REVIEW OF
THE
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION'S
SHELTER CLUSTER COMMITMENT

Sara Davidson
Gill Price

This version updated in August 2011

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Sara Davidson and Gill Price would like to thank the many individuals who assisted and supported us in conducting this review.

Particular thanks must go interviewees and survey respondents in the International Federation, the Shelter Cluster, to current and former members of Shelter Coordination Teams and to staff of other organisations who generously gave their time and shared invaluable insights during our original research in 2009.

The original report has been updated in 2011. Responsibility for any omissions or errors of fact or interpretation rests with the lead consultant, Sara Davidson.

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACTED	Agency for Technical Co-Operation and Development
CAS	Co-operation Agreement Strategy
Federation	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
FedNet	Federation internal website
FTE	Full-time equivalent
HR	Human Resources
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OCHA	UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
UN	United Nations
UN/IO	United Nations or International Organisation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
WHO	United Nations World Health Organisation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary findings

The present report is based on a comprehensive review conducted in 2009. This revised and updated version incorporates the Federation's experience until August 2011, with additional findings drawn from desk review. Information has been drawn from the IFRC's internal and external websites and from external reviews of Shelter Cluster deployments. Recommendations in the original report remain unchanged but additional notes describe the Federation's progress in implementing them since the original report was issued in January 2010.

In 2006 the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA). The MoU committed the Federation to take a leading role in the provision of shelter in response to natural disasters. The Federation pledged to increase its own operational capacity and to co-lead or 'convene' the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Shelter Cluster at global level. The Federation further pledged to coordinate at field level agencies the work of agencies providing shelter in those natural disasters that called for an international response. Its co-lead, The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) responds to shelter coordination needs following conflict.

The Federation has made rapid overall progress in meeting the commitments it undertook. It appointed a Head of Shelter and began establishing a Shelter Department at the Secretariat in 2006. That year the Federation issued its first global shelter appeal. This succeeded in raising funds for the Federation's enhanced operational and coordination capacity, including the cost of deploying Shelter Coordination Teams to work at field level, though did not raise sufficient funds to meet forecast levels of shelter stockpiles required.

Together with UNHCR, the Federation co-chairs the Shelter Cluster at global level. The Federation has formalised and clarified commitments between the co-chairs and, within the context of generally informal and sometimes temporary agency alliances, established a number of Shelter Cluster and Shelter Coordination Team procedures. Although the IASC clusters are still seen as primarily United Nations bodies, the Federation is credited with widening participation by non-UN agencies in the development of activities, products and services by the Shelter Cluster.

With UNHCR, the Federation has jointly led the Cluster's work on increased preparedness, particularly in the areas of training and Information Management. It has led work on surge capacity for coordination and contingency planning in natural disaster. It has involved Federation and, to a lesser extent, non-government (NGO) partners in Cluster training aimed at widening the pool of recruits for Shelter Coordination Teams. The Federation has worked with National Societies, UN and NGO partners to staff Shelter Coordination Teams and developed formal agreements for particular emergencies with partners outside the Federation. It has developed a shelter coordination 'toolkit', a manual for use in emergency response by the Federation, Cluster

partners and other agencies. By 2011, it had two global Focal Points, for Information Management and for coordination and environment, in post.

In addition to technical support for Federation members, the Shelter Department has deployed Shelter Coordination Teams in response to eighteen emergencies since 2006:

	Year	Emergency	Country
1	2006	Earthquake	Yogyakarta
2	2006	Typhoon Durian	Philippines
3	2007	Cyclone and floods	Mozambique
4	2007	Cyclone, Yemyin floods	Pakistan
5	2007	Cyclone Sidr	Bangladesh
6	2008	Cold wave	Tajikistan
7	2008	Cyclone Nargis	Myanmar
8	2008	Koshi floods	Nepal
9	2008	Baluchistan earthquake	Pakistan
10	2009	Cyclone Aila	Bangladesh
11	2009	West Sumatra earthquakes	Indonesia
12	2009	West Java earthquake	Indonesia
13	2009	Floods	Burkina Faso
14	2009	Typhoons Ketsana and Parma	Philippines
15	2009	Floods	El Salvador
16	2010	Cyclone Giri	Myanmar
17	2010	Earthquake	Haiti
18	2011	Floods	Lesotho

The Federation-led Shelter Cluster has supported contingency planning in Nepal, the Philippines, Kyrgyzstan and Mozambique.

Cluster partnership and agreements with NGOs are seen as beneficial in enhancing not only the predictability and technical capacity of the coordination response but recognition of the shelter sector as whole. Such recognition has been particularly important in the context of shelter, a relatively new specialisation within humanitarian assistance, and in a situation where many agencies delivering shelter continue to employ generalists.

The Federation has, within a short time, been seen as adding to this 'new' sector's credibility, capacity and legitimacy. The Federation is, on the basis of this review, regarded as a dynamic Shelter Cluster co-chair, and has enhanced its reputation and influence in the process. With its Federation and non-Federation partners, it has added to the perception that the Shelter Cluster is at the forefront in driving humanitarian reform.

Nevertheless, the Federation continues to face many challenges as it seeks to continue to fulfil and 'anchor' the commitments it has made. Some of these challenges relate to the ambitious scope and time-frame the IASC has set for humanitarian reform. While few can disagree with the aims of humanitarian reform, predictability, surge capacity, adequate funding and better coordination are identified as *chronic* problems in humanitarian assistance. The context in which humanitarian reform operates demands

collaboration by a wide range of actors, including the ability to work effectively together across disciplines and across intra-organisational, national and/or cultural boundaries.

The Federation and its partners have shown how much is possible and, despite many challenges, have begun to change thinking and practice in the shelter sector. Nevertheless, lasting solutions to chronic problems will be difficult for any single agency, federation, partnership or network to achieve and sustain. Commentary on humanitarian reform and UN and Federation experience with other inter-agency platforms and intra-agency initiatives suggest that mainstreaming will require long-term commitment, focus and resources if new ways of working by partners in the humanitarian reform process are to be 'anchored.'

The challenges for the Federation reflect, in part, the limited time it has had to mainstream its commitments. However, the present review finds that there was more the Federation could have done to manage the expectations and workload its MoU commitment placed on staff. While the Federation's commitment to the Shelter Cluster was a corporate, that is, a Federation-wide, one most responsibility appears initially to have fallen on staff of the new Shelter Department, established in Geneva even as the Secretariat decentralised many other Geneva-based roles.

While technical innovation and Shelter Coordination Team deployment were properly the Shelter Department's responsibility, communication, dissemination and surge capacity were, in view of the corporate commitment made, those of the wider Federation too. This was particularly so in view of the fact that the Department had an operational role as well as preparedness and advocacy roles within its policy and plans. Though innovation and good practice have been identified and developed, dissemination and communication about the Federation's role in the Shelter Cluster among target groups inside and outside the Federation have been delayed or uneven, and not always well-integrated with concurrent policy development, simultaneous Federation coordination initiatives and organisational change.

These factors hampered early recognition and acceptance of Federation-led Shelter Coordination Teams in the field. They have contributed to confusion for Federation members between the Federation's operational and coordination roles and between internal and external coordination initiatives. Within the Federation and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the communication gap has fostered misunderstanding and suspicion about a Cluster role that many have yet to accept in principle, not least because of perceived threats to neutrality, even though support to Shelter Coordination Teams has, in practice, been provided when requested.

The present review does not assess the work of other organisations that have funded or joined the Shelter Cluster. Humanitarian reform must, if it is to succeed, however, remain a joint programme. By 2009, global cluster funding had ceased and the Federation, like other cluster lead agencies, was struggling to finance its commitment. The review therefore makes a number of recommendations for the Shelter Department and the Federation and, effectively, for the Shelter Cluster and the IASC. The wider impact of humanitarian reform and of the cluster approach on disaster-affected communities lies outside the scope of this review but is, at the time of writing, the subject of an ongoing evaluation by the IASC. Subject to its scope, that evaluation should also inform the Federation's decisions about future commitment to the Shelter Cluster.

The Federation has acquitted itself well in the view of most who contributed to the present review. This is largely owing to the dedication of Shelter Department staff and Shelter Coordination Team members, and to the support of Federation colleagues, including many who have not necessarily understood or agreed with the Shelter Cluster role.

That a vote on the Shelter Cluster commitment was won and a MoU signed is of less significance than the fact that neither act was an end in itself but, like 'sheltering', only the start of an evolving process. Given the risks and challenges that remain for the Federation in both shelter operations and shelter coordination, irrespective of any future Cluster role, it remains imperative that the Federation continue to listen to the voices of Federation and ICRC members. These voices should include those of colleagues who do not understand the Cluster or who maintain reservations about the Federation's role within it. Not least, the Federation should also listen to the voices of affected communities, the Shelter Cluster's ultimate beneficiaries, on how effective its coordination is.

Recommendations

1. The Federation should assess the impact on shelter provision to disaster affected communities of coordination and contingency planning by the Federation-led Shelter Cluster. This may be partially covered in the IASC's forthcoming evaluation of the impact of the cluster approach. [a]

2. Subject to the scope of the IASC evaluation, the Federation should

    i. Undertake an assessment of such impact. [b] The assessment team should include National Society representation in order to strengthen the credibility of findings with Federation stakeholders and should consider the financial implications for the Federation and its donors of its Shelter Cluster role at global and field levels.

    ii. Consider the implications of contingency planning through the Shelter Cluster mechanism on national contingency planning processes, and promote strategies for strengthening and clarifying responsibility for such planning.[c]

---

[a] August 2011: the IASC's second external evaluation of the cluster approach included only one country (Myanmar) where the Federation had led the Shelter Cluster.

[b] August 2011: the Federation has followed its external review of the Federation-led Shelter Cluster in Haiti with one that seeks to evaluate the effects of shelter coordination on shelter delivery in the large scale response.

[c] August 2011: revised guidelines on IFRC contingency planning are expected to address this issue.

3. The Federation should consider whether, in the light of evolving experience, its MoU with OCHA now adequately defines its roles in 'emergency shelter' and, if necessary, agree clarifications and amendments.

4. The Federation should examine opportunities for greater complementarity between internal and external cooperation and coordination initiatives in order to share lessons learned and to ensure clarity. Federation resources on Movement cooperation and coordination should be reviewed and updated in order to include information about shelter coordination.

5. Relevant units within the Federation, for example, Secretariat departments, Zones, Regions and National Societies, should consider whether a plan of action will assist them in mainstreaming the Federation's corporate commitment to the Shelter Cluster. Plans of action will benefit from consistency in the description of activities to ensure a common understanding of MoU objectives, and so that activities can be costed and achievements be tracked.

6. The Federation should deploy communications expertise and resources to assist it in developing internal and external communication and reporting strategies, and clear, appropriate and unambiguous messaging on its Shelter Cluster role for different stakeholders.[d]

7. Additional communication and outreach about the Shelter Cluster role should be scheduled into the activities and budgets of Shelter Department staff and the work of other relevant departments in order to address perceptions of an information gap. The Federation should take advantage of events and mentoring opportunities that focus on Federation principles and policy as well as on those that address primarily technical aspects of shelter or shelter coordination.

8. The Federation should seek Human Resources (HR) expertise to review and strengthen its work on surge capacity in shelter operations and coordination. Subject to the findings of such a review, the Federation should

    i. Consider pilot development of standby capacity in shelter coordination for a limited number of imminent emergencies.

    ii. Employ dedicated HR support for the current shelter roster in order to manage mutual expectations and to retain members.

9. Notwithstanding Recommendation 8, management and support of Shelter Coordination Team members should be part of the regular activities of Shelter Department staff and the Federation should address concern about delay to contracts and lack of timely debriefing for Shelter Coordination Team members.

---

[d] August 2011: The Shelter Department has commissioned a number of communication products, including a video on the work of the Shelter Cluster, available on external and internal websites. Case studies and a video based on the large-scale cluster deployment in Haiti are available on FedNet.

