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| **Summary of Discussion** | **Action Points** |
| **ICCG Performance Monitoring Reviews**  The GCCG secretariat provided an overview of ICCG performance monitoring reviews (PMR)undertaken by ICCGs and ISWGs in 2019, including reviews using the “ICCG Performance Monitoting Tool” developed by the GCCG.  Main highlights:   * PMRs were carried in 12 of the 29 locations with an ICCG/ISWG: Burundi, CAR, Chad, DRC, Ethiopia, Haiti, Libya, Niger, Nigeria, oPt (Gaza), Syria-Gaziantep, Yemen. The reviews used different approaches. Seven of the 12 ICCGs-ISWGs used the newly developed ICCG PM tool: Burundi, Ethiopia, DRC, Haiti, Libya, Syria-Gaziantep, Yemen. * Key issues of concern to ICCGs were identified through these reviews, the most common ones being: ineffective/poor interaction between the HCT and ICCG; insufficient collaboration between the national and sub-national ICCGs; lack of joint frameworks on CE/AAP; a need to improve joint needs analysis, better monitoring to support the response, and improving collaboration with development stakeholders.   The GCCG secretariat shared initial feedback on the use of the PM tool. The main strengths identified were flexibility and adaptability to all contexts; the promotion of an open dialogue in the ICCG relating to its functioning and performance. Weaknesses highlighted were the length of the process; lack of buy-in from clusters in few countries; not suitable for the sub-national level; not sufficiently critical as the tool relies on self-assessment.  Moving forward, OCHA/GCCG secretariat will be liaising with ICCGs to promote expanded use of the tool during 2020. The GCCG will need to review the tool towards the end of the year in case adaptations are necessary based on further feedback from the field. It was also proposed that the CCPM and ICC PMRs take place in a coordinated fashion and be carried out at during the same time frame the same time, by all the clusters to identify common strengths and weaknesses and to address common gaps in a coherent and collective way.  The GCCG secretariat underscored that the ICCG PM is a priority for OCHA, aiming to increase the number of countries undertaking such exercise in the future. Moreover, OCHA/SWAPS is organizing training for inter-cluster coordinators in the field, with one of the sessions on how to improve ICC. Participation of GCCs would add value to the discussion.  In addition to sharing the results from the PMRs , the GCCG secretariat highlighted additional issues of concern in relation to coordination quality indicators arising from the 2019 coordination data collecton.: no systematic coordination architecture reviews; lack of HCT Compacts; unevenness in development of ICCG workplans, and lack of visibility on CCPM exercises and outcomes (when/how/by whom).  Questions and Answers:   * CCCM: The point around self-assessment is key, and should be looked at while revising the PM tool. * GLC: The purpose of this type of tool is to allow self-assessments and not to carry out evaluations/audits, but rather to encourage discussion between clusters; for 2020 it may be worth considering holding off on the ICCG PM, given additional workload due to COVID-19 (GHRP, etc). * CCCM proposed a facilitated discussion, that would be more qualitative, instead of being a long process. GBV AoR concurred, suggesting to keep the process light and look for qualitative inputs. * GPC suggested it might be worth looking at how the coordination system will look in the future, given the changes ahead. * GCCG secretariat acknowledged the need to keep the process light and suited to local circumstances, noting that the tool is adaptable, allowing individual ICCGs to decide how to carry out the review. It is important to have an opportunity to reflect on how the ICCG is performing and it would also be beneficial to have the point of view of the field CCs on this. GCCG secretariat appealed to the GCCs to encourage CCs to support this process, including through a message to be shared with field CCs as well as helping OCHA address issues that may emerge through the PM process in individual operations.   In conclusion, the GCCG agreed that performance monitoring should continue to be carried out in 2020, keeping the process light, adapted to local context and taking into account current constraints. CCs in the field would be encouraged to provide their feedback on the tool to the extent possible. |  |
| **Exchange on the Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Internal Displacement**  Ms. Zeender, representing the secretariat for the Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Internal Displacement, briefed the Group on Panel’s genesis and terms of reference / scope of work, as well as its membership and membership of the Expert Advisory Group. Ms. Zeender also updated on the consultations with a variety of stakeholders completed to date, and commented on the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on the Panel’s ability to engage with relevant parties. [*Refer also to the accompanying PowerPoint presentation.*]  Overall, the intention for the Panel is to:   * Provide independent, “out of the box”, strategic narrative on Internal Displacement, while managing expectations and propose concrete follow-up. * Better understand and contextualize multi-causality of internal displacement. * Bring greater visibility to the issue, in particular to devastating consequences for displaced and communities and affected countries. * Propose people, protection, solutions-centered way forward. * Ensure national ownership, responsibility, political commitment and effective governance capacity as keystones to durable solutions.   Subsequently, Ms. Zeender invited GCCs to share their perspective, and also challenges and issues reported to them by their field counterparts, particularly in relation to the following three themes:   * How can relevant actors (humanitarian, development, Governments, etc.) work coherently toward facilitating durable solutions while ensuring the protection of IDPs? * Do you have specific examples of successful collaboration enabling durable solutions to internal displacement? * Recommendations and issues for the Panel’s attention on how to better respond to internal displacement.   