

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 2 February 2022
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Ela Serdaroglu, Mr. Pablo Medina and Ms. Sahdia Khan, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Anna Ziolkovska, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Ms. Wan Sophonpanich, Mr. Marco Rotunno and Mr. Bruce Spires, Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster (CCCM); Mr. Abdul Majid and Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Linda Doull, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Ms. Athalie Mayo, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Ms. Nancy Polutan-Teulieres, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Ms. Jennifer Chase and Ms. Astrid Haaland, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Ms. Michelle Brown and Mr. Thorodd Ommundsen, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Mr. Brent Carbno, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC); Mr. Ron Pouwels, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Ms. Christelle Loupforest, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Jim Robinson, Housing, Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan, Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat).

Invitees: Mr. James Wheatherill, Deputy Head of Office OCHA Ukraine; Mr. Sebastian Rhodes-Stampa, Chief, Emergency Response Section, OCHA; Mr. Peter Muller, UNDAC Global Lead, OCHA; Ms. Jane Cocking and Mr. Damian Lilly IASC Consultants; Mr. Martin Fisher, IFRC; Ms. Dina Abou Samra, OCHA; Mr. Nisar Syed, Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordinator Unit.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>The Chair welcomed participants, introduced Mr. Spires (CCCM/IOM), Mr. Rotunno (CCCM/UNHCR) and Ms. Polutan-Teulieres (GPC) to the group, provided an overview of the meeting’s agenda, and requested any amendments to the agenda; no amendments were provided. She then provided the following overview of the status of action points from previous meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GCCG to identify two new GCCG representatives in the JIAF [<i>pending, will be addressed as a separate agenda item.</i>] ○ GCCG to identify leads for all activities in the GCCG workplan. The Chair encouraged GCs who have not yet volunteered to take the lead in some of the remaining activities, including the nomination of leads to the Capacity Building Task Force [<i>ongoing.</i>] ○ GCCs to reach out to their teams in the Philippines for possible areas of support [<i>ongoing.</i>] GBV AoR informed that a regional Information Management Officer (IM) would be deployed during 2-3 months to the Philippines. CCCM is also deploying two additional staff to reinforce the cluster. ○ GCCG ToR status within OPAG [<i>pending, OPAG did not address this during their last meeting.</i>] ○ Ms. Moira Reddick to contact GCs individually to discuss the IASC Protection Policy Review [<i>ongoing.</i>] ○ Follow up on GCCG missions to Colombia and Cameroon [<i>ongoing.</i>] <p>OPAG: The Chair informed that the OPAG meeting of 27 January 2022 focused on the arrangement, priorities and chairing of the new Task Forces. The deadline for co-chair nominations was extended to allow for more nominations, especially from local NGOs. GBV AoR asked if there had been a clarification about the criteria for joining the new Task Forces, the Chair noted that this was not specifically discussed but that she had suggested on behalf of the GCCG, that the participation of entities relevant for implementation of the work priorities, such as clusters, should also be considered. On localization OPAG members had discussed the need for more participation by local actors. GBV AoR further enquired if the GCCG would be trying to participate in some Task Forces or this will be left to Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs). The Chair asked GCs to inform her if they want to be included in some of the Task Forces and noted that it was agreed the chairing of the Task Forces would be at the D1 level.</p> <p>HPC Steering Group meeting: The heaviness of the HPC process was discussed, the Chair made a number of suggestions on behalf of the GCCG, in line with prior GCCG discussions, including the importance of exploring multi-year HPC. The next HPC SG meeting will cover the CLARE II evaluation and looking at some of the data on clusters (from the 2020 coordination mapping) in a selected number of countries. GBV AoR asked about the agenda on localization and the Chair and CCCM stated that the main priorities suggested were better alignment with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GCCG-s to reach out to the group to identify an additional GCCG representative to the JIAF ● GCCG-s to follow up on the OPAG discussion about the ToR of IASC associated entities ● GCCG-s to follow up about the ToR and preparations of GCCG missions to Colombia and South Sudan.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>the work of the Grand Bargain stream on localization, focusing more on the rollout and implementation, dissemination and awareness-raising of IASC guidance that had already adopted.</p>	