10. The Federation should engage Shelter Cluster partners in:

i. Examining the need for a Letter of Understanding between cluster lead agencies and partners to clarify mutual expectations and commitments, for example around issues of training, promotion, etc.

ii. Considering how financial information can be shared and transparency enhanced.

iii. Clarifying situation and requisite capacity, procedures and resources in place before leadership of the Shelter Coordination Team following natural disaster might be assumed by a Shelter Cluster partner other than the Federation.

iv. Reviewing the situation, capacity and/or resources in place before a Shelter Coordination Team is withdrawn, and how handover can be strengthened.

v. Reviewing the use and effectiveness of Shelter Cluster products, including standard operating procedures, manuals, publications and tools.

vi. Updating and user-testing Shelter Cluster web pages and information on co-chair and partner websites.

vii. Advocating for an IASC communications strategy and programme that target international cluster partners and stakeholders.

viii. Advocating for a global campaign on shelter funding.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1   Background

In 2005 the Federation's General Assembly signalled its support for an international programme of humanitarian reform initiated by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC).[1] In late 2006 the Federation Secretary General and the United Nations Emergency Response Coordinator signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), committing the Federation to take a leading role in the provision of shelter in response to natural disasters. The Federation's commitments were both global and local. At global level, the Federation pledged to increase its operational capacity and to lead a 'network of interested organisations'. Following specified natural disasters in which emergency shelter was required, it further pledged to coordinate a network of agencies at field level.[2]

The 'network' referred to in the MoU was the IASC Emergency Shelter Cluster. Clusters in different technical sectors are a key tool in efforts by the IASC to reform humanitarian response. The cluster approach is intended to ensure predictability and leadership in humanitarian response, to enhance accountability and partnership among the 'interested organisations' working in a technical area, to fill gaps in the provision of assistance to affected communities and to reduce duplication in multi-agency responses. Leadership, predictability, coordination, accountability, gaps and duplication were among chronic, systemic problems identified in the 2005 *Humanitarian Response Review*.[3]

1.2   Purpose of report

The present report was commissioned by the Federation's Shelter Department. It reflects on steps taken by the Federation in fulfilment of the commitments it made in 2006. It considers demands on the Federation and its members, and how the Federation has met the expectations of stakeholders in leading or 'convening' the Emergency Shelter Cluster. Through desk review, and interviews with and questionnaires to current and former staff of Shelter Coordination Teams, of the Movement and of other Shelter Cluster partners and stakeholders, the report considers:

- The extent to which the Federation has met the MoU commitments it made in 2006 in respect of the Shelter Cluster

- The extent to which the Federation's role in convening the Cluster has improved the coordination of emergency shelter

- How the Federation's performance in leading the Cluster in natural disaster and preparedness has contributed to advancing humanitarian reform.

Findings are intended to provide a 'report card' that will inform the Federation's own understanding and next steps as Cluster convener. The report aims to identify lessons and make recommendations on a) the measures needed to maintain the commitment made by the Federation and b) how the Federation can improve its services to the Shelter Cluster.

We emphasise that this review is not an evaluation of the work of the Federation in respect of its shelter operations though this is referenced by informants. The review does not evaluate the work or impact of Cluster partners or the impact of the Shelter Cluster's work. The impact of work by all clusters is the subject of evaluation by the IASC.

The present report is based on a comprehensive review conducted in 2009. This revised and updated version incorporates the Federation's further experience until August 2011. Additional findings are drawn from documentation, including external reviews of cluster field deployments. Recommendations in the original report remain unchanged but additional notes describe the Federation's progress in implementing them since the original report was issued in January 2010.

2. CHALLENGES FOR THE FEDERATION

The MoU committed the Federation to new responsibilities. In addition to scaling up its own capacity to deliver shelter, the Federation pledged to develop policy and capacity in the humanitarian shelter sector as a whole, coordinating the work of shelter agencies globally and at country level (a generic terms of reference for cluster lead agencies is shown at Annex D). These three overarching challenges – Federation shelter capacity, a dual role in shelter, and collaboration with new partners – are considered in this section. A fourth challenge, mainstreaming, is considered in Section 3.

2.1 Federation shelter capacity

The Federation's role in the provision of shelter began in the 19th Century but its first major shelter operation took place in 1949 when it provided tents and relief items for 300,000 Palestinian refugees. [4] In 2007 the Federation launched appeals for 27 large-scale natural disasters, most of which involved meeting shelter needs. In the same year, National Societies responded to a total of 540 emergencies. Shelter needs were met through locally appropriate solutions, with external technical or logistical assistance provided when required. [5] Globally, an estimated 20 million people were displaced in 2008 because of natural disaster, and 42 million rendered homeless as a result of conflict. [6]

In the Federation's Development Cooperation Policy, capacity building in general is acknowledged as central to improvement of members' disaster preparedness and local response capacity, particularly in countries prone to natural disaster.[7]

The Federation's MoU with OCHA defines emergency shelter as:

> *The provision of basic and immediate shelter needs necessary to ensure the survival of disaster affected persons, including 'rapid response' solutions such as tents, insulation materials, other temporary emergency shelter solutions, and shelter related non-food items.[8]*

This definition had the potential to limit opportunities to build national capacity that could deliver safer, disaster-resistant and sustainable sheltering solutions requiring longer term intervention during preparedness or response. The contradiction was addressed in Federation Global Shelter Plans which increasingly re-framed 'emergency shelter' as a process of 'sheltering.'

> *Sheltering, even when the needs are generated by natural disasters and other emergencies, goes beyond the immediate provision of basic shelter solutions and is closely associated with longer-term reconstruction as well as with measures to assist individuals, families and communities to re-establish themselves and resume ordinary life.[9]*

Scaling up shelter capacity did not mean a quantitative increase alone but activities that were wider in scope, different in quality and implied a longer-term relationship with affected communities through contingency planning or response. This approach was expressed following the Asian tsunamis in the slogan *'Build back better.'*

Capacity building needs of Federation partners at national level varied. Operational capacity differed according to context and depended on previous involvement in shelter programmes, and on skills and experience of staff. There was, in general, an absence of dedicated shelter personnel across the Federation. Despite its long experience, the Federation, like other shelter agencies, relied primarily on generalists to deliver shelter programmes.[10] This was part of the difficulty in a 'new' sector where agencies had not previously considered shelter as core to mandate or response: few agencies had shelter departments or permanent shelter staff and specialist shelter capacity in the global 'south' was limited and under-supported.[11]

2.2   A dual role for the Federation

As a member of the IASC, the Federation had a commitment to humanitarian reform and to adoption of the cluster approach. Through its 2005 General Assembly decision, it made a specific commitment to convene the Shelter Cluster, coordinating work at global and, when necessary, country level.

When the Federation activated a Shelter Coordination Team at country level, like WASH Cluster lead UNICEF, it attempted to put in place a 'firewall', recruiting staff with responsibility either for shelter coordination or for shelter operations but not for both roles simultaneously. However, as in other clusters where lead agencies have an operational and a coordination role, the dual role remained hard for Federation members and others to understand, as comments made in the course of this review indicate.

- *'There have also been situations whereby the accountability/responsibility of the IFRC as cluster convenor is clearly interpreted differently by its regional and field level delegations, leading to confusion as to which agency/organisation can/should take the leadership function.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'On one side there are Federation people [in Shelter Coordination Teams] using National Society resources, but on the other side staying totally independent, and not reporting to the Federation at country level. So the commitment is not clear. This is not only for National Societies but also for delegates working in the country. This creates a lot of controversy and confusion.' (Delegation)*

- *'[The government] confuse the coordinating role of the Shelter Cluster with the implementing role and plans of the Federation. (Shelter Coordination Team member)'*

- *'... at the country level, whenever a natural disaster situation occurs in a conflict-affected zone, the IFRC action as cluster convener generates confusion and tension within the RC&RC Movement (e.g. Baluchistan earthquake 2008) and undermines the neutrality and the independency of the Movement' (Cluster observer)*

Some Federation members advocated for closer ties between coordination and operations. A Shelter Coordination Team and a National Society might have separate representation in respect of government yet each representative would be expected on occasion to be able to articulate the other's role. Similarly, where responsibility for representation in inter-cluster and IASC meetings was borne by the Shelter Coordination Team leader and the Head of Delegation respectively, each would need an appreciation of the other's commitments. This was particularly important, for example, if the Shelter Cluster and the National Society were involved in longer-term contingency planning as well as response

- *'It's very important that the Shelter Coordination Team has close contact with the Federation in country and the National Society. Sometimes the Shelter Coordination Team felt it was too close but I feel it was very important NOT to have a firewall ... as the country delegate, you represent the Federation as a whole at the IASC – so have to report on local country activities AND the cluster activities. [You] need close contact with both – so you can give accurate reports but also so you can advocate for their needs ...' (Delegation)*

Others supported clearer separation of roles:

- *'A clear separation of functions between shelter cluster needs around the humanitarian reform point of view, and emergency shelter from the operational point of view is in my opinion what needs to happen to enhance commitment' (Zone)*

The Federation itself relies on the effective coordination of members in governance and operations hence is no stranger to the challenges coordination presents. Internal agreements on aspects of coordination include the Seville Agreement, the Development Cooperation Policy and the mechanism for disaster response within the Movement Coordination Framework.[12] A Cooperation Agreement Strategy (CAS), adopted in 2005, one year before the MoU with OCHA was signed, places emphasis on 'acting as one organisation', with the plans and role of the National Society at the centre of decision making. [13]

These agreements remain in force, a factor which partially explains why in some countries the National Society saw leadership of the Shelter Coordination Team as *its* responsibility. When the Shelter Cluster is established at country level in response to natural disaster, the Federation takes the convener role on the basis of its mandate to 'organise, co-ordinate and direct international relief actions in accordance with the Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Disaster Relief.' [14] The constitution also indicates that this role should be undertaken at country level 'through or in agreement with the National Society and in conformity with the laws of that country'. [15] This principle is echoed in the IASC's Terms of Reference for cluster lead agencies, which emphasise the importance of ensuring coordination with, and facilitating the engagement of, government authorities and national organisations in the cluster response. [16] According to the Shelter Department's 2009 *FAQ* leaflet, coordination by National Societies of shelter 'will be subject to the mandate of each National Society, their capacity and interest' as well as to the Federation's own mandate.'[17]

As apparently conflicting policies and ambiguous guidelines remain in force, the potential for confusion is clear. They help explain not only why some National Societies saw leading the Shelter Coordination Team as their responsibility but also why those outside

the Secretariat found it difficult to see where the role of the Federation ended and the role of the Cluster began.

- *'I realised that we never asked ourselves how the Shelter Cluster links to the Movement coordination mechanism'. (Secretariat)*

- *'Our main focus as a zone is to ensure we provide quality services to our National Societies. Considering the level of development of some National Societies and the already existing coordination demands within the IFRC, our lead role in Shelter could have both a positive and negative impact in the outcome of our intervention'. (Zone)*

Source: IFRC, 2007, CAS Guidelines and Toolkit for more effective cooperation

Lessons learned from CAS are a reminder of the challenges coordination initiatives are likely to face in any organisation, even in one that has an historic commitment to international collaboration. CAS lessons include the need to adapt coordination concepts to local context, to avoid short time-frames and to maintain awareness of the potential for confusion with other initiatives. [18]

The complexity of coordination, coupled with limited dissemination of information about the Shelter Cluster role, discussed in Section 3, has affected perceptions of where Cluster commitments and operational responsibilities 'sit' in the Federation. This is particularly the case at national level where traditional sources of funding or activities such as NFI distribution are perceived by some as threatened by the Shelter Cluster. It was also the case in Haiti when recruitment for operational teams proved slower than recruitment for FACT or shelter coordination ones.[19]

Among non-Federation partners, however, the deliberate separation of coordination and operational roles is appreciated and generally reflects well on the Federation.

- *Unlike other clusters, such as WASH, which was perceived as very agency-driven, the shelter cluster was noted for its nonalignment with IFRC interests. (Myanmar Nargis review)[20]*

- *'They made a huge effort to understand the distinction between cluster and agency and that really paid off.' (Haiti review)[21]*

2.3 Collaboration

The Federation's relationship with its approximately 25 partners[22] in the global Shelter Cluster can be seen as a form of strategic alliance. Four principles of partnership characterise this model of interaction.[23]

- Shared principles and goals
- Voluntary nature of relationships (that is, not contractually bound)
- Provision of mutual support
- Reciprocal trust, cooperation and harmonization of effort

These principles reflect the approach to work with partners in clusters. [24] Though the roles and responsibilities of cluster lead agencies have been defined by the IASC - and, in the Federation's case, by its MoU - terms of reference for cluster partners at global and country level have not. Like the partners in a strategic alliance, cluster partners are generally viewed as equal but autonomous. The Federation has begun to formalise secondment and handover arrangements with individual Shelter Cluster partners. However, the essentially voluntary nature of cluster relationships means that, like other cluster lead agencies, it has responsibility but not authority. Thus the 'coordination' of the cluster approach normally relies on informal and voluntary collaboration.

