

**Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting - 18 November 2020**  
**DRAFT Summary of discussion and action points**

**Participants:** Athalie Mayo and Sean Price, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Jennifer Chase, Gender-based violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Jim Robinson, Housing, Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Brent Carbone and Caroline Teyssyier Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (GETC); Emma Fitzpatrick, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Anthony Nolan, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Pablo Medina and Brett Moore, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Stefano Fedele, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Dher Hayo and Wan Sophonpanich; Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster (CCCM), William Chemaly, Global Protection Cluster (GPC), Michael Copland, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR), Davide Rossi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Christelle Loupforest, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Erik Kastlander, Information Management Working Group (IMWG); Marina Skuric-Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Randa Hassan, Annarita Marcantonio, GCCG Secretariat.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the draft agenda which was adopted.</p> <p>1. Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</p> <p><b>(i) Stepping Back to Look Forward:</b>  GCCG-S collated inputs on all topics and shared with the Focal Points (FPs). Thus far, progress has been made on three topics. One of the 13 topics has been reviewed by FPs and consolidated (Topic 7- Emergency Preparedness and DRR). FPs for Topic 13 (HDN) met to discuss defining a problem statement and next steps. The Chair urged the FPs to finalize the review of their topics and submission of consolidated note/problem statement and noted that no date would be set for the overall GCCG discussion on all topics until further progress was made on other topics.</p> <p><b>(ii) Nagorno Karabakh:</b> GCCG-S set up telecon between GER Cluster (Roberto Paganini) GFSC (Bruno Minjauw), and OCHA-Baku (Ivane Bochorishvili) to clarify role of ER in Azerbaijan response.</p> <p><b>(iii) GHO:</b> Following a request at the last meeting, the GCCG-S shared information on Trends analysis for the 2020 GHO.</p>	<p>1. GCC FPs to finalize the review of their “Stepping Back” topics and submission of consolidated note/problem statement.</p>
<p><b>2. Humanitarian coordination mechanisms in non-cluster activated countries</b></p> <p>The issue elicited significant interest from GCCs, who indicated that their respective clusters were providing ongoing support to non-cluster countries in varying degrees. The Chair suggested that this topic could be considered as part of the “Stepping Back” exercise. Following a brief discussion, FPs from Topic 1: Cluster activation /deactivation &amp; accountability (Brett and Pablo Medina), agreed to incorporate this question within Topic 1 considerations.</p> <p>A summary of the points made by the GCCs follows:</p> <p><b>Ms. Jennifer Chase (GBV AoR)</b> raised the question of GC approaches to support sector coordination in non-cluster activated countries, and how clusters support non-cluster countries on preparedness, including working with governments. <b>Mr. Michael Copland (CP AoR)</b> stated that preparedness is a function of clusters to support systems in place, fitting well with the nexus approach. For the CP AoR, engagement with governments has been welcome but is complex in conflict settings. CP AoR has developed guidance on this which Mr. Copland would share.</p> <p><b>Mr. Anthony Nolan (GEC)</b> stated that the GEC was considering where to emphasize preparedness (non-cluster countries where core skill training is taking place or new crises within existing cluster countries).</p> <p><b>Ms. Athalie Mayo (GLC)</b> stated that the GLC considers gauging the level of needs and the resources available for response as a factor in considering supporting non-cluster countries. On preparedness, a Logs Cluster donor funded project is in place to help reinforce national logistics capacities both before and after a response. <b>Mr Sean Price (GLC)</b>, added that determining factors for Logistics Cluster support are in line with the Cluster Approach and the presence of IASC-like mechanisms (e.g. Bangladesh, Nigeria). In a preparedness context with Lead Agency presence, the CLA will have responsibility for preparedness actions. In other situations, Logs will rely on global partnerships to determine the feasibility of response.</p>	<p>2. Michael Copland to share CP AoR’s guidance on working with national authorities.</p> <p>3. Focal Points of “Stepping Back” Topic 1 on Cluster activation /deactivation &amp; accountability [Food Security &amp; Shelter] to include the question of GCC support to non-cluster countries as part of the topic for consideration.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p><b>Mr. Dher Hayo (CCCM)</b> stated the group should reflect on and develop a guidance note related to the accountability of Cluster Lead Agencies and Global Clusters for cluster-like coordination mechanisms, knowing that for some Global Clusters, 40% of country support is to non-cluster countries.</p> <p><b>Mr. Stefano Fedele (GNC)</b> stated that the GNC aims to support both cluster and non-cluster (sectors) in building national capacity wherever possible, citing GNC support to 65 countries. The GNC prioritises cluster countries for support, but otherwise there is little distinction. Mr. Fedele raised the concern about pressures to merge nutrition cluster coordination with food security or health and highlighted the need to respect the specificity for each sector.</p> <p><b>Pablo Medina (GSC):</b> Mr. Medina highlighted the GSC’s pragmatic approach, whereby request for support are considered regardless if there is cluster in place or not. He recalled that from the outset, the Cluster Approach envisaged preparedness as part of its key deliverables. He highlighted how following the Haiyan emergency, there has been a global reticence to activate clusters, and there was a need to demystify and correct the perception of clusters. He also noted that in places where clusters were not activated there was less predictability, less accountability, and as a result less funding.</p>	
