

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 29 September 2021

Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Brett Moore (GSC); Pablo Medina (GSC); Stefano Fedele (GNC); Dher Hayo (CCCM); Bruce Spire (CCCM); Naouar Labidi (GFSC); Linda Doull (GHC); William Chemaly (GPC); Celine Maret (GPC); Jennifer Chase (GBV AoR); Maria Agnese Giordano (GEC); Michelle Brown (GEC); Monica Ramos (GWC); Caroline Teyssier (ETC); Christelle Loupforest (MA AoR); Athalie Mayo (GLC); Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Randa Hassan (GCCG-S); Annarita Marcantonio (GCCG-S), Janet Puhlovic (GCCG-S).

Invitees: Farhad Movahed (IASC Secretariat); Anne-France White (P2P Support Project); Nisar Syed (Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordinator Unit).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>1. Review of agenda and follow-up from previous GCCG meetings</p> <p>The Chair welcomed participants, provided an overview of the meeting's agenda, and requested any amendments to the agenda; no amendments were provided. She then provided an overview of the status of action points, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCCs to share with GCCG-S examples of generic MoUs / ToRs for co-chair/co-facilitators <i>[Update: Three Global Clusters provided templates. It was agreed to further discuss this at the GCCG retreat.]</i> • GCCG retreat to take place on 23-24 November <i>[Update: Availability was reconfirmed and the dates are now set. There will be an option to connect to the retreat virtually. The next step is narrow down the topics of discussion and prepare the meeting agenda.]</i> • GCC to review color-coding and dates in SBLF recommendations matrix <i>[Update: No comments were provided so this document is now final.]</i> • GPC and GEC to draft note to the ERC and present it to the group in the second half of September <i>[Update: This was completed – see agenda item #4]</i> • CCCM to provide list of localization questions for inclusion (in the CCPM guidance) after consultation with the task team <i>[Pending]</i> • GWC to share results from their survey on localization when available <i>[Pending]</i> • GCs to share good practice examples on protection risk management and mitigation with Ms. Caroline Blay/GPC <i>[Update: GCCs kindly reminded to send examples]</i> • GCCG-S to draft GCCG support mission ToR for Colombia <i>[Update: Mission postponed to early 2022]</i> • GCCG-S to share with GCCs the GHC presentation about the 'Sehatmandi' project <i>[Completed]</i> • GCCG-S to request meeting with the ERC on behalf of GCCG <i>[Update: See agenda item #4]</i> • Note: Action points from the previous meeting related to Ethiopia, Haiti and Afghanistan are addressed under agenda item 2. <p>Ms. Christelle Loupforest briefed that there is a new Co-Coordinator for the Mine Action AoR, Ms. Hannah Holloway, Humanitarian Disarmament and Peacebuilding (HDP) Coordinator – Danish Refugee Council (DRC) Geneva Representation. DRC will assume this role for two years. The GCCG chair enquired whether there were any objections to having Ms. Holloway added to the GCCG, particularly given the objective of increasing NGO participation in coordination structures. The GCCG agreed that Ms. Holloway would attend one GCCG meeting in the future, as part of her orientation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GCCs and Secretariat to follow-up on incomplete action points from the previous meeting 2. GCCG retreat confirmed for 23-24 November; GCCs and Secretariat to develop retreat agenda 3. GCCG-S to include new Co-Coordinator for Mine Action AoR in a future meeting, as part of her orientation.
