

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 28 May 2021
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Ela Serdaroglu and Mr. Brett Moore, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Anna Ziolkovska, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Ms. Wan Sophonpanich and 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); Mr. William Chemaly and Ms. Celine Maret, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Mr. Ron Pouwels and 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 and Ms. Marie Agnese Giordano, Global Education Cluster (GEC); 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).

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>The Chair informed the group about the departure of Ms. Sofia Khetib, Deputy GPC Coordinator and welcomed Ms. Celine Maret, who will represent the GPC in the meeting. She also introduced Mr. Ron Pouwels as new Child Protection AoR Coordinator and announced the departure of Mr. Franck Bouvet as Deputy GWC Coordinator.</p> <p>Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair provided an update on follow-up items from the GCCG meeting of 7 May 2021. • The draft TOR of the GCCG have been updated to reflect the comments received from two clusters and shared with the GCCG. Unless there are any final comments or objections the TOR will be submitted to IASC-s for OPAG endorsement. No objections were received. • The planned P2P mission to DRC had been postponed. • The Chair reminded the group that an email about the JIAF had been shared and GCs had been requested to select their primary member for the JIAF Advisory Group (JIAF AG), which would be meeting on 22 June. • The Chair briefed the group about the main points discussed during the OPAG meetings of 19 May and 27 May and reminded that the summary of the 19 May OPAG meeting and background documents to the 27 May meeting had been shared with the group. The summary of the 27 May meeting will also be shared with the group once available. <p>Field support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethiopia: The Chair noted that the Emergency Director’s Group (EDG) had held a meeting about Ethiopia and that the summary of the meeting had been shared with the group. As a follow up meeting is planned for 4 June the Chair encouraged GCCs to brief their CLAs on any issues that needed to be addressed. She reminded of what had been communicated previously on the need to address gaps especially in Shire. She asked if any further action or advocacy was required to fast-track recruitment, and possibly activate procedures which may exist / could speed up deployments through CLAs. • GLC said it would have a global call with partners about the situation in Ethiopia • GFSC commented that specific gaps, rather than temporal unavailability of longer-term staff needed to be highlighted, and that it was working on a variety of arrangements to cover existing gaps. • CCCM noted that due to the recurring crises in the country, teams prefer longer term deployments over surge support, however these have been challenged by low funding. • GSC pointed out that coordination arrangements were still being looked at and more international missions are planned. Shelter cluster partners on the ground are very active, he added, and areas outside Shire are becoming more accessible. • Central America: Ms. Marcantonio (GCCG-S) informed the group that the region would be a focus area for the EDG in their 3 June meeting. The EDG could request additional 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GCCG- S to share with the GCCG the P2P ToR 2. GCCs to submit their JIAF primary member nominations by 3 June 3. GCCG-S to submit the GCCG ToR to OPAG for final deliberation and endorsement 4. GCCs to advocate about Ethiopia and enquire about Central America from their CLAs ahead of the planned EDG meetings 5. GCs to share if available contingency plans or documents about Goma with the GCCG 6. GCCG-S to reach out to OCHA in Goma to learn more about needs and plans and share the feedback with the GCCG 7. GCCG-S to coordinate with GPC on briefing on Cameroon mission / possible dedicated session.

