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| **Summary Record** | **Action Points** |
| **Opening remarks:**  The GCCG Chair welcomed the participants, introduced the agenda and thanked all coordinators and colleagues who contributed to the preparations for the retreat. She informed the GCCG that, as per the preference expressed by the GCCs, the retreat would focus on both stocktaking (including against the agreed priorities and existing work plan) and a range of other topics that has been prioritised by the GCCG. |  |
| **Localisation:**  [*The session was co-led by the Global Education and CCCM Clusters and the Child Protection and GBV AORs, with a guest speaker from RG2 - IFRC.*]  The session started with an update on the workstreams and groups related to localisation, including:   * Sub-group on localisation within Results Group 1, the tasking to develop targets and benchmarks to measure progress on localisation; * Grand Bargain workstream, on localisation which predominantly focuses on risk sharing, funding from the pooled funds and capacity building; * Cluster-specific localisation Task Teams and Groups – e.g. Child Protection, GBV, and Education * Humanitarian Networks and Partnerships Week, which offered another platform where practitioners, beyond those involved in the Grand Bargain and IASC RGs, could engage on this topic, with some worthwhile conclusions which perhaps have not yet been translated into action.   Considering that currently no coherent approach exists on localization in the system (although many of the GCs are engaged in the various workstreams, and engagement with local partners is taking place on the ground), Mr. Nolan (Education) suggested the GCCG consider agreeing on a joint approach to take localisation forward, perhaps starting with a common conceptual framework for localisation in coordination which would set out the possible collective way forward and yet remain broad enough to be adapted as needed by individual clusters, and which would be based on five pillars:   * governance and decision-making, * influence and participation, * partnerships, * funding, and * institutional capacity.   Mr. Nolan also referred to CCPM, and the role it could play to support this workstream. Ms. Sophonpanich (CCCM) in turn reminded the Group of their agreement to use the CCPM tool this year to promote more localised approaches to coordination, also in connection with the work being undertaken by the sub-group of IASC RG1 and linked to indicators and benchmarks around localisation. She proposed that the CCPM guidance be reconsidered to ensure it also promotes collection of data in relation to barriers to localisation, as well as capacity and funding. In response, Mr. Fedele (Nutrition) cautioned about the potential difficulty of using a single tool to measure the various approaches GCs are taking to localisation. In response, Mr. Copland (Child Protection) explained that the existing diversity of approaches is one of the reasons why a single tool should be deployed to take a comprehensive look at the clusters’ engagement on localisation. Mr. Bouvet (WASH) suggested that the focus of localization efforts should be on capacity-building of national and local partners in collaboration with development partners.  Lastly, the group was briefed on some of the ongoing efforts in relation to institutional capacity strengthening and opportunities for the GCCG’s greater engagement.  Outcome 1: Review and analyse the existing CCPM questions/data and review the guidance for facilitation of CCMP to enhance localisation efforts in coordination:  1. Identify questions and scope of analysis,  2. Run analysis and present to GCCG, and  3. Review guidance and develop revisions/supplementary guidance for coordinators to strengthen local engagement in CCPM.  Outcome 2: GCCG to review and finalise Framework for Institutional Capacity Strengthening (based on existing CP/GEC framework) to use and promote with cluster members, ICCG, pooled funds and donors, as well as for the development of local partners. This is in order to increase access of local partners to resources, scale up successfully, and improve collective preparedness.  Outcome 3: Promote and advocate/communicate on localisation activities within the GCCG and other fora. | **FP:** CCCM / Education / Child Protection / GBV  **by:** mid-August 2020  **by:** mid-October 2020  **by:** mid-November 2020  **FP:** Education  **by:** 31 August 2020  **FP:** CCCM  **by:** 30 November 2020 |