<p>Briefing on the situation in Ukraine</p> <p>Mr. Weatherill briefed on the latest developments in Ukraine and scenarios under consideration by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT). Four scenarios are considered in the inter-agency planning:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Status quo remains: 2.9 million people in need of assistance in the East of the country. 2) Limited escalation: Circumscribed to areas nearing the contact line, one million additional people affected. Costing of this scenario would be of \$150 million during six months in top of the current \$190 million Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP). This scenario would require a revision of the HRP. 3) Significant escalation: Including in areas beyond the contact line, additional 5 million people in need and 1.8 million of newly displaced. Costing of this scenario would be \$868 million for the first six months. A Flash Appeal is planned within 24/48 hours in case of an evolution of the situation towards this scenario. 4) Country-wide hostilities: Millions displaced. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNC advocated for the activation of the Nutrition Cluster and the Chair enquired if the geographic location of the clusters is a factor being considered. • Responding GNC’s intervention advocating for the activation of the Nutrition Cluster Mr. Weatherill noted that while there are pockets of food insecurity, there have been no reports of large-scale nutritional needs to date and that coordination arrangements could be revisited if there is evidence for the need of expanded nutritional programming. The Chair suggested that GNC and OCHA Ukraine should follow up further bilaterally. • To GNC’s comment that Ukraine is a transition/nexus country and enquiry about whether the mindset of cluster partners on the ground would be conducive to a rapid scale-up and whether there were ways in which the GCCG could support a fast scale-up Mr. Weatherill underscored that Ukraine is a nexus country with a need to evolve towards a development approach and service provision. In non-government-controlled areas there are no government services and humanitarian assistance needs to continue. The aim is to transition humanitarian programming in government-controlled areas by the end of 2023. Specifically, in the health sector, there is planning for a quick scale up of mobile health capacities. The absence of numerous humanitarian actors and important NGOs is a concern, but many are expected to start operations in country if the situation deteriorates. • Responding to a question from the Chair on whether the geographic location of clusters – an issue raised in past P2P reports - was being considered he said that some CLAs are moving clusters to field locations and there is a renewed interest and growing consensus within the HCT on re-examining the location of the clusters. • MA AoR highlighted the extensive landmine contamination and expressed her hope that the planned logistics capacity assessment mission to Ukraine meets with MA AoR partners and includes them in the contingency planning. GFSC informed that there is a coordinator in place working closely with the WFP regional office on contingency planning. GFSC is monitoring the situation and can provide support through a dedicated staff from the global level if the situation escalates. GEC is discussing transitioning and will have a call to discuss resourcing and preparedness. • Mr. Weatherill confirmed that mine action is an important area with well capacitated partners in country. On food security, he noted that OCHA is also working with WFP on contingency planning noting 59 percent of the \$868 million for contingency planning is for food assistance, which would require a significant logistical capacity and greater cash management capacity for effective delivery. An ETC mission is planned from 6 February to support the UNCT and analyse the capacity to communicate across UN offices if the network goes down. Commenting on scenario ‘3’, he added that several clusters would 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNC to follow up bilaterally on the nutrition coordination structure in Ukraine.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>need augmented capacity, particularly Shelter and Education, which do not have dedicated full-time cluster coordinators.</p> <p>In closing, Mr. Weatherill emphasized that the operations focus on a region that includes only around 15 percent of the country and added that many of the challenges encountered relate to a lack of development and must be addressed through a development approach with clusters needing to be pushed to look more at transitions. Finally, he noted that the GBV AoR is active and no particular concerns were identified preventing its scale-up.</p>	
