



IOM Symposium on Organizational Practice and Policy on the Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE) – Report

Geneva, Switzerland - 15-16 November 2018

Executive Summary

IOM gathered key managers, at the country, regional and HQ levels of the Organization for a symposium on *Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE)* in Geneva in November 2018, for an internal discussion and review of current practice, existing guidance and a prioritization of institutional policy goals on P/CVE, to further build professionalism and coherence within IOM. This follows a similar symposium held in Nairobi in November 2016.

The scope and scale of IOM's PVE programming has continued to grow in the past five years, as has the need to address a complex array of emergent challenges such as the return of family members of foreign terrorist fighters, and the increasingly xenophobic rhetoric associating migration and violent extremism. Establishing and updating institutional policy, coherence and guidance for field missions contributing to the prevention of violent extremism must therefore be a priority for IOM. Managing risk, security of IOM operations, communications and oversight, partnerships and public dialogue were all areas to brought into further focus through the PVE Symposium.

Key outcomes of the two-day event included:

- **Need for Further Policy Guidance:** Participants expressed support for clear guidance and materials that define IOM's overall approach to PVE, grounded in IOM's institutional mandate and experience, address risk factors and supports appropriate communications on migration and PVE.
- **Institutional Capacity and Resource Needs:** Participants uniformly acknowledged the critical need for more capacity in TRD to bolster support to Missions and institutional oversight in line with the current endorsement practice, for recognition as a coherent and responsible PVE actor.
- **IOM field Capacity and Institutional Partnerships:** Moreover, participants reflected on *field staff capacity*, highlighting deficits such as context analysis, adaptive decision-making and political skills, and suggested both more training and creating *institutional partnerships* to augment research and analysis, monitoring and evaluation and some aspects of design and implementation.
- **Knowledge management and the new field of PVE:** As PVE is a newly emerged area of practice, both within IOM and more broadly, more must be learned about how to conduct successful programmes and effectively monitor results. Capturing both IOM experiences to inform future programming and shaping best practices is critical both externally and internally. Participants called for resourced knowledge management includes curation of field experience, access to emerging research and coordination with other UN and non-UN entities engaged in this work.
- **Acknowledging and Managing Risk:** Participants acknowledged the sensitivities associated with PVE programming including the potential for politicization of the issue, stigmatization of populations, and reputational risks to the organization. Increasing institutional capacity and oversight was acknowledged as critical.



Background

The field of preventing/countering violent extremism (PVE) has expanded in recent years, with a growing role for international peace and development actors, locally-led initiatives and with high levels of donor interest. These trends reflect the consensus that top-down, security-focused operations cannot alone address the phenomenon of violent extremism (VE). IOM recognizes that VE, which feeds off and aggravates armed conflict, irrespective of religion, ethnicity or political ideology, is a significant factor in displacement and human suffering. In line with IOM's commitment to mitigate the drivers of displacement, the Organization has identified the importance of contextualized, preventive action and has been increasingly called on by Member States to contribute to PVE efforts.

To develop institutional coherence on this area of work and build off the DG's August 2015 memo, IOM held its first Symposium on Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE)¹ in Nairobi in November 2016. Since then, the scope and scale of IOM's relevant programming has grown, with additional challenges and opportunities emerging. In recognition of this and the need to move forward with institutional policy initiatives, DOE-TRD convened a two-day Symposium on Organizational Practice and Policy on the Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE) in Geneva from 15 to 16 November, bringing together Directors and over 55 key managers and other relevant staff from the country, regional and HQ levels.

Core objectives of the event were: allow staff to engage and provide updates on programmatic, donor and host government engagements; promote coherence within the portfolio, including in relation to IOM's mandate; discuss risks and reinforce coordination and oversight mechanisms; and advance internal policy development for IOM's engagement on PVE.

