

## Cluster Performance Monitoring

### *Final Report*

<b>Cluster:</b>	<b>Emergency shelter &amp; Non-food item</b>
<b>Country:</b>	<b>Sudan</b>
<b>Level:</b>	<b>National</b>
<b>Completed on:</b>	<b>11 April 2017</b>

This report provides the findings of the Cluster Performance Monitoring and allows the reporting of good practices, constraints and action points that will be identified and agreed upon by the cluster during the revision of the preliminary report

### **Introduction**

The cluster approach was established in 2005 following an independent Humanitarian Response Review, to address gaps and to increase the effectiveness of humanitarian response by building partnerships. Thus, the cluster approach has been implemented for 12 years now.

Following the experience of the Humanitarian community in responding to the two L3s, the Haiti earthquake and the Pakistan floods in 2010, the IASC Principals “agreed there is a need to restate and return to the original purpose of clusters, refocusing them on strategic and operational gaps analysis, planning, assessment and results”. At the global level, the aim of the cluster approach is to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by ensuring that there is predictable leadership and accountability in all the main sectors or areas of humanitarian response.

Similarly, at the country level the aim is to strengthen humanitarian response by demanding high standards of predictability, accountability and partnership in all sectors or areas of activity. The cluster is about achieving more strategic responses and better prioritization of available resources by clarifying the division of labour among organizations, better defining the roles and responsibilities of humanitarian organizations within the cluster/sectors, and providing the Humanitarian Coordinator with both a first point of call and a provider of last resort in all the key sectors or areas of activity.

## **Sudan Emergency Shelter and Non-food items Cluster**

### **Brief context and establishment of the ES/NFI cluster**

In October 2008, the HCT in Sudan adopted the cluster approach as a means to strengthen and improve the overall coordination of humanitarian action in Sudan. In April 2009, the HCT agreed to roll-out the cluster approach in Darfur. The ES/NFI Sector was led by UNJLC, which was established in 2004 to facilitate logistics coordination for the complex emergency that erupted in Darfur. A Non-Food Items Common Pipeline (NFI CP) was established in 2007, and later expanded to cover the Rest of Sudan. In 2009, UNJLC was appointed Sector Lead for the NFI & ES Sector in Sudan, and following the expulsion of CARE (the Common Pipeline partner in charge of managing warehouses and transportation of NFIs), UNJLC and IOM assumed management of warehousing and transportation respectively. The leadership of the Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items Sector including management of the NFI Common Pipeline in Sudan, was transitioned from WFP to UNHCR on 1 April 2012.

The primary purpose of the ES/NFI Cluster is to support and strengthen coordination of life-saving ES/NFI assistance to populations who have lost their shelters and domestic household items due to having fled from conflict or as a result of natural disaster. The cluster coordinates all partners to ensure appropriate and efficient response to humanitarian crisis by providing life-saving ES/NFI support to populations in need in accordance with national and global standards.

### **The 2016 emergency ES/NFI humanitarian situation**

In 2016, the ES/NFI cluster continued its commitment towards saving lives and providing protection to people affected by conflict and disaster, returnees and refugees with the provision of ES/NFIs through the NFI CP and partner stocks. Based on 2014/2015 distributions and current context, the Sector planned on assisting 140,000 HHs (700,000 people) out of the 2.2 million estimated to be in displacement throughout Sudan for ES/NFI assistance in 2016.

Shelter support material (tarpaulins, bamboo sticks, wooden poles, rope and tools) were provided with the basic ES/NFI kit (which includes a plastic sheet) in locations where this is not easily available, to prevent IDPs leaving the displacement sites and exposing themselves to protection risks. Since the NFI items are not intended for long-term use, the Sector also provided needs-based renewal NFIs for People with Specific Needs (PSNs) amongst the protracted caseloads. The SRP request for the ES/NFI cluster was US\$ 30m of which, 26.7% was funded.