<p>Operational updates</p> <p>EDG annual review of operations: The Chair informed that there will be an EDG mission to Cameroon by the end of March early April, further updates on the EDG will be provided during the next GCCG meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Rhodes-Stampa provided an overview of ongoing sudden onset emergencies and UNDAC responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tonga: The scope and scale of natural disasters is overcoming COVID-19 restrictions, except in the Pacific. Multi-sectorial assistance has been delivered by air and sea and stand-by partners are being deployed into Suva (Fiji) to support the response remotely. The government of Tonga has welcomed technical assistance but underlined that there is no need for a big international response. - Peru: The waves of the tsunami have provoked casualties also in Peru, where in addition to this a large oil spill has caused widespread damage to the Northern Coast of the country. An environmental emergencies team was deployed and will present their conclusions to the government on 2 February 2022. - Philippines: Typhoon Rai has caused fewer human casualties but more extensive infrastructural and crops damage than typhoon Haiyan. The HCT has released the new Humanitarian Needs and Priorities Plan, targeting 840,000 people with a funding need of \$169 million, the plan will be presented to donors on 2 February 2021. - Mozambique and Malawi: Cyclone Anna has particularly impacted Southern Malawi and affected around 800,000 people. Staff have been deployed to support with rapid needs assessment but efforts are hampered by poor access. A light Flash Appeal and CERF application are under preparation. - Madagascar: Tropical cyclone Batsirai is expected to land in the country on 5 February and people recently affected by cyclone Anna could be displaced again. HCT members are updating and increasing their emergency stock lists and UNDAC and partner teams are on stand-by. <p>The Chair noted on this point that the Regional OCHA Director was invited to the GCCG meeting of 12 November 2021 and transmitted to the group a number of asks regarding the preparedness and response in Madagascar. Mr. Rhodes-Stampa will communicate bilaterally with ETC about the activation of the crisis connectivity charter. GLC emphasized that Batsirai could be the biggest storm in three years and enquired the group about GC surge response and stand-by preparation plans.</p> <p>Central African Republic (CAR): The Global Protection Coordinator will go on a mission to CAR between 6 and 11 February 2022. The mission aims to increase the visibility of the protection cluster and its priorities towards donors and humanitarian leadership, and to discuss protection coordination needs, structures and relationships, engaging actors also about IDP protection. Finally, the GPC will also look into resource mobilization and donor engagement. GCCs are encouraged to share with the GPC specific messages/asks to colleagues in CAR by 5 February 2022.</p> <p>Colombia: Ms. Marcantonio informed that there is still need for support. The proposed timeframes for a GCCG mission are March or May 2022. She asked if GCCs support a mission and would be available to participate. The Chair encouraged GCCs to share their interest and reminded that a mission to South Sudan will be also planned soon.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCCG-s to follow up with EDG-s for a briefing during the next GCCG meeting • GCCs to communicate bilaterally with GPC their specific asks regarding GPC's mission to CAR • GCCG-s to collect participation intentions and consult with the GCCG about the best timing for the missions to South Sudan and Colombia.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Briefing on the UNDAC training</p> <p>Mr. Muller informed that OCHA is developing an online training to build the awareness about UNDAC deployments of UNDAC operational partners. A similar in-person course was organized three years ago with associated partners, including clusters, which allowed cluster coordinators to deploy with UNDAC in sudden onset emergencies and clusters receive alerts for surge responses. Joint deployments allow cluster coordinators to benefit from the connectivity, logistics, analysis and mapping of UNDAC during the deployment. Focus will initially be on the operational partners at the global level and later rolled out at regional level. The training will be rolled out after March 2022. ETC shared interest in taking part at both global and regional levels. Other GCs are invited to convey their interest in including global/regional level participants from their clusters by contacting Mr. Muller.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCs to reach out to Mr. Muller to share their interest in participating in the training for UNDAC operational partners
