The Inter-Agency Security Management Network | Final Report
38th Session, 20 to 22 June 2023

Executive Summary

The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its 38th Session from 20 to 22 June 2023 in Montreux, Switzerland. The IASMN, chaired by the Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security (USG UNDSS), Mr. Gilles Michaud, and supported by co-chair, Mr. Jess Torp of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). Some 35 organizations of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS) participated, in-person and virtually, as well as representatives of CCISUA, FICSA and UNISERV.

On the first day, IASMN members held group discussion on the UNSMS functionality, as requested by the Steering Group in May 2023. Participants commended the interactive and collaborative format of the groups, where they discussed pre-determined questions before reporting the main points discussed back to the plenary. Throughout the session, members and working groups updated participants on the progress of their works, including progress on new operational initiatives, security communications, armed guards/residential security measures, hostage incident management (HIM), Security Risk Management (SRM) / Safety and Security Incident Recording System (SSIRS) improvements, fire safety, human resources, training, and others. The IASMN endorsed the policy on "Risk Avoidance: Alternate Work Modalities, Personnel and Family Restrictions (Relocation and Evacuation)."

UNWTO will host the next full session of the IASMN in Madrid, from 13 to 15 February 2024.

Contents

Introduction

1. The Inter-Agency Security Management Network (IASMN) held its 38th session in Montreux, Switzerland, from 20 to 22 June 2023. Representatives of some 40 UNSMS organizations attended (in-person and virtually), along with representatives of CCISUA and UNISERV. The meeting was chaired by USG UNDSS and co-chaired by Mr. Jess Torp of WIPO.

Opening Session

Adoption of Agenda

1. The USG UNDSS introduced the agenda. Participants did not suggest any changes and adopted the agenda.

2. **The IASMN:**
   - **Adopted the agenda as presented.**

Opening Remarks

3. Mr. Thomas Gruber, Head of the United Nations Division, State Secretariat, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, delivered opening remarks, welcoming participants and acknowledging the productive partnership between the Swiss Government and the IASMN over the past decade. He recognized the increasing complexity of the challenges faced by the UN and the international community, including growing geopolitical tensions, isolationist tendencies, and rapid technological advancement. He expressed gratitude to the UN personnel for their efforts and achievements amid multiple crises.

4. In his welcome to participants, the USG UNDSS expressed his gratitude for the ongoing support from the Swiss Government, not only for hosting the meeting but also for their investment in UNDSS, which benefits the entire UN. He noted that the turbulence of the past few years had highlighted the need to enhance capabilities in emergency preparedness, response, and forward-looking analysis. The USG underscored that UNDSS is aligning its resources with partners' priorities and trend analyses. In that vein, he introduced the Department's recent initiatives, such as finalizing tools to improve emergency response and establishing partnerships with different organizations. He added that UNDSS has established an Operational Resilience Unit (ORU), which aims to reinforce programmes with resources and technical support during crises. The diverse team, consisting of operational, analytical, and programme experts, will enhance the work and resource allocation of UNDSS. The USG mentioned a new digital transformation strategy, collaborating with companies like Microsoft and Amazon to draw from their expertise. The USG noted the addition of 13 countries to the country planning process in the months ahead. He expressed concerns over rapid transitions like those in Somalia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, and Mali. He emphasized the need to rethink collective approaches and funding to compensate for the loss of missions while ensuring continued operation in highly unstable environments.

5. Ms. June Anyango Onguru, CCISUA, expressed a growing need for the United Nations to learn from its responses to situations, such as those in Afghanistan and Sudan. She emphasized the disparity in treatment between internationally recruited staff and national staff in times of security crises and called for more efforts to support diversity at all levels within the UN, including nationality, gender, and other factors.

6. The USG acknowledged the recurring issue of different treatment between national and international personnel during crises, which is a system-wide challenge. He highlighted that this disparity would be addressed in the after-action review, as recommendations on addressing it may be proposed. The USG affirmed that efforts are ongoing to ensure diversity and inclusivity in the organization. Mr. Mark Polane, UNISERV, requested that staff federations have an opportunity to provide feedback to the after-action review.

7. In response to a question from UNODC, the USG mentioned the department's collaboration with Amazon and Microsoft under their corporate social responsibility initiatives to address gaps in information management. Amazon is focusing more on crisis response, whereas Microsoft aids in general information management strategy. Current efforts include updating existing platforms to make them more user-friendly and technologically up-to-date.

8. Ms. Julie Dunphy, UNHCR, asked about the new approach to analysis, highlighting the ongoing analytical work in individual organizations and the possibility to align with their efforts. The USG noted that the department was focusing on enhancing its analytical capacity, emphasizing the quality of analysis over quantity of analysts. He highlighted the value of staff acting as analysts in their decision-making and suggested that improvements could be achieved without necessarily expanding personnel. He noted that UNDSS could collaborate with other organizations for strategic level analysis, as well as include analytical posts in emergency response situations. Lastly, he underlined the need for a shift in mindset about what analysis means and how it can be done more effectively.

9. Mr. Naqib Noory, UNFPA, emphasized the need for learning from past operations like Sudan and Afghanistan, while urging better communication during these processes. He highlighted the importance of adapting to changing security situations through consultation, especially considering the upcoming transitions of peacekeeping mission. Lastly, he called for improved coordination among the first responders of the UNSMS for optimal outcomes.

10. Mr. Valentin Aldea, DPPA, reiterated the suggestion from the DPO focal point regarding the review of the Integrated Security workforce, underscoring its importance in light of future mission transitions and diminishing resources. The USG noted that his office would follow up with DRO on the progress of this review.

Summary of Progress on Recommendations

11. Ms. Justyna Pietralik, UNDSS/SPPU and IASMN Secretariat, briefed on the outstanding IASMN recommendations (**CRP 1 Annex B**). She noted that, of 17 remaining actionable recommendations, 15 were still ongoing, some of which were long-term actions.

12. Mr. Arve Skog, UNDP, raised a query concerning the Lessons Learned process, suggesting the need for the UNSMS to adhere to a formalized, standardized process in this area and emphasized the significance of such an initiative. Mr. Paul O'Hanlon, UN Women, proposed that a working group be formed to move the process forward.

13. Mr. Marc Jacquand, UNDSS/SPS, agreed that the lessons learned mandate resides within the CEMS unit in SPS. He noted that over the past year, their focus has been predominantly internal, aiming to restart the unit with an emphasis on evaluation and compliance, but work will restart on the lessons learned process.

14. Participants, including UN Women, WFP, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNMD, UNICEF, WHO and IOM, expressed support for a coordinated approach to lessons learned on security management. They supported the formation of a working group, not led by a single agency, to standardize security management practices across entities and volunteered to participate in such a group. Mr. Paul Farrell, UNICEF, clarified that the working group's output would be a guideline on lessons learned, in support to the existing policy in the *Security Policy Manual*, Chapter V, Section D, "Compliance, Evaluation and Best Practice". Mr. Angelito Bermudez, WHO, agreed, suggesting the group could decide to include operationalization details in the Security Management Operations Manual (SMOM). Mr. Luc Vandamme, IOM, noted that IOM had just finalized their internal security-focused lessons learned and could contribute to the working group. WFP requested the outcome to be action oriented, with clear accountabilities on designated actions.

15. The USG summarized the discussion, noting the establishment of a working group to develop guidelines on lessons learned, to be led by Mr. Jacquand. He noted that these guidelines should be developed relatively quickly, given the growing need for this product.

16. **The IASMN:**
    - **Took note of the progress made in implementing the IAMSN's outstanding recommendation;**
    - **Established a working group to develop guidelines on lessons learned linking to the Security Policy Manual, Chapter V, Section D, "Compliance, Evaluation and Best Practice", under leadership of SPS/CEMS, to be provided to the next Steering Group for consideration.**

Updates on New Operational Initiatives

Planning for UN Results and Resilient Security Programming

17. The update on Planning for UN Results and Resilient Security Programming **(CRP 2)** was delivered by Mr. Jacquand and Mr. Martin Laffey, UNDSS/DRO. Mr. Jacquand introduced the session, noting that UNDSS has set up a new Emergency Response Team (ERT) and the ORU (which have already begun their work), and are currently making adjustments to country-level planning are also underway. He illustrated these elements as separate lines of defense against volatility and unpredictability. In the context of each country, UNDSS aims to plan their support for the UN presence in each country, aligning their work with UN priorities. For a subset of these

countries, the ORU will provide extra support, and an even smaller subset will receive additional support from the ERT.

18. Mr. Jacquand outlined the UNDSS planning principles, which will be articulated in an upcoming UNDSS capstone doctrine on planning. The UNDSS country programme aims to provide clarity on how UNDSS will support and contribute to UN results and inform resource allocations and may encourage further donor support. He discussed a pilot initiative for assessing and addressing security risks to UNSMS programming in various countries, including Afghanistan and Nigeria. The process aims to understand potential security risks and their impact on UN missions within the cooperation frameworks in each country. UNDSS plans to clarify its strategic intent, commitments, and evaluate its performance in every country. This involves creating new partnerships, repositioning its resources, developing communication strategies, and addressing training needs. A risk register for each country programme will be created, and a monitoring approach will be implemented to measure success. The approach is being tested in various countries and, to support, an infrastructure has been established at the headquarters and an online training programme is being developed.

19. Mr. Laffey highlighted several strategic initiatives aimed at enhancing the operational resilience of the department. The goal is to improve the quality of outputs, align with partners, and optimally utilize resources based on the requirements and security situations of the programmes. The team has been working on the concepts of 'instability' and 'resilience' over the past 6-9 months to better frame their approach. The team is seeking to utilize existing information and understand the reasons behind a country's instability. They use three indices: the Fragile States Index, Global Peace Index, and the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment, which provide insight into the security drivers behind a country's fragility. Mr. Laffey outlined the team's focus on foresight development, data, country programming, risk assessment process development, and the integration of the results chain as a framework.

20. Participants expressed support for the current direction. Several posed follow-up questions, offered suggestions, and requested that the PowerPoint presentation be shared with IASMN members, which UNDSS confirmed would be done.

21. Mr. O'Hanlon stressed the importance of existing security structures and offered UN Women's comprehensive training packages as a resource. He emphasized the need for a nuanced approach to managing resources in crisis situations and praised the current process for its potential in enabling their programmes in the field.

22. Mr. Brian Baker, UNRWA, expressed concern over potential duplications in the planning process, noting that planning to enable field programmes and being risk-informed were already part of the existing system. He also raised concerns about the integration of security aspects into agency country programme documents and the endorsement of such documents, as well as the potential complications of each UNDSS office requesting additional resources simultaneously and whether the current structure had the capacity to manage these additional complexities.

23. Ms. Marie Montalvo, WFP, queried how the new framework would yield concrete benefits for field operations and how the work would fit within existing monitoring, evaluation, and programme cycles.

24. Mr. Noory queried the approval mechanisms for the UNDSS country programmes and requested further clarity on the links between the proposed approach and programme criticality, the Framework of Accountability, and programme assessment. He expressed concern about additional paperwork burden on security advisors and asked for clarity on balancing this with existing resources. He inquired about the engagement with DOs and RCs and sought further explanation on the initiative's operational side. Finally, he requested information about resource allocation for the newly established units and asked that the documentation on the initiative delineates specifically what would be required of other UNSMS organizations.

25. Mr. Jacquand commented on pilot projects in Nigeria and Nicaragua, noting positive feedback from the UN Country Teams and DOs. He emphasized that the proposed approach is a management plan, not a security plan, thus limiting any potential duplications. Mr. Laffey underscored that their objective was to improve the quality of output within the already established results chain, without adding or subtracting from it. He clarified there was no intended movement of posts from the field to the desks or headquarters. Instead, the goal was to focus existing resources in the locations where they are needed most.

26. Mr. Russell Wyper, DPO, noted the need to discuss transition plans and to account for situations of rapid drawdown of resources versus the increasing demand for security resources, seeking clarity on the timeframe and the role of the ORU in these situations.

