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| **Summary of Discussion** | **Action Points** |
| **Agenda, follow-up on past action points:**  The GCCG Chair thanks the GCCG member for their feedback on the query from Afghanistan regarding guidance on preventive COVID-19 measures for households, and informed that the information was shared with the field. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic also advised that, as per agreed action points, the GCCG secretariat shared with the Group information on the MPTF COVID-19 and the finalised questionnaire for the data collection exercise 2020.  She also informed that the GCCG-S is following up on organising the briefings on: (i) the RCCE common service and (ii) the AOR model - both briefings expected to take place at the next GCCG meeting, on 30 September, and (iii) data responsibility – planned for October, once the Humanitarian Data Centre completes consultations with individual GCCG members.  Lastly, Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic drew attention to the two outstanding matters that require action from the GCCs: (a) the cluster activation and deactivation exercise – although the deadline to provide information has passed on 11 September, to date only six GCs provided the required feedback, and (ii) sharing results of the CCPM exercise – the initial deadline having passed in mid-August, submissions were only made by six GCs; and urged the GCCs to provide the missing information soonest possible. She added that, in the coming days, the GCCG secretariat will follow up directly with those who had not done so yet. |  |
| **COVID-19:**  Update from the OCHA COVID-19 Cell:  The Head of the OCHA COVID-19 Cell referred to the different, ongoing efforts to identify a vaccine and commented that all analyses pointed out to increasing unlikelihood of the October statement milestone being met. A delay would obviously have consequences for roll-out, also in countries of concern to humanitarians.  With regards to the GHO, Mr. O’Malley informed that the EDG agreed to propose to the IASC Principals that Mozambique, Pakistan, and Zimbabwe be added for 2021 cycle. He also clarified that, contrary to earlier proposals for some of the GHO/HRP countries to use a light framework, standard methodology would apply to all countries included in the GHO/HRP 2021.  On the MPTF COVID-19, Mr. O’Malley informed that the 18 pre-selected countries (of about 80 initial submissions) have now been asked to submit formal proposals. The available pool of funding is USD 20 million, with one third of the amount being set aside for projects meeting the Gender marker.  In addition, Mr. O’Malley drew the Group’s attention to the ERC’s briefing to the UN Security Council on COVID-19, which Mr. Logcock did jointly with DPPA and DPKO. The briefing aimed at securing the Council’s support for mobilising resources, including from IFIs, to support the COVID-19 response and to tackle the socio-economic impact of the pandemic, also warning of risks and consequences if not addressed. Mr. O’Malley added that additional, country and topic-specific briefings (Yemen, South Sudan, food security, etc) were also ongoing and planned for the near future.  Lastly, Mr. O’Malley mentioned communications materials produced by the Gates foundation, which are a reach resource of information on COVID-19 and its secondary effects.  GHRP monitoring and reporting:  Mr. Goetghebuer (OCHA), referring to a written communication which was shared with the GCCG ahead of the meeting, informed the Group that the work on the next GHRP progress report was ongoing, based on the same approach as for the August issue. Specifically, as agencies are asked to provide input on progress and achievements, clusters are encouraged to share any relevant data or information, directly with OCHA focal points or through their Cluster Lead Agency. Relevant templates had been shared with the GCCG by email, with the deadline of 21 September for submissions.  In response to the Global GBV AOR’s question on monitoring and reporting against the GHRP beyond 2020, Mr. Goetghebuer informed that the initial intention to fold COVID-19 response(s) into the GHO 2021 and any specific HRPs within it was being upheld. Nevertheless, he added that, should there be such a demand, specific reports could be produced, but clarified that such a reporting would be based on specific demands and/or be proposed in view of the evolving situation. |  |
