

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 22 June 2022
Final summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Mr. Angel Pascual, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Linda Doull, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Ms. Celine Maret, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Mr. Abdul Majid and Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Mailin Fauchon and Ms. Mary Jelliti, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Ms. Michelle Brown and Mr. Thorodd Ommundsen, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Mr. Stefano Fedele, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Mr. Ron Pouwels, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Ms. Jennifer Chase, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan, Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Ms. Janet Puhlovic, Mr. Mate Bagossy (GCCG Secretariat).

Invitees: Ms. Maria Rosaria Bruno (Head of Office, OCHA Lebanon); Ms. Helena Mazarro (OCHA Lebanon); Mr. Nisar Syed (Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordination Unit); Ms. Aida Mengistu (OCHA P2P).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</p> <p>The Chair welcomed participants, introduced Ms. Fauchon (GLC) to the group, provided an overview of the meeting’s agenda, and asked if there were any amendments to the agenda; no amendments were suggested. She then provided the following overview of the status of action points from previous meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination Mapping: Data collection has been finalized and cleaning is in progress. Data will be shared with GCCs in mid to end August. • Cash Advisory Group: No interest was received from GCs to participate in the CAG. • HPC Steering Group: At the last meeting which focused on localization, it was concluded that the HPC SG should focus on HPC-related issues and not duplicate work done by the Grand Bargain and the IASC localization taskforce. The discussion paper was shared with the group for comments and only GEC sent inputs. The next meeting is scheduled on 7 July. • OPAG update: The last meeting focused on the workplan and activities of Task Force 2 on Accountability to Affected People (AAP) and the IASC Task Force 3 on Preserving Humanitarian Space. The readout will be shared with the group when available. • EDG update: Some EDG directors are planning a visit to the Horn of Africa region during the first half of July, more updates will be provided on this. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GCCG-s to share the coordination mapping data with GCs when available in August 2. GCCG-s to share with the GCCG the readout of the last OPAG meeting when available 3. GCCG-s to request update from IASC-s on the EDG mission to the Horn of Africa
<p>Lebanon HCT update</p> <p>Ms. Bruno briefed the group about the results of the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) retreat that took place during the second week of June.</p> <p>Context: Ms. Bruno underlined that unfortunately the situation in the country keeps deteriorating and needs continue to grow. The HCT retreat gathered numerous actors to discuss key priorities, such as AAP, localization and the aid architecture. Donors have developed a common and unified position, ‘whole of Lebanon approach’, to avoid duplications, be needs (not status) driven, looking at the broader humanitarian, development and peace nexus, including with and preserving the much needed refugee response. The emergency response plan was expanded in mid-June to better complement the refugee response and the HCT came to a number of commitments (the list of commitment will be shared with GCC). OCHA, UNHCR and UNDP will keep working to foster a joint approach with all concerned interlocutors.</p> <p>Support from GCCs: There is need for support from GCCs to operationalize and help sectors deliver on their six core functions, particularly for those sectors that will be joined up, as simplification of tools on needs, response and gaps will be required. Ms. Bruno encouraged GCCs to reach out to their teams in Lebanon and support them technically with these changes.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair inquired from Ms. Bruno which would be her specific asks from the coordinators. Ms. Bruno emphasized three asks from GCCs: 1) Keep monitoring the situation in Lebanon as it is likely to dramatically deteriorate and not all sectors have dedicated resources; 2) OCHA, UNHCR and UNDP are committed to streamline cross-sectoral issues but the sectors need support to also streamline their own tools; 3) advocate for additional resources for dedicated coordinators and less turnover for some key sectors. She added that donors had also raised questions about the overall costs of the response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. GCCG-s to share with GCCs the summary of the Lebanon HCT retreat

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEC expressed support for the simplification of the coordination system, noting that there is still confusion about the existence of two inter-sectoral coordination groups and asked Ms. Bruno about her reflections on this. GFSC enquired about the availability of additional data on the deteriorating food security outcomes. Ms. Bruno commended the support extended by the Education Sector and noted that while two inter-sectoral groups had been kept, one is purely humanitarian and the other is related to the refugee response and co-led by the government and includes the broader focus of the LCRP framework, notably humanitarian, stabilization, nexus and development interventions for the refugee response. The UNCT has signed a new cooperation framework this year and will define in the next two months their programmatic activity for the upcoming three years. Coherence with this framework must also be maintained. A follow up mini-retreat of the HCT will take place on 14 July to follow up on the HCT retreat action plan. The Ukraine crisis has had an effect on food insecurity and in June 2022 the minimum expenditure basket was double the minimum wage. The new emergency response plan requires USD546 million for 18 months - this is a big amount in conjunction with the Refugee Response Plan that amounts to approximately \$3.2 billion. GNC noted that Lebanon deserves additional support and expressed interest in bilateral discussions on how to best support existing capacity and explore additional capacity for the country. Ms. Bruno agreed with GNC and highlighted the strategic place of nutrition in the funding allocations. She added that evidence generated by the sector has led to growing needs in the sector countrywide and across population groups. Ms. Bruno appealed all sectors to invest in data and evidence to support needs-based assistance. 	