This document provides an overview of the proceedings from the Symposium, key points for consideration and follow-up actions. The key points and follow-up actions were shaped by points raised during the Symposium and on written evaluations collected at the conclusion of the event. A selection of responses from the evaluations, as well as the event's concept note and agenda are contained in the Annex.

Meeting Overview and Outcomes

Capturing the breadth and diversity of IOM's PVE portfolio

During 2018, IOM's PVE portfolio grew to include 16 active projects focused on PVE-specific programming (across five regions), with many others containing relevant contributing components. The event provided IOM colleagues, from various regions and with different focus areas within PVE, to engage on programming components and approaches.

A dedicated **session on field perspectives** allowed representatives from IOM **Uganda, Morocco, Niger, Bosnia and Herzegovina** to present on their respective PVE portfolios, reflecting the diversity of operating

¹ Since 2016, IOM has branded its work on VE under PVE, rather than CVE, due to core functional areas of work within this larger field, as well as operational and institutional risks related to 'countering' violent extremism as distinct from 'preventing' violent extremism.



environments and work being undertaken. Inputs from colleagues allowed further comparisons and experiences to be shared.

A session during Day 2 on **Emerging Areas of Work** was led by representatives of IOM **Nigeria** and **Kosovo**. This session shed light on the **PVE components of novel DDR programmes** that assist governments with caseloads of: 1) returning dependents of foreign terrorist fighters (Kosovo) and 2) former fighters associated with designated terrorist organizations in countries of on-going conflict (Nigeria), as well as family members and communities of return. Linkages were drawn between PVE and reintegration programming, the highly politicized and sensitive nature of this work, and potential risks for recidivism, stigmatization or retribution in communities of return. Significant interest was raised about these programmes and IOM's role in this evolving field, as well as how to ensure that appropriate level risk analysis and mitigation are integrated.

These sessions highlighted that **valuable lessons and best practices** are being generated across IOM's PVE portfolio. However, they are **not being systematically compiled and distributed across missions**, presenting a **significant gap in potential knowledge sharing** and learning. Several participants underscored a desire for more frequent meetings and a digital platform for information sharing. The idea of partnering with external researchers or a think tank were also discussed.

Engaging with external perspectives

Two sessions of the Symposium were dedicated to engaging with interlocutors external to IOM, allowing staff to gain a more holistic understanding of, and place IOM within, the broader field of work and discourse occurring around P/CVE. On Day 1, a session led by **Amanda Fazzone Tschopp from the *Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF)*** covered the evolving global landscape of PVE. In particular, she engaged participants on the **continuously shifting discourse and sensitivities that surround VE**, the **drivers of VE** and related considerations for preventive activities and the wide range of risks and pitfalls facing PVE actors. She underscored the **need to look past traditional narratives** of why people, particularly youth, join VE groups and **the need to engage with researchers** to better understand **context-specific dynamics** and incentives.

On Day 2, a panel of distinguished guests provided reflections on the policy environment and practices, reinforcing many of the realities presented on Day 1. **Peter Neumann, Professor of Security Studies at the Dept. of War Studies at King's College London**, spoke on the relative **lack of satisfying definitions** of CVE and preference for considering this field of work to be framed as countering radicalization or the precursors to terrorism. He also shared the ways in which **CVE can be co-opted by states** for their own PR or political gains, such as gaining favor with regional/international bodies or shutting down internal voices of dissent. With this in mind, it is important to be aware of incentives and objectives of key actors with whom one engages when developing programmes, structuring interventions and choosing beneficiaries. Touching on lessons learned, he noted that small, yet carefully structured and well-informed programmes can have a disproportionate effect on addressing the issue of VE.

Next, **Martine Zeuthen, Team Lead of the Royal United Services Institute's (RUSI) Strengthening Resilience to Violent Extremism Programme in Kenya**, provided a practitioner's perspective on PVE. She introduced **key questions that should be asked** when designing P/CVE activities as well as the various types of interventions



that can be used. She underscored the **need to recognize highly localized contexts/influences** and provided a framework for understanding radicalization and recruitment via structural motivators, individual incentives and enabling factors which is more dimensional than the common framing of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors.

