

Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) meeting – 30 March 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); Ms. Emma Fitzpatrick, Global Health Cluster (GHC); Ms. Celine Maret, Global Protection Cluster (GPC); Mr. Abdul Majid and Ms. Naouar Labidi, Global Food Security Cluster (GFSC); Ms. Mary Jelliti, Global Logistics Cluster (GLC); 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. Brent Carbno, Global Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (GETC); Ms. Marina Skuric Prodanovic (GCCG Chair); Ms. Randa Hassan, Ms. Annarita Marcantonio and Mr. Mate Bagossy, (GCCG Secretariat).

Invitees: Mr. Anvar Munavvarov, Mr. Fawad Hussain Syed and Ms. Uta Filz (OCHA); Ms. April Pham (Senior Gender Advisor, OCHA); Mr. Aaron Holmes, (GLC); Ms. Audrey Janvier, (IMWG).

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Follow-up on previous GCCG meetings (action points, summary record, etc)</p> <p>The GCCG Chair provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting. GWC requested to briefly discuss feedback from OCHA towards donors about information sharing gaps by clusters within the Ukraine response. The Chair agreed to include this in the operational update discussion on Ukraine.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GCCG Chair updated the group about the completion status of the follow-up items from the GCCG meeting of 2 March 2022; and reminded the group to share examples on localization in the Central African Republic. GLC shared the link to LogiE. The LogiE tool has been developed within the Field-Based Preparedness Project (FBPP) of the GLC to enable national and international stakeholders to access and exchange operationally relevant logistics information for logistics Emergency Preparedness and Response activities https://logie.logcluster.org/. JIAF meeting of 10 March: GFSC noted that there is nothing to report further to the information shared earlier with the group via email. OPAG meeting of 15 March: The Chair noted there was an error in the draft minutes that had been shared, which would be corrected by IASC-s, with regard to the NGO co-chair of the GCCG. Final comments had been received and are being followed up so that the GCCG TOR can be finalized. GWC drew attention to the webinar to launch the Inter-Agency Toolkit on Localisation in Humanitarian Coordination on 5 April. An invitation will be shared with GCCs. Finally, the Chair reminded GCCs to share field mission plans with the GCCG secretariat. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-s to share with the GCCG the link to the webinar on localization GCCs to share their field mission plans with the GCCG-s.
<p>Operational updates</p> <p>Mozambique: Ms. Hassan reminded that the Mozambique P2P mission report was shared earlier with the group and that some of its conclusions relate to clusters and inter-cluster coordination: 1) creating more inclusive structures for the participation of national NGOs, 2) reviewing ToRs of area HCTs and 3) strengthening cluster coordination with dedicated coordinators and IMOs, especially in Pemba. The GCCG-s will reach out to P2P and ask how the group can support with operationalizing the P2P recommendations. Finally, there was also a recommendation to submit to the IASC the formal activation of more clusters in the conflict-induced displacement context. GHC informed that there will be a Flash Appeal in early April in response to Cyclone Gombe. The Chair suggested having a dedicated session about the Mozambique P2P recommendations during the next GCCG meeting.</p> <p>Ukraine: Mr. Anvar Munavvarov updated the group about the situation in Ukraine and highlighted the following: Humanitarian context: The situation is worsening, 10 million people, including more than half of Ukraine's children have fled their homes, 6.5 million people are internally displaced and over 4 million refugees have left to nearby countries. Scale-up: The humanitarian system is scaling up to deliver. Since 24 February close to 1 million people have been reached with assistance, mostly in the East. Humanitarian logistics and supply chains are also scaling up but face significant access challenges and security risks. There are at the moment over 1,200 UN personnel across hubs in the country.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GCCG-s to reach out to P2P and enquire about possible areas of GCCG support to the conclusions of the Mozambique P2P mission report GCCG-s to include a dedicated session on P2P recommendations for Mozambique during the next GCCG meeting IMAC to share the slides on population figures with the GCCG-s for forwarding to the GCCG.