

## **GCCG Meeting**

8 November 2023, 14:00 – 16.00 GVA time

**Participant/Global Cluster:** Linda Doull (GHC); Dher Al-Hayo and Wan Sophonpanich (Global CCCM); Michelle Brown (GEC); Brett Moore (GSC); Nisar Syed (UNICEF-led Global Clusters Rep); Jennifer Chase (GBV AoR); Samuel Cheung and Peter Kozelets (GPC); Stefano Fedele (GNC); Abdul Majid (GFSC); Mary Jelliti and Mailin Fauchon (GLC); Roberto Paganini (GCER); Brent Carbo (GETC); Julie Bara (GWC); Erik Kastlander (IMWG); Christelle Loupforest (MA AoR); Mary Pack (GCCG Co-Chair); Randa Hassan, Annarita Marcantonio, Mari Sawai and Fabia Hasch (GCCG-s).

**Invitees:** Kimberly Lietz (OCHA oPt).

### **Summary and action points**

#### **Welcome and agenda overview**

1. Ms. Mary Pack, GCCG Co-Chair, said she would be chairing the meeting alone as Ms. Marina Skuric-Prodanovic was on surge. She welcomed participants and provided a brief overview of the agenda. She explained that the agenda item on the briefing on the GPC/AoRs mission to Ukraine was moved up as several presenters have to leave the meeting early. Concerning the agenda item on the GCCG retreat, Ms. Pack informed GCCs about the proposal to postpone the GCCG retreat to the last week of January or the first week of February 2024. She asked GCCs to reflect upon possible conflicts until the discussion at the end of the meeting or indicate preferences in the chat box if they have to leave early. No changes to the proposed agenda were made, and the agenda was adopted.

#### **Updates and follow-up on GCCG action points**

2. Ms. Pack provided an update on recent IASC meetings and pending action points from previous GCCG meetings.
  - The IASC Task Force 1 on Centrality of Protection met on 11 October.
  - The IASC Taskforce on Localization - Workstream 1 met on 18 October. The Task Force Co-Chairs had presented an updated workplan which was submitted to OPAG for approval.
  - An all-day IASC OPAG meeting was held on 17 October. Ms. Skuric and Ms. Brown (GEC) represented the GCCG. Ms. Brown shared key highlights. The IASC secretariat reminded that IASC associated entities were observers only and could not provide interventions. The session on the HPC reflected concerns on where the decision-making responsibility lay on prioritization. An update on Gaza discussed the role of OPAG in such situations and whether a joint platform on policy and advocacy was needed. The GCCG was asked to comment on its work regarding cluster leadership/co-leadership, and enhancing participation and representation. There was a discussion on whether the task forces on accountability and localization should be merged. The Secretary-General's Summit of the Future was also on the agenda. GHC asked about the outcome of the prioritization discussion; Ms. Brown clarified that no clear solutions were identified. It was flagged that the prioritization exercise took away time from responding to needs, and clarity was needed on the decision-making process. GSC asked about discussions related to the UN reform process, including on the HDP nexus or the IDP Review. Ms. Brown clarified that the discussions on the reform were kept at high level and without direct implications for GCCs' work.
  - The IASC Task Force 3 on Preserving Humanitarian Space met on 25 October.
  - The IASC Task Force 4 on Humanitarian Development Collaboration and its Linkages to Peace Advances met on 30 October.
  - The IASC webinar on the Implementation of IASC Localisation Guidance in West Africa took place on 2 November. The francophone webinar on localisation, "Promouvoir la localisation à travers les mécanismes de coordination humanitaire", was held on 7 November.
  - The HPC Steering Group met on 19 October. Members of the Steering Group asked for further details on common messaging for the field concerning HPC lightening, however such guidance is not envisaged for the time being. Global CCCM asked for more information on the merged HNRPs that several countries were piloting, highlighting concerns that any new tools should be linked to ongoing reviews/processes such as the IDP review. Ms. Pack asked OCHA to set up a briefing on HPC lightening. GEC proposed for the GCCG to collectively look at good practices and different approaches adopted at the field level, referring to South Sudan as a positive example. GBV AoR reminded that no guidance was currently to be made available on HPC lightening.
  - A hybrid OPAG meeting on the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (IAHE) on operations in Afghanistan will take place on 21 November at 14:00 to 16:00. Ms. Pack asked interested GCCs to confirm their participation and noted that CCCM (Ms. Wan Sophonpanich) had so far expressed interest.

