Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 25 May 2022
Summary of discussion and action points

Participants: Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Ms. Ela Serdaroglu and Ms. Sahdia Khan, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Mr. Dher Hayo and Ms. Wan Sophonpanich, Global Camp Management Cluster (CCCM); Ms. Linda Doull, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Mr. William Chemaly and Ms. Celine Maret, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Mr. Abdul Majid and Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Athalie Mayo, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Mr. Thorodd Ommundsen, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Ms. Christelle Loupforest, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Mr. Ron Pouwels, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan, Ms. Annarita Marcantonio, Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat); Ms. Darya Sagaydak, (OCHA IMO).

Invitees: Ms. Hannah Rose Holloway, (Danish Refugee Council, Humanitarian Disarmament and Peacebuilding Coordinator); Mr. Nisar Syed (Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordination Unit); Ms. Audrey Janvier (IMWG); Mr. Anvar Munavvarov (OCHA).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc) The Chair welcomed participants, introduced Ms. Holloway (MA AoR, DRC), Ms. Janvier (IMWG) and Ms. Sagaydak (OCHA IMO) 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: • **EDG-OPAG meeting**: GPC noted that the meeting did not take place but added that the Humanitarian Policy Group has released the Protection Policy Review report publicly. • **Coordination Mapping**: GCCG-s will reach out to the GCs in order to ask help completing the five remaining surveys, these could be completed offline if needed. • **EDG update:** There will be an exceptional 6-month extension of the IASC humanitarian system-wide Scale-Up activation for northern Ethiopia, until 29 October 2022. • **HPC Steering Group:** The next meeting will focus on localization. The problem statements from the two NGO members will be shared with the group when available. GCCs are encouraged to provide any inputs to the GCCG Chair. • **JIAF updates:** GFSC updated on the last JIAG meeting. Cluster coordinators supported the JIAF field testing proposed by the technical group, OCHA was asked to establish criteria and determine a few countries where the JIAF can be tested; the final selection will then be done by consensus. Technical level simulation in the Hague (29 August to 2 September): To take place only after a go decision by JAG on 16 August. The objective of the simulation is to test JIAF 2.0, develop recommendations for the improvements, training and communication. This will help to generate evidence and identify coordination challenges. GCCG is expected to select 2 staff from 5 country context and from amongst 9 clusters for the simulation. The Chair asked when the nominations are due and encouraged GCs to nominate candidates. The JIAF PMU will reach out directly to the GCCG-s or GCCG can reach to JIAF team to get additional information. Finally, there were some changes in the JIAF workplan, as a number of activities were completed earlier than planned. • The Chair reminded GCCs to share their field mission plans with the GCCG secretariat.	1. GCCG-s will reach out to GCs to try to complete the few remaining 2021 Coordination mapping surveys 2. GCCG-s to share the HPC SG NGO member problem statements with the group after these are available 3. GCCG-s to communicate with the JIAF PMU about the nomination process and deadlines of GCCG representatives for the review in The Hague. Deadline is 10 June.
Operational updates **Ukraine:** Mr. Munavvarov updated the group on the response to the crisis in Ukraine and highlighted the following: **Latest figures on the situation:** - The situation in Ukraine continues to deteriorate with the east facing the fiercest fighting. Civilian casualties: 8,462 civilian casualties including nearly 3,930 killed as of 23 May (OHCHR) - Displacement: more than 14.5 million people are forcibly displaced - Return movements: More than 2 million people have crossed into Ukraine since 24 February.	4. GCCG-s will enquire for more details about support modalities with the activity-based costing 5. GCs are invited to support Ukraine clusters with activity-based costing.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points

Latest figures on the response:
- Humanitarian presence is growing in shifting into the east of Ukraine (Dnipro).
- So far, some 256 partners report on planned or ongoing activities – more than half of them are national NGOs and 54 are INGOs.
- The UN and its partners have so far assisted over 700,000 people in need with cash assistance in the amount of some USD 117 million in 24 oblasts.

Challenges
- The biggest constraint to humanitarian operations remains access.
- The Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator, Ms. Osnat Lubrani, is expected travel to the two NGCA territories.
- The issue of conscription for NGO staff working in Ukraine and national UN staff and their dependents in NGCA remains unresolved.
- Permission to operate in Luhanska oblast NGCA: so-called accreditations have expired for several agencies.
- Advocating for the fast-track approval of visas to the Schengen zone and/or other EU countries for those INGO staff arriving to support the Ukraine response.
- Operating environment for humanitarian workers as well as logistics (including availability of fuel, travelling only by car and insufficient number of cars).