- *'Though coordination and networking is facilitated, not all humanitarian actors abide by or pay attention to decisions being made / facilitated by the Emergency Shelter Cluster.' (Cluster partner)*

This reinforces the importance of partnership and relationship-building, which form part of the Federation's MoU with OCHA, and of the terms of reference for Shelter Coordination Team leaders. Work with global partners is discussed more fully in Section 3. At country level, Shelter Coordination Team leaders are tasked with ensuring that 'Emergency Shelter Cluster members work collectively in a spirit of mutual cooperation and through consensual decision-making, ensuring complementarity of various stakeholders' actions as far as possible.' [25]

The involvement of additional local partners at country level also requires appreciation of *their* concerns. The shared goals of global Cluster partners are improved quality, coverage, and coordination of shelter provision. However, national partners, inside and outside the Federation, also have other priorities, for example, addressing immediate operational needs, accessing funds, and maintaining existing relationships with government and community.

- *'Whether you approach a local National Society or Federation, it is important to understand that they are having to deal with a disaster. The shelter cluster is not their priority – nor should it be. The emergency response is quite rightly their prime responsibility.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

Contingency planning through longer engagement with clusters is more complex when a National Society is already part of local systems and is following the Seville Agreement and Supplementary Measures. These agreements highlight the responsibility of the Host National Society or other lead agency in coordination. The IASC's November 2006 guidelines on the cluster approach outline the responsibilities of cluster lead agencies in

ensuring effective coordination of shelter contingency planning.[26] However, these responsibilities are not made explicit in the Federation's MoU with OCHA, signed two months earlier. The Federation's 2007 contingency planning guidelines reference the cluster approach in relation to response but less explicitly so in relation to contingency planning. [27] The Federation's 2009 leaflet *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment* assigns responsibility for Shelter Cluster contingency planning (but not response coordination) to the National Society, supported by the Secretariat.[28] There is a sense, therefore, that different parts of the Federation are 'singing from different hymn sheets' and this helps explain concern that contingency planning through the Shelter Cluster can cause confusion or even undermine national efforts.

- *'[Contingency planning] is an important component of humanitarian coordination. I don't know if [the Cluster process] has added value over previous sectoral structure ... Contingency planning is a bit of a nightmare.' (Zone)*

- *'The problem they tell me about: they say the National Society is already engaged in national coordinating systems, e.g. a contingency committee. So how to step out and be part of another committee that coordinates the international part of the response? The international [coordination] committee might criticize the government'. (Secretariat)*

In 2011, revised guidelines on contingency planning are expected to address this issue.[29]

Collaboration by local partners may also be determined by the perception of opportunities to engage meaningfully with, influence, or benefit from the cluster approach. The concerns of NGOs are explored in a review by ICVA.[30] Several of the Federation's external reviews of Shelter Cluster deployment reflect concern about language barriers, expatriate attitudes, and cluster meeting arrangements. [31]

- *'In [national] cluster coordination it's people with high level qualifications from the UN who speak good English. But people from the National Society may be less qualified, shy, uncomfortable. The Coordination Team is not so well understood ... I could see my colleagues feel uncomfortable.' (Secretariat)*

- *'There are so many barriers for [local NGOs]. First there's the language barriers which deters people at meetings. Secondly… not all local NGOs had people in Islamabad and small NGOs didn't have people in Islamabad but ... Islamic relief were there and they … completely understood the process and they convened the cluster meetings ... in the field and they had people who spoke the language and were able to get smaller local NGOs to meeting.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'I found that on one hand the Shelter Cluster has been proactive in inviting [shelter] actors to share their experiences with stakeholders. The shelter cluster meetings happened to be a good platform for sharing information ... On the other hand I didn't see local NGOs participating at the national shelter cluster meeting.' (Haiti review)[32]*

3. MAINSTREAMING THE CLUSTER ROLE

3.1 Mainstreaming

The term mainstreaming is frequently used to describe the measures which cluster leads and other organisations must take to address the systemic failures identified in the 2005 *Humanitarian Response Review*. Mainstreaming is not defined in humanitarian reform documentation but references are made to the mainstreaming of costs, cross-cutting issues, early recovery, cluster activities and of the cluster approach as a whole. [33] For the Federation, mainstreaming in the context of the Shelter Cluster is 'specifically used to describe the integration of the cluster role and responsibilities within the existing operating model of an agency, i.e. responsibilities within job descriptions, standard trainings, manuals, fundraising mechanisms, etc.' [34] An IASC Taskforce on Mainstreaming, of which the Federation is a member, agreed benchmarks on mainstreaming cluster functions and costs at the end of 2009.[35]

Mainstreaming is more typically associated with programmes designed to address chronic exclusion of persons from the 'mainstream', for example, owing to gender, disability or HIV status. Gender mainstreaming in the UN has been described as 'a long, slow process, requiring inputs on many fronts over a long period of time, including advocacy, advice and support, competence development, development of methods and tools and vigilance in following up and evaluating progress,' [36] ultimately contributing to a 'profound organisational transformation.' [37] Mainstreaming is about more than money or a signed agreement, essential as these are to its success.

The present report sees mainstreaming as a long-term strategy employed to anchor innovation and good practice in day to day activities and policy. [38] It requires five sets of activities. [e]

1. Preparatory work.

2. Identifying or developing innovation and good practice: in the context of the Cluster, innovation and good practice include the Shelter Coordination Team and the procedures, resources and tools associated with it.

3. Disseminating innovation and good practice among target groups: these groups are key individuals and organisations inside and outside the Cluster and throughout the Movement.

4. Influencing attitude and behaviour within target groups: innovation/good practice become anchored in organisational policy and activities and 'the way we do business.'

5. 'Aftercare.'

---

[e] Adapted from Research voor Beleid, 2008, "Selling" innovations: manual for mainstreaming project results, SZW - Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment

Using the model above, the present report finds that much has been done by the Federation to identify or develop innovation and good practice but less to disseminate Cluster innovations and the cluster approach among key target groups. Nevertheless, the Federation has begun to influence thinking and behaviour on shelter coordination among the individuals who informed this review and their organisations: for some, working through the Cluster and its partners is becoming the norm.

It is still too soon to say whether or not the Federation's work will result in the anchoring of new ways of working. As others have noted, humanitarian reform requires more than mainstreaming by individual organisations, even those as large as the Federation. In a note on the strategic challenges for humanitarian reform, the Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG) cautioned that 'while leaders may be able to initiate change, they cannot ensure its implementation or integration' within the diverse and complex system of UN and other humanitarian actors.[39] The context in which humanitarian reform operates demands what is sometimes called 'complex collaboration': the ability to work together effectively across disciplines and across intra-organisational, national and/or cultural boundaries.

The complexity and costs of mainstreaming are understated in exhortations to international organisations to coordinate better or respond to emergencies as predictably as a local fire brigade, though, arguably, Federation members have come closer to filling such a role than other international agencies. The success of Federation mainstreaming also rests on the conviction of others in the 'diverse and complex system' that humanitarian reform and clusters should be 'the way we do business,' and on those who are prepared to commit additional and proportionate resources – time, money and people - to supporting the cluster approach.

The IASC's second external review of the cluster approach, published in 2010, sounded a note of cautious optimism, however. It found that

> *Five years into that [humanitarian reform] process and based on largely qualitative evidence collected in six countries, the evaluation team concludes that these investments are beginning to pay off as the benefits generated by the cluster approach to date already slightly outweigh its costs and shortcomings. It is also important to note that the direct financial costs of coordination are borne by donors and agencies, whereas the costs resulting from the absence of coordination would be imposed on affected countries and populations.[40]*

3.2   Preparatory work

The Federation prepared for its Cluster role by appointing new staff, establishing a Shelter Department at the Secretariat and launching its first global shelter appeal. Its MoU with OCHA established that the Federation itself would fund the commitments it made, in order to maintain its independence. The Federation would not be Provider of Last Resort if Cluster partners were unable to meet shelter needs. OCHA, in its turn, would advocate with donors to ensure that funding for shelter and the Federation would contribute to the design of appeals.

In early 2006, the Secretariat appointed a Head of Shelter whose job description reflected the wide scope of MoU commitments (though did not reference the Shelter

Cluster by name). The benefits the Federation felt it could bring to the shelter sector were set out in the first global shelter programme appeal.

> *'Although there are many experienced and committed agencies within the shelter sector, the sector itself is lacking a significant shelter agency to provide the critical mass to progress key sector initiatives. The International Federation, with its global identity, independent status, and international, regional and national presence, is uniquely placed to provide this key role for the shelter sector.'* [41]

Mainstreaming must demonstrate benefits not only for target groups but for the 'mainstreamer.' [42] The Federation had long experience in shelter operations but the Secretariat and members believed there was more they could do. Scaling up its operational capacity, as required by the MoU, gave the Federation as a whole a focus on the quantity and quality of shelter it provided through its own operations.

- *'The Federation has been doing shelter since 1889. Most National Societies are the primary shelter agency for their government.' (Secretariat)*

- *'Southern National Societies said we are already involved in shelter and we don't do a good job.' (National Society)*

- *'There had to be benefits to the Federation and National Societies. So the Shelter Department would strengthen the role of the Federation.' (Secretariat)*

In addition, within a competitive funding environment, its public commitment to shelter provided the Federation with an opportunity to differentiate its services and raise its profile.

- *'There isn't one thing [the Federation is] known for. We do everything from soup to nuts. If someone talks about the long laundry list of things that we do, it could be any agency. The Federation wanted an identity.' (National Society)*

The MoU came into force immediately and in its entirety. The 2006 appeal and subsequent ones set out five expected results. These covered the Federation's shelter operations (Objectives 1-3), Shelter Cluster and coordination activities (Objective 4) and shelter advocacy (Objective 5).

The Shelter Department sees Objectives 4 and 5 as distinct yet the language and the description of activities in work plans and other documents are sometimes ambiguous. Objective 5 reflects commitment to a broader shelter 'network' and to shelter sector initiatives beyond those of the global Cluster.[43] Yet the term 'network', as used in the Federation's MoU with OCHA and in other resources on FedNet, refers to the Shelter Cluster.[44] In the first global shelter appeal, 'network' refers variously to Federation members, to the Shelter Cluster, to other shelter agencies and to aid sector institutions.[45] For those outside the Shelter Department, it is not easy to see where Federation activities end and Cluster ones begin.

Until 2009 no annual Federation work plan template existed or was required. [46] The Shelter Department developed its own. Its annual work plans since 2007 have listed coordination activities, outputs and budget estimates, and staff responsible. By 2009 the

job descriptions of all Shelter Department staff included responsibilities toward the Shelter Cluster and to Shelter Coordination Teams, as did those of two shelter Focal Points based in Federation zones.

Monitoring and reporting employ established internal IFRC procedures. Updates on shelter coordination are provided by the Shelter Department to the Secretary General as part of the reporting process for Governing Board meetings, General Assemblies and the International Conference.[47] Appeal reports include headline reporting on finances, indicating totals raised and shortfalls. The Shelter Department reports externally on Cluster activities via Cluster meeting minutes, Federation appeal reports and the IASC's annual cluster capacity-building reports. No formal reporting mechanism by the clusters or cluster lead agencies has been established but IFRC uses global Shelter Cluster meetings and emails to cluster members to report on progress, and requires cluster partners undertaking cluster activities similarly to report through the global cluster meetings.[48]

Although the Global Shelter Programme provides a 'road map'[49] it has been difficult to detect any phased plan of action to aid the Federation in meeting its extensive new commitments. This is surprising. Firstly, as described in Section 2, the MoU commitment entailed organisational and role change for the Federation as a whole. Secondly, the timing of this commitment offered particular challenges: establishment of the Shelter Department paralleled a process of decentralisation which brought key staff changes at the Secretariat, relocation of functions to the Zones and delays in some Shelter Department recruitment.

- *'The Federation has been decentralising. The process started as the Federation made its commitment to the Shelter Cluster. So when the Federation should be <u>collecting</u> resources for the shelter cluster we are pushing things out [of the Secretariat]. People said 'Come back and talk to us in 6 months.' (Secretariat)*

Thirdly, response to successive funding appeals by the Federation and by the clusters in general was delayed and fell significantly short of targets, as the Federation's first shelter programme update reported.

- *Despite widespread endorsement of the International Federation's commitment to the shelter sector, this has not been complemented by the provision of the required financial support. The implementation of activities and limited expenditure to date have reflected this financial uncertainty. With more funding now available the rate of expenditure will increase significantly as the activities developed can now be implemented. However this funding is primarily for the capacity building and membership services and not for stock procurement.[50]*

Lastly, the Federation's new roles in shelter coordination and advocacy were highly visible: this was one of the reasons why they had been adopted.