## GCCG Meeting

8 November 2023, 14:00 – 16.00 GVA time

3. Regarding pending action points, Ms. Pack invited GSC to update on its paper regarding CBPF/CERF. GSC reported that the final comments had been integrated and proposed to keep the format informal, as it comprised of a collection of feedback from clusters, rather than recommendations. The report would be framed as a GSC-led paper with inputs from clusters and would be shared shortly. There were no objections.
4. Concerning the follow-up on recommendations from the GBV AoR Rapid Safety Audit from the DRC, Ms. Pack asked GCCs to share updates on the progress made. CCCM reported that funding has been allocated to conduct safety audits in the assessed areas. A GBV staff has been deployed until February to work with different clusters to mitigate and respond to the risks identified in the report and work with various actors.
5. Ms. Pack reminded the GCCs of the upcoming IMWG Briefing on DEEP. Ms. Pack also reminded GCCs to flag any potential conflicts on the forward calendar of GCCG meetings when shared by the GCCG secretariat.

### Action points

- i. *GCCG-s: organize a briefing on HPC lightening.*
- ii. *GSC: share the finalized paper on CBPF/CERF with GCCs and GCCG-s.*

### Briefing on GPC / AoRs mission to Ukraine

6. Ms. Pack invited members from the GPC and AoRs to brief on the mission to Ukraine. The mission was the second one for GPC/AoR to Ukraine, visiting Kyiv, Kharkiv, Dnipro, and field sites such as Chernihiv. The objective was to give technical support, work with cluster lead agencies of the respective AoRs and support on advocacy strengthening. Ukraine was chosen due to its geopolitical importance but also as it represents more than 30% of the GPC funding received this year. Further, the context is unique in terms of a strong government, local authorities, and civil society.
7. GBV AoR shared that the mission emphasized that the guidance and tools for humanitarian work are available and can produce high-quality services for GBV if adequate funding is allocated. However, the funding level will likely decrease and current HRP discussions are indicating a decrease in PiN and budget. The HC's vision is for humanitarian responders (and the cluster) to focus on the hard-to-reach and conflict-affected areas, i.e. the geographical crescent of the front lines in the South and the East and singular spots of severity in the rest of the country. GBV AoR stated that while it understood the HC's rationale, this posed a challenge of how to address spots of severity in the West where many IDPs are located, and mental health issues and disabilities are highly prevalent, in particular when development actors are not proactive to fill the gap, highlighting the challenge of prioritization. Mission members also shared that the HCT has discussed a shift towards area-based and subnational approaches based on the outcomes of the Operational Peer Review mission. A working group was initiated to pilot ideas to combine both approaches.
8. Concerning humanitarian access, MA AoR and GPC expressed concern about a 20-kilometer zone on the front line which is inaccessible to humanitarian organizations. Despite some areas being retaken by the government, five million people remain in non-government-controlled areas that are inaccessible to international humanitarian organizations. The mission briefed on the "Humanitarian Operations Planning Cell" which is a rapid response mechanism to coordinate among agencies on sending humanitarian convoys to high-risk areas. The GPC mission encouraged the HCT to find a link between the rapid response mechanisms and the regular cluster programming.
9. Concerning localisation and transition, GPC and the AoRs reiterated the high level of local capacity and government leadership in Ukraine. Greater consideration was needed in finding the right allocation and use of capacities of international technical experts, given this strong local capacity. Further, the mission reiterated the need to support local actors in frontline areas and find innovative ways of funding local partners. GBV AoR gave an example of a municipal system with currently 120 mobile units in operation. Additional examples of national capacity include a hotline for men and male survivors of conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV). At the same time, local organizations attempting to count the number of persons with disabilities lack support from the government or international actors.
10. MA AoR added that the government was developing a mine action strategy and operates mine action coordination centers. Concerning the government's current priority on agricultural recovery, it is necessary to advocate for a humanitarian approach to mine action focusing on protecting people. In MA AoR's estimation,

## GCCG Meeting

8 November 2023, 14:00 – 16.00 GVA time

this large professional cadre and strong local authority capacity will enable the transition to development and cluster deactivation could be envisioned within the next year.

11. Concerning recovery and reconstruction, GPC noted considerable evidence all over Ukraine in terms of new construction, however the cooperation between humanitarian and development actors was a question.
12. The floor was open for comments and questions. GBV AoR invited Ms. Doull (GHC) to report on her mission to Ukraine a month ago. Ms. Doull stated she had understood that OCHA Ukraine estimates a 30 to 40 per cent cut of funding for the 2024 HNRP and that the impact of work in single spots of severity is often low. She also reported that there are structural issues and constraints for the humanitarian response due to the ongoing health system reform in Ukraine. A more focused operational area is needed as other actors will be available to support the Western and Central regions. Concerning the access constraints, Ms. Doull noted that joint planning could enable the needed agility and flexibility to enter these areas. Ms. Doull reported on the absence of strong intercluster engagement, dialogue, and planning. GBV AoR agreed on the perception of a gap between the HCT and the ICCG. Ms. Doull reiterated the importance of area-based coordination.