Coordination:
- Consolidation of hubs. The idea is to have humanitarian hubs/ in Lviv, Vinnytsia, Kyiv, Dnipro, Odessa and in NGCA (Donetsk and Luhansk). OCHA will present the updated map on hubs for the HCT endorsement on 25 May.
- A new Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator, Sebastian Rhode-Stampa, is expected to arrive in Ukraine on 29 May and will stay for the next three months.

Funding update:
- Flash Appeal funding update: To date, nearly $1.4 billion (62 per cent) in funding for the Flash Appeal against some $2.2 billion in funding requirements.
- The Ukraine Humanitarian Fund (UHF) stands at $186 million. As part of the third UHF reserve allocation 26 projects were recommended for endorsement for a total amount of approximately $45 million, pending further technical and budgetary review. This will bring the total amount of three allocations so far this year to some $90 million.

Ms. Hassan updated the group on the most recent work of the Ukraine ICCG following her recent surge deployment to Ukraine:

The ICCG has done analysis of the needs versus the response in priority areas. The HCT has defined four priority areas of the response: 1) Crossline and NGCA areas, 2) areas under threat, 3) newly accessible areas and finally 4) the broad IDP response.

The ICCG is focusing on analysis of the newly accessible areas, looking at specific needs and the response. Spreading the response outside main urban areas is a challenge, landmines and contamination are also a concern for operational partners.

In terms of cluster response: There is still no full scale up at the subnational level. In order to maintain the link with the ICCG and allow clusters to support the subnational level, clusters are attending subnational hub meetings.

Flash appeal revision: Ends in August but will be revised until the end of 2022. After this an HRP will be planned for 2023. As the HCT decided in 2020 to shift to activity-based costing, some coordinators might need additional support from the global level on this. GCCG volunteers are welcomed for offering support/guidance to clusters on the field on activity-based costing.

In the HCT, protection issues are high on the agenda, for example evacuation of civilians. The Protection Cluster SAG has developed guidance on minimum standards for evacuations. In addition, an HCT protection strategy was developed and will be put for the HCT's endorsement. An AAP working group has been established. Under the IASC guidance, an Operational Peer Review (OPR) should take place no later than five months after the scale up, therefore a review is expected in the upcoming months. Localization is challenging despite the many actors present, many of them are new to the response and only the Protection Cluster has a national co-chair.

Mozambique: The GCCG-s is following up on P2P recommendations relevant to clusters and localization, and will revert to the GCCG as needed. .

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
Ethiopia: Given the continuously deteriorating situation in several regions, the HCT has asked to consider an expansion of the Scale up activation scope to new regions of concern. Tigray region remains under a de-facto blockade. Three additional ICCGs were set up at the subnational level: Benishangul-Gumuz, the Somali Region and Oromia. The HCT request for extension has also highlights the need for sustained support to ensure that sufficient and full time cluster capacity is maintained in Addis Ababa and at the subnational hubs. It would be good that the group discusses Ethiopia again after the new benchmarks of the scale up extension are determined. **Lebanon: Lebanon:** The HCT is planning an HCT retreat in mid-June with a focus on strengthening AAP, localisation and coordination arrangements. **South Sudan**: A joint GCCG mission will take place from 2 to 10 June. The composed of clusters whose presence was specifically requested by the South Sudan operation (CCCM, GHC, GNC, GPC and GWC, in addition to the GCCG chair). The mission aims to support cluster coordinators and ICCG subnational focal points (including by following up on P2P recommendations and findings) and will visit two field locations Malakal and Bor. **Discussion:** • With regard to Ukraine, CP AoR noted that when the current Flash Appeal was drafted it was kept limited in terms of content, this meant that Child Protection (CP) and other areas were featured in a limited space. There was a promise of a more extended Flash Appeal coming up in May. Now it appears that there will be no extended Flash Appeal coming out, CP partners are concerned about the limited CP coverage in the current plan. GPC asked if activity based costing accelerates or blocks localization efforts and enquired if there were lessons learned on this from other locations. Ms. Hassan suggested that if GPC and CP AoR were willing to provide guidance on activity-based costing, their interest would be transmitted to the field. She clarified to CP AoR, that the intention is to keep the FA as light as possible. An HNO and HRP will be prepared and this is where additional details can be incorporated. • To the question of whether there was agreement on clusters needing to be represented at subnational level or plans to have subnational sectorial level coordination established, Ms. Hassan clarified that there are four subnational level hubs and while subnational cluster presence has started to pick up (e.g. Protection and Health Clusters), for the most part clusters are still not present in hubs. • Ms. Hassan highlighted the need for strengthened coordination for Kiev and other areas following Russian Forces withdrawal last month, and noted the lack of a Kiev hub in place, mainly due to limitations on staff numbers. GHC indicated that activity-based costing for Health is very specific and WHO technical experts will directly support the Health cluster on this.	
GCCG Terms of Reference The Chair reminded the group that the updated GCCG ToR was endorsed by the OPAG on 31 March. The main change in the ToR is the establishment of an NGO GCCG co-chair position. The Chair reminded the group of the requirements for the co-chair selection. The GCCG will engage with the three consortia that have members in the EDG. The objective is to promote diversity and avoid the nomination of an organization already represented as GC/AoR global lead or co-lead. GCCs are encouraged to provide suggestions. A general email will be sent out requesting nominations and the GCCG will be asked to endorse the recommended candidate. **Discussion:** • GSC asked what will be done if no suitable candidate is found. The Chair replied that this would require opening an additional discussion. GSC added that NGO networks with a global presence and having country offices as local NGOs may be interesting to explore. • CCCM asked if the co-chairing has a significant financial or time implications. The Chair clarified that the selected NGO would be expected to identify a person who could devote about 4 hours a month to the GCCG-s, which will not be remunerated. The function of the GCCG-s remains with OCHA so the co-chairing will not require a significant time investment. If more than one candidate is nominated, the suggested nominees will be	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points

