policy on alternate work modalities, relocation, and evacuation.

45. Ms. Kulawat noted that the Applicability Policy had been submitted to the IASMN Steering Group and had undergone extensive reviews. She explained the revisions, stressing that the changes do not represent a change in philosophy and that the policy is underpinned by the notion of direct contractual relationship. She noted that, unlike in the previous iteration of the policy, those who provide services a UNSMS organization on less than a full-time basis are considered UNSMS personnel when actually providing those services. She added that the revised document also divides the categories of those to whom the policy is applicable into more coherent groups (UNSMS personnel and eligible family members). Finally, she noted that an issue that arise in the Steering Group meeting in November 2021, concerning a footnote on third parties, had been resolved.
46. Mr. Richmond noted that, while his legal team agreed with the language in the policy that established a contractual relationship to the UNSMS organization with direct administrative authority. He added that this implies that accountability would rest with UNDP for all contracts managed by UNDP, including those on behalf of other UNSMS organizations. He therefore suggested a footnote to clarify that entities such as UNDP that manage contracts for other organizations (to whom the contract holder is providing services) are not accountable for those personnel. He suggested this would help alleviate any confusion in the field.
47. Mr. Vandamme noted that IOM had no concerns on the language in the revised policy. He requested that invitations to the planned “info cafes” on newly revised policies be extended to other UNSMS organizations, and that additional explanatory documents, such as two-pagers highlighting the most important changes, be produced, as had been done for other major policy revisions.
48. Mr. Brian Baker, UNRWA, suggested that a footnote be included to specifically address UNRWA personnel, the majority of whom are not classified as UNSMS personnel, in addition to paragraph 2, which offers applicable language. He noted the need to maintain consistency with the way UNRWA area personnel are addressed in the Secretary-General’s report. Mr. Farrell expressed that further discussions on this issue would be helpful as, in his view, UNRWA area staff are UNSMS personnel, and that there are implications on the use of the SRM process. He noted that the policy document, as it stands now, is strong and offers a clear, logical approach to accountability, and urged that it be endorsed.
49. Ms. Pietralik suggested that, as a compromise, the issues raised by IASMN members, where additional clarity was sought, be included in a two-pager that UNDSS produces to accompany new and heavily revised policy documents.
50. Mr. Simon Butt, OCHA, noted that many of the issues raised during this session have been discussed, and resolved, in the working group, which included OLA representation, and he urged the group to accept the policy as presented. On the issues that were specific to organizations, he agreed this should be addressed either in a guidance/socialization note or through clarity provided within those organizations.

51. Mr. Baker agreed that additional clarity on UNRWA area staff could be provided through a two-pager explainer but stressed the need for consistency on the issue. Ms. Kulawat agreed, suggesting that, once there is internal clarity in UNRWA on this, UNDSS will ensure that the Secretary-General's report reflects this accordingly.
52. Mr. Farrell added that the language on eligible family members has been revised, and it now reflects more accurately the relationship between eligible family members and the UNSMS.
53. Ms. Kulawat summarized, noting that members agreed to endorse the policy as presented and that the additional issues would be clarified through socialization efforts as well as the two-pager document. She noted that, as per the Policy Review Group's discussion, there was also a suggestion that each UNSMS organization could develop its own internal guideline to explain the revision and account for its specific arrangements, if needed.
54. **The IASMN:**
  - **Endorsed the revised Applicability Policy, with the provision that additional explanatory notes are included in the two-pager in the policy's promulgation package.**

## Strategic Communications Working Group

55. Mr. Alister Wood, IOM, and Ms. Laura Lacanale, WFP, presented the update on the work of the Strategic Communications Working Group (SCWG) (**CRP 7**). Mr. Wood introduced the group's progress and highlighted the requests submitted in the CRP. He reiterated the request for IASMN representatives to encourage their communications specialists to participate in the working group, as more members are still needed. He highlighted that the group is functioning well and that its members are sharing resources to get the messaging off the ground. Mr. Wood also recalled that, at the last Steering Group meeting, members were reluctant to cover the costs of a commercial entity's work on UNSMS messaging, so several members of the working group have agreed to fund this, as they believed in the product. He noted four entities have contributed \$35,000 for the video, which will be the basis of the strategic communications plan and to which other communications products will be linked.

56. Ms. Lacanale showed the group a rough mock-up of the video, which will use an animation technique, called rotoscoping, that produces realistic-looking action. She noted that the video would use actors, who have already been selected for the roles, and last no more than two minutes. The scenario is of a senior security professional explaining the UNSMS to a colleague who is being onboarded. (Screenshot from the presentation below.)



57. The ASG UNDSS expressed her appreciation of the video and its novel approach, which will likely enhance learning. Mr. Vandamme highlighted that the video contributes to an agreed UNSMS priority, and his organization is one of its financial supporters. He also reiterated the appeal from the SCWG for additional UNSMS members to join the group.

58. Mr. Farrell said the video's approach was very engaging, attractive and dynamic while he raised an issue on the overall messaging and the use of certain words. He noted that, for one, the UNSMS does not "guarantee" safety, and highlighted that the IASMN should have some ownership of these messages and wording. He suggested that the text be shared, possibly in the form of a Word document, so that feedback can be given on the possible reframing of some keywords before production has advanced. He also noted that, while the video targets one specifically group – new personnel – there are other audiences, especially decision-makers, including DOs, and Member States, which should be considered by the group.

59. Mr. Wood responded that the analysis of the text would start with the working group, which will review it to ensure consistency and accuracy. He noted that, at that point, the group could bring the product to the IASMN, possibly via an ad hoc session.

60. In response to a question on product timelines, Ms. Lacanale noted that the video would be ready by the next IASMN session and would be distributed to sponsoring organizations at that time.

61. Ms. Kuusinen summarised the CRP asks and urged UNSMS members to contribute personnel, whether on a temporary or more permanent basis. He echoed Mr. Vandamme's point on communications being one of the seven agreed UNSMS priorities. He suggested that, at the next

Steering Group, the SCWG provide a progress update, which could include some points specifically in reference to Mr. Farrell's suggestions.

62. **The IASMN:**

- **Recognized the work undertaken to date by the Working Group, including the creation of various inter-agency resource sharing mechanisms;**
- **Agreed to provide specialists to the inter-agency communications network to initiate the proposed strategic programme;**
- **Requested that the group provide an update to the Steering Group meeting on next steps and possible ideas for additional target groups such as DOs.**

## TESS Service

63. Mr. Peter Casier, head of the Telecommunications Security Standards {TESS+} team / Senior Programme Manager, provided an update on the TESS Service (**CRP 8**) via PowerPoint<sup>1</sup>. He briefed the IASMN on the TESS funding developments from the previous six months, which included cash flow issues that continued through mid-February 2022 due to delays in the 2021 extra contributions and in the approval of WFP/UNDSS MoU. Mr. Casier noted this has now been resolved and the 2022 JFA contribution had been transferred. Mr. Casier also highlighted that the USG UNDSS and WFP Executive Director exchanged letters to confirm WFP's continuing as the TESS+ Coordinating Agency.
64. Mr. Casier also updated on TESS+ operations/field support in detail, noting that achievements included completing technical missions in Democratic Republic of Congo, Nepal, Nigeria & Zimbabwe, finishing assessment missions in Georgia, Libya, Tunisia, Burundi and Azerbaijan, and providing "intense remote support" for Iraq, Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Cameroon, and Sudan. He added that over the past 6 months, TESS+ also provided regular webinars, and online and onsite trainings. It continued lab tests on mobile satellite systems/long-term standards, while providing what Mr. Casier described as "a lot of ad hoc remote technical support."
65. Ms. Montalvo noted that WFP supports the way forward on the TESS+ Service Charter, requesting that two clarifications be made in the document: one on the issue of legal custodian (ensuring that terms are used consistently throughout the document) and on data ownership. Mr. Casier agreed to edit the document to ensure consistency on the issue of legal custodian (keeping the reference in one chapter and removing it from others) and expand further on the issue of data ownership, making clear the distinction between public and restricted information and who can access these.
66. Mr. Richmond expressed appreciation for TESS+'s contributions and enquired about the prioritization mechanism, noting that page 12 of the document states that a request can be received from any stakeholder. He suggested that this seemed a bit broad and that a tighter

---

<sup>1</sup> The presentation is available on UNSMIN.

mechanism of prioritization – or a more in-depth explanation of how it works – may be needed. The USG noted he had a similar question on prioritization.