<p>human and financial resources for the region. Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador are developing a joint HNO and will develop individual HRPs. This could be further discussed in an upcoming GCCG meeting, once the outcomes of the EDG meeting are known. The Chair suggested that GCCs discuss Central America with their CLAs before the EDG meeting on 3 June. GLC informed the group that preparedness activities were ongoing in the Central America region, Colombia, Haiti, and other countries with non-IASC activated coordination mechanisms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DRC (Goma displacement): GLC enquired whether GCs had in-country or cross-border contingency plans in place in Goma. CCCM said it was looking at a possible, but still unconfirmed, surge deployment in response to the situation in Goma. GSC has produced a draft response plan for the situation with potentially up to 350,000 displaced individuals, 30 percent of whom would cross to Rwanda and 70 percent of whom would be displaced elsewhere in North Kivu. He added that 20,000 people had already crossed into Rwanda. GSC can share this draft and has a meeting planned with partners on 28 May. UNHCR has also prepared a response plan. <p>GFSC informed that there are two active teams and a FSC cluster in Goma, the feedback from the field is that more should be done for the response. Currently, the FSC team from Kinshasa is providing support and the global level is following up on eventual needs for additional support. GFSC underlined that the emphasis must be on speeding up the response as the opportunity window for action is small.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cameroon: The Chair suggested coordinating with GPC to find a date in June for the discussion with the OCHA team in Cameroon that was suggested in a previous meeting. 	
<p>Stepping Back to Look Forward III: Inter-cluster Coordination</p> <p>Ms. Wan Sophonpanich, CCCM, presented a summary of inputs received from GCCs on the 'Inter-cluster coordination' topic of the Stepping Back to Look Forward exercise. GCCs provided various suggestions related to how to better articulate the relationship between the ICCG and the HCT and how to promote a more operational coordination.</p> <p>The full summary of the issues identified and related recommendations will be shared separately.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. GCs participating in the HPC workshop to ask ICCG participants about their perception of the GCCG 9. GCCG-S to collect practical examples of GCCG support to ICCGs 10. CCCM to organise a small group of GCCs to structure and determine concrete action points of the three SBLF sessions conducted to date.
<p>Coordination Mapping</p> <p>Ms. Randa Hassan and Ms. Bernadette Dabbak presented the main results of the 2020 Coordination Mapping survey. They clarified that although the final review of the date had not been completed, the following findings can already be highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The survey included Humanitarian Country Teams (HCTs), Inter-cluster Coordination Groups (ICCGs), clusters, and other coordination mechanisms, such as Technical Working Groups (TWGs). ● More than 2,200 coordination mechanisms, in 30 locations (28 operations), were covered and more than 700 people were involved in the survey. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. GCCG-S to organise a meeting during the second half of June with a group of volunteer GCCG members to discuss the methodology, next steps and key

<p><u>HCT/ICCG survey</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HCTs: HCT composition in 2020 was similar to 2019, with the UN, INGO and NGO consortia representing more than two thirds of the total membership. There was an improvement in overall attendance, and a noteworthy increase at the country-director level. These findings are potentially linked to an overall increase in virtual meetings. ● HCT compliance has remained at similar levels to 2019. ● ICCGs: ICCG leadership is similar to 2019, with over three quarters of the ICCGs chaired by OCHA Heads and Deputy Heads of Office. ● ICCG compliance has seen a decrease in work plans and an increase in performance monitoring. The percentage of ICCGs with ToR remained was similar to the previous year, nearing the totality of the operations. ● ICCGs spend most of their time working on HNO/HRPs (32 per cent on average), operational analysis (19 per cent), context analysis and monitoring (13 per cent each). ● A total of 59 per cent of ICCGs have a subnational presence and engage with their national counterparts every two weeks, or on an ad hoc basis. <p><u>Cluster/sector/AoR survey</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In total, 298 national clusters, 1,069 subnational clusters/sectors/AoRs, and 531 TWGs were surveyed in 28 operations. The survey covered 175 new subnational-level coordination mechanisms and 142 new TWGs. ● Cluster/sector/AoR compliance has been generally observed regarding available strategies and ToRs. ● National and subnational leadership of clusters/sectors/AoRs has experienced very limited changes between 2019 and 2020. UN agencies hold around three quarters of the national leadership positions and a similar percentage of INGOs are represented as co-chairs. At the subnational level, the percentage of UN leadership decreases to slightly more than half of the mechanisms, with the rest led by INGOs, government bodies and NNGOs. ● Capacity: Dedicated coordinator capacity is generally at a higher level than dedicated IMO capacity. Gaps exist, however, in both categories in some locations. The global average of dedicated capacity is of 60 per cent for coordinators and 44 per cent for IMOs (the latter being a 10 per cent increase from 2019). However, the survey does not evaluate whether available capacity is sufficient to cover the needs of a given operation. ● Localisation (government and NNGOs): 19 per cent of national leadership and co-chairs, 25 per cent of subnational leadership, 24 per cent of TWGs and 49 per cent of the overall membership is composed of local/national actors, with NNGOs having a larger percentage than government actors in the overall membership numbers. <p><u>Key issues in the 2020 mapping</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Terminology and understanding: Differences exist with regard to the terminology used. The diversity of terminology used under area-based coordination was problematic. The GCCG should consider this, and work on promoting the use of common terms. ● Activation-related issues: Some operations were unclear on their activation status and official denomination. A clean-up of activation history is needed to help clarify this area. ● Coordination capacity: Capacity was similar to last year's. There was an improvement on the IMO side, an area previously identified as needed improvement. Many coordinators mentioned the increased use of pooled funds to support coordination and some had concerns about the extent to which national authorities dedicated resources to coordination. ● Substantive issues – coordination: Coordination architecture review and transition plan levels remain unsatisfactory and require increased attention. ICCG workplan numbers have declined, an aspect that should be looked at more in detail. ● Localisation: The distribution of leadership remained at similar levels to last year, with a slight increase in NGO and national authority co-chairs at the national level. Care should 	<p>messages on coordination mapping</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. GCC to further self-nominate to join the working group 13. GCCG-S to share the Coordination Mapping presentation with the GCCG 14. GCCs to look at and comment the survey summary that was shared with them by the GCCG-S.
--	--