### Operational Updates

13. **Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT):** Ms. Pack handed over to Ms. Hassan (GCCG secretariat) and welcomed Ms. Kimberly Lietz (OCHA OPT). Ms. Hassan invited Ms. Lietz to brief on operational updates from OPT.
14. Ms. Lietz reported that the Flash Appeal of US\$1.2 billion was published, aiming to cover basic needs over three months. It reflects immediate humanitarian needs without reference to early recovery or reconstruction. Additionally, line items for coordination were included for every cluster and AoR. The aim is to enhance coordination mechanisms in Gaza and facilitate a scale-up in the West Bank. Ms. Lietz referred to the vital role cluster coordinators played in prioritization. The recommendations put forward by the cluster coordinators were shared with donors. Ms. Lietz reported that there was little to no visibility on the movement of goods into and within Gaza. Information on logistics is currently of utmost importance to identify needs and coverage of aid. Ms. Lietz remarked on the high number of staff and partners who have been killed and the critical role of UNRWA. Ms. Lietz asked GCCs to reach out and encourage donors to fund items on coordination and to support the role of the clusters in identifying the priorities in the response.
15. The floor was open for comments and questions. On plans for an inter-agency mission to Gaza, Ms. Lietz responded that the mission plans remained open due to the sudden changes in movement opportunities. The mission aims to collect facts on operational capacities and possibilities for area-based coordination, including the options for safe spaces, staff housing, and communication infrastructure. Ms. Hassan enquired on the link between UNRWA's response and coordination role vs the IASC and OCHA's coordination role. Ms. Lietz reported that OCHA OPT works closely with UNRWA which is part of all inter-cluster coordination groups and has the greatest capacity and visibility on the ground. UNRWA components have been embedded in the Flash Appeal under cluster sections. Referring to GBV AoR, Ms. Lietz reported that OCHA OPT has been advocating for dignity kits, SRH products, emergency obstetric kits, and specialized items for people with disabilities.
16. **The Pacific:** Ms. Hassan noted that the Pacific Humanitarian Team had requested a retreat to review working modalities, roles and responsibilities and preparedness for the upcoming cyclone season. OCHA Pacific requested support for the planning of the retreat which will bring together the HCT and the ICCG. A short mission of OCHA SWAPs (undertaken by Ms. Hassan) will support OCHA Pacific. Ms. Hassan noted that she will contact GCCs for specific coordination issues and will take on key messages or questions.

### Coordination mapping

17. Ms. Hassan provided an overview of the findings relating to clusters/sectors/AoRs from the 2022 annual coordination mapping exercise (which took place in the first quarter of 2023). A draft of the findings will be shared with the GCCs ahead of publication.
18. A record number of 36 country-level locations were surveyed for this latest mapping exercise (the previous year was 31 country-level locations). The additional locations, mapped at GCCG request, included El Salvador, Guatemala, Pakistan, Pacific, Syria (NES) and include non-activated, non HCT settings. Due to sudden conflict in Sudan, the country was removed from the 2022 analysis. The consolidated data has been

## GCCG Meeting

8 November 2023, 14:00 – 16.00 GVA time

shared with the GCCs on all mapped locations. For analysis and reporting purposes, the same countries (and criteria) will be used as in previous years to allow for consistency and data comparison purposes.

