



Executive Summary

The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its 37th Session at the United Nations Secretariat in New York from 7 to 9 February 2023. More than 34 representatives of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS) organizations participated (in-person and virtually), along with representatives of CCISUA, FICSA and UNISERV. This meeting marked the end of Mr. Kuusinen's tenure as co-chair. Mr. Kuusinen served as Co-chair since 2020 and the IASMN is grateful for his dedicated service. The IASMN endorsed Mr. Jess Torp of WIPO as the new Co-Chair.

On the first day of the meeting, the USG UNDSS briefed on several initiatives of the United Nations Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS), including outcomes of the Leadership Week, the ongoing Generic Job Opening (GJO) process, new information/knowledge management initiatives, and the strengthening of the planning approach through the Results Chain and increased headquarters support to the field. In the following session, members discussed the results from the most recent survey which indicated support to maintain the current number of meetings, with in-person participation preferred but with hybrid arrangements for virtual attendance available, and that the winter IASMN session should be held in New York every second year, alternating with a location closer to the field. Members received updates from working groups on policy reviews, Security Risk Management (SRM) / Safety and Security Incident Recording System (SSIRS) and armed guards/residential security measures and suggested the groups' next steps. The IASMN suggested that, based on the updates of the Policy Review Group, the Group should finalise the policy on Risk Avoidance (*Security Policy Manual*, Chapter 4, Section D) and present at the next IASMN session for approval. The IASMN took note of an update on

the ongoing Hostage Incident Management (HIM) and recommended a review on the best investment for HIM in the next 12 to 18 months.

On the second day, UNDSS presented an update on the 2022 JFA, where an over-spend of \$1.1 million was being projected, largely due to operations in Ukraine. Most members did not support the request to support this increase which, while fitting within the initially approved amount of \$144 million, did surpass the ceiling imposed by the Finance and Budget Network (FBN) of \$131.4 million. The HR Strategy Working Group presented its progress, which they noted had been limited due to the lack of traction on issues such as the establishment of the common roster and proposed the working group be disbanded. Members, however, urged that the group continue its work, suggesting possible avenues. The sub-working group on the Results Chain presented its work, with the IASMN noting that the document clarifies the activities of UNDSS and other UNSMS Organizations. The Security Communications Working Group presented an update, mainly on a proposal for a Security Week, receiving feedback on the duration of the event, which the group would review. The Training and Development Section (TDS) presented the ToRs for the Training Needs Assessment, which were approved with minor modifications. The Fire Safety Working Group introduced its new scoping document, which set out the proposed changes to the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS) fire safety policy and related guidance. The working group on gender and diversity delivered an update, focusing on the gender percentages for security personnel of UNSMS organizations. The IASMN requested that the working group consider the causes of issues and challenges on promoting greater diversity, including potential solutions and best practices.

On the third day, members participated in a strategic discussion, led by OCHA, on access and civil-military coordination. Members identified several areas for greater engagement on this issue and requested that discussions continue. Finally, the {TESS+} Programme Manager presented an update on several areas related to security communications systems, with members expressing support for progress.

Contents

- Introduction 4
- Opening Session..... 4
 - Opening Remarks..... 4
 - Adoption of the Agenda..... 6
- Summary of Progress on Recommendations..... 6
- Member Survey..... 7
- Policy Update 8
- Hostage Incident Management (HIM) Update 10
- SRM/SSIRS Working Group 12
- Armed Guards/Residential Security Measures WG 14
- Presentation of 2022 JFA Expenditures 15
- Results Chain..... 18
- Human Resources Strategy WG 20
- Strategic Communications 22
- Training 24
- Fire Safety WG 26
- Gender 27
- Thematic Cross-Sectoral Issues..... 29
 - Humanitarian Access..... 29
 - Military-Civil Coordination..... 30
- Security Communications 32
- Close of Session..... 33
 - Co-Chair Selection..... 33
- Annexure (Agenda and Participant List) 34

Introduction

1. The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its 37th session at the United Nations Secretariat in New York from 7 to 9 February 2023. Representatives of some 34 UNSMS organizations attended (in-person and virtually), along with representatives of FICSA, CCISUA and UNISERV, who have observer status with the IASMN. The USG UNDSS chaired the meeting, and Mr. Lassi Kuusinen of the ICC co-chaired.

Opening Session

Opening Remarks

2. The USG UNDSS delivered the opening remarks, providing the IASMN with an in-depth briefing of UNDSS's recent activities focused on 1) a strategic update (including outcomes of the Leadership Week, the GJO process, work on information/knowledge management, planning initiatives and partnerships), 2) resource allocation and 3) the Secretary-General's Bulletin (SGB).
3. The USG emphasized that the recent Leadership Week in Tarrytown, New York, was a different event from those usually held in Glen Cove with senior UNDSS personnel, in that it focused on internal planning and stock-taking. The USG noted that his recent meetings with Resident Coordinators and triple-hatted officials reflected a different, more positive tone towards UNDSS' plans, and stressed the Department's orientation towards keeping the UN operational in the field. The USG highlighted that UNDSS is committed to maximizing the use of its current resources while seeking extra-budgetary funds, and extending more headquarters support to the field, with a greater focus on results, faster deployments during crises and more diversity of skills within the workforce. He updated on the progress with the GJO campaign, noting that the rosters for P3, P4 and P5 posts were being replenished and could be used shortly to fill posts. The USG highlighted that discussions have recently begun with Amazon Web Services (AWS) to help bring about a digital transformation of the Department's work, including reengineering UNSMIN and enhancing the eTA for greater functionality. He added that Leadership Week focused on planning, both for the field and headquarters, and how to better tell the story of security, with a view to attracting additional resources from Member States and donors. In that vein, he noted that the Department would be launching a funding appeal to build extra capacity for emergency response, for psychosocial support and for digital transformation the following week.
4. The USG UNDSS briefed on the Department's approach to planning, elaborating on the ongoing work on the "Results Chain" and the Operational Resilience Unit that is currently being established to focused on planning (including determining planning protocol, analysis, and country plans). The USG noted that this new unit would help address the issue of post reallocation by establishing the principles, in collaboration with IASMN partners, by which such decisions are made. The USG thanked colleagues for their excellent contributions on resource requirements submitted in December 2022.. He added that a good example of reallocation of resources and reconsideration of the on-field mission's structure is Somalia, which is also a relevant case showing how the possible pace of the deployment of humanitarian response and

additional resources. He added that the other organizations' requests for increased UNDSS support in Guinea Bissau, Gabon, Cameroon, Turkey and Ethiopia has been accepted. He noted that he would share with the IASMN in writing where the allocations are occurring.

5. The USG highlighted that the Department was working on the update of the SGB, noting the document represents the way in which the Secretary-General articulates the purposes, functions and responsibilities of each Department under his authority. The USG invited IASMN members to provide input for consideration on the SGB, noting that while it falls under the remit of the Secretary-General, he welcomed feedback on the overall positioning of the Department, its functions and responsibilities. He highlighted the turnaround time for inputs would be relatively short, as the document needed to be submitted onward for HR consultations. Mr. Marc Jacquand, UNDSS/SPS, added that the document would be shared with the IASMN shortly and members were welcome to engage with him bilaterally in case they had questions. Finally, the USG emphasized the notion of humility, requesting that members remain open to different ideas to ensure effective programme delivery.
6. Mr. Simon Butt, OCHA, suggested that, in relation to the extra-budgetary funding, the focus should be on allocating more resources in the initial stage of a crisis as for the Ukraine case. He added that building resilience in conflict-affected area increases the chance to persuade the donors to allocate more resources. Mr. Drew Donovan, ITU, agreed, stressing that member states may be more inclined to recognize the value of resilience and hence invest in this notion of security. Mr. Butt also noted that access to communities (referred to as "Access to Affected Populations, or AAP",) was a critical link in resilience.
7. Mr. Paul Farrell, UNICEF, expressed appreciation for the detailed update provided by USG UNDSS and the plan to discuss the guiding principles for the allocation of posts, adding he would be available for consultations. Ms. Julie Dunphy, UNHCR, thanked the USG for the comprehensive briefing and took note of his readiness to share the appeal document with the IASMN members
8. Mr. Angelito Bermudez, WHO, welcomed the fund-raising efforts, and noted the importance of security being at the planning table at the outset of crisis response.
9. Mr. Valentin Aldea, DPPA, expressed support for the changes envisaged and agreed that UNDSS personnel should be able to help address challenges related to humanitarian operations. He suggested, however, that this aspect may be missing in the current training curricula. He also highlighted the importance of consultations on the changes planned, mentioning the example of Somalia, which was echoed by Mr. Russell Wyper of DPO.
10. Mr. Anders Brynne, DOS, fully endorsed the crisis response efforts, asserting that the various current mechanisms should be more coordinated. He maintained that, in order to enhance the partnership between UNDSS and DOS, the communications regarding the restructuring of a security mechanism on the ground should start as early as possible.
11. Ms. Maria Victoria Montalvo, WFP, welcomed the achievements shared by USG. She inquired about the nature of the role that IASMN is expected to play in accomplishing such

achievements. She emphasized the preference for a risk preparedness approach over an emergency response one.

12. In response to a question from UNHCR on collaboration with external organizations, as well as on “Plan B”, the USG noted that, if no donor funds were forthcoming, the Department would engage in some difficult reallocations to help carry out the proposals. He noted that, while a couple of organizations have shown interest, there is no official engagement (other than with AWS). He also explained that, on the UN side, P/C/SAs would be expected to engage with the UN Country Team, the Humanitarian Country Team and other bodies, with support from headquarters.
13. Mr. Naqib Noory, UNFPA, stressed the importance of decentralization but highlighted the importance of quality control to ensure a set minimum standard is maintained. He added that his organization values opportunities for engagement and that, in order to give inputs on post allocation, a discussion on criteria for post levels would be helpful.
14. Mr. Arve Skog, UNDP, recalled the discussion from the IASMN Steering Group on the functionality of the UNSMS as a whole, specifically whether the UNSMS system was moving in the right direction and requested that it be added to the agenda for the next IASMN meeting, so that the proposed changes – which he welcomed – can be considered within the entire system.
15. Mr. Luc Vandamme, IOM, commended USG for the transparency and pointed out the strategic importance of “telling our story” to both Member States and donors to help them understand the added value of security and obtain extra budgetary funds. In this vein, he noted it would be important to explain the difference in mandate of UNDSS versus the Security Offices of the UNSMS Organizations, as this is often misunderstood.