Given limited resources, difficult timing and its responsibilities for disaster response as well as disaster preparedness, a phased approach could have reduced pressure on the Shelter Department and allowed both the Department and the Federation an opportunity to bridge some of the gaps in innovation and dissemination.

3.3   Identifying or developing innovation and good practice

a. Developing Shelter Cluster partnership and procedures

From the Shelter Cluster's inception, the Federation, as a member of the IASC, took part in Cluster meetings. From late 2006, the Federation chaired alternate meetings. Meetings took place at least once a month in 2006, approximately every two months in 2007 and quarterly in 2008.

As the Federation saw it, there was a need to develop basic procedures in order to establish ways of working and boundaries.

- *'There is an absence of anything beyond generic terms of reference… There were no [cluster] procedures in place … We started with a blank piece of paper…' (Secretariat)*

In 2007 the UNHCR and the Federation exchanged a Letter of Understanding formally setting out their responsibilities and the procedures for activating Shelter Coordination Teams. Review informants, including the Cluster co-lead, acknowledged the lead agencies' good working relationship during and between meetings.

- *'UNHCR and the Federation person co-presented a design for the next generation of family shelter tents. They presented it together and talked about what they had been doing for the past three months. A number of us were just gobsmacked because usually UNHCR are working in this direction and the Federation are working in this direction. These guys were working [together] from the beginning and it was incredible to see that.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Most informants believed that the Federation's engagement had opened up the Cluster, and appreciated the opportunity to participate in its activities. In 2006 the Federation reviewed the Cluster's work plan and proposed that projects within it be undertaken by smaller groups of partners. UN Habitat led a group on risk mapping; the Shelter Centre work on NFI standards; the Federation and UNHCR led work on Information Management, etc. This approach was intended to strengthen partnership and encourage broader ownership of activities: though the Clusters are, in fact, 'IASC clusters', they were and are widely seen as 'UN clusters.'

- *'We were running with a risk of becoming very UN-centric in a way. And the Federation put a kind of fresh blood inside and started opening partnerships.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

By providing partners with a platform, the Cluster enhanced systemic awareness of important shelter issues and processes. Most partners saw the approach as positive though a minority believed that resources developed by other Cluster partners could be better promoted and built on by the lead agencies, a reminder of the need to share credit, underscored in quality improvement frameworks.[51]

- *'I feel we've had a voice and been part of the cluster in a real sense… Even between meetings there is considerable level of contact …There is real participation and real dialogue.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'I would definitely say I feel we've got a really strong partnership [with the Federation] and yes, both ...in what we can offer each other and in the way that we listen to each other as well.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'IFRC, you don't have to teach them about partnership ... [cluster members would ask] 'is the cluster going to do this or that?'' [The Federation] turned it round and said "you are the cluster."' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'Consideration might be given to recognition of the ongoing and future initiatives of the Cluster partners and work done by other organisations ... in a manner consistent with other clusters.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

For partners without a Geneva base, particularly NGOs, projects proved a more practical and affordable option than attendance at global Cluster meetings.

- *'... if you're getting engaged in something and there's some funding in it that's actually going to cover your time and travel costs, that's a lot better than asking people to fly over to Geneva and do stuff for free. None of us have additional capacity to do this so [having a project] worked quite well ...' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Until 2008, those attending global Shelter Cluster meetings were predominantly the staff of UN agencies and of the International Organisation for Migration (IOM). In 2005-07, on average two NGO representatives took part, in person or by phone. Less frequent participation by NGOs in meetings and the fact that, as a platform or inter-agency project, the Cluster had no formal structure may help to explain why some NGO informants had questions about Cluster finances.

- *'There was a lot of confusion at the beginning around what the funding was actually for: whether it was building the capacity of the co-leads or whether it was building the capacity of the sector or the cluster members. So there were all sorts of discussions about what we could spend the money on. That was definitely interpreted differently by different organisations.'(NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'Further clarity would be welcomed on how funds are appealed for by the IFRC on behalf of the cluster members, how the funds are received, and accountability in the dispersal of funds.'(NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'I understand this is a fully funded mandate, though I am not quite sure.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

This suggests that global Cluster partners, like the cluster lead agencies, might wish to see more formal procedures in places, for example a general Letter of Understanding setting out mutual commitments and contributions. By 2008, however, the Cluster's approach had become increasingly *in*formal.

- *'... for the 2007-2008 cluster appeal-supported projects, project reports were provided along with the regular consolidated cluster reports to donors. For 2009, the global cluster decided <u>not</u> to establish a formal mechanism and workplan – it is a platform to use to identify thematic or project specific collaborations which are/will be reported on accordingly. Cluster*

24

updates are developed and presented to the cluster itself and other shelter fora on request.'(Secretariat)

NGO participation in the global Cluster increased, however. By 2008, on average eight participants from NGOs were attending quarterly meetings and the number of shelter NGOs taking part had also increased. By 2009, the majority of meeting participants were from non-UN agencies (see Annex A).

b. Developing Shelter Cluster resources and expertise

In addition to its work on training (below), the Federation led or contributed to the development of a number of resources and tools for the Shelter Cluster.

Coordination Toolkit

The Federation has developed an Emergency Shelter Cluster Field Coordination Toolkit, an electronic manual under constant revision, which builds on coordination and technical experience by the Federation, Shelter Coordination Teams and partners. The manual includes comprehensive guidance on the cluster approach, Shelter Cluster procedures, strategic planning advice, technical standards, assessment and Information Management and templates for coordinators and technical staff. One Shelter Coordination Team member new to the cluster approach found it useful, a more experienced one less so.

- *'The cluster toolkit was given to me by the OCHA lady. I have to admit I never looked at it. The document I actually referred to the most was [given by] ... an IFRC person who was supposed to be there on mission ... he handed me over a USB key with the IFRC Cluster toolkit and I probably referred back more to this than I actually did the OCHA documents.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'Every emergency is different so you cannot generalise. There are documents on humanitarian reform [in the toolkit] which provide a good guideline on the equipment you should have, etc, but this is not the reality. They provide a good standard to aim for but will never be achieved ... [The consultant] wrote a lot of the documentation along these lines. [It's a] good effort but unrealistic. It provides a standard but cannot be achieved.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

In 2011, revision of the toolkit started. This was expected to be linked to a wiki and to a coordination handbook for the Shelter Cluster in natural disaster.

Other products

Working with CARE, Sphere and Catholic Relief Services, the Federation led the development of a performance management framework for Shelter Coordination Teams. The Federation co-leads the Cluster's Information Management and Technical Reference Groups with UNHCR. An Information Management framework and best practices have been developed and the workbook produced for Information Management training serves as a manual on this topic. The Federation was part of the

peer group for a Cluster project led by CARE on integrating environmental considerations into the Shelter Cluster. IFRC and HelpAge have produced a guide to integrating age into shelter programmes. [52]

Reviews and stakeholder surveys

There is little information available on how Shelter Cluster resources and products have been used by Shelter Coordination Team members and Cluster partners. However, at the time of writing, the Federation had commissioned external reviews of sixteen Federation-led Cluster deployments, and Shelter Department staff had conducted two online stakeholder surveys. There is an invitation to provide feedback on the global Shelter Cluster website currently in development. Reviews and surveys are placed in the public domain on this site, on the Humanitarian Reform website, and on FedNet.

The Federation is one of only two cluster lead agencies that commission and share reviews in this way. UNICEF, the only other agency to do so, has also published an independent review of resources developed by the global Nutrition Cluster and this may offer a useful model for the Shelter Cluster. [53]

Information Management

The new Shelter Cluster website includes links to each of the country websites launched following Shelter Coordination Team activation. While content varies, each uses a largely standard format, including information about meetings (for example, notices and minutes), Information Management (contact lists, reporting templates, maps, agency assessments, progress reports), Technical Working Groups (documents and supplier information), strategic documents; useful links and documents (guidelines, publications, standards and catalogues), contact details for the Shelter Coordination Team.

Information Management has generally been seen as one of the Federation-led Shelter Cluster's strongest points. It is one of two areas in which Shelter Coordination Teams, have a measure of standing capacity, in this case with support from the Canadian Red Cross. Information Management was seen by informants as particularly valuable in helping smaller agencies fill shelter gaps. However, even where National Societies, NGOs and delegations were well-established, the Shelter Cluster's role in Information Management added value.

- *'After the Jogjakarta earthquake in 2006 there were a number of smaller NGOs that got involved in programming based on what they'd heard from the clusters. Especially the Shelter Cluster. And they were able to fill in some of the gaps or expand in that area.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'It was good for the [National Society] that the Cluster was there. All work was going through the [National Society] because they were providing information. But if you're [a national] you need a low profile. They got requests from the government for figures they could not give. So the ... Secretary General said "we are going to refer these questions to you [in the Cluster]." That was better for them.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'The information relayed to us from such clusters is critical for our own (as well as back donor) analysis, priority setting and decision making as to allocation of our support ... the information has been credible and timely.' (Federation National Society)*

- *'Information Management [was] very much appreciated. In Pakistan [they] did a great job.' (Delegation)*

- *'The ESC Baluchistan Google group has been very helpful and powerful. It created transparency and saved a lot of emails. The field had less internet access, so the site was not always approachable.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'Information Management [in Haiti] was really good. So was mapping ...' (Haiti review)*

Some saw in the cluster's approach a risk that teams would remain in the capital exchanging information with one another, rather than in the field talking to affected populations.

- *'Where are the people who went to the field? [They're] now sitting in a hotel. [There] seems to be few who engage with beneficiaries ... [there's a] risk of using secondary data. You can learn from individuals. We have lost some field skills while people have gone to cluster meetings. Helicopters are great because you are isolated with your key informants. Now the instinct is to open offices, get a phone, ring New York instead of going to the field.' (Secretariat)*

The hub and sub-hub structure offer a means through which the Cluster attempts to address concerns such as this, for example, in Haiti in 2010. However, such an approach called for increased levels of staffing.

Some informants saw the information provided by the Shelter Cluster as less useful for larger agencies with local partners, good contacts and faster direct access to information.

- *'... the type of disaster that the Shelter Cluster gets called in for is often larger scale, affecting a wide area so we wouldn't be relying on the Shelter Cluster or using that information to inform our programming ... clusters are ... dependent ... on voluntary information and assessment information and programming information but if you were going to rely on the cluster to inform you about operations you would probably not begin work until two or three months after.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'One of the guys in our team had been there for two years and knew all the agencies and individual staff. People can and will still get information with or without the cluster, either through OCHA or formal and informal contacts with each other. They do not need the cluster to do this – it is not the key.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

It was notable, however, that in Haiti, a country in which many major NGOs had been present for several decades before the earthquake of 2010, the Cluster's Information Management function helped consolidate its reputation among international stakeholders

- *Despite its delayed start, the IFRC-led Cluster came quickly to be seen as an authoritative source of information for international media as well as international partners in Haiti. [54] (Haiti review)*

- *'I am impressed by IM, GIS work, bulletins. They've responded to particular, additional functions. The sharing of information – they're one of the few clusters to share information.' (Haiti review)[55]*

In Myanmar in 2008 where field access was difficult, few agencies had local partners and few secondary data were available, the Shelter Cluster had filled the information gap and helped provide estimates used by agencies, donors and the national government.

- *'The Cluster was good at getting information to cross-reference. All the clusters came together put information on a map from 1997 and extrapolated from that.' (National Society)*

- *'[The value of the Cluster?] Statistics: especially in a country like Myanmar where there is a very limited number of statistics, coming up with that first number… so that [we] could come out with a figure and donors could start looking at budget figures.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

In Bangladesh in 2007, the Shelter Coordination Team played a major role in the sharing and managing of information between clusters which otherwise had no mechanism for doing so.

- *In the absence of OCHA, the first Shelter Coordination Group information manager was praised for his role in the establishment of an information management group, for innovation with UN and government counterparts and for contributing to lessons learning and future preparedness in Bangladesh. (Bangladesh Sidr review)[56]*

c. Developing and deploying shelter coordination personnel

Cluster capacity

Challenges to the Federation's capacity to deploy Shelter Coordination Teams are typical of surge capacity problems in the wider humanitarian sector, as described in the *Humanitarian Response Review*. The Federation's extensive membership offers it a potentially wider pool of recruits than UN/IO or NGO cluster partners. Nevertheless, in recruiting for Shelter Coordination Teams, the Federation too has faced a problem of specialist capacity in shelter, as described in Section 2. The Shelter Cluster was likely, at least initially, to be drawing on a limited pool of candidates if it were to recruit experienced alliance managers with the requisite seniority and technical skill for Shelter Coordination Teams.