<p>Briefing on the IASC Protection Policy Review</p> <p>Ms. Cocking updated the group on the status of the IASC Protection Policy Review, emphasizing the importance GCs feedback during the process. The review intends to check progress on the implementation of the IASC Protection Policy five years on from its original agreement in 2016. The key objectives of the policy were to encourage all humanitarian actors to commit to 1) address protection issues 2) engage collectively to achieve meaningful protection outcomes, 3) mobilise other actors and 4) evaluate commitments and progress towards placing protection at the centre of humanitarian response.</p> <p>A paper issued in preparation of the information gathering outlines the eight key issues that are recurring enablers or blockers of the achievement of protection outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership: The lack of strong, clear leadership to ensure protection is central to the humanitarian response. Accountability: The lack of clear accountability amongst the diverse set of actors involved in the centrality of protection. Protection architecture: The institutional structures and coordination mechanisms related to protection both facilitate and block protection outcomes. Conceptualisation: The conceptual misunderstanding and different interpretations about the centrality of protection. Capacity: The mismatch between the protection challenges faced by humanitarian actors and their capacity to address them meaningfully. Results and impact: The need to ensure a more results-oriented approach to protection. Working with other actors on protection: The need for a holistic approach to protection challenges that involves peace, development and human rights actors Localization: Significant time has been dedicated to engage local and national actors, listening to them and their conceptualization of protection. <p>Ms. Cocking outlined that following the data gathering and research process, a new phase of consultations, during which GCs are very welcomed to engage, will start from the second week of February 2022 to present the findings and encourage discussion about the implications of these findings. The review is not about tracking the progress of a single policy but about tracking collective progress towards achieving protection outcomes. Finally, Ms. Cocking asked GCCs if they were aware to what extent the Protection Policy had made a difference and what would be their key steps to ensuring protection is at the centre of humanitarian response. She emphasized that one aspect that crosses over the conceptual and architectural issue is the extent to which the Protection Cluster has been expected in many locations to be solely responsible for the identification of what the delivery of protection analysis means in terms of centrality of protection, this was not the intention and nor should it be the case.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair reminded the group that the recommendations of the report will have an impact and influence the work of GCs and encouraged the group to contact Ms. Cocking for follow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-s to organise a meeting between Ms. Cocking and interested GCCs to discuss the IASC Protection Policy Review GEC to share with the GCCG its experience of protection collaboration with the CP AoR.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>ups. GPC commented that the Protection Cluster had been meeting regularly with Ms. Cocking and MA AoR added that it has physical protection at the core of its responsibilities but is perhaps not focusing enough on other protection issues. MA AoR agreed that the humanitarian architecture can be a blocking factor and underlined that this is the situation with UNMAS not being part of the IASC architecture. GBV AoR underlined the AoR's engagement and shared her interest in a consultation with core members about how to better support the broader protection. She also emphasized that being more inclusive or clear about how the different protection areas come together could strengthen the agenda of the centrality of protection. GEC added that the GEC and CP AoR worked to move issues from conceptual to practical level and developed a joint framework on how to integrate these into HPC processes. In 2022 there will be a focus on the Joint Education Needs Assessment and how to improve the collection and analysis of data around protection needs for children while the GEC is also linking this to preparedness work. The GEC can share with the group practical experiences on this collaboration with the CP AoR. GHC noted that coordination exists with the GPC and the AoRs, but its integration into practical programming is a challenging question. A Joint Operational Framework has been made between GHC and GPC/AoRs, aligning public health situational analysis with protection analysis. Finally, GPC underlined that the centrality of protection is a system-wide responsibility that goes beyond the GPC and its AoRs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair suggested a dedicated discussion with the group to which several GCCS confirmed their interest. Ms. Cocking agreed with the Chair's suggestion to provide framing questions and sharing draft findings in advance. 	