67. In response, Mr. Casier noted that any issues on prioritization go through the TESS Interagency Steering Group, as well as the TAG, and noted that TESS+ is currently able to fulfil all the requests received and has not had any conflicts on this in the past. He offered to clarify the issue of prioritization further in the TESS+ Service Charter. The USG noted that the IASMN may wish to consider whether any tweaks should be made to the prioritization process.
68. Mr. Butt recalled an example from Sudan, where he noted that the recommendations had not been fully implemented, which suggested that TESS+ may be spreading itself too thin, having taken on board many assignments, some of which seemed incomplete. The USG responded, noting that, in the Sudan case, the work to implement the TESS recommendations had not been completed, but that the accountability to ensure funding and implementation of TESS recommendations rests with the DO (supported by the UNSMS and the ICTWG), not TESS+. Mr. Casier echoed this, noting that TESS+ provides support but does not “own” any of the field support projects. He also added that the current prioritization system has still enabled TESS+ to remain nimble and that the Service has always been able to respond to emergency requests.
- 69. The IASMN:**
- **Took note and support the overall process and progress made to date on the current {TESS+} services within its corresponding funding;**
  - **Endorsed the updates of the {TESS+} Service Charter, provided that minor revisions are incorporated to reflect the IASMN’s feedback including clarifying TESS capability to respond to UNSMS needs and in prioritizing support.**

## Security apps

### COSCATG and Working Group on Guidance on SCS

70. Mr. Casier briefed on the Common Security Communications Applications Ad Hoc Technical Working Group, known as COSCATG, as well as on the IASMN Working Group on Guidance on Security Communications Systems (SCS) (both covered in **CRP 9**). He noted that the COSCATG was fairly new and had replaced the COSCA<sub>G</sub>, which had split into: 1) a group working on technical elements (the COSCATG) and 2) the associated policy work, which was taken up by the IASMN working group on SCS guidance and procedures. He noted that the COSCATG is not an IASMN working group, and hence its ToRs (attached to the CRP) were being provided for the IASMN for their information, not endorsement. He also noted that the group membership had also been finalized, having achieved a balance of technical and business-side (security) members. He noted the group’s purpose was to work on the practical technical implementation of the common security communications system and its interface with the other security communications systems.
71. Mr. Casier noted that work on the common SCS is complex and that agreeing on the COSCATG’s ToRs was critical in ensuring the group is focused and clear on the future direction. He

highlighted that practical output was expected by June 2022 and mentioned that a meeting of the group would be called shortly to start work on the implementation, which entails the technicians/programmers building the different API interfaces.

72. In response to the USG's question on whether the platform itself would be available by June 2022, Mr. Casier stated that there are multiple variables at play, and that use cases for the platform ranged from the basic to very advanced; however key functions, such as messaging and what used to be referred to as 'headcount', should see progress by June. He offered to provide, for the next IASMN Steering Group, a progress update and plan for the common platform, with all use cases. He stressed the work for the more advanced use cases would take a substantial amount of time, but the key ones that are most important to the field should progress significantly by June.
73. Ms. Montalvo enquired whether the eTA currently had the functionalities needed for its use to be enforced, whether there were any "carrots" to motivate colleagues to use the systems and whether there were any security consequences and mitigating measures for the period that the operational systems are not working together. Mr. Casier referred the question on eTA to DSOS<sup>2</sup> (and their dedicated session on the app), though noted that he was under the impression that the functionalities were in place and the group was only waiting for the eTA guidelines to be endorsed. He noted that some UNSMS members had an issue with the use of one specific application being made mandatory. As per agreement with the Chair, that issue would be addressed after the user group updates<sup>3</sup>.
74. Mr. Aldea requested further details on how DOS contributes to the overall process on SCS for field missions, including the fact that the missions may use specific types of security communications equipment and configurations. Mr. Casier noted that DOS is represented by two personnel from OICT/DOS in the TESS governance mechanism (TESS Interagency Steering Group) and that, for internal operational use, organizations may use their own communications systems and standards and that the TESS standards apply only to the use of technology for common security purposes.

**75. The IASMN:**

- **Supported the overall progress and process on the UNSMS Common SCS applications.**

## User Groups

### eTA

76. Ms. Esther Kuisch Laroche, UNDSS/DSOS, provided an update on the eTA application (**CRP 11**), noting that the technical working group had decided to split the content of the original eTA guidelines into two. This would include guidelines that would focus on access and accountability, and there would be an eTA manual that would provide details on the technicality of the eTA. She also expounded that the group's members drafted the guidelines in a consultative process. As such, she asked the IASMN to endorse the new guidelines. Ms. Kuisch Laroche additionally

---

<sup>2</sup> Following the IASMN session, DSOS, in light of its restructuring, changed its name to the Division of Partnerships and Specialized Support (DPSS).

<sup>3</sup> Please see that summary, starting on page 17 of this report.



pointed out that the next focus would be the eTA manual which was expected to provide more clarity on specific functionalities.

77. Ms. Senida Panjeta, UNDSS/DSOS, highlighted that the overall functionalities of the eTA had remained the same. She also mentioned an ongoing effort to implement a few changes requested by different agencies, funds and programmes. One such request was the implementation of the SMS vendor and SMS functionality. However, this went beyond the eTA user group and needed to be discussed at the ICT committee meeting.
78. Ms. Montalvo asked what measures were in place around security risk management in situations where it was difficult to account for or have a system reliable and effective for headcounts. In response, Ms. Panjeta noted that in the meantime, headcounts had to continue as it was previously done since there was no common system in place at the moment. In addition, the existing situation made it difficult to have a structured and systemic way of collecting the numbers. To address this scenario, she underscored that a plan was in place to constitute a group that would work on the details of these requirements for the interoperability platform. It is estimated that it would cost around \$110,000, according to OICT. Ms. Panjeta expressed that an actual platform was tentatively going to be in place between June and July 2022.
- 79. The IASMN:**
- **Endorsed the Guidelines on the Use of the e-Travel Advisory;**
  - **Took note of the progress of activities presented in the eTA Business Plan.**

## **Everbridge**

80. Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia, FAO, presented the progress made by the group towards institutionalizing the group and liaising with the Everbridge provider from a technical perspective and the commercial aspects as captured in CRP 12. Everbridge confirmed its capability to comply with the requirements of the common security communication applications platforms. He established that 13 use cases were immediately achievable while case number ten needed further technical development. Further, he submitted that the expected time frame for delivering the cases was approximately six months. Mr. Trentinaglia also requested an opportunity to provide a detailed briefing to the full IASMN on the Everbridge security communications system. He alluded that it was necessary given that the IASMN was moving towards the interoperability of the common security communications systems ETA, Everbridge and SCAAN.
81. Mr. O'Hanlon asked how much the Everbridge system would cost. He noted that costs depended on users' number (more users translated to a lower cost). Mr. Paul mentioned that UNWOMEN had rolled out Everbridge in locations where ETA failed. Additionally, he echoed the caveat that the SRM should not identify a single system.
82. The USG proposed that the Everbridge User Group consider conducting a presentation on Everbridge outside the IASMN. The move would ensure that the presentation was conducted to

entities solely interested in the application. The USG also highlighted that allowing an outside vendor to present at the IASMN would make it challenging to handle future requests by other vendors. Mr. Trentinaglia seconded the proposal of not having an external vendor addressing the IASMN. Nonetheless, he emphasized the need to have the technical working group brief the IASMN on the capabilities of Everbridge.

**83. The IASMN:**

- **Took note of the establishment of the Everbridge User group;**
- **Supported the overall progress;**
- **Requested that a dedicated briefing on the application take place, to be led by FAO, for interested organizations.**

**SCAAN**

84. Mr. Donovan Drew, ITU, gave an update on SCAAN covering the period from September 2021, mainly around the notifications for headcounts (**CRP 13**). He noted that SCAAN brought forth the interactive voice response (IVR) online in the first quarter of the year. Through this product, an operator would be able to initiate a pre-recorded message sent to their registered users. Moreover, cell phone users could reply using push-button responses. He also pointed out that SCAAN had introduced email notifications as part of the notification portfolio. In this process, users would first receive an initial SCAAN application alert followed by the IVR or SMS depending on the cell coverage. SMS service was now fully operational in 67 countries as a two-way SMS system. Through Mr. Donovan's submissions, the SCAAN working group proposed a modification on the UNSMIN website to have a navigation tab encompassing all the common security communications systems ETA, Everbridge and SCAAN. The tab would also list the associated costs, recommendations and progress on TESS.