Adoption of the Agenda

16. The USG UNDSS presented the agenda for adoption, taking note of a few minor amendments to accommodate changes to presenter schedules, impacting sessions on the Results Chain (CRP 14) and Security Communications (CRP 9). Mr. Skog emphasized the need for the IASMN to agree on the on recommendations during the meeting and suggested that an agenda item (review and approval of IASMN recommendations) is added to the IASMN’s agenda. Mr. Noory and Ms. Montalvo endorsed Mr. Skog’s proposal. Mr. Kuusinen agreed, highlighting that the “asks” in each CRP in the future should be clearer, to facilitate the review of recommendations, as had been recommended in the IASMN member survey.

17. The IASMN:

- **Approved the agenda with the suggested amendments.**

Summary of Progress on Recommendations

18. Ms. Justyna Pietralik, UNDSS/SPPU and IASMN Secretariat, briefed on the outstanding IASMN recommendations (**CRP 1 Annex B**). SPPU highlighted that the follow-up on recommendations is limited to the specific decisions of the IASMN and, if a given issue is marked as “completed”, it does not mean that work on the issue will cease, but that the specific IASMN recommendation

has been fulfilled. Ms. Pietralik noted that in-depth progress on most of the recommendations will be shared throughout the session and mentioned that the package on the revised Hostage Risk (formerly Incident) Management has been disseminated, and that an Info Café on the Applicability Policy is being planned.

19. Ms. Montalvo suggested that the point on Lessons Learned should be marked as “ongoing” rather than “completed”, suggesting that the Afghanistan process simply highlighted gaps in the overall lessons learned system. Mr. Skog reflected that he had understood UNDSS would be establishing a process, with Afghanistan as its pilot case, recalling that UNDP and other partners provided some feedback on this. The USG agreed that there was more work to be done on the Lessons Learned process.
20. Mr. Vandamme welcomed the Info Café planned to explain the Applicability Policy and suggested that the timeline for this be advanced.

21. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the progress made in the implementation of the outstanding IASMN recommendations;**
- **Requested that the Lessons Learned process/approach be made more action-oriented and finalized.**

Member Survey

22. Mr. Kuusinen presented the CRP on governance issues including the member survey and role of the Steering Group (**CRP 2**), highlighting some of the findings from the last survey on working modalities and frequency. He also raised the question of the next IASMN Co-chair, as this was his last meeting as Co-chair, and reiterated the members’ general preference to appoint a smaller organization, ideally not NY-based to provide regional balance, as the next Co-chair.
23. Noting the preference expressed, Mr. Butt withdrew his nomination as next Co-chair. The USG UNDSS highlighted the importance of the Co-chair in providing input to IASMN discussions and pointed out that the time commitment required of the Co-chair is not greater than what is needed for members to prepare for the meetings. He stressed the aspect of continuity and the need for the new Co-chair to work with the next USG of UNDSS¹. The question of the Co-chair was tabled for the last day of the meeting, so that participants had time to reflect and nominate somebody for Co-chair².
24. **Frequency and Modality of Meetings:** Participants discussed the frequency and modalities of IASMN sessions and IASMN Steering Group (SG) meetings, with most expressing support for the current format of the meetings, meaning maintaining the schedule and having in-person meetings with hybrid arrangements. Mr. Aldea mentioned the importance of raising the presence and profile of the IASMN in various locations. Adding to this, Mr. Farrell highlighted

¹ USG Michaud’s five-year term is set to end in mid-2024.

² This discussion is concluded on the last day of the meeting and is summarised in the section on “IASMN Co-chair” on page 32 of the report.

the budget constraints, and that by having the meetings in different locations, including in field locations, the respective organization has the opportunity to connect the IASMN travel with other travel to this location, increasing exposure and being financially prudent. Mr. Paul O’Hanlon, UN Women, pointed out that participants are more committed and engaged in face-to-face meetings as opposed to virtual meetings. Mr. Robert Telenta, UNODC, expressed support for having two full IASMN meetings face-to-face per year, highlighting their importance for smaller organizations that are not part of the SG and not at the weekly VTC. Mr. Jess Torp, WIPO, also stressed the importance of having the meetings in New York, as organizations not based in NY can combine the IASMN travel with meetings with other NY-based agencies. Other participants, including ADB, UNOPS, DPO and UNRWA, voiced their support for the proposals.

25. Ms. June Onguru, CCISUA, also highlighted the benefits of in-person meetings. In particular, she pointed out that internet connectivity in the field can be a problem for those having to participate online, and as such, it would be beneficial to have some of the meetings in the field both for the participants onsite and also for the other IASMN members to see what work is being done in the field.

26. The USG UNDSS encouraged to hold the future meetings face-to-face, while conceding that it is not possible to completely forego the remote / hybrid option. He noted that the Swiss government will continue to support one IASMN meeting per year in Switzerland, though the specific location may change. Finally, he agreed with the points made by members, stating that having the meetings in the field demonstrates unity and leadership of the IASMN.

27. The IASMN:

- **Recommended that the number of meetings shall remain as is (two Steering Group meetings and two full IASMN sessions a year);**
- **Recommended in-person participation at the meetings to the extent possible but requested that hybrid arrangements for virtual participation be in place to accommodate those who cannot travel;**
- **Recommended to alternate between New York and a location in the field each year to hold the full IASMN meeting, to the extent possible, meaning the IASMN would be held in New York every two years.**

Policy Update

28. Ms. Suchada Kulawat, UNDSS/SPPU, presented the update on policies (**CRP 3**), highlighting the progress made on the revision of SPM Chapter 4 Section D (“Risk Avoidance - Alternate Work Modalities, Personnel and Family Restrictions (Relocation and Evacuation”), including the working group’s current work on the accompanying guidelines of the policy. As Chair of the Policy Review Group, she noted that the following the completion of the review of policies on Applicability, the Framework of Accountability and Risk Avoidance, the next policy in line to be reviewed is the Security Clearance Policy. She noted that the Field Reference Group is currently developing Warden Guidelines.

29. Ms. Pietralik briefed on the progress of the revision of the DO and SMT Handbook, which has recently commenced. She emphasized that this is a relatively simple technical update on policies that have changed since the last revision three years ago, and that in order to secure translation funding, the revision needs to be completed within the first quarter of 2023.
30. Participants discussed whether the revised policy on Risk Avoidance (not submitted to members as part of the CRP) should be circulated and tabled at this IASMN session. Mr. Farrell noted that the revised policy on Risk Avoidance is highly relevant for colleagues in the field and should thus be adopted quickly, as it is an improvement on the previous version. Ms. Kulawat noted that the working group did not send out the policy for approval in this IASMN session due to the ongoing review of the guidelines, which may have implications for the policy, but that, if this was the members' preference, the policy could be circulated and tabled on another day of this IASMN session. Several participants, including UNHCR, UNRWA, UNISERV and OCHA, voiced their support on circulating and discussing the draft policy at the present session, with the aim of endorsement.
31. The discussion therefore resumed on the third day of the IASMN session on the draft policy on Risk Avoidance. The USG UNDSS expressed that the guidance on Risk Avoidance should make clear that, in some of the cases covered, there is delegated authority from the Secretary-General, whereby USG UNDSS would issue the approval on behalf of the Secretary-General. Mr. Aitor Arauz, UNISERV, noted an issue with the phrasing of "alternate work modalities" (which may be mistaken for "alternate work arrangements", an HR term which does not have the same meaning) and "personnel and family restrictions", and pointed out some issues in paragraphs 11 and 12. He noted that Mark Polane from FSU has suggested that a definition of "family" and "non-family" duty stations be provided and that long-term implications – i.e. what happens when measures extend over a certain period of time – are explored.
32. Mr. Bill Miller, UNDSS/DRO, commented on the lack of clarity in regard to the roles and responsibilities, especially of the DO, in the draft policy, and pointed out some issues in paragraphs 15, 16, and 26. IOM and WFP agreed that they are not ready to endorse the draft policy on Risk Avoidance as circulated in its current state. Mr. Vandamme added that, in view of the cross-cutting nature of the policy, time was required to consult internally with HR and Legal colleagues.
33. Members discussed the process of policy approval, noting that the Steering Group had previously recommended for the policy to be submitted to the IASMN for approval, but that due to concerns raised within the working group while reviewing the guidelines, the Chair had requested the IASMN to take note only. The USG UNDSS highlighted that the policy needed to be flexible on notifying the Host Government, as a recent example from the field showed this was not always possible and a more rigid approach might therefore leave the DO with a function they cannot fulfil.
34. On a separate topic, Ms. Montalvo suggested that the working group should focus on producing guidelines on the security of locally recruited personnel, including issues such as risk identification and a comprehensive review of the measures available for these personnel. Mr.

Farrell suggested producing guidance on “Risk Transfer” (the only remaining part of “Accept, Control, Avoid and Transfer” without guidance) and noted that the Security Clearance Policy remained in the review queue. Mr. O’Hanlon noted that adding policies to the queue for policy review may delay the review of other policies, which have passed their initially planned review dates. He suggested the Secretariat manage those timelines. Ms. Kulawat agreed that the Secretariat would carry out technical reviews, as needed, of other policies.

35. The IASMN:

- **Requested that the draft revised policy on Risk Avoidance: Alternate Work Modalities, Personnel and Family Restrictions (Relocation and Evacuation) be circulated for inputs to the working group for further review with active and informed participation by members;**
- **Recommended that the Security Clearance policy be reviewed once the Risk Avoidance guidelines are completed;**
- **Recommended to put the development of guidelines on locally recruited personnel in the policy review queue.**

Hostage Incident Management (HIM) Update

36. Mr. Miller, Mr. Farrell, and Ms. Dunphy presented an update on progress on HIM (**CRP 4**). Mr. Miller thanked all partners for participating in various topics over the past several years to ensure there is a viable programme which is well understood by those who attended DO training and within the UNSMS. He noted that the revised policy has been promulgated in January 2023 after being approved by the High-Level Committee on Management in December 2022 with a promulgation package, including a communique and a 2-pager explainer. He explained that HIM is aimed to be inculcated across the leadership level, which would help to effectively seek the safe release of UN personnel.

37. Mr. Farrell noted that inter-agency training (“HIM v3”) has received consistently positive feedback and the Group is now undergoing minor adjustments based on feedback from personnel. The main areas of improvement for the sessions centered around daily “homework”, in that there was insufficient time for participants to complete it and for mentors to review it, given the schedule. For virtual sessions, there was only one mentor (which allowed for consistency), so the use of many mentors for the in-person sessions needed to improve consistency across all mentors. He added that UNDSS is sponsoring two additional trainings in Bangkok and Nairobi.

38. Ms. Dunphy concurred that feedback based on survey results is overwhelmingly positive, but that colleagues were asking for “refresher” training or sessions to allow them to practice the skills regularly to avoid losing them, so this capacity needs to be built in to ensure the availability of people who are trained and ready to support at any given time. She noted the training was commended for its good leadership and high HIM level of experience of its mentors. Given the importance of the work, she stressed the Group needs to ensure that the people involved in delivering HIM training have the appropriate, proven and successful HIM leadership and experience.