There is no 'magic bullet' where surge capacity is concerned.[57] People In Aid has identified enablers of surge capacity, defined in the humanitarian context as 'the ability of an organisation to rapidly and effectively increase [the sum of] its available resources in

a specific geographic location in order to meet increased demand to stabilise or alleviate suffering in any given population.'[58] Against this measure, the Shelter Department has followed good practice by using a range of approaches to address surge capacity. It has set up a roster, developed job descriptions for Shelter Coordination Team roles, identified and/or developed staff, mentoring them on the job when necessary and pre-positioning funds for their deployment. A Standard Operating Procedure drawn up in 2008 sets out Shelter Coordination Team roles, person specifications and personnel procedures, together with the responsibilities of Federation and other organisations involved in Shelter Coordination Team deployment.[59]

The roster includes both delegates and consultants. National Societies in Andorra, Australia, Canada, Finland, the Netherlands, UK and USA have contributed delegates for Shelter Coordination Team deployment in Bangladesh, Myanmar, Tajikistan, the Philippines and Pakistan. By the end of 2009, four consecutive Shelter Coordination Teams had seen almost all Coordinator and Information Manager posts filled and funded by National Societies.

While this capacity has been key to staffing Shelter Coordination Teams, surge capacity, including standing capacity, that is, staff employed full-time in other roles but available on stand-by to mobilise, *was* still seen as a challenge by informants. Though a measure of standing capacity in Information Management was secured in 2009, uncertainty about deployment of Shelter Coordination Teams was viewed as a limitation.

- *'Unlike some of the UN agencies, IFRC have no stand-by arrangements but rely on rosters. This makes it difficult to get people to travel immediately, so the position of IFRC/shelter cluster is often compromised.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'Sometimes what happens is that [the Shelter Department] gets on the phone ...''Are you interested in going to Country X?'' ... ''When do you need me there?'' 'Tomorrow.'' Well, ... you've got to get a visa and 'plane tickets sorted out and ... the visa process takes a number of days ...' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'With this model, there is a big gap as it takes time to bring in people and they have a lack of understanding of the context, whereas the UN are already based in country'. (Delegation)*

The overall shortage of shelter specialists has meant that initially few Cluster partners were willing to second their own permanent staff to support coordination. The Federation responded by negotiating staffing agreements with the Cluster's global and local NGO partners, ACTED, CARE and RedR Australia for specific emergencies, and with UN Habitat for inclusion of Early Recovery expertise. The Federation has frequently provided funding for recruitment and salaries though in some cases, for example CARE in Haiti, partners themselves have secured funds to support Cluster roles; partner agencies have recruited against a Federation job description and employed the candidate.

Partners felt this arrangement benefited both their agency and the sector as a whole. A longer-term staffing agreement between CARE and the Federation is under discussion and a framework agreement on secondments from the private sector had been drawn up. In the Shelter Cluster's Haiti deployment, 25% of personnel were drawn from National Societies in Andorra, Australia, Britain, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Nigeria, Spain and the USA; 20% were from partners CARE UK, CartONG,

MapAction, UNHCR and the World Wildlife Fund; 55% came from the centralised roster of freelancers which the IFRC has built up as part of its global responsibility for Cluster surge capacity.

- *'It's good for us at HQ level to have someone on the ground … It's a way in to lots of other information. It's also a way of pushing the sector forward…'*
  (NGO Cluster partner)

- *Cluster members appreciated that the composition of the team came not only from IFRC, but had NGO representation as well, from CARE. This, coupled with the fact that the team did not work out of the IFRC office, helped to demonstrate its independence and transparency. The arrangement strengthened the cluster mechanism, ensuring high levels of buy-in from participants.(Myanmar Nargis review)[60]*

- *'… for us this is a huge asset. The fact that an organisation like IFRC … recognises that it's important to have someone who's looking at the long term, at the recovery and the development areas, it's wonderful. It's something that never happened before with any other actor…' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

Global capacity-building was perceived by some as having overlooked the Federation's own policy on national capacity-building. Capacity-building by the Federation among its members and other local organisations, particularly in disaster-prone countries or where permanent clusters are being considered, was thought more appropriate and more sustainable.

- *'In cluster coordination we need to develop adequate coordination and planning capacities – for assessing needs.' (National Society)*

- *'The challenge is how to develop our own capacity and strategies for managing shelter, particularly to reach difficult areas. This is a big challenge.'*
  (National Society)

- *'...the Cluster needs to build in surge capacity into local institutions not just strive for a short term improvement in coordination and information flows …' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Whether or not local approaches could deliver additional coordination capacity, the Shelter Department notes that the role of Liaison Officer in the Shelter Coordination Team, filled by a host National Society, has been tried in the Philippines, tested in Salvador, and is expected to be further developed elsewhere.[61]

Some UN/IO Cluster partners questioned why the Federation did not delegate leadership of the Shelter Coordination Team to another agency on occasion. For the Federation, this was an issue that the IASC and partners had to resolve. In fact, IOM led the Shelter Cluster in Haiti following the tropical storms and hurricanes of 2008 and in Pakistan following the 2010 floods. After the Haiti earthquake of 2010, it led both camp management and shelter clusters for the first month of response after which the Federation took over leadership of the Shelter Cluster.

- *'Global Cluster leadership doesn't necessarily mean that the organization has to keep the role at the country level ...IFRC ... limited partners' empowerment to maximize cluster services at country level'. (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'[The Federation] have to ensure the job is done. If IFRC is working in ten emergencies and the eleventh comes on...they don't have to lead it all. Could Oxfam? [The Federation] should ensure the job's done.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'... we are supportive of a collaborative approach ... If partners wish to take on country lead roles, they need to demonstrate the same institutional commitment and investment that IFRC has made, and we need to agree which countries so we do not duplicate resources. IFRC are also requesting the IASC to better define country to global linkages where the country lead is <u>not</u> the same as the global lead. At present, this is a missing piece in the system ...' (Secretariat)*

Continuity at country level

There were concerns that expert Shelter Coordination Teams did not stay long enough after an emergency to make a lasting difference. The Federation and the Cluster increasingly promoted the view of shelter as a longer term process of 'sheltering' and included an Early Recovery adviser in Shelter Coordination Teams. Nevertheless, a three-week or even a three-month Federation-led deployment during the emergency phase only, though consistent with its MoU, appeared arbitrary to outsiders.

What lay behind length of deployment –- financial resources, Cluster policy or the Federation MoU –- was not clear to review informants. Of more concern was the perception that the systemic gap that shelter coordination was intended to fill sometimes simply *moved*. If the system did not perform seamlessly at handover, as was frequently the case, affected populations could remain at serious risk through lack of shelter provision, or duplication of provision could occur. If a Federation-led Shelter Coordination Team handed over to an agency that was seen as performing poorly for any reason, this reflected badly not only on the agency but on the Federation itself. Unfair though this might seem, it is the risk for any cluster lead agency or convener.

- *'... if a IFRC-led cluster team zips in for 2-3 weeks, for the emergency phase, and then leaves, any real expertise in housing reconstruction and recovery is lost ... a lack of local capacity will ... mean that disaster survivors will ... possibly [be] housed in ... dangerous housing when they do get permanent shelter. Not much of an improvement on the way things were before the Cluster Approach.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'The IFRC needs to ensure that it avoids a situation whereby (due to resource limitations) it is forced to withdraw its coordination/leadership capacity before the end of an emergency response operation, leaving a gap in the coordination of the cluster ... and without comprehensively "handing over" to an alternative agency.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'We requested them to ... bring in someone with technical expertise to look at reconstruction issues from the very beginning of the Emergency Shelter Cluster so that by the handover, there is some continuity. [The consultant] didn't come to the SCT ... Transition should be*

smooth and both clusters should work together from the middle if the ESC is to ensure a smooth transition.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)

- *'In Bangladesh after 2007 Sidr cyclone, Federation assumed at the beginning a shelter cluster convenor role, but handed it over to UNDP in an unorganised manner. The missing coordination showed clearly the results in October 2008: little shelter prepared for the victims and a big number of completely different solutions.' (Delegation)*

The Shelter Department is aware of this issue.[62] A review of the MoU's narrow definition of shelter and/or clearer messaging to global and local partners about the Federation's own constraints might further clarify understanding of its role.

- *IFRC has highlighted in different fora that there is a 'gap' in the allocation of lead agency coordination responsibilities regarding shelter recovery ... IFRC have promoted the establishment of a thematic reference group with the Global Shelter Cluster to address this, without much progress to date. (Secretariat)*

This is an issue for the wider Federation as well as the Global Cluster. In March 2010, IFRC announced that it would extend the emergency phase of its operation in Haiti for up to twelve months after the earthquake.[63] The Shelter Department's proposal to extend Shelter Cluster deployment for the same length of time was opposed by the Delegation and Zone and the original date for a November Cluster handover to UN-Habitat was confirmed.

Even this shorter (nine-month) Shelter Cluster deployment was threatened by a funding shortfall and the Federation's internal accounting procedures: some staff left the Shelter Cluster in August before the situation could be rectified. In the event, the Shelter Cluster handover proceeded on schedule in November. Yet informants to the Haiti review, among them Federation operations personnel, noted the coordination gap this would leave because UN-Habitat had yet to realise sufficient financial and personnel resources.[64] This is an area in which the Federation, like the Global Cluster, needs to reach a consistent view, one that places foremost the interests of disaster-affected communities.

Staff development

With UNHCR, the Federation leads the global Cluster's Training Reference Group. In order to widen the pool of potential Shelter Coordination Team members, the Federation piloted training for cluster technical advisors and trainers. It jointly led training for cluster coordinators in Geneva, Panama, Bangkok and Dakar for staff of delegations and National Societies in 2007.[65] In 2008 the cluster lead agencies jointly delivered training of trainers, coordinators and information managers. In 2009 the Federation funded cluster coordination training in Amman, with support from the Middle East and North Africa Zone. Participants came from UNHCR, NGOs and National Societies in Andorra, Canada, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Sweden and Syria. The Federation also provided support and mentoring for first-time coordinators recruited for Bangladesh and Pakistan.

- *'We are pleased with the work of the Shelter Department and team. Their focus on quality personnel and training is right direction to ensure quality services. One recommendation*

would be to integrate … shelter training components/modules into ERU and Field School and vice versa with the view to produce more holistic thinking shelter delegates.' (National Society)

- *'[I] had not had any training before taking on the role, but got great support from the [Senior Shelter Officer] through regular communication and continuously talking through things. A trainer … was also brought in for 4 week …This was very helpful.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'I could be deploying with 700,000 people on nobody's radar… on the basis of 5 days of very poor training.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

Most of the Shelter Coordination Team members who contributed to this review had received training before recruitment or shortly afterwards (if, for example, recruited in country). Information Managers described good professional and personal support during deployment by the Federation's Information Management consultant.

Given the Cluster's increasing partnership with shelter NGOs, it is perhaps surprising that only two NGO representatives attended the 2008 Information Management workshop and that the shelter coordination workshop that year had no NGO representatives. The Federation saw lack of NGO capacity, of secure funding and of institutional commitment at senior level as disincentives for NGOs.[66] An NGO informant, while partially sharing this view, believed that lack of training continued to bar NGOs from participating in the Shelter Coordination Team.

- *I said if you'd let us send more people on the training we'd have had more people to supply! So hopefully we can get them onto the trainings in future' (NGO Cluster partner)*

In 2010, successful completion of a 30-hour distance learning course was required before entry to residential workshops on coordination and on Information Management. [67]

By July 2011, eight shelter cluster coordination training programmes had taken place.[68]

Standby capacity

Given all that the Federation was doing to develop capacity for Shelter Coordination Teams, why was there a perception that capacity was also an area of weakness?

- *'[Surge capacity] is not as developed as other areas. Trained and capable coordinators are needed. Operations are as good as the people you send there.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Some of the reasons are discussed above. As we have seen, systemic and sectoral capacity shortages played a part, and the length of time Shelter Coordination Teams, once deployed, were able to stay in the field was sometimes seen, fairly or unfairly, as too short.