27. Mr. Vandamme enquired about the potential risks to UNDSS that the process entailed, as well as the involvement and consultation process for the work conducted so far. Ms. Dunphy raised several questions related to the project timeline and the proposed training plan, pointing out the ambitious nature of the change for many UNDSS personnel. She enquired about the project's alignment with existing emergency response protocols and what consultations had been undertaken. She also enquired about the need for specialized rosters of personnel with specific skills, and how UNDSS planned to source and manage these rosters.

28. Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron, UNOCT, enquired how the team would ensure efficiency and agility in implementing the new proposal, given persistent resource constraints. Mr. Peter Marshall, UNEP, inquired whether the focus was only on country teams, or if other entities like headquarters and regional offices were considered for a pilot as well. He expressed concerns about the potential politicization of the "security quadrants" (as shown in the PowerPoint) by member states.

29. Mr. Farrell suggested sidebar consultations to facilitate better understanding and management of the process. He also noted potential confusion due to the different usage of the term "risk" across platforms, emphasizing the need for clarity, especially in relation to the SRM. He requested more information on how the country-specific analysis feeds into a global concept of resource allocation, particularly in relation to the placement of posts funded by the Jointly

Financed Activities (JFA) budget, emphasizing the need for an algorithm or process for such decisions.

30. Mr. Sherif Noaman, OHCHR, discussed the differing risk profiles among UNSMS organizations within the same security area. He highlighted the need for quality over quantity when boosting security capacity and stressed the necessity for continuous, up-to-date training for security professionals.

31. Mr. Jacquand confirmed that risks to UNDSS could entail potential impacts on the programmatic operational efficiency and responsibilities, such as inadequate staffing in certain countries or misunderstandings about UNDSS's role. He clarified that these risks do not pertain to security risks to the UN, which are captured separately. Mr. Jacquand shared that consultation processes are underway with several entities both at the HQ and field levels, and that pilot programmes have incorporated multiple parties' perspectives. He mentioned that out of the 12 training modules being developed, 11 are ready and will be rolled out to 13 countries in alignment with their planning steps for immediate application. He noted that the focus has mainly been on field operations at the country-level, and addressed concerns about workload, explaining that the goal is to implement consistent planning processes within UNDSS to aid comparison, systematic support, and informed prioritization of resources.

32. Mr. Laffey clarified his use of the terms "resilience" and "readiness", emphasizing that they are part of a complex language regarding preparedness but are not interchangeable. He acknowledged the significance of training and preparedness efforts made by various stakeholders, noting that these efforts often target different aspects of the results chain. He confirmed the ongoing work to boost cross-country capacity and capabilities, as well as refining a skill-specific roster. He addressed a point on the sensitive issue of member states and the "security quadrant", explaining that it's an internal tool for prioritizing resources and aligning with existing indices of instability. He noted that the current process aimed to align with existing systems rather than seek to replace them.

33. The USG highlighted that country plans would inform where to prioritize the allocation of existing resources and where additional ones are needed, which would be key in making a case for extrabudgetary funding. He reiterated that a process to identify principles for reallocating resources was ongoing.

34. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of the update.**

Lessons Learned Exercise: Sudan

35. The USG UNDSS introduced the brief session on the Lessons Learned Exercise (**CRP 3**), noting that the Secretary-General had approved the concept and approach for the lessons learned exercise for Sudan, but consultations were still needed to define the Terms of Reference (ToRs).

36. Mr. Jacquand clarified that the process of drafting the ToRs will be managed by the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG), with a coordinating role played by UNOCC. An

independent consultant is meant to lead the process, ideally someone with dual or triple hat[1] experience. Two steering groups, one at the headquarters level and one at the field level, will be created to provide input on the methodology, review findings, and engage with the USG and the independent expert. The field level group will be led by the office of the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General (DSRSG) / Resident Coordinator (RC) / Humanitarian Coordinator (HC). The aim is to launch the process immediately and complete it within six months. The next steps involve the EOSG taking over the process, beginning the drafting of the ToRs, identifying the independent expert, and establishing the two steering groups.

37. Mr. Noory reiterated his request for more transparent information sharing regarding lessons learned initiatives that impact all UNSMS organizations, which he noted would facilitate the alignment of internal mechanisms. Referencing the working group on lessons learned guidelines discussed earlier that day, Ms. Dunphy noted that a timeline for its establishment would be helpful in the event it could feed into the security components covered by the ToRs. The USG noted that, in the interest of time, the security focal points of various UNSMS organizations would be involved through their Executive Heads on the development of the ToRs.

38. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of the update.**

Results Chain

39. The ASG UNDSS provided an update on the progress of the Results Chain (**CRP 4**). She noted that since the last IASMN, a working group meeting was held where the structure of the group was discussed. As the chair of the group, she had observed a decrease in attendance, but she noted that the recent Steering Group meeting did not recommend the disbandment of the original working group. She had proposed reconfiguring the group into a standing technical group to review and adjust the results chain as needed, as it is considered a living document.The ASG noted that the Results Chain is a tool for transparency and accountability and that it is not mandatory for organizations to implement but can provide valuable insights for their own structure and operations. She highlighted that the Results Chain has been incorporated as a foundational element in the new UNDSS planning doctrine, bridging the gap between planning, new initiatives, and strategic results.

40. In the plenary discussion that followed, members discussed whether the larger working group should disband in favor of the proposed smaller standing group, before ultimately agreeing to maintain the working group.

41. Mr. O'Hanlon acknowledged the work done on the results chain but noted that he did not feel he had full clarity on UNDSS's role and responsibilities. He suggested that the results chain was inter-connected with the discussion on a Service Level Agreement (SLA). Mr. John Dunne, UNOPS, agreed that UNDSS services should be codified in some form of a charter or agreement

---

[1] In certain situations, the Resident Coordinator may also serve as the Humanitarian Coordinator, which is referred to as a "double hat". Additionally, they may also serve as the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General (DSRSG) if a Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) is appointed ("triple hat").

so that expectations are clear. Mr. Farrell agreed on the need for clarity and suggested that a charter document could serve this purpose, along with the establishment of a complaint mechanism to address concerns. Ms. Montalvo added that clarity on both sides of the equation, rather than focusing on the accountability of one of the parties, was crucial.

42. The USG noted that an SLA would not be suitable for the Department's role and purpose and proposed exploring a feedback mechanism that allows addressing instances when UNDSS's performance falls short of expectations. He noted that the results chain is meant to be a tool that provides clarity about the responsibilities of the Department and other UNSMS organizations. He emphasized the importance of viewing the UNSMS as a system that collaborates to deliver outputs for programme delivery and recalled that the UNSMS was created as a collaborative forum where all organizations contribute funds to support a department coordinating efforts across the system. He acknowledged the crucial role of the department in coordination, training, and providing security expertise across the entire UNSMS, but stressed that the relationship should not be viewed as a client-service provider interaction, underscoring the principle of collaboration that underpinned the creation of the UNSMS.

43. Mr. Farrell pointed out the disproportionate role that the UNDSS plays in the system, particularly in terms of its ability to block certain actions and suggested that the results chain model might need adaptation to better reflect the desired functioning of the system. He suggested that while the focus of six major points within the working group makes sense, it should be chaired at the right level, possibly by the chair of a sub-working group. He recommended that the working group continue to exist and focus on these six points and suggested adding a seventh point: a mechanism for addressing real-time issues. Ms. Montalvo supported this addition and requested more information on the timeline of activities.

44. Mr. O'Hanlon agreed that the results chain should outline all functions and actions of the UNSMS, not only UNDSS's responsibilities. If this approach is confirmed, he felt there would be no need to revisit the idea of an SLA, as the document would essentially list the functions carried out by all involved parties. He emphasized the need to focus on addressing issues, which might be due to capacity or capabilities, rather than assigning blame.

45. The USG suggested that real-time, operational issues should be managed directly through existing channels like the DRO and the desk and should be elevated only if the response from these entities is unsatisfactory. He emphasized the existing role of the DRO Desks in partnership with various organizations to tackle problems on a day-to-day basis. He proposed that strategic discussions on systematic issues affecting global operations should be the focus of a new forum or mechanism, rather than creating a separate entity to handle the tasks already within the purview of DRO desks.

46. Mr. Farrell suggested the working group could provide a scoping document outlining the type of issues that could be raised and the appropriate escalation paths for different types of problems. He proposed that they codify procedures for different situations, whether they are day-to-day issues or more strategic concerns. He emphasized the need for a feedback mechanism for situations when things are not working as expected, whether it's in real time or long term.

47. The USG summarized the discussion, noting the addition of the seventh activity to the work of the group. He suggested that the results chain be a standing agenda item for the next couple of IASMN meetings.

48. **The IASMN:**
    - **Agreed that the Results Chain represents the activities, outputs and outcomes of UNDSS and UNSMS organizations in support of UNSMS goals;**
    - **Agreed to maintain the working group, adding, to the existing activities, a seventh activity on the establishment of a feedback mechanism on any shortfalls for the UNSMS, as part of the Results Chain.**

Functionality of the UNSMS

49. The session on UNSMS functionality **(CRP 5)** focused on three sets of questions that were discussed in three breakout discussion groups, followed by a plenary session where group rapporteurs summarized their discussion.

50. Mr. Jean Louis Dominguez, ILO, served as rapporteur for discussion group I on Strategic Vision, Goals and Approach. He noted that the group assessed the Framework of Accountability to provide enough flexibility to enable programme delivery within UNSMS. Mr. Dominguez highlighted that group I members felt it was important for each UNSMS organization to have its own Programme Criticality (PC) in its countries of operation to help in its individual decision-making process. He added that the group would like for the SRM to be more granular through a systematic use of ad hoc SRMs, so that each organization could best deliver on its mandate and programmes.

51. Mr. Aidan McNally, OPCW, served as rapporteur for discussion group II on Crises Responses and Role of Stakeholders. Mr. McNally explained that the group divided the discussion into responses before crises, during crises and after crises. Before crises, the discussion group considered the SRM process to be too static and lacked the ability to effectively support crisis management. To achieve better results, group II suggested having a more fluid SRM that allows decision-making at lower levels, including agencies when there is capacity. The group also considered having more ad hoc SRMs based on programmes rather than purely geographical factors. During crises, group II emphasized that decisions need to be speedy, accurate and decentralized. Further, the group II members discussed that the DO should play the role of a coordinator rather than a decision-maker. They noted that the post-crisis phase is too centralized at the DO and Security Management Team (SMT) level, which impacts the return to normal operations.

52. Ms. Dawn Wilkes, UPU, served as rapporteur for discussion group III on Collaboration. To further strengthen and enhance collaboration amongst all UNSMS organizations, group III discussed opportunities for top-down cultural change, implementation of requested trainings, commitment to mutual invitation to workshops and retreats, joint IASMN missions and providing feedback to UNDSS field mission reports. On what works well, group III emphasized the collegiality and adaptability in country, as well as good communication from IASMN working

groups and security cell effectiveness. Areas for improvement listed by the group include IASMN/UNSMS bureaucratic processes and the need for the SRM system to be addressed in a continuous basis by all SMTs.

53. Following the briefing by the rapporteurs, the USG UNDSS opened the floor for comments. Mr. Farrell shared that he found the format of the group discussions to be useful. He mentioned that there is a disconnect in purpose within the UNSMS, particularly on the level of decentralization for decision-making being at times overly restrictive. He suggested taking the decentralization one step closer to the level of the agency representative as decision maker (in some situations), who works more closely with the risk and is accountable for programme delivery.

54. Mr. Baker expressed that while smaller agencies may not have the capacity to develop their own SRMs, a blanket SRM can restrict operations and add unnecessary costs. He noted that organizations with a larger operational response within a country know their risk tolerance and would need more flexibility. He added that agencies should have the ability to build and compile their own PC. Mr. Torp shared concerns about a full-scale decentralization of decision-making, especially for organizations with little field presence that rely on UNDSS for security decision-making.

