

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 16 April 2021
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Mr. Angel Pascual, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Anna Ziolkovska, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Ms. Wan Sophonpanich, Mr. Dher Hayo and Mr. Alistair Bremnath, Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster (CCCM); Mr. William Chemaly, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Athalie Mayo, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Ms. Jennifer Chase, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Mr. Bruno Donat, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Ms. Joyce Mutiso, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Mr. Jim Robinson, Housing Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Ms. Maria Agnese Giordano, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Mr. Brent Carbo, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (GETC); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan; Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat), Ms. Bernadette Dabbak (OCHA – Coordination Mapping).

Invitees: Ms. Carla Martinez and Ms. Victoria Martinez (OCHA - Cameroon); Mr. Stuart Campo (OCHA) and Ms. Rachelle Cloutier (UNHCR).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting, which was adopted by the GCCG.</p> <p>Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GCCG Chair updated the group about the completion status of the follow-up items from the GCCG meeting of 10 March 2021. <p>Field support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colombia: Ms. Hassan (GCCG-S) updated the group with respect to a possible reconfiguration of coordination in Colombia. The Assistant Secretary General a.i. conducted initial talks with the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and further discussions will take place over the coming months. Protection concerns are a priority in this context. An HQ-level mission (e.g. P2P) will take place before the end of the year and provide recommendations, there will be no changes before the mission is completed. The Head of Office of OCHA in Colombia will be invited to brief the group once more information is available. Honduras: A review of the coordination architecture is needed, as three months have elapsed since the activation of clusters in January 2021. The review will be led by the Resident Coordinator (RC) and the GCCG might be asked to provide guidance. Coordination Mapping: The cluster data cleaning process is about to be concluded and cluster data will be shared next week with GCs. A few field clusters are being contacted with questions regarding the inputs they provided. Following that, the team will focus on the HCT/ICCG data collected by OCHA, with the overall cleaning process expected to be completed by the end of May. A meeting will be convened to discuss the findings with the GCCG before the summary report is released. GBV AoR informed that she had a call with the Protection Cluster and Areas of Responsibility (AoRs) in Colombia, who conveyed concerns about the transition. It appears that not all actors support the transition, which is perceived as a <i>fait accompli</i>. The GPC would be interested in participating in the planned HQ mission to Colombia. GBV AoR welcomed the architecture review in Honduras and expressed her willingness to support the process. MA AoR welcomed the planned mission to Colombia and pointed that when headquarters missions visit mine contaminated areas, as it is the case of Colombia, they should be encouraged to include the MA AoR in the agenda of the visit. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-S to share with the GCCG a compiled calendar of main GC events. Cluster Coordination Mapping data to be shared with GCCG GCCG-S to flag to IASC-s / P2P the importance of reaching out to MA AoR ahead of planned missions.
<p>Field operations: Cameroon</p> <p>Ms. Carla Martinez, OCHA Head of Office in Cameroon, briefed the group about the coordination set up and challenges in the country, highlighting the following aspects:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG to follow up on flagging Cameroon cluster resourcing to EDG

