

**Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 27 April 2022**  
**Summary of discussion and action points**

**Participants:** Ms. Monica Ramos, Global WASH Cluster (GWC); Ms. Sahdia Khan, Global Shelter Cluster (GSC); Ms. Ruxandra Bujor 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, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Mary Jelliti, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); Mr. Stefano Fedele, Global Nutrition Cluster (GNC); Ms. Michelle Brown and Mr. Thorodd Ommundsen, Global Education Cluster (GEC); Ms. Jennifer Chase, Gender Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR); Ms. Christelle Loupforest, Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR); Mr. Ron Pouwels, Child Protection Area of Responsibility (CP AoR); Mr. Jim Robinson, Housing, Land and Property Area of Responsibility (HLP AoR); Mr. Brent Carbo, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (GETC); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat).

**Invitees:** Mr. Andreas Schuetz, Mr. Paul de Carvalho-Pointillart, Mr. Anvar Munavvarov and Ms. Juliet Lang (OCHA); Mr. James Angus Bruce Steel (Ukraine IMWG); Mr. Nisar Syed (Chief, UNICEF Global Cluster Coordination Unit).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p><b>Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</b></p> <p>The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting. GSC suggested to add an update about the GSC annual consultations which was accepted.</p> <p>The GCCG Chair updated the group on follow up items from past meetings. The update from Mozambique about the P2P review follow up would be postponed due to the unavailability of relevant colleagues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>South Sudan GCCG mission planning:</b> Updates will be provided early May.</li> <li>• <b>HPC Steering Group meeting:</b> Focused on monitoring, recommendations include creating a subgroup focused on indicators. Minutes of the meeting will be forwarded to the GCCG and could be discussed at the next GCCG meeting.</li> <li>• <b>OPAG meeting with the EDG on the Protection Policy Review:</b> The GPC and AoRs will update on this in the relevant agenda point.</li> <li>• <b>JIAF updates:</b> GEC and GFSC confirmed there were no additional updates</li> <li>• The Chair reminded GCCs to share their field mission plans with the GCCG secretariat.</li> <li>• <b>Ukraine GCCG ad-hoc meetings:</b> The Chair asked the group if the ad hoc meetings should continue every two weeks or be folded into the regular GCCG meetings. The group expressed its preference towards the Ukraine updates being again part of the operational updates in regular GCCG meetings.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GCCG-s to follow up with GHC about sharing the ToR of the GCCG Capacity Building Task Force</li> <li>2. GCCG-s to share the HPC Steering Group minutes with the GCCs</li> </ol>
<p><b>Operational updates</b></p> <p><b>Ukraine:</b> Mr. Anvar Munavvarov updated the group about the situation in Ukraine:  <b>Humanitarian context:</b> The fighting has intensified in the East (Donetska and Luhanska provinces) and South (Kherson province). As of 27 April, there are 5,840 civilian casualties between killed and injured, close to 13 million people are displaced, 5.3 million refugees and 7.7 million IDPs.  <b>Infrastructural impact:</b> WHO has reported more than 160 attacks against healthcare facilities. Nearly 1.5 million people are currently without running water, mainly in Eastern Ukraine. According to UNICEF 4.6 million people are at risk of losing access to piped water. The targeting and destruction of energy infrastructure is increasingly crippling essential services and the national economy.  <b>Latest figures on the response:</b> There are over 1,400 UN staff and over 10,000 staff of NGOs, municipalities and other entities working in the humanitarian response.  The UN and partners have significantly expanded and work now from nine operational hubs: Dnipropetrovsk, Vinnytsia, Lviv, Uzghorod, Mukachevo, Chernivtsi, Luhansk, Donetsk and Odessa, in addition to the representational presence in Kyiv. Additional hubs will be set up as conditions allow. Since the beginning of the war, 3.4 million people have received humanitarian assistance, including in hard-to-reach areas. This represents an increase of 900,000 people reached within a week.  <b>Cash assistance:</b> To date, some 350,000 vulnerable people have been assisted with multi-purpose cash (MPC) assistance.  <b>Humanitarian Convoy planning:</b> Between 18 March and 20 April, five inter-agency convoys have successfully delivered assistance.</p>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p><b>Challenges:</b> Humanitarian Access remains a key issue due to conflict and mine contamination. An Access Working Group is active and co-chaired by OCHA and NRC. Conscription is another challenge, especially in non-government controlled areas, in government areas the UN has obtained a six months' exception, NGO staff and dependents remain however at risk of conscription.</p> <p><b>Bureaucratic impediments:</b> These still remain, but on 25 April the Ukrainian government opened the registry for legal entities so INGOs can be registered and open up offices.</p> <p><b>Coordination with Ukrainian authorities:</b></p> <p><b>High-level strategic coordination:</b> The launch of the high-level National Coordination Platform on 21 April 2022 was an important step. This platform brings structure and regularity to the relationship at strategic level.