39. Mr. Miller reported that DRO is currently evaluating security advisers at many levels regarding how to manage crises and stressful situations to better translate academic training into action and scenario-based training. He noted that for the next two iterations, DRO will continue to partner with UN Agencies/Funds/Programmes (AFPs) which will build them a new core cadre of 60 personnel for the deployment worldwide.
40. Mr. Vandamme suggested to have a shorter refresher for those who have done HIM 1, 2 or 3 already to build up the capacity faster, given that HIM training is relatively long, and they will already have some knowledge on it by then. Mr. Miller noted that crisis management training will be provided to DOs in Bangkok with adequate guidance and scenarios to better support HIM teams. Consultations are also currently done with CISMU and the Counsellors Network to enhance psycho-social support for relevant family members based on the needs and orientation of a particular duty station.
41. Regarding the constituting of the Advisory Group, Mr. Miller commented that it is a close and operationally focused group featuring daily practitioners who are responding on a routine basis with relevant historical knowledge. He noted that mentors are in the training environment passing down academic information and acting as a facilitator to ensure students stay on task in the roles that they are assigned and meet the learning objectives.
42. Mr. Farrell confirmed this arrangement and agreed students needed specific training to focus on the role they may play in a HIM response. However, he was against shorter training to bring those HIM v1 and/or v2 certified up to HIM v3 standards, given the very different nature among HIM 1, 2 and 3, and that participants need to learn more through the full HIM v3 training course. Connection to Headquarters in HIM response is a key part of the training, as is support to families and “proportionate response”. A balance needs to be attained between getting more people up-to-date and the quality of training. Mr. Miller added that willingness to deploy immediately is key and everyone involved is held accountable.
43. Ms. Dunphy clarified that she is referring to the new cadre who have already completed HIM v3 and it is important to ensure they are confident to go and support immediately by maintaining their skills. Mr. Farrell concurred that it is more about maintaining skills and knowledge rather than pure refresher training. He proposed that UNDSS consider focusing on those who performed well in the HIM training and find ways of providing them with refresher training or exposure to real-life scenarios and not spend additional efforts trying to prepare new trainers and mentors if there will not be further urgent training requirements.
44. USG UNDSS agreed with the point made by UN Women that the training is reaching a level of saturation. The USG clarified that UNDSS HIM trainings are funded through the Peacebuilding Fund. The focus will be on those who have already received training and are within the current funding scheme. There will be no extra-budgetary funding for the training in the coming years.
45. Mr. Miller noted that HIM training is not just about the ability to manage risks in a hostage situation, but is also centered around active listening, communication and critical thinking skills

so participants can eventually grow into senior leadership positions to mentor others and be a solid security professional in general.

46. Mr. Farrell commented that refresher training is meant to be replicable at a minimum cost so it will be conducted virtually and is easy to facilitate. Given the lack of extra funding, it is important to have the right trainers/mentors and increased exposure to real incidents for those trained.

47. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the progress made;**
- **Recommended a review on the best investment for HIM in the next 12 to 18 months to enhance the quality of HIM training delivered and HIM knowledge.**

SRM/SSIRS Working Group

48. Mr. Farrell and Mr. Butt presented an update on the Working Group's progress (**CRP 5**). On the SRM part, Mr. Farrell noted two main issues surrounding the SRM are implementation based on a lack of baseline comprehension and the e-tools to meet the SRM objective of being adaptive, dynamic, and flexible. SRM webinars and trainings mostly received positive feedback from experienced professionals and new participants alike, as they helped to codify and explain different useful concepts like the SMT. On the e-tool, the "measure management tool" now allows users to remove SRM measures that are no longer needed or replicated. Mr. Farrell reported that e-tool fixes are now ongoing to address UNSMIN issues. Ad-hoc SRMs are also being addressed to increase innovation and inform on the overall issue.

49. On SSIRS, Mr. Butt reported that the group has now identified many areas where the SSIRS system can now produce useful outputs and reliable data for UNSMS organizations to reduce their workload and make them better informed overall in management through factual reporting, including reports to top management. SSIRS can also be used to inform situational analysis, threat and environmental analysis, programme planning analysis and quarterly-trend analysis for a country office of the UNDSS team anywhere. The working group has obtained best practice products with the relevant reports which should now be in SSIRS. On the product side, he noted that SSIRS is capable of producing the outline of an SMT presentation. He also reported that the balance with access to the necessary data without making data entry over taxing must still be achieved. The sub-group is close to finishing the taxonomy review on incidents with some minor improvements. For the main group, the taxonomy review will next be focused on weapons and impacts before it is brought back to the main working group.

50. Ms. Montalvo stated that WFP had recommended that this review undertake a "deep dive" into the SRM - which the USG UNDSS had agreed with in the previous IASMN Session - the final outcome of which would be tested by practitioners. For SSIRS, Ms. Montalvo requested some clarity on the outcomes and a timeline to ensure everyone in the IASMN is on the same page and to manage expectations on the outcomes. She stressed the importance of interoperability of systems, since some UNSMS organizations already have their own reporting systems in place.

51. Mr. Brian Baker, UNRWA, agreed the system has a collective responsibility to ensure the quality of the SRMs is high, and noted that there are cost connections to the tool, since the LCSSBs are based on SRMs. He suggested drafting a plan stipulating how the technical quality of SRMs would be monitored.
52. Mr. Bermudez noted that his organization may be able provide a relevant weapons expert for the working group, though he would need to confirm this. He noted both the SRM and SSIRS are fundamental and valuable references for security professionals and management purposes alike. In fact, SRM compliance and the level of incidents derived from SSIRS have already become integral parts of the WHO's basic internal control frameworks. Mr. Aldea also suggested that SPPU reach out to OMA to find a qualified military advisor to assist with weapons taxonomy.
53. USG UNDSS noted that the major challenge is the nuances required in the output of the SRM which then leads to decision-making. He felt that the more familiar people are with the SRM, the less objective it will become. There should be more engagement with security professionals on these issues. However, he also highlighted that SRMs remain a good, objective tool if utilized properly and that quality assurance is key. He requested the working group, when they are at the stage of considering the development / IT solution, to let him know, as there may be options out there that are cost-effective.
54. Participants discussed the issue of users manipulating the SRM tool to come up with a specific result. Mr. Farrell agreed that the more familiar people are with the SRM, the easier it may be for them to manipulate the system. The risks then end up being inflated because the descriptors are not being chosen properly. To address this, he explained the working group is now building in the tool of peer review with validity checks to achieve better objectivity. This would also facilitate proper oversight of the SRM process by UNDSS. He also proposed running a session on the SRM for IASMN colleagues to help increase capacity and oversight.
55. Mr. O'Hanlon pointed out that manipulation of the system to achieve an outcome is unacceptable and that quality assurance through peer reviews should help address this.
56. Mr. Butt noted that it has been nine months since the start of the working group, and that it took longer than expected for members to fully comprehend SSIRS and set realistic expectations. However, good progress has since been made.
57. The UNDSS ASG raised the problem of certain participants failing to answer basic questions during the SRM training. She suggested having a follow-up in the field through peer-to-peer learning or supervisors transferring the learning of the SRM through practice and support.
58. Ms. Florence Poussin, UNDSS/DRO, reported that DRO has established a small team focusing on SRM and SSIRS, highlighting that DRO is building internal capacity to be able to provide support and address issues of awareness, consistency, peer-to-peer reviews and oversight for UNDSS and the IASMN.

59. Mr. Noory stated his organization was keen on decentralization and empowering the field, which led to the removal of oversight from the Headquarters, suggesting this could be brought back if required. There is also an issue of language, which may be affecting learning outcomes, and suggested TDS could review this.
60. Mr. Vandamme noted there is a need to make the SRM more palatable, but the trainings generate a low success rate in the test and exams of the SRM process, which may show participants find it difficult to digest and understand the material. He suggested that there is currently low confidence among security professionals in the SRM process, which is also seen as lacking innovation. He suggested it is important to ensure that the SRM is understood by security professionals and to improve its capability of coming up with innovative measures to manage risk. In this vein, he noted that community acceptance is not always taken into account in managing risks and offered IOM's readiness to share some best practices on the issue.
61. Mr. Farrell noted that oversight was needed, and it was also important to keep the system flexible and dynamic, and that more discussion was required on headquarters involvement at the working group level. He suggested to increase the capacity and create the right incentives for decentralization to use the tools properly, with veto capability that would be used in poor outcomes. He suggested that it would be best to focus on why certain participants have performed poorly in the training and then address the issues identified.
- 62. The IASMN:**
- **Took note of the progress made;**
 - **Supported the way forward, as presented in the CRP;**
 - **Encouraged UNSMS organizations that have products which involve SSIRS data to share it with the SSIRS section of the working group;**
 - **Urged that UNSMS organizations with weapons experts join the Taxonomy Working Group on Weapons;**
 - **Suggested that the SSIRS project be handed over to developers by the next IASMN meeting if the current progress is maintained;**
 - **Supported an IASMN-level webinar on the issue for interested members.**

Armed Guards/Residential Security Measures WG

63. Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia, FAO, presented the most recent policy updates of the working group on Armed Groups and Residential Security Measures (**CRP 13**). Mr. Trentinaglia discussed the different modalities of entering into contractual agreements with private security companies and their respective implications, especially in extreme situations. He presented three available options: (1) to maintain the prevailing model, meaning that UNSMS personnel enter into contracts directly with private armed guards security companies; (2) to change the model to one where UNSMS organizations would extend their contracts with private security companies to residential security for personnel; (3) to elaborate a more flexible approach, giving each Organization the freedom to opt for option 1 or 2 and thus, avoid aligning the whole system to a single approach. Mr. Trentinaglia noted the group's general approach would be to

make minimal amendments to the overall guidance, and that OLA's assistance was being requested to ensure the changes are appropriate. The working group is continuing the discussions and will gather information from the field on existing contracting modalities to ensure the changes are reflective of operational needs.