Finally, **Leanne Erdberg, Director of the CVE Program at the U.S. Institute of Peace** spoke on the peacebuilding aspects of PVE, touching on three core points. First, peacebuilding work such as PVE needs to go beyond theoretical/ideological constructs to consider the deeply human components of what attracts people to join or remain in VE groups. Notably, she discussed the **need to holistically consider how internal neurological and physiological reactions and psycho-social benefits may contribute to draw individuals to a VE group**. These include the adrenaline that comes from participating in active fighting, positive affirmation and sense of purpose that comes from carrying out assigned duties, or the strong sense of belonging that accompanies joining a tight-knit, goal-oriented group. Second, she emphasized that actors engaged in PVE programming need to **steer away from theories of linear causality**. The challenges faced in this sector of work cannot be simplified for our own (or donor) purposes, as there are no straightforward, linear ways of overcoming VE. Finally, interventions that actively engage with participants to **work towards change-oriented goals**, either for personal or communal change, can offer effective alternatives to the incentives that may make joining a VE group appealing.

Programming – Opportunities, distinctions and potential pitfalls

PVE can potentially have a large impact even through small interventions, but there are significant programmatic considerations and risks. Programming **needs to be highly case-specific**, targeting those most at-risk/susceptible to radicalization or recruitment, while also **safeguarding against potential stigmatization** of participants. Research and analysis related to the context and impact of projects must be properly resourced. Where IOM has an extensive field presence, or network of local partners, the Organization is well placed to develop effective, sensitive programming if framed appropriately through robust context analysis.

The symposium provided an opportunity to discuss the **distinctions between PVE-specific and PVE-related programming**. Centrally, *PVE-specific programming* is designed pursuant to a theory of change supported by evidence to address the structural drivers of violent extremism, create resilience among potentially vulnerable populations and prevent recruitment or mobilization to extremist violence. Meanwhile, *PVE-relevant programming* refers to activities that do not meet the definition of PVE-specific programming but that nonetheless are expected to contribute to PVE aims. These may be particularly prominent in DDR programmes or some components of community stabilization/social cohesion activities.

Optics also play a considerable role in the potential efficacy, level of sensitivity and longevity of a PVE programme. As with other sectors of IOM’s work, placing local partners or the government as the external face of a programme when possible is a best practice. Balancing government ownership while safeguarding against political instrumentalization was also raised as a challenge. Likewise, branding of a programme that uses sensitive terminology, or which implicates certain groups/affiliations should be avoided, as it can **risk stereotyping participants and place IOM and partners in unsafe situations**. Among specific concerns discussed were ‘counter narrative’ or ‘counter messaging’ programming which could put IOM in direct conflict with VE actors, their agendas, methods or messages. **Given IOM’s status as a multi-mandated organization, careful consideration and mitigation measures should be taken** to ensure that PVE programming and the



positioning it may convey, does not interfere with other lines of work, or implicate the Organization in unintended ways.

Risk management and oversight

Given the significant sensitivities surrounding PVE, the Symposium's discussions often circled back to a range of topics relating to risks and appropriate approaches and procedures for minimizing them. During an allocated session on risk, **IOM's Chief Risk Officer, Clarissa Van Heerden**, presented on changes that have occurred to IOM's risk management procedures and forthcoming guidance, as well as thematic, P/CVE related risks.

Symposium participants were also split into break-out groups to delve more deeply into specific topics and then report back to the larger group. These included political instrumentalization, stigmatization of target groups including potentially migrants, the safety of staff and participants, national and international legal tensions, confrontational counter-messaging, lack of effective monitoring mechanisms, and programmatic risks linked to lack of IOM capacity and general knowledge of effective interventions.