55. Mr. Bermudez pointed out that while policies and guidelines have been developed within the UNSMS, the issue lays with implementation. He noted that part of the implementation would be producing *ad hoc* SRMs not only on a geographical basis but also making them agency and programme specific. Mr. Bermudez mentioned that the preparation of PC in all duty stations or countries, even in areas with a risk below high-level, would help produce more agile responses in case of emergencies.

56. Mr. Vandamme added that polices and guidelines have been dictating more than advising the work of the UNSMS. He agreed with the comments made on the need for a more granular SRM, emphasizing the need to decentralize security decision-making and for the DO to have more of a coordinating role and less of a decision-making one. Mr. Vandamme also recommended a client satisfaction survey as well as joint retreats (UNDSS/UNSMS Organizations).

57. Ms. Florence Poussin, UNDSS/DRO, pointed out that there are a number of countries and areas where there is flexibility, agility and support for agencies. As examples, she cited the cases of Afghanistan, where agencies operate differently in regions inside and outside of the capital, and Ukraine, where the IAEA accepts a different level of risk than the SRM. Ms. Poussin added that the UNSMS needs to look at countries and areas where things have worked well and translate this to other areas.

58. Mr. Daniel Chase, World Bank, noted that the discussion seemed to point to two key concepts: subsidiarity and specialization. He explained that there is a will to push decision-making down to lower levels where there might be more proximity and knowledge. He elaborated that agencies often have the subject matter expertise while UNDSS has expertise in frontlines and assistance efforts in countries where not all organizations have security specialists. Mr. McNally suggested

that UNDSS could be responsible for some of the more strategic level assessments to identify crises while agencies look at the direct risks affecting their operations.

59. The USG UNDSS emphasized that the discussion was helpful and summarized some of the main points raised, such as the possibility of creating more flexibility in assessing risk and decision-making in the field. He explained that the Framework of Accountability already provides enough flexibility in decision-making, recalling the case of IAEA. He also pointed out that the system works well in many places, which may indicate an isolated issue with people who are managing the process, rather than the system as a whole. The USG recalled that the working group was established to work on the SRM, adding that it could be a venue to address the main issues identified. He also recognized the progress and hard work of the IASMN to build a robust system that is guided by thought-out policies and guidelines. The USG suggested that the next IASMN Steering Group meeting discuss ways of moving forward with the ideas raised at this session.

60. Mr. Farrell noted that more guidance, training and knowledge might not be enough to address the system's shortfalls. To have more clarity on what is working – and what is not – Mr. Farrell suggested conducting a survey, focusing on the decision-making of DOs. UNFPA, IOM and UNDSS/DRO supported the idea of a client satisfaction survey.

61. Mr. O'Hanlon, suggested having a proper two-day workshop separate from the IASMN to identify ways forward. DPO, WFP, IOM and UNRWA, supported this idea and added the benefit of having an external facilitator for the workshop.

62. Mr. Skog, raised some discussion points from group III, namely the need to increase interaction between UNDSS and other UNSMS organizations at all levels, and to improve inclusiveness and communication. In a similar vein, Mr. Noory added that the agencies were no longer invited to UNDSS' regional workshops, noting the need for collaboration and inclusiveness. Similarly, Mr. Wyper provided an example of how to work more collaboratively, noting that a review of the integrated workforce hadn't yet taken place after repeated requests. Mr. Polane touched on the need of having consistent and clear communication, citing examples of disparate communication in Afghanistan, Haiti and Sudan.

63. Ms. Poussin pointed out that lessons learned after crises are very important to provide feedback on how the UNSMS is doing collectively. She said that mission reports from the desks can be shared collectively but noted that this collaborative approach should go both ways. She added that regional workshops are open to regional security advisers from the agencies.

64. The USG UNDSS wrapped up the session by recalling the need to capture what was discussed in each discussion group to organize common themes. He suggested that a small group of volunteers could work on the way forward. After having clarity on the main topics for prioritization, the USG UNDSS noted that this could help feed into the survey and the workshop could help further refine the work on these issues. The USG UNDSS accepted UNISERV's offer to circulate the survey to increase trust.

65. **The IASMN:**

- **Agreed to capture group discussions in greater detail to identify common themes, requesting Rapporteurs of the three groups to send the group's inputs to SPPU and, on the basis of the compiled report, requested a group of volunteers to analyze common themes and identify a way forward;**
- **Requested that the IASMN, with feedback from the three groups, including feedback from other grups such as the Medical Directors Group, prepare a plan for a survey on key aspects of the functionality of the UNSMS, with collaboration from staff federations;**
- **Requested that SPPU organize, with support from IASMN members, a workshop or two-day retreat to analyze the way forward on the findings, preferably with an external/independent facilitator;**
- **Requested that findings are presented to the next Steering Group meeting, with groups providing advice on way forward.**

Security Communications

66. After brief introductions from the accompanying {TESS+} team, Mr. Peter Casier, TESS-COSCATG-PULSER, provided an update on security communications systems (**CRP 6)**, which consisted of three separate components.

{TESS+}

67. As part of the session on the {TESS+} service, Mr. Casier reported on the organization's shift in focus from standardization work on security communication systems to more extensive training efforts, which has seen significant participation. He noted that preparations are underway for their first "global tour," a two-week participatory training in six world regions. The training will be divided into technical training for connectivity workers and security training for UN personnel. All their standardization documents and mission reports are available online, and a more navigable website has been developed to help users find necessary documents. Additionally, they've updated their security communication system scorecard, which provides a detailed overview of the security communication systems in about 90 countries.

68. Mr. Casier outlined key initiatives including the development of an objective status report for security communication systems, the creation of a library of long-term commercial agreements, and testing hardware-based communication solutions that don't require internet. He also mentioned the deployment of Remote Security Operations Centers (RSOCs) in several countries (a demonstration of which was given during last year's IASMN session). Mr. Casier highlighted the cost savings this solution can provide in regions like Afghanistan. Further, he mentioned a mobile version of the RSOC that had been developed as a collaboration between the ETC and {TESS+} in Ukraine. These systems, powered by satellite connection and solar panels, extend VHF/UHF radio connectivity to remote areas and have proven successful in reestablishing communication in crisis situations, like Ukraine. He also announced a succession plan for his role, with Mr. Alf Ellefsen, WFP/{TESS+} Project, temporarily taking over until a permanent replacement is available.

69. Mr. Robert Telenta, UNODC, questioned whether he could communicate with UNODC personnel in various locations via the VHF interface Mr. Casier demonstrated. He also sought clarification on the arrangements to unify different communication systems across countries and entities.

70. Mr. Polane expressed concern about data security, specifically relating to personnel data, and requested assurances that the data is properly protected. He also mentioned the "UN Digital ID" project, suggesting that this could potentially be integrated with the current project to enhance data security.

71. Ms. Dunphy raised concerns about {TESS+} governance, noting that the {TESS+} Interagency Steering Group meetings have been infrequent. She suggested that more regular, formally managed meetings would ensure proper governance and to provide guidance for operations and that any recommendations from {TESS+} missions should be channeled through the TESS steering group. She noted that the role of the coordinating agency (now WFP) could potentially be rotational within members of this inter-agency group as per the earlier TESS charter.

72. Mr. Butt and Mr. Noory referred to a disconnect between some of the reported success and his team's experiences on the ground in Sudan, Afghanistan, and Haiti, where a lack of communications was experienced during emergencies. Mr. Noory requested more clarity on how projects were priorirized and whether remote training could replace some of the in-person training that was planned. He noted that costs have increased in many locations and queried why the system in Sudan did not work effectively. He also raised concerns about maintaining up-to-date equipment and suggested that standards for the equipment be established. Lastly, he emphasized the importance of follow-through on TESS recommendations.

73. Mr. O'Hanlon mentioned that UN Women's experience with {TESS+} has been highly positive and noted that issues, such as the three incompatible communication systems in Afghanistan, arose from decisions made prior to the implementation of TESS. Mr. O'Hanlon believed that the TESS team is making significant efforts to bridge these gaps and enhance the system. He emphasized the importance of acknowledging the successes and tangible cost savings brought by TESS.

74. Mr. Casier discussed the technical solution to regulate access to remote VHF security networks, explaining they would work with a group to establish clear guidelines on who should have access. On the topic of governance, Mr. Casier underlined the coordinating organization's centrality to the success of {TESS+}, as well as the challenges entailed, noting that it would be the IASMN and not the inter-agency committee that would appoint a successor coordinating organisation. He mentioned some examples where local teams did not follow recommendations, noting that the ultimate responsibility rested with the local team. Reasons for non-implementation varied from regulatory issues to lack of funding or leadership. Regarding the Locally Cost Shared Security Budget (LCSSB), he agreed they had seen instances where costs increased, though that had been contrary to the advice of {TESS+}. On the matter of Long-Term Agreements (LTAs), he clarified that they didn't manage them directly but provided technical advice where needed. In terms of training, he explained that they tried to offer online options where possible, but highlighted the importance of face-to-face interactions.

75. Ms. Poussin addressed the communication breakdown during the Sudan crisis, attributing it to several issues like active fighting, staff displacement, and looting. She praised the {TESS+} team's quick response in establishing remote communication from Nairobi and stressed the importance of frequent communication between the {TESS+} team and DRO for better field implementation. While discussing cost savings, she pointed out that they are reflected not only in local budgets but also in individual (organizational) ones.

76. Mr. Butt expressed concern over countries potentially lacking communication in crisis situations, requesting a list of such "red flag" countries to help plan internal communication strategies. He also asked for information on instances where {TESS+} solutions were not being implemented in order for his team to support and follow up.

77. Mr. Polane emphasized the need for proper communication protocols for dependents in missions, drawing on the situation in Sudan as an example. He stressed the security issues caused by evacuation plans being posted on social platforms. He recommended the reintroduction of practices such as regular security drills and equipment training for dependents, highlighting the importance of these measures in ensuring their safety during emergencies.

78. Ms. Dunphy suggested that the operational IASMN meeting held weekly should include a quarterly update on {TESS+}, inviting in the TESS project manager where necessary. The goal would be to better understand the countries on the "red list" and, if needed, to follow up with respective SMT members to advance the project. She suggested that these aspects also be addressed to the {TESS+} Interagency Steering Group in governance discussions.

79. Mr. Noory emphasized the need for accountability and escalation in situations where communications deficiencies exist. He agreed that the {TESS+} initiative is not primarily about cost savings but about optimizing resources and ensuring the safety of field personnel. He highlighted the need for effective implementation of recommendations and advocated for an escalation process for SMTs.

80. Mr. Casier agreed that {TESS+} could regularly provide a list of "red" and "orange" countries that have communication challenges, as identified by the scorecard. He agreed that {TESS+} representatives could participate in the IASMN operational meetings and noted that current challenges on non-implementation are mostly related to implementing processes, managing deployments, and budget issues. He also emphasized their collaborative work with manufacturers in product testing and prototyping, including their early involvement with Starlink.

81. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of progress made on the current {TESS+} services;**
   - **Recommended that the "red list" of countries (where communications would likely not work in a crisis) be routinely shared and featured in operational video VTCs (as determined by DRO);**
   - **Requested that {TESS+} Steering Group meet before each IASMN session so that regular updates of their meetings/recommendations can be shared with the IASMN.**

COSCATG

82. Briefing on the Common Security Applications Technical Group (COSCATG), Mr. Casier outlined the progress made in bridging the gap between different security applications, namely Everbridge, SCAAN and ETA. He reported that the three first use cases - "security broadcast", emergency and routine "status verification" - are now interlinked, meaning that a security broadcast from one application can be seen by users of the other applications. He emphasized that soon, the application a person is using – whether it's Everbridge, SCAAN or ETA – will not matter, as everyone will receive the same security broadcast and be part of the same headcounts.

83. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of the progress made to date.**

PULSER

84. Mr. Ellefsen delivered an update on the work of PULSER (Profile-linked UN gLobal Security-driven Reconciliation), a sub-working group of the COSCATG. He noted that the group comprised technical and security professionals and was working to address the issue of inaccurate date in the TRIP system. Mr. Ellefsen explained the proposal put forward by the working group, which consisted of four distinct phases, noting that the Steering Group expressed support. He added that the coordination with the Policy Review Group will begin when they commence their review of the policy on security clearance and that PULSER believes UNDSS would be best placed to leave on the implementation of this proposal.