evaluated against listed requirement and the selected candidate will need to be endorsed by the GCCG. • GPC asked if GCs are expected to find candidates or propose suitable profiles to the GCCG-s. The Chair encouraged GCs to suggest options to the GCCG-s that will then reach out to the EDG-represented NGO consortiums. GPC highlighted GSC and CCCM's global work on localization and encouraged finding a candidate with strong localization dimension, adding this thematic area should be also a priority.	
Information Management Working Group (IMWG) Update Ms. Audrey Janvier updated the group about the IMWG work. A survey was circulated with members to understand their priorities vis-à-vis the IMWG. The IMWG is also looking at how to improve linkages and communication with the field. The results of the survey will lead to develop the workplan for 2022 and 2023, the IMWG would like to share the survey with the GCCG. Improved linkages between CCs and IM focal points is also an objective. The deadline for the survey is 8 June. After the analysis of the results a subgroup of the IMWG will be established to develop the workplan and present priorities. Ms. Janvier is available to discuss with GC focal points to ensure priorities of the IMWG and GCs are aligned.	
CLARE II update Mr. Nisar Syed briefed the group about the key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation of UNICEF's Role as Cluster Lead Agency (CLA) Role (CLARE II). **Objective and purpose:** provide an updated assessment of how well UNICEF is fulfilling its CLA responsibilities since the last evaluation 7 years ago, and offer insights and recommendations for improvements. **Scope**: covers global, regional and country-level perspectives with a deep drive from 9 "focus" countries; WASH, Education, Nutrition, Child Protection with equal attention; both coordination and leadership aspects of CLA role. **Approach**: mixed methods – collecting, synthesizing and triangulating qualitative and quantitative evidence from internal and external sources. **Key findings on UNICEF's CLA coordination role:** - UNICEF has generally delivered on the coordination responsibilities of its CLA role - There have been improvements in staffing of cluster coordination teams since CLARE I but there are still frequent instances of 'double-hatted' staff (although less prevalent than in CLARE I), and gaps in positions at country level - Country-based clusters have become conduits for burdensome processes (HPC) and cluster coordinator workloads are too heavy and compromising strategic thinking - Efforts to mobilise resources through the clusters are appreciated by stakeholders yet UNICEF is often also perceived to be more concerned with its own resources, rather than mobilizing funding for the collective response. **Key findings on UNICEF's CLA leadership role:** - UNICEF could have performed better in its leadership responsibilities, especially in: - Building consensus among cluster partners around a shared vision and strategy - Bringing clusters closer together by working towards inter-sectoral connections; and - Sharing experiences on the cluster approach in HCTs and the IASC - UNICEF has not pushed enough for global level analyses and advice - CLA leadership responsibility sits in at least 6 different entities in UNICEF, yet most of the CLA burden ends on cluster coordinators and the GCCU, with insufficient support from across the organization - Co-leadership arrangements have often been reduced to practical divisions of labour, resulting in missed opportunities. Different terminologies used create confusion on co-lead roles, especially when arrangements are not specified in writing. **Recommendations (overarching):** - UNICEF should approach the CLA role from the understanding that its work is even more effective when carried out on behalf of the collective of actors - UNICEF should align internal systems with its CLA responsibilities and ensure agency-wide accountability for the fulfilment of these responsibilities	6. GCCG-s to enquire about updates on the Review of the Implementation of the IASC Protection Policy and revert to the GCCG about this.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