The importance of existing oversight channels, such as HQ-led endorsement procedures², support to missions with programmes and review of reports was reiterated. However, missions must also take holistic risk management and mitigation into consideration throughout project development and implementation.

Partnerships and external communications

Recognizing the growing field of actors and demand for P/CVE programming, conversations and Symposium sessions touched on ensuring that IOM is positioning itself appropriately and adroitly. **This includes developing strong local and international implementing partnerships, a diversified donor base and well thought through, consistent communications/visibility.** Importantly, many participants expressed the **need for more guidance** on how to frame relevant issues for field staff and appropriately speak about PVE and migration to donors, government and the public. This included a discussion on how to address the growing toxic narratives around migration and violent extremism.

Also reiterated, IOM does should not undertake direct counter-messaging confronting VE groups, their methods or their messages as is inappropriate for the organization. Instead, **focus should be on vulnerabilities including structural conditions and individual incentives.** Confrontational approaches not only present reputational risk to the organization but could put staff and beneficiaries as well as other programmes at risk.

Key Points of Consideration

The following points were gleaned from the Symposium's discussions and evaluation forms and are intended to inform the development of further guidance and initiatives by IOM at the HQ level. Many of the points were raised or reiterated across several sessions:

- 1. The highly political and politicized nature of PVE:** Donors may be acting with a foreign policy agenda, and we may be working with non-traditional arms of donor entities. As a result, IOM staff may find themselves collaborating more closely with diplomatic and security counterparts than

² In accordance with the DG memo on Convening a Task Force on Counter-Terrorism and Countering Violent Extremism, 18 August 2015, all PVE related projects are currently endorsed at HQ level by DOE/TRD.



development practitioners and often within political conflicts. Defining PVE as a practice area may be problematic as the underlying causes are highly contextual and often related to a range of developmental and public policy concerns at the local level that are appropriated and instrumentalized by VE groups for their political purposes. As such, 'PVE' is an effort that tends to focus on underlying conditions and less on VE itself.

2. **IOM capacity for undertaking programming.** In relation to *field staff capacity*, some participants questioned whether training (such as adaptive decision-making and political skills) is enough to overcome staff capacity deficits and **suggested creating institutional partnerships to manage this portfolio and fill gaps**. These include analysis, monitoring and evaluation and some aspects of design and implementation. Moreover, if IOM wants to be recognized as a coherent and responsible actor in this area, **the capacity of HQ to provide support needs to be bolstered**.
3. **Stigmatization:** Some participants questioned whether IOM's participation in this field itself attaches stigma to migrants or migration, by suggesting a mandated link. There is also concern over PVE's tendency to stigmatize Muslims. This highlights the **need to take great care in the use of language, terminology and how programming is framed**. IOM should consider how programming, such as integration assistance, can incorporate specific attention on other forms of violent extremism, including from the extreme right, to reinforce IOM's commitment to addressing all forms of extremism leading to violence regardless of religion, ideology or ethnicity or culture.
4. **Communications:** There was a consensus that IOM should not be involved in messaging that directly confronts violent extremist groups, their ideology, methods or messages. IOM can continue to work on alternative or positive narratives, ensuring that local voices participate in content design and communications. However, the guest speakers highlighted an issue that warrants greater attention: alternative narratives will not work if they are too sanitized and must address real issues and empower voices, which may in some situations produce criticism of governments, their policies, human rights records or commitment to social equity, all of which must be considered in light of IOM's mandate and structure.
5. **Understanding contexts:** A robust evidence base rooted in dynamic research and analysis that accounts for shifting contexts is crucial for ensuring programming is case-specific and adaptive. Emphasized throughout the symposium was the fact that VE is neither a uniform phenomenon nor attractive even to those exposed to structural drivers such as marginalization, discrimination, human rights violations or deprivation. Only a small subset of those choose to join such movements and as such careful localized context analysis is necessary to develop appropriate and effective interventions.
6. **Donors:** IOM Missions need to negotiate time frames, terminology, research; expectations; scope and approach; and IOM should aim to diversify its donor base to avoid the perception of being attached to a particular policy agenda. The analytical demands and need for intensive management should be emphasized to donors as critical to appropriate and effective programming.
7. **Knowledge management and the new field of PVE:** As a relatively new area of practice, both within IOM and more broadly, not enough is known about effective PVE programming or monitoring for results. Capturing both the successes and gaps in IOM's PVE portfolio is critical to informing future programming and shaping best practices for PVE, both externally and internally. Mechanisms for intra-Organizational knowledge management includes curated and accessible field experience, and emerging research as well as close coordination with other engaged UN and non-UN entities.