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Humanitarian convoys: The first convoy was organized on 18 March to Sumy, a second convoy brought assistance to Kharkiv and nearby locations. The HC/RC and other UN colleagues reached Kharkiv with the convoy. If access is secured more convoys will take place.</p> <p>Humanitarian ceasefire: The Secretary General asked the USG/ERC to engage with the parties for arrangements towards a possible humanitarian ceasefire. The USG/ERC has been in contact with the parties and will travel to the region as soon as possible.</p> <p>Challenges: Secure access, large and increasing scale of humanitarian needs, large area impacted, attacks on roads and infrastructure, and lack of drivers and vehicles. The operating environment is highly volatile with attacks on civilian infrastructure on a regular basis.</p> <p>Coordination: The UN crisis coordinator and the HC/RC are liaising with the government of Ukraine to ensure alignment between the international response and the government response. This includes consultations on rolling out the humanitarian operational hubs. OCHA continues to lead the operations planning cell from Lviv and has currently 65 staff in Ukraine and 18 in Poland. OCHA Focal Points have been assigned to work with 24 oblast administrations and the office in Rzeszow (Poland) continues to provide logistical support for cross border assistance and staff movements.</p> <p>Cash: It is expected cash will be the main modality of response; partners are scaling up their cash assistance and plan to reach 1.3 million people in the coming months. In kind assistance will probably remain the preferred assistance modality in the East of the country. The Cash WG co-chairs have approved the use of multi-purpose cash (MPC) based on a harmonized approach. Partners are encouraged to roll out and MPC activities and report their progress to OCHA and the Cash WG.</p> <p>Funding: IASC Principals have agreed to revise the Flash Appeal and the Refugee Response Plan. The plan has received nearly USD506 million out of the USD1.5 billion needed, which is approximately 44 percent of the requirements. The country-based pooled fund is of USD122 million, the latest reserve allocation was increased to USD30 million and the next allocation of USD50 million is expected to open shortly.</p> <p>IMAC: Mr. Fawad Syed updated the group on the work of the information management cell (IMAC) and responded to GWC noting that IMAC has not identified any information sharing gap from the clusters. Teams are now focusing on the Flash Appeal. The baseline for affected population figures was circulated on 29 March to the clusters.</p> <p>Data products: A team is working on harmonisation of displaced population figures, the new update on this will be out on 4 April, the data detail will still not reach oblast level, this will take another four to five bi-weekly rounds. The focus of IMAC is on the provision of more in depth analysis, such as the area of control map, looking at hostilities locations and severity of damage. There is also a bi-weekly situational analysis report based on secondary data, this is available in the IMAC site. Everyone can register to receive it as long as they represent a Humanitarian Partner and use an official email address. The following are the main figures IMAC is working with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total population: 44 million • Population affected: 23 million • Population in need: 12 million • Population targeted by the Flash Appeal: 6 million • More than 10 million people displaced, 6 million within the country and more than 4 million abroad <p>The total population baseline has been updated to 44 million using a new methodology, all partners should use the new figure. Data on non-displaced people in conflict areas is not yet available and the IMAC is working on obtaining these numbers.</p>	
<p>Ukraine Flash Appeal Revision</p> <p>Ms. Uta Filz briefed the group on the Flash Appeal revision: On 23 March the IASC Principals decided to revise and simultaneously re-issue the Ukraine Flash Appeal (FA) and the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP). The revision is envisaged to be completed by 11 April and after this a joint event and joint document ('strategic chapeau') will be prepared together with UNHCR summarizing the Flash Appeal and the RRRP. The timeline for cluster inputs was moved to 4 April, giving two additional days (and was subsequent to the GCCG meeting moved</p>	<p>6. Ms. Filz to share Flash Appeal revision documents with the GCCG-s to be forwarded to the group</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>to 5 April, following the decision to revise the FA for 1 March – 31 August 2022, with the RRRP duration from March – December 2022). The templates and figures of the Flash Appeal will be shared with the group to ensure GCs can support their teams in the field.