<p>GCCG representation in the JIAF</p> <p>GWC reminded that GWC and GHC had represented the GCCG in the JIAF during 2021, a year during which several technical and strategic conversations were carried forward within the JIAF. She emphasized that in addition to outreach through CLAs GCCG representation in these discussions is useful to share concerns and key questions at a more operational level, an area where clusters are at the frontline and should maintain their visibility. She highlighted that 2021 required a lot of engagement by GCCG representatives in the JIAF while 2022 is expected to require less time commitment. Two representatives are needed to assure coverage when one is out and also to better interpret all the nuances of the discussions.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to a question, GWC noted that the alternative option of CLAs representing the GCCG option was not ideal as the collective GCCG voice has a weight and autonomy from the CLAs. She added that having GCCG representatives provides more room for the GCs to participate in the discussion and come up with a collective position. The Chair thanked GWC and GHC for their work as representatives and GFSC for volunteering to be one of the new GCCG representatives to the JIAF. She encouraged other GCCs to volunteer for the second representative position. 	
<p>AOB</p> <p>Coordination mapping: Ms. Hassan informed the group that the coordination mapping survey went out on 25 January to over 650 cluster and ICCG focal points. The deadline for submission is 25 February 2022 and completion rates will be monitored throughout the process. The GCCG Secretariat will reach out to GCCs for support in encouraging relevant clusters to complete the survey where there have been delays in submission. Once the raw data from the surveys has been collected, this will be shared directly with the GCCs.</p> <p>Ms. Hassan then responded to a question that had arisen in recent days from two clusters in the Whole of Syria response regarding language in last year's global coordination mapping report i.e.: "Note on IASC Coordination Structures at Country Level in 2020". The question was in relation to the sentence: "In total, over 2,200 coordination structures were mapped across 28 operations (30 locations, taking into account the three components of the Syria response).</p>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Syria (Damascus, regional, Gaziantep”, specifically, why the Northeast was not listed as one of the components of the Syria response.</p> <p>Ms. Hassan explained that the annual coordination mapping exercise is designed to capture IASC coordination structures at the national and subnational levels. The survey is sent to IASC clusters, sectors and AoRs. It maps their adherence with IASC coordination policy and good practice in terms of ToRs, Transition Plans, CCPM, cluster leadership and staffing of coordinator and IMO, participation of national and local actors, etc.</p> <p>For the Syria response IASC coordination structures are Damascus, Gaziantep and WoS coordination platform. That is why the language in last year’s report specifies that the mapping took place for those areas. She underlined that the report is not intended as an operational overview of the Syria response as a whole, and certainly not any statement or reflection on the relevance or contribution of the NES coordination platform – it is simply (as indicated by the language in the document) where the 2020 mapping took place.</p> <p>Ms. Hassan stated that it is clear that the Syria operation is complex and its clear there are response areas that are outside IASC structures. The NES coordination structure is an integral element within the Syria response with strong links to Clusters and Sectors. This is why the WoS Syria survey has been uniquely and purposefully set up to allow WoS Coordinators to indicate sectoral WGs in the NES area and this data will be shared with all GCs for their use.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHC commented that donors hold CLAs accountable for coordination in the North-East as part of the Syria response. She added that mapping only what is formalized is part of the ambiguity of humanitarian coordination and a point for the EDG to decide upon. GEC suggested that if questions arising from WoS coordinators on this issue was a recurring matter, perhaps it could be clarified or framed before the survey goes out. Ms. Hassan agreed with this suggestion and offered to address this and any other incoming questions about the mapping. Reporting on Syria coordination structures will be guided and informed by any agreed terminology endorsed by the Whole of Syria Strategic Steering Group (SSG). • The Chair concluded the meeting encouraging GCCs to propose agenda items and reminding that there will be another OPAG meeting for which a GC volunteer is welcomed. • Upcoming GCCG meeting: Wednesday 2 March 2022, 2 – 4 p.m. (GVA) Forward agenda: Preparedness/localization by GLC, activation/deactivation, HPC. 	