8. **Differentiating between PVE-specific and PVE-related activities:** PVE outcomes can be achieved through highly focused PVE specific programming, but because VE is driven by structural and individual factors, other assistance interventions may contribute to PVE outcomes. This raises questions of when and how best to characterize an intervention as PVE programming. PVE interventions will by necessity utilize tools familiar in other IOM programming. The determining contributing factor will, likely, hinge on the intended outcomes of the program. **A Community Stabilization or Social Cohesion programme that intends to address drivers of VE as one outcome should still be viewed as principally a PVE programme.**³
9. **Big problem, small response?** With the recognition that VE is a phenomenon underpinned by complex structural factors, individual incentives and enabling factors, it is quite difficult to fully address VE through discrete PVE initiatives. Participants expressed some concern that the prevention problem is much bigger than IOM's capacity for intervention. One suggestion was for IOM to focus on identifying a specific niche within the field and focusing on "catalyzing" support, e.g., building capacity of CSOs or developing scalable models. Others highlighted that as relatively few communities and individuals are susceptible to VE much could be accomplished with targeted programming. This point reinforced the need for context specific and targeted programming to achieve impact.
10. **Policy guidance:** Participants expressed a clear need for materials and guidance that specify IOM's approach to PVE, and that grounds that approach in IOM's institutional mandate and experience, and that provides advice on how to address risk factors and communicate appropriately about migration and PVE.

Follow-Up Actions

- TRD moves forward with finalizing and sharing internal guidance on PVE programming
- An internal platform is developed for HQ and field offices to share and discuss PVE related tools, best practices and other useful information
- Channels and partnerships that further capacitate TRD to provide assistance and guidance on PVE project development, endorsement and implementation are explored and solidified
- Resource needs for building out PVE capacity and oversight are addressed
- Partnerships with external institutions are explored to strengthen understanding of VE and the impact of IOM programming
- Begin planning subsequent PVE meetings, incorporating the feedback provided on this event by participants

³ The project code for PVE work, PE is active



Annex.

1. Concept Note

Symposium on Organizational Practice and Policy on Prevention of Violent Extremism (PVE)

Hotel Novotel, Geneva
15-16th November 2018

Since IOM's first Symposium on Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism (P/CVE) was held in Nairobi, in November 2016, the scope and scale of IOM's PVE programming has grown, as has the need to address a complex array of emergent challenges such as the return of family members of foreign terrorist fighters and the increasingly xenophobic rhetoric on migration and violent extremism. Establishing and updating institutional policy, coherence and guidance for field missions contributing to the prevention of violent extremism must therefore be a priority for IOM. Managing risk, security of IOM operations, communications, partnerships and public dialogue on migration are all areas to be brought into focus through regular internal discussion, planning and assessment on the topics and work relating to P/CVE.

Through a gathering of key managers, at the country, regional and HQ levels of the Organization, IOM will convene its 2nd Symposium for an internal discussion and review of current practice, existing guidance and a prioritization of institutional policy goals on C/PVE. To continue to help build professionalism and coherence within IOM, the Symposium will seek to include a session bringing in external expertise and views on key issues relating to P/CVE.