Although the Emergency Shelter Cluster trained approximately 250 individuals in 2007-08, [69] those trained were not always available because they worked for other organisations, including National Societies, which could not always release them to the

Shelter Cluster. Of those individuals who might be available, none was on standby. A total of 80 persons were nominated for inter-agency training by the Federation, with a view to their being deployed in Shelter Coordination Teams. In 2009, 33 of these persons had been deployed at least once in a total of 70 person deployments.[70] The Federation now aims to reduce the Shelter Coordination Team roster to a smaller number of individuals who can be regularly deployed.

Systemic and sectoral staff capacity was beyond the Federation's control, at least in the relatively short period covered by this review. However, a strategic HR approach, coupled with the Federation's experience in disaster forecasting, might help it address to some extent the issue of standby capacity for coordination. Shelter Coordination Teams are still seen, to some extent, to be competing with the Federation's operational teams for staff, logistical resources and visas. Between contingency planning, into which the Shelter Cluster and the Cluster approach are moving, and the activation of Shelter Coordination Teams following natural disaster are imminent emergencies. A pilot exercise focusing on the development of standby coordination capacity for a small number of imminent emergencies predicted by the Federation may be worth considering.

- *'…I know there's a lot of scraping and scrambling for staff especially if an emergency happened around Christmas time but we have the same problem too …I'm not aware of any more of a delay than 5 days or so because the Federation wasn't able to get a good person … What would be great would be – the advantage of having a core group of people - was that then you would make sure that learnings from one cluster would be brought to the next one.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Roster maintenance

In the short term, the Federation should do more to support those on its shelter coordination roster. Shelter Coordination Team members who informed this review, including National Society delegates, freelancers and staff originally recruited by partner agencies, expressed strong commitment to the work of the Shelter Cluster and the Federation.

- *'[I'm] very impressed with what the Shelter Department has accomplished … They are doing a lot, and from scratch … The decision making is clear and it makes sense, plus they are trying to involve people and build on continuous learning, like this review.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'It's one of the better-organised clusters with WASH not far behind. Despite tiny resources, [Head of Shelter] is outstanding …' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

However, some thought that the workloads of the Federation and the Shelter Department were outstripping personnel capacity. Shelter Coordination Team members did not always begin difficult, high profile missions with a briefing or contract or end missions with a debriefing. Good practice was demonstrated in the case of information managers for whom support was consistently provided by a consultant. But, given the leading role of Federation members in developing the People In Aid standard and the Shelter Cluster's success in promoting shelter standards, the experience of some Shelter Coordination Team members was disappointing.

- *'Mid-mission [the Information Management Consultant] responds in hours, seemingly even in an overnight in Canada. [He] is always there for support and is tremendously responsive. That's never an issue.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'Two of us were [in the field] without signed contracts so there's a question mark over what the Federation would do if we got into trouble.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'[Shelter Department staff] is so horribly overwhelmed with work it's hard to talk. You go to Geneva for a week and don't get to speak to [them]. [They] are overloaded.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'[My colleague] wanted to have a face to face meeting with [Shelter Department staff] so that he could explain the challenges / difficulties and achievements. We both wanted this meeting to take place but it was not possible to get an appointment. A face to face de-briefing is very important.' (Delegation)*

In 2009, the Federation had 5.5 full-time equivalent posts in the Shelter Department in Geneva. [71] A regional shelter specialist in Panama and in Kuala Lumpur reported to their respective zones. The additional post of Shelter Coordination Team Officer, recruited in mid-2009, was expected to go some way to address the areas of staff support and roster maintenance. Both areas would also require strategic and financial support if roster staff were to be retained and their skills kept up to date. The Federation's own HR specialists and People In Aid are possible sources of strategic advice. In the meantime, care needs to be taken to ensure that committed roster members do not feel like a resource to be mined but consistently like members of the community of practice which the Federation wishes to create.

- *'Certainly I appreciate email contact from the Shelter Cluster. It's never a case of "another email from the Shelter Cluster?" ... I'm happy to be part of the community and appreciate the constant contact and the continuing efforts to ... include everyone and keep up the relationship...' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'[The Shelter Department] have said we might have some work, some documents that we'd like you to look at. And everyone has said, yes, send it to us, don't worry... we'll give you feedback or we can edit something or we can look at something ...there was no answer [from the Federation], no feedback and I felt that it was all a one-way street...What was the final document sent ...? Were our comments included or the other people's?' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

Following the appointment of the consultant on Information Management, hosted by the Canadian Red Cross, in 2009-10 the Netherlands Red Cross hosted a Global Focal Point for Coordination. This appointment ended in mid 2010 owing to personal circumstances but the Shelter Cluster began work to establish three positions for Global Focal Points, two for coordination and one for Information Management. [72] A new Global Focal Point for Coordination and Environment, funded by the Finnish Red Cross, started work in April 2011.

3.4   Disseminating innovation and good practice

The Federation's MoU with OCHA sets out its role in raising awareness about the need for shelter. However, it does not refer to dissemination by the Federation – or OCHA – of information about the Shelter Cluster, the Federation's role in shelter coordination or the cluster approach.

Communication issues that affected the Federation were echoed in the IASC's 2006-07 report on Global Capacity Building by the Clusters. This identifies 'delays in effective dissemination of the whole humanitarian reform agenda to the field level' as a source of risk and challenge, underlining the need for a greater role in communication by the IASC. [73] Such delays negatively affected both Federation-led cluster deployments in Bangladesh[74] and may have contributed to the situation which saw IFRC became Shelter Cluster lead agency only a month after the earthquake in Haiti in 2010. [75]

- *'As well as explaining the Federation's Emergency Shelter Cluster role – the Federation must, by default, explain the broader humanitarian reform process and the whole cluster approach – particularly how National Societies might engage with and across the cluster system.' (Secretariat)*

- *'We ... have not done sufficient advocacy. This applies to all clusters.' (Delegation)*

- *The recently finalized UN SOPs for emergency response highlight the manner in which the UN family in Bangladesh fails to actively include INGOs, the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement and civil society actors. (Bangladesh Aila review)[76]*

Federation members were informed about the changes in policy to which the General Assembly had agreed. Progress in ratifying the MoU was included in letters from the Secretary General and President in 2005 and 2006. The new commitments were briefly noted in published annual reports for 2005-2007. This provision, however, stops well short of a targeted strategy that begins with the needs and perceptions of groups inside and outside the Federation.

Review informants concur that many in the Federation and the ICRC either did not understand or did not agree with its new role in the Shelter Cluster. Changes in senior management at the Secretariat that followed decentralisation also meant that most communication about the corporate change of policy, as well as about innovations and good practice in shelter and shelter coordination, was left to the Shelter Department.

The Secretariat had limited communication resources with which to support the Shelter Department after 2006. For the Department itself, as a Geneva-based technical department, there was uncertainty about the messages needed.

- *'In our first year we had help, then we soft-pedalled because we weren't clear on the message ...We're just starting to get communication out. There's still an opportunity for [more]. Myth-busting is one of our challenges.' (Secretariat)*

- *'I believe communication support could have been provided more effectively if it had been resourced. The communication work of shelter ... is more quantitative than strategic and this needs to be addressed. I believe the cluster lead role is extremely important when issues of*

credibility, added value, reputation etc. are considered in the broader humanitarian community. I think we can do a lot more in terms of effective advocacy reinforced with a strong communications and media support (jointly targeting policy people, donors, humanitarians and media for instance.' (Secretariat)

- *'I have participated in events where shelter coordination has been talked about. It's been a bit haphazard ... There is no budget for disseminating on humanitarian reform.' (Federation Secretariat)*

By the time a more concerted focus on communication began, the Shelter Department had to address not only gaps in understanding but, as Section 2 indicates, significant misunderstanding, concern and scepticism, particularly within the Federation. The challenges that the Department encountered demanded not only shelter technical solutions but corporate resources and a corporate strategy.

- *'[The Federation should be] communicating more and with greater clarity to stakeholders (Red Cross and external stakeholders) as to what the Federation's role as cluster convener actually means ...' (National Society)*

- *'No training has been given. [You] need half a day or a day where you have the chance to go through the issues in depth. We get some documents and bits of information but these can be ad-hoc. Communicating by documentation is also difficult as you have other priorities then never get back to read what is sent'. (Delegation)*

- *'The lack of proper training for Heads of Offices in regional offices is something that has ended [with] shelter as a purely technical matter and not as a strategic issue for coordination, relationship building and partnership.' (Region)*

- *'... the Federation could and should ... scale up the internal (Movement) dialogue ... the shelter commitment and all its implications are still very poorly understood by National Societies and Federation alike... There is still a considerable need for dialogue with National Societies – not only at the technical level but especially at the political level. The decision was adopted at the 2005 General Assembly without much time for analysis, reflection and debate, and the implications were and still are poorly understood.' (Zone)*

- *'I dealt with political hiccups ... "Now you're the Federation supporting us, now as cluster coordinator." It's hard for National Societies and delegates to understand how roles are separate. You need clean and clear messaging...' (Secretariat)*

- *'I think they knew how [the Shelter Cluster] fit into the overall deployment for IFRC in Haiti, but not what we did ... We did try to integrate socially, but there was a palpable sense of cultural difference ...' (Shelter Coordination Team member)[77]*

Outreach by the Shelter Department was much appreciated by Federation colleagues. It resulted in greater understanding of and commitment to the Shelter Cluster role. But messages about the Shelter Cluster also needed to be discussed in the context of Federation principles and local politics, not solely in the context of shelter as a technical issue.

- *'What we are lacking is access to "principles" discussions. These cover very important issues about mandates, roles etc. Country level staff have a lot to say from their experience, etc. ... There is also need for this in global meetings where [Head of Shelter] has representation – some of the issues are more related to principles and mandate, than shelter. [It's] important that these are fully aired.' (Delegation)*

- *'When [Shelter Department Senior Officer] was here in the early days and we had fruitful discussions ... he was very, very precise about giving us guidance on what they wanted ...together we worked out what we needed and we just got on with it.' (Region)*

- *'... we invited [Head of Shelter] to the regional National Society meeting ... to talk about a) sheltering and b) the Shelter Cluster. [He also] came to the Heads of Delegation meeting ... we invited [Shelter Senior Officer] ... to [meet] the National Society disaster management technical people from 5-6 countries ... it put the issues on the table and in operations. It didn't clarify everything ...People were still saying "it goes against the principles of the Red Cross" [and] "reporting to the UN." But it helped the National Society understand.' (Zone)*

Despite high personal levels of awareness about the Shelter Cluster, therefore, review informants consistently requested more dissemination. This was also necessary to aid swift activation and integration of Shelter Coordination Team activities. Too often, dissemination happened only in the midst of local cluster activation. This was too late.

- *'It's at country level that [understanding of the cluster] has to happen. At the start of a disaster so much depends on local officials, army, country offices. There's quite a distance between a country office and a Geneva desk.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'In the lead up to Cluster activation, IFRC Tajikistan found themselves in the awkward position of being asked probing questions during ...meetings about a role which they knew nothing about. While they sought clarity from the Region, Zone and Geneva, the pointed questions continued.' (Tajikistan review)[78]*

- *'I just felt that we had to have a tiny thing in Urdu to hand over to people when we arrived.'(Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'...during the period when there's no disaster in the country, make sure the cluster system, the role of the Emergency Shelter Cluster is being made clear to all the national societies, ICRC ... national authorities. Disseminate the message what our role is because that can make a huge difference.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

- *'... the National Disaster Management Authority ... wanted to know our role and it was very hard to explain that we were not UN, not IFRC but independent. Finally they asked who paid our salaries and we had to confirm that it was IFRC. As soon as they had this information, they accepted us as IFRC and left us alone.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

Global Shelter Cluster web pages are not easy to find or up to date. Two humanitarian reform websites offers in-depth resources for the specialist but few for those looking for general background information. Lists of global Cluster partners on the relevant pages of the Humanitarian Reform and OneResponse websites and on the web pages of the Shelter Centre (which carries some details of Cluster meetings and developments since

2008) differ from one another. FedNet's Shelter Cluster page is not open to non-Federation partners or roster members. Shelter coordination is rarely referenced elsewhere on FedNet, though it has obvious links with the coordination initiatives described in the site's 'Working Together' web pages. IFRC has launched a new website, still in development, which will be managed by the cluster co-leads rather than by OCHA.[79]

- *'... sometimes [there] is also a lack of understanding of what is available, for example, it's on the web-site but we don't know [that] and have not looked.' (Federation delegation)*

- *'We have to improve visibility in the Federation website and documents about commitment to the cluster. It's not apparent.' (Federation Secretariat)*

- *IFRC's intranet ... can be accessed by IFRC staff throughout the world. As with all such information, there are major challenges:*
  - *You have to know that it is there in order to look for it*
  - *You have to know that it is important in order to invest time to understand it*
  - *The potentially enormous gap in knowledge of the subject between those posting the information and those accessing it can make understanding it more rather than less difficult. (Tajikistan review)[80]*

Like most clusters, the Shelter Cluster has no logo.[81] Unlike most, it has two names. The Federation's MoU refers to 'emergency shelter,' as do UNHCR, FedNet and OCHA's OneResponse and Humanitarian Reform websites. Cluster publications refer to the 'Emergency Shelter Cluster' but the Federation and its partners increasingly, to the 'Shelter Cluster.' In February 2009 Britain's Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors announced its membership of the 'UN Global Shelter Cluster.'[82] In Haiti in 2010, however, local website and materials referred to the IASC Shelter Cluster.