85. Mr. O'Hanlon expressed significant reservations about the proposed solution to the personnel profile database problem. He argued that the scale of the issue – nearly a million profiles with three-quarters of a million needing manual deletion – is overwhelming, suggesting this manual approach is impractical and inefficient. As a result, he noted that implementing this manual process would necessitate hiring a new dedicated role in many UN organizations, and therefore UN Women did not support the manual deletion proposal. Instead, he advocated for an IT solution, much like many existing systems that automatically prompt inactive users over a period of time before deleting their profiles.

86. Mr. Polane agreed that the issue with the personnel profile database is not just an IT problem. He highlighted the importance of data-sharing among various UN organizations and advised the project team to connect with two High-Level Committee on Management (HLCM) working groups focused on UN Digital ID and inter-organizational data-sharing.

87. Mr. Bermudez expressed concerns about the manual updating of personnel profiles. He shared the fact that TRIP profiles only apply to travelling personnel leaves those who don't travel without profiles. He suggested that systems such as BSAFE, which is mandatory for all UN personnel, could be linked to establish profiles for everyone under the UNSMS. He also mentioned the potential usefulness of existing projects like the UN Digital ID and noted that manual updates were already being implemented in several country offices and therefore a decision on the way forward needed to be taken imminently.

88. Ms. Dunphy advocated for a technological solution to accurately identify personnel, stating manual clean-up was not feasible, especially in large operations like UNHCR. She expressed concern over UNDSS being asked to manage this issue, citing the process's complexity, particularly in regions with high staff turnover, and requested an update on the UN digital ID at the next IASMN meeting.

89. Mr. Farrell emphasized that their main concern was transitioning from a TRIP profile to a personal security profile. He advocated for simultaneous projects: to address immediate fixes and to consider policy implications at the same time. He noted the need for the team to liaise with the Policy Review Group to define their needs and strategies for parallel operations. He also stressed the necessity for any shift to the personal security profile to be synced to the revision of the security clearance policy.

90. Mr. Sobron underscored the importance of navigating various global data protection laws and reiterated the importance of handling HR data responsibly and ensuring its safe, confidential transmission.

91. In response to queries on how FAO had handled its recent data clean-up, Mr. Vladislav Khamidov, FAO, discussed how they resolved a significant problem of excessive personnel profiles. They utilized each staff member's unique email ID to clean up unnecessary profiles and established an automated API process between IT and HR departments for creating and deleting profiles. However, he cautioned that varying HR and management systems across UNSMS organizations might complicate this solution's application.

92. Ms. Poussin addressed several points regarding the UN digital ID, pointing out that a couple of organizations, such as the ICT and ITU, could provide an update on its status. She noted that their current proposal formalizes existing processes, involving mass cleanup, manual maintenance, and long-term automation, which are all interconnected steps. Some organizations, such as FAO, had started to link their HR data to the TRIP data, which was previously approved by the IASMN. However, she noted that implementation varied at the field level. Ms. Poussin added that long-term automation needed continuous maintenance, with DSS offering coordinated support.

93. Mr. Marshall shared the challenges they had faced in Kenya with tracking and managing Secretariat entities, particularly when people retired or left the organization. He emphasized the need for an IT solution for these problems.

94. Mr. Polane commented on the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), clarifying that UNISERV had been legally informed that GDPR does not apply to the United Nations.

95. Ms. Esther Kuisch, UNDSS/DSOS, highlighted that her division had been reaching out to private and UN partners for support in their digital transformation endeavours, including Microsoft. She proposed inviting these partners to further discussions to better understand the issues and generate potential solutions to making the process less cumbersome.

96. The USG UNDSS summarized the discussion, noting that the group's proposal was to explore technological solutions to the issue at hand before proceeding with what was outlined in the CRP. He suggested that the PULSER working group could extend invitations to potential partners who could provide insight into how technology could facilitate the process.

97. The following day, the discussion was revisited at the request of Mr. Casier and further inputs were presented. Mr. Casier clarified some misunderstandings, emphasizing that the proposal focused on the automation of mass clean-up of user profiles, not manual intervention. He noted that the proposal was a carefully crafted plan developed with input from numerous security and ICT professionals from multiple UN entities. He reiterated that the proposal had four phases, starting with preparation and documentation of existing tools, then an automated mass cleanup of inactive profiles, followed by some manual tweaking, and finally, a linking between different IT systems for automated profile management. He confirmed that most of these strategies have already been used, but the proposal sought to implement them systematically across organizations.

98. Mr. O'Hanlon reiterated his belief in a system-wide approach to address the issue. He pointed out that while UN Women had received no advisories regarding any automated cleanup system, UNDSS colleagues had approached them for a manual cleanup of profiles in various locations. Ms. Dunphy expressed that a clear paper – such as the session CRP, updated to reflect the discussion – would aid in moving the process forward within their organizations.

99. Mr. Farrell clarified that, in relation to upcoming recommendations, Annex A of the PULSER proposal included a name change for the personal security profile, which he did not support. He suggested that any such changes should wait until the Policy Review Group addresses the issue with the security clearance policy.

100. Mr. Casier agreed that policy changes should be delayed until they were embedded in the work of the policy review working group. He acknowledged the need for a clear paper detailing the necessary steps for ICT personnel in each organization to link their databases, stating that this would be part of the execution phase. Mr. Casier emphasized the importance of automation and minimal manual input and confirmed that DSS would take over management of the team, with the understanding that they would have the support of DPSS and other entities. Summarizing the discussion, the USG noted that some modifications to the CRP/paper were necessary, based on the discussions.

101. **The IASMN:**
   - **Requested amendments be made to the PULSER Solution Guidance Paper to reflect (except for aspects related to the renaming of the TRIP Profile) and reiterated the importance of an IT-system approach to data clean-up;**
   - **Referred any related policy changes to the Policy Review Group;**
   - **Recommended the hand-over the management and facilitation of the PULSER Sub Working group to UNDSS as an on-going longer-term process.**

Armed Guards / Residential Security Measures Working Group

102. Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia, FAO, discussed the working group's contributions to align the SMOM's provisions with the UNSMS security policy on residential security measures **(CRP 7).** This included two key foci: interlinking policy frameworks and addressing specific issues raised in the student group discussions. The group was also tasked to coordinate with legal and procurement experts to align policy frameworks. Legal issues around individual staff members contracting with private security companies were discussed. The consensus was that, where possible, organizations should enter into contracts with security companies rather than requesting individual personnel to do so. The group also discussed the mandatory nature of residential security measures and suggested that it be further discussed within the policy review working group.

103. Mr. Farrell highlighted his concern about the mandatory nature of residential security measures, suggesting that a person-centered approach to security should grant individuals more autonomy in making decisions, especially concerning their families. Mr. Polane underscored the potential underestimation of dangers at certain duty stations, suggesting that mandatory measures might be necessary in some cases. He emphasized that individuals, especially those with families at duty stations, may not fully comprehend the security risks they face.

104. Participants debated whether more inputs could be incorporated before the revised documents are promulgated. UNHCR, WFP and IOM had proposed more changes and requested that these be addressed before the documents are considered final. Ms. Dunphy proposed additional minor amendments primarily about language in the residential security measures guidelines. She suggested revisions on page 4 about agency record-keeping and page 21 to broaden "zone wardens" to include agency wardens or security focal points. Additionally, she recommended early lease assessments and included the need to consider guest houses in the guidelines based on input from the medical director's working group. These changes, she noted, were minor and aimed at enhancing clarity and practicality.

105. Mr. Vandamme pointed out that his team had provided feedback on minor changes as early as November, and suggested revisiting and incorporating this input. Using the residential security service checklist as an example, he illustrated how some questions could be confusing due to their format, recommending alterations for consistency and clarity. He emphasized that guidance already exists and there was no immediate urgency to finalize these policies. Mr. Butt supported the idea of a step-by-step approach, expressing his desire for more discussion about residential security measures. He pointed out the real-world impracticality of some current requirements with respect to security guards.

106. Participants agreed that, if minor, these could be considered before the next phase of the review commences, which will take place at the Policy Review Group meetings.

107. Mr. Butt expressed his objection to the use of the term "duty of care" within the UN context, which was relatively undefined. He highlighted that, as a security management network, they

should focus on their specific responsibilities instead of using the general term. Mr. Polane referenced a document that he emailed to the group which defined "duty of care".

108. Mr. Khamidov agreed that the residential security survey needed separate review. The USG supported the notion that the current working group be disbanded.

109. **The IASMN:**
- **Endorsed the working group's proposed changes to the policy and guidance documents contained in the Annexes, with minor feedback from IOM and UNHCR considered for the guidelines;**
- **Requested the residential security measures policy be fully reviewed, including issues around the mandatory nature of these measures, as well as to address additional feedback from other UNSMS organizations in the Policy Review Group;**
- **Agreed to disband the working group.**

Strategic Communications Working Group

110. Ms. Aaina Chopra, UN Women, presented the update from the Security Communications Working Group **(CRP 8).** She shared an update on four topics: Security Week, logo proposals (with 12 options shown), animated video and short clip video. She noted that Security Week was planned for the first week of October, designed for both in-person and online participation with daily events centered around different themes. The supporting communications products would be fully customizable, allowing different organizations to add their own branding. She informed that the group worked on new logo options with designers from ICT and UN ICC, which were open to further modifications based on group feedback. She presented two versions of an animated video, with minor differences in storyline, based on the experience of a UN colleague going on a mission. Ms. Chopra asked for feedback on the preferred version. Finally, she noted that a series of short video clips was planned, with different organizations discussing security topics in line with Security Week. This option dovetailed with an earlier IASMN Steering Group recommendation that less expensive media options be explored. She mentioned the need for a new co-chair for the working group with the retirement of Mr. Alister Wood of IOM.

111. Participants overwhelmingly voiced support for the work accomplished by the group, noting strong appreciation of the flexibility, timing and themes of Security Week. Mr. Jacquand noted the first video had won awards, which further amplified the visibility of the work of the UNSMS. He suggested the sequel video emphasizes the connection between the tasks, activities, and the UN mandate, but advised caution about overstating its impact. Mr. O'Hanlon underscored the video's potential to bridge the gap between security professionals and staff members. He appreciated the idea of UNSMS organizations creating short videos to highlight their own mandates and processes.

112. Of the two videos, the majority of participants expressed a preference for the first version.

113. Mr. Noory raised concerns about the level of communication regarding the UN's life-saving role, suggesting the USG share testimonials on UN TV to highlight this further. He proposed expanding

the Women's Security Discussion Forum led by UNFPA in West Africa during Security Week, as it could offer a platform for sharing experiences and solutions to complex issues. Mr. Skog emphasized the importance of incorporating promotion of the work being done by humanitarian and development organizations into the communication strategy, as it acts as a risk mitigation measure. Mr. Polane offered assistance in amplifying communications related to security management, potentially through staff federations.

114. Ms. Montalvo raised a concern about an image representing the SRM that seemed to suggest a mere "tick of the box" as it depicted a checklist.

115. Several members voiced support for a logo while several others expressed opposition. Ms. Montalvo was not in support of a logo, noting that the HR Network and the budget network also did not have independent logos. Mr. O'Hanlon also voiced his reservations about the need for a new logo, suggesting more consideration is needed before deciding. Mr. Bermudez shared concerns regarding the use of a logo, suggesting the utilization of the UN logo instead.

116. Ms. Dunphy suggested the logo would help create a shared responsibility and unity within the UNSMS. She suggested a preference for the third logo option, which has a simple, person-centered approach and does not include Sustainable Development Goals. Mr. Farrell and Ms. Poussin also supported the third option, noting its simplicity and ability to convey unity under the UNSMS. Mr. Marshall noted he did not have a preference on whether to have a logo, but expressed that he preferred option 8 among the designes presented. Mr. Chase endorsed the use of visual aids like videos and logos, citing evidence that people are less inclined to read text. He advised incorporating the acronym "UNSMS" into the logo for effective branding.