The Symposium will focus on the following objectives:

1. To **update on programmatic, donor and host-government** engagement in the area of Preventing / Countering Violent Extremism.
2. To promote **coherence** of the work within the current portfolio of PVE programmes and their links to IOM's mandate.
3. To reinforce **coordination and oversight** for IOM's PVE programmes.
4. To advance the internal **policy development** for IOM's engagement with Preventing Violent Extremism.

The rapid spread of violent extremism is a critical concern within the broader context of global insecurity and armed conflict. Increasingly, the international community, including the United Nations and its member states, recognize that efforts to counter violent extremism (CVE), particularly through security-based and counter terrorism approaches alone, are insufficient in addressing the global threat and expansion of such groups. Prevention efforts are increasingly important, inter alia, for global at-risk youth, and for those who may be vulnerable to recruitment within irregular migration pathways, or in situations of marginalization or displacement.

In 2017, some 40 million people were displaced globally by conflict, with a significant proportion related to the violence carried out by terrorist and extremist groups. At the same time, conflict-related



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

displacement is becoming increasingly protracted, raising potential vulnerability to radicalization or recruitment. Across a wide spectrum of activity, IOM is engaged in initiatives designed to prevent susceptibility to recruitment, as well as in reintegration of specialized groups and improved protection of vulnerable migrants.

The importance of preventing recruitment into violent extremist groups and the process of addressing radicalization pre-emptively, through work on root causes and vulnerabilities to recruitment, in complementarity to support for the return and reintegration of those formally disengaged or disassociated from violent extremists into civil society, is increasingly recognized. Furthermore, since the United Nations Secretary General launched the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism (2015; A/70/674), global thinking on research, policy and practice has evolved considerably, including, for example, growing recognition of the roles of women in PVE and peacebuilding, the potentially positive role of 'youth' and the need to deepen engagement with this group; understanding of the complex drivers, above and beyond economic or religious motivations; and the inter-connectedness of factors that enable violent extremist groups to grow and flourish (UNDP Oslo II, PVE; 2018). Therefore, whilst the phenomenon of violent extremism remains relatively new, the discourse and strategic focus of PVE actors has evolved rapidly over the past 3 years.

The symposium will afford IOM colleagues at senior and technical levels to engage in a structured, facilitated dialogue which will form the basis of organizational best practice, guidance and the policy process.



2. Agenda

Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) Symposium

Geneva, Switzerland
15-16 November 2018

Objectives:

1. To provide **updates on programmatic, donor and host-government** engagement in the area of Preventing / Countering Violent Extremism.
2. To promote **coherence** of the work within the current portfolio of PVE programmes and their links to IOM's mandate.
3. To reinforce **coordination and oversight** for IOM's PVE programmes.
4. To advance the internal **policy development** for IOM's engagement with Preventing Violent Extremism.

| Day 1- 15 November 2018 | | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------|
| 0830-0900 | Coffee and introductions | |
| 0900-0930 | Opening remarks and objective setting | Mohammed Abdiker |
| 0930-1000 | Taking stock of IOM's current PVE portfolio; discourse, policy and practice | Louis Hoffmann |
| 1000-1045 | The evolving global landscape of PVE <i>-Amanda Fazzone Tschopp, Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund (GCERF)</i> | |
| 1045-1100 | COFFEE BREAK | |
| 1100-1300 | Field perspectives: Country mission experiences implementing PVE programmes | IOM Missions |
| 1300-1400 | LUNCH | |
| 1515-1530 | COFFEE BREAK | |



| | | |
|------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1530-1700 | 360° Review: 2 years on from the November 2016 Symposium | Jason Aplon, Plenary |
| 1700 –1800 | Reception | |