| **ICCG Fitness for Purpose:**  [*The session was co-facilitated by the Global Health Cluster and the GCCG secretariat*.]  Ms. Hassan (GCCG secretariat) reminded the Group of its commitment under the workplan (as agreed in the Group’s last retreat) for the GCCG to work towards strengthened inter-cluster coordination at the field level. She highlighted the role of the ICCG Performance Monitoring exercise to contribute to enhanced ICC and provided an update on the key issues requiring strengthening that were highlighted through the ICCG Performance Monitoring exercises in 2019. Examples include: inter-sectoral analysis to inform the response, relationship between the HCT and the ICCG, collaboration with development actors, monitoring of the response for better outcomes, and AAP and community engagement frameworks. Ms. Hassan added that the ICCG Performance Monitoring process is an important opportunity for engagement on improving the functioning of inter-cluster forums.  Ms. Doull (Health) invited the GCCs to reflect on how the Group could support strengthened ICC, given that it was a shared interest for all clusters, as well as to comment on whether the issues highlighted through the ICCG performance exercises resonated with the GCCs or if there were any other areas of concern. As part of feedback, Ms. Sophonpanich mentioned the need for greater cohesion between the HCT and the ICCG, which is often dependant on the relationship between coordinators and their employing agencies. Ms. Doull concurred, adding that involving HCT in the dialogue around ICCG performance monitoring could be one of the solutions to the issue, coupled with a strengthened messaging by the GCCs to the CCs on their role in the ICCGs as well. Labidi (Food Security) suggested that the matter be investigated on a context by context basis. Ms. Hassan encouraged GCCs to ensure that CCs in the field actively participate in these reviews, and share feedback on the process. Noting that the ICCG Performance Monitoring was but one of several “review” processes Clusters were involved in during the year, Ms. Hassan suggested that the GCCG consider at a future meeting the links/appropriate timing between the CCPM, ICCG Performance Monitoring, and the HPC After Action Reviews.  Outcome 1:   * GCCG secretariat will share text for GCCs to send to CCs that can be adapted to inform and encourage CC participation in ICCG PM exercise, and * OCHA will send message to all ICCs to remind ICCs to carry out ICCG PM exercises in 2020.   Outcome 2**:** A review of the ICCG Performance Monitoring tool will be carried out towards the end of the year seeking inputs from ICCs and CCs. | **FP:** GCCG-S  **by:** 31 August 2020  **FP:** GCCG-S  **by:** 30 November 2020 |
| **GCCG Logo:**  Referring to past suggestions and attempts to establish a visual identity for GCCG products and advocacy efforts, the GCCG secretariat presented options for a GCCG logo to be developed in collaboration with the OCHA visualisation service. Due to time constraints, the Group did not take a decision on the way forward. The issue will be discussed at the next regular GCCG meeting, with the aim for securing a final decision. | **FP:** GCCG-S  **by:** 31 August 2020 |
| **GCCG Collaboration and Information-Sharing Platform:**  Referring to past requests from the GCCG, the GCCG secretariat informed the Group that it had followed up on the feasibility of establishing a web-based collaboration platform for the Group. Considering the GCCG’s status as an IASC Associated Entity, it was recommended that the GCCG build on the existing presence within the IASC portal, which would also provide a password protected space for the group to share and keep records of limited distribution. GCCs reacted positively to the proposal and agreed that as much content as possible, including meetings agendas and minutes, should be kept available for broader consumption, also as part of ensuring full transparency around the body’s work and engagement.  Outcome: GCCG will focus on revamping its existing presence on the IASC website, which in turn will become the primary platform for information-sharing, record keeping and advocacy for the Group. Most documents would be made available to the general public (transparency), while some internal/un-curated content would remain password protected. The GCCG secretariat will finalise the outline/proposal and present it to the GCCG for final approval. | **FP:** GCCG-S  **by:** 31 August 2020 |
| **Stepping back to look forward:**  [*The session was led by the Global Protection Cluster, with support from the GCCG secretariat.*]  Mr. Chemaly (Protection) opened the session with a request for GCCs to share their thoughts, experiences, and concerns in relation to the evolution of the humanitarian coordination system, including the cluster system, and opportunities for the GCCG to engage as a group. Ms. Hassan (GCCG secretariat) elaborated by highlighting some of the issues which may be compelling drivers for change:   * Funding levels, especially the likelihood of reduced financing for 2020, * Capacity, especially capacity of cluster coordinators and cluster IMOs, * Remote support and impact of COVID-19 on working practices * New crises: e.g. food insecurity, economic collapse, compounding of crises, * Alternative coordination models: effectiveness of the cluster system, etc, * Humanitarian-Development Collaboration, and * New contexts, especially expansion of work to non-cluster countries.   Mr. Chemaly added that, following the COVID-19 response, there will likely be appetite for review of the humanitarian system, including the clusters, with the aim to continue increasing the efficiency of the response.  