**85. The IASMN:**

- **Took note of the progress of the SCAAN User group;**
- **Supported the overall progress towards UN-wide interoperability.**

**Mandatory Use of a Single SCS Application?**

86. Mr. Casier also brought up the topic of the mandatory use of a single SCS application. He noted a need to put overall guidance on the status where different security communications applications were in use until a standard common solution was rolled out. For instance, he asked, 'what happens if designated officials, security management teams, and security advisers decide to use an unsuitable tool?' He also noted that the mandatory use of one specific technical solution was not compliant with the approach used in TESS. Mr. Casier elaborated that, in the case of TESS, overall standards and approaches were defined but no single technical product was identified for a particular operation. On the other side, leaving the decision to Designated Officials and SMT to decide which security communication application to use could mushroom to the use of several other applications, including to unsuitable applications. He gave

the example of doing headcounts and sending of security alerts as a current challenge faced in the field, which would be resolved once a common system was in place.

87. Mr. Vandamme supported the proposal by UN Women that one single system should not be made mandatory as an SRM measure. He also supported the proposal by Mr. Donovan to have a tab on UNSMIN named SCS as opposed to the current ETA since there were several systems in use. Mr. Casier also embraced having a tab on UNSMIN that highlighted and gave prominence to the other systems. He also proposed the inclusion of TESS into that tab. Ms. Panjeta agreed that the proposed changes to UNSMIN would not pose any technical issues and would be implemented.
88. Mr. Kuusinen expressed disappointment with the progress made towards enhancing the interoperability function of the platforms. He stressed that the focus should be on having a system where all other systems could connect under the right circumstances and agreed standards.
89. Ms. Kuisch Laroche responded that the eTA would be the common platform and efforts were in place to enhance the interoperability of the three systems, hopefully by June 2022. She also clarified that not all functionalities would be ready by the said timeframe, but the crucial things would be interconnected. Ms. Kuisch Laroche also elucidated that all functionalities were working. The only action was looking into the SMS functionality available in the other systems. Once sorted out, ETA would have similar functionalities as the other systems in the next few months.
90. Mr. Donovan questioned if OICT was able to put all the APIs in place to make this interoperability for the different SCS tools. Ms. Senida responded by expounding that there was a one-time cost of USD 110,000. Besides, there would be a 20 percent maintenance cost of the one-time amount. She also pointed out that in the first phase of the project, which aimed at bringing on board the existing applications, there would be no additional cost to those APIs currently being developed. However, subsequent new requests for connections would attract an expense of roughly USD 3 to 5,000 per API.
91. Mr. Vandamme suggested that there was a need to make a difference between the end-users' application and the common platform that would connect the different systems. He also advocated for the eTA to change its name, and the USG supported the idea to rebrand the app.
92. The USG raised a question for inputs around the authority the Designated Officials had in making decisions concerning risk mitigation measures in their respective areas in specific countries. Mr. Paul commented that the general principle was that only people within the organization's legal framework had the decision-making authority. The USG invited bi-lateral discussions around this question for ideas and inputs after the IASMN meeting.
93. Mr. Butt stated that different countries had a justification for using one of the three systems since they were not interoperable at the time. He also argued that it was not practically possible to have a security adviser working on three systems to push messages to staff. On the contrary, Mr. Paul disagreed with Mr. Simon's idea noting that the IASMN could not demand an agency to

switch systems and identify a single product for security communication. In his take, Mr. Vandamme pointed out that making a particular system mandatory in places where a working platform was adequately developed and effective was counterproductive.

94. Ms. Kuisch Laroche reiterated that the important thing now was the ability to conduct rapid headcounts. It was therefore prudent to maintain the existing corporate systems as progress on inter-operability should be made by June 2022.
95. In a later session, the USG noted that he will be writing to the DOs on the mandatory imposition of a security communication system to ensure that their decisions are based with full understanding of the ongoing situation in their area so that they can better balance the pros and cons of their decisions while noting work being done on the common security platform
96. Mr. O'Hanlon, in response, stated that there may be a potential breach of rules and regulations in procurement if there are multiple platforms and there are other platforms that are available and cheaper.
97. The USG suggested that IASMN members share their views with him on the issue. Mr. Farrell suggested that everyone should be copied in the message that will be sent out requesting inputs so that everyone can be involved in the discussion and see what others are putting forward. This may help in deciding whether there is a need to have a broader discussion.

## TAG

98. Ms. Kuisch Laroche presented an update on the Technology Advisory Group (TAG) (**CRP 14**), which consisted of two parts: the results of a survey recently carried out by the group and a request from the TAG for the IASMN's inputs on its future direction and format. She noted that the survey identified some potential technologies that may be of interest to the UNSMS<sup>4</sup>, and highlighted an issue, for the IASMN's consideration, on compliance systems. On the future format for the TAG, she highlighted a potential new direction for the group, which would be a community of practice, without a group chair but with a moderator assigned to the group. She noted that would mean that the group comes together to address clearly defined needs or questions on technology, rather than to focus on reviewing security-related technologies in a monthly meeting.
99. Mr. Sobron, mentioned that UNOCT has a dedicated team working in the area of UAVs, and they are coordinated at the Sectorial level by OSMC-DOS. UNOCT asked if UNDSS has liaised with OMA and Ms. Kuisch Laroche confirmed that OMA was already dealing with the issue of UAVs and that a briefing on their progress on this will be requested.
100. Mr. Donovan recalled his experience as TAG co-chair and noted that, while there is still an interest and a need for knowledge on technology, ad hoc (rather than regular working group) sessions may be more appropriate for the TAG at this time. Ms. Montalvo also supported the

---

<sup>4</sup> The full survey results are available in the CRP.

proposed direction, noting that soliciting advice on specific and concrete problems, from qualified experts or advisors, would be preferable to the current format of the TAG.

101. Following on these interventions, as well as member messages via the chat, Ms. Kuisch Laroche noted the support for the TAG to move from the current advisory group model to a community of practice that will meet ad hoc in response to specific IASMN requests. She noted that ToRs would be developed for the group and a moderator assigned, with an update on this presented at the next Steering Group meeting. On the question of ensuring that the community model is sufficiently resourced, Ms. Kuisch Laroche suggested this be considered in the ToRs. The USG seconded this, noting the ToRs should include options for managing capacity/tasks.

**102. The IASMN:**

- **Took note of the responses to the TAG-related services' survey;**
- **Agreed that the TAG would become an ad hoc group that would advise on specific issues;**
- **Agreed that the TAG's ToRs would be revised, a moderator appointed and new ToRs developed. These would include suggestions on managing capacity and taskings and would be reviewed at the next Steering Group meeting.**

## Training: SCOLT

103. Mr. Vandamme, Chair of the Standing Committee on Learning and Training (SCOLT), provided a detailed update on the Committee's work in several areas (**CRP 15**). He briefed on the general progress of the SCOLT; the work of the Security Training Governance and Prioritization Mechanism, the 2021 IASMN Security Training and Learning Priorities; the revision on the Learning and Training Policy (SPM Chapter 5 Section C), which was being presented for endorsement; a consideration on a Training Needs Assessment (and whether TDS could be requested to undertake a strategic level learning/training needs analysis across the UNSMS to map out a longer term strategy); and requirements for security professionals to participate in SSAFE training (which he noted was still under revision).

### ***SPM on Training and Learning***

104. Mr. O'Hanlon took the floor, noting that he was not in a position to endorse the SPM on training and learning as he felt control of the STPGM's setting of training priorities had been relinquished and some of his concerns, which were provided earlier to the SCOLT, remained unaddressed. At the request of Mr. Vandamme and the USG, he presented these to the forum. They included: whether a policy on security training was actually needed and specific language in paragraph 20 (reference to UNDSS reviewing all training needs); paragraph 22 (reference to UNDSS working with the support of SCOLT, rather than as more of a team); paragraph 23 (reference to 'mobile teams' should be expanded to include other teams); paragraph 24, second part (compliance monitoring, which seems to push more workload on to UNSMS organizations); paragraph 25b (more clarity on who/what determines the qualifications mentioned); and a caveat on paragraph 25e (reference to training being delivered, but "as per agreement by the STGPM"). On the latter, he noted that, if the IASMN communicates a priority, that should be enough to consider the issue a priority.

105. The USG/UNDSS noted that there were multiple demands being placed on TDS, such as both training delivery and training development and, in a context of limited resources, prioritization was critical. He highlighted that the STPGM included IASMN and SCOLT representation and stressed that more training is needed than ever and that all UNSMS organizations need to work together to deliver. He noted that this was linked to Mr. O’Hanlon’s earlier point on whether the JFA is sufficient.
106. Ms. Kuisch Laroche stressed that TDS continues to deliver training programmes, noting the section was directly involved in 22 learning programmes and oversaw 15 learning programmes in 2021. She noted that some of Mr. O’Hanlon’s inputs could be easily addressed through edits, though others may need further discussion by the SCOLT.
107. The USG suggested that, after addressing Mr. O’Hanlon’s comments, another silence procedure be launched for the approval of the SPM chapter on training and learning. Mr. Vandamme agreed, noting, however, that he had already been very flexible in his approach in order to get to an agreement on the document in what has been an immensely time-consuming process. He noted that, if the silence procedure is not successful this time, it may be worth considering not having a policy on training, given the disparate views. Ms. Kulawat agreed with moving forward with the third silence procedure and continuing to work with partners to achieve consensus.