| Day 2- 16 November 2018 | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 0830-0900 | Recap of Day 1 | TRD |
| 0900-1030 | <p>Panel Discussion: External perspectives on preventing violent extremism – policy and practice</p> <p>-Peter Neumann, <i>Professor of Security Studies at the Dept. of War Studies, King’s College London</i></p> <p>-Leanne Erdberg, <i>Director of Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Program at the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP)</i></p> <p>-Martine Zeuthen, <i>Team Lead of the Royal United Services Institute’s (RUSI) Strengthening Resilience to Violent Extremism (STRIVE) Programme in Kenya</i></p> | Peter Van Der Auweraert (Moderator) |
| 1030-1100 | COFFEE BREAK | |
| 1100-1200 | Terminology and definitions | TRD/ Plenary |
| 1200-1300 | Managing external partnerships | Panel Discussion /Q&A |
| 1300-1400 | LUNCH | |
| 1400-1500 | Emerging areas: Foreign Terrorist Fighters and the role of DDR in PVE | Tajma Kurt /Fernando Medina |
| 1500-1615 | Information and communication | Panel Discussion /Q&A |
| 1615-1630 | COFFEE BREAK | |
| 1630-1730 | Symposium outcomes: Policy and practice for IOM | Louis Hoffmann / Katie Kerr |



3. Input Provided on Evaluations

Feedback forms were made available throughout the Symposium in an effort to capture inputs and comments from participants, pertaining both to specific sessions, as well as to the broader discussion of IOM's engagement on PVE. Two evaluative questions on the quality and relevance of the Symposium were also included. A selection of responses is included below:

Day 1

Session: The evolving global landscape of PVE

- Raising interest in reintegration and capacity building; sincerely evaluate projects and measure success, admit honest lessons learned; very useful!
- Interesting breakdown of terminology around terrorism. Also mentioned good practices, what causes people to become radicalized. Very informative.
- Understanding of the structural motivators (grievances), individual incentives (search for adventure and/or redemption) and enabling factors (peers/proximity) to frame the programs

Session: Field perspectives: Country mission experiences implementing PVE programmes

- All were different, but most of the challenges rotated around poverty, marginalization and unemployment, as well as issues of safety for staff, beneficiaries and partners.
- Developing, compiling a compendium of PVE activities implemented by IOM, good practices and lessons learned. It could be used by mission and ROs for expanding PVE portfolios.
- The link between the nature of the threat and the formula/approach needs to be clear
- It would be good to look at nascent programs to insert takeaway points during first steps.
- Impact, outcomes and outputs seem hard to be measurable. Need for measurable indicators.

Session: Underlying issues and risks for IOM Interventions

- Glad the new IOM Risk staff member was here. We need to give this stream of work a good risk analysis resulting in risk assumption by the DG.
- Good to have a session on risk management.
- Good feedback from various groups. Probably good to have a section on safety and security of staff and assets, as well as reputational risk and duty of care for third parties.
- We need to be more focused on this and do analysis at regional and local levels

Session: 360° Review: 2 years on from the November 2016 Symposium

- Since 2015 PVE/CVE/Stabilization has grown. Most projects may not use the words P/CVE, but their aim is to prevent radicalization or terrorism.
- Useful to know the outcomes of the Nairobi meeting and where we stand
- The non-operationalization of the Nov 2016 Symposium recommendations has impeded the development of a common position on PVE, creating a gap.

Day 2

Panel discussion: External perspectives on preventing violent extremism

- We always need a look from outside and it served to build networking/connections
- Very good panelists; Big takeaways point is the need for more analysis



- Precise, focused and assisted in clarifying the definition and scope.
- Very constructive and relevant, sincere and ultimately revealing IOM’s experience as needing further consolidation and institutionalization.

Session: Terminology and definitions

- Good discussion and useful having in place working definitions which could be used at all levels.
- Need to have two levels of definition for each word/concept: 1) For donor/UN/IOM discussion and 2) For the field teams/local partners that programs empower
- Key to success and IOM’s security strategy, helps bring clarity under pressure. Key to IOM’s security in the field and globally as an organization.