### **The coordination arrangement in Sudan**

In Sudan, the clusters are referred to as sectors. The ES/NFI sector is led by UNHCR, with the national Humanitarian Aid Commission (HAC) as the government counterpart, and has 36 members. At state level, the sector is represented by sub – national coordinators in five states who liaise closely with the National Sector coordinator to ensure an adequate preparedness and response. Sector coordination meetings are convened by on a regular basis bringing together UN agencies and NGOs with local authorities in an effort to coordinate, harmonize and improve the provision of ES/NFIs. The Sector coordinator and the field ESNFI focal points ensure that information and recommendations discussed at sector meetings are shared, raised or disseminated in other meetings as appropriate. To ensure effective coordination for a more holistic response, the ES/NFI sector is an active member of the ISCG (Inter Sector Coordination Group) working closely with Protection, WASH, Health, FSL and RRR sectors and also participates in state and field level humanitarian coordination forums.

The cluster has the following functional working groups:

- Strategic Advisory Group (SAG)

UNHCR (as lead agency/chair, HAC, 3 NNGOs, 3 INNGOs, 1 UN agency, 1 Government focal point, 1 Donor

- Technical working groups (TWIGS): TWIGs are established and provided with TOR by the SAG on an ad-hoc basis as necessary. A focal point is appointed to facilitate the work of the group. Such groups have a limited life-span and are dissolved once the outputs outlined in the TOR have been achieved
- Peer Review Group (PRG) – Project prioritization for the 2017 HRP

HAC, OCHA and Sector Coordinator (observers) 2 National NGOs, 2 International NGOs, and 2 UN agencies.

- Programme Review and Technical Review Groups – Project selection for pooled funds as and when required

HAC, OCHA and Sector Coordinator (observers), 2 National NGOs, 2 International NGOs, and 2 UN agencies.

Proposals particularly those seeking pooled funds are reviewed by PRG and TRGs coordinated by the sector lead. Proposals are reviewed and vetted against agreed criteria that are also communicated to all cluster partners

### **ES/NFI sector reporting lines and information sharing**

Technical updates on delivery of assistance, gaps etc. are provided to all partners during the coordination meetings and through monthly updates. The meetings provide an open forum for discussing coverage of beneficiaries, activities implemented, gaps that need to be coordinated, plans to cover unmet needs of targeted beneficiaries, best practices, and minimum standards that guide members in the provision of NFIs and shelter-related interventions. The meetings also discuss issues with the smooth operation of the NFI Core Pipeline, which is managed by the sector lead agency, UNHCR.

### **State and sub state level coordination arrangements**

Sector coordination meetings, held fortnightly in the Darfur states and once a month in South Kordofan State and Khartoum, are key to avoiding overlaps and gaps in service provision. They also serve for sharing knowledge on alternative building techniques for environmentally friendly shelter; and learning lessons from experienced cluster partners. In Blue Nile state and Central Darfur state where UNHCR does not have a presence, cluster partners rotate as chairs and convene monthly coordination meetings.

### **Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring**

The purpose of a Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring is to identify areas for support and improvement, to ensure that clusters are efficient and effective coordination mechanisms, which fulfill the core cluster functions, meet the needs of constituent members, and support delivery to affected people. It is also an effective

way of demonstrating accountability and the added value of the cluster and to justify the cost of coordination. A Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring provides an in-depth assessment based on the perceptions of partners and cluster coordinator about the functioning of the cluster in fulfilling its six specific core functions, which are:

1. Supporting service delivery
2. Informing strategic decision-making of HC/HCT for humanitarian response
3. Planning and strategy development
4. Advocacy
5. Monitoring and reporting
6. Contingency planning/preparedness
7. Accountability to affected populations

## **2. SUDAN CLUSTER COORDINATION PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

As per IASC guidance, and an integral part of the Transformative Agenda the HCT is required to review coordination mechanisms and setups on an annual basis to ensure they remain fit-for-purpose. The process is designed to be light and straight forward; the survey tools such as the questionnaire are standard, available online and administered by the global shelter cluster.

This report provides the findings of the Cluster Performance Monitoring of the ES/NFI sector in Sudan highlighting good practices, constraints and action points that are identified and agreed upon by the sector during the revision of the preliminary report.

### **A: Methodology**

The CCPM online survey was sent out to 36 ES/NFI cluster partners comprising local NGOs, International NGOs, UN agencies, National authorities (HAC), and donors with a detailed explanatory email on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2017. The participation of partners at the sub-national level (e.g. Darfur) was facilitated where there was lack of internet. Two separate questionnaires on cluster performance were submitted to the Cluster coordinators and to cluster members, with an initial deadline of two weeks for response. Due to overlapping tasks related to the SHF and HRP processes, sector partners were unable to complete the exercise and were given an extension. The survey was closed for partners on 19 February with an overall response rate of 70% (see Table 1-Response rate among partners).

