

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 23 June 2021
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Mr. Pablo Medina and Mr. Brett Moore, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Mr. Stefano Fedele and 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); Ms. Astrid Haaland, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Mr. Jim Robinson, Housing Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Ms. Michelle Brown, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Ms. Monica Ramos, Global Wash Cluster (GWC); Ms. Evaezi Otuorimuo, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Mr. Erik Kastlander, Information Management Working Group (IMWG); Ms. Marina Skuric-Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan, Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Ms. Janet Puhalic, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat), Ms. Bernadette Dabbak (OCHA – Coordination Mapping).

Invitees: Mr. Nisar Syed (Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordinator Unit); Ms. Kimberly Lietz (OCHA, Needs Analysis and Response Section).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the proposed 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 Chair updated the group about the completion status of the follow-up items from the GCCG meeting of 28 May 2021. GWC informed that no feedback had been received from the JIAF PMU about the GC focal points proposed to be members of the new JIAF Advisory Group (AG). The first meeting of the newly constituted JIAF AG would take place on 24 June 2021. GWC added that she would seek clarification about her own role as all GCs will now be part of the governance structure. 	
<p>Update on GCCG Terms of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair updated the group about the GCCG Terms of Reference. The IASC Secretariat had suggested the addition of a footnote specifying that OPAG is the primary body for approval of all IASC policies to ensure consistency with other guidance. Once updated, the final version of the TOR submitted to the OPAG will be shared with the group. 	
<p>Ethiopia Joint Mission</p> <p>GCCG-S updated the group about the latest changes in coordination structures in Ethiopia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area Humanitarian Teams and ICCGs are in place in both Shire and Mekelle. Hubs are also being created in other field locations. The main challenges are limited humanitarian access, protection concerns, security and limited financial resources. The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) had bilateral follow up calls with a number of IASC Principals. The Emergency Directors Group (EDG) is planning a field mission to Ethiopia between 1 and 6 July. The draft Terms of Reference (ToR) of the mission have been shared with the group. The mission's objectives are to support access and promote a united humanitarian narrative. Some GCCs had suggested a GCCG mission to Ethiopia. This could be useful and would need to have specific ToRs. The GCCG mission would ideally be small and take place after the EDG mission has ended. The Chair enquired whether GCCs had any reflections on this and suggested they share plans for individual field missions. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCCM commented that several staff had challenges entering the country due to new entry regulations and asked if other GCCs have had similar difficulties deploying personnel. He also expressed support for the idea of a light joint mission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-s will check and revert on requirements for access/entry into Ethiopia GCCG-S to update the group on the findings of the EDG mission GCCG to review the need for a mission depending on outcome of EDG mission.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLC noted that she had discussed field visits with teams in the field who had suggested waiting until after the elections and confirmed ongoing challenges with visas. • GPC is also planning a mission and would support a collective mission with other GCCs. • GBV AoR confirmed having sent surge IM support to Mekelle and coordination support to Shire. • A number of clusters (CCCM, GPC, GWC, GFSC) expressed support for the idea of a joint mission. Most agreed that it was best to have clear ToR and wait for the elections and the EDG mission to be concluded, particularly as the latter would guide the focus of a GCCG mission. • GWC said that its current priority was the deployment of NGO partner field personnel. This was proving to be a challenge as there was no way to obtain visas online and access to Tigray was restricted. GWC asked OCHA to find out more about access regulations and restrictions into both the country and the Tigray region. • GFSC noted that restrictions were in place for all missions within Tigray, but travel to the region is still possible. • GEC agreed with timing the GCCG mission after the EDG visit. 	