</p> <p><b>Secretary General's mission to the region:</b> The Secretary-General visited Turkey and Moscow and is expected to visit Poland and Ukraine on 28 April. The Secretary-General has proposed the establishment of a Humanitarian Contact Group.</p> <p><b>Funding update:</b> A revision of the Flash Appeal (FA) and a revision of the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP) were finalized and published on 25 April. The FA update will extend the appeal to August 2022 (another three months). The UNHCR RRRP has been revised to year end. In the FA, over USD 2.25 billion (including USD600 million for multi-purpose cash for a targeted 2 million people) is now required for needs inside Ukraine, more than double of the amount requested when the appeal was initially launched on 1 March.</p> <p><b>Ukraine Cash Coordination:</b> Mr. Andreas Schuetz, co-chair of the Ukraine Cash Working Group (CWG) provided the group with an overview of the cash assistance in Ukraine:</p> <p><b>Coordination structure:</b> The CWG is co-chaired by OCHA and ACTED. The CWG has already over 300 members and reports to the ICCG. An MPC transfer value existed before the conflict and task teams were formed rapidly to revise and operationalize MPC assistance, helping to determine all the feasibility and delivery parameters.</p> <p><b>MPC:</b> It was agreed by the HCT that MPC will be the preferred modality to address immediate multiple needs. The majority of the country still has functioning markets and banking system. The MPC transfer value is aligned with the minimum expenditure basket (MEB) and closes the income gap between what people earn and what they need for basic social needs. As of 27 April, 250,000 were assisted with cash for a total value of USD 51.8 million. The objective is to assist 1.3 million people by the end of May. Partners can find in the dashboards a comprehensive overview of all cash actors and amounts transferred by region.</p> <p><b>Achievements:</b> 1) A harmonised toolbox was developed at record speed, 2) people have been reached with assistance while on the move in midst of a conflict and 3) a dynamic and responsible CWG has been set up, including dedicated task teams.</p> <p><b>Challenges:</b> 1) Obtaining data from the government on beneficiaries, 2) bringing the government together about a principled response and 3) improving the operational capacity of some partners.</p> <p>Finally, CWG is focusing on MPC rollout and strengthening engagement with the government, particularly about digital solutions, as well as strengthening AAP.</p> <p><b>GBV response in Ukraine:</b> GBV AoR briefed the group on her surge mission to Ukraine and the status of the GBV response.</p> <p><b>Coordination and background:</b> The GBV AoR was set up in 2014. A former cluster coordinator has been surged into the coordinator position, the surge mission consisted on support to this position.</p> <p><b>People in Need (PIN):</b> Studies conducted before the conflict provided good prevalence baseline data and this has facilitated PIN calculations,</p> <p><b>Capacity and response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many NGOs are present but population movements and the crisis in the East have required NGOs to redeploy their staff and coordination.</li> <li>- The role of municipalities in the response is worth underlining, many response services for GBV are done at municipal level, it is therefore important to work closely with the authorities, strengthening their role in the humanitarian response without creating parallel systems.</li> </ul>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The country has 30 shelters for survivors or GBV Mobile teams are also being set up by UNFPA and UNICEF.</li> <li>- The country has a lot of trained psychologists and social workers. There are also three national hotlines, which provide referrals, psychosocial support and legal aid remotely, included in hard to reach locations.</li> <li>- An Anti-Trafficking Group was placed under the Protection Cluster; the question is also addressed at the regional coordination level.</li> <li>- OHCHR has documented conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) cases since 2014 and is well positioned to pursue the required CRSV investigations.</li> <li>- A risk mitigation document in transit centres and collective centres was developed by CCCM and GBV AoR.</li> <li>- Finally, there are many local volunteers ensuring IDPs receive the needed assistance. Volunteers need training around humanitarian principles and the humanitarian system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenges:</b> Shelters and some drop in centres have been repurposed to meet the need of IDPs, making it difficult to find out what exactly is functioning and able to receive referrals. Around 45 percent of the services under the government are still functioning, with some of them overwhelmed. Around 70 percent of women reported having experienced some form of GBV already before the conflict, the highest rates are found in East Ukraine. A Sexual and Reproductive Health Working Group exists and emergency contraception kits were procured and delivered by UNFPA, the Logistics Cluster and the Health Cluster.</p> <p><b>Cash and GBV task Force for risk mitigation:</b> The Task Force will review guidance to ensure it complies with do no harm and GBV risk mitigation principles.