The Global shelter cluster information management focal point at UNHCR, Geneva, provided remote support for the analysis of the results of online survey, as well as

feedback on the survey response rate. From the responses that participants provided during the online survey, scores were assigned to each key cluster function. These scores were compiled into an automatically-generated report summarizing the performance for each of the core cluster function. The median score for each sub-function was calculated, and then further classified into a performance status. A descriptive report of the cluster and its outputs was shared with all cluster partners on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2017, and partners were invited to a validation workshop on 11<sup>th</sup> April to review, further analyze and validate the results.

The results of the survey were presented to the cluster partners during the workshop on 11th April in Khartoum facilitated by the Cluster coordinator. The CCPM validation workshop provided cluster partners the opportunity to review and discuss the findings of the online survey. This process was guided by the criteria developed by the IASC for evaluating the performance of the cluster, where the partners jointly agreed on actions needed to improve the performance of the cluster. This was done through self-reflection and by identifying areas that are working well and those that required increased attention from the ES/NFI cluster coordinator, cluster lead agency, partners, and national authorities. This participatory process contributed to strengthening transparency and partnership within the cluster. The different action points proposed by the working groups were then consolidated into this report / action plan for the Sudan National ES/NFI Cluster. The outcome of this consultative process, with collectively agreed actions on areas of support and area that needed improvement, by whom and by when, are presented below (see Table 3 - Results of the cluster coordination performance monitoring and follow up actions)

#### Participation of partners in the Cluster Coordination Performance Evaluation

The table below shows the number of cluster partners in Sudan that completed the survey. The survey was open from 24/01/2017 to 19/02/2017, during which time 19 people completed the survey, including the cluster coordinator. The survey was sent to both cluster partners at the national level and the sub-national level. Due to competing priorities with the 2017 SHF process, the expected number of participants was low. A breakdown per type of organization of the 19 people that completed the questionnaire for cluster partners can be found below.

Partner type	Number partners responding	Total number of partners	Response rate (%)
International NGOs	4	10	
National NGOs	7	17	
UN organizations	6	2	
ICRC/IFRC	1	2	
Donors	1	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>52</b>

The table below shows the cluster partners' participation rate during the discussions of the CCPM preliminary report and the development of action plan. 24 people (70%) from partner organizations participated in the discussions and development of the plan of action.

Table 2 Participation rate in the CCPM validation workshop;			
Partner type	Number people participated	Total number of organizations	Participation rate (%)
International/National NGOs	17	27	
ICRC/IFRC	2	2	
UN organizations	4	2	
Donors	0	3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>70</b>

## B: Results of the Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM) and follow up actions – The Cluster Coordination Performance Evaluation Report

**Chart 1: Classification of performance status:** The chart below describes the various colors that represents the classification of the performance of the cluster.

Green = Good	Yellow = Satisfactory; needs minor improvements	Orange – Unsatisfactory; needs major improvements	Red = Weak
--------------	---	---	------------

**Table 3 Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM) and follow up actions**

IASC core functions	Indicative characteristics of functions	Performance status	Performance status Agree or Change Constraints: unexpected circumstances success factors: good practice identified	Follow-up action, with timeline	Timeline and responsible
<b>1.Supporting service delivery</b>					
1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities	<i>Established, relevant coordination mechanism recognizing national systems, subnational and co-lead aspects; stakeholders participating Regularly and effectively; cluster coordinator active in inter-cluster and related meetings.</i>	<b>Good</b>	<p><b>Agreed with the rating</b></p> <p>The SAG established in November 2016 has agreed on the sector strategic priorities</p> <p>Regular sector meetings are appreciated by sector members. Participation of partners is very good at the sub-national level, except in one state where it was reported to have dropped, as emergency needs had reduced. However there have been increased returns in the state and sector participation in meetings has increased.</p> <p>National and sub-national coordinators participated in inter-sector meetings in all states. Coordination with government counterparts in all locations was reported as good.</p>	.	<p>Sector coordinator to re-circulate strategic documents every six months including the inter-sector Emergency Response Framework as there is a large turnover of partner staff.</p> <p>Monthly coordination meetings chaired by partners on a rotating basis to be re-instated in locations where there is no sub-national coordinator – starting May 2017</p>
1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of	<i>Cluster partner in dynamic mapping of presence and capacity (4W); information sharing across clusters</i>	<b>Good</b>	<p><b>Agreed with the rating</b></p> <p>Cluster completes the 4Ws at the sub-national and national level</p>	Minor gaps such as verification of beneficiaries at sub-national level need improvement especially at onset emergency.	Assessments and response can be improved through more joint needs assessment.

