Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 1 September 2021
FINAL - Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Ela Serdaroglu and Mr. Brett Moore Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Mr. Stefano Fedele, 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. Celine Maret, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Ms. Jennifer Chase, 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); Mr. Brent Carbno, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC); Ms. Christelle Loupforest, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Ms. Janet Puhalovic, Ms. Bernadette Dabbak, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat).

Invitees: Farhad Movahed (IASC Secretariat); Ms. Caroline Blay (GPC).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points

The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting, which was adopted by the GCCG.
 	
Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)
• The Chair updated the group about the completion status of the follow-up items from the GCCG meeting of 21 July 2021 and asked whether the group had any follow up questions. No questions were asked.
 	
Request from GCCG for EDG actions concerning Cameroon: The Chair acknowledged comments received and proposed to revise the letter with **four main recommendations to the EDG:**
   1) Increased donor advocacy given the low funding levels of the HRP.
   2) Increased engagement with the HC/HCT on ways to improve resourcing.
   3) Review coordination architecture to streamline existing structures and processes.
   4) Review the level and type of engagement with national/local actors, including ensuring that they form a greater part of the HRP.
 	
The chair enquired whether the GCCs had comments on the letter. The following comments were provided:
• GFSC suggested that reference is made to all ongoing emergencies, not only the ones listed in the draft. She also proposed that the coordination architecture review should be a medium-term objective, instead of a longer-term one.
• GBV AoR suggested to hold off sending the letter as the EDG's attention is now focused on Afghanistan and Haiti.
• The IASC-S briefed that a system-wide scale up may be soon activated for Afghanistan, stretching response capacities. There had been continuous discussions about an EDG mission to Cameroon during the last quarter of 2021, but the crisis in Afghanistan has led the EDG to reassess its priorities and plan a mission there instead. Regarding the recommendation to carry out an architecture review, clarification was sought on the timing of the review (i.e. whether it should happen before a proposed EDG mission) and whether the GCCG would conduct it independently or carry it out with P2P or another entity. If the GCCG has the capacities to conduct a review, it should flag this to the EDG. The EDG may ask the GCCG about its field support to larger emergencies.
• The Chair confirmed that the options mentioned by the IASC-S for the architecture review had been considered by the GCCG and suggested keeping a flexible position regarding the order of the architecture review and proposed EDG mission.
• CCCM noted that both capacity of the GCCG and timing of the letter should be (re)considered. Issuing a letter about Cameroon now could be misperceived.
• The Chair suggested waiting for a week or two given the current focus on Afghanistan, Haiti and Ethiopia, revising it to include inputs received during the meeting and then considering if the timing was right to send it to the EDG.
	1. GCCG-S to prepare a revised letter to the EDG on Cameroon
	