117. Mr. Farrell voiced support for the video initiative and agreed that concentrating on staff as the primary audience was sensible. He recommended referring to "TRIP" as "security clearance" in the video to maintain relevance should the system's name change in the future. He expressed approval of the Security Week initiative and mentioned ongoing collaboration with regional security advisors to plan events globally during this period.

118. Mr. Marshall commented on the matter of financing for a video, noting that while his organization was one of three committed to contributing, he thought all members should have the opportunity to contribute. He suggested that a request for funds should be extended to the whole group, not only those three that had initially agreed to provide support.

119. Regarding Security Week, Mr. Skog shared that similar initiatives have been conducted in Kenya in the past, such as an exhibition in 2018. Current plans are in place to conduct similar activities in the third quarter and, if possible, align these with Security Week. He also mentioned inviting agencies to participate in these events.

120. Mr. Vandamme commended the great work of the working group and confirmed their readiness to contribute $10,000 towards the production of the new video and asked for additional contributions to cover the remaining $27,000. Mr. Sobron advocated for all organizations to contribute to demonstrate collective commitment.

121. Mr. Skog indicated that his organization's commitment to funding a video was contingent on the absence of branding from other UNSMS organizations in the video. He emphasized that it would be challenging to justify within his organization a video branded by another entity. Mr. Chase commended the idea of producing video content without strong individual branding, as it allows different entities to utilize the material effectively.

122. Mr. Telenta proposed a practical suggestion for the planned Security Week activities, suggesting a single collection point for all global activities, especially to assist smaller UNSMS organizations. Ms. Poussin suggested that field level activities for the event be coordinated or discussed through the Security Cell or a similar mechanism.

123. Ms. Chopra clarified points about the proposed logos, saying they had all been cleared with DGC. She informed the group of a shared database for all of the products they have created. She confirmed that the logos for the video would be as per the agreement of the group.

124. The USG summarized the discussion, noting general agreement and flexibility regarding Security Week and the call for UNSMS members to participate. He suggested sharing information about activities through the working group. While the logo had faced some objections, he noted that the majority valued the unity it represented. The USG noted there seemed to be agreement on the production of the proposed video sequence, but highlighted funding as a key issue and requested that more organizations consider contributing. He suggested the need for more outward-facing products that could improve understanding around the role of the UN among donors and beneficiaries.

125. Ms. Chopra addressed the funding requirements. For Security Week, no financial contributions were necessary, only resources and time to help organize events. However, the animated video involved a cost quoted at €38,000. Efforts were underway to negotiate the price and agencies had already volunteered to fund the video, but additional contributions were welcomed. Ms. Chopra clarified that the focus of the working group was mainly on internal positive messaging about security. While they did consider some external aspects, the group decided to maintain a more concise, internal focus for the first Security Week to ensure its success. However, she agreed they could explore extending some elements externally if desired.

126. Mr. O'Hanlon acknowledged the extensive workload and time investment of the working group, suggesting a new co-chair be appointed to replace Ms. Alister Wood of IOM. UNOCT volunteered to co-chair the Security Communications Working Group.

127. **The IASMN:**
   - **Recognized the work completed to date;**
   - **Endorsed the plans for Security Week, encouraging members to organize events in accordance with the guidance and, to the extent possible, in a coordinated manner (with a plan of activities to be compiled by Security Communications Working Group);**
   - **Requested more inputs and further engagement on the UNSMS logo (including a survey);**
   - **Endorsed the plans for the sequel video on the UNSMS, expressing a preference for the first sequence, and the short video clips;**

- **Requested members to consider a financial contribution for the animated video;**
- **Requested the working group to consider outward-facing products in the future, with member state focus;**
- **Approved UNOCT as incoming co-chair of the working group, replacing IOM.**

Hostage Incident Management

128. Ms. Poussin presented an update on Hostage Incident Management (HIM) **(CRP 9)**. She mentioned that in recent months, UNDSS, alongside UNICEF and other UN organizations, conducted three HIM trainings, which was most recently held in Bangkok and Nairobi and trained over 60 participants. Mr Farrell noted the trainings received very positive feedback. He noted that the training sessions had undergone slight adjustments based on feedback, such as incorporating more theoretical knowledge into webinars prior to practical sessions. The first refresher training for graduates of HIM version 3 from 2019 was also conducted, which more focused on proportionate response, as there hadn't been sufficient discussion on this topic during the initial training. Finally, he mentioned ongoing training initiatives, including a Critical Incident Stress Management Section (CISMS) workshop in Brindisi where the Expert Advisory Group was assisting with briefings for stress counsellors who may fulfil the family liaison and support function in a hostage case.

129. Ms. Poussin emphasized the need for refresher courses and highlighted plans to involve mentors, trainers, and alumni in future trainings. The strategy for development included maintaining an updated expert list, ensuring trained staff can apply their knowledge, and developing awareness on HIM within and outside the UNSMS. The plan also aimed at updating guidelines and best practices, maintaining statistics, and partnering with external entities. She asked for support for the strategy's continued development and implementation. Mr. Farrell also requested support to amend the Expert Advisory Group's ToRs to have the group chair be Deputy Director, DRO (rather than Director, DRO).

130. Mr. O'Hanlon expressed concern about lacking feedback from the recipients of HIM services. He highlighted the need for better communication, particularly when dealing with high-stakes cases, including receipt of final reports and lessons learned from past incidents. He also called for clarification regarding the responsibilities of different entities involved in HIM. Mr. Dunne agreed that focal points of organizations whose personnel were involved in HIM cases needed to be kept informed, as they are accountable to their Executive Directors.

131. Ms. Montalvo raised concerns about the evaluation of the training's impact on participants, highlighting the need for clear objectives and practical examples to validate the effectiveness of the training.

132. Ms. Dunphy echoed the need for feedback within each organization, citing her own internal structures that are in place during HIM situations. She discussed the role of the advisory group in integrating lessons learned into the process and upcoming guidelines.

133. Mr. Baker underscored the importance of learning from failures, suggesting this should be incorporated in the training, and noted he would like to see the statistics on cases where proportionate response had been used. As a security focal point who had undergone HIM version 3 and refresher training, he commended the training and recommended participating in the training as a means to better understand it.

134. Mr. Skog raised concerns about follow-up and refresher training, noting that in the past there was a lack of such training after the initial sessions. He questioned whether there was a plan to invest resources in all previous trainees or if investment would be more selective.

135. Mr. Noory emphasized the continuous learning required in this field, particularly with dynamic technological factors, like the use of social media for intimidation during hostage situations. He expressed support for the approach proposed by DRO and asked how individuals who had received previous versions of the training would be kept up-to-date.

136. Mr. O'Hanlon highlighted the need for more than one person in his team to be trained to ensure resilience within the organization and called for a greater number of courses. He noted the need for clarity about the roles trainees could assume after the training.

137. Ms. Poussin acknowledged there were some gaps in the training and explained their strategy for improvement, which includes capacity-building, collaboration, and developing recognized experts. She stated that trainees were evaluated during the course and afterwards, and the evaluation could be shared with their organization on a case-by-case basis.

138. Mr. Farrell recognized the progress made over the last five years in rebuilding the training programme and called for more transparency around hostage cases. He suggested that stakeholder management is a key aspect of training. He also clarified that not everyone trained would become a team leader, and that the role they played would depend on their strengths and comfort level. Lastly, he emphasized that the latest version of HIM training was significantly different from previous versions and required retraining, but suggested that briefings and other forms of learning could also be beneficial.

139. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of progress;**
   - **Requested proper HIM policy implementation, especially vis-à-vis stakeholder management;**
   - **Supported the strategy for the development and expansion of the UNSMS HIM response quality and capacity;**
   - **Agreed that UNDSS would share HIM training reports.**

SRM/SSIRS Working Group
140. Mr. Farrell and Mr. Butt presented on the two aspects of the SRM/SSIRS Working Group **(CRP 10)**. Mr. Farrell discussed the progress on comprehension-building through webinars and other resources, including a video produced with UNICEF titled "What Is Risk". He mentioned the focus of the training on peer review and validity checks and highlighted the new "validity check report"

in UNSMIN for each SRM Area, which was designed as a detailed summary of all event descriptions and their associated assessments to allow for validity checks and help improve SRMs. Mr. Farrell highlighted the progress made on defining the purpose of collecting data, creating data, and detailing the outputs. He acknowledged that the team led by Ms. Roberta Belli, DRO, had made considerable progress and established a working model for the UNDSS dashboard. He noted that further work was needed to determine what UNSMS organizations needed from the information output.

141. Mr. Butt then discussed the completed incident and weapon taxonomies and the nearly completed impact taxonomy. He suggested that the group continue to advise on data collection and policy guidance, proposing that they support Ms. Belli's team in leading the rest of the work. Ms. Poussin highlighted the revival of an online training on UNSMIN for DSS security professionals and hoped for the continuation of their collaboration.

142. Ms. Montalvo supported the group's work, advocating for the focus not to solely be on comprehension-building but to also include an emphasis on flexibility, the effective use of data and information, and a stronger mechanism to prevent biases. Mr. Baker suggested a need for further comprehension-building among security decision-makers, expressing concern over some security decisions made at the SMT level.

143. Mr. Vandamme expressed the importance of continued discussions on the SRM and comprehension. He suggested the working group also consider a discussion on the mandatory nature of the SRM measures. He further enquired whether road safety incidents were included in the SSIRS taxonomy.

144. Ms. Poussin mentioned that her team was working on a comprehension strategy to improve understanding of the SRM among security professionals. They also aimed to examine the quality of the SRMs and were considering the implementation of a peer review system.

145. Mr. Butt confirmed that safety incidents were included in their taxonomy. He suggested that the SRM group could advise and support areas where there are concerns about SRMs, either due to over- or under-assessment of risk.

146. Mr. Farrell highlighted the importance of oversight in achieving better SRMs, suggesting the need for a strategy to ensure proper authoritative oversight without micromanaging the field or disrupting the decentralization process. He shared a successful case study of coordination between different individuals and groups, recommending to build on such experiences for better SRM outcomes.

147. Mr. Sharif expressed concern about the practicality of involving DRO desks in SRM preparations in situations with multiple countries or security areas. However, he suggested this involvement could be beneficial for areas facing significant issues. He stressed the need to unify the understanding of the practice to improve the drafting and building of SRMs in different security areas.

148. The USG acknowledged the importance of ensuring quality SRMs in specific countries, indicating that smaller groups had been brought onboard to assist the field and the P/C/SA's. However, he asserted that intervention should start with representatives who are part of the security cell developing the SRMs, as they have a better understanding of the environment and risk mitigation measures. He also emphasized that the working group's role was to review SRM quality from an operational perspective, but collaborative consultation could be beneficial when issues arise.

149. Ms. Dunphy expressed her appreciation for the proposal to have the security cell more actively involved in the process. She highlighted that discussions throughout the process were often insufficient, leading to pushback at the SMT.

150. Mr. Farrell mentioned that the current system wasn't working effectively in many places, with bottlenecks and difficulties in improving the SRMs, and suggested the opportunity for comprehension-building through a case study could be beneficial.

151. The USG expressed openness to engagement with DRO to improve the quality of SRMs, particularly in places like Ukraine where challenges have been flagged, but noted that the desks' work on SRMs was high-quality. He agreed that case studies could be beneficial.

152. Mr. Butt raised concerns about the inability to delve into specific issues during the limited time of weekly operational IASMN meetings. He suggested setting aside time slots to better discuss their specific concerns and provide support, as well as address recurring issues in specific countries, noting that the weekly meetings may not be the most appropriate space to address SRM details. Ms. Poussin committed to follow up with the team on this issue.

153. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of the progress of the working group;**
   - **Supported the way forward proposed by the working group;**
   - **Requested that the SSIRS work within the group continues on two items: the impact taxonomy and the agency output needs, including a dashboard, after which members will support DRO with advice/support on SSIRS policy, guidance, systems and tools and on any process issue that would allow for better use of SSIRS, including data validation, oversight, peer review, and visualization.**

HR Strategy Working Group

154. Ms. Renu Bhatia, Executive Office/UNDSS, presented an update on the progress of the HR Strategy Working Group **(CRP 11)**, which has met twice since the last IASMN. She noted that the working group has sent out a survey to IASMN members and the CEB HR community on the common roster. Ms. Bhatia highlighted that 13 IASMN members responded to the survey, including nine members who expressed interest in participating in the common roster and engaging with their respective HR units. She added that some of the organizations that expressed interest in the common roster did not commit to providing resources, including funding, people, capacity or expertise. Ms. Bhatia informed that the working group has expressed interest in

moving forward with the common roster for the P3 level and that there is an IASMN approved profile that is broad enough to attract diversity. She also explained that the working group is providing inputs to the ToR's for the P4 and P5 levels, which use the same profile as the generic UNDSS P4/P5 job opening. She mentioned that the working group suggested liaising with the Gender Working Group to assess possible commonalities between the two groups. Ms. Bhatia thanked WFP for their offer to give a presentation on their workforce planning exercise. According to Ms. Bhatia, another item discussed in the working group is the UNDSS consultant who is preparing a report on strategic workforce planning.

155. Mr. Noory, as co-chair, recalled the historical evolution of the working group and the priorities that were identified in the Steering Group meeting in The Hague and later endorsed at the IASMN. He explained that, after the initial momentum, interest in a common roster had declined because of the ongoing initiative of the shared roster . The interest of nine IASMN organizations to join the roster can revive the momentum and stimulate feedback on the P4 and P5 job descriptions. Mr. Noory also asked for suggestions on moving forward with the workforce from peacekeeping missions that are winding down.

156. Ms. Montalvo expressed support for the way forward proposed in the CRP and informed that WFP will hold a briefing on strategic workforce planning at the end of June 2023. She also asked whether UNDSS would align and compare the HR job profiles with the Results Chain activities. The USG UNDSS responded by clarifying that the Results Chain focuses on activities, while the job opening focuses on competencies. Still, he noted that the Results Chain will be reflected on the job description.

157. Ms. Bhatia proposed that each organization working on building the common roster could consider all candidates as internal to facilitate mobility. Ms. Dunphy asked whether considering only internal candidates would not limit the purpose of the roster, as it would act as a rotation mechanism, rather than identifying new talent. Mr. Polane agreed with Ms. Dunphy and noted that member states would not favour preferential treatment applied to internal candidates. He also highlighted that field personnel from peacekeeping missions that are downsizing or closing should be included in the roster if they meet the requirements. Ms. Bhatia agreed that focusing only on internal candidates could present a barrier, and that HR was looking at an approach to address this issue.

158. Mr. Noory explained that the working group could accommodate changes to the P3 ToR's, but the timeframe is short. Entities wishing to do so need to include their inputs in track changes so that they can be addressed in the working group if they are substantive enough. He also noted that the gender representation has not yet been properly addressed. The USG added that it would also be important to consider the experience of the UNDSS Generic Job Openings (GJO) campaign in attracting diversity.

159. Mr. Noaman asked whether there would be a harmonization or standardization of P4 positions regardless of the different titles a P4 might have in different organizations. Ms. Bhatia confirmed that the aim was to harmonize the job profiles, but that the organization could still add specificities.

160. Mr. O'Hanlon mentioned that his organization provided inputs to the ToR's to ensure they were more inclusive, but these were not accepted. He asked what the working group had done to address diversity issues in the ToR's. Ms. Bhatia informed that the group is committed to working with the Gender Working Group to achieve better results. She suggested that IASMN members give ideas to the working group on what more can be done.

161. **The IASMN:**
    - **Took note of the progress made;**
    - **Confirmed that the working group may take the next steps to develop a common roster for the nine entities that have indicated interest in participating;**
    - **Requested active engagement from members, including from their HR colleagues, and for UNDSS to share best practice on recruitment;**
    - **Requested the HRSWG to explore new elements around diversity in the work on rosters.**

Budget Update

162. Ms. Bhatia provided an update on the budget and expenditures **(CRP 12)**. She noted that the Finance Budget Network (FBN) ceiling for 2023 was lower than projected, with an overexpenditure for 2022 of $1 million. However, she pointed out that a $7 million funding from USAID helped. For 2023, Ms. Bhatia explained that UNDSS made a conservative expenditure projection for Sudan. She mentioned that a proposal is out for voluntary contributions and in the case that there is funding, the projections are likely to change. Ms. Bhatia emphasized that the unpredictability of crises and unknown factors on the operational side may also impact projections. She highlighted that UNDSS is seeking ways to reduce expenditures, citing as an example that regional workshops are being organized virtually. The USG UNDSS added that when crises hit (e.g., Sudan) and spill over to other countries (e.g., Chad), it paints a grim scenario for the entire region. He underscored that he is engaging with member states in light of the humanitarian appeal for Sudan, noting that humanitarian aid cannot move forward without security support.

163. Mr. Simon Butt, OCHA, stated that UNDSS does not have the capacity to fully support humanitarian operations. He suggested building the argument on why there is need for increased funding for UNDSS for the next year. He indicated that the CRP does not support this idea as it shows that there are no staff in many field locations, and more at HQ than indicated in the JFA. He suggested taking a global look at UNDSS's responsibilities and deployment of workforce to identify potential gaps, as indicated in point 5 of the Sudan lessons learned. Mr. Butt suggested conducting a JFA audit to explain what the problem is. The USG added that UNDSS needs more flexibility to respond to crises, hence the need for more funding. He also explained that the new ORU will be responsible for mapping resources, capabilities and country plans, which will help review capacity and identify potential gaps. Ms. Bhatia clarified that the JFA Budget was recently audited by the Board of Auditors and there were no negative recommendations, which clearly shows that the funds are spent as planned and approved by the General Assembly.

164. Mr. Baker pointed out that more resources are needed for priority countries and that some resources are sitting in low-risk countries. The USG agreed and mentioned that the department plans to move posts around and eliminate those that have been vacant for years.

165. Mr. O'Hanlon underscored that current donor appetite is low, which makes reaching out to them challenging in the current momentum where others may be negatively affected by scarce and proposed to have a discussion on organizations that have requested to join UNSMS at the next IASMN. He suggested engaging all IASMN members to consider whether more members should join the UNSMS and the potential impacts. UNDP, WFP and UNRWA disagreed with this suggestion and the USG pointed out that this would need to be discussed in the Steering Group first. The USG also clarified that by investing in security, donors enable the delivery of aid to beneficiaries.

166. Mr. Skog appreciated UNDSS's efforts to reduce expenditures, took note of the update and requested that UNDSS identify possible savings to ensure that the total expenditure is within the budget ceiling approved by the FBN. Mr. Skog asked if there will be a working group to discuss the possibility of having a reserve fund to respond to emergencies. The USG responded that such an initiative exists, but the establishment of the working group is still pending.

167. Mr. Marshall asked if there are thoughts on outsourcing some of the security work to other UN entities to gain more flexibility. Ms. Bhatia informed that the UN Secretariat is participating in a UN System-wide Common Back-Office initiative, which will initially be rolled-out to 50 countries. Additional details from the respective offices on the list of local services at the country level have been requested.

168. **The IASMN:**
   - **Took note of the update.**

Policy Update

169. Ms. Suchada Kulawat, UNDSS/SPPU, briefed on the draft policy update on Chapter 4, Section D: Risk Avoidance: Alternate Work Modalities, Personnel and Family Restrictions (Relocation and Evacuation), to be considered for endorsement by the IASMN while the group was developing the guidelines for this policy. She noted that the members of the Policy Review Group had agreed on the consensus draft policy for submission to the IASMN. She indicated that once the IASMN approved the draft policy , it could form the basis for the finalization of the guidelines to accompany the policy. Ms. Pietralik noted that the draft on the Warden guidelines was still under development. Moreover, she noted that updates to the DO handbook should be ready soon.

170. Mr. Polane commented on the designation of duty stations. He noted that some duty stations under the D or E classifications, which are not designated as "non-family duty stations", may still be unsuitable for families and dependents for safety reasons. He suggested that a discussion on the parameters of the designation of duty stations ought to take place. The USG noted that the issue on the designation of duty stations was beyond the scope of the IASMN.

171. Mr. Farrell suggested that a statement be attached to the IASMN report to the HLCM, recommending a renewed discussion at the level of the ICSC on the matter of designation of famil/non-family duty station status to find a more nuance decision-making framework that wasn't solely linked to the UNSMS establishment of Family Restrictions. Ms. Montalvo expressed support for the suggestion made by Mr. Farrell.

172. Mr. Butt emphasized that the policy update for endorsement deals with these issues under the terminology of "family restrictions," as well as the issue of non-family/family duty stations, falls under the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), not the IASMN.

173. Mr. Farrell noted that the ICSC determination of non-family/family duty stations is directly linked to family restrictions produced by the IASMN. He suggested that the IASMN, through the HLCM, ask the ICSC to look at other pertinent qualities rather than relying on family restrictions. Mr. Skog expressed support for this suggestion.

174. Ms. Montalvo suggested that the working group work simultaneously on TRIP and guidelines of locally recruited personnel rather than in sequence. Mr. Butt suggested that working simultaneously on the issues would not be beneficial in terms of quality of output or time saved.

175. Mr. Farrell endorsed the proposal to work on guidelines and policy in parallel as guidelines are meant to require minimal oversight. He brought up the issue of evacuation of local staff and questioned whether it was within the remit of the IASMN. On this note, USG UNDSS noted that while relocation and evacuation is beyond the IASMN, there may be policies around the topic that are restrictive and should be reviewed.

176. Mr. Noaman commented that the approach on the relocation and evacuation of local personnel is problematic, as seen in Sudan. Mr. Noory also welcomed the proposal, especially in light of the lessons learned from Afghanistan and Sudan. The USG pointed to the recommendations or comments in the lessons learned exercise from Afghanistan as a starting point for reviewing the policy.

177. Mr. Chase noted two problems that arise with relocation: evacuation destination and lack of travel documents.

178. Mr. Farrell suggested that the issue of relocation and evacuation be looked at after the Sudan lessons learned process was finalized. Mr. Skog stressed the importance of reviewing policies in a systematic manner, noting he was in support of reviewing the approach on residential security measures.

179. Ms. Kulawat briefed on the Policy Review Group and noted that there are no official terms of reference for the group. She suggested that the working group could discuss the issues of travel security clearance and locally recruited personnel after they finalize the guidelines for the policy update on Risk Avoidance. The USG endorsed the idea of bringing the policies under consideration up in the Policy Review Group. He further recommended that a terms of reference for the working group be developed. Ms. Montalvo expressed support for the statement of the USG.

180. Mr. Butt suggested that the Policy Review Group should focus on the guidelines and travel security clearance until the next IASMN meeting.

181. Ms. Poussin proposed sending a survey to the IASMN members to prioritize which policies should be reviewed. Mr. Farrell noted that, after the guidelines on Risk Avoidance are finalized, the group should commence work on the policy on security clearance (SPM Chapter 5 Section A) as a priority. He put forward that the Policy Review Group should make a recommendation on which policies to prioritize. ICC supported the suggestion.

182. The IASMN:
- **Endorsed the policy "Risk Avoidance: Alternate Work Modalities, Personnel and Family Restrictions (Relocation and Evacuation)";**
- **Took note of the ongoing work on the draft guidelines on Risk Avoidance;**
- **Requested the Policy Review Group to come up with considerations on prioritizing policies and other documents for review with recommendations to the Steering Group.**

Engagement with Non-UNSMS Organizations; Security Symposium

183. Ms. Kulawat updated on engagement with non-UNSMS organizations and the Security Symposium **(CRP 14)**. She recalled that 14 organizations have expressed interest in joining the UNSMS, either as a member or as an observer. She noted that the Symposium has three objectives. Firstly, to promote engagement with relevant stakeholders. Secondly, to promote collaboration on security risk management with those organizations which work towards achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Lastly, to exchange information and enhance dialogue with organizations that wish to collaborate on security matters with the UNSMS. She noted that the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank had offered to host the Symposium in 2024 in Beijing.

