

GCCG Meeting

21 September 2022, 13:00 – 15.00 GVA time

Participant/Global Cluster: Ross Tomlinson (GWC); Linda Doull (GHC); Celine Maret, Samuel Cheung, Kathrine Starup (GPC); Mary Jelliti and Silvia Lopez Cabana (GLC); Brett Moore and Ela Serdaroglu (GSC); Abdul Majid, Marie-Helene Kyprianou and Cristina Majorano (GFSC); Michelle Brown and Maria Agnese Giordano (GEC); Stefano Fedele (GNC); Astrid Haaland and Rofand Khalaf (GBV AoR); Dher Hayo (CCCM); Marina Skuric-Prodanovic (Chair); Randa Hassan, Annarita Marcantonio, Darya Sagaydak and Janet Puhalic (GCCG-S).

Invitees: Felix Omunu, Stuart Campo, Jos Berens, and Fanny Weicherding (OCHA); Erik Kastlander (IMWG).

Summary and action points

Updates and follow-up on GCCG action points and workplan

1. The Chair welcomed participants and outlined the meeting's agenda. The agenda specifically focused on information management (IM), in line with GCCG's workplan to focus 1-2 meetings a year on IM issues. The Chair asked if there were any amendments to the agenda; none were provided. The Chair then provided the following updates:
 - Samuel Cheung was welcomed as the incoming **Coordinator of the GPC** as of 1 October 2022. William Chemaly was thanked for his contribution to the work of the group.
 - The process to select the **NGO co-chair** of the GCCG was ongoing. Once nominated by the NGO consortia, the GCCG will review and endorse the candidate electronically.
 - The co-chairs of the **IASC Taskforce (TF) on Localization** have asked for one representative of the GCCG to be formally designated as a member of the taskforce. CCCM volunteered, noting that this dovetails with their research project with the Humanitarian Advisory Group on localization. GEC/Save noted that it already had a participant (NRC) on the taskforce; it was unclear if NRC had a seat on the taskforce in an individual capacity or as a representative of the GCCG. The Chair took note that CCCM and GEC were both interested in being a member of the taskforce and said she would clarify with the TF co-Chairs.
 - The **HPC Steering Group** met on 1 September to continue its discussion on localization, the Global Humanitarian Overview and costing methodologies. The Steering Group agreed that the cost methodology report needed to be accompanied by a cover note proposing a recommended way forward, before being submitted to the OPAG.
 - An in-person **OPAG meeting** was planned for 11 October in the NRC office in Geneva. It would include a one-hour session on the work of the GCCG, preceded by the submission of a six-month progress report. A GCC was requested to join the Chair at this session. CCCM/UNHCR volunteered but requested information on the timing of the session before providing firm commitment. The Chair thanked CCCM and also offered to circulate the request to GCCs not in attendance to see if anyone else was interested.
 - In terms of GCCG meeting **action points**, most have been completed. The GCCG will receive the action point tracking matrix bi-annually for information. Janet Puhalic (GCCG-S) focused on a handful of action points that required follow-up, as follows:
 - The GCCG mission report on **South Sudan** was almost finalized and would be shared with the GCCG shortly. The ICCG already has taken action on a draft shared with them earlier. A dedicated GCCG meeting took place on 14 September to pinpoint post-mission support need, with four areas of collective engagement identified: (i) subnational cluster support; (ii) localized leadership of the cluster; (iii) improved sharing of AAP data within the cluster and ICCG; (iv) improved cluster coordination on cash. CCCM asked for clarification on how the NGO concerns regarding the South Sudan mission report would be addressed. The Chair clarified that the NGO concerns were taken into account to the extent possible and that the mission would note its willingness to engage further with the Forum if useful.
 - On aligning **GCC global strategies**, the GCCG-S offered to hire a consultant to carry out this work, if the GCCs drove this process. GNC noted it has advocated for such a process for the last two years; he indicated support for hiring a consultant. He noted that there were some challenges regarding alignment, which were outside the control of the GCCs and that this needed to be further considered by the consultant. CCCM/UNHCR agreed with hiring a consultant. GHC noted its strategy needed to align with the timeframe of the WHO Global Program of Work to get funded. The GCCG-S would consult bilaterally to be able to fully assess whether a consultant would be useful at this point.
 - On **Somalia**, GCC support was requested to help country level clusters collect needs and response data at the subnational level and to support the four priority clusters in the development of a joint application to donors. WASH indicated that it would revert on this issue. GHC indicated such support was already being provided and they were working quite closely with their counterparts. GNC agreed with GHC's remarks, noting that he believed there was a misunderstanding of the GCC role and a lack of clarity on what additional support was needed. The Chair indicated that further information would be requested from the OCHA Somalia Office, before reverting back to the four concerned clusters.
 - On **Iraq**, the HC's proposal to deactivate clusters was submitted to the IASC on 12 September; ICVA and SCHR submitted concerns, which are being addressed at the country level.
 - On **Colombia**, Randa Hassan (GCCG-S) noted that an architecture review was not planned at this time; the RC was designated as HC; there would be a humanitarian response plan