<p>2. Operational updates on Afghanistan, Haiti, and Ethiopia</p> <p>On Afghanistan, Mr. Farhad Movahed noted that the Scale-up protocol went into effect on 11 September and that “ground rules” on how to interact with the Taliban and other stakeholders have yet to be agreed; in lieu of these, the Humanitarian Country Team (HTC) is using the 2019 Joint Operational Principles, which were updated earlier this year. He also noted that the OCHA Office in Kabul led country clusters through a self-assessment to map capacity; the mapping was shared with the GCCG prior to the meeting and all were encouraged to feed into this process as part of the Scale-up.</p> <p>The Chair complemented Mr. Movahed's briefing by noting that the situation in Afghanistan appears calmer, with road missions taking place to Jalalabad, Kunduz, etc. There are overall concerns that pledges</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. GCCs to review Afghanistan cluster capacity mapping and reach out to their respective cluster coordinators to ascertain if additional support was required

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>made against the Flash Appeal are not being received and that there is insufficient operational capacity at the subnational levels, which is affecting the timeliness of delivery. DSRSG/RC/HC Ramiz Alakbarov will be in Geneva in mid-October for the upcoming Humanitarian Coordinators retreat. The Chair asked participants whether they had been involved in the cluster self-assessment exercise (and if not, she encouraged them to engage with their cluster counterparts), whether dedicated and sufficient coordinator and Information Management Officer (IMO) capacity were in place (and if there were instances of double-hatting), and whether the clusters were sufficiently supported in engaging with the authorities when required. Ms. Randa Hassan pointed to the need to carry out a coordination architecture review to ensure appropriate structures are in place in advance of a Scale-up.</p> <p>Participants indicated that they were not involved in the cluster self-assessment, with some updating the GCCG on efforts to scale-up cluster capacity or provide surge support to Afghanistan. GEC stressed the urgency of activating the education cluster from the current Education in Emergencies Working Group, with the decision still pending at country level. GLC indicated that logistics was also functioning as a working group, but with dedicated coordinator and IMO capacity; it did not foresee the need to activate the logistics cluster if partners received the required support. Mr. Movahed briefed that the Emergency Directors Group (EDG) discussed the possibility of CCCM cluster activation to bolster capacity in this critical sector. Some clusters were de-activated and humanitarian capacity lost due to a push to orient Afghanistan to development programming; even if this was the case, participants agreed that more preparedness needed to be undertaken to avoid the current situation and that the ICCG needed to ensure alignment of coordination capacity across the board. Participants expressed concern about the inconsistent inclusion of female responders on humanitarian teams and on partner capacity, given cash limitations, the impact of sanctions on contracting processes, and the effects of both of these factors on the supply chain. GSC offered to share a recent joint statement by NGO partners on the issue of female participation on humanitarian teams.</p> <p>On Ethiopia, Mr. Movahed briefed that a three-month extension of the Scale-up protocol for Ethiopia will be discussed by the IASC Principals at their 20 October meeting; the Scale-up has been in effect for six months. The findings from the OPR mission, led by Kevin Kennedy, will guide the decision; the OPR report should be completed by 13 October. Ms. Annarita Marcantonio complemented that the ICCG is reviewing cluster capacity and gaps in both Tigray and Amhara regions and that the mapping will be shared when available. GFSC indicated that she would be going on mission to Ethiopia soon and asked for an update on how the HRP will be handled (national plan vs northern Ethiopia) as this impacts the operation and how coordination structures are set-up. Participants questioned the usefulness of OPRs, which tend to have similar recommendations, and suggested that the P2P Support Project undertake a meta-analysis of its report in order to provide the IASC Principals or EDG with the key issues affecting most operations. Ms. Anne-France White of the P2P Support Project expressed interest in meeting with GCCs to discuss how to better structure OPR reports or follow-up on recommendations. The Chair indicated that the GCCG-S will update its analysis of OPR/P2P reports that was undertaken two years ago and that the update will be provided to the GCCG.</p> <p>On Haiti, the Chair briefed that a number of GCCs met in early September to discuss ways to support coordination in Haiti. This group suggested that GCCs advocate with their CLA Country Representatives for funding and resources for coordination; that the GCCG-S follow-up with OCHA Haiti to understand if activation was discussed at the HCT (as of 29 September, the HCT has not yet discussed it and activation is unlikely as the government is not in favour); and that the GCCG-S set up a system for early discussions with GCCs in the event of sudden onset emergencies. GNC noted that it was too late to activate clusters two months after the earthquake and that the perception that clusters would replace national capacity needed to be dispelled; clusters are critical resources for preparedness and to strengthen national capacity and can be scaled back if no longer needed. GNC further briefed that UNCIEF internally agreed to scale-up and provide extensive support to sectoral coordination and that it is considering the recruitment of national officers to support sectoral (government) leads at national and department levels. GNC noted that the GCCG needed to further discuss how emergency coordination architecture should look like in these types of contexts, looking at the national risk and capacity profile and how the international community can best support through surge or other means; it was further suggested that this issue be discussed at the GCCG retreat.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. GCCG-S to follow-up on activation of education cluster in Afghanistan 6. GSC to share joint statement on female participation on humanitarian teams 7. GCCG-S to share the status of Ethiopia clusters' resources with GCs as soon as available 8. GCCs are encouraged to reach out bilaterally to P2P Support Project and discuss how to improve OPRs 9. GCCG-S to provide GFSC with requested HRP information 10. GCCG-S to update analysis of P2P/OPR reports 11. GCCs to advocate with their CLAs for funding and resources for coordination in Haiti 12. GCCG-S to set up a system for early discussions with GCCs in the event of sudden onset emergencies.