64. Regarding the potential liability issue, Mr. Nicolas Hergot, UNESCO, suggested allowing the SMT to decide whether it should be mandatory for the organization (rather than the personnel) to sign the contract for residential security, adjusting to the country's legal system. Mr. Torp noted that all contracts, including rental leases, carry a risk of potential lawsuit and personnel are therefore already exposed to such risk. Mr. Farrell reiterated that, by their very nature, contracts have to be entered into on a voluntary basis. Mr. O'Hanlon stated that, in some countries like Afghanistan, personnel do not have a choice of where to live but are still required to pay for it.
65. Mr. Baker expressed his support for the hybrid approach, adding that there must be flexibility to take decisions grounded in an assessment.
66. Mr. Arauz highlighted the importance of the geographical and cultural dimension, noting that the comfort levels of personnel with this type of security differed.
67. Mr. Trentinaglia stated that the working group's approach is aligned with the inputs given, noting that the preference would be to take advantage of contracts organizations have in place and that the working group was not, at this point, revisiting the mandatory nature of the RSMs. He noted that OLA's assistance was needed so that the group could prepare a draft proposal on amending the contract modalities.
68. Mr. Vandamme suggested that procurement expertise should also be sought, and that the UNSMS could use mutual recognition agreements to piggyback on other organizations' procurement processes. Mr. Farrell stated he did not see a need for an inter-agency procurement group at this stage, since due diligence is covered by each organization, and that the legal aspects should be considered first.
69. **The IASMN:**
 - **Took note of the progress made and requested that legal guidance be provided to the group by OLA, as well as guidance from procurement specialist(s).**

Presentation of 2022 JFA Expenditures

70. Ms. Renu Bhatia, UNDSS/EO, presented the 2022 JFA UNSMS expenditures (**CRP 7**). She noted that, largely due to the crisis in Ukraine, the JFA UNSMS has an estimated over-expenditure of \$1.1 million over the 2022 FBN ceiling, stressing that this was still a projection as the financial period for 2022 was not yet closed. She noted that the appropriation by the General Assembly for 2022 was \$144.1 million, while the FBN set a ceiling of \$131.4 million. She added that, earlier in the year, UNDSS notified the IASMN and FBN that it would revert to IASMN members FBN if the expenditures could not be maintained within the ceiling.

71. The USG noted that the expenditures were to support the operations of UNSMS organizations. He added that, when UNDSS was established – and its funding model set – it was a different global security of fewer crises.
72. Several organizations, including UNDP, UNESCO, World Bank, FAO, WHO, UNFPA and ITU noted they were not able to support the additional expenditures, highlighting that they have budget pressures of their own as they relied on voluntary contributions and would themselves not be able to exceed their budget limits. Mr. John Dunne, UNOPS, noted that his organization could support the additional expenditure, but agreed with the sentiments expressed by others, particularly that savings later in the year could have offset the increased Ukraine expenditure.
73. Mr. Skog noted that UNDSS must continue to adhere to the budget limits endorsed by the FBN, and suggested that, going forward, UNDSS should assess priorities with the IASMN and share a plan for efficiencies, including prioritizations and identifying savings. Mr. Trentinaglia noted that there has also been a steep increase in LCSSBs world-wide, and Mr. Noory suggested that a precedent should be avoided, citing the example of the TESS project, for which organizations were asked to contribute funding to cover a shortfall. Mr. Noory and Ms. Dunphy also noted that they would have wanted to discuss the reprioritization of positions.
74. The USG highlighted that, as shown in the budget lines, the increases relate to operational costs for emergency response, essential security assessments and global price increases, particularly for vehicles and freight-forwarding contracts. He noted that a 20 per cent reduction in the budget in 2023 was foreseen and that he had requested UNDSS senior management to come up with proposals on how to meet the budget restrictions, highlighting that this issue would be discussed in a separate session. Mr. O’Hanlon suggested this would lend support for an SLA to help organizations understand what services they would receive³.
75. In response to a question from IOM, referencing the budget showing under-expenditure on field operations and over-expenditure on DRO/HQ costs, the USG noted that this was a result of surging personnel, as surge is managed from the headquarters. He highlighted that surge capacity for last year equated to 54 full time personnel.
76. Members made several suggestions for how to deal with the projected overspend, including through the Locally Cost-Shared Security Budget (LCSSB), or apportionment among UNSMS organizations according to their LCSSB percentage (rather than the global headcount) or asking the main external donor to the Ukraine response for additional funding. Mr. Bermudez suggested considering whether other existing funds for Ukraine could be tapped for this. Ms. Bhatia, however, noted that the UNDSS was not able to request more funds from the donor. On the LCSSB, she added that the contributions sourced through this model often failed to materialize as some organizations did not meet their financial commitments. Ms. Bhatia further pointed that most of the UNSMS organization were direct or indirect beneficiaries of DSS’ services in Ukraine. There were about 25 entities currently operating in Ukraine; and those who

³ The issue of the SLA was also discussed at the session on the Results Chain.

do not directly operate in Ukraine often get indirect benefits as they operate through their implementing partners and INGOs/NGO..

77. Members reflected on the importance of the immediate availability of funding for crisis response and expressed broad support to the UNDSS strategic initiatives in this direction. Mr. O’Hanlon suggested that UNDSS should present a budget that contains all the resources needed to provide the services that UNSMS organizations request, noting that increases may at times be necessary, and that he felt there should be a contingency in the JFA for emergency response. He added that the unit that was being established to that end (and was included in the 2023/24 budget) had UN Women’s full support. Mr. Daniel Chase, WBG, also suggested that a more robust, organic budget for UNDSS may be in order and that crisis response/surge could be handled by a mechanism outside the JFA. Mr. Vandamme and Mr. Butt noted the importance of rapid fundraising, particularly within the first day of the crisis, when donor attention was focused. The USG noted that a new unit for emergency response is being established and would be responsible identifying requirements when a crisis hits.
78. Mr. Remo Lalli, CEB Secretariat, clarified the roles of the FBN and the IASMN on the budget reviews, noting that the IASMN is meant to conduct a substantive review of the budget proposal, as the FBN is not able to weigh in on the appropriateness of safety and security budgets. The FBN’s review is based on financial management principles for which controllers are responsible within their own organizations and collectively.
79. Members discussed the level of detail they felt would be required to allow them to pronounce, from a substantive point of view, whether the spending was appropriate. Ms. Dunphy, Mr. Vandamme and Mr. Skog stated that a deeper level of detail would be required to review the budget. Mr. Hergot, however, noted that irrespective of the level of detail provided, it would be difficult for members to support over-expenditure. In response to a question from UNICEF on whether there are specific standards for the provision of such information, Mr. Lalli noted that there is an established presentation format showing staffing and non-post budget lines. Ms. Bhatia noted that the level of detail customarily provided to the IASMN is much greater than that provided to the FBN or in the budget fascicle. She further mentioned that the IASMN members can provide the template with the level of details requested.
80. Mr. Butt noted that the budget process had been followed well and that the department’s interventions in Ukraine had been appropriate. The ASG UNDSS stressed that UNDSS followed the proper process agreed with the IASMN, and exercised due diligence in doing its best to maintain expenditures within the budget ceiling in 2022.
81. In response to a comment from UNDP noting that unspent funds should be credited to UNSMS organizations, Ms. Bhatia noted that the organizations are only charged actual costs and that, if there is under-expenditure, it is returned to the appropriate organization (for JFA) / member state (for RB).
82. Mr. Butt suggested that the question on over-expenditure was not one he felt the IASMN could answer as the Network had already given input on requirements and agreed to the higher

amount (of \$144 million) beyond which UNDSS had not spent but, despite this, many UNSMS organizations would not support in the FBN.

83. The USG summarized the discussion, highlighting that he would engage directly with the FBN on the estimated over-expenditures in 2022. He stressed, while it may be difficult for members to agree on all the budget points, he expected that the IASMN would come to a broad consensus and that Security Focal Points would engage with their Controllers ahead of FBN meetings to share their positions.

84. The IASMN:

- **Did not agree with recommendation to support approving the over-expenditure for 2022;**
- **Requested that members specify the level of detail sought from UNDSS in order for them to review the 2022 expenditures;**
- **Took note of the USG's initiative to discuss directly with FBN to find a solution for the over0expenditures in 2022;**
- **Requested IASMN members to engage with their controllers ahead of FBN meetings to share their position.**

Results Chain

85. Mr. Michael Center, UNRWA, and Mr. Miller presented an update on the Working Group's progress (**CRP 14**). Mr. Center reported that the bulk of the work regarding the results chain has been completed and is now ready for implementation in 2023. Individual organizations are encouraged to flesh out their own individual tasks related to their security programmes in support of the activities of the results chain and to better fit into the outcomes of the UNSMS as a whole. Mr. Center noted that there needs to be more engagement to ensure the entire UNSMS workforce and security professionals understand the results-based approach. The next step for 2023 is to create an FAQ to keep people update and to conduct more field consultations, and to refine the language to ensure a focus on outcomes as opposed to activities. Links need to be added to the spreadsheet for each of the existing policies, guidelines or manuals, which would also help the IASMN to identify any gaps in guidance.

86. Moving forward, Mr. Center stated that the results chain-based approach should be brought into individual working groups. Efforts by working groups should be focused on filling gaps in policy, guidance, procedures or manuals related to the expected outcomes, outputs or activities of the results chain. The Steering Group should review the necessity for and the work of individual groups based on the results chain concept. The sub-working group is now working on a 5-series podcast which serves as an education tool, with episode 1 already completed. He noted that there should be no more than 2 version releases of the results chain per year (after January) to avoid confusion.

87. Ms. Montalvo expressed her appreciation for the work of the sub-working group and the willingness of WFP to support it. She requested updates on the next steps and way forward for this product and clarity on how the results chain approach will be integrated within the compliance mechanisms and Service Level Agreement/ Service Charter.

88. Mr. O’Hanlon reminded participants that this was a sub-working group of a larger working group that was originally chaired by the UNDSS ASG, suggesting it was necessary to revert back to what the original working group was set up to do. He added that this work offers a clear understanding of functions being carried out by UNDSS to support the wider UNSMS.
89. Mr. Farrell noted that the results chain approach is fully part of UNICEF security’s 2023 work plan and links to their Framework of Accountability for security. He recommended changing the term “agencies” to “UNSMS organizations” which comprises all organizations, including UNDSS, and reflecting the work as “ongoing” rather than “completed” in CRP 1 Annex B.
90. Ms. Montalvo enquired how the results chain would be integrated into training and into a compliance mechanism. Mr. Miller noted that DRO was working incrementally to implement the results chain matrix for the wider UN system, which would then inform training elements. Although the results chain is not a compliance mechanism, it would help document how the requirements of the UNSMS are being met. Mr. Farrell noted that all change initiatives like the results chain require significant communications.
91. Several participants (UNICEF, UN Women, UNDP, WFP) brought up the issue of the Service Level Agreement (SLA) or Service Charter in the context of the results chain. Mr. Farrell noted that, while the General Assembly resolution on UNDSS would preclude an SLA, extracting the functions of UNDSS from the Results Chain, to clearly establish a “service charter” document would be extremely helpful. Mr. Butt suggested that the functions in the results chain offer sufficient commitment from UNDSS to enable accountability and corrective action, and that the next step should be to identify indicators of success and gaps. The USG UNDSS highlighted that the Department should be measured by the results achieved rather than single tasks. He stated that he has had conversations with many of the Executive Directors of UNSMS organizations in recent months and they had agreed that an SLA was not required. He added that it does not fit with the model on which the Department was founded, and that performance should be based on the results chain.
92. The UNDSS ASG noted she had initiated a meeting of the original working group in December, and though attendance was low, further efforts would be undertaken to reinvigorate the group. She acknowledged that the results chain is not mandatory to all organizations, but it remains extremely relevant to identify indicators of success to collectively achieve results.
93. Mr. Center added that outcomes and activities should not be changed at this stage – since the results chain had already been considered as a whole - but that UNSMS organizations should need to determine how they feed into them. He noted that the results chain has already mapped out who is in the lead for each output.
94. On communication, the USG UNDSS noted that the results chain helps organizations to communicate what they do and how they do it, as well as show how the roles of UNDSS and other UNSMS organizations differ, which would be helpful to donors.
95. Mr. Farrell noted that a document showing the delineation of tasks between UNDSS and other UNSMS organizations would help. The USG UNDSS agreed that having clarity on tasks was

critical, noting there are two components to UNDSS support (field and broader organizational support), and that it would also assist with the discussions on the budget.

96. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the progress made by the sub-working group;**
- **Requested that the work be reflected as “ongoing” rather than “completed” in CRP 1 Annex B on recommendations;**
- **Endorsed the proposed next steps and requested the initial strategic working group (of which the results chain was a sub-working group) to consider its work and to advise the IASMN on its own next steps;**
- **Noted that the results chain clarifies the activities of UNDSS and the extent of involvement of other UNSMS organizations.**

Human Resources Strategy WG

97. Ms. Bhatia delivered an update on the work of the Human Resources Strategy Working Group (**CRP 8**). She presented an update on the working group’s achievements, explaining the difference between its work on *shared rosters* as well as the *common roster*. As part of the shared roster, organizations that have signed the mutual recognition agreement now have access to the P3 security personnel rosters of the other signatories through the Inspira platform. The establishment of a common roster would be a result of a joint effort across the UNSMS to build one joint roster together, allowing roster candidates to be treated as internal candidates across entities when applying for openings. Ms. Bhatia noted that, in spite of several efforts, there was limited interest from the respective HR components of UNSMS organizations in proceeding with the development of a common roster. Only a few entities had expressed interest in actively participating and dedicating resources to the initiative. Ms. Bhatia also noted that other initiatives in support of joint coordination across the UNSMS had either already been met through other UN initiatives (such as common vetting/harmonization of references, which is now largely handled by One UN HR in Bonn) or were not yet ready to be addressed (such as workforce planning). Most importantly, the establishment of a join Inspira platform where participating entities can upload their respective rosters to share with other entities is a good first step in achieving a unified roster system. She therefore suggested that the working group be paused and that UNDSS may seek to extend the shared roster platform to P4 and P5 security rosters and build on lessons learned before revitalizing the concept of the common roster. Mr. Noory, co-chair of the working group, highlighted that the group had wanted to improve mobility across entities, but that the current lack of interest and progress suggests a pause would be warranted.
98. Mr. Farrell suggested that, since “UNSMS Workforce” is a UNSMS priority, the working group could move away from its original tasks and focus on other tasks that would be of benefit to the UNSMS. He suggested that, for instance, the group could provide inputs on allocation of security workforce resources within UNDSS.

99. Mr. Baker agreed that the working group may still have a purpose in resolving some issues, such as those encountered in using a shared roster (e.g. expectations of those on the roster, ensuring a fair process for internal candidates, etc.)
100. Mr. Farrell suggested that the group could either refocus its energy on achieving its stated outcomes (a “last push” strategy) or come up with an exit strategy, as well as consider a change of chair to take on this work.
101. Mr. Vandamme noted that UNSMS organizations could explore internally with their respective HR sections whether there is support for the shared and/or common rosters and that, if there was sufficient interest, roadblocks to achieving progress could be explored by, for instance, making the process simpler or more flexible. Mr. Donovan concurred it would be worthwhile for the working group to continue.
102. Ms. Bhatia noted that the respective entities’ different regulations and rules are the biggest obstacle to achieving a harmonized approach. For example, one organization may treat candidates on shared or common rosters as internal, whereas other entities may not.. Some members, such as UNESCO and UN Women, noted that they would want to have the last word on selecting/vetting candidates, with UN Women stating they would not commit to a common roster.
103. Ms. Bhatia highlighted that, while the working group could continue, IASMN members would need to supply ideas and engage more actively with their HR counterparts. Mr. Noory highlighted that the group required re-engagement from IASMN members, recalling that while enthusiasm had initially been high, attendance had fallen steeply.
104. The USG UNDSS summarised, noting that the working group would plan to meet by the end of March 2023 but that, before the meeting, members would be asked to: 1) engage with their HR counterparts on the concept of the common rosters and other initiatives that the group could work on; 2) provide feedback to the HRSWG Co-chairs on the other aspects the group could work on; and 3) consider more active participation in the group. Ms. Bhatia added that IASMN members who were not part of the working group were also welcome to submit ideas.

105. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the progress made, though did not support the disbanding of the working group;**
- **Recommended that UNSMS organizations engage with their HR counterparts on the concept of the common roster;**
- **Requested that UNSMS organizations reflect and provide feedback to HRSWG chairs on other aspects of HR that the working group could focus on;**
- **Called for greater participation in the working group;**
- **Requested that a proposal on any additional work for the working group be brought forward at the next Steering Group meeting.**

Strategic Communications

106. Mr. Alister Wood, IOM and Chair of the Strategic Communications Working Group (SCWG), together with Ms. Aaina Chopra from UN Women, presented the up-to-date work from the last IASMN session, focusing upon the strategic communications plan (**CRP 10**). After thanking the IASMN for the genuine engagement regarding phase 1 of the communication plan, Mr. Wood explained that this phase is gradually evolving on the basis of elements previously agreed upon (notably, Communications Resource Library; UN Security explained video in four languages; UN Security explained Flyer, UN Security Explained visuals and posters). Mr. Wood called upon the participants to more actively engage with phase 2 of the work, which is currently under discussion. Importantly, as discussed by Ms. Chopra, a central part of it is represented by the Security Week (to be held approximately between the first/second week June 2023 so as to be aligned with UN Security Symposium), which is planned for a total of five days in order to increase the visibility of security-related issues. Ms. Chopra argued that the communication is pivotal to ensuring that the donors fully understand how the UNSMS can effectively manage security risks. Additionally, the SCWG reached consensus about the UN Security Explained animated video sequel, which should include clips from the field to show the different areas of security. The possibility of having a logo and a website is also part of the ongoing discussion within the SCWG.
107. The IASMN Co-Chair expressed appreciation for the working group's progress, stressing the strategic importance of maintaining an efficient communication to attract and allocate additional resources. A discussion on the issue followed, with comments grouped, by theme, in the paragraphs below.
108. **Support for Security Week Concept:** Several members expressed strong support for the SCWG's considerable achievements and endorsed the general concept of the Security Week. Ms. Montalvo noted that WFP piloted Security Week last year, with good results as well as some lessons learned. Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron, UNOCT, also commended the proposal, stressing that the communication is still a weakness in the security system, and that repetition and explanations of basic concepts (such as the UNSMS) is still needed. Mr. Jacquand cautioned against under-investing in security communications, highlighting its role as an enabler.
109. **Security Week Duration:** Several members expressed concerns with the tentative duration (five days) of Security Week, with most suggesting a shorter timeframe. Ms. Dunphy highlighted the number of items proposed for discussion, concluding it would be ambitious to discuss them within a week, particularly the first time the event is held, given that much preparation is required on each topic and that the proposed dates are only a couple of months away. She added that it may be more prudent to schedule it for later in the year, noting that the Security Week needed to have the full buy-in of the UNSMS at the field level, and not only of respective organizations, which would take time. Ms. Elisca Lagerweij, OPCW, noted that Cyber Security has an "Awareness Month" at her organization, which gives organizers more time and less pressure. Mr. O'Hanlon suggested that the timing of Security Week be reviewed, proposing that, if shortened, it could be held before the Security Symposium, as it may lead into the discussions.

110. **Security Week Topics:** Mr. Baker suggested that a mechanism be deployed to identify what issues personnel would like to receive more information on during the Security Week event, e.g. through a survey. Ms. Poussin stressed the need to target the event appropriately, noting that, if it is aimed at personnel, the priority should be to identify and address issues and themes of interest to this group and avoid overlap with other events like the Humanitarian Network and Partnerships Week or the Security Symposium. She suggested the staff union be part of the working group to provide further perspective. Ms. Dunphy suggested that the event focus on key areas and tackle recurring questions from staff, noting it could help prepare personnel to deploy to high-risk environments. She suggested that civil-military coordination be excluded from the themes. Ms. Lagerweij stated that, in addition to information personnel may *wish* to have, there was also information that the personnel *need* to have, which should also be considered in planning the event. Mr. Sobron suggested that an effort be made to identify issues that non-security personnel struggle with, so that some could be addressed during the event. Several members expressed they were not in favour of including the topic on “causes of insecurity”.
111. **UNSMS Logo:** Several members voiced support for a UNSMS logo, noting its many potential benefits and its need to be more encompassing than the UN logo. Ms. Dunphy pointed out this would help address the misconception that various policies and platforms are UNDSS (and not UNSMS) products, which would foster buy-in. Mr. Farrell noted that the present “logo” was not really IASMN/UNSMS-specific, and that a unique logo would be helpful. Ms. Chopra stated the group would check with DGC, as there are rules on logo creation. Mr. Lyle McFadyen, UNICC, noted that his organization had recently completed a rebranding, with a new logo, and he would check whether they could extend any support.
112. **UNSMS/IASMN Website:** Ms. Poussin cautioned against the working group managing a dedicated website, noting the effort required, including for liaison with OICT. Mr. O’Hanlon noted the need to consider the sustainability of the initiatives being led by the working group, noting it is not a standing committee and therefore had a limited timeframe. Mr. Farrell agreed the website should not be managed by a working group.
113. **Funding:** Mr. O’Hanlon reiterated that his organization would not be able to contribute funding for a video, though highlighted that UN Women did provide resources for the working group.
114. In light of the feedback received, Ms. Chopra and Mr. Wood noted that the SCWG would work on a more concrete plan concerning the Security Week. Mr. Wood agreed that the working group would not be running the website discussed, but rather uploading products on behalf of the UNSMS. He added that the group would look at making the logo more encompassing. Mr. Kuusinen concluded the discussion, stressing the value of the working group in promoting the UNSMS.
115. **The IASMN:**
- **Recognized the work completed to date;**
 - **Considered the proposed action plan for 2023 and provided inputs;**