included in the GHO; and consideration was being given to streamlining refugee-migrant and cluster (IDP) coordination. GNC suggested developing guidelines to govern merged clusters, voicing his opinion that when two clusters merge, they form another type of coordination structure, which the GNC can support but does not recognize as a cluster.

Action points

- (i) *GCCG-Chair: Follow-up with the co-chairs of the IASC Taskforce on Localization and with CCCM and GEC on participation in this group.*
- (ii) *GCCG-S: Canvass whether other GCCs are interested in attending the in-person OPAG meeting on 11 October in the NRC office in Geneva. Circle back to CCCM on the timing of the session.*
- (iii) *GCCG-S: Canvass GCCs whether they are interested in having a consultant align GCC global strategies.*
- (iv) *GCCG-S: Clarify with OCHA Somalia what support needs exist regarding needs and response data and the joint proposal to donors by the four priority clusters.*
- (v) *GCC: Discuss and consider developing guidelines to govern merged clusters.*

Update on Pakistan

2. The Chair noted that at the last GCCG meeting, a request was made to discuss the coordination and response structures in Pakistan, following extensive flooding. To that end, the Chair invited Felix Omuwu, on surge to OCHA Pakistan, to provide an update.
3. Mr. Omuwu noted that 33 million people were affected by the floods and the government reported extensive damage to infrastructure and agricultural land. The humanitarian community launched an initial Flash Appeal totaling \$160 million to complement the government-led response; the appeal was limited in size given that the government has a significant cash-based programme. Mr. Omuwu reported a revision of the appeal was underway and the requirements were expected to increase substantially due to public health (acute water diarrhea), food insecurity and malnutrition risks. Instead of (re)activating clusters, sectoral coordination mechanisms have been used in line with the HC's push to have more 'localized' coordination. However, local capacity is overwhelmed, and sectors are not scaling up fast enough to meet needs, despite the government's push for the international response system to do more. Sectors generally have double-hatted staff, limited information management capacity, and limited government involvement. IMO capacity was particularly needed for needs and response analysis. The weakest aspect of sectoral coordination was reported to be subnational capacity. OCHA's presence is limited to a Humanitarian Advisory Team (HAT), with additional surge capacity provided mainly by the OCHA Regional Office in Bangkok as well as other offices. The HCT planned to discuss a possible activation of clusters at its meeting on 23 September, given the pressure to scale-up the response.
4. The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments, which were as follows:
 - GHC noted that the HC/HCT clearly indicated that clusters would not be activated at the start of the crisis. This had a negative impact within Cluster Lead Agencies, with Country Representatives reluctantly (or even not) accepting highly experienced surge capacity offered by the GCC. She further noted that clusters exist for the very purpose of scaling-up in a crisis and the rationale for not using them was not clear, particularly when only 10% of needs have been met so far. GHC reported that the acceptance/space to provide support was limited and that learning needed to be collected on how/why these decisions were made.
 - FSC supported GHC's points. He noted that the appeal size was too small. As he was on mission to Pakistan, he observed firsthand that the scale of the crisis had grown to 83 districts affected. Millions of hectares of crops were destroyed, and the next planting season was in two weeks – insufficient time to fundraise, plan and implement. He noted that the food security sector has reasonable capacity at the national level and that the focus was now placed on strengthening provincial/district level coordination.
 - GNC added that the lack of cluster activation affected coherence and predictability of the response. He also questioned why clusters were not activated given that they were an IASC mechanism for such crises. He expressed worry that the cluster approach was being perceived as a barrier to localization. He noted that the GNC provided remote and standby partner support so far, but what was needed was the activation of clusters to mobilize full support.
 - GSC/IFRC supported the previous GCCs' remarks and noted that the lack of activation made it difficult to fundraise and support country-level coordination. Cluster activation was critical in this regard, particularly in making the case internally and enabling the GCC to discharge its supporting function. She asked for clarification on when the HCT would decide whether to activate clusters (Mr. Omuwu's reply: 23 September).
 - GEC/UNICEF asked for clarification on the government's and IASC Principals' view of cluster activation and the process of activation. (Mr. Omuwu's reply: The government has not opposed cluster activation and has in fact requested it in some meetings. Ms. Hassan clarified the cluster activation process.)
 - GBV AoR reported it provided remote, intensive IM support and was carrying out a technical support mission as of 25 September.
 - GPC reported it was supporting the drafting of a protection analysis, which would be available shortly.
 - GLC reported that it had resource on standby, but they have not been requested as the cluster was not activated. She also shared a link to the cluster activation process via the chat.