service delivery	<i>in line with joint Strategic Objectives.</i>		Whilst the sector maintains a database of partners and activities, these are not coordinated sufficiently in areas that lack a sub-national coordinator and there are no specific ES/NFI sector coordination meetings	<p>This is mostly related to access.</p> <p>Partners need to improve information sharing to ensure no duplication of activities</p>	Sector coordinator to discuss at ISCG
<b>2. Informing strategic decision-making of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response</b>					
2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis (across other sectors and within the sector)	<i>Use of assessment tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, individual assessment / survey results shared and/or carried out jointly as appropriate</i>	<b>Good</b>	<p><b>Agreed with the rating</b></p> <p>Assessments are conducted regularly by partners and results are shared at cluster coordination meetings. New partners are engaged to cover identified gaps as and when needed.</p> <p>Whilst most partners utilize the standard sector assessment tool partners requested a modification to this to align it with questionnaires used by other partners.</p>	Revise standard sector assessment forms to incorporate	May/June
2.2 Analysis to identify and address (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication, and cross-cutting issues.	<i>Joint analysis for current and anticipated risks, needs, gaps and constraints; cross cutting issues addressed from outset.</i>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<p><b>Partners proposed to change the rating from unsatisfactory to satisfactory with minor improvement following discussions</b></p> <p>Sector partners were engaged in the HNO process for the 2017 HRP but sector consultation meetings at field level as usual were not conducted due to delays in the process and consultation was instead by e-mail.</p> <p>Gaps in items due to customs hold –up of shipments and insufficient low funding resulted in renewal distribution being put on hold as new emergencies (Jebel Mara crisis) took priority</p>	<p>Previous practice of sector field –level consultations to be continued</p> <p>Inter sectoral approach to Cross-cutting issues suggested. Establish a platform to improve IS information sharing on good practices, success and challenges and lessons learned.</p> <p>Advocacy with GoS departments involved in customs clearance required</p>	<p>Annually for the HNO, but also bi-weekly/monthly at sector coordination meetings</p> <p>Sector coordinator to discuss at ISCG</p> <p>UNHCR supply unit on a regular basis</p>



2.3 Prioritization, grounded in response analysis	<i>Joint analysis supporting response planning and prioritization in short and medium term</i>	Good	<b>Agreed with the rating</b> The response plan including priorities for the 2017 HRP was endorsed by all partners, with minor adjustments based on comments received		Sector coordination team to continue circulating sector strategy/SOP for the core pipeline twice a year
<b>3. Planning and strategy development</b>					
3.1 Develop sectorial plans, objectives and indicators directly supporting realization of the HC/HCT strategic priorities	<i>Strategic plan based on identified priorities, shows synergies with other sectors against strategic objectives, addresses cross cutting issues, incorporates exit strategy discussion and is developed jointly with partners. Plan is updated regularly and guides response.</i>	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	<b>Agreed with the rating</b> Whilst there is reasonable synergy with other sectors for an overall response, this area can be strengthened. Partners acknowledged the need to implement activities that would build resilience towards an exit strategy.	Explore ways to mitigate the effects of reduced funding on planned assistance  Involve community leaders in discussion involving exit strategies and encourage communities to increase IG activities such as production of woven grass mats/bricks etc.  Introduce market fairs in stable locations for extremely vulnerable protracted IDPs as an exit strategy from renewal distributions	Technical Working group to be set up to conduct feasibility of market fairs/ vouchers system with guidance from UNHCR CBI officer May/June 2017
3.2 Application and adherence to existing standards and guidelines	<i>Use of existing national standards and guidelines where possible. Standards and guidance are agreed to, adhered to and reported against.</i>	Good	<b>Agreed with the rating</b> Due to high turnover of partner staff, especially NNGOs, new staff lack awareness of existing standards and guideline	Share existing ES/NFI Sphere standards/guidelines/protocols with all partners  No clear fund allocation for capacity building	Sector coordinator/ reporting officer to share with partners on a regular basis starting May/June 2017  Conduct Capacity building workshops July onwards
3.3 Clarify funding requirements, prioritization, and cluster	<i>Funding requirements determined with partners, allocation under jointly agreed</i>	Good	<b>Agreed with the rating</b>	Lack of clarity or transparency by some partners in sharing information related to fund allocation	Sector partners to update FTS on a regular basis and keep sector coordinator informed on funds