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b> ICCG meetings are useful, initial discussions about a 10-month Flash Appeal were pushed back by cluster coordinators. Predicting numbers in the long term is very challenging. CCCM added that is focusing on working with local partners and exploring the use of cash at the community and collective centre level, based on the priority needs identified by site managers. Also, the translation of Minimum Standards for Camp Management has been nearly finalized and an online version being developed. Some oblasts are not so keen in utilizing cash out concerns of misuse. The authorities have different positions in different areas.</p> <p><b>IMAC:</b> Mr. James Steel from the Ukraine IMWG highlighted the following products:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3Ws are being collected weekly</li> <li>- Stocks and pipelines information</li> <li>- New products and pages e.g. a contact management system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFSC commented that clusters in Ukraine were not consulted when OCHA decided to cap MPC beneficiaries and that partners were asked to report directly to the CWG on MPC. He noted that decisions about the MEB fall under clusters rather than under the CWG. Another point of concern is that if food is distributed and people receive MPC in the same area that includes the food basket, this could be a duplication of aid.</li> <li>• Mr. Schuetz clarified that clusters were consulted about MPC. The CWG has discussed twice the MEB numbers with the ICCG, these were also presented to the HCT and none of the clusters or HCT members raised concerns in country. The CWG also had discussions with the ICCG about the target figure, beneficiary numbers need to remain realistic. If the 2 million target beneficiaries can be reached there is nothing that would impede revising this numbers. Finally, food assistance should only be done where MPC cannot be default modality. In hard to reach areas food assistance is very important while in areas where the market is functioning MPC should remain the preferred modality. On reporting, this is done through the CWG and 3Ws to see what organizations are carrying out in terms of MPC assistance, this is shared with clusters.</li> <li>• MA AoR enquired if other clusters are experiencing security ceiling restrictions.</li> <li>• GSC noted that housing and rent can be a significant part of the regular expenses and enquired about the articulation of the CWG with the Shelter Cluster to define the amount of the minimum expenditure basket. She added that an assessment of the rental market is ongoing. Mr. Schuetz replied that a top up for rent was agreed, the overall MEB will also</li> </ul>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>be looked at very soon, the transfer value will remain as it is for the upcoming flash appeal. If there are changes in terms of inflation the CWG will react appropriately.</p>	
<p><b>IASC Protection Policy Review (PPR) recommendations</b></p> <p>Mr. Chemaly (GPC) noted that the PPR was conducted by an independent team, which has resulted in recommendations that will be presented to the OPAG, the Emergency Directors Group and the IASC Principals. He noted three key PPR recommendations that affect clusters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Call for strengthened accountability in protection:</b> This can lead to the OPAG defining who is responsible of what when it comes to protection. Clusters other than the Protection Cluster might become recipients of additional responsibilities. This is an area that will require engagement by the GCs.</li> <li>- <b>Call to review the functioning of the Protection Cluster:</b> This is linked to the upcoming cluster reviews.</li> <li>- <b>Creation of an entity that would replace ProCap:</b> The review recommends a more permanent structure of protection experts that would be linked to the Humanitarian Coordinator and coordination beyond the humanitarian system (HDN). GCs must ensure that links to ProCap and GenCap experts include all clusters, not only the Protection Cluster.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GBV AoR noted despite considerations that the structure of the Protection Cluster is too complex the specific areas represented by the AoRs are critical. She added that the PPR evaluates the protection policy but not the AoRs.</li> <li>• MA AoR shared her interest on the MA AoR being invited to the IASC discussions when the response to this review is under consideration.</li> </ul>	<p>3. The GCCG to explore how to engage with the recommendations to review the Protection Cluster structure and coordination systems overall.</p>
