

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 7 May 2021
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Ms. Ela Serdaroglu, Mr. Brett Moore, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Anna Ziolkovska, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Ms. Wan Sophonpanich, Mr. Dher Hayo, Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster (CCCM); Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Linda Doull, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Ms. Athalie Mayo, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Ms. Jennifer Chase, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Ms. Joyce Mutiso, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Mr. Jim Robinson, Housing Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Ms. Michelle Brown, Ms. Monserez MacKenzie and Mr. Nicolas Servas, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Mr. Brent Carbno, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (GETC); Mr. Erik Kastlander, Information Management Working Group (IMWG); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan; Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat), Ms. Bernadette Dabbak (OCHA – Coordination Mapping).

Invitees: Mr. Farhad Movahed (IASC Secretariat); Alexandra De Sousa (OCHA Ethiopia).

| 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 16 April 2021. The Chair reminded that a summary with main points of last OPAG meetings was shared with the group, informed that the next OPAG meeting will be on 19 May and 27 May, and asked if there were GCCs willing to represent the GCCG together with her in these meetings. <p>Field support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cameroon: Ms. Marcantonio (GCCG-S) thanked facilitators from the GPC and the GBV AoR for supporting the recent Cameroon ISWG Workshop that took place from 20 to 22 April. She provided a brief overview of the content of the workshop and informed that the workshop report would be shared soon. The discussion centered on roles and responsibilities within the sectors, the ISWG and the HPC process. Participants identified challenges and solutions and formulated recommendations. The main request from the ISWG in Cameroon was to have for more resources and advocacy for coordination. Finally, she informed the group of a forthcoming mission to Cameroon by the GPC Coordinator, Mr. Chemaly. GCCs who would be interested to know more about the mission's objectives were invited to directly liaise with the GPC-C. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCs to indicate interest on possible participation in upcoming OPAG meetings GCCG-S to share the Cameroon workshop report with the GCCs after finalization. |
| <p>EDG Update</p> <p>Mr. Farhad Movahed, IASC Secretariat, updated the group about ongoing discussions at the Emergency Directors Group (EDG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale-up activation for Northern Ethiopia: This is the first time that a system-wide scale-up has been triggered for a conflict situation since the new scale-up protocols were agreed in late 2018, a process that has been a learning experience, especially given the complex situation in Ethiopia. The EDG and IASC Principals have agreed that an extra effort was needed for a low-key ramp up of internal measures to deploy more capacity and resources to the Tigray response. The six-monthly Early Warning Early Action & Readiness (EWEAR) report is expected to be shared soon. The Inter-Agency Analyst Group has highlighted four countries at risk, with Myanmar on top of the list as a risk of high concern. A Deputies Forum ASG-level meeting on Myanmar is expected to take place in the second week of May to further discuss support for the operation. Afghanistan: There has been contingency planning ahead of the planned US/ISAF troops withdrawal later this year, and a regional contingency planning is ongoing in case of | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG to share the P2P ToR with the GCCs once approved by the HCT |