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFSC asked if the pre-crisis population figures per oblast will be used as reference and if there is a displacement population breakdown per oblast of origin. Ms. Filz confirmed that the planning figures, which include pre-crisis population at oblast, estimated affected population and the IDP had been shared with the ICCG, in addition to planning parameters such as taking into consideration that the Flash Appeal remains complementary to the government’s response and other actors. As the 1 March 2022 FA did not include a monitoring framework, there is also a need to commit towards a more formal and systematic response monitoring integrated in the Flash Appeal. • In response to a question raised by one of the clusters on a donor raising the issue of clusters not providing enough data and whether OCHA may have raised this issue, the Chair clarified that OCHA in Ukraine had, on the contrary, given positive feedback on the collaboration with the clusters and the level of data that was being received. • MA AoR asked which scenario was being considered for the revised Flash Appeal. Ms. Filz commented that is difficult to project into a specific scenario. It was agreed with the OCHA country office and communicated to the ICCG that if the situation changes the Flash Appeal could be updated again. • Ms. Pham informed that a comprehensive gender analysis on the situation will be finalized in early April and partners will be encouraged to use it in their programming. • The Chair reminded a recent discussion by the group about the presence of many new actors in the response and the agreement by the group to prepare a short handout to inform these new actors about the role of the clusters and humanitarian coordination. The note will be prepared by the GCCG-s and a draft shared shortly with the group for review. The group agreed with this. Ms. Pham added that many local organizations are unfamiliar with the humanitarian architecture and is important not to overwhelm them with information. • GBV AoR emphasized the importance of cash in the response and highlighted that a task force was created within the Cash WG to look at risk mitigation. Also, she noted that one of the challenges to get accurate data is that Ukraine was a development context in which the response was done at the municipality level. The Chair suggested a short overview of the cash programming be included in the next GCCG meeting agenda. • GPC noted that the Protection Cluster national coordination was set up in Lviv and the GPC is looking at establishing sub-national offices in in Vinnytsia, Uzghorod, Tchernivtsi and Dnipropetrovsk. GPC is looking at working with local partners as much as possible. Updated key advocacy messages will be shared with the group. An Anti- Human Trafficking Task-Force has been established under the Protection Cluster and the Ops Cell has an anti-trafficking focal point working with the team in country. The Chair welcomed GPC’s advocacy messages and suggested that GBV AoR provides a short update during the next meeting on her mission to Ukraine. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. GCCG-s to draft a handout to new humanitarian actors in Ukraine and circulate it to the GCCG for comments 8. GCCG-s to include in the next GCCG meeting agenda an overview of the cash response in Ukraine 9. GPC to share advocacy messages with GCCG-s and GCCG 10. GBV AoR to provide an update on the situation in Ukraine during the next GCCG meeting 11. GBV AoR to share with the GCCG-s and GCCG-s to circulate the document on the GBV situation in the country as an attachment to the draft summary.
<p>Update on the Gender Reference Group (GRG)</p> <p>Ms. April Pham briefed the group on the priorities of the GRG and areas where GCCG support is needed. The GRG is now a continuing associated entity of the IASC until at least 2023.</p> <p>Objectives of the GRG: The GRG is redefining its ToRs and work priorities based on the Inter-Agency Evaluation on Gender, Equality and Women and Girls (evaluation). The GRG is seeking to strengthen the capacity of the system to respond and holding it accountable, achieving a balance between technical guidance on gender and practical involvement of stakeholders to collectively work towards the goals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. GCCG-s to circulate the definition of Women-led organizations for feedback by the GCs.