- WASH reported that it has supported subnational, double-hatted coordination focal points and was putting in place IM capacity. He also reported that non-activation impacted significantly on national level coordination leadership.
 - The IMWG Chair noted that the IMWG had discussed Pakistan at its last meeting. He further noted disaster preparedness was insufficiently linked to the response and that all the gains made during the previous response/cluster activation process were lost.
5. The Chair asked Mr. Omu to relay the GCC's feedback to the HCT, particularly the difficulty of providing global support without an activation. If scale-up was required, cluster activation was needed. The outcome of the HCT's discussion on activation would be relayed to the GCCs. The GCCG-S also would develop a handout for the GCCs outlining the cluster activation process, for ease of reference.

Action point

- (vi) *GCCG-S: Follow-up with OCHA Pakistan on the HCT's discussion on the activation of clusters. Consider how to collect learning on (non) activation of clusters and GCC support to sectors. Prepare a GCC handout on cluster activation.*

Briefing on the 2021 ICCG performance review results

6. Annarita Marcantonio (GCCG-S) provided an overview of the 2021 ICCG performance review results. As background, she noted the reviews were a collective responsibility of ICCG members to self-assess their performance against the responsibilities outlined in the standard ICCG terms of reference; a tool was first developed by the GCCG/OCHA in 2019 and updated subsequently with use; and, the review process consisted of a survey, a dedicated meeting and a report, which assigned a performance status to each responsibility and identified corrective measures to any underperforming areas. Ms. Marcantonio noted that 27 operations conducted ICCG performance reviews in 2021. The five highest scoring areas were reported as ICCG functioning, integration of cross-cutting issues, advocacy, HCT-ICCG collaboration, and support to subnational level coordination. Community engagement regressed in performance from 2020 to 2021, with 40% of operations reporting dissatisfaction with decision-making being informed by affected people's views. Localization also scored poorly as did various aspects of the HPC – i.e. preparedness, early warning and early action, inter-sectoral needs analysis, response modalities (e.g. cash and in-kind), monitoring, and humanitarian-development collaboration. OCHA was providing support to ICCG in implementing their corrective measures for low scoring areas. As a next step, Ms. Marcantonio proposed providing the results to the HPC Steering Group for their action and to the GCCs for their use on mission and when engaging their country-level counterparts. She asked GCCs to encourage their country-level counterparts to engage in the reviews and reported that the GCCG Capacity Development Taskteam planned to develop a standard training module on the role of cluster coordinators in inter-cluster coordination.
7. The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments. Ms. Puhalic recommended that recommendations from the presentation be included in the GCCG workplan to ensure tracking/oversight; the GCCs agreed. GEC noted that some action – notably in the areas of preparedness and localization – required the GCCs' collective engagement; she further noted that the group discussed localization but not preparedness. She recommended that the GCC focus on preparedness. The Chair noted that localization would be further discussed at the upcoming GCCG retreat and that the planned webinar on localization for country-level counterparts would need to be postponed to 2023.