Ms. Sophonpanich (CCCM-Natural Disasters) noted that financing and capacities are issues of concern and that training is being undertaken to increase capacity. She drew attention to the many ongoing discussions on coordination models, HDC, etc. for which a common position of the Group would be helpful. She recalled that the GCCG had attempted to embark on a review of the cluster system. Mr. Hayo (CCCM-Conflict) added that capacity building and localisation of the response are issues on which the GCCG needs to stay ahead of the game, together with greater focus inter-cluster collaboration and adjusting to operating in new types of contexts/crises.  Recalling the reviews and evolution of the humanitarian system which took place following major events (e.g. Humanitarian Reform and he Transformative Agenda) , Ms. Giordano (Education) concurred that another review is likely looming, especially considering that COVID-19 response showed the need to consider work in countries where clusters were active and those without an active cluster system. She informed of the UNICEF effort to review the clusters it leads, and suggested that the GCCG agrees on a set of common reference points that would be applied in all cluster and inter-cluster surveys.  For a service cluster such as the ETC, and key focus was ability to deliver in the new context, including through provision of remote support, which, as Ms. Teyssier explained, was possible thanks to strong partnership networks. She added that a strong focus on local partnerships would continue.  Ms. Labidi (Food Security) informed of cluster-internal discussions related to how to remain fit for purpose in the current context, and focus on the provision of required guidance, strengthened advocacy, and continued analysis. In her view, it would be key for the GCCG to invest in comprehensive/holistic approaches that would look across clusters and contexts, helping to identify overarching trends and challenges that could be addressed collectively.  Mr. Paganini (Early Recovery) recalled the external evaluation of the ER cluster (2018) recommending the de-activation of the Global ER Cluster which has still not been taken forward. In his view, a discussion/review of the cluster system would be timely and the GCCG should find a way of tabling it/bringing it to the attention of the IASC Principals and CLAs.  Ms. Doull (Health) argued that the issues highlighted are not new and that the GCCs’ and GCCG’s added value was how they contribute to context and event-specific coordination, which is critical. She also mentioned localisation as an area requiring investment, which has been proving very effective in the COVID-19 context. Lastly, embracing the idea of a cluster system review, she pointed out that any evaluation of coordination should comprehensively look at both clusters and alternative models of coordination, to understand what types of coordination are most effective.  Ms. Mayo (Logistics) agreed with other GCCs, adding that attention should be focused not only on shortcomings but also on successes of clusters and how they remain fit for purpose 15 years on. She elaborated on the increasing demand and expectations, with the clusters’ skills and expertise being increasingly deployed to support responses in locations where they are not formally activated. She also informed of the GLC’s plan to launch an internal review and drew attention to the varying degree of understanding, amongst various partners, of the scope of GLC’s area of responsibility.  Mr. Fedele (Nutrition) pointed out that clusters’ activity extends beyond ongoing emergency contexts, with many supporting sectors in non-cluster countries, including on preparedness and post-crisis activities. He informed of the GNC plan for a new strategy, expanding on guidance and tools which would also support inter-cluster and inter-sector coordination, and a renewed focus on localisation and humanitarian-development collaboration. He suggested that the Group considers a common approach to addressing changing needs to maximise on changing opportunities.  Mr. Donat (Mine Action AOR) mentioned the issue of capacity and adaptation to the lack of it as key challenge to coordination. In his view, coordination and inter-cluster coordination should remain more inclusive.  Mr. Copland (Child Protection AOR) argued that any review should be about coordination and not clusters per se. He also agreed that the clusters’ reach increasingly expanded to cover contexts where support to sectors was being provided without clusters necessarily being activated. He also drew attention to migration and climate change as thematic issues that need to be investigated as part of the key drivers for change. Lastly, he pointed out that, although there are increasing expectations for cross-sectoral approaches, the tools to enable such approaches might not yet be available.  Jim Robinson (Housing, Land, and Property AOR) re-emphasised the importance of preparedness and drew attention to the ongoing inter-cluster engagement in a variety of areas, including engagement with development actors. He also pointed out the need to ensure protection issues remain central.  Ms. Chase (GBV AOR) concurred with increased focus on preparedness and IM capacity, which are not areas which attract a lot of donor funding. She also stressed the need for greater cross-cluster engagement and collaboration.  