| Summary of Discussion | Action Points |
|--|--|
| <p>refugee outflows. The situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan may require additional focus in the coming period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer to Peer (P2P): A P2P mission is going to support the HCT in DRC in late May. The main objective is to review the current humanitarian architecture in-country. • Madagascar: The High-Level Task Force on preventing famine is discussing adding southern Madagascar to the list of countries where efforts need to be focused to avert famine. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFSC thanked for the update and informed that a regional donor briefing on Madagascar organised by the regional OCHA office took place on 6 May. She added that an IPC alert has been received from the country with people reported in IPC 5 (catastrophe) for the first time. Although clusters are not formally activated, there is food security coordination in place. GFSC is interested in learning about other sectors' plans. • GNC updated the Group on a Global Partner call focused on nutrition response for Tigray and Southern Madagascar that highlighted the deterioration of the situation. Interested GCCs are welcomed to join these calls if interested. GNC pointed out that although there is IPC food insecurity ongoing, is not clear whether famine thresholds have been reached. An IPC acute malnutrition analysis assessment is being planned. • GBV AoR enquired about updates on Colombia regarding the possible cluster handover to the Government. • On Colombia Mr. Movahed noted that the Acting D/ERC is going on a field visit for consultations with the Government and partners regarding the reconfiguration of the humanitarian system following requests from the government to transition out of humanitarian coordination mechanisms. • GBV enquired whether the scope of the field visit and the reconfiguration and handover of clusters in Colombia to the Government have been reconsidered in light of the dire humanitarian and protection concerns. Mr. Movahed clarified that the scope of the field visit had not changed and that the intention of the field visit was to ensure that the necessary consultations about transition are made with all relevant actors and partners. • Ms. Hassan (GCCG-S) added that there is no immediate handover of coordination planned in Colombia. A P2P or similar mission at a later date will undertake further in-depth consultations, including considering protection concerns. No major change is expected in the short term. | |
| <p>System-wide Scale-up: Northern Ethiopia</p> <p>Ms. Alexandra De Sousa, OCHA Ethiopia, briefed the group about the current situation in the country, the scale-up in the North, and the resourcing gaps that have been identified, highlighting the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activation of scale-up for the Tigray region. • Needs: The population of Tigray is 5.7 million; 5.2 million among them are in need of humanitarian assistance. • Resourcing gaps at national level: Health and WASH coordinators positions have been vacant for five months, and Education for three months. • Resourcing gaps at sub-national level: OCHA aims to have sub-national coordination hubs in both Shire and Mekele. Specific key gaps in Mekele are sub-cluster coordinators in Agriculture, Education, Nutrition and Protection, while in Shire almost all sub-clusters coordinator positions are vacant. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the ensuing discussion with GCCs, Ms. De Sousa urged the GCs and CLAs to ramp up support to the Scale-up with the provision of staff to fill the identified gaps in coordination and information management. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. IMWG to follow up with the field on strategies to reinforce IM capacities 5. GCs to discuss with IMWG their interest into co-locating staff and joining efforts with regard to IM capacity |

| Summary of Discussion | Action Points |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCs acknowledged the request and expanded on their current capacity as well as plans to deploy additional human resources. Several GCs stated they are deploying or have already deployed surge capacity, while more durable solutions have been or are being identified through recruitments or secondments. | |
| <p>2020 Performance Monitoring Review</p> <p>Ms. Marcantonio presented to the group the results of the 2020 ICCG Performance Monitoring Review (PMR), an annual self-assessment of the functioning, roles and responsibilities of ICCGs or ISCGs that was completed by 20 operations. Since the tool is based on self-assessments, future revisions of the tool will likely include requirements to provide specific evidence in order to strengthen the objectivity of the information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology: Consists of three steps: a survey based on the ICCG ToR, survey results grouped in a report and, finally, a discussion about the results and areas that might require corrective measures. It was decided to highlight and prioritize areas of work that were flagged as lowest performance and needing improvement by at least 30 percent of the surveyed operations. Highest performance areas: These included the regular functioning of the ICCGs (agenda, objectives, minutes), the integration of cross-cutting issues (such as gender and disability), the accountability towards affected populations and advocacy. Lowest performance areas: Collaboration between the HCT and the ICCG: Most operations found that the ICCGs are not properly advising the HCTs and the HCTs are not providing sufficient strategic guidance to the ICCGs. Some of the solutions proposed include better sequencing meetings, sharing recommendations and best practices, sharing strategic issues and having joint meetings. ICCG-HCT collaboration could also be integrated into training of relevant staff. Support to sub-national level from the national level: This was assessed as needing improvement by 14 operations, with some noting the difficulties to establish cluster capacity at the subnational level. Solutions proposed to this challenge included: participation of national-level members in sub-national forums, matrices to follow up requests from the field and having sub-national level as standing agenda item in ICCG meetings. Supporting architecture reviews could also serve as a corrective measure. Localisation: Half of the operations found that the participation of local actors in coordination needs to be strengthened. Reasons listed behind the lack of participation included: limited understanding of IASC coordination structures, lack of capacity, and lack of interest due to poor access to funding. Solutions identified included: the development of strategies to reinforce the inclusion of local actors in clusters and including them as co-coordinators and co-facilitators. Integrating localisation in trainings came up as another recommendation, as did the dissemination of relevant guidance. HPC phases: Half of the operations stated that the preparedness and contingency planning components of the HPC need improvement. Needs assessment and analysis, as well as the use of monitoring results to adjust the response were mentioned as areas for improvement. Collaboration with development actors: Flagged as needing improvement in both programmatic and coordination sides, according to 14 out of the 20 operations. Some suggestions for improving this were: having joint meetings between ICCG and development actors, and joint UNCT and HCT meetings. Some ICCGs wished to receive guidance on coordination mechanisms and models around the HDC. Early action and early recovery also regularly appeared as areas needing improvement. The way forward encompasses: a revision of the tool, based on feedback from field operations; sharing findings within OCHA and with clusters in order to define actions that need to be taken in each area; inclusion of focus areas in the forthcoming HPC and coordination workshop that OCHA is organising for its staff. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-S to share PMR findings report and the PPT presentation GCCG-S to reach out to GCCs for inputs and best practices on ICCG management to prepare the ICCG FPs annual training. |