<p>3. Briefing on the P2P and GPC missions to DRC</p> <p>Ms. White briefed on the recent P2P support mission that was undertaken in DRC. The mission focused on supporting the HCT's review of the humanitarian coordination architecture. It carried out 15 workshops with</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. GCCG invited to support DRC steering committee to streamline and

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>194 humanitarian actors in Bukavu, Bunia, Goma, Kalémie, Kananga and Kinshasa, paying particular attention to the four <i>comité régional inter-organisations</i> (CRIOS); four <i>intercluster régional</i> (ICR), and two <i>comité local inter-organisations</i> (CLIOs). Based on the workshops and other consultations, the P2P team supported the HCT to develop an action plan focused on five improvement areas: (1) overly complex and heavy coordination structures; (2) insufficient engagement with non-humanitarian actors on the nexus; (3) the need for more accountability in the implementation of the response; (4) the need to realign UNDSS security management to the humanitarian response structure; and (5) use of information for strategic decision-making. Since the mission report has not yet been finalized, the detailed findings that were discussed at the meeting are omitted from this summary record. The GCCG was invited to support the work of a steering committee in Kinshasa to streamline and strengthen coordination, building on the GCCG's 2017 mission there which pinpointed many of the same issues and presented similar recommendations. The P2P support mission report is expected to be finalized by mid- to late October. The HC will brief the EDG on implementation of the HCT's action plan in six months.</p> <p>Mr. William Chemaly (GPC) briefed on his mission to the DRC, which coincided with the P2P mission. He underscored that the layered coordination was duplicative and required considerable resources to maintain. It was the result of years of introducing new mechanisms without deactivating others. Mr. Chemaly suggested returning "back to basics", coordinating enhanced support on localization, carrying out additional GCC missions to the DRC, and encouraging CLAs to re-engage in inter-agency/cluster coordination after "retracting" due to the complexity of the response structure. On the funding side, Mr. Chemaly noted that there was a need to carry out more advocacy to raise the profile of the crisis and to garner more funds given extreme donor fatigue; return to multi-year planning; and reduce the number of Humanitarian Fund allocation cycles, which took away capacity from the operational response.</p> <p>Participants took note of the findings and agreed with the need for more streamlined coordination, a return to multi-year planning, coordinated localization support, and advocacy for funding (particularly for mine action activities). Comments were also made on the difficulties of applying the nexus in an insecure context; the challenges of short-term measures, like yearly road rehabilitation; and the uncertainty of the MONUSCO drawdown.</p>	<p>strengthen coordination</p>
<p>4. Update on Stepping Back to Look Forward</p> <p>Mr. Chemaly (GPC) and Ms. Marie Agnese Giordano (GEC) reminded participants of the work that they jointly undertook as part of the Stepping Back to Look Forward (SBLF) initiative. They also reminded participants that at the 1 September meeting of the GCCG, it was agreed to draft a note to the ERC and to request a meeting with him. Mr. Chemaly and Ms. Giordano prepared a draft letter to the ERC, which was circulated for comment in advance of the GCCG meeting. The letter is based on the SBLF discussions, focusing on common issues where the majority of clusters are in agreement and which require decision by the IASC. It is an opportunity to show the GCCG's proactiveness and to create a channel of communication with the new ERC in order to engage him on the cluster approach.