	2. GCCG-S to draft the ToR for the GCCG support mission to Colombia
	
	3. GCCG-S to address OPAG comments and finalize the GCCG ToR
	
	4. GCCG to hold annual retreat on 23-24 November
	
	5. GCCs to share with GCCG-S examples of generic MoUs / ToRs for co-chair/co-facilitators

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
GCCG support mission to Colombia: The ICCG has proposed four priorities for the mission: 1) strengthen inter-cluster coordination at the national and subnational levels, 2) review agency role at the subnational level to represent the cluster on LCT/LHT, 3) strengthen the HCT and ICCG role in promoting protection approaches, and 4) support clusters and the ICCG on planning, prioritization, and maintaining effective linkages with development actors. The suggested timeframe of the mission is between late October to early November 2021. If the GCCG agrees, Terms of Reference (ToR) can be drafted. The Chair enquired about the interest and capacity of the GCs to participate in this mission and highlighted the specific role of protection. The floor was opened for comments and the following points were made: • GBV AoR enquired about OCHA's plans in Colombia and asked if the acting ASG planned to visit the country. • The Chair noted that the acting ASG was unlikely to visit Colombia in the short term. • GNC reemphasized the need for a discussion about the integrated Nutrition and Food Security Cluster in Colombia but noted that a GCCG mission was not a priority. • GBV AoR added that a number of coordination architecture issues would benefit from a GCCG mission, but that the mission was not urgent now. She added that Central American countries are modelling their humanitarian architecture after Colombia, which has a unique application of IASC coordination that may not be suited to other contexts; this further increases the importance of addressing the residual coordination issues in Colombia. • GPC added that an upcoming protection mission to Colombia will focus on supporting cluster partners on data analysis and the HPC. • The Group agreed with the drafting of a ToR for the support mission and delaying the mission until early 2022. **GCCG ToR**: Comments were received from OPAG members and the GCCG Secretariat is working with the IASC Secretariat to address them. The final version will be shared with the GCCG. **GCCG retreat**: The Chair proposed that the annual retreat take place in person, from 25-26 November. She also asked GCCs to propose external presenters to be invited. The group agreed with the in-person modality but GBV AoR requested a shifting of dates so that the retreat would not conflict with the 16 Days of Activism against GBV. It was agreed to hold the retreat from 23-24 November. Participants also expressed interest in supporting the 16 Days of Activism. **OPAG meetings**: The Chair asked GCCs to volunteer to attend upcoming OPAG meetings on Engagement with Non-State Armed Groups (8 September 2021) and Centrality of Protection (30 September 2021). **Generic MoUs/ToRs for co-chairs**: To meet recent field requests, the GCCG-S asked GCCs to share their generic MoUs/ToRs ToRs for co-chair/co-facilitators arrangements. These also would be useful to support localisation efforts. The coordination mapping in 2020 indicated that only half of co-chairs/co-facilitators have MoUs/ToRs in place.	
Field updates IASC Secretariat updated the group on the ongoing discussions at Principals level about the Afghanistan, Haiti and Ethiopia crises: **Haiti:** The EDG Chairs have been in direct contact. There has been no request for support. **Ethiopia**: The six-month system-wide scale up is set to expire in October 2021; it is likely that activation will be extended for another three months. Discussions are ongoing about the Deputy HC's replacement and the establishment of a regional envoy to support the response. An operational peer review mission will take place in two weeks to look at course corrections.	6. GCCG-S to share with GCCs the HCT-endorsed operational guidance about Afghanistan when this is available 7. GCCG-S to share with GCCs the GHC presentation about the

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
Afghanistan: Several EDG members are going to Afghanistan and will look at the possibility of system-wide scale up. An appeal is being prepared, which will consist of reprioritized portions of the HRP as well as additional requirements. The operation is in need of a reliable air bridge between Kabul and sub-national hubs. **Discussion** **Afghanistan:** • The Chair noted that engagement with the new authorities exists at the national level but is not always replicated at provincial levels. The ICCT is working to translate its prioritization exercise into a Flash Appeal / addendum to the HRP covering the next four months; this will be available by the first week of September. A new partner capacity assessment and mapping of cluster priorities will also take place in the next two weeks. Around 35 percent of humanitarian partners indicated that they were not able to implement programmes due to conflict. Donors are discussing funding and absorption capacity. Counter-terrorist legislation has impacted financial agreements. • GHC noted that the WHO's polio teams have remained operational and negotiations are ongoing about continuing the polio campaign. • CCCM pointed out that negotiations on programming depend on the districts and the programs, explaining that health facilities in the Herat region appear to be operational. She also pointed to disagreements about how strict the humanitarian actors' position should be, particularly with regard to restrictions towards female staff. • The IASC-S clarified that the updated 'ground rules' that will be used by partners to interact with the new authorities and adapt to the new operational environment will be an annex to the existing Joint Operational Principles. • GHC underlined that the WHO's main concern is the funding of the 'Sehatmandi' project, that covers more than 2,200 primary and secondary healthcare facilities. The World Bank suspended its funding and the implications are enormous: 95 percent of the supported health facilities risk closure by 5 September, 9 out of 38 COVID-19-focused hospitals have ceased functioning with significant impact on maternal and child mortality if the project is not resumed. Discussions are ongoing with donors to find a remedy to this urgent situation. While there is a difference in red lines between rights-based and operationally focused partners, the collapse of the health system must be prevented in all cases. The GHC will share a presentation to donors on this project. • GPC shared that a meeting with 18 donors took place in late August. Donors were receptive to the key messages shared with them. • GBV AoR agreed with CCCM on the variety of scenarios within the country and noted that some health facilities are open or just reopened, while others remain closed; and differing approaches taken to regarding female staff being allowed to work. A single uniform guidance for the whole country could be inapplicable and is not the best manner to remain fully operational. • The Chair noted that a CERF allocation is pending the approval of the ERC. • GSC commented that a fee has been imposed on trucks going to Kabul. Winterization plans include an envelope of around USD35 million. He also clarified that the cluster's most active partners have needed to reduce their operational footprint by around 30 percent and agreed with previous comments that there are inconsistencies in the approaches taken by the new authorities across the country. **Ethiopia:** • The GCCG-S briefed that clusters capacity in Shire and Mekele may need further strengthening, adding that the status of cluster capacity will be shared as soon as available. The situation is continuing to escalate; access and limited availability of food and other supplies remain grave concerns. • GNC noted that there are discussions about establishing sub-national sector coordination in Amhara and Afar. GNC is in the process of identifying national and international staff to cover these areas. In Tigray, there are major issues about cash and fuel availability.	'Sehatmandi' project 8. GCCG-S to share the status of Ethiopia clusters' resources with GCs as soon as available 9. GCCG Chair will call for a meeting with interested clusters to discuss ways to support coordination in Haiti