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<p>Gender with Age Marker (GAM): The GRG encourages the use of GAM, the top six clusters/AoRs that use the GAM are WASH, Food Security, Health, Protection, Education and GBV AoR. The use of this tool necessitates time but contributes to improved results and GCs are invited to encourage their partners to use the tool. GAM was developed by the GenCap ENCAP project and the GRG is working to make the tool more easily available to users, including a dashboard to facilitate download of its components.</p> <p>Gender expertise at the onset of emergencies: The evaluation underlined the importance of ensuring expertise on gender is present from the onset of the emergencies at both agency and cluster level. Ms. Pham asked if clusters are making sure that the necessary expertise is available at the onset of emergencies. The specific recommendation from the evaluation had been that <i>“The EDG should ensure that in sudden onset emergencies, gender equality expertise is integrated immediately into the initial rapid response through having gender equality integrated clearly into the terms of reference – and responsibilities – of the front-line actors who carry out cluster activities”</i>.</p> <p>Gender Accountability Framework: Is used to review the compliance of IASC entities, including clusters, with the IASC gender Policy. The compliance is checked yearly since 2018 and a dedicated working group was established to reinforce collective ownership of the framework. The expectation is to leverage this reporting to strengthen accountability and take action in areas where gaps are identified. In addition to this, the evaluation recommended updating the modules for cluster coordinators to reflect gender and GBV expertise.</p> <p>Definition of Women-led organizations: The GRG constituted a WG to establish a common definition of what are Women-led organizations. The suggested criteria are not so inflexible as to disqualify organizations that already work on this. The proposed definition will be circulated for inputs by the GCs, deadline for comments is 8 April.</p> <p>Integration of Gender perspectives: The Inter-agency evaluation emphasized the integration of gender perspective across the IASC and its work streams. The GRG will be working with taskforces and the GCCG to ensure that gender is better streamlined.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reference to the recommendation on the updating of the Cluster Coordination Reference module, the Chair added that given the expected coordination review and the level of effort and time involved in the updating of the module, this activity would for now be put on hold (alongside other required revisions). She also asked Ms. Pham to outline any specific expectations from the GRG vis-à-vis the clusters. Ms. Pham invited GCs to refer to the management response plan ensuring that there is technical capacity on gender at the onset of emergencies. The Chair acknowledge this was an issue but also that it should be viewed in the context of the more systemic problem of under resourcing of essential cluster functions across different operations. • MA AoR enquired if there are discussions on how to evolve the GAM to include more disability-related parameters. Ms. Pham replied that disability and other diversity factors are included as key considerations. • GHC informed that WHO is working to increase gender commitments through GBV lens. PSEA and GBV focal points are included in 11 major emergencies. Is important to separate GBV and gender as these are different areas of expertise. However, it is very challenging to have dedicated gender officers in the clusters. It might be more feasible to have gender focal points being linked to clusters. • Ms. Pham concluded underlining that the GRG is very active promoting gender analysis, ensuring messaging around GBV is amplified and advocating for resources to address gender considerations. To the Chair’s question if there were plans for follow up from the OPAG on the management recommendation, Ms. Pham responded that no timelines had been specified. The Chair closed by saying the group was looking forward to have the GRG as observer in the GCCG after the GCCG ToR are approved by the OPAG. 	