<p>Operational updates</p> <p>Burkina Faso: Ms. Mengistu updated the group on the outcomes of the P2P mission to Burkina Faso and highlighted the following: Background: The P2P support mission took place from 30 May to 10 June at the request of the Humanitarian Coordinator to review the coordination footprint, with the objective of making it more operational and decentralizing the architecture. The mission also looked at how to support and expand humanitarian access and cross-cutting issues (AAP, protection, PSEA, localization), as well as how to scale up support to humanitarian actors to better support the affected population. The number of internally displaced persons has reached 1.9 million and the situation keeps deteriorating, with new and secondary displacement happening. Mission: The team was led by Ms. Marta Ruedas and included ICVA, NRC, UNICEF, FAO, UNDP, P2P and OCHA. The mission followed a bottom up approach with a lot of consultations at the regional level. Fourteen workshops were conducted to identify challenges and solutions. Displacement sites were also visited and it was evident that assistance is not keeping pace with needs. The mission ended with an HCT retreat where the findings were presented and an action plan established. The report has not been finalized yet, as feedback from the HCT is pending, the report is expected to be released during the first week of July and will then be shared with the GCCG. Issues identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination architecture: Is very centralized and heavy, with under-resourced regional levels and communication gaps between national and subnational levels. Regions are seldom included in the development of response strategies or cross-cutting action plans. Rapid response mechanism (RRM): Is affected by the heavy architecture, a few mechanisms exist, separate from the cluster architecture but is not clear how these relate to the larger cluster coordination mechanism. Cross cutting issues: A lot of work is done at the capital level, with dedicated personnel, however the subnational level has very limited knowledge about the activity on cross-cutting issues and better inter-agency collaboration is needed. Relationship of the HCT with external partners: Donors asked for more transparency and information exchange from the HCT and a stronger evidence base to articulate the needs. Relationship of the HCT with the government: Is challenged by fast evolving needs and context. The authorities control over lists of beneficiaries for example, leads to delays in the response and potential risks of politicization. Access: There are very limited collective efforts to negotiate access with non-state armed groups. The civil-military coordination has also been affected by the new 	<p>5. GCCG-s to share the P2P report on Burkina Faso with the group when released [done]</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>transition government and its lack of full recognition by the Economic Community of West African States(ECOWAS).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duty of care: Agencies have their own requirements and system in place but are not doing enough collectively. • National NGOs (NNGOs): There are good practices from the humanitarian leadership to ensure NNGOs inclusion in the coordination architecture, however NNGOs are flagging limitations in their ability to make decisions on programming. This includes looking at nexus opportunities. <p>Areas of support needed from GCs: Once the HCT plan is ready there will be specific actions requiring GC support to their teams in the field. A lot of the issues relate to better resourcing at the regional level, but also training for cluster coordinators at the regional level. There is also the need to make the coordination structure lighter and more fit for purpose.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPC noted that the regional protection Working Group is organizing an extraordinary meeting on Monday 27 June to discuss the protection risks in the region. This will facilitate the collective move forward in response to the crisis in Burkina Faso. • Ms. Hassan reminded that the GCCG has engaged a lot with Burkina Faso and commented that the weaknesses identified at subnational level are not surprising. She added that the GCCG will continue its support and long standing engagement with the country. • GEC asked if the RRM lacked coordination with specific sectors or across all sectors. As education is not usually included in RRM, the GEC is working with partners and ECHO to better integrate education in RRM. Often clusters are not so involved in supporting and exchanging information with RRM. GEC is interested in the findings on Burkina and available to brief the GCCG about their RRM project. Ms. Mengistu responded that the RRM in Burkina Faso lacked coordination across all sectors, it responds to immediate needs but its linkages to broader coordination remain unclear. 	