| **IASC Reference Group for Gender in Humanitarian Action:**  The Co-chairs of the IASC Reference Group for Gender in Humanitarian Action (GRG) briefed the Group on the mandate and workstreams of the entity. Specifically, they highlighted the commitments of the humanitarian system (championed by the IASC) with respect to gender policy and gender mainstreaming, and GRG’s objectives and priorities. Ms. Pham and Ms. Lafreniere also recalled the two recommendations made by the 2018 report on the Accountability Framework with regard to the Global Clusters:   * be individually briefed on the content of the 2017 Gender Policy, so that they are informed of its content in terms of the standards and roles and responsibilities assigned to them so that any future product development adequately reflects that; and * be briefed on the 2017 Gender Policy Accountability Framework mechanism, so that they are aware of their reporting obligations.   Lastly, the Co-chairs elaborated on the ongoing efforts for improved analysis of the existing programming and for capturing and sharing good practice, mentioning the engagement with OPAG’s Results Groups and in HPC activities, including those related to the GHRP. They also encouraged submissions from the Global Clusters to the annual reports and the Cluster Self-Assessment on the Gender Policy (only five GCs contributed to the last report) and offered to work closely with GCCs to ensure the data is provided to the next iteration. In fact, the GCCs still can liaise with UN Women to ensure their feedback is properly reflected in this year’s report. The GCCG secretariat will follow up with the GRG Co-chairs to clarify deadlines for submission. [The deadline was subsequently clarified as being 25 September – please see separate email on the subject].  The Global Shelter Cluster Co-coordinator reported that several donors had expressed interest in obtaining an analysis of the diversity, including gender balance, of Shelter teams, and the cluster made commitments in this regard that it will need to deliver on.  The Global CCCM Cluster Co-coordinator reported her cluster’s engagement, as part of the Call to Action, on GBV prevention and mitigation, but also staffing and team composition in the field (camp staffing and community engagement support: inclusion, women’s groups, etc.), and mainstreaming of gender into any CCCM activities over the past 4-5 years. She informed that gender considerations are also being reflected in the Camp Management Standards which are currently being revised.  Ms. Chase, the Global GBV AOR Coordinator, recalled the commitment made for a greater coordination of gender and GBV activities, also with PSEA. She also informed that the GBV AOR took stock, in the context of localization, of the capacity and inclusion of women-led organisations and continues to engage in advocacy in this regard.  In response to the GCCG Chair’s question regarding the existing guidance on gender and gender mainstreaming, Ms. Pham informed that the Gender Handbook is the most comprehensive reference guide, adding that she was also aware of cluster-specific gender (and age, disability) guidance and standards – e.g.: WASH. In her view, the issue is not about the lack of policies or guidelines, but rather about the lack of consistency and accountability in adherence to the existing norms. She concluded saying that the IASC Gender evaluation will hopefully help to build momentum for greater attention to gender aspects of humanitarian action. Ms. Sophonpanich (Global CCCM Cluster) concurred with Ms. Pham, adding that, although significant progress has already been made on finding common language and common commitments, and ensuring gender considerations are embedded in planning and delivery, measuring the impact, and hence ensuring accountability, remains a challenge.  Referring to the strong commitment of the Global Logistics Cluster, and its Cluster Lead Agency, in gender mainstreaming (gender marker, etc.), Mr. Price pointed out that not all clusters are involved in direct delivery and contact with the beneficiaries, but instead deal with implementing partners. As such, they are bound by HR policies and standards of the implementing partners, but remain committed to gender considerations and, in fact, include implementing partners while reporting on achieving gender commitments at the institutional level. Mr. Price pointed out that, while contracts with implementing partners do include specific requirements with respect to gender standards and gender mainstreaming, it is very challenging for CLAs and GCs to be liable for compliance, especially by smaller / local partners, which might not have the same capacities as well-established, global humanitarian organizations. In his view, there should be a way of taking this into account while measuring fulfilment of gender commitments, perhaps even through a development of a “gender score card.”  In closing, the GCCG Chair suggested the GRG Co-chairs meet with the Group again once the IASC Gender evaluation was completed to discuss the findings and recommendations and, specifically, what they mean for the work of global and in-country clusters. Ms. Pham added that the GCCs should use the HPC 2021 as an opportunity to implement gender and GBV commitments through greater analysis and better planning, while Ms. Lafreniere reminded that significant resources, including analyses, for specific countries were available to (global) cluster coordinators to facilitate planning. | i) Global Clusters to provide inputs for the Cluster Self-Assessment on the Gender Policy by 25 September;  ii) GCCG-S to follow up once IASC Gender Evaluation is completed at end of 2020 and invite GRG Co-Chairs to GCCG meeting. |