Action point

- (vii) *GCCG-S: Include ICCG performance review recommendations into the GCCG workplan. Consider including preparedness activity in 2023 GCCG workplan or as a discussion item in a future GCCG meeting. Include localization as an item in the upcoming GCCG retreat. Postpone the localization webinar for country-level clusters to 2023.*

Update on the IMWG

8. Mr. Erik Kastlander, as IMWG Chair, provided an update on the work of the IMWG and identified opportunities for collaboration between the GCCG and IMWG. As background, he noted that the IMWG was established in 2006 and has evolved over time from an IASC structure to an independent body. It has a diverse membership – including cluster IMOs, refugee and migration actors, academia, donors – and focuses on strengthening information management to support improved preparedness and response decision-making.
9. Mr. Kastlander outlined the priorities of the IMWG, which are depicted in the image below. He noted that historically the IMWG focused on tools, capacity development and normative work. Increasingly, linkages to country-level IMWGs and the GCC have become a priority. A sub-working group of global cluster information management focal points was recommended to strengthen linkages to country-level IMWGs and to better feed into global work requiring input from cluster information management focal points. Mr. Kastlander mentioned that such a group would be of benefit to the work of the GCCG. He stressed the need for GCCs to encourage their IMOs to engage in both the sub-working group and the IMWG. To frame the discussion, Mr. Kastlander posed two questions: how does the IMWG relate to the GCC and how can linkages between cluster IM focal points and the GCCG be strengthened?

Priorities	
1	3W common tool
2	Cluster IM capacity monitoring
3	Better linkages with the field
4	Better linkages with GCCG
5	Review GIMWG ToRs
6	ArcGIS Online
Other:	
1.	Development of a common data collection tool and sectoral questions repository
2.	Jointly defined and open-source platforms and systems
3.	Partner reporting common tool
4.	Regular updates for those unfamiliar with GIMWG set-up
5.	Shared capacity building exercises
6.	Better linkages with national emergency management authorities
7.	Data interoperability. (P-codes?)
8.	HPC response monitoring (if it goes ahead); FTS (discussion on that could be hosted by the GIMWG); common data sets at global level (e.g. country pop); pooling of / cross-sharing IM capacity building resources

10. The Chair noted that the coordination mapping was an important area of continued collaboration between the two groups; she added that it was possible to do a joint GCCG-IMWG meeting as was done in the past, before opening the floor for questions and comments. GWC noted that many of the IMWG priorities focused on centralizing data at the global level; instead, effort should be placed on supporting national and subnational data collection and decision-making. GEC/UNICEF supported the priorities but noted the challenge of having sufficient resources to advance them; she pointed to item #8 as being particularly valuable to the global level and asked whether the IMWG could support the establishment of a centralized roster of emergency IM capacity as this was an area of collective weakness. The Chair asked Mr. Kastlander to consider these points and to address them at a future GCCG meeting.

Action point

- (viii) *GCCG-S: Organize a follow-up session on GCCG-IMWG collaboration in December 2022 or early 2023.*

Briefing on the 2021 coordination mapping

11. Ms. Hassan briefed the GCCs on the 2021 coordination mapping results, using a PowerPoint presentation which accompanies this meeting summary. As a result, this summary does not include the data conveyed during the briefing, given that it is detailed in the presentation and will be further expanded in an analysis report to be circulated to the GCCs for comment shortly.
12. Following the presentation, the Chair thanked Ms. Hassan, Darya Sagaydak, global and country-level cluster coordinators and IMO for their contribution to this mapping. She further noted that the figures and observations were initial and may change in the compilation of the analysis report. She then opened the floor for questions and comments.
13. GSC thanked Ms. Hassan for the presentation and asked for further analysis on localization and any correlations between improvements to coordination and funding to HRPs. GPC inquired about whether the increase in coordination mechanisms could be attributed to improved quality of the response or if increases in cluster member could be a result of increased development actor engagement; she also asked for more localization analysis of the data and suggested that the data be made available to the IDP review team. GNC noted that the definition of led/co-lead and co-chair was too inconsistent to draw any conclusions from the data and asked for further clarification to slide 15. GEC/Save thanked Ms. Hassan for the presentation, particularly on the three-year overview to look at progress over time.
14. The Chair noted that in previous years, when the mapping data was analyzed in relation to HRP funding or even HRP scoring, it was inconclusive and not possible to make any correlations. Similarly, it was difficult to make any correlations between improvements in coordination metrics and the quality of the response. Ms. Hassan further added that there were limits to the survey and what could be extrapolated and that more analysis on localization would be provided in the report, including at the HCT level. She noted that the report also would include more qualitative analysis on thematic areas like AAP and disability. Ms. Hassan encouraged participants to reach out to her directly if they had further questions or comments.
15. Connected to the mapping, the Chair inquired whether the GCCs remained interested in engaging donors on the key conclusions of the mapping in the next 1-2 months; if there was a decision to organize such an engagement, a GCC was needed to lead on the meeting preparations and drafting of messages. GHC noted that an engagement would be needed but that the group was not ready at this point. She further