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
Indicators point towards a country-wide deterioration of the situation, including drought in some areas. **Haiti:** The Chair updated the group about the situation in Haiti. A 10 person UNDAC team set up an Onsite Operations and Coordination Centre, with a sub-center in Les Cayes, to support coordination in the affected area. Aid is now being delivered via helicopters to remote communities. Access remains an issue with gangs controlling key roads into the affected area. Unconditional mobile cash transfers worked well in the past but are stalled. On community engagement, the population of the Grand Sud often view responders with suspicion. UNDAC is likely to provide support to the operation until the end of September • GNC enquired if official cluster activation was planned. He indicated that there may be reservations following the challenging transition process in 2014/15, after cluster deactivation. However, there now are significant national and subnational coordination needs and it is difficult to provide sustained capacity if clusters are not activated. GNC encouraged OCHA to take a more proactive stance, guiding the HCT and emphasizing to the national authorities the capacity building and supportive role of clusters. He indicated that may be increased sensitivities about the effect of foreign aid on national capacities and self-government. • The Chair indicated that there were some concerns in the HCT relating to government sensitivities on activation and that an HCT discussion about coordination structures/capacities would be important to clarify the needs and approaches to be taken. • GWC briefed that it carried out a training of government-led coordination. There was the possibility to carry out another such training in the second half of 2021. GWC will deploy a Cluster Coordinator and IMO for two months, along with staff to conduct the training. Other clusters were invited to join. GWC indicated that capacity would be needed beyond the initial surge deployment.	
Stepping Back to Look Forward (SBLF) Ms. Ela Serdaroglu (GSC) briefed the group on the SBLF. Three sessions of SBLF have been conducted to review the cluster approach and explore what is or is not working. The GCCG already received a **summary note with recommendations from these three sessions**. The recommendations have now been color-coded and grouped into 1) items to be brought to the attention of OPAG/EDG 2) items requiring OCHA action 3) items to be included in the GCCG workplan. GCCG members are encouraged to review the color-coding and the dates by when action is supposed to be taken and provide feedback to the GCCG-S. The core group recommends ending the topic-specific sessions for now. The core group proposes sending the new ERC a two pager on the state of the cluster approach. GPC and GEC have volunteered to draft the note, which will be circulated to the GCCG by the second half of September. It also proposes to invite the ERC to dialogue/meet with the GCCG. GEC and GSC expressed their appreciation to GCCG-S for its support to the process. **Discussion** • The Chair clarified that the 2018 IASC decision to carry out a 'light coordination review' remains pending for now. It is unclear if the upcoming Principals meeting will discuss this issue. The High-level Panel on Internal Displacement may also include recommendations on coordination in its report. • GSC encouraged the group to be proactive and to engage the ERC on the cluster approach. He also expressed support for the two-pager. • The group agreed with the approach proposed by GSC. The content and scope of the two pager will be subject of a discussion at the next GCCG meeting. The GCCG-S will also seek a meeting with the ERC, on the GCCG's behalf	10. GCCG to review color-coding and dates in SBLF recommendations matrix 11. GPC and GEC to draft note to the ERC and present it to the group in the second half of September 12. GCCG-S to request meeting with the ERC on behalf of GCCG