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The humanitarian coordination structure has been set up to include three different complex emergencies occurring in the country: the conflict in the Far North region; the crisis in the North-West and South-West regions (NW/SW); and the presence of refugees in the Eastern region. Each of these crises has a dedicated coordination mechanism. Simplification is challenging as these are three distinct operational scenarios. Coordination is led by sectors in the Far North, in the East it is under UNHCR, in NW/SW it is led by clusters, and at the national level there are sectors co-led by the Government. In the Far North and NW/SW several sectors and clusters are co-chaired by NGOs, including a number of local NGOs. The ICCG and ISWG in NW/SW and Far North, Ms. Martinez noted, report to the ISWG in Yaoundé. • Key figures: A total of 4.4 million people are in need and 3 million people will be targeted by the humanitarian response, which requires a funding of US\$362 million. The Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) were launched last week. Ms. Martinez highlighted that the funding received by the Cameroon response during the last three years has remained consistently below 50 per cent of the total funding requested. • Coordination capacities: There are 10 sectors at the national level, 10 sectors in the Far North and 10 Clusters in the NW/SW. As of 15 April very few sectors or clusters have dedicated Coordinators or Information Management staff (IMOs). In terms of staffing coverage, at the national level only 20 per cent of the sectors have dedicated sector coordinators, none in the Far North, and 40 per cent of coordinators and 30 per cent of IMOs in the NW/SW, as the best covered region. Ms. Martinez emphasized that the limited capacity and lack of adequate staffing has an impact on inter-sector and inter-cluster performance and causes difficulties in the subnational – national level interactions. <p>Ms. Martinez suggested that GCs can provide support in the following three areas by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the dedicated coordination and IMO capacity of clusters and sectors in Cameroon. • Strengthening remote support (guidance, mentoring) to clusters in the field. On this point, Ms. Martinez thanked the GCs and AoRs facilitating the Inter-sector Working Group (ISWG) Workshop in Yaoundé, planned for 20, 21 and 22 April. • Contributing to the increased visibility of the humanitarian crises taking place in Cameroon. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MA AoR thanked for the presentation and offered remote support. • GBV AoR noted that it was providing remote support through its regional team. • GSC added that it was also providing support through both remote and in the field teams. • GWC noted that it has dedicated support in country and added that it would be helpful to understand where the most critical gaps are. • HLP AoR pointed that Cameroon is an operation where the AoR has been looking at how to improve coordination, and suggested bilateral follow up with Ms. Martinez. • CCCM commented that it might provide a capacity building mission. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Martinez expressed thanks for the offers for remote support and re-emphasized the lack of dedicated coordinators. She remarked that a significant difference is observed among clusters that have a dedicated person, especially experienced staff. There is a link between these issues, as lack of visibility of an operation often leads to less funding, which in turn leads to less experienced staff in the field. • With regard to the the ISWG Workshop, the Chair reminded the group about the importance of responding collectively to similar requests from the field in the future and sharing facilitation between clusters. • There was agreement by GCCs that the challenges around resourcing for humanitarian coordination in Cameroon be flagged to the Emergency Directors’ Group (EDG). • There was also agreement to sound out the GCCG about potential interest in mid-May for a dedicated discussion between GCCs and OCHA Cameroon. If there is sufficient interest expressed by GCCs, the GCCG-S will organize a one-hour teleconference on coordination structures in Cameroon. 	<p>5. GCCG-S to gauge GCC interest in a dedicated discussion between GCCs and OCHA Cameroon.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>JIAF – GCCG Governance</p> <p>Ms. Monica Ramos – Representative to the JIAF Steering Committee for the GCCG (GWC) updated the Group on the status of the JIAF revision process, highlighting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance structure: Option three appears to be the choice where there could be GCCG consensus and this feedback was shared with JIAF. The Humanitarian Program Cycle Steering Committee (HPC SC) reorganization is not going to be completed as rapidly as the JIAF’s Project Management Unit (PMU) had anticipated. Ms. Ramos said she would communicate with the group as soon as there is concrete feedback or information and will meanwhile continue advocating for time-bound consultations and ensuring the GCCG has a say in the transformation processes. • Independent review: the JIAF is due to undergo an independent review. Some concerns come out from agencies about the best placed proposal, however a majority decision has been taken to contract it. • The JIAF PMU is looking to explore linkages between intersectoral People in Need (PIN) calculations and sectoral PIN calculations, and has asked whether GCs can share the guidance about how