- **Expressed concern on the feasibility of the proposal for Security Week and suggested that the SCWG consider holding an ad hoc meeting on the way forward, where an amended course of action would be proposed;**
- **Requested that security communications continue to be featured, as needed, in future IASMN meetings.**

Training

116. Mr. Benjamin Owusu-Firempong, UNDSS/TDS, presented an update focusing on the Training Needs Assessment (TNA) (**CRP 11**), which aims to identify training gaps and links to the UNSMS results chain. The proposal is to hire a consultant to collect data from UNDSS management, IASMN, SCOLT and other working groups. The estimation is a 20-week implementation time frame after consultant recruitment, with an estimated cost of \$72,000. The consultant would take inventory of the knowledge and skills required, recommend new training requirements, and identify the specific training audience.
117. Participants largely welcomed the TNA and made some suggestions to its ToRs, suggesting that the section of paragraph 11 referencing consultations with UNSMS organizations should be amended to give the organizations the scope to decide this, paragraph 13 on the submission of the report should make it clear where it was to be submitted, and the UNSMS Organization Country Security Focal Points should be grouped with “security personnel” to maintain consistency. In addition, there was a suggestion that the wording in paragraph 10 be expanded from “development priorities” to “delivery and development priorities”.
118. Mr. John Dada, UNDP, noted it would be important for the SCOLT to be formally consulted during the data collection process. He added that the next steps need to be clearly defined; especially on the submission of outcomes to SCOLT and IASMN for review/endorsement, and how the same outcomes will translate into work planning and implementation. Mr. O’Hanlon enquired whether the consultancy would rely on an individual or a team, noting that the timeline seemed relatively tight. He noted that, for a single consultant, the amount, broken down per day, seemed high. Mr. Baker enquired whether the TNA could encompass a review of current training mechanisms, such as the SCOLT and the STGPM. Ms. Dunphy noted the upcoming evaluation of the ETB and IFAK training and enquired whether results from that would be synchronised with the proposed TNA.
119. In response to a question on whether the TNA would assess the impact of the trainings being delivered, Ms. Esther Kuisch, UNDSS/DSOS, noted that the TNA had been requested by the IASMN to review what skills and competencies were needed within the wider UNSMS security workforce and whether the current training available responds to these needs. She noted assessing the impact of training would be done separately.
120. In response to a question on whether the TNA could be done with in-house resources, Ms. Kuisch recalled that this had been discussed with SCOLT chairs, and there was agreement that having TDS carry out the work would have implications for their own delivery on other priorities. Mr. Owusu-Firempong noted that the initial plan of using a consultant was based on a previous

assessment, and that TDS was open to considering other possibilities, such as using a company. He agreed that keeping the IASMN and other stakeholders abreast of progress was a priority, and the reporting requirements for the consultancy would be designed accordingly. He noted the priorities identified would inform development priorities for the following year, which was the reason for the timelines indicated in the ToRs. He noted that TDS would brief the SCOLT on February 20 on the three ongoing developments: the SCP and the trainings for security decision-makers and UNSMS Organization Country Security Focal Points.

121. Mr. Vandamme requested that priorities identified before 2023 be considered in the planning, as several of these had not been tackled but remained important. He also recalled that UNDP had done a similar assessment, though with a narrower scope and suggested the organization could consider sharing their experience on this.
122. Ms. Montalvo announced that the consultancy BCG had offered some pro bono services to WFP, and mentioned that, if the ToRs were agreeable to them, BCG may be in a position to carry out the work.⁴
123. The USG noted that the scope of the TNA should not be expanded to governance or impact assessments, as there are other mechanisms to consider these issues. He noted that, for the work to inform priorities for 2023, the SCOLT should first discuss it, after which the results should be submitted to the IASMN, outside the regular schedule, in order to be decided before the start of 2024.
124. Ms. Kuisch suggested that TDS could solicit informal quotations from interested parties, noting that one consultant may not deliver the results needed within 4 months, and that a small team may be a better option. She proposed that TDS would consider the different options and revert to the IASMN by email⁵.

125. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the objectives, scope implementation modalities timelines and funding mechanisms as proposed in the ToRs;**
- **Recommended the approval of the TNA ToRs (CRP 11 Annex A), with minor amendments, as proposed during the session;**
- **Requested that the SCOLT and TDS further discuss the options on how the TNA will be funded and conducted, and revert to the IASMN via email.**

⁴ After the IASMN session, WFP communicated to DPSS that it would not be possible to have the TNA done pro bono.

⁵ After the IASMN session, DPSS informed the IASMN that the rules and regulations of the UN Secretariat would not allow them to seek informal price quotations, so DPSS/TDS would need to base the amount on previous contracts with a similar scope. The amount remains the same for an individual consultant. DPSS also provided the quote for a company for comparison.

Fire Safety WG

126. Mr. Robin Stenhouse, UNDSS/DPSS, presented the scoping document (**CRP 12**) via a PowerPoint presentation⁶, highlighting that it is not meant to be regarded as a road map; rather it should be viewed in terms of where IASMN and UNSMS want to end up. He stressed the need to view the issue more broadly than before, noting that there were several documents pertaining to fire safety that needed to be harmonized.
127. Mr. Anders Brynnel, DOS, expressed concern about physical security being included in the ongoing work on fire safety, requesting that this issue be addressed in a second phase, while expressing support for the overall scoping document and the other planned policy adjustments. Mr. Farrell stated that he was not concerned about including physical security from the outset, noting that safety remained tied to security.
128. In response to a question from WIPO on UN standards conflicting with host country standards, Mr. Stenhouse agreed there could be such a conflict, noting that this was why the focus of the working group was on principles, which would allow organizations to organize the work in a way that's appropriate for them. He compared it to a pie, which organizations could split in different ways to allocate the functions in a flexible way.
129. Mr. O'Hanlon sought to confirm whether UNDSS was retaining mandates on fire, road and air, noting that there is fire safety expertise in the system and that the working group could identify any future expertise required for implementation. He also endorsed working on physical security from the start. The USG UNDSS noted that fire and roads safety were being retained, as codified in the upcoming Secretary-General's Bulletin on UNDSS, as these safety incidents can quickly translate into security events.
130. Ms. Montalvo noted a concern about the risk of the "bunkerization" of premises and the need to be attuned to the perception of the local population.
131. Mr. Stenhouse stressed that engineering/architecture cannot be left out, as security personnel would need to have some knowledge in this area so they can offer competent advice. He noted that the role of the fire safety focal points needs to be addressed in the guidance.
132. In response to the USG's question on next steps, Mr. Stenhouse offered that, for the next IASMN, a policy rewrite (at least partial) could be provided, along with the structure of the supporting documents, and topics for training/development.
- 133. The IASMN:**
- **Endorsed the proposed changes to the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS) fire safety policy and related guidance, as outlined in the Scoping Document for Fire Safety;**
 - **Requested that an update be provided to the IASMN's 38th session.**

⁶ The PowerPoint can be found on UNSMIN, in the section of the IASMN.

Gender

134. Ms. Clairene Alexander, UNDSS/SPS, delivered an update on gender inclusion (**CRP 6**), which included a presentation of gender statistics for all UNSMS organizations, as requested during the 34th IASMN session. She noted that data analysis was performed on 33 UN entities and showed that women make up approximately 20% of the security workforce. Within UNDSS, this number is 22%. She highlighted that, while the UNSMS has been diligent in attempts to reach gender parity, with many members having a clear gender strategy for the recruitment of women, barriers remain. Ms. Alexander stated that the key action requested pertains to statistics. She asked if the IASMN wished to determine a timeline and to establish a reporting mechanism to monitor the progress with these statistics over time. She also reported that the sub-working group on security learning programmes is focused on reviewing the FSA, SCP, BSAFE and SSAFE courses from a person-centred lens; while the policy sub-working group is working on the analysis of gender-centred approach in security policies.
135. **Gender strategies:** The USG UNDSS asked participants if there is an individual gender strategy within each security element or whether it is part of a broader gender strategy instead, noting it is crucial to share data and strive for improvement, whilst acknowledging the challenges in expanding diversity. He mentioned that UNDSS is updating its gender strategy for the next four years and would update the Group once it is completed.
136. In their replies, several participants (UNRWA, UNHCR, UNICEF, IOM) noted their organizations had gender strategies for the entire entity and not for security personnel specifically. Ms. Dunphy noted that, while gender parity for the organization has largely been achieved, women make up only 10 per cent of the security workforce. She noted that within their plan of action for the past three years, 50 per cent of international recruits had been women, but that retention remained a challenge. Mr. Vandamme noted that most of IOM's security professionals are hired at country-level, so it can be difficult to influence the overall gender parity for the security workforce from headquarters. Mr. Farrell noted that his organization is fairly diverse, though it varies across departments. In some areas there are relatively few women, while in other departments, women are the majority. He suggested that individual preference for different types of work may be a reason.
137. Mr. Torp noted that reaching parity may be difficult in some organizations and duty stations due to some personnel staying on until retirement and added that WIPO hopes to reach parity on outsourced personnel. Mr. O'Hanlon reported that reverse bias exists in his organization where men may be favoured above women due to the disproportionately high level of women in his organization's overall workforce. He noted that retention and barriers for testing remain the two biggest problems, and it was important to make the organization more attractive and strive for equality instead of parity.
138. **Retention:** Retention was a common theme in this session, with members noting that personnel frequently move between organizations and the cadre needs constant replenishment. UN Women noted that, when searching to fill posts, the UNSMS organizations were often competing for the same candidates. Several members used the term "poaching", though one member

cautioned against the term, noting that inter-organization moves were beneficial to career development.