</p> <p>A number of clusters expressed reservation with using such a direct approach, suggesting that there may be other ways of communicating. They underscored that it was important to first sensitize and engage with each GCC's respective CLA as this letter would impact the ability of some GCC to advocate with their CLAs. Other GCCs cautioned that Global Clusters were independent of the agencies and that it was critical to represent cluster partners / SAGs. After some back and forth, the GCCG decided to extend the deadline for comments from 4 October to <u>13 October</u> and that during this time, each GCC could consult with its CLA, SAG or partners if it wished. The majority of participants felt that the letter needed to be sent to the ERC directly and that it was not controversial. It was pointed out that if some GCCs wanted to opt out of signing the letter, they could do so. Most participants thought that sending the letter in advance of a meeting with the ERC was critical to framing the discussion. The GCCG-S was asked to invite the ERC to the upcoming GCCG retreat and if he was unable to attend, to organize a meeting when available.</p>	<p>14. GCCG to provide comments on draft letter to ERC by 13 October</p> <p>15. GCCG-S to invite ERC to GCCG retreat once letter is finalised (or if unavailable, a dedicated meeting).</p>
<p>5. Update on JIAF</p> <p>Ms. Monica Ramos (GWS) provided an updated on the JIAF. She briefed that a JIAG meeting was taking place on 30 September and encouraged all GCCs (or delegated representatives) to attend to ensure that their voice was heard on the Brussels workshop and the Yale independent review. The Brussels workshop is scheduled to take place in November in order to (i) reflect on the recommendations of the Yale independent review and the guidance provided by the JIAF Steering Committee, and to (ii) agree the skeleton design of JIAF 2.0 (framework, methodology, process) and next steps and timelines for the</p>	<p>16. GWS/GCCG-S to (re) send Yale independent review</p> <p>17. GCCs to comment on review by 13 October deadline</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>methodological development of JIAF 2.0. Ms. Ramos underscored that GCCs were expected to participate on the first day of the workshop, although it was not clear whether attendees needed to travel or could connect virtually. She also briefed that comments on the Yale independent review were expected through the CLAs, unless the GCCG wanted to prepare a joint position on the review. Comments on the report were expected by 13 October, in advance of the JIAF Steering Committee meeting on 26 October, when it will agree which recommendations to accept/reject and which to prioritize. Ms. Ramos indicated that she would (re) send the Yale independent review to the GCCG.</p>	<p>and to attend first day of November workshop in Brussels.</p>
<p>6. IASC group updates: HPC Steering Group and OPAG AAP Task Force</p> <p>The Chair gave a brief overview of the key issues that had been discussed in the last meeting. Due to time limitations, the Chair noted that the HPC Steering Group ToRs and the September meeting minutes will be sent to the group via email. The Steering Group is chaired by OCHA and is composed of 9 entities, including the GCCG Chair. The next meeting of the Steering Group is scheduled for 8 October.</p> <p>On the OPAG Task Force on Collective AAP, the Chair reminded participants to comment on the draft recommendations (some of which related to the clusters) by Friday, 1 October. This Task Force is time-bound, led by IFRC and WFP, and composed of 10 members. It started its work in early September and is expected to be dissolved by 7 October 2021.</p>	<p>18. GCCG-S to send HPC SG ToRs and meeting minutes</p> <p>19. GCCG to comment on draft AAP recommendations by 1 October.</p>
<p>7. AOB</p> <p>The Chair reminded participants of the (i) HPC - Disability inclusion and GBV risk mitigation meeting on 30 September at 16.00; (ii) the HLP on Internal Displacement report launch on 29 September; and (iii) the postponement of the 30 September IASC OPAG Meeting on Centrality of Protection.</p>	
<p>Next GCCG meeting: 27 October 2021, 14.00-16.00 (GVA)</p> <p>Forward agenda: CLARE II evaluation results, GCCG retreat prep, Colombia mission planning, SBLF/ERC letter, GBV reference group.</p>	