<p><b>3. OPAG meeting - “Future of Entities Associated with the IASC”</b></p> <p>The Chair provided a short summary of the OPAG meeting and noted that comments received had been compiled and share with the GCCG. As one of the OPAG members had requested a follow up discussion by OPAG-members only, she suggested that the Group postpone the discussion on changes proposed by OPAG member until after the OPAG meets again on 27<sup>th</sup> November where there may be additional comments or views from IASC members that impact the GCCG TOR. The suggestion was agreed to by meeting participants.</p>	<p>4. Discussion postponed until after next OPAG meeting.</p>
<p><b>4. Operational updates: Key issues from the field</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Randa Hassan (GCCG-S)</b> provided a short update on the humanitarian situation and response in Ethiopia following the hostilities taking place in the Tigray region followed by an update on the situation of camp closures in Iraq.</p> <p><b>On Ethiopia, Ms. Athalie Mayo (GLC)</b> stated that the GLC was looking at how to support the Country Team Logs cluster which had recently been extended for 12 months. She raised a general concern regarding the indicated length of a cluster activation, stating that it was not possible to predict coordination and response needs 12 months in advance. At the appropriate time, Logs Cluster in Ethiopia will conduct a systematic gap and needs assessment. Ms. Mayo further raised the concern and challenge when the co-lead of the cluster is a party to the conflict.</p> <p><b>Ms. Randa Hassan (GCCG-S)</b>, referring to the point raised by the GLC on the duration of cluster activation, suggested that the GCCG could re-emphasize the importance of coordination architecture reviews to ensure coordination structures are relevant to the context.</p> <p><b>Ms. Emma Fitzpatrick (GHC)</b> enquired if any CLAs were reviewing their grading of the emergency level for Ethiopia and noted WHO would be having an internal call on this later that day. The WHO Regional Office is deploying surge National Level cluster coordinator and will be seeking an international sub-national cluster coordinator as soon possible. The WHO Sudan, Ethiopia, and Djibouti country offices and the two Regional Offices (AFRO /EMRO) are in close coordination looking at support needs.</p> <p><b>Mr. Dher Hayo (CCCM)</b> stated that there were advanced discussions on the official activation of the CCCM cluster in Ethiopia</p> <p><b>Ms. Wan Sophonpanich (CCCM)</b> CCCM is looking at deployment to support the Shelter/NFI cluster and the CCCM WG.</p> <p><b>Mr. Brett Moore (GSC)</b> highlighted the need for a massive scale-up of shelter for Ethiopia. The GCS is reaching out to IOM who are coordinating shelter in Ethiopia and are hoping to get more data on shelter needs.</p>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>With respect to <b>Iraq</b>, participants indicated concern with the camp closures taking place and the impact on displaced and vulnerable people. The group agreed to standby for any requests for support coming from the field level and will await outcome of decisions on public statements and advocacy from the HCT. <b>Mr. Brett Moore (GSC)</b> highlighted the pressure on IDPs to return to their location of origin, which are to a large extent damaged villages where demining had not taken place and are in need of reconstruction. This raised the question of longer-term interventions and the role and its usefulness of the cluster in such a context, knowing that this is primarily a government responsibility.</p>	
<p><b>5. Updates from Global Cluster annual meetings</b>            CCCM, GLC and GSC provided updates from their annual partner meetings. All clusters reported very good overall participation despite the on-line format. Common areas covered by the cluster meetings include transition and the nexus, localization, area based and urban responses, coordinating with the private sector and impact of COVID-19. Notes from the meetings can be found on the clusters' websites.</p>	<p>5. GFSC to provide an update from their partner meeting at the next GCCG meeting.</p>
<p><b>6. AOB</b>            Responding to a question from the Chair on the next GCCG retreat, the GCCG expressed a preference to hold the "Stepping Back" discussion in December and to have the GCCG retreat in January 2021. The Chair urged the group to finalize the work around the Stepping Back initiative. She noted the preference of the GCCG for the January timeline and added noted that the GCCG may need to reconsider the date for the retreat depending on how soon the GCCG workplan for 2021 may be requested by OPAG (to be confirmed). The Chair informed the group that planning for the next HNPW taking place from 10-14 May 2021 was starting and requested feedback on whether there was interest for the Group to facilitate a session at the meeting.</p> <p>• <b>Next GCCG meetings:</b>  <b>2 December from 14:00 – 15:30 (Gva time).</b>            Suggested agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covid-19 update</li> <li>• Briefing from ALNAP on their 2020 State of the Humanitarian System inception report</li> <li>• Discussion on the Urban Settlements Working Group paper on Area-based coordination</li> <li>• CCPM</li> <li>• GFSC update from their partner meeting</li> </ul> <p><b>16 December -. 14:00 – 15:30 (Gva time).</b>            Suggested agenda items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HPC process</li> </ul>	<p>6. GCCs to inform GCCG-S of interest to facilitate a session at the 2021 HNPW</p>