

**Summary note of GCCG meeting
17 April 2024, 14:00 – 16:00 GVA time**

Participant/Global Cluster: Dher Hayo, Wan Sophonpanich, Shadab Mansoori (CCCM); Friedrich Affolter and Elisa Radisone (GEC); Mary Jelliti (GLC); Emma Fitzpatrick Monica Ramos (GWC); Ron Pouwels (CP AoR); Pablo Medina and Seki Hirano (GSC); Stefano Fedele (GNC); Peter Kozelets (GPC); Damien Joud (GFSC); Eleonora Serpi (HLP AoR); Marina Skuric-Prodanovic (Co-Chair); Randa Hassan, Mari Sawai and Elizabeth Carpentier-Baugh (GCCG secretariat).

Invitees: Aida Mengistu, Anne-France White, Kevin Kennedy (Peer-2-Peer); Farhad Movahed (IASC secretariat); Kimberly Lietz (OCHA OPT); James Darcy, Enrico Leonardi (IAHE Team); Nicole Henze (IAHE secretariat).

Welcome and agenda overview:

1. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic, GCCG Co-Chair, welcomed participants and provided an overview of the proposed agenda. [Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic subsequently explained that Ms. Pack, GCCG Co-Chair would not be able to co-chair the meeting due to other engagements.] GEC asked to provide an update on the Interagency Monitoring Group (IMG) under AOB.

Updates and follow-up on GCCG action points

2. Ms. Skuric provided an update on recent IASC meetings and pending action points.
 - IASC meetings: TF1 on Centrality of Protection (10 April); TF4 on Humanitarian-Development Collaboration (HDC) (16 April); EDG mission to Port Sudan (28 April to 2 May).
 - Meetings/events: Past and upcoming GCCG and cluster events were pasted in the chat box, available through link: [GCCG calendar of events & forward agenda.xlsx](#). GFSC noted it was planning a mission to Nigeria on 21 to 22 April. Ms Skuric suggested GFSC contacts Ms. Marcantonio (GCCG-s) to coordinate on upcoming GCCG mission to Nigeria.
 - Action points/ reminders: (1) GCCs were reminded on the need to provide support on transition to their counterparts in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. GEC noted they were supporting the Honduras Education Cluster with guidance and resources. (2) The draft guidance on cluster activation and transition guidance including checklist and case studies have been almost finalized. Ms. Skuric clarified that suggestions on recommendations from the IASC IDP Review could not yet be incorporated into the guidance before the management response to the IASC IDP review was finalized. (3) The GCCG secretariat will organize a GCCG briefing on the Flagship Initiative. (4) GCCs were reminded to provide comments on the IASC Climate Crisis roadmap by 19 April. (5) Briefings for GCCs have been organized on JAWS on 23 April at 14:00, and activity.info on 22 May at 15:00. (6) GCCs should provide updates on progress against their respective workstreams in the GCCG workplan at the next meeting in May. (7) GCCs were asked to propose items for the GCCG mid-year retreat. (8) The GCCG session during HNPW will be on 7 May, 14:00-15:30. CCCM and Mr. Hayo asked GCCs to advertise the event widely and identify speakers.

Operational Updates

3. **OPT:** Ms. Lietz briefed on the humanitarian situation in OPT.
 - The incoming HC Mr. Muhannad Hadi has arrived in country. He has identified cluster coordination as a priority, highlighting the importance of education, nutrition and protection in particular.
 - Coordination in Gaza including area-based coordination in Khan Younis is functioning well with regular meetings being held. Agency representatives and cluster coordinators are working on potential military incursion scenarios to inform additional planning. National NGOs have begun to approach cluster coordinators to identify and fill gaps, however, it has not been possible to fulfill many of their requests e.g. on fuel.

Fuel continues to present a major operational challenge, in addition to insecurity affecting the movement of cash.

- A Flash Appeal has been published asking for USD 2.8 billion targeting 3.1 million people out of 3.3 million people in need.
- The maritime corridor will be divided into three zones: military, a zone for trucks to offload goods, and a humanitarian pick up zone.
- It was noted that no further feedback had been received from CLAs on bureaucratic impediments. GLC noted that this may be due to field colleagues feeling that raising issues would not lead to any solution. Ms. Skuric reminded GCCs of the importance of continuing to advocate on various issues and encouraged them to provide details on remaining bureaucratic impediments to facilitate further advocacy efforts.

4. **Sudan:** Mr. Movahed provided an update on Sudan, noting that the system-wide scale up was extended until the end of June 2024 focusing on famine prevention. The EDG will carry out a 10-member mission to Port Sudan from 28 April to 2 May to look at operational challenges, cross border, and the famine prevention response. A mission ToR was shared in the chat box: [link](#).

