GCCG Meeting
2 November 2022, 14.00 – 16.00 GVA time

Participant/Global Cluster: Monica Ramos (GWC); Linda Doull (GHC); Celine Maret and Samuel Cheung (GPC) Joyce Mutiso(CP AoR); Mary Jelliti (GLC); Brett Moore and Ela Serdaroglu (GSC); Abdul Majid (GFSC); Michelle Brown and Maria Agnese Giordano (GEC); Stefano Fedele (GNC); Dher Hayo, Wan Sophonpanich and Ruxandra Bujor (CCCM); Brent Carbno (GETC); Jennifer Chase (GBV AoR); Christelle Loupforest (MA AoR); Erik Kastlander (IMWG), Marina Skuric-Prodanovic (Co-Chair); Mary Pack (Co-Chair); Randa Hassan, Annarita Marcantonio, Darya Sagaydak (GCCG-s).

Invitees: Farhad Movahed (IASC secretariat), Eva Vognild (OCHA, Field Information Services), Jos Berens (Centre for Humanitarian Data), Helena Fraser (DCO), Christian Cricboom (OCHA Head of Office, Haiti), Nadja Kristina Gueggi (OCHA Haiti)

Summary and action points

Updates and follow-up on GCCG action points and workplan

1. The Co-Chair (Ms. Skuric Prodanovic) welcomed participants and outlined the meeting's agenda: Updates and follow-up on GCCG action points and workplan: Iraq transition, operational updates, briefing on Haiti, briefing on the UNDCO, coordination mapping, GCCG retreat. She asked if there were any amendments to the agenda - none were provided.

    She then introduced and welcomed the new GCCG Co-Chair, Ms. Mary Pack, from International Medical Corps who had been nominated by the three NGO consortiums. Ms. Pack expressed her appreciation for the work of the GCCG and outlined some of her previous engagement with clusters at both global and country level, but also with the OPAG and other IASC bodies. Ms. Pack will be touching base with individual GCCs bilaterally. Ms. Skuric Prodanovic then provided the following updates on past action points:

    - She reminded GCCs of the need to follow up with cluster coordinators in **Libya on transition planning.** The GHC noted that HoO of WHO in **Libya** had voiced significant concerns about the UN's decision to scale down the humanitarian architecture and proceed to transition, including the lack of stability and a poorly articulated nexus process with no clear rationale for transition. WHO will have further discussions with the RC/HC on this issue. The Co-Chair pointed out that if the intention is to transition, deactivation of clusters should take place, and that RC/HC had still not sent the formal deactivation request to the EDG for endorsement.
    - GCCs to remind their field cluster coordinators in Iraq to complete the **Iraq Transition Survey.**
    - GCCs to complete survey on **non-activated contexts**.
    - GCCG-s follow up on data recommendations on Yemen / **HPC Steering Group** remains pending.
    - The development of papers on area-based coordination (CCCM) and the menu of support options for HCs (GCCG-s with GFSC) are still pending.
    - Results from the **P2P mission** to Myanmar are likely to be discussed at the next GCCG meeting.
    - The Co-Chair reminded GCCs to share information about planned field missions.
    - Representation of the GCCG to the **IASC Localization Task Force:** CCCM and GFSC expressed interest. The Co-Chair will check with the IASC Localization Task Force whether CCCM is considered an expert or a member. If CCCM is considered as an expert, the seat will be assigned to the GFSC, otherwise the GCCG-s will launch a vote to select a GCCG representative. (Follow up by GCCG Co-Chair).
    - The GCCG Co-Chair, GHC, GNC and CCCM met the South Sudan **NGO Forum**, to discuss findings of the GCCG mission to South Sudan and follow up on issues raised by the NGO Forum in their letter. The NGO Forum expressed appreciation for the outreach by the GCCG and the clarifications provided on each of the points. Next steps: The NGO Forum will consult internally on how to close the loop on the original letter that had been sent. Key takeaways for GCCs: The NGO Forum had requested more synchronization and standardization between clusters on funding allocations, coordination, and leadership issues. In the discussion that followed, GBV AoR noted variances on pooled funds from country to country. GEC proposed that the GCCs provide input on analysis of what is working for local partners during the Pooled Fund meeting due to take place in January in Geneva.
    - The Co-Chair suggested that for future GCCG missions, findings are first shared with local NGOs before being finalized.