#### ***Training Needs Assessment***

108. On the request for a training needs assessment, Ms. Kuisch Laroche noted that one such assessment had been done in 2017, and that parts of it are likely to still be valid. She suggested this be considered in the SCOLT, before a decision is taken on whether another assessment is needed and if yes, what resources would be required for that. She also highlighted the role of the SCOLT in identifying training priorities.
109. Mr. Vandamme noted that, although the SCOLT had provided inputs on priorities, this was done through an Excel table, which did not provide a comprehensive analysis on needs or gaps in security learning and training. He recalled his experience with UNDP, where a similar assessment was undertaken by an external consultant and proved very helpful.
110. The USG noted that the results chain could provide a foundation for the work, at least for the training needs of security professionals. Mr. Center confirmed that the results chain could be useful for this, particularly in terms of identifying what a security professional should be capable of, what the requirements are, and develop a curriculum around that. Mr. Butt agreed that the results chain would help to identify broad areas of competence to be addressed via training, but that it would be a struggle to identify where training is required in the implementation of SRM measures, which vary from country to country. He agreed the group needed to consider the gaps, as well as the future, whether through a study or another initiative.
111. The ASG UNDSS suggested that helping those performing the duties on the ground should be a key focus, and that multiple sources, including the field, should be used to validate any needs assessment.

112. Mr. O’Hanlon noted that the 2017 assessment focused specifically on UNDSS and not the UNSMS.

113. The USG summarised that the overall agreement seems to be that the assessment is needed, but that the ‘how’ needs to be further refined. He suggested that he would call a meeting of the STPGM to discuss how to proceed with a needs assessment for the UNSMS and update the IASMN at its next meeting. He noted that it would be helpful to have this assessment ready for 2023-2024.

### ***SSAFE Requirements***

114. The final discussion in the SCOLT session focused on the requirement of security professionals to undergo SSAFE training. Mr. Vandamme introduced the discussion by recalling the earlier session on SCS and noting that, if the DO has the ability to decide the SSAFE is required, then specific language would not be necessary as the training would be an SRM measure. He noted that opinions on whether the SSAFE should be required of security personnel were divided within the SCOLT.

115. The USG noted that, if there is a policy on a given issue, that document should be used to inform decisions. Mr. Farrell noted that, within the SCOLT, most members felt this should be a policy-level discussion and that there was a strong consensus, with minor refining left to be done.

116. Several members suggested that the SSAFE requirement could be a “non-issue” in terms of the limited number of security professionals who have not done the training and the DO’s ability to grant exemptions. Mr. Richmond noted that this primarily concern newly hired personnel, and it may be difficult to assess their qualifications to exempt them from the training.

117. **Security Personnel Exclusion:** The main arguments for this included the already existing expertise of security personnel, as well as cost and flexibility considerations. Mr. Farrell noted that security professionals should be experts in this area, and that what’s being considered is not making exemptions but redefining the exclusion criteria. He added that DOs may not currently know that they could have security personnel exempted. He noted that such a redefinition would allow for more flexibility on using resources / available SSAFE training slots. Mr. Kuusinen suggested that more advanced training, such as the Security Certification Programme, could supersede a more basic course such as the SSAFE, and suggested that the overall training requirements of security personnel be considered as part of this issue.

118. **No Security Personnel Exclusion:** The main arguments included the need to help ensure an equal level of qualifications among security personnel, the relatively little savings that would come with not requiring the SSAFE and leading by example / building credibility by having security personnel participate in SSAFE. Mr. Miller highlighted that, given the diverse backgrounds of security professionals, as well as the drive for greater diversity, the training would help standardize qualifications. The USG also noted that there are several UN-wide mandatory trainings, such as on gender, that must be taken even if the post-holder is a gender specialist. Mr. Aldea noted that the SSAFE course also includes a section on local context, which a

newly deployed security professional may not have, and made a case for a uniform approach on the implementation of SSAFE to all categories of personnel.

#### 119. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the progress made by SCOLT since its establishment in October 2020;**
- **Took note of the progress made by SCOLT on the IASMN 2021 Security Training and Learning Priorities**
- **Requested that SCOLT further refine the language on the consideration on the requirements for UNSMS Security Professionals to participate in SSAFE Training, taking into account the feedback received from the IASMN**
- **Requested that the revised SPM, Chapter V, Section C on Learning and Training be resubmitted for endorsement following the silence procedure, after addressing the feedback received from UN Women.**
- **Agreed that the way forward on the training needs assessment will be the discussed at the next meeting of the STGPM, to help set priorities for 2023/24.**

## Training: TDS

120. Ms. Kuisch Laroche, DSOS, delivered the TDS Update, which included notes on progress as well as the Annual Report, via PowerPoint<sup>5</sup> (CRP 16). She highlighted the gaps and possible solutions identified by surveys and consultations with DRO and training focal points, as well as the proposed time frame for implementation. She gave a brief overview of the Annual Report, highlighting that 2021 saw a partial resumption of in-person security training, and that, of in-person courses that were locally organized, 40 per cent were delivered by UNDSS in 2021, compared to 30 per cent of the courses in 2019. She noted that in 2021, numerous innovations were undertaken, such as the launch of the new orientation pathway, a compilation of best practices for inclusive security training, webinars on the physical security assessment tool, and new blended learning to train peer helpers. She noted that TDS were able to deliver on 81 per cent of the planned learning events in the 2021 calendar and implement five new or revised training standards in the middle of a pandemic.

121. Mr. Butt flagged that, since UNDSS has decreased its training delivery, he relies on the cooperation and collaboration of other larger UNSMS organizations with training capacity for courses. He noted that, while this was not an immediate problem, there is the risk that those other organizations will no longer be able to accommodate his personnel at some point. Mr. Richmond agreed that UNDP was seeing fewer trainings delivered by UNDSS resulting in some organizations taking on more responsibilities to run courses. He added that this model may not be not sustainable as these entities now have to incur additional costs. Ms. Kuisch Laroche suggested this be further discussed offline, to pin down where partners feel that TDS involvement has diminished and stressed that the section continues to deliver training.

122. Ms. Katja Hemmerich, Chief TDS, noted that, previously, TDS had focused on the delivery on the SCP and LSA training, which meant there were fewer resources for updating the ETB or SSAFE courses, developing new training materials or piloting new courses. She noted that the section

---

<sup>5</sup> The PowerPoint is available on UNSMIN.



was not focused on balancing delivery with development activities and requested that partners provide further details on the gaps to help TDS address them.

123. On the training statistics presented, Mr. O’Hanlon queried whether those courses were for the UNSMS or the ISW, noting that his organization would not have had access to courses for ISW. Vandamme noted that his organizations had also delivered a significant number of trainings and that some courses have trainers from both UNDSS and other UNSMS organizations, which may also skew the statistics.

124. The USG UNDSS noted that TDS had made an intentional shift to better respond to IASMN priorities on development and quality control some two years ago, and he highlighted that all UNSMS organizations needed to work together to address any delivery gaps. Ms. Kuisch Laroche offered to join the next SCOLT meeting specifically to discuss this issue.

125. **The IASMN:**

- **Took note of the Annual Report on Security Training for 2021; and**
- **Took note of the progress made to date in the review of training for security decisionmakers and support the implementation process.**

## Armed Security / Residential Security Measures

126. Mr. Trentinaglia presented the update on the working group on armed security and residential security measures (**CRP 17**). He highlighted that the group was requesting one action – the approval of its ToRs – and provided some background on the group’s *raison d’être*, which is to fill a policy gap regarding the contracting of armed security services by UNSMS personnel for the purposes of the residential security measures. He mentioned the group met six times in the second half of 2021 and was revising the two applicable policies to make sure they make explicit and clear references to each other to close the existing policy gap. He noted the group focused primarily on updates to the policy on armed private security companies, with just one change needed to the policy on residential security measures. He noted the group plans to finalize these changes and address suggestions raised at the Steering Group meeting, which was to revise the section on management oversight and quality control of the armed security contracts.

127. The USG UNDSS requested inputs on the ToRs of the group, as presented, noting that members would have an opportunity to discuss the proposed revisions at a later date.