Ms. Sergaroglu (Shelter-Natural Disasters) pointed out that funding to the sector has always been an issue, and so is sustaining capacity, also to enable carrying out of preparedness work. In this context, alternative coordination models and arrangement need to be considered especially in the context of COVID-19 and potential need to provide remote support or support through partners. Mr. Moore (Shelter-Conflict) confirmed challenges with adequate levels of funding and drew attention to the often static, unfavourable view of clusters, which, when considered per context, actually show certain diversity and adaptation. He also expressed his support for reactivating the GCCG proposal [from two years ago] for a review of the coordination system, pointing out that it would also be important to look at the value-for-money aspect of coordination and whether coordination is not forced at the expense of actual delivery.  The GCCG Chair highlighted the value of the GCCG as a thought leader, recalled the keen interest in which the Group had approached the idea of a review two years ago and enquired how the GCCG wished to take some of these ideas forward.  Mr. Chemaly reflected that there is a desire for GCCG to frame the current issues faced by the humanitarian system and implications for coordination, including highlighting the catalysing effect of COVID-19 on questions such as sector/cluster, nationalization/localization, HDN, etc. and demonstrate the GCCs’ interest to evolve. He suggested that the Group work on a “think piece” possibly suggesting new aspects of a re-imagined humanitarian coordination system to demonstrate the GCCs are part of the solution and that “whatever happens, there will be a need for coordination.”  Outcome 1: Follow up session to better frame the issue among the GCCG and agree concrete next steps,  Possibilities include:   * GCCG urging action on the coordination review by bringing to the attention of the IASC key issues that are now in the fore and necessitate action, including considering what remains an effective component of the cluster approach and what should evolve.   Related actions: GCCG-S to check with IASC-S status of review of coordination and share ER cluster review and last version of TOR for coordination review developed in 2018. | **FP:** GCCG-S/all GCCs  **by:** 11 September 2020 |
| **GCCG Workplan 2020:**  [*The session was co-led by the Global Education Cluster and the GCCG Chair*.]  The Global Education Cluster Coordinator and the GCCG Chair drew attention of the Group to the existing commitments included in the workplan which had been elaborated as a result of the GCCG retreat of January 2020. In particular, four core areas of the Group’s activities were discussed:   * field coordination support, * tools, services and products, * thematic engagement and guidance, and * functioning of the Group.   In relation to field coordination support, the GCCs agreed to continue coordinating COVID-19 information and collecting good practice from the field and building on any outcomes from the inter-sector working group under the Global Food Security Cluster. At the same time, the GCCG agreed to prioritise engagement with the EDG, in particular on priority actions to be supported (e.g. following the discussions with RC/HCs).  As far as tools, practices, and products are concerned, the GCCs agreed to share summaries of all CCPMs done in the past 12 months (by 31 August 2020) and to engage on aligning of timelines for the Performance Monitoring exercise(s). Both the GCCs and the GCCG secretariat committed to engage with country clusters and inter-cluster coordinators on promoting ICCG performance monitoring and for the GCCG to undertake a review of the tool prior to its re-launch for the 2020 cycle.  As part of thematic work, the GCCG agreed to ensure that localisation component of the CCPM is reviewed (mid-November 2020) – also as part of anticipatory engagement with OPAG’s RG1 on indicators and benchmarks - and that existing guidance on localisation will also be updated (by 30 November). Regarding Area-based Coordination, the Group decided to form a small working team that would propose a set of questions that would be used to survey all Global Clusters on the concepts and approaches they use. In addition, GCCs agreed to prioritise engagement with OPAG’s RG2 on the common service for Risk Communications and Community Engagement.  Lastly, the Group will also work on finalising its Terms of Reference, support the clean-up of historical cluster activations and de-activations (parameters of the exercise to be proposed by the GCCG secretariat by 31 July), and engage as a Group on cluster IM capacities, also in anticipation of the data collection exercise 2020. The GCCG secretariat will work with the Global CCCM Cluster to advance to finalisation of the paper on Terms and Definitions. The GCCs also committed to continue reflecting on issues related to field coordination and the cluster system that they may wish to collectively bring to the attention of the OPAG.  Outcome: GCCs agreed to concrete priorities and actions for the remaining 6 months of 2020. The GCCG secretariat will amend the draft document based on the feedback received (by 31 July) prior to a final consultation/approval by the Group. | **FP:** GCCG-S  **by:** 31 August 2020 |