IAHE in Afghanistan

5. Mr. Darcy, Team Leader, presented the key findings, conclusions and recommendations from the IAHE response in Afghanistan: [slides](#). Six recommendations were presented in various areas, namely (1) ensuring readiness planning for high-risk countries; (2) resourcing and harmonizing the 'basic needs' agenda; (3) humanitarian principles and Protection Strategy; (4) accountability and risk management; (5) programme evolution, and (6) evidence, outcome and performance indicators. Recommendations 1, 5, and 6 were noted as particularly relevant to clusters.
6. GCCs asked Mr. Darcy how they could scale up the response, with GSC noting they are reaching only 18 per cent of those in need. Mr. Darcy and Mr. Leonardo highlighted the resource gaps, high cost of the response, and political considerations by the authorities as limitations and suggested a dialogue with donors. On the recommendation on accountability and the use of metrics, Ms. Skuric asked about the example of South Sudan where the HCT was using a critical metric to strengthen the response and whether it should be considered as a good practice to be replicated elsewhere. Mr. Darcy responded that accountability should be about reaching critical outcomes in operations, and this goes beyond just delivery of programmes. To enable this, metrics and indicators were essential. Ms. Skuric advised that the recommendation 6 be made as specific as possible to ensure it gets taken forward. Ms. Henze said that the next steps were to work with the IASC and the HCT on the management response to the recommendations. Ms. Skuric and CCCM remarked that the involvement of cluster coordinators in the crafting of scale-up benchmarks would make them more useful. Ms. Skuric asked that the reference to cash be more specific and suggested a more precise use of terminology in the report.

Peer-2-Peer Mission on Mozambique

7. Mr. Kennedy gave an overview of the Peer-2-Peer mission on Mozambique in February, touching upon the impact of climate change, coordination arrangements and funding shortages. He noted below the P2P Mission Team's recommendations for Mozambique:
 - The UN presence is limited to Maputo and Pemba, whereas the NGOs have a much wider presence across the province, closer to the affected population. The mission recommended the UN to move out of Maputo and Pemba.
 - There is a lack of joint programming in the north and the response is uneven leaving visible gaps even in locations where IDPs had been displaced months prior. The mission therefore recommends a stronger coordination to ensure gaps

- are filled.
 - There are two sets of clusters: one in the North focused on humanitarian response to the conflict impact, and the other in Maputo focused primarily on natural disaster planning and response. The mission recommended that the clusters in Maputo undertake reviews to see if they should be adjusted or transition/be deactivated, based on an analysis of the context and national coordination capacity.
 - Most of the clusters remain entirely UN-led, with no NGO co-chairs (international nor local), and there has been limited involvement of local organizations. Two national NGOs recently joined the HCT in Maputo, but no national NGOs are part of the HCT in the North. There is a reluctance to include Mozambiquans in the response which is problematic, and the mission recommends a much stronger localization element in the response.
8. GCCs referred to challenges in mobilizing funding including from the CERF, and GNC noted a more general severe underfunding was resulting in response gaps. GSC noted the shift from natural disasters to conflict in 2019 but that the Maputo coordination structures remained focused on natural disasters. GNC clarified that its cluster is co-led by the Ministry of Health in Maputo, Beira and Capo Delgado. IFRC further pointed out that IFRC has traditionally co-coordinated the GSC cluster with IOM in a formal or non-formal way. Mr. Kennedy noted that the RC/HC was on board with looking at the disconnect between Maputo and the north and have committed to implementing the Action Plan to address these. Ms. Mengistu noted that the government of Mozambique had a good capacity in disaster management and highlighted the importance of clusters avoiding duplication in efforts. Ms. White asked the GCCG to work with the field colleagues on emphasizing the importance of NGO co-leadership, given reluctance at the field level. Regarding GCC support to the team in Maputo, Ms. Mengistu recommended engaging with the HC on what's needed to avoid creating additional layers and processes to an already heavy structure, and to be in line with the HCT Action Plan commitment to prioritize presence and fit-for-purpose structures where the affected communities are particularly in the north. CCCM asked whether the mission had also looked at the solutions side. Mr. Kennedy clarified that the mission did not have this in its scope, but that the lack of cooperation between humanitarian and development was flagged as an issue.

AOB

9. **IASC IDP Review:** Ms. Skuric reminded GCCs that there was a matrix laying out the management response and noted that the circuit breaker proposal had been submitted to IASC Deputies. Ms. Skuric enquired whether GCCs had been consulted by their CLAs on the management response, with GCCs confirming that two CLAs had consulted them.
- Climate Working Group:** GEC provided an update on the activities under the Climate WG of the GCCG. A survey was being developed to map the actions of clusters. He proposed discussing this further at the next GCCG meeting. CCCM referred to an HNPW session on extreme heat and proposed to link the work of the Climate WG.
- Inter-agency Monitoring Group:** GEC said that the data disaggregation working paper was close to finalization. A concept note on outcome monitoring was being developed, and GEC asked GCCs to share concept notes on how clusters calculate the number of people reached. Given multiple commitments, Mr. Affolter asked whether his deputy could step in to represent the GCCG in IAWG. For accountability reasons, Ms. Skuric proposed to put this motion to a vote at the next meeting.

Action points:

- GCCs: Provide comments on the IASC Climate Crisis roadmap by 19 April.
- GCCs: Advertise the GCCG event during HNPW through their networks and propose speakers.
- GCCs: Workstream leads to provide progress update on the workplan at the next

GCCG meeting.

- GCCs: Propose agenda items for the GCCG mid-year retreat (26 June).
- GCCs: Provide feedback regarding bureaucratic impediments in OPT.
- IAHE secretariat: Consider amending the recommendation 6 to be more specific and to use a more precise terminology on cash in the report.
- GCCs: Emphasize the importance of NGO co-leadership with field cluster coordinators in Mozambique, and support/advise the HC and HCT on how to move towards NGO co-chair arrangements for all clusters.
- GCCs: Support cluster coordinators in Mozambique in their effort to streamline and simplify the coordination structures, and follow up on further support needed by HC/HCT.
- GCCs: Share concept notes on how clusters calculate the number of people reached with GEC.
- GCCG-s: Hold a vote on the replacement of Mr. Affolter as GCCG representative to the IAWG at its next meeting in May.