128. Mr. Aldea raised two points on the ToRs, suggesting that a name change be considered to reflect the specificity of the task and that the group propose concrete changes to the policies rather than a paper. He also noted that DPPA continues to have concerns on deploying armed security personnel in a residential context and feels this should be a solution of last resort as the management of such assets is high risk. Mr. Trentinaglia agreed that armed security should be a “last resort measure” and noted that such concerns are also the reason the policy revision will clarify oversight, management, and quality control responsibilities. On the suggestion of changing the group’s name, Mr. Farrell pointed out that the ToRs are internal to the IASMN, and that the group’s task was clear to the Network; therefore, he urged that the name remains

unchanged. He also noted that, as per the ToRs, the group will present recommendations in track changes.

129. **The IASMN:**

- **Approved the ToRs for the Working Group.**

## HIM Update

130. Ms. Poussin presented the introduction to the HIM session (**CRP 18**), which was followed by updates from UNHCR and UNICEF on the issue. She noted that the Expert Group was established last September and has met twice since its inception. The group has started exchanging some lessons learned, established baseline statistics and shared templates of after-action reports. She noted a Teams knowledge repository has been set up, and that the group has agreed to discuss the HIM course and revise refresher courses in the future, as well as review policy and guidelines on HIM. She noted a proposal for an HIM Portfolio Manager, to be based within UNDSS, has been discussed, and that UNHCR has sponsored HIM3 trainings that were launched last year. In addition, UNDSS received a grant from the Peace and Development Trust Fund, which will cover more training in 2022 (in addition to the Crisis Management Training for DOs.) A total of 75 security professionals will be trained, including personnel from other UNSMS organizations and SLT partners. Finally, she noted that those who completed the previous versions (HIM1 and HIM2) are still considered HIM qualified, and that HIM concepts from the most recent course should be mainstreamed into other types of training, such as the one on communication skills.

131. Mr. Dell'Amico updated that the recent UNHCR-led trainings, although virtual, been very well received and have fulfilled their criteria. He noted that the next UNHCR-led training is meant to be in person and that there is more than enough need and qualified candidates to justify having both UNHCR- and UNDSS-led courses. He stressed that the courses would have common standards and that he would be approaching IASMN members to solicit potential candidates for the training.

132. Mr. Farrell added that the policy updates referred to by Ms. Poussin are based on a UNDSS/DRO best practice document, which had been shared with the IASMN. The document included issues such as dealing with Member States and family support, among others, and was also used to create an internal UNICEF policy. He highlighted that he had been requested to start some of the 'track change' revisions of the UNSMS policy on this and has completed a draft. He thanked DRO for launching the expert group and added that UNICEF have created prevention webinars in English, French and Spanish, which they are ready to share. The floor was then opened for comments, and the discussion has been summarized below, grouped by issues.

133. **Participation of smaller UNSMS organizations:** Mr. O'Hanlon highlighted the need to ensure that smaller organizations can also take part in these trainings so they can develop their own capacity. He suggested that two courses be specifically earmarked for smaller organizations. Ms. Poussin noted that the UNDSS-led training will be open to external participation, with a minimum external participation set.

134. **Continued UNDSS Role:** Mr. Arve Skog noted that UNOPS entrusts the management of their HIM cases to UNDSS, as they see this as part of the Department's functions. He noted his organization is interested in having their personnel trained, so they could support, but that they continue to count on UNDSS' leadership on HIM in the future.
135. **Dates for upcoming courses:** Mr. O'Hanlon stressed the need to fix the training dates (which are currently marked as TBD) so that nominations can be submitted. Ms. Poussin noted that the planning for the UNDSS-led courses is not yet done, as the Department was still waiting for donor funds to be transferred. She added that UNDSS' goal was to have the trainings completed within a year of the funds arriving and highlighted that the Department was very keen to launch these.
136. **Using non-UN HIM courses:** Mr. Richmond enquired whether any consideration has been given to using courses, such as those already being run by commercial organizations, to get more UNSMS personnel trained on HIM, considering the limited slots available on the UN courses. Mr. Farrell noted that the way UN cases are managed is unique due to the legal status of the UN and therefore the management response must be in line with the specific situations, vulnerability and status of the Organization. Issues such as ransom payment are also extremely sensitive and are handled differently than in other organizations.
137. **Basis for Considering HIM1 and HIM2 as still valid:** The basis on which HIM1 and HIM2 would be considered valid was debated throughout the HIM session, with diverging opinions on the issue. Ms. Montalvo and Ms. Elisca Lagerweij enquired about the basis for considering the two previous trainings as still valid and, conversely, what would have made the trainings invalid. Ms. Montalvo stressed that WFP would like clarity on the core minimum criteria on validity set by the group, so that other resources can be considered to fulfil the same requirements. Mr. O'Hanlon noted that deploying personnel who have completed earlier versions of the training could lead to suboptimal outcomes and raise potential issues in Bols. He felt there was a significant difference between the earlier versions and HIM3 and urged that the decision on having all three be considered valid be reconsidered. Ms. Poussin mentioned that there is no international, ISO or related certification for HIM training, but rather, that the group considers that those who have been through an earlier version of the course are still qualified to be part of the HIM cell and, should they participate in a case, headquarters support is always provided. She also noted that personnel with HIM1 or HIM2 training are currently participating in HIM cases due to the limited pool of HIM3-trained staff. She noted that, in addition to the training itself, experience with HIM cases was important. Mr. Farrell noted that the baseline curriculum of the HIM training has not changed, so nothing had been invalidated by the new training. He highlighted the changes in the new versions – such academic research background for negotiations training (HIM2) and best practices on family support (HIM3). Mr. Baker added that he had completed the very last HIM2 and the very first HIM3 courses and felt that although HIM3 was far more useful, those who completed the HIM2 training should not have their training be made invalid by the introduction of HIM3. Mr. Marshall suggested that the issue of validity should be considered by an independent body such as a Member State or consultant and whether it was an issue of content or the duration of someone, post-training, not using the skills.

138. In response to Mr. O’Hanlon’s point that HIM1 and 2’s continued validity seems to have been a decision taken by the expert group, Ms. Poussin stressed that no decision had been made. She noted the issue had been discussed within the group, although further discussions on this may be needed. She suggested that UNHCR or UNICEF share the HIM3 curriculum so that UNSMS members can be reassured about the continuing between HIM1 and 2, and the current version. She also noted that the group dealt with not only training on HIM but also concepts and management, stressing that the focal point remains UNDSS. When HIM cases arise, UNDSS manages them and holds the responsibility when assigning people to manage the cases. Mr. Butt added that it was important to separate a policy on training from management decisions, and that it is a management decision to deploy personnel to work on an HIM case.
139. **Fading of Skills / Refreshers?** Mr. O’Hanlon noted that, since he has had no experience in HIM after completing HIM1 and 2, he no longer lists it in his CV/P11 as he feels it is out of date and he would not be qualified to participate in such a high impact incident. He added that there may be some 400 UNSMS personnel with HIM1 and 2 completed, the majority of whom have also not participated in any HIM cases and have, essentially, outdated HIM qualifications. Mr. Farrell agreed that maintaining skills was an extremely important issue, and one of the vulnerabilities of the previous approach to HIM. He noted that he was working on a refresher exercise for those who have completed HIM3 and have not worked on an HIM case, to be taken every couple of years or so. This could be worked into the HIM3 training concept and, eventually, HIM1 and HIM2 would no longer be recognized as valid. He added that benefits of the HIM training can also extend to support personnel who may not carry out any of the five specific functions on the HIM team but are still helpful.
140. **Crisis Management Training / Mission Involvement:** Mr. Russell Wyper, DPO, requested that the crisis management trainings be coordinated with DPO as well as DPPA, as they have developed some training products with XB funding this year. Mr. Aldea stressed that personnel in field missions should also have the opportunity to participate in the HIM training.
141. **External Validation and Engagement:** In response to a question on how the HIM3 training had been validated by external sources, Mr. Farrell noted that engagement with external entities, including Member States, was part of the process at the start, but it had fallen off. He highlighted that this was why the advisory group ToRs included re-establishing connections with outside experts and part of the reason the current consultant, who has a strong connection with those experts, was brought into the project. Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron Puelles commented that UNOCT has recently produced a manual on countering kidnapping and extortion in collaboration with Member States, and suggested a round table on the issue of HIM with Member States, to include not just those from P5 countries but also from regions such South America and Africa, which also have significant experience with HIM. Mr. Farrell agreed, noting that such engagement is a two-way street, with Member States also soliciting the UN’s HIM expertise.
142. **Policy Update:** In response to Mr. Kuusinen’s question about the next steps on the ongoing HIM policy update, Ms. Poussin explained that the group will review Mr. Farrell’s proposed changes, which will then be submitted to the Steering Group and, in due course, to the IASMN.