Session: Managing external partnerships

- Need to be able to adapt IOM’s discourse to donors to a certain extent BUT need to have/know IOM’s red lines. Increase capacity in negotiating with donors.
- Circulate tips on how PVE activities should be best phrased for each donor. Country offices in donor countries could help with contextualization.
- We need to focus on our partnerships with government but also with CSOs
- Excellent with a focus on relevant partners, not just using partners for the sake of it, as failure to secure good partners can become a security risk.
- Critically important to not only deliver but also the need to manage expectations. The ability of saying “no” should be institutionalized to reflect what we cannot do.

Session: Emerging areas: Foreign Terrorist Fighters and the role of DDR in PVE

- Good session. Given the limited time it was good to include 2 countries only.
- Very interesting and useful, necessary to have more time to discuss and explore opportunities
- IOM has over 25 years of experience on DDR in very practical terms. It makes it the most relevant Organization in this emerging field, but we need to invest, so that standards in IOM remain high.
- This is an area that we must seriously reflect. Well covered but need to be careful with issues relating to local level duty of care and diligence.

Session: Information and communication

- Very useful, underline a necessity for capacity building in media and communication.
- Important to have a coherent message as IOM
- Two lines of communication: for the donors/public (American, Japanese, European, etc.) and for the beneficiaries as a way to meet/further the objectives of the program
- Very important aspect of our work today. We need to keep up.

General Questions/comments:

From a scale of 1 (very low) to 5 (very high) how constructive did you find the Symposium overall:

| Score | Respondents |
|-------|-----------------|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | x (1) |
| 4 | xxxxxxxxxx (10) |
| 5 | xxxx (4) |



From a scale of 1 (not relevant at all) to 5 (very relevant), how pertinent to your work were the sessions and discussions:

| Score | Respondents |
|-------|--------------|
| 1 | |
| 2 | |
| 3 | xx (2) |
| 4 | xxxxxxxx (8) |
| 5 | xxxxx (5) |

Other comments on the quality/usefulness of the Symposium, suggestions for future events:

- 1) Cascade the Symposium to Regional Offices to have more people attend from the region; 2) Meet at the HQ level 2 times a year. Field visits for HQ to see what is going on.
- Would like to see a session on challenges within the Mission. Sometimes it takes more time to convince HR or COM than to talk to the donor or Govt.
- Create and collect a repository of tools developed for PVE activities
- A few topics remain probably unaddressed, such as M&E. While the difficulty of measuring was raised many times, what concrete actions can be taken to mitigate this and support programming?
- Long overdue and absolutely relevant. Key to institutionalize this knowledge.
- In future symposiums there might be considerations in inviting relevant government representations, as they can provide new positions and observations.

What issues/topics would you like to see addressed in the upcoming PVE Guidance Note?

- Risk analysis + level where risk assumption is taken by IOM; data protection principles; clarity about approaches IOM will NOT take, i.e. CVE lens, counter-narratives
- 1) How to engage with donors; 2) Competition with other UN agencies
- 1) Standard indicators for PVE projects to allow for assessing global impact of IOM’s work; 2) Shared key terminology, even just for internal purposes
- Monitoring and evaluating systems; how to measure indicators
- When PVE can be initiated and how it is interlinked with xenophobia, DDR and social cohesion.
- 1) Legal frameworks; 2) More emphasis on partnerships, particularly the role of the private sector.

What type of support would you like to see from HQ moving forward?

- I would like to see “peer-learning” in a way Missions learn from other Missions.
- Repository of PVE projects as well as reports and evaluations and products such as training manuals, market assessments, etc. (Need a curation system)
- Knowledge management; organizing trainings to expand the pool of practitioners
- Training opportunities for managers and field staff; project development; donors mapping
- M&E support
- More of such forums and outreach in relation to institutionalizing knowledge and positioning IOM as the key/best agency for this work, able to manage/implement complex programming successfully.
- 1) An IOM strategy; 2) Creation of a central pool of funding support of ongoing and developing programmes; 3) Fundraising support