be taken on the use of terminology around leadership of national authorities to avoid mixing IASC responsibilities and accountabilities with those of a host government.

- GCCs are encouraged to provide comments on the draft version of the survey report by 2 June. A final report will be circulated with the group before its release.

Discussion

- IMWG recommended adding additional questions in future surveys that would also provide feedback on perception.
- The Chair said that a discussion about the next mapping had been planned and suggested IMWG join the smaller group of GCCs that will consider lessons learned / adjustments needed for next year's survey. She suggested that it would be good if a group of GCCs could work on preparing messages emanating from the survey for specific stakeholders (e.g. EDG, donors, etc).
- GSC asked to have the presentation shared with the group and noted the importance of the activation database, which could be put in parallel with the results of the survey. He also noted the strong impact this could have on advocacy and quality, as well as the problematic nature of recording progress in localisation and the importance of context-specific terminology.
- The group agreed that the point on localisation being a context-specific objective should be transmitted to the OPAG when appropriate. GHC noted that subnational capacity needs to be looked at more in detail, as this is where localisation takes place. She observed that while coordination architecture, was the responsibility of the HC/HCT, it would be interesting to see where the reviews were being done. If the nexus is the way forward in theory in shifting coordination architecture to the evolving situation with greater national government ownership, it would be interesting to see if reviews were taking place in the nexus countries and if there was potentially less need for clusters in those contexts.
- Agreeing with the GSC's point about the importance of maintaining an activation database, Ms. Hassan also pointed out the importance of linking it to coordination architecture reviews. Regular reviews would clear up most of the identified anomalies and the group should advocate for them. In terms of subnational capacities, she noted that there is more data available that can be analysed, added to the report and reflected in an updated version. Terminology issues should be addressed by the GCCG. In some locations, HCTs are not formally activated as they do not have an HC. This is another aspect to consider not only for the mapping but also when determining which support to provide to these countries.
- Ms. Dabbak confirmed that most positions at the subnational level were filled by double-hatting coordinator positions and there were many vacant subnational IMO positions.
- In closing, the Chair requested that GCCs review the draft survey summary that had been shared. She called for a small group of interested GCCs to be constituted to explore the future of the survey and its methodology and to work on teasing out key messages from the survey for different audiences.
- GLC, CCCM and IMWG manifested their interest in participating in the meeting proposed by the Chair.

AOB

- GLC informed the group about the departure of Mr. Bruno Vandemeulebroecke, Deputy GCC. The GLC will be looking for a new Deputy GCC.

Upcoming GCCG meetings: 23 June 2021, 10 a.m. – 12 p.m. (GVA)

Cameroon debrief
MRP for Gender IAHE
ICCG Tool
COVID-19 update