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Overview

- Took place between 25 November 2021 and 20 May 2022
- Independent team
- Evaluation framework and approach developed and agreed during inception process
- Data collection:
  - >270 documents
  - >40 interviewees
  - Survey of global stakeholders
Context

- Three “ages” of GSC strategic formalization
  - Mostly informal – until 2012
  - One-page strategy – 2013-17
  - More robust, current strategy – 2018-22

- Formalization trend reflects strength of partnership

- Developed explicitly to be inclusive of the broad and diverse set of stakeholders represented in the cluster, resulting in buy-in and coherence
KEY FINDINGS
Overall relevance

- Wide-ranging and cutting edge for the time, almost no gaps mentioned
- Continued relevance, including through COVID
- Identity and purpose of the document a little ambiguous
  - Neither operational nor inspirational
  - Did bring partners together
- Prioritization not readily apparent to all
- Relevance varied to different stakeholders
Resourcing

- Strategy was **ambitious in scope**, not necessarily aligned to **resource realities**
- Prioritizing resources was a challenge
- Some did point to strategy’s **utility to fundraise**
- Funding situation did bounce back, but **strategy impact not clear** in either direction
Measuring the strategy

- Monitoring framework established and implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Targets and baseline</th>
<th>Actual results</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Target Achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2020 (mid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordination</td>
<td>% of stakeholders who are satisfied with the performance of the Shelter Cluster disaggregated by country-level and global</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average time (hours) in which a trained and experienced coordinator is deployed to newly activated country-level clusters</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>&lt;72 HRS</td>
<td>&lt;72 HRS</td>
<td>&lt;72 HRS</td>
<td>&lt;72 HRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of country-level clusters that undertake a cluster performance review</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advocacy</td>
<td>% of the total humanitarian funding received that is allocated to the Shelter Sector, disaggregated by region and crisis type</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of advocacy statements / positions established and regularly updated</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of people assisted vs people targeted, disaggregated by region and crisis type</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evidence-Based Response</td>
<td>% of cluster partners reporting that response strategies are &quot;appropriate&quot; based upon the existing evidence</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of shelter lessons learned is regularly collected and disseminated</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of shelter cluster coordinators and partners reporting that they have access and use evidence, learning and best practice</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
<td>&gt;90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity</td>
<td>% of cluster coordination team members who feel prepared / have access to tools to address ongoing and emerging challenges</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of people trained in key cluster coordination roles during the reporting period</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of people trained in coordination trainings who are deployed in deputy / junior coordination roles to country-level clusters during the reporting period</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring the strategy

A number of limitations:

- Scope for better capturing **key aspects** of GSC performance
- Reporting **explanations and timeframes** (started late mid-2020)
- **Linkages to existing systems** – notably CCPM
  - Despite push and provision of tools, CCPM not well taken-up or capitalized upon
- Tracking and consolidated **financial data** for the GSC
Strategic Area 1: Coordination

- Support for country-level clusters by the GSC was positive overall, with some variability
  - Drop-in support during and also after COVID crisis
- Appreciation for broad and extensive range of guidance and other materials
  - Not always well-geared towards the field (language, practical, etc.)
- Some gaps in guidance – e.g. non-cluster activation, co-chairing with govt. etc.
- Key agendas remain not fully realized: e.g. localization, ABA, recovery
Strategic Area 2: Advocacy

- GSC is well-regarded and highly visible, including within CLAs
- Strategy helped guide advocacy work at country-level
- GFP offered a significant boost
- Efforts to improve donor engagement but without clear improvement
  - Donor Consultation Group is a missed opportunity
- Funding drives prioritization more than the other way around
- Complexity and number of GSC “priorities” in strategy diluted potential for advocacy
Strategic Area 3: Evidence-Based Response

- Highlight as one of four pillars was generally appreciated
- In some cases, evidence clearly being generated, stored, and used
  - Shelter Projects, Annual meetings clear bright spots
  - Other impressive knowledge bases – e.g. on IEC materials
- Major limitations in accessibility due to poor knowledge management systems overall, website in particular
- Some regression (e.g. in evaluation), gaps (e.g. NFIs, vulnerability classification)
- GFP taking a strategic and sensible approach – positive outlook, pending reliable funding
Strategic Area 4: Capacity

- A lot of effort to enhance localized capacity with clear success stories and limitations
- HLP on a positive course, but requires continuous attention
- IM remains a difficult area to address
  - Skill sets not so clearly defined – profiles often don’t match needs
  - Need to break out of specialized roles to more general capacity
- Core capacity in other languages a clear gap
Cross-cutting: protection, environment, gender, and disability

- Strategic mentions, but doesn’t really prioritise these areas
- Strong efforts by WGs, CoPs (ECoP), individual country-clusters
- Impact of new GFP in environment still to be felt
- Some frustration around funding can affect mainstreaming, perception of the centrality of these issues
Big Picture

- The strategy was the right one for the time, was incremental and positive step, inclusiveness helped build buy-in
- It remains broad and relevant enough to encompass GSC work and partners’ various comparative advantages and agendas
- Lack of clear purpose, priorities, and identity were issues that compounded against funding constraints
- Many aspects of the strategy remain areas to achieved
Main Recommendations

- Instead of full revision of the strategy, opt for a light touch review
- Prioritise delivery of key implementation gaps
- In parallel, work to align with other clusters in two key ways
  - Common strategic focus on the “core business” of global clusters and supporting country-level on their core functions
  - Align approaches to strategies, including timing, to facilitate better inter-linkages
- For next strategy, adopt a “strategic framework” approach with a range of better targeted tools to support implementation