Questions and answers:  CCCM drew attention to the fact that the discussion around Internal Displacement should also look at the issue of preparedness as an intrinsic part of durable solutions, also against the backdrop of linking humanitarian assistance to development. Ms. Sophonpanich also pointed out the strong focus on the international system, while the system itself aims to promote local solutions and localization. She also highlighted the need to take closer look at funding mechanisms at country-level and offered to share some concrete examples from the field.  In response, Ms. Zeender confirmed that the Panel was also looking at preparedness issues and that it definitely aimed at engaging with national governments to seek good practice related to internal displacement. Ms. Zeender added that financing for recovery was also an issue being considered by the Panel.  A question was also raised on how the GCCs can better engage with the Panel, by providing questions and examples. Ms. Zeender welcomed such contributions and informed that they could be shared directly with the Panel’s secretariat by sending them to Caelin Briggs ([caelin.briggs@un.org](mailto:caelin.briggs@un.org)). [*A questionnaire is also attached.*]  GSC added that a lot of feedback has already been provided through the UNHCR submission, especially around the centrality or protection and the need for protection-driven approaches, but also more broadly aiming at linking humanitarian action to development. Mr. Moore added that shelter is often only one of many aspects of the overall vulnerability, quoting poverty amongst slum dwellers and urbanization, as well as climate-related and conflict-related migration, as causes to be looked at. Mr. Moore continued by highlighting the need to support good governance and comprehensive interventions – i.e. aligning shelter solutions with interventions such as education, health, etc. and addressing housing, land and property issues early on.  Responding to a question about whether the Panel would focus on coordination issues, Ms. Zeender advised that this was not an issue at which the Panel was looking particularly closely and that the focus was much more around increasing stakeholders’ capacities for a more effective response to internal displacement. | i) if interested, GCCs should share relevant questions and information on challenges and good practice in the field |
| **Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc.)**  GHRP: monitoring and reporting:  Mr. Goetghebuer (OCHA) informed the Group that the first Progress Report against the GHRP, with a particular focus on Logistics as a sector and some countries, had been published: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-humanitarian-response-plan-covid-19-april-december-2020-progress-report-first>. The next update to the GHRP is due on 16 July, with contributions currently being gathered. He also confirmed that, at current stage, no additional updates of the GHRP were foreseen.  Mr. Goetghebuer drew GCCs’ attention to the focus shifting towards monitoring and reporting, and donors expectations in this regard. He elaborated by presenting the agreed reporting schedule, as follows:   * End of August: Progress report – deadline of contributions confirmed as 21 August * End of September: Progress report * End of October: Progress report * End of December: Progress report   He noted that the Global Humanitarian Overview would be produced by the end of November.  In closing, Mr. Goetghebuer encouraged Global Clusters to contribute to the future reports, by providing narrative and data about achievements, at country, regional, or global level. He also recalled OCHA focal points for GHRP reporting: Lisa Peterson: [peterson1@un.org](mailto:peterson1@un.org) and Benjamin Negus: [negus@un.org](mailto:negus@un.org).  Basic Information Package and COVID-19 Engagement Matrix:  A representative of the Global Protection Cluster has been contacting individual Global Clusters to ensure they share the materials with the field, with some but not all having already done so. The GCCG Chair encouraged everyone to proceed without further delays, and reminded GCCs to share feedback received from the field with respect to the documents shared but also with respect to challenges and good practice more broadly. | i) GCCs to share feedback from the field |
| **AOB:**  GCCG Mid-year Retreat:  The GCCG Chair reminded the Group of the retreat scheduled for 7-8 July and requested that the GCCs inform the GCCG secretariat of their attendance, or nominate alternates who will attend on their behalf. She also encouraged individual GCCs to facilitate sessions, with GEC, GNC and GPC agreeing to do so, in addition to coordinators that were already involved (CCCM, GEC, GSC and GCP and GBV AoRs).  Field support and engagement with in-country (inter-)cluster coordinators:  The GCCG Chair solicited views from the group on inviting to future GCCG meetings representatives of ICCGs from specific countries – e.g. an inter-cluster coordinator could be invited alongside two or three cluster coordinators from the same country. She asked GCCs to propose specific operations. The GCCG agreed this should be taken forward.  JIAF:  The Global Protection Cluster Coordinator informed the Group that the GCCG feedback was shared with the JIAF working group on Friday 26 June and that a lot of the over 250 comments were integrated into the second draft which has been circulated. Mr. Chemaly also informed of the meeting which took place on 30 June and where the feedback was discussed in greater detail. He added that any unresolved issues would be raised with the JIAF Steering Committee. The expectation was that by 3 July, the JIAF guidance would for 2021 would be “sufficiently ready” for circulation to the field. | i) GCCs to confirm the attendance for their respective Global Clusters  ii) GCCG secretariat to follow-up with GCCs who volunteered |