<p>Update on Mozambique field mission</p> <p>Mr. Dher Hayo, CCCM, briefed the group about his recent mission to Mozambique, during which he traveled to Maputo, Nampula, and in the conflict-affected area of Cabo Delgado region in the North of the country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings were held with OCHA, the Resident Coordinator, other UN agencies, national and international NGOs, development and humanitarian donors, and national and regional authorities. • Nearly 800,000 people are displaced in the North of the country - 90 percent live in rural and urban areas and 10 percent live in formal and informal IDP sites. The government calls these sites ‘villages’ and estimates there are approximately 140 of them. The government considers these villages as the long-term solution for the IDPs and to where they should resettle. Land is provided in some of these villages and there seems to be no clear plan for the eventual return of the displaced population to their areas of origin. • Overall response systems in the country are more accustomed to development plans and have limited experience addressing humanitarian crises. • The needs are visible. IDPs live in very poor conditions despite the presence of numerous international humanitarian actors. • Although access to people in need is possible, the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) is underfunded and actors on the ground would like to update it to adapt it to the dynamics of the crisis. • Local actors had commented that funding levels of the HRP cannot be ascertained through the financial tracking system (FTS) because the FTS is not always up to date. A rapid analysis of funds received by the clusters, carried out by cluster coordinators beyond the FTS, was suggested as a possibility. This could enable actors to approach donors with more realistic funding data and enable better advocacy. • A scale up is taking place, with a Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator now covering the North and many agencies deploying additional personnel despite challenges with visa applications. More unified advocacy is recommended to ease visas and registrations. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair noted the risks of having parallel financial tracking systems and enquired how the financial tracking performed by clusters would feed back into the FTS. • CCCM clarified that the intention is not to undermine the FTS with parallel systems. However, many donors and agencies are not reporting to the FTS until the following calendar year. CCCM would like to raise awareness about this problem. • With regard to the HRP, CCCM suggested GCCs could reach out to their field colleagues to offer support with the mid-year review if it takes place. 	<p>4. GCCG-S to follow up about possible support to increase familiarity of actors on the ground with HPC tools.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors had commented that the HRP does not reflect the current crisis. Hence a mid-year review is recommended. At the national level, many actors are not familiar with the HPC tools and might need support. • The Chair agreed with the need for more outreach to the country teams and to follow up on which support could be provided to the field in Mozambique to increase familiarity with HPC tools and procedures. • HLP AoR informed the group that the HLP AoR had been established this week in Cabo Delgado under NRC and UNHCR co-leadership. • Mr. Nisar Syed asked whether guidance was needed in the field regarding humanitarian tools since government actors are not familiar with these types of interventions. • CCCM agreed that there is a need to unify terminology used for displacement sites and provide guidance to actors in the field, including government authorities who are more accustomed to development settings. 	
<p>Update on Cameroon field mission</p> <p>GPC briefed the group about his field mission to Cameroon and asked the GCCG-S to share the field mission report and related article with the group. The GPC mission to Cameroon was a continuation of the GCCG-supported training of the Cameroon Inter-cluster Coordination Group (ICCG). GPC noted that the scope of challenges in Cameroon go beyond coordination and that the complex emergency in the country is not being adequately addressed. There are two major crises, the Far North and the Southwest/Northwest.</p> <p>Far North</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around 2 million people are living within reach of armed groups. There are refugees from Nigeria and around a million displaced people within Cameroon. These groups are hosted by an impoverished host community with limited access to basic services and governmental support. • The total funding for humanitarian assistance in the Far North is less than USD 10 million. • Around 500,000 youth are at risk of being forced to join armed groups. This could mimic patterns seen in other locations. • Agencies on the HCT are traditionally focused on development programming. Only five percent of the dedicated funding to these programs has been disbursed, with only six months left in the 3-year programming cycle. <p>Southwest and Northwest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The armed conflict started three to four years ago and access is very challenging, with numerous bureaucratic impediments and regular attacks against NGOs. • The Government promotes a development program for this area. • Two out of three schools have been directly attacked and 500,000 children are out of school. Total funding across all sectors amounts to less than US\$ 10 million. • In the rest of the country, there are 500,000 IDPs in accessible areas and yet nearly no programming addressed at them. • The Government has greater focus on development and the nexus, rather than conflict. Getting attention on the conflict in Cameroon is challenging as there are already numerous crises in the region. • Staff in the country need better preparation to face the challenge represented by the conflict emergency. A change in the scale of the response is required, otherwise, the crisis will further accelerate. • GPC recommended that an EDG mission takes place and suggested that a letter to the EDG could be prepared with this recommendation. GPC also recommends GCCs visit the field and advocate more with their CLAs to do increase the response. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of GCCs expressed their support for the idea of drafting the letter to the EDG. The Chair suggested that the letter could also include some of the conclusions of the Cameroon ICCG workshop that GCCs had taken part in and enquired whether any further 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. GPC and GCCG-S to draft a letter to the EDG on needs in Cameroon for review by the GCCG 6. GPC to follow up bilaterally with GCCs about specific sector-related issues of concern in Cameroon 7. IMWG to flag the Cameroon situation during the IMWG meeting on 24 June 8. GCCG-S to share with the group the Cameroon GPC field mission report and article 9. GCCG-S to look into possible patterns of countries where HDN is in place.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>action was needed on having an additional meeting on coordination which had been discussed during the GCCG meeting of 16 April 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHC added that prioritization of the nexus can sometimes take away or hamper the recognition of the humanitarian needs. She asked whether humanitarian agencies were providing sufficient evidence collectively on the gravity of the situation. Development actors need to step up and modify their funding instruments to deal with the context. Humanitarian funding shrinks in these contexts, and development funding needs to adapt its use as urgent needs are ultimately not addressed. There should be a conversation with development actors about how they would change their modalities. • GPC concurred and asked how development actors could be further engaged, to which GHC suggested engaging the Principals and bringing the issue to the main donors and funding institutions. The GCCG-S chair was asked to explore ways of initiating this conversation and enquiring from the EDG who the right development counterpart could be. • With regard to coordination, dedicated coordination staff are needed but the funds are nearly non-existent and senior management in-country is not prioritizing this issue. Analysts and access specialists are needed in both OCHA and the major agencies. • The HRP has just been released. GPC recommended that the HRP goes through a light review with a focus on the coordination infrastructure. Until a change in the narrative is acknowledged, it will be difficult to implement major changes. • The tension between national and sub-national coordination is also a concern, with different narratives and understandings between levels. In some sectors, there are serious communication issues. GPC offered to follow up bilaterally with GCCs of the concerned sectors. • GHC suggested that a Peer 2 Peer mission to Cameroon could be useful. • GPC emphasized that the main game changer would be modifying the cash flow to the operation. He added that focusing on coordination alone as a priority would not convince in-country actors. • Ms. Marcantonio commented that coordination issues had come up during the ICCG workshop, and that limited commitment and engagement of CLAs in the HCT had also been highlighted. The coordination architecture in Cameroon might not be ideal for the response and might need a light review and adaptation. This is an issue that could merit a specific conversation within the GCCG and could be included in the letter drafted to the EDG. • The Chair proposed the following action points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GCCG-S and GPC to incorporate inputs from the ICCG workshop and the GPC field mission in preparation for the message to the EDG. The draft will then be shared with the group for a review before being sent to the EDG. ○ IMWG to flag the situation during the next IMWG meeting on 24 June 2021. ○ GCCG-S to follow up on the suggestion point made by GHC about operations with parallel development and humanitarian programming and to try to compare patterns of nexus countries where there are IASC coordination mechanisms. ○ The idea of a P2P mission to be suggested alongside engagement with the EDG. 	
<p>Release of the 2022 HPC package</p> <p>Ms. Kimberly Lietz from OCHA's Needs and Response Analysis Section updated the group about the HPC 2022 package.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HPC 2022 package is now publicly available in OCHA's knowledge management platform.¹ • The fundamental elements and timing of the HPC remain the same. • The focus of the HPC will remain on further enhancement of inter-sectoral analysis and multi-sectoral analysis as a complement to what is done at the cluster level. 	

¹ <https://kmp.hpc.tools/content/hpc-2022-facilitation-package>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The template is available in English, French and Spanish and is being translated into Arabic. • Improved guidance for the JIAF is based on feedback from practitioners last year. There is a lighter field focus guidance document, with additional supporting companion tools. • Methodological additions include stronger guidance on engaging local actors in the JIAF process with a nod to the criticality of localization. • The JIAF tools were drafted in collaboration with clusters and agencies. • A helpdesk for the JIAF is also being established. • Enhanced guidance on response monitoring is now available, providing some recommended approaches for consideration. • The timeline remains similar. OCHA offices will be required to provide information in early November 2021. • Summary reports from the multi-partner review and the HPC quality scoring will be released in the following weeks. 	