139. **Recruitment:** UNRWA expressed concern that job postings and descriptions that mention military or police backgrounds may deter candidates, contributing to the gender gap. The USG UNDSS suggested that leaving the element of military and/or police background in the JO was important, as some qualified candidates may have this experience, but agreed that other/additional skills sets are an asset to the organization and the department. Mr. Dewaine Farria, ADB, suggested that journalism could be added to search criteria, noting that applicants from this field can communicate well, work quickly and have experience in different types of locations. Mr. Donovan suggested including additional elements in the job description that would attract female candidates who have related experience in security.
140. Mr. Farrell noted that recruitment is also linked to personal preferences and associated incentives, which were outside the group's control. He also suggested the group remove the reference to parity and rather focus on diversity. Ms. Lagerweij noted that her organization started approaching those applying for related types of work, such as legal affairs, or by combining thematic areas such as physical security with cyber-security, which led to more interest in job postings.
141. **Beyond Gender:** IOM raised the point that, while gender parity is important, it should not be looked at in a binary manner, and that there were other factors that would be important to consider in diversifying the security workforce, such as geography/disability/race. Mr. Peter Marshall, UNEP, agreed, suggesting that overall diversity in decision-making was important. Mr. Farria suggested looking at how diversity is defined noting that, for instance, geography is not necessarily reflective of factors such as race and suggested that candidates whose mother tongues were not English could be sought out to raise diversity. Mr. O'Hanlon noted that the working group had a triple mandate – to consider gender, geography and disability, and suggested they could tackle this issue. He added that some 20 per cent of people have a disability and were being missed by the current analysis.
142. Participants debated how, and whether, to expand the focus beyond gender. Several members noted that it would be difficult for their organization to provide the data beyond gender, on factors such as racial profile or sexual orientation, as this was confidential information. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Farria noted there were tangible advantages to having a more diverse workforce as it gives security managers a greater perspective.
143. Mr. Arauz expressed that the figures presented on gender were not acceptable, stressing that the staff federation is available to consult on the issues of gender, as well as geographic diversity and disability. He proposed that the IASMN commission a more in-depth study which looks at the underlying causes of the generally poor gender parity as well as its consequences.
144. The USG UNDSS agreed that diversity goes beyond gender but highlighted the added value of having gender diversity in the security workforce and decision-making positions, noting this is part of a people-centric approach. He noted it was important to remain focused on reaching

gender parity and suggested that the working group look at the causes of the IASMN's challenges in this regard, along with potential solutions and best practices (including those outside the UN system). These findings could be discussed at the next IASMN Steering Group. The USG suggested this be the focus for the group for the next six months, following which the group could reconsider the approach and whether other factors, such as language and geographical representation, should be included.

145. The IASMN:

- **Took note of the report produced on the analysis of the gender statistics;**
- **Took note of the progress of the training and policy sub-working groups to date;**
- **Requested the Working Group to consider the causes of issues and challenges on promoting greater gender diversity, including potential solutions and best practices and provide an update to the next Steering Group meeting;**
- **Requested the co-chairs to consider the possibility of taking on the other elements of diversity i.e. geographical balance and others, to determine which of these to consider and how and when to address them.**

Thematic Cross-Sectoral Issues

Humanitarian Access

146. Mr. Aurelien Buffler, Chief of Policy Advice and Planning for OCHA, briefed on humanitarian access issues, as well as civil-military coordination, in a plenary session with IASMN members. He noted that the main reason for the UN's presence in conflict areas tended to be the delivery of humanitarian aid – with political and development work often stalled – and that those in need frequently lived in areas held by non-State actors, necessitating negotiations with such groups, including those classed as “terrorist organizations”. Mr. Buffler explained that the main challenge to effective aid delivery is gaining acceptance and trust of the local communities, who may have an inherent defensive posture towards foreigners. For these reasons, humanitarian neutrality needs to be regarded as a key principle and tool to manage security risk.

147. Mr. Buffler stressed that humanitarian access should be a key parameter of security management, as it is instrumental to mitigate security risks for staff while enabling proper assistance. He also stressed that certain expressions - such as “terrorist” – are counterproductive and that some security risk management measures, such as armed escorts, could also be problematic, depending on context. He highlighted several good practices, such as recently in Ukraine, where UNDSS' efforts to quickly deploy personnel were harmonized with the humanitarian assistance provided by OCHA. He also mentioned Syria, where OCHA and UNDSS established a task force for negotiating access to better deploy humanitarian assistance.

148. Mr. Farrell noted that the IASMN is aligned with the messages expressed, and that the SRM working group was striving to make the process more dynamic, flexible and programme-specific, which would also better reflect acceptance (including when it was lacking). He agreed that labelling a person as “terrorist” is counter-productive for both analysis and decision-making, and

is not the practice of the UNSMS, where only the term “terrorism” is used (to refer to a type of tactic).

149. Mr. Vandamme urged caution when dealing with negotiating access to avoid legitimizing non-State actors and to better build institutions and empower local communities. He presented a recent case of a country where local gangs were asking for money in order to provide access. He agreed that Ukraine was a good practice and added that acceptance is a good risk management strategy.
150. Mr. Jean-Louis Dominguez, ILO, pointed out that communication between security personnel and missions to the field is essential and should take place at the earliest stages to increase the chances of success. Ms. Dunphy reiterated the value of the community-based acceptance to be able to effectively operate and noted that physical presence may be helpful in security acceptance. She stressed that the ability to do *ad hoc* SRMs bearing in mind the profile (acceptance) of the respective organization quickly is fundamental. Mr. Baker noted that his organization places significant focus on acceptance in their SRMs and stated that programme colleagues often understand the context better than security personnel do, given the amount of time they spend with the communities. He also emphasized the need to engage with non-state actors to secure acceptance. Ms. Sanja Potrebic, UN Women, agreed that acceptance was critical and suggested that security personnel collaborate on securing access. Mr. Noory proposed that skills in security access/acceptance be incorporated into recruitment of security personnel, which could be considered by the HR Strategy Working Group. He also suggested that adopting more advanced technology – such as more discreet bulletproof vests, for instance – may help with acceptance.
151. Mr. Miller pointed out that access is based on acceptance, which in turn is based on familiarity. This can be only achieved by including security personnel at the very beginning of the operation so that they are familiar with the context and the problem.

Military-Civil Coordination

152. Mr. Sergio da Silva, OCHA Civil-Military Coordination Service (CMCS), stressed how fundamental it is to balance humanitarian operational needs, constraints and expectations against the measures put in place to manage the risk down to an acceptable level. He added that, recently, CMCS has been engaging with private military companies, as well as non-state armed groups, and that it was important that humanitarian and security personnel understand each other’s concerns and expectations. Mr. Buffler acknowledged that there may be security risks created by humanitarian organizations’ practice – such as paying fees to armed groups – which would need to be considered. He noted that some of the challenges could be mitigated by ensuring that humanitarian and security personnel understand each other and becoming more familiar with the operating context. The USG UNDSS noted that an approach of “localization” could be useful, whereby those with local ties, such as implementing partners or national staff, help secure access.

153. Participants discussed who were the true acceptors of risk – whether it was the DO signing off on the SRM or, in fact, the personnel deployed. Mr. Buffler noted that more discussion/analysis was needed on what level of risk was acceptable and at which point was the risk too high. In response to the comments made by USG DSS on the subject, Mr. Vandamme suggested a separate discussion be held on “who accepts risk?”. He noted there are policies in place but that it may be hard for decision-makers to judge appropriately and asked whether UNSMS organizations expected field personnel to accept a high level of risk based on the mandate of the organization. He further noted that personnel may not always be informed of their exposure and that it is important that they are briefed accordingly. In this vein, he mentioned that he has seen instances whereby UNSMS Organizations have authorised personnel to refuse deployment in (very) high risk environments. Ms. Montalvo shared the same concern, adding that there is a lack of clarity on defining the level of acceptance which warrants further review.
154. Mr. Vandamme stressed the importance of ad hoc SRMs, noting that they would likely better reflect acceptance. He also added that many people do not understand the SRM process, seeing it as overly complex, which highlights the importance of training.
155. The USG UNDSS noted that another major security incident was inevitable, and that the UNSMS needs to build resilience into the processes so that decisions are clearly justifiable, and decision-makers are not penalized in case of injuries or fatalities. He stated that another meeting on this issue is warranted. Ms. Montalvo expressed support for a specific meeting on this, noting that, while the UNSMS has a robust process for managing risk, she felt that there is no specific process for accepting risk that clearly specifies what risks, and to whom, are acceptable.
156. Mr. Butt noted that acceptance is covered in the strategic framework of the UNSMS (Annex E of the SRM Manual) but that there should be a focus on how to operationalize it. He noted that the best practices identified arise from contexts where the security advisor and the programme manager work together very closely, as in the Syria case (Joint Access Security Cell) or the Iraq case (Joint Security Humanitarian Team). He noted it was important for humanitarian colleagues to alert security when programmes are, or might be, about to change.
157. Mr. Farrell stressed it was important that IASMN members have the same understanding on security risk, suggesting that the SRM webinar be held before any follow-up discussions on the acceptance of risk. Based on the USG’s comments, the issue really isn’t about “who accepts risk” but more about how senior management will respond to a serious incident (and managing this response to retain resilience in operations). He also urged to properly look at the issue of informed consent, including possibly seeking legal advice and looking at the internal working culture of UNSMS organizations.
158. The USG UNDSS concluded the session, highlighting the need for *ad hoc* SRMs to be quick, simple and easy to understand – a requirement that will inform the work of the SRM/SSIRS working group. For their part, Mr. Buffler and Mr. da Silva noted the need for two-way dialogue between security and programmes, as early as possible, and referred briefly to risks other than security, such as political and reputational risks of not delivering, that must be considered.

Security Communications

159. Mr. Peter Casier, TESS-COSCATG-PULSER, delivered a presentation on the progress and overview of {TESS+} services, COSCATG and PULSER (**CRP 9**).

{TESS+}

160. Mr. Casier highlighted the current and past {TESS+} operations to date, the ongoing reassessment phase, and the {TESS+} online public library. He presented the {TESS+} finances and budget, which is part of the JFA budget, noting that the group is not seeking additional funding, as their cost savings and cost-optimization were successful.

161. Following a question raised by Ms. Montalvo, Mr. Casier explained that the most difficult challenges in many countries lay outside the influence of security personnel, such as lack of coordination, an inability to raise sufficient funds to improve SCS systems or regulatory issues related to the Host government, such as a lack of licensing for satellite systems.

COSCATG and PULSER

162. Mr. Casier presented the progress made by COSCATG on the first three use cases (one on "Security Broadcasts" and two on "Status Verification" [previously called "Headcounts"]), which are the most urgent ones in the field. He gave an update on the technical work done by the three user groups SCAAN, Everbridge (EB) and eTA, highlighting that SCAAN's common application link is being rolled out, whereas EB development is expected to be finished in early Q2 2023. Finally, he noted that {TESS+} contributed \$70K for the EB development costs and will contribute the same amount for the SCAAN development costs.

163. Mr. Casier recalled that, in June 2022, the IASMN requested COSCATG to coordinate the clean-up of the UN personnel profile database, which has been a challenge since 2010. Under COSCATG, {TESS+} facilitated PULSER ("Profile-linked UN gLobal SEcurity-data Reconciliation"). Since June 2022, the group started working on its development. Mr. Casier added that PULSER has been active since October 2022, yet additional work is required to strengthen these tools, and improve the guidance and the training needed. Mr. Casier concluded by announcing that by the next IASMN session, a concrete proposal of PULSER will be provided.

164. In response to questions posed by Mr. Telenta and Ms. Dunphy, who both noted that their respective organizations have already started the clean-up process, Mr. Casier reiterated that the PULSER WG simply works on a structured approach which will facilitate an easier clean-up process, but that organizations should continue with their clean-up and not wait for the working group's proposal.