Action points

i) *GCCs encouraged to complete non-activated contexts survey by* ***Friday 4th November***.

ii) *Co-Chair (Ms. Skuric) to follow up with IASC Localization Task Force if TF considers CCCM an expert or a member*
iii) *GCCG to monitor concerns /further developments about the transition in Libya.*
iv) *GCCG to follow up on specific requests from South Sudan NGO Forum during the localization session at the GCCG retreat.*
v) *GCCs to provide input on what is working for local partners during pooled fund meeting in January in Geneva.*
vi) *GCCGs to circulate open letter to international donors from Polish-Ukrainian national NGOs from GLC.*

Briefing on Iraq transition

IM Mission Debrief
2. The Co-Chair introduced Eva Vognild (OCHA – Field Information Services) and Jos Berens (Centre for Humanitarian Data). The focus of the briefing was data responsibility, information management and ICT in the context of the Iraq transition.
3. Mr. Berens presented the mission's activities: focused discussions with clusters and OCHA on the challenges related to IM, data responsibility and ICT. He noted a best practice example – the CCCM cluster has developed a strong IM transition plan, data management registry and information sharing.
4. Key recommendations for future transition missions: 1) conduct missions earlier to increase value; 2) promote data responsibility based on the IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility in Humanitarian Action during transition for country offices, clusters, and partners.
5. Mr. Berens observed that clusters have taken distinct approaches to how they handle data and in terms of IM processes and data management. Clusters with up-to-date data management registries are better prepared for transition.
6. Ms. Vognild outlined further recommendations for OCHA and the IMWG: 1) IMWG to provide guidance to clusters in transition; 2) Promote global cluster IM support through transition; 3) Identify good practices for clusters to learn from each other.
7. Mr. Berens noted there will be a follow-up session with clusters after the mission. He concluded that there was interest from several clusters and partners in maintaining ActivityInfo after the transition.
8. The Chair summarized three key takeaways for the GCCs to provide more guidance on: 1) there is no standard approach on how to hand over data and data management activities or required capacity to take over; 2) there is a need for global cluster support to clusters deactivating in Iraq; and 3) applying lessons learned – e.g., having missions earlier when transitioning. The mission findings will be presented to the IMWG at the next meeting on 17 December.

Action points
vii) *GCCs to follow up on discussions / debrief to global IMWG and any issues for follow up.*

Update on GCCG workstream
9. GWC provided a brief update on the GCCG Transition Workstream, noting that surveys had been received from 10 clusters thus far and encouraged GCCs to ask field colleagues to complete the survey by the deadline. GWC also noted that UNICEF-led clusters had discussed good practices and recommendations for guidance on deactivation and transition. More information will be provided at the retreat.

Action point
viii) *GCCs to encourage respective cluster coordinators in Iraq to complete the survey on transition. Deadline **Monday 7 November**.*

Operational updates:

Update on oPt
10. Chair noted that the oPt mission was postponed to the second and third week of January. OCHA/GCCG-s, GFSC and GWC will be part of the mission.

Action point:
  ix)   *GCCG-S to share draft ToRs of oPt mission with GCCs.*

Update from the EDG (Farhad Movahed- IASC secretariat)
  11. Mr. Farhad Movahed noted:
  - The Ethiopia System-Wide Scale Up will be extended till the end of January and will be country-wide. The EDG mission to Ethiopia will take place next week. Directors will follow up on Scale Up benchmarks related to both the conflict and the drought.
  - Ebola outbreak in Uganda: EDs will explore what can be done to support the response plans (e.g.,government plans, WHO plans, regional plans, country plans) and to reconcile them. The aim is to increase risk communication through multi-sectoral efforts to ensure mobile communities and refugees are included in planning. Mr. Mohaved noted we should plan according to the worst-case scenario already.
  - The EDG mission to Yemen planned for November has been postponed to the first quarter of 2023. The mission will focus on operational issues and findings from the IAHE Evaluation and support needed from HQ.
  12. The Chair noted that the Yemen HCT is following up on the IAHE Evaluation. CCCM asked whether there were any reactions from the EDG relating to donor questions on the ToRs for the IASC independent review on internal displacement. Mr. Movahed noted that point had not been discussed in recent EDG meetings.