<p><b>GC feedback on annual partner meetings</b></p> <p>Mr. Ommundsen (GEC) and Mr. Majid (GFSC) briefed the group on the GEC and GFSC global partner meetings.</p> <p><b>GEC:</b> GEC's global partners have grown from 17 in 2017 to 57 in 2022. The GEC engages with partners three times a year and meetings are structured around three issues: 1) a global overview, 2) a partner perspective and 3) a spotlight on a specific country. Key takeaways from the annual meeting: Partners seek a more proactive collaboration, beyond information sharing, engaging more into the strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>GFSC:</b> The GFSC has 70 partners at the global level, at the country level there are around 1,500 partners across 38 operations. Key takeaways from the annual GFSC meeting: Previous meetings had focused on growing food security issues and AAP. In this meeting Partners were also very interested in anticipatory action (AA) as raising alarms on time is important. There was a discussion about activities that can be collectively conducted in IPC 5 contexts, also with WASH, Nutrition and Health clusters in terms of AA.</li> <li>- The <b>Global CCCM Cluster</b> meeting will take place in Istanbul at the end of June.</li> <li>- The <b>Global Shelter Cluster event</b> will take place on a hybrid mode on 6 and 7 July.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>New IASC Cash Coordination Model</b></p> <p>Ms. Juliet Lang provided the group with an overview of the new IASC Cash Coordination model: <b>Background:</b> The Grand Bargain Caucus on Cash Coordination was tasked by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) to propose a new model for cash coordination. The new model was agreed in early 2022.</p> <p><b>Advantages of the new model:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Predictable and accountable mechanisms for cash coordination</li> <li>- Leverages existing coordination structures, ensures clear accountability to one agency</li> <li>- Provides a referral path in country (to the IS/ICCG and subsequently to the HCT if needed) and globally</li> </ul>	

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creates a global level Cash Advisory Group (CAG) to promote principles, guidelines and tools for effective cash coordination.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cash Coordination at the Country Level</b> (in IASC settings): The responsibility for Cash coordination lies within the ICCG, led by OCHA. The principles of the new model apply also in refugee contexts, in this case an ISG will take the lead. Where CWGs exist, these should become a subgroup of the ICCG/ISG. There should be a minimum of two co-chairs, one of them non-programmatic, this would be OCHA in an IASC setting, accompanied by a programmatic co-chair. The leadership co-chairing requirement does not apply in refugee settings.</p> <p><b>Cash Coordination at the Global Level:</b> A global CAG will be constituted, it will be chaired by OCHA in IASC settings and by UNHCR in refugee contexts. Country CWGs will not have a direct reporting line to the Global CAG but will refer to it for support and guidance.</p> <p><b>Global CAG links with the GCCG:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information sharing on cash assistance across responses and across global clusters</li> <li>- Sectoral Support/Advice: Engagement with the GCCG to support clusters/sectors in the use of CVA as a modality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Country Level CWG links with clusters:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IS/ICCG is accountable for overall cash coordination, day-to-day tasks are delegated to the CWG</li> <li>- Ensures cash response is coherent, effective and avoids duplication, including via coordination with clusters/sectors</li> <li>- Links to clusters and sectors (membership of CWG); clusters/sectors continue to coordinate cash for sectoral response</li> <li>- Provide information management on cash across the response in collaboration with cluster IMOs for sector specific cash</li> <li>- Capacity building support for clusters (and others) via CAG and capacity building networks (e.g. CaLP, CashCap)</li> <li>- Provide multisectoral market assessments and cash feasibility assessments to inform clusters/sectors' modality selection</li> <li>- Contributes to analysis and recommendations for IS/ICCG on which needs can be met via MPC.</li> </ul> <p><b>Next steps:</b> The CAG is tasked with completing and presenting a detailed transition plan – that is to take place over 18 months - to the IASC Deputies Group by September 2022.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFSC commented that the GFSC has a CWG at the Global Level and they followed up on the revision process. GEC added that the GEC also has a Cash Task Team.</li> <li>• MA AoR noted that the new model seems coherent. In 2021, MA AoR prepared with the help of the Global Protection Task Team on CVA a report about how cash can be used in Mine Action. The MA AoR is now piloting cash interventions and is interested in taking part in cash-related discussions.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Humanitarian Networks and Partnerships Week:</b> Will take place in a hybrid manner from 2 to 20 May 2022.</li> <li>• <b>Coordination Mapping:</b> Mr. Bagossy updated the group on the status of the coordination mapping, thanked GCs for their support with the process and highlighted that the completion status is at 99 percent. The GCCG-s will contact GCs/AoRs with outstanding surveys to request their support with completion.</li> <li>• <b>Agenda of GCCG meetings:</b> The Chair invited GCCs to express their interest and propose specific field updates/operations to be put in the agenda of GCCG meetings.</li> <li>• <b>Upcoming meetings:</b> Wednesday 25 May 2022, 10 a.m. – 12 p.m. (GVA).</li> <li>• <b>Forward agenda:</b> South Sudan GCCG mission, CLARE II, Ukraine, IMWG, Mozambique P2P follow up.</li> </ul>	<p>4. GCCG-s to contact GCs/AoRs with outstanding Coordination Mapping surveys to ask for their support with completion.</p>