contributions to HC's overall humanitarian funding considerations	<i>criteria and prioritization, status tracked and information shared.</i>		Allocation of pooled funds to sector is jointly agreed and priority projects/locations identified by PRGs Partner funding information from FTS is shared at coordination meetings and sector updates		received to facilitate funding opportunities.
<b>4. Monitoring and reporting</b>					
4.1 Monitoring and reporting on Activities and needs : measuring progress against the cluster strategy and agreed results; recommending corrective action where necessary	<i>Use of monitoring tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, regular report sharing, progress mapped against agreed strategic plan, any necessary corrections identified.</i>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Agreed with the rating</b>	PDM results have indicated need to revise the NFI kit content and the number of items provided per family size.	Set up TWG to evaluate results of PDMs conducted and suggest possible revisions to NFI basket  June/July 2017
<b>5. Building National capacity in preparedness and contingency planning</b>					
5.1-3 National contingency plans identified and shared, an partners contributing; role of the cluster and partners are clearly defined and understood in the contingency plan; cluster has discussed how to strengthen response capacity in country		<b>Satisfactory, needs minor improvement</b>	<b>Agreed with the rating</b>  Response capacity is quite good - presence of NGOs in all areas. Improved security situation in the areas of coverage. Timely delivery of ES/NFIs, as partners work closely to achieve timely response.  National NGOs participate in contingency planning, but field level involvement in development of preparedness can be strengthened	The lack of early warning systems was flagged.  Partners conduct assessments but often information is not shared. A more strategic approach is required for efficient information sharing between national and field levels	Partners to share the results of all assessments conducted on a regular basis with sector coordination team for the information of the SAG for decision making, and for inclusion in sector updates
<b>6.Supporting robust advocacy</b>					

6.1 Identifying concerns and contributing key information and messages to HC/HCT messaging and action		<b>Good</b>	<p><b>Agreed with the rating</b></p> <p>Information on challenges and issues requiring advocacy are discussed at sector coordination meeting. When required, the sector shares this information with the HC/HCT.</p> <p>Partners are supported to advocate with donors when funding gaps are identified.</p> <p>Key messages are also shared with the information Management team that puts together this information for HC/HCT intervention and action when required.</p>	Sector response report representing all sector partners, highlights the challenges and concerns, besides outlining response provided by partners in line with partners capacity.	On a regular basis, partners are required to update the sector coordination team on issues that need to be addressed.
<b>7. Accountability to affected populations</b>					
7.1-3 Mechanisms to consult and involved affected people in decision making; agreed mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints; key issues relating to protection from sexual violence and abuse raised and discussed		<b>Good</b>	<p><b>Partners proposed to change the rating from satisfactory to good following discussions</b></p> <p>Good practices have been strengthened since the last CCPM.</p> <p>Post distribution monitoring missions confirmed that mechanisms for suitable distribution sites, ascertaining that distribution reached the correct beneficiaries and complaints mechanisms are in place.</p> <p>Defined vulnerability criteria for selection of those most in need are confirmed with the communities and selection done in consultation with them.</p> <p>The Darfur hotline is a good mechanism for beneficiaries to ensure their complaints are heard and response provided.</p>	<p>Consultation with partners and beneficiaries need to continue, to ensure that good practices are continued.</p> <p>There is however a need to set up a standard accountability mechanism for the sector, as all partners currently use their own.</p> <p>Partners should train their staff on code of conduct, PSEA. There was a request for partners to share useful tools relating to GBV.</p> <p>Partners flagged the need for specific funding to improve accountability measures.</p>	<p>Sector coordination team/SAG to review current accountability measures documents and prepare a common draft for discussion with field committees and beneficiaries for comment and feed back</p> <p>July 2017</p>