<p>South Sudan GCCG mission debriefing</p> <p>Ms. Doull briefed the group on the GCCG mission (CCCM/IOM, CCCM/UNHCR, GPC, GHC, GNC and the GCCG chair) and highlighted the eight focus areas (1) Coordinator/co-coordinators, (2) Cluster members, (3) CLAs, (4) ICCG (national), (5) ICCG (sub-national), (6) Localization, (7) AAP and (8) Cash.</p> <p>General observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCCG focus has been on humanitarian aspect of coordination, understanding that nexus discussions are ongoing but should not distract/detract from significant improvements that are needed on humanitarian coordination • Basics on cluster coordination are suboptimal • More robust decentralization is needed and will need resources: get the sub-national clusters work at both ICCG and cluster level, become nimbler with decentralized decision-making and greater accountability • There is a need also for much greater accountability, the level of reporting is weak. • Colleagues at subnational level feel they have the ability and information to take decisions but they are not empowered to do so. <p>Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant cluster coordinator staff deployment gaps exist, requiring periodic cluster capacity monitoring at HCT meetings for collective accountability and joint resource mobilization and advocacy with donors/HQ. • There are different issues related to CLAs being perceived as not fully representing sector-wide concerns at the HCT and prioritizing their own agency interests, at the expense of cluster membership. <p>ICCG (national/subnational): Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are challenges around national and subnational levels coordination. ICCG engagement with the subnational levels is not optimal, this was witnessed also during the field visits. • Proactivity and preparedness planning/readiness faces challenges, the ICCG could work better on these. The ICCG (national) workplan is very high-level and requires more tangible outputs, timeframes and assigning responsibilities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. GCCs to share their tools and initiatives on how to assess the capacities of local partners 7. GWC to share the links to the member induction packages 8. GPC, if available, to brief about the South Sudan Protection roundtable at next GCCG meeting 9. GCCG-s and participating GCCs to finalize and share the mission report with GCCG

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance monitoring needs to be improved through existing tools. Performance and accountability is not discussed collectively and subnational ICCGs must be empowered to take decisions on rapidly unfolding events. <p>Cross cutting issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Localisation: There are multiple disconnected initiatives on localisation, and the HCT and ICCG need to articulate their vision on localization. There is for example no standard approaching on mapping partner capacities. AAP: An HCT AAP strategy exists but is not widely understood or collectively implemented. There is a breakdown between the tools and what is done in effectively in the field in terms of AAP. Cash: Cash use is increasing but there are opportunities to enlarge its use. There are good ideas to reinforce cash programming but also significant challenges. <p>The HRP is 26 percent funded but there is an expectation for further reprioritization of the focus of the response and a significant increase of the quality of the response. The question is how to improve these in the very constraining environment and with teams exhausted responding to acute operational needs.</p> <p>GNC added that there is a key challenge in adjusting to the wishes of some partners who want to transition from humanitarian response to more development linked programming. While there are HDN opportunities, is important to underline that the humanitarian response remains paramount and is important to continue strengthening it. There are major challenges but also obvious opportunities to maximize what is being done without necessitating additional funding. There are many priorities but is important that basics are covered, however, several gaps were observed by the mission.</p> <p>The Chair added that it would be helpful if all GCCs could support their clusters in improving:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Collective understanding of responsibilities of cluster members (including using induction packages that have been developed by some clusters) 2- More consistent and better use of CCPMs 3- Better equity between coordinators and co-coordinators and avoiding putting double-hatting cluster coordinators in situations of possible conflict of interest, particularly around submissions of project proposals. 4- Stronger use of monitoring indicators to evaluate the quality of the response 5- Significant improvement in mutually sharing feedback from affected people between cluster members. 6- Measuring capacity of partners: GHC has developed a tool to determine the capacities of local partners, it would be helpful if other GCs could share other similar tools they may have developed. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEC noted that it was looking at pooling its localisation resources and looking at the issue from an institutional, cross-cutting and programmatic lens. The Chair added that the issue of capacity mapping is complex and differs between clusters. GWC commented that the online WASH Coordination Toolkit includes a capacity mapping page open to all. On the briefing of cluster members, GWC has started a global orientation webinar run yearly, GWC has also developed a SAG induction and a partners' briefing package that can be replicated in the field. GEC noted that every new Education Coordinator is briefed through a standard package. 	