their sectoral PINs are calculated, if they have these available as a documented process. In addition, when shared, it is requested that clusters confirm whether or not the documents can be made a reference to in the JIAF. • GFSC enquired about the urgency to complete to the review, pointing that there will be no time to complete the review for the 2022 cycle. It was explained that the time constraints were linked to the expiration of donor funding that had been allocated to the review. • GSFC highlighted that the revision process is important to all the group, and expressed regret that the information about possible implications of late timing was not shared and discussed earlier. GFSC added that FAO and WFP, CLAs of GFSC, have reservations about the proposed choice and methodology. However, GFSC supports moving ahead with the process once these methodological concerns are addressed. • It was confirmed that this feedback would be shared with the PMU. It will be important to get a clear calendar of the main consultations and steps taken, in order for the Group to be able to follow up and provide recommendations on time. • CCCM noted that there is a document being prepared for the IMOs in CCCM, which could possibly be shared with the group. 	<p>6. GCCG-S to collect the guidelines for calculation of sectorial PINs from all clusters and their status by the end of April.</p>
<p>GCCG Terms of Reference</p> <p>The Chair opened the discussion about the GCCG Terms of Reference (ToRs) sharing with the Group the results of the three-question survey about co-chairing and noted that all 15 GCs and AoRs had participated in the vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair proposed that, considering the results of the survey, the rotating NGO Co-chair option is selected and carried forward. She also shared the results of the vote with regard to the rotation frequency of the non-permanent Co-chair. Since the majority had voted in favour of the 12-month rotation frequency, the Chair proposed the GCCG adopts this frequency for the NGO Co-Chair. • Good suggestions were also provided by GCCs about how to strengthen relations between the GCCG and the EDG and these have already been shared with the IASC-s. She also encouraged GCCs to provide additional ideas. • The Chair also suggested to further look at the initial selection criteria which had been proposed / circulated in the background documents for the meeting. She briefly explained the rationale for the criteria that had been drafted by the GCCG-S and also explained the two suggested processes, noting that Option 1 was the process used by the EDG for their members and hence may be a good model to follow. • The Chair suggested that since the GCCG is strongly encouraged to have an NGO Co-chair, and the relation with the EDG could be strengthened, the group may look at the 	<p>7. GCCG-S to share the revised GCCG ToRs with the GCCG for final comments.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>possibility of the NGO Co-Chair being an EDG member. She asked GCCGs for their views on all of these different elements that she had presented.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCM enquired whether the NGO Co-chair will have enough time to fulfil the role. The Chair responded that the time implications of the role are clear and the permanent Chair and secretariat can provide support. If no NGO has the capacity or willingness to be the Co-chair, she added, then the current structure could continue. • The Chair clarified that the co-chairing will be incorporated in the ToR, in addition to the changes and comments already made by OPAG members. • GBV AoR commented that cluster co-leadership experience could be a very limiting requirement for candidate NGOs. • MA AoR commended the approach but enquired whether limiting the NGO co-chairmanship to NGOs part of the EDG could exclude other organizations that are potentially better or more suitable to the role than those part of the EDG. • The Chair conceded that the pool of NGOs part of the EDG could potentially be small. Ms. Dabbak clarified that in 2019, three INGO were leading or co-leading clusters or sectors at national level, and more than 10 at sub-national level. • CCCM suggested that the selected NGO Co-Chair needs to have experience in inter-agency or inter-cluster coordination. • GBV AoR commented that having a Co-chair that is also an EDG member would give a stronger voice to the group. • CCCM enquired whether being an NGO already leading a GC should be avoided, in order to give access to new actors. The Chair suggested that if external NGOs with capacity showed an interest in co-chairing in the future, the ToRs could be modified to allow for their participation. • It was agreed that the GCCG-S would further adjust the selection criteria based on comments made and re-circulate the TOR for final comments, before submission to the OPAG. 	