| **GCCG Terms of Reference:**  The GCCG Chair recalled that the final draft of the GCCG Terms of Reference document had been shared with the Group prior to the meeting. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic pointed out that no additional concerns had been raised regarding the language of the document and that the only the outstanding issue was that of the Abor voting rights. She informed the group that, regardless whether the AORs preferences were taken into consideration or not, the majority of the Coordinators were in favour of removing the language related to voting from the text, and amending the language on the decision-making quorum accordingly. The Group confirmed its support and endorsement for this amendment.  Separately, the Global CCCM Cluster Co-Coordinator, sought clarification regarding the inclusion in the document of a reference to the participation of the UNICEF-led clusters representative and why this position was being specifically mentioned in the TOR.  Given Mr. Syed’s absence from the meeting, the Chair explained that this text had already been included in older drafts of the TOR and that the representative would similar to the IM WG representative and the Chair, have no ‘voting rights’. She also noted that her understanding was that his presence was also an indication of UNICEF’s commitment to the work of global clusters, promoting greater coherence and complementarity in its approach to cluster issues.  The WASH Cluster Coordinator noted she was new in her role but that she would relay this issue to Mr.  Syed. The Global GBV AOR Coordinator listed some of the advantages that she had observed in the past from the previous UNICEF Cluster Coordinators’ participation. However, to simplify the issue, she suggested a similar solution to that on the AOR voting rights - that the reference to his participation be removed from the TOR without this excluding the possibility of his attending as an observer. She clarified that it was key for each of the GCCs to participate in and contribute to the activities of the GCCG, even if a given CLA has a dedicated capacity to ensure coherence among the Global Clusters they lead. Considering this feedback, the GCCG Chair suggested that she would seek final agreement from UNICEF on the removal of  the reference from the text, with the clear understanding that the UNICEF-led clusters representative would continue to participate and contribute to the Group’s work, albeit without decision-making authority (unless such an authority were delegated to them by specific GCCs, and by notifying the GCCG Chair).  The GCCs confirmed their support for and endorsement of the proposed final text of the GCCG Terms of Reference, provided the issue of removing the reference to the UNICEF-led clusters’ representative be resolved. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic also advised that once finalised, the document would be shared with the OPAG for final endorsement. | i) GCCG Chair to seek final agreement for removing reference to the participation and representation by the UNICEF-led clusters’ representative;  [**completed**]  ii) GCCG Chair to share the document with the OPAG on behalf of the GCCG. |
| **AOB:**  GCCG representation at the JIAG:  Global Nutrition Cluster Coordinator suggested that the Group makes a decision on the new representatives to the JIAG, reminding that he and the Global Protection Cluster Coordinator have been performing this function for over a year now. Mr. Fedele suggested that the usual procedure be used to identify the new Focal Point(s) – i.e. that the GCCG secretariat organise a call for volunteers followed by a “vote of approval” by the Group. Reacting to the proposal, the Global Food Security Coordinator suggested that the change of focal points only take place as of 2021, to allow for completion of the current HPC work cycle. Mr. Minjauw also informed that, should the current Focal Points were unable, for whatever reasons, to discharge the function until such time, he would be willing to provide the support required for the transition period, and until the new GCCG representative(s) to the JIAG is selected. Thanking Mr. Fedele and Mr. Chemaly for their diligence in representing the GCCG at the JIAG and recognising the achievements made thanks to their and the GCCG’s engagement, the GCCG Chair suggested that Mr. Fedele and Mr. Chemaly present the Group with a proposed timeline for their transition out of the JIAG FP roles, at which stage the Group’s secretariat will proceed with the “call for volunteers” and subsequently with seeking GCCs’ endorsement of the candidates. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic added that any transitional arrangement, if indeed required, could be discussed, pending feedback from Mr. Fedele and Mr. Chemaly.  JIAF: Inter-cluster Persons-in-Need (PiN):  The Global Food Security Coordinator raised concern regarding the inter-cluster Persons-in-Need (PiN) number and the proposed way for calculating it for HNO/HRP 2021, which has not yet been endorsed. Mr. Minjauw stressed it must be endorsed by the GCCG prior to roll-out to the field. In response, Ms. Dhur, representing OCHA, informed that the working group has been working closely with all concerned partners, including the GFSC and the IPC, to ensure comments and issues raised are addressed. She added that comments received from the IPC had already been reflected in the existing projection guidance, and that any final comments were still welcome by 17 September. The final draft would be shared with the GCCG ahead of the HPC Steering Group meeting scheduled for Thursday 24 September.  Update from the EDG – stock-taking meeting:  The GCCG Chair informed the Group of the following three outcomes of the EDG meeting held on 15 September:  i) The EDG Chair will have a follow-up discussion with the OPAG Co-chairs to strengthen linkages between the work and priorities of the EDG and OPAG/RGs. This is in addition to the communication from ERC Lowcock on the decision to extend the IASC structures.  ii) On bureaucratic and administrative impediments, two parallel tracks will be pursued: (a) an EDG call will be arranged immediately to provide concrete recommendations to IASC Principals by the end of September on how major visa issues in specific operations can be addressed; and (b) an EDG call will be arranged to explore how such impediments can be more strategically and proactively addressed through collective messaging/advocacy vis-à-vis governments, communities and armed groups to facilitate humanitarian access and acceptance more broadly.  iii) The EDG broadly agreed to recommend the extension of the COVID-19-tailored IASC Scale-up Activation for an additional three months (until 17 January 2021).  IASC Principals will consider this recommendation, and, if approved, common messaging will be developed around the extension.  ICCG Performance Monitoring:  The GCCG Chair informed the Group that the GCCG secretariat would be approaching individual GCCs with requests to participate in performance review workshops. Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic elaborated that the support would not require a significant time commitment, yet that it was part of the field support component of the GCCG workplan. The GCCG agreed with this proposal.  GCCG meetings going forward:  Ms. Skuric-Prodanovic informed the Group that the next regular meeting will take place on Wednesday, 30 September at 14:00 (as per the bi-weekly, standard schedule). She added that, based on frequent feedback from the Group and to ensure the meetings serve their intended purpose, the GCCG secretariat will adjust the invitation to include only the Coordinators and their deputies (as opposed to sending invitation to the entire mailing list), while any guests will be invited only for specific agenda items. Agendas and any background documents will initially (prior to the meeting) be shared only with Coordinators and their deputies. The agendas will subsequently be posted on the GCCG IASC website, together with meetings’ records. The GCCG Chair elaborated that the GCCs would, of course, continue to be able to share the documents with their global and country team as they deem fit. There was no objection by the GCCs to this new approach.  “Stepping back to look forward”:  The GCCG Chair thanked Mr. Copland (Child Protection AOR) for his support with re-formulating the questions which will serve as basis for the Phase 1 of the exercise and informed that few additional adjustments were made to the list of co-leads for the 13 workstreams. She informed that Group that the GCCG secretariat would be shortly circulating a message which summarises all information related to taking this endeavour forward, including the agreed timelines.  Update from the Global CCCM Cluster:  Ms. Sophonpanich informed the Group that the Global CCCM Cluster is undertaken this year a review of its strategy and might, as part of the process, seek best practices from other Global Clusters.  The Global CCCM Cluster Co-coordinator also informed that, for the past two years, the GC has been working on developing camp management standards, also working with the SPHERE Project. She encouraged her peers to provide their feedback either through Humanitarian Standards Partnership (survey can be find via link: <https://diagnostics.phap.org/s3/CMStandardsValidation>) or by reaching directly to her. | i) GNC and GPC Coordinators to propose a transition timeline;  ii) GCCs to volunteer to become Group’s Focal Points to the JIAG;  iii) GCCG-S to send out a call for volunteers for JIAF FPs; and subsequently organise the selection poll; |