Action point:
  x)   *EDG Secretariat and GCCG-S to share donor letter on the IASC independent review for displacement with GCCs.*

Briefing on Haiti
  13. The Co-Chair introduced Mr. Christian Cricboom (OCHA HoO Haiti) to present on the situation in Haiti.
  14. Mr. Cricboom noted there were over 3,000 cholera cases and emphasized the stark contrast with the 2010 outbreak. The current dire situation is linked to insecurity, the rainy season as well as the lack of national capacity and access on the ground. A Flash Appeal "Cholera+" is being discussed with the Haitian government and should be launched soon. He highlighted food insecurity issues, with 20,000 people in IPC level 5, and most of the country in IPC levels 3 and 4, making this the worst food insecurity situation in years. Factors aggravating the crisis were as follows: 1) political and economic crisis; 2) gang violence and civil unrest; 3) inaccessibility to WASH in schools.
  15. Mr. Cricboom emphasized there were very few dedicated coordination/IM capacities whether from the UN side or the government. With the deterioration of the situation, the question of cluster activation has arisen again and will be tabled at the next HCT meeting. In previous years both the government and the agencies had categorically rejected the idea of cluster activation, with the authorities wishing to maintain their lead on sector coordination, especially in view of past experiences around the 2010 earthquake and agencies being content with sectoral coordination.
  16. In the discussion that followed Mr. Cricboom asked the GCCs what would change if clusters were activated and whether GCCs have had any discussion with their country level counterparts on this.
  17. CCCM (IOM) confirmed it had engaged with the country office. The understanding was that CCCM was not a stand-alone sector, and this was a point of discussion with the authorities. It has been a struggle to find additional CCCM capacity for Haiti. Activation would mean more visibility and funding allocated for coordination.
  18. The concern on how to manage the role of the government and the relationship with the government be affected by possible activation was also flagged.
  19. The GNC indicated that cluster activation would result in greater capacity to fundraise and greater onus on the CLAs to take up their CLA leadership responsibilities. In previous situations, the lack of activation and the perception that OCHA was not supportive of activation allowed CLAs to maintain the status quo of response and focus on technical assistance. GNC advocated for an "internal activation" regardless of an IASC activation, meaning the hiring of P4-level coordination staff to support national capacity in their function as lead. He added, however, this was unlikely to happen without a formal activation.
  20. The GLC indicated the challenges of providing more staff due to the cap on international staff for security reasons and asked if it was possible to advocate with UNDSS on this point.

21. Similar to GLC's point, GBV AoR asked whether cluster activation would provide more capacity considering the highly insecure context, with limited access by external actors given the security constraints. Security constrains were also raised as a concern by ETC. The FSC defined Haiti as a high priority for the FSC, given the IPC level 5 in a number of areas, with a senior-level coordinator and IM support in place.

Action points

xi) *GCCs to get in touch with relevant CLAs and counterparts in Haiti ahead of the HCT meeting next week where cluster activation will be discussed.*

Briefing on UN Development Coordination Office (DCO)