<p>COVID-19 update</p> <p>GHC updated the GCCG on COVID-19 global trends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The update referenced data from 20 June 2021. Global confirmed cases have reached 170M and there have been more than 3.8 million deaths. • The overall global trend shows a decrease in new cases and number of deaths. However, there are significant country and regional differences. • No less than 33 countries in Africa have seen an increase in cases. • There are multiple reasons for these variations, including variants of concern, increased social mixing, inequitable vaccine distribution, and neglect of public health measures. • Vaccination has started in many humanitarian settings. The GHC Covid-19 task team is regularly tracking vaccination in humanitarian settings. • There are disruptions and concerns about supplies in some countries. • Looking at vaccine equity, more vaccines have been administered than the actual number of COVID cases. • A lot of work is being achieved in terms of vaccination, but the inequity continues, with supply disruptions in several countries in crisis. • There is a global need to accelerate Covax donations from countries with excess doses. Discussions are ongoing with donors about this. • Challenges include operational costs of delivering the vaccine, and complexities about indemnity and liability. • COVID is not over and the future is more uncertain than when we were at the beginning of the pandemic. The situation has changed but is not better. • There is a concern about overreliance on the vaccines. Vaccination is going well but more must be done. • Poor adherence to distancing measures and increased travel is also putting the success against the virus at risk. • Lack of vaccine sharing comes up as a top concern. • There is also a concern that the current global COVID-19 architecture, particularly in terms of funding, is not quick enough to respond to sudden surges. • There is discussion about what is needed at the operational level to respond to surges of different magnitudes. • There is new guidance available on risk communication.² • There will be an EDG call on 29 June to discuss how the wider system can and should be ready. Key messaging for humanitarian partners and CLAs could come out from this meeting. <p>Discussion</p>	<p>10. GHC to share with the GCCG the paper about Covid-19 that has been prepared for the EDG.</p>

² <https://www.who.int/teams/risk-communication/preparing-and-responding-to-COVID-19-surges>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the Chair's question on what GCCs should do, GHC responded that the best is for GCs to reflect on lessons learned in terms of people, money and staff needed for surge and to ensure that decisions and funding are flexible and decentralised. Speed is essential. Responding to a question about implications for global architecture, GHC said that this was the subject of an ongoing discussion with GAVI and donors. The majority of funding is going into long-term approaches. She added that one of the issues that will be flagged to the EDG is what potential proportion of long-term funding is available for humanitarian needs if additional resources are needed. The Chair asked GHC whether she could share with the group the paper that will be shared with the EDG. Also, she encouraged GCCs to share any reflections/lessons learned for their clusters about the response to COVID-19. GNC commented that a shift towards longer term investment is a natural stance and pondered whether humanitarian response to COVID-19 has considered the effect COVID-19 has had on infrastructure. GHC noted that the concern is how to deal with sudden surges, particularly now that the trends are changing with vaccine inequality. 	
<p>ICCG PMR tool</p> <p>Ms. Annarita Marcantonio (GCCG-S) gave an overview of the ICCG Performance Monitoring Review (PMR) tool and explained the intention was to consult the GCCG for changes/improvements that were being suggested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The tool was developed in 2018, tested in four operations in 2019 and rolled out in 20 operations in 2020. Results from 2020 reviews were presented during the GCCG meeting on 7 May 2021. The tool is based on the standard ICCG ToR and CCPM methodology. It consists of a short guidance, a survey and a report summarizing the results and is used to identify corrective measures. The tool was developed at the global level by OCHA and the GCCG at the request of field colleagues. Based on feedback from field operations over the course of the last two years, a light revision of the tool is being proposed with changes in the following five areas: <p>1. Participation and commitment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As in some countries collective buy-in was limited, it is recommended that the process is discussed and agreed in advance by HCTs and ICCGs. The suggestion would be to indicate the need for a quorum of 60 to 70 percent of ICCG members. <p>2. Scope of the reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the national level, some operations included the subnational level. It is important to keep the processes at the national and subnational level separate, as survey questions are based on national ICCG ToR. Subnational coordination forums, wishing to undertake a review, could adapt the process their needs and mandate. Questions and areas to assess: While some operations have suggested changes in the survey, overall questions should be kept unchanged, to ensure compliance to the ICCG standard ToR and allow for comparison across the operations. <p>3. Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field operations stated it would be helpful to suggest a timeframe for the ICCG PMR and to define the ideal length of the process: detailed steps and time to be allocated. <p>4. Use of the results and linkage with other processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PMR report vis-à-vis the ICCG workplan. Some colleagues in the field suggested that the CCPM results inform the ICCG PMR. Ms. Marcantonio enquired if GCCs had views on linking up CCPM and ICCG PMR. Suggestions have been made to share and discuss results with HCTs. It is recommended that there is regular monitoring of agreed-upon corrective measures/actions. <p>5. Technical aspects:</p> <p>For each response, participants should:</p>	<p>11. GCCG-S to share proposed revisions to ICG PMR tool with GCCG for comments and inputs before the version 2.0 is released.</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a narrative. • Have evidence-based responses and analysis: each result must be supported by facts and evidence, based on clear indicators, to be better defined in the guide. • Revise the scoring terminology; introduce a guide on average calculation. <p>Next steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes will be presented on 24 June 2021 to the IMWG for their feedback. A group could be constituted to look at the revised tool. • The proposed revisions to the tool will be shared with OCHA ICCG focal points. • The proposed revisions will be shared with the GCCG for final comments and inputs before the version 2.0 is released. GCCs are kindly requested to review these and provide comments. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed revisions will be shared by email with the group for comments. Ms. Marcantonio suggested that considering staff turnover and quality needs, a 60 percent quorum could be considered realistic. The Chair enquired about the group's opinion on this. • CCCM added that that it would share some proposed inputs to CCPM questions on localization and agreed with the proposed linkages between CCPM and ICCG PMR and with having a quorum between 50 to 70 percent. • GEC commented that it supports the inclusion of localization questions. • Ms. Marcantonio commented that the quorum would be a way of improving participation, but that it would also be helpful if GCCs could encourage their CCs in the field to participate. • GEC suggested designing the analysis to gather data by type of organization (local/international) responding to questions about participation and accountability. 	
<p>Stepping Back to Look Forward: next steps</p> <p>Ms. Randa Hassan, (GCCG-S) updated the group on progress of the Stepping Back to Look Forward exercise.</p> <p>The GCCG-S is reviewing what came out of the three sessions and extracting key elements into a short paper. The Chair noted that this was one of the most conceptual and strategic tasks that the group was working on and the importance of not losing momentum.</p>	<p>12. GCCG-S to share with GCCG a summary and compiled SBLF action points from the three sessions presented so far.</p>
<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination Mapping: The Chair thanked members of the group (GLC, CCCM-ND and IMWG) who had volunteered during the last meeting to take part in a small group to work on terminology and other issues related to the coordination mapping and invited more volunteers to join the group. Ms. Hassan reminded the group about the importance of collectively agreeing on key definitions. Results of the mapping indicate that colleagues in the field have divergent understandings on key coordination terms. Ms. Hassan asked for GCCs to step up as volunteers to work on this. CCCM-C and GBV AoR (Astrid Haaland) expressed interest in taking part in this effort. • The report on coordination mapping has been slightly updated, the final version will be sent to GCCs for final red-line comments with a short turnaround time before the report is shared with the IASC. • The Chair informed that the HPC SG has been reconstituted and the GCCG has been asked to be part of it, represented by the Chair. The first meeting will take place in July, and more information will be shared as it becomes available. • Workplan: the GCCG workplan will need to be reviewed during the next GCCG meeting in advance of the regular 6-month update to the OPAG. • GNC reminded the group to start consultations within their CLAs about the guidance on cluster staffing, with a suggested deadline of 10 July 2021. The deadline could be 	<p>13. GCCG-S to share the final report on Coordination Mapping with the GCCG</p> <p>14. GCCG-S to organise a meeting of a small group of GCCs to work on coordination terminology.</p> <p>15. GCCG-S to update the GCCG on next steps regarding the HPC SG</p> <p>16. GCCs to consult with their CLAs about</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>extended to September if no OPAG meeting takes place during July and August. Some clusters, such as GHC indicated that this deadline would not be feasible due to internal review processes. The Chair suggested that GNC may wish to reconsider the timelines for the submission of this document to OPAG.</p> <p>Upcoming GCCG meetings: 21 July 2021, 2 – 4 p.m. (GVA)</p> <p>Forward agenda: Colombia SBLF Ethiopia</p>	<p>the guidance on cluster staffing.</p>