clarified that the findings from the coordination mapping were similar over the last three years, and it was unclear what were the GCCG's 'asks' – i.e. more subnational coordination structures or improved development actor collaboration? She underscored that the GCCG would need to properly define the outcomes of such an engagement. GEC/Save agreed and noted that the 'drivers' and influences on coordination needed to be clarified before even considering an engagement. The IMWG Chair agreed with the previous comments and noted that donors would want to know more about how the qualitative aspects, such as whether an increase in coordination capacity translates to greater reach by the humanitarian system. CCCM/UNHCR asked for clarity on the way forward. The Chair noted that this issue would be discussed at an upcoming GCCG meeting and that a GCC focal point was needed to lead on this work; no focal point volunteered at the meeting. The GCCG Chair will try to identify a volunteer through a few bilateral calls.

Action point

- (ix) *GCCG-S: Organize a follow-up session on donor engagement. Seek a GCC volunteer to lead on preparing a possible donor meeting and drafting key messages.*

Briefing on the revision of the IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility

- 16. The Chair welcomed Stuart Campo, OCHA's Team Lead on Data Responsibility, to brief on the process and timeline of the OPAG-approved revision to the IASC Operational Guidance on Data Responsibility.
- 17. Mr. Campo briefed that the OPAG tasked the Data Responsibility Working Group (DRWG) to revise the Operational Guidance by February 2023. The DRWG is co-chaired by DRC, IOM, OCHA and UNHCR and is composed of a diverse set of actors, including several Global Clusters and Cluster Lead Agencies. Mr. Campo noted that the Operational Guidance was first published in February 2021 to advance data responsibility across the humanitarian system, particularly at the country level. He noted that the first phase of the revision process was almost complete (i.e. outreach/briefings, desk review, survey) and would be followed by the drafting and consultation of the revised guidance. Mr. Campo asked GCCs on their preferences for engaging them and their country-level counterparts in the revision process, whether they were interested in collaborating to develop cluster-specific versions of the Operational Guidance template, and what were the barriers or challenges to adopting the Operational Guidance at the cluster/sector level. He underscored the valuable inputs provided by clusters in developing the guidance and welcomed GCCs engagement in the revision to ensure that the Operational Guidance was operationally relevant and easy to use by country-level responders.
- 18. CCCM/UNHCR expressed interest in a bilateral exchange with Mr. Campo. GLC asked participants to share any projects/initiatives that they were undertaking on data sharing and security as it was interested in collaborating. Given the lack of time for discussion, the Chair invited Mr. Campo to have bilateral discussions with the GCCs and to provide his contact details (campo2@un.org) to the group.

Action point

- (x) *GCCG-S: Provide Mr. Campo with the GCCG contact list.*
- (xi) *GCCs: Share any information on cluster-specific data sharing/security projects or initiatives with the GLC.*

AOB

- 19. Ms. Puhalic briefed in the chat that the survey of coordinators/co-coordinators in Iraq, developed by the GCC focal points on cluster transition and deactivation (workplan activity #11), was on hold given ongoing consultations at country level regarding cluster deactivation. GCCs were encouraged to transfer any transition documents to the GCCG Collaborative Space by the end of the week.
- 20. The Chair asked GCCs to continue to inform each other of their mission plans and announced that the next GCCG meeting would take place in mid-October – date tbd (confirmed for 12 October following the meeting). Agenda items include: briefing on the IAHE on Yemen, Libya transition, and retreat preparations.