Different names reflect important debate and evolving policy, as described in Section 2. However, deciding and promoting Cluster aims and protecting Cluster identity are closely linked. The Cluster plans to develop a guidance note on this issue.[83]

- *'We said at the start "Emergency Shelter Cluster." I think we have to look at shelter needs in the longer term ...I've seen examples of when an organisation provides a community affected by disaster with tent/materials – then replaces it with another tent – it's wrong. It's not responsible that we forget you. I think it's our job to help them until they're back to normal ...' (Secretariat)*

The Federation's 2008-09 global shelter programme appeal referred to communication and the need to raise awareness of the Federation's role in operations and coordination. In early 2009 the leaflet *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment* addressed the key questions in five languages. The responsibilities of the Shelter Coordination Team Officer, appointed in mid-2009, include communication, cluster visibility and website maintenance.

This new post will be a welcome addition to the Shelter Departments' communication capacity. However, fulfilment of its very broad range of tasks – the post also includes

support for preparedness and response activities and the welfare of Shelter Coordination Teams – is likely to remain a challenge. The Shelter Department's pragmatic response to dissemination begs the question of whether communication about a Federation commitment and about the cluster approach should remain the sole responsibility of the Shelter Department or of the Federation alone. By 2011, the Shelter Department has commissioned a number of communication products about the Cluster, including a video, available on FedNet and Shelter Cluster websites. It has also commissioned case studies and a video based on the Cluster's response in Haiti, available on FedNet.

3.5   Influencing the attitude and behaviour of target groups

Though dissemination and communications were uneven, the Federation's proactive role in the Cluster at global and Country level had, by the time of this review, impressed partners, influenced thinking and, to some extent, behaviour. The Federation is seen as leading by example and the Shelter Department staff are highly regarded.

By mid-2011, the Federation had deployed Shelter Coordination Teams in response to eighteen natural disasters.

	Year	Emergency	Country
1	2006	Earthquake	Yogyakarta
2	2006	Typhoon Durian	Philippines
3	2007	Cyclone and floods	Mozambique
4	2007	Cyclone, Yemyin floods	Pakistan
5	2007	Cyclone Sidr	Bangladesh
6	2008	Cold wave	Tajikistan
7	2008	Cyclone Nargis	Myanmar
8	2008	Koshi floods	Nepal
9	2008	Baluchistan earthquake	Pakistan
10	2009	Cyclone Aila	Bangladesh
11	2009	West Sumatra earthquakes	Indonesia
12	2009	West Java earthquake	Indonesia
13	2009	Floods	Burkina Faso
14	2009	Typhoons Ketsana and Parma	Philippines
15	2009	Floods	El Salvador
16	2010	Cyclone Giri	Myanmar
17	2010	Earthquake	Haiti
18	2011	Floods	Lesotho

It had also initiated in-country analysis of contingency planning, including in Nepal and the Philippines, and supported National Society leadership on contingency planning in Kyrgyzstan and Mozambique.

The Federation was seen by UN partners, in particular, as a dynamic organisation that was contributing positively to humanitarian reform efforts at a global level.

- *'[Federation] approach, commitment, drive and energy [in] shelter, partnership and humanitarian reform in general have been of the highest quality.'*
  (UN/IO Cluster partner)

- *'The IFRC has been an extremely pro-active member of the Global Cluster Leads group … The IFRC has always responded to requests for feedback and inputs to various initiatives, participates in meetings and discussion and is a pro-active partner in strategic analysis on how the system can be strengthened,' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'In terms of IFRC's role as cluster lead on shelter, it has led the Emergency Shelter Cluster well and its role is acknowledged by all external interlocutors.' (IFRC Real-Time Evaluation Haiti)[84]*

It was seen by Cluster partners as adding to the credibility of the shelter sector.

- *'[The Federation's role] represents a large amount of humanitarian support to the sector. They have huge resources. To have them involved and coordinating, that's crucial.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'I think this is also more of a tribute to the Federation than the Cluster itself - the Federation has brought a sense of legitimacy to the whole idea of shelter as a humanitarian sector… ' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Most global Cluster partners thought that the coordination it provided was valuable. Coordination of shelter agencies, though still imperfect, was, in systemic terms, an improvement on what had gone before and was beginning to affect how agencies worked together.

- *'We waste less time, we have less doubling of effort, and fewer gaps.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'We didn't have a clear leadership [earlier]. Most of the shelter projects are done by many different actors but nobody was putting the things together and trying to act as a system… as a response system.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'Unlike before the Clusters came into existence, there is a system, at least on paper.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

Cluster partners appreciated the Cluster's advocacy on shelter quality and standards. This was beginning to influence the work of country level partners though some working in Shelter Coordination Teams felt distant from operations and unable to influence quality.

- *'[There's a] stronger voice, a more common understanding of what quality is and a real push for … appropriate standards and quality.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'In Myanmar there was a shelter kit that was developed by the technical working group of the cluster and at that point in time [we] didn't have a technical shelter person on the ground … So they were looking to the cluster to set the standard so we would know what to do.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'...the Cluster Coordinator … did a very good job. He triggered a discussion around Sphere. This was becoming a challenge for the National Society as they should also advocate for Sphere, which meant they needed to advocate with government who had designed a camp for 1000 people [but] which, based on Sphere standards, would only accommodate just over 100.' (Delegation)*

- *'There's a strange kind of vacuum at the heart of the cluster which didn't seem to mind that much about the shelter outcomes ... but maybe that's ... the nature of coordination and you can't be accountable for quality on the ground: ultimately, its all the partners who are actually doing things'. (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

Cluster partners were beginning to see shelter coordination as 'the way we do business.'

- *'[Now] I will get ... questions from our teams in the field saying, "what are we supposed to do with the cluster?" Whereas previously it would be "oh this is just another UN meeting. We don't have anything to do with this"... now there is more of a "Wait a second... We do the Shelter Cluster. It is an important one. What can we do? ...What are they looking for?"' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'[Would people see the difference if there were no longer a Shelter Cluster?] Definitely, yes, definitely. Because ... not having a coordination system ... either at the global or the local level it will be chaotic ...and especially after two or three years that we already went through the process of knowing each other.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

Although the cluster approach was neither universally understood nor universally popular, most Federation colleagues saw it as their role to provide support for Shelter Coordination Teams. Federation informants also indicated there had been a change in attitude towards shelter in the Federation, and shelter quality was seen as improved.

- *'At country level there is a lack of resources and shelter expertise, so the Global Shelter Department helps a lot. So this area requires less and less of my involvement, this leaves me to concentrate on other aspects of my work...' (Delegation)*

- *'Prior to the cluster approach, we were known for our national societies and a network of volunteers. IFRC is now recognised in the humanitarian sector, and seen as an expert in shelter.' (Delegation)*

- *'I've seen the Federation change its opinions of whether or not shelter is an appropriate activity for the Federation to be involved in emergency operations ... as I say I don't know whether there's any cause or effect here. It's just an observation but I'm talking about the Federation and its partners ...actually doing shelter rather than the cluster. So it seems to have kindled an interest in shelter in general, it seems to me.' (Region)*

- *'We've probably been more involved in shelter response than in the past. The quality of what we've been providing is improved. I think we <u>had</u> a tendency to say, we will provide tents or tarps or both. But now we think "what's the most useful way to help?"' (Secretariat)*

- *'I think we have improved our shelter operations because of work with the Shelter Cluster. We hadn't challenged ourselves.' (Secretariat)*

Informants among most stakeholder groups believed that the Federation's role in the Shelter Cluster had had a positive effect on its visibility and reputation. The Federation was better placed than before to influence global decision-making on humanitarian issues.

- *'I think that the Shelter Department in Geneva… some of the people they've got, what they've been able to accomplish, I think it has improved their reputation. What they're achieving is very strong … externally, I think it is proof that they have stepped up to the plate …' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'The role of IFRC as Global Shelter Cluster Convenor has greatly impacted on the image of the IFRC … in a very positive way…The proactive involvement of the IFRC in the development and implementation of the cluster approach (and the wider humanitarian reform agenda) … have led to its positioning much more at the strategic centre of decision-making.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'[The Federation is] is seen very positively in [this country] – mainly due to recognition of the expert (shelter) status … We are seen as better equipped and with good surge capacity … We get good exposure to government and other organisations.' (Delegation)*

- *'… we are better positioned to address other matters and our image has improved… the positioning of the Federation is a crucial factor of its success during disasters, either in conversations with Governments and UN agencies or for wider coordination. Being a convener put the International Federation at the level of some UN agencies and enables the dialogue from another perspective.' (Region)*

- *'Since our shelter cluster lead is seen as very positive by donor governments it has helped our image among the missions in Geneva. They have on several occasions come back to me giving extremely positive feedback on how the Federation has taken on this lead role.' (Secretariat)*

- *'From my perspective IFRC has done an excellent job as convenor of the Shelter Cluster. In particular the structures put in place to ensure capacity to lead the clusters at field level is available and the IFRC's commitment to mainstreaming its cluster activities have been an example of best practice amongst Cluster Lead Agencies. This has led to a very positive perception of IFRC.' (Donor)*

- *'Real engagement of the Movement with the other two pillars of humanitarian response. Good relationships with UN and NGOs. Professional technical knowledge and experience shared.' (Donor)*

Not all agreed with the overall positive assessment. A Shelter Coordination Team's performance (or an unsuccessful handover) reflected negatively on the Federation. Some within the Federation remained opposed in principle to the role of Shelter Cluster convener.

- *'The Movement in general has started to comprehend the added value of stepped-up coordination and the process leading to increasing our capacities to perform the role! On the other hand, many failures have also damaged the Federation's image with the international humanitarian community.' (Delegation)*

- *'I have a very critical view of the convener role and think it affects the perception negatively. The notion of "convener" versus "lead" is not easy for external actors.' (National Society)*

- *'It affected [the Federation] negatively by undermining the image of "neutral and independent actor. " When deployed in conflict-affected countries [it] generated confusion with the ONS, the Authorities and other humanitarian actors and tension with the ICRC.' (Cluster observer)*

A number of informants perceived both positive and negative effects on image, the latter generally because of concerns about independence and mandate.

- *'The positive side is especially being placed as a main entity on shelter issues with expertise and resources. It has also brought the Federation more into the general humanitarian community. The latter is also the negative part since it has created tensions between the ICRC and the Federation (more in the beginning than later), can in some cases have put a question mark to the Federation's independence, and may also have created some issues between the Federation Secretariat and the National Societies that did not believe in this role for the Federation.' (Secretariat)*

- *'I would say [image is affected] positively. Although I don't consider that ICRC greatly appreciate the role – that is, the convenor role is OK but the association with the UN is not positively seen within ICRC.' (Delegation)*

- *'The Federation's role ... has positively affected perceptions about the technical competency of the Federation as a coordinator of humanitarian assistance. It has also contributed to positive perceptions about the IFRC's willingness to engage with non-Movement partners. [It] has created some ...potential negative perceptions about the linkages between the Federations' cluster coordination role and the shelter responses of National Societies – specifically the perception that the Federation can exercise control / compliance (rather than just influence) the shelter actions of ... National Societies.' (Secretariat)*

Two evaluations commissioned by DFID and published in March 2011 expressed somewhat conflicting attitudes to the Federation's Cluster role. The *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review* found 'this has not worked well' owing partly to the inherent difficulty of shelter programmes and to the length of cluster deployments but appears to view the Federation as the Cluster's sole lead agency. [85] The *Multilateral Aid Review* sees the Federation's 'positive lead in the Shelter Cluster' as one of its organisational strengths but appears to link this to intra-Movement partnership. [86]

Working together in the Cluster had clearly opened doors to further external collaboration by the Federation and its partners.