- Use the knowledge and experience of leading three clusters and one AoR to lead reflection and changes in the IASC to update and clarify the underlying tenets of the cluster approach. **Overview of management response (MR)** - There are three overarching recommendations and twelve sub-recommendations. All these were agreed except for one, which was partially agreed; half of the 35 action points, have already been initiated. Most actions are to be completed by the end of 2023. **Key priorities:** - Budget allocations for key Cluster Lead Agency functions - Mainstreaming CLA accountabilities and commitments across the organization - Advocacy at IASC level for updating the guidelines and adapting clusters to the context. **Key takeaways at GCCG level**: - IASC cluster guidance needs to be updated and cluster processes to be streamlined/rationalized, with a view to ensure a balance between coordination activities and leadership. - Simplification of the HPC processes is needed. This could be done via multi-year planning/funding for HNO/HRPs, strengthening monitoring of needs; and addressing transition of clusters - Report (through the Executive Director) at least once a year at the IASC Principals meeting on how the assigned agency is delivering on its CLA role; propose adjustments/new ideas related to CLA role - Clarification of co-leadership by the IASC for a stronger definition of functions and implications - IASC to review the concept of provider of last resort to ensure it is more consistently applied/rejected. Finally, Mr. Syed encouraged all CLAs and agencies to support and collaborate in the realization of the key priorities and implementation of key takeaways. **Discussion** • Responding to questions from the GCCG, Mr. Syed clarified that there is a dissemination strategy and specific targets. The aim is to also reach the EDG and OPAG after presentation to the UNICEF executive board, as one of the key messages is that changes need to be the result of collective rather than individual efforts. He encouraged agencies to undertake evaluations collectively and pointed out that CLA accountability needs to be more regularly monitored. UNICEF is updating its agency accountability frameworks, as accountability has to be shared by all levels and cannot be the sole responsibility of the coordinators. The accountability framework will be presented to the UNICEF board in June 2022. A Talent Management Strategy has also been developed and will be rolled out in the next two years which corresponds to the recommendations related to HR specific issues; however, the challenge remains the resource allocation. In terms of funding, UNICEF has adopted a two-fold approach at country level to ensure that resource mobilization is effective at the initial level and also proposing a pool funding mechanism to transfer funds to active emergencies. Lastly, UNICEF has 33 active platforms with coordination capacities, these include 256 staff at the national level, with an annual cost of $65 million, of which 46 percent is currently funded. • To GPC's question on next steps on the Review of the Implementation of the IASC Protection Policy the Chair said the GCCG-s would enquire if there were further updates since the last IASC Deputies meeting and would revert. • GEC informed that the GEC co-leadership review has been finalized and that a management response was being prepared.	
AOB **Global Cash Advisory Group (CAG):** The Chair updated the group on CAG discussions, including that the latest intention was to have a core group and a CAG Plus group which would have a wider set of actors, originally proposed as observers. As some organisations had suggested having a GCCG representative in the CAG Plus/observers category she enquired if	7. GCs to express their interest to represent the GCCG in the CAG 8. UNICEF/GNC to revert whether

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
there was interest from GCCs in taking part in this. GFSC suggested that GCCG membership in the CAG could facilitate discussions and exchange. **GCCG Capacity Building Task Force**: The Chair enquired if there were any updates on who would lead the Task Force together with GHC, given the expected absence of the GNC Co-Chair. Mr. Syed said he would reach out to the GNC on this and revert to the GCCG-s. **In person meetings:** GCCG asked if the GCCG meetings should go back to in-person format. There was agreement in returning to in-person meetings, the dial-in option will be kept. • **Upcoming meetings:** Wednesday 22 June 2022, 1 p.m. – 3 p.m. (GVA). • **Forward agenda**: South Sudan GCCG mission debrief, Mozambique	they would continue co-leading the GCCG TF on Capacity Building 9. GCCG-s to organize the next GCCG meeting in in-person format with virtual participation possible.