| **Area-based Coordination:**  [*The session was co-led by the Global Shelter Cluster (Conflict and Natural Disasters), Global CCCM Cluster (Natural Disasters) and the GCCG secretariat*.]  The discussion took into account the soon-to-released paper by the Centre for Global Development suggesting the need to further develop hybrid model alternatives to clusters (including those based on area-based coordination/approaches) and the need for the GCCG to take on a proactive (rather than reactive) approach on area-based coordination/approaches. The aim was for the GCCG to:   * formulate a shared understanding of “area-based coordination,” so that the GCCG can clearly and effectively communicate it to stakeholders, and * communicate this understanding to relevant IASC entities to ensure consistency of views for informed decision-making.   Ms. Hassan (GGCG secretariat) introduced the topic, highlighting the diversity of terminology used to describe area-based approaches to coordination which is also linked to a diversity of applications of these approaches by various actors on the ground. She further explained that area-based coordination refers to any coordination of assessments, programming and response for a given geographic area, while working closely with a local authority. She pointed out that this modality is not new, but that recently it started to be misconceived and even juxtaposed against or suggested as an alternative to the cluster system.  Mr. Moore (Shelter-Conflict) referred to the work of the Urban Settlements Working Group on Area-based Approaches (<https://www.sheltercluster.org/working-group/settlements-approaches-urban-areas-working-group/documents>), which focuses predominantly on programmatic and preparedness aspects in natural disasters settings, but does not exclude considerations of coordination set-ups. He added that there are no inherent tensions between the ABAs and the cluster approach, but rather examples of complementarity.  Ms. Sophonpanich (CCCM-Natural Disasters) highlighted that the CCCM cluster traditionally works with all partners and actors in a given geographic area (settlement, campr, etc.) which actually might be not present outside the setting itself, hence de facto engaging in area-based approaches to coordination. These approaches promote participation of both displaced populations and host communities. She also elaborated on the importance of information management, needs assessments and CWC and feedback mechanisms. Lastly, she added that ABAs are predominantly deployed in high-density, (sub)urban settings and remain linked to the cluster/sector system, and by extension requires the involvement of CLAs.  In closing, Ms. Serdaroglu (Shelter-Natural Disasters) stressed that the traditional cluster/sectoral coordination – e.g. through clusters and cluster-like systems – co-exists with ABAs and that there is a merit in embracing this co-existence as part of the broader humanitarian coordination architecture/mechanisms. In her view, the question is more on how ABAs is approached, including in terms of accountability, etc.  Mr. Fedele (Nutrition) concurred that the ABAs is not a new concept and that it is at times wrongly juxtaposed as an alternative to the cluster system, while, in fact, it has been taken up by the clusters and applied in many contexts and complementarily. Ms. Serdaroglu added that this might be perhaps due to lack of clarity on transition to sub-national and more granular levels. Ms. Doull (Health) drew the attention to the fact that some equate ABAs to multi-sectoral coordination, which contrasts with the reality on the ground, in particular the rather weak inter-sectoral coordination at sub-(sub-)national level(s). She also linked ABAs to localisation and in particular building capacities of local actors and institutions. Mr. Moore pointed out that, indeed, the draft paper by the Centre for Global Development is using the ABAs angle to suggest changes to the existing cluster system. Mr. Nolan (Education) expressed the view that the focus on ABAs might be simply linked to unaddressed issues of sub-national coordination and suggested greater advocacy in this regard.  Ms. Teyssier (ETC) welcomed the idea of GCCG developing a common understanding and terminology on ABAs. Ms. Sophonpanich added that the GCCG should also consider how coordination at sub-national level would be taken forward, in particular sectoral vs. inter-sectoral, both in terms of capacity and funding. Ms. Serdaroglu closed by pointing out that the ABAs work by GCCG could be linked to the broader discussion on the future of coordination.  Outcome 1: Follow up meeting to:  (a) Area-based Coordination Task Team to propose a basic definition and survey questions to get feedback from global clusters on area-based coordination,  (b) review existing data (2019) and literature on sub-national coordination and decide whether this requires further unpacking on quality aspects/fitness-for-purpose, and  (c) produce a “position” paper reflecting the GCCG’s perspective on area-based coordination and any key messages for EDG, HCs, and/or others. | **FP:** Shelter, CCCM, GCCG-S  **by:** 31 August 2020  **by:** 31 August 2020  **by:** 30 September 2020 |