184. Ms. Dunphy commented on the Symposium, noting that most of the attendees were IASMN members, and querying how the information gathered during the session would be used to support UNSMS policies and practises. She expressed concern over the potential implications of admitting additional non-UN members due to the potential expectations from organizatons that may want to now join, based on the engagement, while recognizing that that engagement was very much required.

185. Mr. Farrell stated that the goal of the Symposiums was not sufficiently clear. He suggested that the IASMN needs to be careful to not raise expectations or send mixed messages communicating with organizations that wish to join the UNSMS, so they do see the Symposium as a first step for UNSMS membership. Mr. O'Hanlon agreed with the point made by Mr. Farrell and expressed concern that the Symposium produced no tangible outcomes to the benefit of the UN. He suggested that a discussion on the benefits and the issues of the Symposium take place.

186. Mr. Sobron stressed that engagement with other entities is a positive but expressed appreciation for the observation that it is essential to distinguish between membership and collaboration for non-UN entities.

187. Mr. Skog suggested that the UNSMS has a responsibility towards UN staff members and expressed concern over expanding the UNSMS to include more non-UN entities.

188. Mr. Chase responding by noting that despite the issues that were brought up, the Symposium serves as a good method of contact-building. Ms. Poussin and Mr. Butt concurred that the Symposium is an effective instrument of collaboration with entities outside the UN. Mr. Butt expressed skepticism around the inclusion of outside entities into the UNSMS.

189. Mr. Farrell reiterated that while the Symposium is a good idea on paper, the lack of clarity around the potential for membership produced a dissatisfactory outcome at the Symposium. He suggested that the IASMN need to be clearer that the Symposium is an instrument of exchange and collaboration, not a matter of membership in the UNSMS. Mr. Baker agreed that outside entities should not be granted membership.

190. Mr. Noory proposed that the issue of membership could not be pushed away, and it warranted an analysis of the impact of accommodating outside organizations by allowing them to join the UNSMS.

191. Ms. Poussin suggested that the Symposium could be opened up to other entities, INGOs or private sector entities, who would be interested. Mr. Butt and Mr. Vandamme expressed appreciation for the proposal. UNHCR agreed and added that the Symposium could be widened to include more UNSMS security personnel. Mr. Farrell expressed support for the proposal.

192. Ms. Kulawat reaffirmed the support for expanding the Symposium to a wider audience. She noted that a discussion around membership of the UNSMS should take place within the IASMN Steering Group.

193. The USG presented two takeaways from the discussion. Firstly, he noted that the intent for the Synopsium when it was created three years ago was to engage with organizations, collaborate, and share information. He raised the point that the Symposium did not intend to raise expectations of organizations to become members of the UNSMS. He suggested a survey to those who participated in the Symposium and reiterated the value of engaging with people who operate within the security landscape with different mandates than that of the UNSMS. He welcomed bringing the discussion around membership to the steering group to be discussed in a more formalized and informed manner.

194. The IASMN:
- **Took note of the updates on the Security Symposium and requested that future Symposiums consider having broader participation, including broader UN, INGOs and private sector engagement;**
- **Requested that the issue of possible new UNSMS membership be discussed at the next Steering Group meeting, in advance of the next full IASMN session, with a CRP to be prepared by SPPU.**

Fire Safety

195. The USG UNDSS began the session by noting it was meant to confirm whether the draft fire policy contained in **CRP 15** was being developed in line with the expectations and for IASMN to provide feedback on the draft policy.

196. Mr. Robin Stenhouse, UNDSS/DPSS, briefed on the draft policy. He noted that the policy was drafted to allow for a flexible, structured, and adaptable process for each location and each member of the IASMN. He asked the IASMN for feedback on the draft policy.

197. Mr. O'Hanlon expressed approval for the draft policy and noted that it was well on the way to be finalized.

198. Ms. Dunphy expressed overall contentment with the policy but suggested that the policy should outline what the responsibilities of the UNSMS organizations are more clearly and delegate less responsibility to security professionals who do not have the accountability or authority particularly as there are many offices who do not have the presence of a security officer She queried if the Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) networks had been consulted. Lastly, she indicated that the Overlap/Redundancy of Fire Risk Management Functions section of the draft policy may needed to be expanded and indicated that comments will be provided.

199. Mr. Butt welcomed the draft policy but expressed concern that the policy put too much responsibility on the UNSMS security professionals.

200. Mr. Skog supported the comments from UNHCR and commented on a need for training of security professionals. In reference to the paragraph on the delegation of fire safety responsibilities, he noted that delegation of such to Agency Security Professionals should be done by their respective senior management, and not by the DO.

201. Mr. Noory endorsed the statement of the UNHCR and welcomed the draft policy but with a plea for more consideration of far remote duty stations as opposed to well-resourced headquarters.

202. Mr. Baker shared the concern of other IASMN members that there was too much emphasis on security professionals and requested more emphasis on the role of UNSMS personnel, otherwise security professionals would not be able to manage the tasks. Ms. Poussin echoed the sentiment of lessened focus on the security professionals.

203. Mr. Noaman noted that issues of fire safety may arise particularly in countries with limited capacity of local authorities or without a safety officer specialized in fire safety.

204. Mr. Stenhouse assured Ms. Dunphy Health OHS had a significant role in the input for the draft policy. He noted that the reason for the clear responsibility on security professionals, rests on the fact that they have a fundamental and functional role in the physical security of UN premises. He highlighted that the draft policy is close to being implementable, flexible, and effective.

205. The USG and Mr. Stenhouse confirmed that the working group had gained direction for the draft policy moving forward.

206. The IASMN:

- **Took note of progress and committed to provide further inputs for consideration of the Fire Policy Working Group.**

Training Update

207. Mr. Benjamin Owusu-Firempong, TDS/UNDSS, provided an update on the training needs analysis (TNA) **(CRP 16).** He pointed out that the TNA has been taking longer than expected due to a back-and-forth between the Secretariat and the procurement office since March 2023. He added that the budget for the hiring of a vendor/company (which is preferable to the hiring of an individual consultant) was deemed too low. UNDSS was advised by the procurement office to increase the budget from $70,000 to $100,000-150,000. However, UNDSS decided to stick to the original budget and submit an updated statement of work and methodology to seek a smaller company to undertake the work.

208. Ms. Montalvo underscored that WFP hoped to offer TNA services, but this was not possible. She agreed that a company is indeed better placed to undertake such an analysis with a multidisciplinary approach and suggested consulting with the HR network as they systematically undertake these assessments and might be well placed to suggest vendors within the established budget.

209. Ms. Bhatia clarified that there is no delay on the part of UNDSS but on the part of the procurement office. She asked IASMN members to share suggestions of vendors/companies who can undertake this assessment. Mr. Owusu-Firempong added that if UNSMS organizations have existing contracts with vendors that might be a good fit, it would be worth exploring those options.

210. Mr. Baker stated that it would be important for IASMN members to see the revised statement of work. In response, Mr. Owusu-Firempong clarified that the ToR's have not changed. Instead, the procurement office had requested an internal document with more details to search for smaller companies that could undertake the task within the established budget. The USG and Ms. Bhatia will have a follow-up discussion on the $70,000 budget (which was determined based on a TNA from 2015/16).

211. Mr. Vandamme suggested that a more comprehensive update on training be provided at the next IASMN, including topics such as the Security Certification Programme – Refocused (SCP-R) update, evaluation of the first responders' training and the Organization Country Security Focal Point (OCSFP) online training. Mr. Owusu-Firempong provided an update on other training issues. He briefed that he met with the first responders' working group and was informed that Individual First Aid Kit (IFAK) trainers have requested to increase the duration of the IFAK to one full day. He added that if this proposal moves forward, it will need to be discussed by the Standing Committee on Learning and Training (SCOLT)/IASMN. Mr. Owusu-Firempong highlighted that the Security Certification Programme (SCP) is moving according to schedule and four modules will be launched online on 1 July 2023, while the two remaining online modules will follow after pilot testing is completed. He clarified that all online SCP modules will be launched before the in-

person module. Further, Mr. Owusu-Firempong added that the outline of the CSFP was shared with the SCOLT for feedback.

212. Mr. Noory asked whether the Emergency Trauma Bag (ETB) training had been replaced by the IFAK and Mr. Owusu-Firempong clarified that both are still running as separate courses. Mr. Noory advised that not all SCP modules should be offered completely online and should have an in-person component. Mr. Dunne supported this point. The USG UNDSS and Mr. Owusu-Firempong confirmed that the SCP will have in-person modules by 2024. Further, Mr. Noory mentioned that UNFPA is in the final stages of finalizing a CSFP training in a hybrid format with the staff college.

213. Mr. O'Hanlon noted that the Training and Development Section (TDS) did not attend the last SCOLT meeting, which impeded the discussion of topics such as the Safe and Secure Approaches in Field Environments (SSAFE) SMOM. Mr. Owusu-Firempong confirmed that TDS would attend the next SCOLT meeting.

214. Mr. Baker informed that UNRWA would like to remain a part of the SCOLT. He also suggested that the budget used for ETB training in low-risk locations could be redirected to other trainings, such as the IFAK.

215. The IASMN:
- **Took note of the progress made in the implementation of UNSMS Training Needs Analysis;**
- **Requested a more comprehensive update from TDS and SCOLT in the next IASMN full session.**

Close of Session

Steering Group Membership

216. Mr. Butt noted that he felt the Steering Group had expanded from its original purpose, pointing out that its function was to review products for presentation to the IASMN, not to discuss the issues themselves. Mr. Butt suggested that the Steering Group should focus on preparing products for the IASMN and urged members to consider its size and ensure it remained effective by maintaining its original function.

217. The USG UNDSS expressed that the Steering Group should ensure that topics brought to the IASMN are well-prepared and ready for discussion. He noted that many topics in the current session were presented merely for informational purposes, which may not be the most efficient use of members' time. He then refocused on the role of the steering group and its impact on shaping the agenda when the group meets.

218. UNODC requested to be part of the mailing list for the weekly operational IASMN meetings.

219. The IASMN:
- **Took note of OHCHR's proposal to join the Steering Group and agreed a message on membership would be circulated to give other UNSMS organizations a chance to express interest.**

IASMN Reporting

220. Mr. O'Hanlon suggested a change in the approach to reporting on IASMN meetings. He reflected on how after each meeting, the Secretariat needs to prepare a report and then gather feedback from participants to ensure accuracy. Mr. O'Hanlon proposed leveraging advanced AI transcription services to create an exact record of what is said in these meetings, which would reduce the Secretariat's work, simplify the review process for the participants, and avoid any potential misunderstandings that could arise from missing small but significant details in the report.

221. Several members disagreed with the proposal, noting that they found the current format helpful. Mr. Baker expressed concerns that creating detailed transcriptions would lead to excessively lengthy reports, which could deter senior managers from reading them.

222. Ms. Dunphy noted that a full transcription of the meeting could result in an overly lengthy document, potentially spanning 60 to 70 pages, which she deemed unhelpful. She expressed appreciation for the Secretariat's efforts to produce a manageable summary document, emphasizing the importance of everyone's agreement on key recommendations to shape future work.

223. Mr. Skog noted that UNDP had tried a similar approach but that it had led to confusing and inaccurate minutes. He expressed doubts about the accuracy of a full transcript and was concerned that a verbatim record might inhibit free and frank discussions in future meetings.

224. Mr. Noory cited concerns about the evolving nature of AI and issues of confidentiality, and emphasized the importance of focusing on recommendations and suggested reviewing them while they are still fresh in everyone's minds. He also proposed optimizing the process by reducing the number of pages and focusing more on the recommendations, much like the HLCM reports.