| Summary of Discussion | Action Points |
|---|---|
| <p>Ms. Marcantonio called on GCCs to encourage cluster and sector coordinators to be active members of the inter-cluster and inter-sector in their countries. She also stressed the need for overall support from the CLAs.</p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair flagged that PMR results indicate overall satisfaction about AAP and PSEA. • GSC commented that the analysis of the results will require some time. Also, he enquired whether the ICC role is generally a distinct full time position or a task assigned to staff covering also other responsibilities. The ICCG relationship to the HCT needs improvement in some countries and cluster coordinators could have a role to play on this. The main task of GCs, he added, is to encourage cluster participation in the ICCGs. • Ms. Marcantonio noted that the role of the ICC did not come up clearly from the PMR, The ICCG is represented by the ICC at the HCT level. Most operations consider the collaboration between ICCG and HCT to be an issue and suggest more collaboration and/or meetings. In some countries cluster coordinators are also represented at the HCT level. • Ms. Hassan informed the group that the annual OCHA training for ICCG FPs will take place soon. OCHA will be reaching out to GCCs for inputs and perspectives on good practices. | |
| <p>Stepping Back to Look Forward III: Inter-cluster coordination</p> <p>It was agreed that, due to lack of time, the session on Inter-cluster coordination would be postponed to the next meeting.</p> | |
| <p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLC enquired whether GCCs are considering any upcoming actions with regard to the deteriorating COVID-19 situation in India and South Asia. GLC is in contacts with its Nepal, Bangladesh and Afghanistan teams. Pakistan is also on GLC's radar as a possible location where the situation could escalate. GWC clarified that it had not received any additional COVID-19 related request for support coming from South Asia. GWC informed that there is a conversation ongoing between WHO and OCHA about scheduling an EDG discussion in relation to the situation in South Asia. • CCCM informed the group that it is reviving the discussion about how to capture localization information from the CCPM. This will be sent out in the coming days with a two-week timeline for feedback, as some IMs from other clusters want to align it with CCCM, which will take place in June. • GWC informed that JIAF is asking to review its 1.0 Guidance. Feedback is expected by 10 May. If there is no time to review the Guidance within such a tight timeline, it would be good for GCCs to engage with technical FPs on the JIAG to enquire about red line comments. The PMU's expectation is that the JIAF SC will validate the Guidance in its meeting on 20 May. GWC will share the email requesting inputs with the GCCG Secretariat, that will share it again with the group. • CCCM-C (Mr. Hayo) informed the group that his planned missions include a field mission to Mozambique on 15 May and offered to have a look into any issues other GCCs wanted him to look at. • The Chair concluded by reminding the group about the upcoming OPAG meetings (19 May, 27 May and 2 June) and encouraging GCCs to volunteer to attend these meetings with her to represent the GCCG. <p>Upcoming GCCG meetings: 28 May 2021, 2 – 4 p.m. (GVA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stepping Back to Look Forward • Coordination Mapping | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. CCCM to send out CCPM related material for inputs from GCCs 9. GCCG to share the email and request for feedback about the JIAF Guidance with GCCs |