22. The Co-Chair (Ms. Pack) welcomed Ms. Helena Fraser from DCO who presented on the development coordination architecture and Resident Coordinator system. She highlighted the following points:
    a. The Resident Coordinator system architecture was reformed to better mobilize the UN system to support the SDGs in support of governments to address national needs and priorities.
    b. The RCs became independent from UNDP thereby ensuring impartiality. The RCs are now anchored in the UN Secretariat (reporting to the UN SG) for greater empowerment and link to the other UN system pillars.
    c. The UN Sustainable Development Group sets global policy direction for UN development work. It is different from the IASC in terms of membership (i.e it is UN only) and having fewer technical workstreams.
    d. The regional collaborative platforms - co-chaired by the Regional Economic Commissions and UNDP regional bureaus – provide regional-level support to support UN collaboration with governments to accelerate SDGs.
    e. Regional inter-agency peer support groups (PSG) are a quality assurance body for UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks.
    f. The system allows RCs to receive predictable support and robust analytical underpinnings. In fragile settings, this ensures close collaboration with OCHA, with alignment of the HNO and the Common Country analysis to harmonized needs, protection challenges, vulnerabilities, and risks.
    g. The RC Office counts on a set of core posts/capacities. Beyond that, its structure and the broader coordination architecture under the cooperation framework depends on capacity in country and state of engagement with host government and or *de facto* authorities. A Steering Committee - co-Chaired with government - and thematic results groups (can be co-chaired with government) provide the overall direction and coherent implementation.
23. The main takeaways were as follows: 1) Entry points for engagement with the clusters will vary in every setting; 2) In some settings with limited development programming, results groups may not be effective. Ms. Fraser recommended closer collaboration with HDP actors in order to achieve a joined-up vision on the reduction of vulnerabilities and risk, and to integrate sustaining peace in development and humanitarian programming.
24. The Co-Chair opened the floor for questions. Responding to a question by the CCCM, Ms. Fraser stressed that transition planning for cluster deactivation must be done hand in hand with development partners on the ground, led by the RC. She noted that the UN development system is about supporting sustainable national capacities, emphasizing the significant shift and challenge on what that looks like on the ground.
25. The GHC commented on the accelerated discussion on nexus, localization, and transition. Ms. Fraser noted that there is a durable solutions WG with a strong development - humanitarian focus. She agreed with GHC that accelerated investment in development, political, peace and security solutions are the key in many of the protracted crises. If resources are not there, the investments on the humanitarian front will not take place. Ms. Fraser recommended more collaboration on collective outcomes, planning, programming, advocacy between humanitarian and development community and ensuring development cooperation framework and humanitarian response plans coincide.

Action point

xii) *GCCG-S to follow up with GCCs on clear asks for DCO given debriefing.*

Coordination mapping – next steps

26. Ms. Hassan thanked GCCs and field colleagues for participating in the coordination mapping exercise. A draft report has been shared with the GCCs for comment. Once finalized it will go to the EDG, the OPAG, IASC Task Forces, etc. and will be a public document on the IASC website. In terms of next steps on mapping side, GCCG-s will come back on how survey for next year will take place. Ms. Hassan asked whether GCCs would like to use the report as a basis for holding a briefing for donors, as had been the case a number of years ago, noting that it could be a useful opportunity to engage with donors, noting that it may be difficult to identify an opportune time. A number of GCCs indicated their interest in proceeding with the organization of a donor briefing. The Co-Chair asked if there were any GCCs willing to take the lead.

Action points

xiii)   *GCCs to provide inputs on coordination mapping report. Deadline **Monday 7 November**.*
xiv)   *GCCG-s to reach out to GCCs who might be interested in leading on this activity.*

Update on GCCG retreat preparations

27. The Co-Chair noted that the draft agenda had been shared with GCCs and asked the GCCs to volunteer to facilitate specific sessions. She also reminded to book travel and hotel rooms, and to be available for and the group dinner on Thursday evening 24 November.
28. GBV AoR made a brief suggestion on also using the opportunity of the retreat to mark 16 days of activism as was the case the previous year. She suggested taking a group photo at the retreat (while wearing orange) and also having GCCs prepare statements on the importance of addressing GBV or on GBV risk mitigation that could then be posted/shared on Twitter.

Action points

xv)   *GCCs to send final comments to the GCCG-S on the draft agenda for the GCCG retreat **by Friday 4 November.***

AOB
29. Update on the migration of HR.info – to be put on the agenda of the next GCCG meeting.
30. Update on Protection Cluster review and IASC Principals' request: The briefing by GPC was postponed to the next meeting due to lack of time.