143. **Next Steps:** Mr. Kuusinen noted that, for the next IASMN, it would be helpful for the expert group to present not only the policy update, but also some considerations on how HIM1 and 2 would eventually be phased out, considering the target numbers of HIM-trained personnel the UNSMS requires, as well as the need for those resources and service to be as up to date as possible. He noted also that the advisory group remains the focal point for the sharing of information on the issue.

144. **The IASMN:**

- **Took note of progress and requested that the HIM Expert-Related Advisory Group brief the IASMN about the retention of qualifications and certification.**

## Guidelines on Common Premises

145. Ms. Jamison Medby, UNDSS/DSOS/PSU, introduced the Physical Security Manual for UN Common Premises (**CRP 19**). The manual was presented to the Steering Group in November and following that meeting, the manual was disseminated for a substantive review. She noted that DSOS did not receive any feedback and the manual was presented to the full IASMN for their endorsement.

146. Mr. Skog and Mr. Richmond noted that they had in fact provided inputs, which had not been incorporated<sup>6</sup>. Ms. Medby apologised for not including their inputs, and a new date was set (March 18) for any additional comments to be submitted.

147. Mr. Baker pointed out that the document talks about managing threats and not risk and therefore, and that he felt it was not ready for IASMN endorsement yet (reference - pages 20, 21 and 22).

148. Mr. Butt reiterated Mr. Baker's point regarding the importance of managing threats as well as risks. Mr. Butt also pointed out that the SRM steps lack detail when addressing decision making. He added that there is no discussion of acceptable levels of risk on which legitimate decisions can be made and, therefore, it is feared that this could lead to a maximalist requirement for security risk management measures. Ms. Medby stated that a reference can be made to other policies which address decision-making rather than describing the whole decision-making process within this manual.

149. Mr. Richmond noted that the information appeared to present requirements rather than advice within a guide. Mr. Richmond adds that within the guidelines, the references to the SMOM and information extracted from other policies make it less clear that this document is a technical one.

150. Mr. Richmond also stated that an opportunity is potentially being missed in that the Physical Manual for Common Premises is also relevant for standalone premises. He suggested that rather than having a whole new manual on non-common premises, both manuals could be merged, or the Common Premises Manual could mention that it is equally relevant for all premises. Mr. Paul Farrell echoed this and stated that this is a great opportunity to rename the manual as the

---

<sup>6</sup> UNHCR later noted that they had also provided inputs to the manual.

Physical Security Manual for UN Premises, so it acts as a force multiplier. Ms. Medby stated that a comment can be included within the document to state that the content is applicable to any UN premises.

151. Mr. Farrell noted that, while some updates still needed to be made, the document is still on the right track and the fundamental concepts are strong.

**152. The IASMN:**

- **Requested that additional inputs on the *Manual of Physical Security for UN Common Premises* be submitted by 18 March and noted that inputs submitted prior to the IASMN would also be addressed.**

## Gender Working Group

153. Ms. Clairene Alexander, UNDSS/SPPS, presented on the updates regarding the Gender and Inclusion Working Group (**CRP 20**). The Working Group was reinstated at the 34th IASMN session in 2021. The Working Group's purpose was to assess and strengthen the coverage of gender, diversity, and inclusion using a person-centric approach within all existing policies, guidelines, and processes. The group is chaired and co-chaired by UNDSS, UN Women and UNHCR. Ms. Alexander added that the group, which now has 16 members, has developed a draft ToRs for consideration by the Steering Group, and it is circulated with the IASMN for endorsement. She noted that the Gender and Inclusion Working Group is subdivided into 3 Sub-Working Groups (SWG) to implement its work plan. Of these, the Policy SWG is chaired by UN Women, and aims to examine policies, guidelines, and processes to ensure that there is a person-centric approach, and that gender, diversity and inclusion are reflected in those documents. When reviewing policies, the group will submit suggestions to UNDSS/Policy who will, in turn, bring the substantive changes to the IASMN Policy Review Group.

154. **SRM SWG:** Chaired by UNHCR, the SRM SWG has 6 members who review SRM and develop tools encompassing a person-centric approach. The SWG it's looking at developing certain tools such as all-encompassing checklists and lists of event descriptors. The work of this SWG is ongoing.

155. **Security Learning Programs SWG:** This SWG is chaired by World Bank and Co-chaired by IOM and has 8 members. This SWG examines existing security learning and training programs to ensure that there is an inclusive person-centric approach and to propose options for consideration.

156. In other matters, Ms. Alexander stated that The Gender Parity and Geographic Diversity Within Security Functions is being considered as a 4th SWG. Additionally, she added that the technical review of gender within the Security Policy Manual was completed by SPPS, and any additional suggestions will be included in the SWG for policy for gender and inclusion.

157. Ms. Montalvo suggested that within the review, the results of the revisions should be shared with training and eventually HR depending on what kind of training is being discussed.

158. Mr. Vandamme stated that it is important to determine who takes the lead on gender and inclusion mainstreaming in security learning programmes. He noted that TDS have published a manual on best practices for inclusive security training and that the ToRs on learning within The Gender and Inclusion Working Group, and the ToR of the SCOLT overlap. The ASG added that TDS maintain the overall lead in training but The Gender and Inclusion Working Group advise from a gender perspective if there are gaps or areas of improvement in terms of the delivery/planning of training.
159. Mr. Bermudez followed up on the feasibility of integrating sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) concepts into the current work of the Gender and Inclusion Working Group. Ms. Alexander stated that SEA is dealt with by the Office of the Special Coordinator and the Office of the Victims Rights Advocate. She added that there are mechanisms, tools, guidelines, policies and guidance documents for SEA so it was felt that it didn't need to be integrated within The Gender and Inclusion Working Group.
160. Mr. Butt suggested that all work on gender and inclusion be included in the results chain. The USG agreed and stated that the results chain is key to driving the implementation of policies and guidelines. Ms. Alexander noted the group would work on this.
161. Mr. Kuusinen concluded by saying the IASMN will endorse the Gender and Inclusion Working Group ToRs.
162. **The IASMN:**
- **Endorsed the ToRs of the Working Group, taking into account the recommendation from the IASMN to review the overlapping deliverable in the TORs of the SCOLT and TDS related to the mainstreaming of person-centered approach in security learning programmes;**
  - **Noted the progress on the structure and workplan of the Working Group through the Sub-Working Groups to date;**
  - **Noted the workflow of the policy Sub-Working Group and its alignment with the policy review and approval process.**

## Fire Safety

163. Ms. Kuisch Laroche introduced the presentation (**CRP 16**), noting that Mr. Robin Stenhouse, UNDSS/DSOS, had been tasked by the USG last year to look into the fire safety from the policy guidance perspective.
164. The USG started the discussion and noted that he has had discussions with colleagues regarding safety and where it should belong. He stated that there is no interest on DOS taking on additional safety related duties and emphasized on moving forward and putting in more work with the focus on e prevention. He also mentioned that he is willing to take that on and requires support in updating the policy.
165. Ms. Kuisch Laroche requested endorsement from IASMN to go ahead with the formation of the working group as discussed in the last meeting, under the chairmanship of DSOS. Once that is

done, the ToRs will be formulated, and a request will be made on who wants to be part of the working group.

166. Mr. Butt mentioned that at the Flood Taskforce meeting, that there was a discussion on embedding OSH within the structures. It was commented that there should be more leadership by UNDSS on this.
167. In response to Mr. Butt, the USG mentioned that the notion of transfer of responsibilities to other areas, it will not be possible since we are part of the Secretariat. He however reiterated on the need to do something regarding fire safety, its management and where the responsibility lies.
168. Ms. Kulawat mentioned that there was a HLCM meeting on Occupational Health the Safety (OHS is replacing former “OSH”) and in this OHS Forum of the HLCM, there was a recognition that the UNSMS will not be taking on any other responsibility related to occupational health and safety issues other than fire and road safety .
169. Mr. Brynnel mentioned that senior leadership engagement is missing and could be a good thing to flag again. This needs to be centralized, coordinated, and implemented throughout the organization.
170. Mr. O’Hanlon reiterated that issues pertaining to safety should sit with a specialist organization/department. He suggested a formal undertaking of the members of the IASMN to go back to the organizations and where it should sit.
171. In response, the USG stated that there is a recognition that there should be an investment in safety, and that it should sit outside the UNSMS framework, there should be a framework that mirrors the UNSMS framework.
172. Mr. Paul Farrell suggested that the messaging focus on the rationalization of responsibility and not transfer of responsibility, since it concerns a responsibility that should be fulfilled by an entity better suited for the purpose.
173. The USG acknowledged that there is expertise in the system, albeit being limited, and that support is required to update safety policies.
174. Mr. Brynnel stated that DOS would take part in the working group. Ms. Kuisch Laroche noted DSOS would email IASMN members to ask for nominations for the working group.
175. **The IASMN:**
- **Endorsed the establishment of a Working Group under the Chair of UNDSS/DSOS to review the current Fire Safety Policy.**

## Review of SRM/SSIRS Implementation

176. Ms. Poussin introduced the presentation on the SRM/SSIRS review (**CRP 22**), noting that a phrase three review group was established. She stated that in this last phase of the review, the group was tasked to look at the phase two review, the recommendations and validate them and



make final recommendations for your consideration. She highlighted the three groups of recommendations, those related to SSIRS, SRM and the recommendations that are more cross cutting. As for the IASMN, there was a request to establish one or two working groups, one dealing with SSIRS and one dealing with SRM or one dealing with both.