225. Ms. Poussin emphasized the necessity of providing digestible reports to the HLCM and other bodies. She noted that the availability of recordings could help resolve any issues with content reflection efficiently.

226. Mr. Farrell noted the value of the report capturing the most crucial issues, stating that a verbatim transcript is not necessary. He commended the quality of the reports over the past years and mentioned the receptiveness to feedback and changes. He underlined the importance of focusing on substantial discussions and excluding tangents or mistakes, and asserted that the reports accurately reflected the meetings' content.

227. Ms. Kulawat highlighted the importance of input into the reporting process, encouraging IASMN members to address any omissions or inaccuracies. She highlighted that SPPU team is open to any clarifications or nuances that stakeholders might want to add. She confirmed that while the team uses the recording for reference, they also respect that what is said in the room may not always be shareable outside due to differences in perception and language use.

Future IASMN Meetings

228. The USG UNDSS noted that WTO offered to host the next IASMN meeting in Madrid, Spain, during the week of 13 to 15 February. However, he also raised a concern about the previous agreement to alternate meetings between New York and field locations each February or winter. Since that agreement, the HLCM has issued guidance contrary to this plan, advising all its networks to have only one in-person meeting annually. Considering the group's accountability to the HLCM, the USG sought feedback on this new guidance and its implications for their meeting plans.

229. Mr. Butt agreed that his organization had also set limits on their carbon footprint, meaning that he would only be able to attend one in-person meeting per year, and he therefore agreed with the proposal.

230. Mr. Baker acknowledged the importance of reducing costs and the carbon footprint but also highlighted the value of in-person interactions that took place twice a year with colleagues. He argued that these meetings were crucial, not just for formal discussions but also for side conversations during breaks. He also recalled a survey, which suggested continuing current meeting practices, and questioned the benefit of hosting a meeting in Madrid rather than a field operation location.

231. Mr. Farrell stressed the importance of in-person collaborations to maintain the network's robustness. He supported a hybrid model to accommodate those concerned about their carbon footprint, pointing out that the HLCM's recommendation was not a directive.

232. Mr. Vandamme supported the points made by his colleagues, citing that his personal experience at the meeting allowed him to solve several issues through one-on-one conversations during breaks. He emphasized the importance of face-to-face interaction in fostering trust and collaboration and preventing misunderstandings. He felt a three-day in-person meeting could replace multiple virtual ones. He also referenced the difficulties experienced during COVID-19 with primarily virtual communication and suggested keeping the meetings primarily in-person.

233. Ms. Poussin expressed appreciation for in-person meetings but emphasized the need to respect guidelines from the HLCM. She underscored the potential effectiveness of virtual meetings, citing financial, environmental, and time management reasons. She proposed shared hosting responsibilities for the annual meetings and separated field-related visits from decisions about meeting formats.

234. Mr. Skog acknowledged the focus on carbon footprint reduction in the UNDP, but noted that some functions required travel. He pointed out that despite overall efforts to reduce travel, some sectors had seen increased travel due to necessity. He highlighted the significance of IASMN meetings for the UNDP's programmes and suggested that the HLCM recommendation was not a directive. He also expressed appreciation for the WTO's invitation to host a meeting.

235. Mr. Chase brought up the potential of a third meeting, a symposium with other organizations. He suggested piggybacking one of the two planned IASMN meetings onto the symposium. This

would potentially encourage more UN participation in the symposium and offer three meetings for the price of two in a year.

236. The USG summarized the discussion, noting that due to fiscal, environmental, and organizational responsibilities, his department would participate in-person at only one meeting per year. This could involve different team members attending different meetings to ensure representation.

237. Mr. Torp requested that, for future sessions, members should plan to be present until the scheduled end of the meeting, expressing disappointment with the early departure of some members.

238. In summary, members agreed that IASMN's 39th Session would take place from 13 to 15 February 2024 in Madrid, to be hosted by UNWTO. The dedicated budget session will take place as a stand-alone meeting in February/March.

Annexes (Agenda and Participant List)

Agenda

Tuesday, 20 June 2023

9:00 – 9:45   **Opening Session**
- Adoption of the Agenda (USG UNDSS)
- Opening remarks (USG UNDSS)

9:45 – 10:30   **Summary of Progress on IASMN Recommendations** (SPPU) (CRP 1 Annex B)

10:30 – 10:45   Coffee Break

10:45 – 12:30   **Updates on New Operational Initiatives**
- Planning for UN results and resilient security programming (CRP 2)
- Lessons Learned Exercise: Sudan (CRP 3)
- Results Chain (CRP 4)

12:30 – 13:30   Lunch

13:30 – 15:00   **Functionality of the UNSMS** (CRP 5)
- Introduction and Background (SPPU)
- Group work / Guided Questions

15:00 – 15:15   Coffee Break

15:15 – 17:00   **Functionality of the UNSMS**
- Group Briefings and Plenary Discussion
- Session Wrap-Up

Wednesday, 21 June 2023

9:00 – 10:30   **Security Communications** (CRP 6)
- {TESS+}
- PULSER
- COSCATG

10:30 – 10:45   Coffee Break

10:45 – 11:30   **Armed Guards/Residential Security Measures WG** (FAO) (CRP 7)

11:30 – 12:30   **Strategic Communications** (UN Women / IOM) (CRP 8)

12:30 – 13:30   Lunch

13:30 – 14:15   **HIM Update** (DRO/UNHCR/UNICEF) (CRP 9)

14:15 – 15:00   **SRM/SSIRS** (UNICEF/OCHA) (CRP 10)

15:00 – 15:15   Coffee Break

15:15 – 16:00   **HR Strategy WG**: Discussion on proposals (EO) (CRP 11)

16:00 – 17:00   **Budget Update** (EO) (CRP 12)

Evening (TBC)   Social Event

Thursday, 22 June 2023

9:00 – 10:30   **Policy Update** (SPPU) (CRP 13)

10:30 – 10:45   Coffee Break

10:45 – 11:30   **Engagement with non-UNSMS Organizations: Security Symposium** (SPPU) (CRP 14)

11:30 – 12:30   **Fire Safety** (SPU) (CRP 15)

12:30 – 13:30   Lunch

13:30 – 14:30   **Training Update** (DPSS) (CRP 16)

14:30 – 14:45   Coffee Break

14:45 – 16:45   **Close of Session**
- Any Other Business
  - IASMN SG Membership
  - Recommendations
- Wrap-up

List of Participants

		Entity	Name of Participant
	1.	ADB	**Mr. Dewaine Farria**
	2.	DOS	**Ms. Tanja Bunjac (Virtually)**
	3.	DOS	*Mr. Seetharam Reddy Nandhyala (Virtually)*
	4.	DPO	**Mr. Russell Wyper (Virtually)**
	5.	DPPA	**Mr. Valentin Aldea (Virtually)**
	6.	EBRD	**Mr. Ian Evans (Virtually)**
	7.	FAO	**Mr. Vladislav Khamidov**
	8.	IAEA	**Mr. Niels Bolt**
	9.	ICAO	**Mr. Michael Romero**
	10.	ICC	**Mr. Lassi Kuusinen**
	11.	IFAD	**Mr. Matthias Meyerhans**
	12.	IIIM	**Mr. Gwenael Croajou**
	13.	ILO	**Mr. Jean-Louis Dominguez**
	14.	IMF	**Ms. Cydia Pinarbasi**
	15.	IOM	**Mr. Luc Vandamme**
	16.	IOM	*Ms. Anastasiia Sientsova*
	17.	ITU	**Mr. Mathieu Baunin**
	18.	OCHA	**Mr. Simon Butt**
	19.	OHCHR	**Mr. Sherif Noaman**

20.	OPCW	**Mr. Aidan McNally**
21.	UNAIDS	**Mr. Tim Martineau (Virtually)**
22.	UNDP	**Mr. Arve Skog**
23.	UNEP	**Mr. Peter Marshall**
24.	UNFPA	**Mr. Naqib Noory**
25.	UNHCR	**Ms. Julie Dunphy**
26.	UNICEF	**Mr. Paul Farrell**
27.	UNOCT	**Mr. Jose Miguel Sobron**
28.	UNODC	**Mr. Robert Telenta**
29.	UNOPS	**Mr. John Dunne**
30.	UPU	**Ms. Dawn Wilkes**
31.	UNRWA	**Mr. Brian Baker**
32.	UNRWA	*Mr. Michael Center (Virtually)*
33.	UNWTO	**Mr. Antonio Garcia Medrano**
34.	UN WOMEN	**Mr. Paul O'Hanlon**
35.	UN WOMEN	*Ms. Aaina Chopra (Virtually)*
36.	WBG	**Mr. Daniel Chase**
37.	WBG	*Ms. Samantha J. Steenkamp-Farrell (Virtually)*
38.	WHO	**Mr. Angelito Francis Bermundez**
39.	WFP	**Ms. Maria Victoria Montalvo**
40.	WFP	*Ms. Ludmilla Dadrass (Virtually)*
41.	WIPO	**Mr. Jess Torp**
42.	WTO	**Ms. Amene Bellir**

43.	USG/UNDSS	**Mr. Gilles Michaud (Virtually)**
44.	ASG/UNDSS	**Ms. Unaisi Vuniwaqa (Virtually)**
45.	UNDSS	**Ms. Esther Kuisch**
46.	UNDSS	**Ms. Suchada Kulawat**
47.	UNDSS	**Ms. Justyna Pietralik**
Observers		
1.	CEB	**Ms. Ekaterina Zizekalova**
2.	CEB	**Ms. Laura Gallacher**
3.	CCISUA	**Ms. June Anyango**
4.	UNISERV	**Mr. Mark Polane**
5.	UNMD	**Dr. Ling Kituyi (Virtually)**
6.	UNMD	*Dr. Gloria Dal Forno (Virtually)*
Participants in Specific Sessions		
1.	TESS	**Mr. Peter Casier**
2.	TESS	*Mr. Alf Ellefsen*
3.	UNDSS/ Meeting Support	**Mr. Stijn De Mets**
4.	IOM/Meeting Support	**Ms. Aigerim Almazova**
5.	ITU/Meeting Support	**Mr. Mohammad Althaher**
6.	WBG	**Mr. Martin Ronnberg (Virtually)**
7.	FAO	**Mr. Piergiorgio Trentinaglia (Virtually)**
8.	OLA	**Ms. Vita Onwuasoanya (Virtually)**
9.	OLA	**Mr. Sinha Surya (Virtually)**
10.	UNDSS/DRO	**Ms. Florence Poussin (Virtually)**

11.	UNDSS/EO	**Ms. Renu Bhatia (Virtually)**
12.	UNDSS/EO	**Ms. Tine Hatlehol (Virtually)**
13.	UNDSS/EO	**Ms. Zhengfan Sun (Virtually)**
14.	UNDSS/DPSS	**Mr. Robin Stenhouse (Virtually)**
15.	UNDSS/DPSS	**Ms. Jamie Medby (Virtually)**
16.	UNDSS	**Mr. Marc Jacquand (Virtually)**
17.	UNDSS/TDS	**Mr. Benjamin Owusu-Firempong (Virtually)**
18.	UNDSS	**Ms. Elena Rice-Howell (Virtually)**
19.	UNDSS	**Ms. Helen Bray (Virtually)**
20.	UNDSS	**Ms. Jamison Medby (Virtually)**
21.	UNDSS	**Mr. Martin Laffey (Virtually)**
22.	UNDSS	**Ms. Dessire De Freitas (Virtually)**
23.	UNDSS	**Ms. Kaitlin Rau (Virtually)**
24.	UNDSS	**Ms. Inez Hariedy (Virtually)**
25.	UNDSS	**Mr. Rodolfo Goyeneche (Virtually)**
26.	UNDSS	**Mr. Daniele Sebastiano Musmeci (Virtually)**
27.	UNDSS	**Ms. Jessica Dodo Buchler (Virtually)**
28.	UNDSS	**Ms. Sophia Nambi (Virtually)**