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
CCPM – Suggested questions on localisation Ms. Wan Sophonpanich (CCCM) briefed the group on the status of the suggested localisation questions for inclusion in the Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring tool (CCPM). At the GCCG mid-year retreat of 2020, it was agreed that the localisation taskforce composed of CCCM, GEC, GBV AoR and CP AoR will look at the CCPM to 1) promote, improve and monitor how clusters are contributing to localisation and 2) be a potential source of information for other initiatives supporting these efforts. Several years ago, UNICEF led the CCPM revision process. At that time, it was agreed not to have one standardized survey but rather a collection of samples used by different clusters. The taskforce reviewed survey forms used by clusters and identified **two cluster core functions where localisation should be emphasized: support service delivery and strategy development.** Some suggested changes to the CCPM are as follows: **Support service delivery:** - Identify and disaggregate local actors to enable better and more detailed analysis. - Be more specific about access of local actors to engage and contribute to coordination. - Engage local actors in the strategic advisory group if there is one. **Strategy development:** - Ensure that there is an inclusion strategy to strengthen technical and institutional capacity of local actors. - Improve access of local actors to direct funding. As part of its review, the localization taskforce pinpointed a number of issues to be addressed: - 'Local actors' can mean different things in diverse contexts - Use of the word cluster as an umbrella term was questioned - Cross-cutting issues were mentioned, in particular MHPSS and GBV were suggested to be a separate subset of response answer options within the CCPM survey - IASC policy/guidance needs to be translated - PSEA could potentially be included as a separate topic, this is however outside the scope of the review. **Discussion** - CP AoR informed that it launched a localisation framework that could be of use to other clusters. - The Chair recommended that the CP AoR framework is subject to a peer review if it is planned for wider use and circulation. - CCCM suggested that an annex about how to support localisation could be added to the CCPM. - GWC commented that CCPM should be better aligned with recently released IASC guidance on localisation. She also enquired what are GCs concretely doing to roll out the guidance to the field. - GEC noted that the suggested changes to the two cluster core functions are good but should be more tied up and cross-referenced with the IASC guidance on localisation. She also agreed with GWC's point about the need to support the roll out of the guidance. - GPC set a funding target of 35 percent of the HRP going directly to local actors. GPC believes that the CCPM survey needs a degree of flexibility to be adapted to the different contexts and field operation capacities. - GEC noted the there was an agreement to be flexible with the CCPM but it would be good for the group to agree on including similar questions on localisation to allow for closer comparison and collaboration. - GHC confirmed that it would be able to add questions to its CCPM survey. - The Chair suggested that GCCs work with CCCM. She emphasized that the definition of a local actor should not slow down the process, as the recently adopted IASC guidance on localization defines what is a local/national actor.	13. CCCM to provide list of localisation questions for inclusion after consultation with the task team 14. GWC to share with the GCCG the results from their survey about localisation when available

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
• CCCM asked GCs to provide their sample survey forms to facilitate comparisons. CCCM will provide a list of questions recommended for inclusions. She also suggested applying the IASC guidance on localization to the CCPM, focusing on recent benchmarks and indicators. • GBV AoR reminded the group that the IASC guidance on localization is one of the potential topics for the GCCG retreat and enquired whether the CCPM process should be tied into that. • The Chair recommended keeping these processes separate for now. • GWC has prepared a survey to understand how country clusters have carried out localisation and will share the results with the group when available.	
Centrality of protection Ms. Caroline Blay (GPC, senior PROCAP protection advisor) asked the group for examples and good practice on managing operations in a manner to mitigate and reduce protection risks. This includes inter-cluster collaboration or sectors reaching out to the protection cluster. She asked the group to send her examples via email (blay@unhcr.org).	15. GCs to share good practice examples on protection risk management and mitigation with Ms. Caroline Blay/GPC.
AOB • **JIAG:** GWC updated the group on the JIAG meeting and shared that OCHA is drafting a summary. Further discussion has been tabled for the next meeting. • **Coordination mapping:** Ms. Bernadette Dabbak informed the group about the upcoming meeting with GCCs and IMOs about the coordination mapping exercise. Feedback from the field has been received. IMOs and clusters are encouraged to look at how can the survey form be streamlined. **The meeting will take place on 14 September at 4 PM;** if IMOs are not able to attend, they can provide feedback through email. **Upcoming GCCG meetings: 29 September 2021, 2 – 4 p.m. (GVA)** Forward agenda: CLARE II evaluation results Colombia mission planning SBLF	