177. Mr. Farrell mentioned that there are some really good, cost effective, high impact immediate actions at the UNDSS level that would assist in the training front. He also suggested that the next improvement should be on leadership on consultation in that, with more consultation in the drafting of SRMs, the better they would be. He finally insisted on the importance of peer review/validity check as a cost effective, high impact way of getting better SRM and programme delivery.
178. In response, the USG noted that, out of these three phases, there has been a commitment on the part of UNDSS to further invest and support staff further through investing in training, awareness and trying to support field operations through SSIRS and SRM. Further, the priority right now is implementing the outcome of the SRM. He asked the team on how to continue the work moving forward.
179. Mr. Butt noted that what's missing in SSIRS is the usability of the data. In response to the question fronted by the USG, he noted that there needs to be a little bit more thinking since there are three things going on in parallel, the immediate fixes, the broader wider updates and the manuals. He suggested a combination of the i.e., the broader wider updates and the manuals as they cannot be separately done.
180. Mr. Richmond noted that there were recommendations that had an impact on policies. He fronted two questions, firstly, whether the issues should be reflected in the document or agreed at the IASMN and secondly, whether there is the consideration to sensitize the DOs and members of the SMT on the CRP prior to sort of putting it on their pallet.
181. Ms. Poussin stated, regarding the question on the entering of the data or incidents stated that the discussion was more focused on the external sources of information, whether that should be included in SSIRS or not, and the group said that it should not be. It's not against the current guidance, which is that you can or the analysts can include incidents that are not UN related that they hear about, but the debate was about whether we include other sources in SSIRS. With regard to hazard, she noted there had been no change, so the recommendation was to retain it as is.
182. The USG raised the question on how to move forward on the mid to long term issues and asked for suggestion on how to tackle the same.
183. Mr. Sobron stated that there needed to be an exchange of views in four areas. The first one is that the IASMN needs to revisit the actual classification of information for security purposes. Secondly, he suggested that the products that are under the IASMN umbrella need to relate to what the internal and external clients are demanding. Thirdly, the need for training to understand how the information provided is impacting others and the accompanying risks. Last

was the need for automatization of these products to ensure timely distribution and create the footprint of accountability.

184. The USG suggested that an update on this be provided the next IASMN, since the same issues will be discussed as part of the information management and knowledge management initiative.
185. In response to Mr. Butt, Ms. Poussin cautioned on the formation of the advisory group. She noted that there is no need to for a large working group just for purposes of communicating with OICT regarding the implementation of the IT changes. Mr Butt noted that there are more improvements to be made and widening the scope of the working group would assist. The USG suggested this be added to the group’s ToRs and adopted in the next meeting.
186. Mr. Farrell noted that, regarding support and guidance, some partners and agencies have some resources and concepts on comprehension building. He also suggested that the opportunity right now is to get improvements of the actual SRMs being done.
187. Mr. Miller stated that they have embarked on a learning campaign to make personnel aware of the information that they have regarding SSIRS which may also assist when doing risk assessments.
188. The USG solicited recommendations to lead the working group, noting that the group should present its ToRs at the next IASMN. Mr. Farrell volunteered, suggesting that he and Mr. Butt take on the task. The USG agreed and invited those interested in participating to contact Mr. Farrell.
189. **The IASMN:**
- **Welcomed the conclusions of the SSIRS/SRM review initiated in March 2020;**
  - **Recommended the establishment of an IASMN Working Group to address continued improvements to SRM/SSIRS processes, to be led by UNICEF and OCHA.**

## Close of Session

### JFA Budget Process

190. Mr. Daniel Lee Chase, World Bank, stated that there was a concern regarding the upward trajectory of the JFA budget. He stated that there have been reasonable questions from the World Bank’s senior management regarding the promised rebate on prior years contributions that arose across the board on budget underruns due to the COVID-19 pandemic. He further noted that the World Bank look forward to continued dialogue with the IASMN, UNDSS and the Finance and Budget Network as they continue working together to support the shared goals of transparency, equity and responsible resource management. The USG commended the frank and transparent contribution.

Co-chair

191. The USG introduced the idea of having a co-chair to assist in the meetings. He also stated that Mr Lassi had expressed interest on retaining the position for another term.
192. Mr. Farrell stated that he would encourage a smaller agency from the IASMN to fill the post of co-chair to give representation to the smaller UNSMS organizations.
193. Mr. Kuusinen highlighted his interest and supported the idea of having a smaller specialized organization take over. He noted that being co-chair provides a different perspective of the functioning of the UNSMS, which is valuable.
194. The USG stated that since his mandate expires in two and a half years, he would suggest that Mr. Kuusinen stay on for an extra year then later bring in a co-chair who would overlap with the next USG.
195. Mr. Butt also expressed interest in the co-chair position, while Mr. Donovan emphasized on the importance of having a specialized agency and agreed with the suggestion posed by the USG.
196. Ms. Mary Mone, UNESCO, supported the USG's and Mr Farrell's idea on having a specialized agency and bringing in a co-chair to overlap with the next USG to have a smooth transition.
- 197. The IASMN:**
- **Agreed that the current co-chair would continue for another year before a new candidate is selected for a two-year term to help provide continuity for the subsequent USG UNDSS;**
  - **Noted the indication of OCHA (Mr. Simon Butt) to be considered as co-chair, and the candidacy of any other potential co-chairs in one year's time.**

### Future IASMN Meetings

198. The USG recalled that the last full session meeting was in September, though a return to the usual schedule (in June), was likely preferable.
199. Mr. Farrell supported the idea of having a physical meeting. He suggested the week of the 20<sup>th</sup> of June since it would be difficult to attend if it was slotted for an earlier date. Alternatively, he stated that the May meeting would be virtual and the June meeting in-person.
200. Mr. Vandamme confirmed that IOM would be able to organize the meeting in Montreux. He agreed with the suggested dates for the meeting and noted IOM would liaise with the Swiss authorities and confirm arrangements.
201. Mr. Nicolas Hergot, UNESCO, stated that the UNESCO HQ in Paris could be a "back up" solution for the plenary session in June in case of any issues, or to host a Steering Group meeting. The next Steering Group meeting was decided to be held virtually in the week of May 2 (likely from May 3 to 5).

202. **Strategic Intent:** The USG also noted that he has introduced some changes to the structure of UNDSS, which included the move of the policy and partnerships team from SPPS/OUSG to DSOS. The other components of SPPS will continue to report directly to the USG.

Annexure (Agenda and Participant List)

## **Agenda**

### **Monday, 21 February 2022**

- 7:30 – 7:45     **Opening Session**
- Adoption of the Agenda (USG UNDSS)
  - Opening remarks (USG UNDSS)
- 7:45 – 8:00     **Summary of Progress on IASMN Recommendations (SPPS) (CRP 1 Annex B)**
- 8:00 – 8:45     **Review of IASMN Working Groups and lessons learned process (ICC) (CRP 2)**
- 8:45 – 9:30     **UNSMS Results Chain (DRO) (CRP 3)**
- 9:30 – 9:45     *Break*
- 9:45 – 10:15    **Presentation of 2023 JFA (EO) (CRP 4)**
- 10:15 – 10:45   **HR WG Update (CRP 5)**
- 10:45 – 11:30   **Policy Update (SPPS) (CRP 6)**
- 11:30 – 12:00   **UNSMS Priority #5: Strategic Communications (IOM) (CRP 7)**

### **Tuesday, 22 February 2022**

- 7:30 – 8:00     **Telecommunications Security Standards (TESS) Service (CRP 8)**
- 8:00 – 9:30     **Security Communications Applications**
- Common Security Communications Applications  
Ad Hoc Technical Group (COSCATG) (CRP 9)
  - WG on Security Communications Systems (CRP 9)<sup>1</sup>
  - App User Groups:
    - eTA (CRP 11)
    - Everbridge (CRP 12)
    - SCAAN (CRP 13)
- 9:30 – 10:15    **Technical Advisory Group (TAG) (DSOS) (CRP 14)**
- 10:15 – 10:30    *Break*

---

<sup>1</sup> CRP 9 covers both COSCATG and WG on Security Communications Systems; therefore, there is no CRP 10, as had been provisioned.