<p>IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility</p> <p>Mr. Stuart Campo, from the Centre for Humanitarian Data in The Hague, and Ms. Rachelle Cloutier, from UNHCR, provided the group with an overview of the IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility and how it relates to the work of the Clusters and AoRs. Mr. Campo highlighted that both collective and individual cluster feedback has been incorporated into the Guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Guidance has very clear responsibilities outlined for cluster lead and co-lead agencies. The adopted Guidance reflects the feedback received from GCCs previously that responsibility must be placed with the lead and co-lead agencies rather than in the clusters at field level. • Another key aspect to highlight is that a number of templates and tools accompany the guidance and are living documents that will continue to be developed. In parallel to these, Mr. Campo noted, there are many individual guidance and tools developed by the different GCs. Mr. Campo is looking forward to draw from the expertise of these tools and also to work together with GCs to further align cluster tools with the new Operational Guidance. • IOM, UNHCR and DRC have transitioned the IASC sub-group into a Data Responsibility Working Group (DRWG) that will continue to support implementation of the Guidance and maintain strong links with the GCCG and the Information Management Working Group. <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair thanked Mr. Campo for the presentation and asked if he could share his main expectations towards clusters in terms of next steps. • GEC enquired whether the guidance has been distributed to the OCHA country level offices, and what could the GCs do to support. 	<p>8. Mr. Campo to draft / GCCG-S to circulate a message that GCCs can send to their field counterparts on how they can support the Guidance dissemination.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Mr. Campo clarified that the Guidance has been circulated within OCHA but was not sure that has already reached all operations and partners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair suggested Mr. Campo prepares a message to the GCCs outlining the type of support required and the manner in which Cluster Coordinators are expected to be involved, GCs could then further disseminate this message to their counterparts in the field. Mr. Campo agreed with the Chair and noted that he will follow up with a message to the Group. Finally, Mr. Campo offered bilateral support and briefings to the GCs and expressed his readiness to join cluster meetings with GCs and country coordinators. GEC and CCCM expressed interest in inviting Mr. Campo to brief in some of their upcoming events. 	
<p>Draft cluster coordination benchmarks</p> <p>GNC briefed the Group about the ongoing work on Cluster Coordination Benchmarks that she drafted together with GWC and CP AoR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective: Developing a benchmark or guidance that recommends an ideal minimum composition of the cluster teams at both national and sub-national level. The guidance could be then approved by IASC and serve as well as an advocacy tool. Structure: The draft benchmark comprises two flowcharts - one about the selection of staff at national level and the other at sub-national level, applicable to both clusters and sectors. Type of contract: If the expected length of the role is more than one year then the contract should be fixed term, and if is more than three months, a temporary contract. If it is less, is recommended to consult the GCs for surge support. Grade: It is recommended that the grade of the Cluster Coordinator is not lower than the highest level of program staff or chief of the respective section at national or sub-national level. Coordinator and IMO grades should be decided in function of the complexity of the operation e.g. major crises would require a P5 Coordinator and P4 IMO. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLC thanked the colleagues from the group for their work and commented that when looking for the right people, many other factors other than the scale of the crisis are to be considered. GFSC also thanked all those who participated in the benchmark drafting and pointed that the applicability of the proposition might very challenging because of the different nature of the clusters and organizations, adding that the draft is too UN-oriented. The soft components and multiple factors, GFSC agreed with GLC, are always present and difficult to translate into guidelines. She noted, however, that the benchmark were a good start. Finally, she proposed to enquire about common practices, and suggested that a baseline mapping could help with advocacy. The Chair noted that comments made suggest that the draft appears to better suited as good practice, rather than guidance, and invited GNC to elaborate on how they would propose to take this forward. GNC responded that the draft is designed for the use of Cluster Lead Agencies (CLA), that are usually UN Agencies. Ms. Ziolkovska asked the GCCs for their opinions on whether this should be framed as specific guidance for CLAs to promote a better resourcing, or as a general guidance for all. To be able to modify the draft, she requested GCCs send written suggestions on what could be improved and how. The Chair suggested that those who have comments meet and find a common denominator, and reminded to the group that if the draft is to be developed into IASC guidance, rather than good practice, it would need to be approved by the OPAG. GSC supported the flowchart but pointed that the actor-based complexity calculation is not sufficient, as in many emergencies the number of partners can be limited while needs are high. GEC responded that the purpose of the draft is a step to support the CLAs accountability and volunteered to support the development of the guidance from May onwards. 	<p>9. GNC to follow up in May to continue with the development of the draft with interested GCCs.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCM concurred that is very important that the GCCG can influence the CLAs to help upholding accountability levels. • It was concluded that GNC would send an email proposing a meeting and further discussions to the interested GCCG members. 	
<p>AOB</p> <p>The Chair informed the Group about outstanding action points on the Stepping Back to Look Forward exercise – the GCCG-S will be following up with relevant GCC leads.</p> <p>Upcoming GCCG meetings: 07 May 2021, 3 – 5 p.m. (GVA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICCG PMR • Coordination Mapping 	<p>10. Follow up about next SBLF.</p>