165. Following a question raised by Mr. Skog, Ms. Bhatia explained that the group is not asking for approval of the funds as they have already been approved as an add-on to the UNDSS operations budget in the JFA budget, and that the group simply wanted to report on TESS expenses separately. Mr. Skog and the USG UNDSS noted that the TESS budget should not be an add-on to the JFA budget but to be an integrated component.

166. Mr. Butt raised a question on where exactly the cost-saving of TESS lies, seeing that the budget in the LCSSB has increased between 2019-2022. In response, Mr. Casier explained that exercises especially in the 'big player' countries contain hidden costs, and that increases in the budget could also be due to transfers of previous bilateral/multilateral cost-sharing into the LCSSB.

167. Lastly, Mr. Noory raised a point regarding the lack of enforcement of TESS recommendations in the field, to which the USG UNDSS agreed, stating this problem should be collectively addressed.

168. The IASMN:

- **Took note and supported the overall process and progress made to date on the current {TESS+} services (part 1);**
- **Took note of the {TESS+} 2022 budget expenditure and supported the allocation of its 2023 funding (part 1);**
- **Took note and supported the overall process and progress made to date by the COSCATG (part 2);**
- **Took note and supported the overall process and progress made to date by the PULSER Sub-Working Group (part 3).**

Close of Session

169. Participants discussed the review of the recommendations at the end of the session. They agreed that such review is important and helpful as some recommendations were not fully agreed upon during the session. It was suggested to circulate the recommendations at the end of each session day at future IASMN meetings to facilitate their finalization. Ms. Kulawat agreed that the recommendations may be circulated after the session, excluding the background notes.

Co-Chair Selection

170. **Co-Chair Selection:** The question of the future Co-Chair was reconvened. Ms. Lagerweij nominated Mr. Torp of WIPO as the new Co-Chair. Mr. Torp accepted the nomination, supported by ITU and ILO, and as there were no objections and no other nominations, Mr. Torp was elected the next IASMN Co-Chair.

171. **Upcoming IASMN Meetings:** Members briefly discussed the upcoming IASMN meetings. The next Steering Group Meeting will be hosted in Paris from 17 to 18 May 2023, and the following Steering Group meeting will be hosted from 18 to 19 October in Nairobi. The Swiss Government confirmed that it will host the annual full IASMN meeting in Montreux from June 20 to 22, 2023. The Security Symposium hosted by the Islamic Development Bank in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, will take place from May 31 to 1st June 2023, and will be organized in a hybrid format. The IASMN's recommendations will be part of the agenda, which is still being discussed. Online participation will be facilitated, though speakers/panellists are expected to attend in person.

172. The USG UNDSS and participants discussed the timeline for the discussion of the JFA budget for 2023 and 2024. The ad hoc discussion will take place on February 24, 2023.

173. The IASMN:

- **Endorsed Mr. Jess Torp of WIPO as IASMN Co-chair.**

Annexure (Agenda and Participant List)

Final Agenda (revision dated Feb 7)

Tuesday, 7 February 2023

9:00 – 10:30 Opening Session

- Welcome and opening remarks (USG UNDSS)

10:30 – 10:45 Adoption of the Agenda (USG UNDSS)

10:45 – 11:00 Coffee Break

11:00 – 11:30 **Summary of Progress on IASMN Recommendations (SPPU) (CRP 1 Annex B)**

11:30 – 12:45 **Member survey and Designation of IASMN Co-chair (ICC) (CRP 2)**

12:45 – 1:45 Lunch

1:45 – 2:30 **Policy Update (SPPU) (CRP 3)**

2:30 – 3:30 **Hostage Incident Management (HIM) Update (DRO/UNHCR/UNICEF) (CRP 4)**

3:30 – 4:00 Coffee Break

4:00 – 5:00 **SRM/SSIRS Working Groups (UNICEF/OCHA) (CRP 5)**

Wednesday, 8 February 2023

9:00 – 9:30 **Presentation of 2022 JFA Expenditures (EO) (CRP 7)**

9:30 – 10:00 **HR WG (EO) (CRP 8)**

10:00 – 11:00 **Results Chain (DRO/UNRWA) (CRP 14)**

11:00 – 11:15 Coffee Break

11:15 – 12:30 **Strategic Communications (IOM) (CRP 10)**

12:30 – 1:30 Lunch

1:30 – 2:00 **Training**

- TDS (CRP 11)

2:00 – 2:45 **Fire Safety WG (DPSS) (CRP 12)**

2:45 – 3:00 Coffee Break

3:00 – 4:00 **Armed Guards/Residential Security Measures WG (FAO) (CRP 13)**

4:00 – 5:00 **Gender Update (CRP 6)**

Thursday, 9 February 2023

9:00 – 10:15 **Thematic cross-sectoral issues**

- Humanitarian Access
- Civil-Military Coordination

10:15 – 10:30 Coffee Break

10:30 – 11:30 **Security Communications (TESS) (CRP 9)**

- Update from the COSCATG (Common Security Communications Applications Technical Group)
- TESS Update

11:30 – 12:30 **Close of Session**

- Any Other Business
- Wrap-up

List of Participants

	<u>Entity</u>	<u>Name of Participant</u>
1.	ADB	Mr. Dewaine Farria
2.	ADB	<i>Mr. Girard Pacifico B. Marin</i>
3.	DOS	Mr. Anders Brynnel (Virtual & in-person)
4.	DPO	Mr. Russell Wyper (Virtual)
5.	DPPA	Mr. Valentin Aldea (Virtual & in-person)
6.	EBRD	Mr. Ian Evans
7.	EBRD	<i>Mr. Leigh Anderson</i>
8.	EBRD	<i>Ms. Lora Chakarova</i>
9.	FAO	Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia
10.	IAEA	Mr. Niels Bolt (Virtual)
11.	IAEA	<i>Mr. Steve Potter (Virtual)</i>
12.	IAEA	<i>Mr. Veljko Nenadic (Virtual)</i>
13.	IAEA	<i>Ms. Eliana Coraci (Virtual)</i>
14.	ICAO	Mr. Mike Romero (Virtual)
15.	ICC	Mr. Lassi Kuusinen
16.	IFAD	Mr. Matthias Meyerhans
17.	IFAD	<i>Ms. Berkis Patricia Perez Vallejo</i>
18.	ILO	Mr. Jean-Louis Dominguez
19.	IMF	Mr. Mark Gibb
20.	IOM	Mr. Luc Vandamme

21.	IOM	<i>Ms. Anastasiia Sientsova (Virtual)</i>
22.	ITU	Mr. Drew Donovan
23.	OCHA	Mr. Simon Butt
24.	OHCHR	Mr. Dmitry Cherepanov (Virtual)
25.	OLA	Ms. Vita Onwuasoanya
26.	OPCW	Ms. Elisca Lagerweij
27.	PAHO	Ms. Maria Teresa Angulo
28.	UN Women	Mr. Paul O’Hanlon
29.	UN Women	<i>Ms. Aaina Chopra</i>
30.	UN Women	<i>Ms. Sanja Potrebic</i>
31.	UNDP	Mr. Arve Skog
32.	UNDP	<i>Mr. John Dada (Virtual)</i>
33.	UNDSS/USG	Mr. Gilles Michaud
34.	UNDSS/ASG	Ms. Unaisi Vuniwaqa (Virtual)
35.	UNDSS/DSOS	Ms. Esther Kuisch (Virtual)
36.	UNDSS/DRO	Mr. Bill Miller
37.	UNDSS/EO	Ms. Renu Bhatia
38.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Justyna Pietralik
39.	UNDSS/SPPS	Ms. Suchada Kulawat
40.	UNEP	Mr. Peter Marshall
41.	UNESCO	Mr. Nicolas Hergot
42.	UNFPA	Mr. Naqib Noory
43.	UNFPA	<i>Mr. Richard Jansen</i>
44.	UNHCR	Ms. Julie Dunphy

45.	UNICC	Mr. Lyle McFayden
46.	UNICEF	Mr. Paul Farrell
47.	UNICEF	<i>Ms. Anne Carlson</i>
48.	UNOCT	Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron (virtual)
49.	UNODC	Mr. Robert Telenta
50.	UNOPS	Mr. John Dunne
51.	UNRWA	Mr. Brian Baker
52.	UNRWA	<i>Mr. Michael Center (virtual)</i>
53.	WIPO	Mr. Tess Torp
54.	WBG	Mr. Daniel L. Chase
55.	WBG	<i>Ms. Samantha J. Steenkamp-Farrell</i>
56.	WFP	Ms. Maria Victoria Montalvo
57.	WFP	<i>Ms. Ludmilla Dadrass</i>
58.	WHO	Mr. Angelito Bermudez
Observers		
59.	CEB	Mr. Remo Lalli (Virtual)
60.	CEB	Ms. Laura Gallacher (Virtual)
61.	CEB	Ms. Ekaterina Zizekalova (Virtual)
62.	FICSA	Ms. Mary Mone (Virtual)
63.	CCISUA	Ms. June Onguru (Virtual & in-person)
64.	UNISERV	Mr. Aitor Arauz
65.	UNISERV	Mr. Michael Lund
Participants to Specific Sections		
1.	IOM	<i>Mr. Alister Wood (Virtual)</i>

2.	OCHA	<i>Mr. Sergio Da Silva (virtual)</i>
3.	OCHA	<i>Mr. Bediako Buahene (Virtual)</i>
4.	OCHA	<i>Mr. Aurelien Buffler</i>
5.	TESS-COSCATG-PULSER	<i>Mr. Peter Casier – Session Presenter</i>
6.	UNDSS/EO	<i>Ms. Zhengfan Sun</i>
7.	UNDSS/EO	<i>Ms. Tine Hatlehol</i>
8.	UNDSS/DPSS	<i>Mr. Benjamin Owusu-Firempong</i>
9.	UNDSS/DPSS	<i>Mr. Robin Stenhouse</i>
10.	UNDSS/SPS	<i>Ms. Clairene Alexander</i>
11.	UNDSS/DRO	<i>Ms. Florence Poussin</i>
12.	UNDSS/SPS	<i>Ms. Helen Bray</i>
13.	UNDSS/SPS	<i>Mr. Marc Jacquand (Virtual)</i>
14.	UNDSS/DPSS	<i>Ms. Senida Panjeta</i>
15.	UNDSS/DPSS	<i>Ms. Anne Hammenrudh</i>
16.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Ms. Xiaohan Xiang</i>
17.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Mr. Ryan Mak</i>
18.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Ms. Henrietta Storig</i>
19.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Mr. Daniele Musmeci</i>
20.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Ms. Gina Farre Duro</i>
21.	UNDSS/SPPU	<i>Ms. Sophia Nambi</i>