- 10:30 – 12:00 **Training**
- SCOLT (CRP 15)
  - TDS Update (CRP 16)

### **Wednesday, 23 February 2022**

- 7:30 – 8:15 **Armed Security/Residential Security Measures (FAO) (CRP 17)**
- 8:15 – 8:45 **HIM Update (DRO/UNHCR/UNICEF) (CRP 18)**
- 8:45 – 9:30 **Guidelines on Common Premises (DSOS) (CRP 19)**
- 9:30 – 10:15 **Gender Working Group (SPPS) (CRP 20)**
- 10:15 – 10:30 *Break*
- 10:30 – 11:00 **Fire Safety (CRP 21)**
- 11:00 – 11:30 **Review of Security Risk Management (SRM)/ Security and Safety Incident Recording System (SSIRS) implementation (DRO) (CRP 22)**
- 11:30 – 12:00 **Close of Session**
- Any Other Business
  - Wrap-up

**List of Participants**

	<b><u>Entity</u></b>	<b><u>Name of Participant</u></b>
1.	ADB	<b>Mr. Dewaine Farria</b>
2.	DOS	<b>Mr. Anders Brynnel</b>
3.	DPO	<b>Mr. Russell Wyper</b>
4.	DPPA	<b>Mr. Valentin Aldea</b>
5.	EBRD	<b>Ms. Leigh Anderson</b>
6.	EBRD	<i>Mr. Stephen Moran</i>
7.	FAO	<b>Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia</b>
8.	IAEA	<b>Mr. Criostoir Leaney</b>
9.	IAEA	<i>Mr. Steve Potter</i>
10.	ICAO	<b>Mr. Michael Romero</b>
11.	ICAO	<i>Mr. Jean Gagnon</i>
12.	ICC	<b>Mr. Lassi Kuusinen</b>
13.	IFAD	<b>Mr. Matthias Meyerhans</b>
14.	IFAD	<i>Ms. Berkis Patricia Perez</i>
15.	IIIM	<b>Mr. Paul Regan</b>
16.	IIMM	<b>Mr. Visar Rexhepi</b>
17.	ILO	<b>Ms. Els Brackenier</b>
18.	ILO	<i>Mr. Jean-Louis Dominguez</i>
19.	IMF	<b>Mr. James Blakeney</b>



20.	IOM	<b>Mr. Luc Vandamme</b>
21.	IOM	<i>Ms. Maricar Purugganan-Adkins</i>
22.	ISA	<b>Ms. Sonja Phinn</b>
23.	ITU	<b>Mr. Drew Donovan</b>
24.	ITU	<i>Mr. Juan Manuel Fernandez</i>
25.	OCHA	<b>Mr. Simon Butt</b>
26.	OHCHR	<b>Mr. Leonardo Da Cunha</b>
27.	OPCW	<b>Ms. Elisca Lagerweij</b>
28.	OPCW	<i>Mr. Bernd Schreiber</i>
29.	PAHO	<b>Ms. Maria Teresa Angulo</b>
30.	UNAIDS	<b>Mr. Peter Koopmans</b>
31.	UNDP	<b>Mr. Mark Richmond</b>
32.	UNDP	<i>Mr. John Dada</i>
33.	USG UNDSS	<b>Mr. Gilles Michaud</b>
34.	ASG UNDSS	<b>Ms. Unaisi Lutu Vuniwaqa</b>
35.	UNDSS/DHSSS	<b>Mr. Robert Delaney</b>
36.	UNDSS/DRO	<b>Mr. Bill Miller</b>
37.	UNDSS/DRO	<i>Ms. Florence Poussin</i>
38.	UNDSS/DSOS	<b>Mr. Esther Kuisch</b>
39.	UNDSS /EO	<b>Ms. Renu Bhatia</b>
40.	UNDSS/SPPS	<b>Ms. Suchada Kulawat</b>
41.	UNDSS/SPPS	<i>Ms. Justyna Pietralik</i>
42.	UNEP/UN-HABITAT	<b>Mr. Peter Marshall</b>
43.	UNESCO	<b>Mr. Nicolas Hergot</b>

44.	UNFPA	<b>Mr. Richard Jansen</b>
45.	UNHCR	<b>Mr. Michael Dell'Amico</b>
46.	UNHCR	<i>Ms. Julie Dunphy</i>
47.	UNICC	<b>Ms. Tima Soni</b>
48.	UNICC	<i>Mr. Lyle McFadyen</i>
49.	UNICEF	<b>Mr. Paul Farrell</b>
50.	UNIDO	<b>Mr. Konstantin Ivanov</b>
51.	UNMAS	<b>Mr. Paul Heslop</b>
52.	UNOCT	<b>Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron</b>
53.	UNODC	<b>Mr. Robert Telenta</b>
54.	UNOPS	<b>Mr. Arve Skog</b>
55.	UNRWA	<b>Mr. Brian Baker</b>
56.	UNRWA	<i>Ms. Yara Dababneh</i>
57.	UN Women	<b>Mr. Paul O'Hanlon</b>
58.	UN Women	<i>Ms. Sanja Potrebic</i>
59.	UNWTO	<b>Mr. Antonio Garcia Medrano</b>
60.	UPU	<b>Ms. Dawn Wilkes</b>
61.	WBG	<b>Ms. Samantha J. Steenkamp-Farrell</b>
62.	WBG	<i>Mr. Daniel Lee Chase</i>
63.	WFP	<b>Ms. Maria Victoria Montalvo</b>
64.	WFP	<i>Mr. Nicolas Morin</i>
65.	TESS Project	<b>Mr. Peter Casier</b>
66.	WHO	<b>Mr. Angelito Bermudez</b>
67.	WHO	<i>Mr. Pierre Nazroo</i>

68.	WIPO	<b>Mr. Olivier Bruyere</b>
69.	WIPO	<i>Mr. Peter Frederic Cave</i>
70.	WMO	<b>Mr. Khaled Bel Melih</b>
71.	WTO	<b>Mr. Michael Dos Santos</b>
72.	CCISUA	<b>Mr. Guy Avognon</b>
73.	CEB Secretariat	<b>Ms. Carmen Jimenez Gonzalez</b>
74.	FICSA	<b>Ms. Mary Mone</b>
75.	OLA	<b>Mr. Surya Sinha</b>
76.	OLA	<i>Ms. Vita Onwuasoanya</i>
77.	UNISERV	<b>Mr. Aitor Arauz</b>
78.	UNISERV	<i>Mr. Abolade Sobola</i>
79.	UNMD	<b>Dr. Ling Kituyi</b>
<b>Participants to Specific Sections</b>		
1.	IAEA	Mr. Niels Bolt
2.	IAEA	Mr. Veljko Nenadic
3.	SCAAN - IOM	Ms. Amy Rhoades
4.	SCAAN/SCWG - IOM	Mr. Alister Wood
5.	SCOLT - IOM	Mr. Dominique Bollier
6.	SCOLT - UNDP	Mr. Jamie Farrell
7.	SCWG - WFP	Ms. Laura Lacanale
8.	UNDSS/DRO	Mr. John Schot
9.	UNDSS/DSOS	Ms. Mimi Huang
10.	UNDSS/DSOS	Ms. Senida Panjeta
11.	UNDSS/EO	Ms. Tine Hatlehol

12.	UNDSS/EO	Mr. Ohyoung Kwon
13.	UNDSS/EO	Ms. Zhengfan Sun
14.	UNDSS/loPtJ	Mr. Martin Laffey
15.	UNDSS/OUSG	Ms. Martina Dragovic
16.	UNDSS/OUSG	Ms. Elena Rice-Howell
17.	UNDSS/OASG	Ms. Arfiya Eri
18.	UNDSS/PCU	Ms. Jamison Medby
19.	UNDSS/SPPS	Mr. Marc Jacquand
20.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Clairene Alexander
21.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Milanka Stamenkovic
22.	UNDSS/SPPS	Mr. Isaac Echakan
23.	UNDSS/SPPS	Mr. Chris Kariyo
24.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Sophie Ladanyi
25.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Mira Luoma
26.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Cynthia Mbugua
27.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Sylvia Sidarous
28.	UNDSS/SPPS	Mr. Aristotelis Vossos
29.	UNDSS/TDS	Ms. Katja Hemmerich
30.	UNRWA	Mr. Michael Center
31.	WFP	Ms. Brenda MacGregor
32.	WIPO	Mr. Jess Torp