<p>GLC mapping of environmental sustainability measures</p> <p>Ms. Jellity briefed the group on the GLC's Environmental Sustainability in Humanitarian Logistics (WREC) Project:</p> <p>Description of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WREC is a consortium project co-led by GLC, DRC, IFRC, Save the Children and WPP and brings around 500 other GLC partners. The project has a multi-donor, academic, and private sector engagement to ensure a full representation of stakeholders and develop realistic and usable solutions to common problems. <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project focuses on greenhouse gas emissions and waste management. It aims to address unintended environmental impacts that can hamper the effectiveness of relief, recovery, and sustainable development efforts. The objective is also to increase knowledge and awareness in the humanitarian community and support practitioners with impact reduction. 	<p>10. GLC to share the report of the first WREC research</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Challenges to greener logistics responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaps in data: Comprehensive quantification of the cumulative environmental impacts from humanitarian logistics does not yet exist • Gaps in capacity: Logistics is where the risk of unintended impact is high, but where current capacity to drive better environmental outcomes is low • Gaps in expertise: Humanitarian supply chain experts are not environmental experts and vice versa. <p>Two studies are ongoing to gather data; the first will be completed soon and the report can be shared with the group. The GLC also has a webpage with available resources and benefits from the expertise of the four Co-Lead agencies.</p> <p>In conclusion, GLC asked GCCs if they have environmentally related supply chain initiatives that could benefit from being shared with the WREC or benefit from its experts and collaboration.</p>	
<p>GCCG workplan status</p> <p>The Chair noted that the GCCG needed to conduct a mid-term review of the workplan. To facilitate the process, she flagged selected extracts where progress was lagging. She noted that the GCCG had set an ambitious workplan for itself and that some of its actions may need to be dropped or reprioritized.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCCG missions: The Chair proposed to cut down the long list of prospective GCCG missions to three: Iraq, Cameroon and Colombia, subject to needs/confirmations from the field. • One pager menu of operational support options: This action could be done rapidly if GFSC and CCCM remain willing to lead on it. The Chair clarified that this includes a list of support options that the GCCG can offer and the group agreed to retain the item. • Repository of activation and deactivation of clusters: The repository has been expanded and updated but there are still deactivations that need to be recorded. The IASC secretariat will be consulted on the next steps. • Learning and capacity building task force: As GHC and GNC were leading on this, the GNC will need to confirm if it was still willing to co-lead the group after the departure of its Deputy Coordinator. • Inter-cluster coordination training modules: These also fall under capacity building; GCs are invited to share their interest about leading this. GEC confirmed that the GEC team can still support on the inter-cluster coordination training module • Minimum standards for cluster coordinators: The deadline was May and the action remains pending. • Terms and definitions: The GCCG-s aims to share a draft for comments with the group in early July, after comments are received the document will be shared with OPAG. • Types of support to non-activated countries: CCCM and GLC will need to confirm their continued interest on leading in this. • Paper on Area Based Coordination: Is still outstanding, CCCM had volunteered to lead on it and will need to confirm if that was still the case. <p>The Chair proposed to merge two of the messaging and advocacy actions and to have GCCs brief donors in mid-September on the findings of the annual coordination mapping and issues identified (further supported by findings from missions such as the one to South Sudan). Finally, also on advocacy, there was a plan for UNICEF to use the CLARE II evaluation to promote discussion at the Principals or OPAG levels, the Chair asked Mr. Syed and GHC if this discussion was still planned.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Chair asked the group if something from the list could be dropped. The group agreed with the proposed action points and follow up. On the accountability framework, GWC clarified that UNICEF clusters are ready to share their tools but these can probably not be adapted to all agencies. Since the alignment of accountability frameworks on the UNICEF model is unlikely, it is better to remove this specific activity from the workplan. She added that the consultation with donors and Principals briefing are workplan priorities for her, in order to prepare for this, GCs could share coordinated briefing notes with their respective Principals. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. GCCG-s to follow up / reconfirm the willingness of individual GCs to lead on pending GCCG workplan activities [done] 12. GCCG-s to consult with IASC-s on the next steps about the repository of activation and deactivation of clusters 13. GCCG to organize a donor briefing in September 14. GCCG-s to contact OCHA Iraq and discuss the mission being planned by some GCCs in 2022 [done]

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GWC pointed out that Iraq is transitioning out clusters and is very important that a mission to takes place to accompany this process. GWC can organize a call in July and come back with a proposition. The Chair proposed to contact the OCHA office and inform them about this interest. 	
<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GWC noted to the group that an earthquake has caused severe damage and human losses in Eastern Afghanistan, the Chair proposed to monitor the situation and consider an ad-hoc meeting of the groups if the situation requires it. The Chair informed that Mr. Bagossy will be leaving the GCCG-s at the end of June and thanked him for his work with the GCCG. Upcoming meetings: A doodle poll will be organised to determine the next GCCG meeting date (20 July or 24 August). Forward agenda: Terms and definitions; follow up on previous action points. 	