<p>Briefing on GLC Institutional Capacity Strengthening Framework</p> <p>Mr. Aaron Holmes briefed the group on the GLC Institutional Capacity Strengthening Framework (ICS) and Field Based Preparedness Project (FBPP):</p>	<p>13. GCs are encouraged to share their localization</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History: The FBPP started in 2018 as response to the 2016 Grand Bargain commitments on localisation and is active in 21 countries, with the Institutional Capacity Strengthening framework in three countries. FBPP partners with National Disaster-Management Organisations (NDMOs) and advocates for collaborative humanitarian supply-chain preparedness. The primary output is a humanitarian logistics preparedness action plan. • Objectives: Enhanced capacities of NDMOs and local actors to deliver timely and appropriate emergency response services as a result of strengthened coordination and more coherent operational behaviours and practices related to national humanitarian supply chain preparedness. • Preparedness is broken down into five areas: 1) Global systemic preparedness, 2) global operational preparedness, 3) in country preparedness of international organizations, 4) in country international preparedness of national bodies, and 5) field level preparedness, this last level is where the FBPP project focuses. • FBPP annually solicits feedback from partner organisations, leading to active project evolution in response to documented challenges and lessons. Originally the project was designed to facilitate gap analysis and in 2021 it was expanded into a strengthening approach at a systemic level, supporting national actors to meaningfully lead processes. The project looks at the presence of cohesive laws and policies, accountable institutions, sustainable financing, strong operational capacities and effective partnerships. However, the essential is the ability of national actors to replicate and update these aspects. Organizations focus often only on operational capacities. Non-prioritization of national actors' ability to own, replicate and update underlying advocacy, design and implementation aspects affects the sustainability of the responses. • Challenges: Lack of definitional clarity and consistency, concepts difficult to operationalize, staff with limited enabling skillsets, hiring structures do not acknowledge difference between doing and enabling, organizational prioritization of results on the ground rather than the growth of partners, funding that do not support long term institutional capacity strengthening and finally, conflicting localization approaches. • Key learnings: 1) Importance of ensuring that internal enabling capacity requirements are acknowledged and addressed, 2) assessing if the capacity strengthening approach is understood and welcomed by national stakeholders and is appropriate to their context and needs, 3) importance of demand-driven project design & outcomes, 4) involvement of national actors in all project processes, and 5) the importance of mindsets over toolkits. • Finally, Mr. Holmes encouraged other clusters to share their experiences of similar initiatives and strategies. With regard to Mr. Holmes' point on localisation, the Chair encouraged clusters to share good practices on localization and reminded the group that this was also agreed during the GCCG retreat. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPC asked if the five preparedness levels include four levels of international actors and enquired if national actors will be included in those four levels. GPC has developed a guidance toolkit for preparation in situations of climate change and natural disaster. Mr. Holmes clarified that the five levels mentioned are used only as an internal reference and do not exclude national actors from the being part of several levels. • MA AoR noted that the GEC and the CP AoR have developed a framework for strengthening the institutional capacity of national and local actors. 	<p>strategies with the GCCG-s</p> <p>14. MA AoR to share with the GCCG-s the framework for strengthening the institutional capacity of local actors developed by GEC and CP AoR.</p>
<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination Mapping: Ms. Hassan updated the group on the status of the coordination mapping and highlighted that only 7 to 10 percent of the surveys remain incomplete. She added that the mapping team will not reach out to Ukraine clusters given their focus on the response, a note will be added to the final report indicating that data collection for Ukraine was not possible this year. Nevertheless, some GCs have indicated that they will try to fill the Ukraine surveys on behalf of their teams in the field, this will be accepted if they can but not considered a must. Updates will be provided to GCs after the data cleaning process begins. GC inputs will also be needed on how to represent Whole of Syria/North East Syria in next year's mapping. 	<p>15. GHC to share again with the group the ToR of the GCCG Capacity Building Task Force</p>

Summary of Discussion	Action Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Building: GHC informed that the GCCG Task Force on Capacity Building, co-led between GNC and GHC, will organize a meeting at the end of April. The ToR of the group will be re-shared with the group. • Upcoming meetings: GCCG meeting, Wednesday 27 April 2022, 2 – 4 p.m. (GVA). GCCG ad-hoc meeting on Ukraine, Wednesday 13 April 2022, time TBC. • Forward agenda: Cash response in Ukraine, GBV update from Ukraine, P2P South Sudan, GCCG South Sudan mission, CLARE II, IMWG, Engage with UN DCO (technical level briefing) on possible areas of collaboration. 	