19. In total, 420 surveys were sent out, of which 40 were not answered. Over 2,365 mechanisms were analysed, including national and subnational clusters/sectors/AoRs, strategic advisory groups, technical working groups, as well as HCTs and ICCGs. Key observations from the data show overall consistent figures with last year. As far as cluster leadership was concerned (lead/co-lead), figures remain mostly consistent compared to last year's results across all entities (UN, INGO, national authority, NNGOs). Reviewing all cluster leadership (lead/co-lead/co-chair), as always, a slightly more equitable distribution of leadership roles is seen across the various entities, and this year's data is again on similar footing with previous years, while seeing very slight increases for INGOs and NNGOs (1%) and a similarly slight decrease (1%) for national authorities. At the subnational level, the leadership figures are on par with 2021 figures.
20. Looking at the percentage of dedicated staffing across clusters, the 2022 mapping revealed that 64% of clusters had a dedicated coordinator during the year. This is a small but notable increase from 60% in 2022. Concerning IMO staffing, there is a one per cent increase in 2022, indicating the need for further advocacy for these positions. At the subnational level, the dedicated staffing of the coordinator role increased from 19% in 2021 to 21% in 2022 while IMO staffing remained similar to 2021 levels i.e. at 5.5%.
21. In terms of cluster responsibilities, fewer clusters reported having a strategy or ToRs in 2022 compared with the previous year (both down by 7%); however, positive improvements were seen as far as completing CCPMs (11% increase) or having transition plans in place (5% improvement).
22. The floor was open for comments and questions. Several GCCs indicated the importance and usefulness of the annual coordination mapping exercise to review trends and have an overview of the key coordination thematics. GNC highlighted the figures relating to national leadership and noted this question might be interpreted differently across the clusters. GNC asked for additional clarification, as per its data, 44% cent of activated nutrition clusters are co-led by national authorities and 86% of sectors were led by national authorities. GNC also expressed concern about the minimum standards regarding long-term dedicated capacity and suggested a need for consensus on this point. Ms. Hassan noted that there were variations across the clusters in terms of participation and leadership of national authorities. She also noted that there was a need to review how national authority participation was reflected and how this question was structured in the survey. In response to a question from GEC, Ms. Hassan confirmed that there would be a dedicated meeting to discuss the mapping process. UNICEF's Global Cluster representative, Mr. Syed, asked for a definition of the category "partial." Ms. Hassan clarified that this category applies if a dedicated coordinator or IMO is in place for three to eight months or if two dedicated coordinators or IMOs are in place for three to five months. Ms. Hassan asked the GCCs to feed back if the figures mirror the GCC's understanding of the status at the field level.
23. GSC commented that the results indicate few improvements, and asked if this aligns with Ms. Hassan's perception. Ms. Hassan agreed that a plateau seems to have been reached in terms of leadership, however, there was a small but positive trend in terms of the number of clusters with dedicated coordinators. GSC proposed to discuss the systemic issues based on the coordination mapping data at the GCCG retreat. Referring to the gap in IM staffing at the subnational level, CCCM noted that the IM function is often centralised at the national level and suggested the gap could be misrepresented. Ms. Hassan noted that indeed, some respondents indicated that a national IMO takes on subnational responsibilities where there is no need for a subnational position and it is important to read the results with an understanding of the context. GEC suggested that some improvements as far as the dedicated staffing figures were concerned could be explained by the impact of the CLARE II Review. GBV AoR reported that donors had expressed a dissatisfaction with the progress on staffing, however, for regional IM staffing some progress was being made by hiring WLOs as co-coordinators. GBV AoR suggested a discussion on best practices to cover the identified gaps.
24. In terms of next years' mapping exercise, Ms. Hassan noted that internal discussions were taking place in OCHA on the feasibility of conducting future mappings, considering capacity constraints. The GCCGs would be updated on this as soon as possible. Ms. Hassan thanked all GCCs and colleagues in the field for their contributions to the mapping.

### Action points

- iii. *GCCG-s to share the draft report on coordination mapping and report on plans for next year's coordination mapping.*
- iv. *GCCG-s to organize a separate discussion on the process of the coordination mapping.*

## **GCCG Meeting**

8 November 2023, 14:00 – 16.00 GVA time

### **Discussion on GCCG retreat**

25. Further to a number of discussions and feedback, in consideration of the current workload imposed by recent crises, and a low response rate by GCCs to lead sessions, Ms. Pack proposed to postpone the GCCG retreat to early 2024 (last week of January or first week of February) and asked GCCs for their views. GBV AoR asked to avoid 5 to 7 February and proposed to have a one-day meeting to address immediate concerns. Ms. Pack explained that a regular GCCG meeting is envisioned for early December. Ms. Pack noted that there is flexibility concerning the dates, however, the retreat needs to take place in late January or early February to finalise the workplan. GSC proposed to adjust the retreat to require less preparation. GEC proposed to have a longer hybrid meeting at the end of the year.
26. Ms. Hassan asked GCCs to express their preference in the chat. GSC, GHC, GETC, GNC, CCCM, GLC and GWC expressed flexibility on the proposed postponement. GETC asked for a timely decision to allow travel arrangements.
27. Concerning possible agenda items for the retreat, GCCG secretariat thanked all GCCs for their responses. Based on the survey results, area-based approaches, transition, climate change, inter-cluster synergies, localisation, and EDG operational priorities will be included in the agenda.

### **Action points**

- v. *GCCG-s to inform GCCs of a decision concerning the postponement of the GCCG retreat.*

### **AOB**

28. Ms. Pack noted that the date of the next GCCG meeting will be communicated in due course and proposed the following agenda items: (1) Operational updates, (2) GCCG retreat - EDG discussion, (3) satisfaction survey, (4) Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations, (5) ICC e-learning module, and (6) HPC.