- *'This isn't a cluster project but... [the Federation] have got funding, whereas we've got the capacity and the management time... it's a joint interest... And actually, we do most of the management. We hire the consultants and stuff. We have a joint overview. We review the work together.' (NGO Cluster partner)*

- *'[We have] benefited in several areas: at a global level through joint programming with the IFRC; through the Shelter Cluster on the production of tools and guidelines, which has strengthened a relationship that has expanded to other areas of collaboration ... for example the World Urban Forum where IFRC has become a key contributor.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'... the team in IFRC is very solid ... Shelter departments of both agencies are close because of the cluster ... We are both working well together. Even if we closed the cluster today, we'd keep that running.' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

- *'This [Shelter Cluster role] helps a lot with making links e.g. with WFP, which has helped in other aspects of our work outside the Emergency Shelter Cluster, such as distributions.' (Delegation)*

- *'The Shelter Cluster is seen as well-run by UN, OCHA and governments (e.g. Nepal). I think this engagement has led us into the UNSDR process; Nepal's action plan with the World Bank ... The Shelter Cluster is one of the best.' (Zone)*

Some wished to know was what difference the Shelter Cluster and the humanitarian reform programme had made to disaster-affected populations, a concern of the IASC's first and second evaluations of the cluster approach and one to be addressed by the Federation's Haiti evaluation in 2011.[87]

- *' [The cluster] has to be matched with what's happening in the field. For example, in Pakistan there are 3m people displaced and 1m+ in camps. How much of what we have here [in the Cluster] gets to Pakistan? ... I'm going to be judged not on the basis of the number of meetings I've gone to. My and [our agency's] credibility relies on effectiveness and efficiency in the field. It has to be linked to the field. It's a challenge…' (UN/IO Cluster partner)*

3.6 'After-care'

The end of a project does not necessarily mean that the process of mainstreaming has been completed. On the contrary: experience teaches that mainstreaming usually just really gets going when the project approaches its end.[88]

As noted in Section 2, the Federation's experience with CAS is that a new initiative should avoid short time-frames. That too is the lesson of mainstreaming. It is also evident in the Federation's experience of initiating and hosting other inter-agency platforms. The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief, People In Aid, the Sphere Project, the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership and the Code of Good Practice for NGOs Responding to HIV/AIDS were all initiated by the Federation or its members, together with their NGO partners. All but one of these initiatives were also hosted by the Secretariat.

The lessons of such initiatives are that mainstreaming will require proportionate and increasing levels of financial and human resources for a period of longer than two years: both Sphere and People In Aid are now over ten years old. The IASC's humanitarian reform agenda has been more ambitious in terms of scope and speed than the joint Federation-NGO initiatives. Most of these have become independent entities with small staff teams yet remain engaged still in mainstreaming with partners and stakeholders.

Support for the IASC humanitarian reform agenda, however, is linked not only to Federation and partner values, but directly to the Federation's own strategy, operations, image and influence. There can be no 'firewall' at headquarters.

- *'I don't think anyone could have understood the commitment. The commitment is really big ... It's going to take decades - by which time there might be a new initiative.' (Zone)*

The IASC appeal, which struggled to meet the cost of global humanitarian reform activities in 2006-08, ceased after two years. Cluster lead agencies are, at the time of writing, expected to bear the costs of humanitarian reform 'after-care' and to include these in their regular funding appeals, as the Federation has done since the start. Donors have apparently offered no incentives. Ironically, though members have been reluctant to see the Federation draw close to the UN, they have not necessarily supported the inclusion of Shelter Coordination Team costs in Federation appeals though, as a former delegate saw it, the cost of coordination was small by comparison with the cost of shelter.

- *'Cost of coordination (meetings, etc.) are minimal – not even worth thinking about. Main costs would be salaries and I would be upset to hear if this is a bottleneck because in the grand scheme of things, these too are minimal. ... Studying the 3-4 most recent mega-disasters, the budget for shelter alone has accounted for 70%-75% of IFRC's total expenditure.' (Shelter Coordination Team member)*

The Federation's Finance Department in Geneva recommends that the costs of coordination are budgeted and accounted for under a separate project code.[89] The cost of Shelter Coordination Teams has been included in Emergency Appeals for disasters in 2009 in El Salvador (approximately 10% of total budget)[90] and in the Philippines and

Indonesia (Shelter Coordination Team costs not separately itemised by Zone).[91] Some in the Federation noted reluctance by donors to support shelter coordination but for one donor the challenge was clarity about costs.

- *'Externally barriers include funding – especially for preparedness ... It's also becoming more and more difficult for the global cluster to fund deployments. So there is lots of pressure to include the costs of the Shelter Coordination Team in the Country Appeal. Here we have to be careful because some donors don't want to fund clusters, but they do want to fund National Societies so this can affect funding opportunities for the National Society.' (Delegation)*

- *'Make more explicit to the donor community exactly what global shelter convenor means in terms of extra activities and costs at global and country level and how this is planned to be integrated into core business.' (Donor)*

The IFRC raised earmarked funds for Shelter Cluster coordination in Haiti separately from its operational appeal. Financial support for the initial six-months shelter coordination budget of CHF 2.07m came from the Netherlands Red Cross, the Japanese Government, the Swedish Red Cross, and DFID (via IOM and CARE)[92] with the balance met by the Canadian Red Cross.

Questions for the Federation as it considers whether and how to sustain its commitment to shelter coordination and/or the Shelter Cluster should properly include the impact on shelter programmes conducted by Federation members and partners. These questions lie outside the scope of the present review but were to be examined in the second phase of the IASC's evaluation of the cluster approach in 2010.

This evaluation included only one country (Myanmar) where the Federation had led the Shelter Cluster. The IASC evaluation team noted among limitations and difficulties in its overall review that:

> *Directly attributing changes in the situation of the affected population to improved humanitarian response and changes in humanitarian response to the cluster approach has proven difficult. Therefore, the evaluation cannot measure impact, but delineates the direct results and further effects of the cluster approach on humanitarian response.[93]*

At the time of writing, the Federation has followed its own external review of the Federation-led Shelter Cluster in Haiti with a second which seeks to evaluate the effects of shelter coordination on shelter delivery in that response.

The responsibilities set out in the Federation's MoU with OCHA have by default been borne largely by staff of the new Shelter Department. The Federation could have had few better advocates. Overall, it has emerged well, largely owing to the dedication of Shelter Department staff and Shelter Coordination Team members, supported by their Federation colleagues including many who did not necessarily understand or agree with its Shelter Cluster role.

That a vote on this commitment was won and a MoU signed is of less significance than the fact that neither act was an end in itself but, like 'sheltering', part of an evolving

process. Given the risks and challenges that remain for the Federation in both shelter operations and shelter coordination, and irrespective of any future Cluster role it may have, it is imperative that the Federation continues to listen to its members and to the ICRC, including to those individuals who do not agree with its role in coordination. It must also listen to the voices of affected communities, the ultimate beneficiaries of humanitarian reform.

Annex A

Cluster partners and attendance at global Shelter Cluster meetings

1. Shelter Cluster partners

Global cluster members in 2011 are

ACTED,
Archi-Urgent
Article 25
CARE UK
Catholic Relief Services
CHF International
Habitat for Humanity
IOM
Medair
Norwegian Refugee Council
Oxfam
ProAct
ProVention
RedR
Relief International

Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS)
Save the Children UK
Shelter Centre
Skat (Swiss Centre for Appropriate Technology)
UK Department for International Development (DFID)
UN Habitat
UN OCHA
UNRWA
US Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance
World Vision

2. Average attendance by agency representatives at global Shelter Cluster meetings, 2005-08

Year	UN/IOM representatives	Federation representatives	NGO representatives	Number of meetings in year
2005	12	1	1	7
2006	11	1	2	14
2007	10	2	4	7
2008	7	2	8	3

Source: data extracted from Archive and Minutes, accessed at
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Default.aspx?tabid=316

3. Participants at sample Cluster meetings 2005-2009

29 September 2005[f]	02 July 2008	24 April 2009[g]
Catholic Relief Service/ICVA	CHF International	CARE
IASC	Habitat for Humanity	CARE
IOM	ICRC	Catholic Relief Services
OCHA	IFRC	DFID
OCHA:	IFRC	Emergency Architecture
UNHCR	IFRC	Habitat for Humanity
UNHCR	IOM	ICRC
UNHCR	OCHA	IFRC
UNHCR	OCHA	IFRC
UNHCR	ProAct Network	IFRC
UNHCR	ProAct Network	IFRC
UNICEF:	ProAct Network	IOM
WFP	Shelter Centre	Medair
	Shelter Centre	Norwegian Mission to the UN
	UN Habitat	Norwegian Refugee Council
	UNHCR	Oxfam GB/Nepal
	UNHCR	ProAct Network
	UNHCR	ProAct Network
	UNRWA	RedR
	World Vision International	RedR
		Shelter Centre
		Shelter Centre
		SKAT
		UN-HABITAT
		UN-HABITAT (consultant)
		UNHCR
		UNHCR
		UN OCHA
		UN OCHA
		UNRWA
		World Vision
		World Vision

Source: data for 2005 and 2008 from Archive and Minutes, accessed at
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Default.aspx?tabid=316 ; 2009
data from List of Participants.

---

[f] First meeting minutes recorded
[g] Last attendance list available

Annex B

Federation and Shelter Cluster documents and web pages reviewed (indicative list)

Date	Subject	Originator	Description
Mar 2007	Transfer of Mozambique ESC to Early Recover Cluster	Shelter Coordination Team Mozambique	*Handover Agreement with UN Habitat*
Apr 2007	Mozambique Floods December 2006	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led Cluster deployment in 2006 (R Rana)*
May 2007	Philippines Typhoon Durian February 2007	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led Shelter Cluster deployment (R Rana)*
Jun 2007	Discussion on three deployments	Shelter Department	*Shelter Cluster field team members' meeting notes*
Jul 2007	Special Session on Pakistan Floods /Cyclone	Shelter Cluster	*Shelter Cluster minutes*
Jul 2007	SCT staff Islamabad	Shelter Department	*Field team staff funding agreement with CARE UK*
Aug 2007	Agreement to share role of ESC convener with UNHCR	Division of Operational Services	*Letter of Understanding*
August 2007	CAS: Guidelines and Toolkit for more effective operation	IFRC	*Manual on collaboration for National Societies*
September 2007	Cooperative Agreement Strategy and Operational Alliances	IFRC	*Brochure on collaboration for National Societies*
Nov 2007	Senior Officer in Shelter Department	Shelter Department	*Job description and person specification*
Nov 2007	Establishment of the Shelter Department in November 2006	IFRC	*Report of the Disaster Preparedness and Relief Commission to the General Assembly 2007*
Nov 2007	Global alliances	IFRC	*Presentation to PNS Information Meeting*
Nov 2007	SCT deployment Bangladesh	Shelter Department	*Circular*
Nov 2007	SCT staff Bangladesh	Shelter Department	*Field team funding agreement with CARE UK*
Dec 2007	Working together in international disasters	IFRC	*Draft manual for Federation*
Dec 2007	Pakistan Cyclone Yemyin Floods June 2007	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led cluster deployment (P Manfield)*
Dec 2007	SCT staff Bangladesh	Shelter Department	*Field team funding agreement with RedR Australia*

Dec 2007	SCT staff Bangladesh	Shelter Department	*Field team funding agreement with ACTED*
Dec 2007	Shelter shortfall in Bangladesh	Shelter Department	*Press release for SCT Bangladesh*
Jan 2008	Partnership guidelines for DRN Member Companies / ESC Collaboration	WFP	*Guidelines for Shelter Cluster*
Jan 2008	Transfer of ESC to Early Recover Cluster	SCT Bangladesh	*Handover Agreement signed with UN Habitat*
Jan 2008	Shelter Cluster Performance Management System	Shelter Department	*Field team performance management framework*
Feb 2008	ESC Survey 2007	Shelter Department	*Feedback and recommendations from field partner agencies*
April 2008	Uganda workshop	Shelter Cluster	*Field team training agenda*
April 2008	List of Federation networks and centres	IFRC	*Webpage list of [76] IFRC formal and informal networks*
May 2008	Federation's decision to lead SCT in Myanmar (Myanmar)	Secretary General	*Secretary General's letter to ERC*
May 2008	SCT staff Myanmar	Shelter Department	*Field team funding agreement with UN Habitat*
June	Future of cooperation and partnerships in disaster management	IFRC Deputy Secretary General	*Presentation to PNS Information Meeting, Geneva*
July 2008	Bangladesh Cyclone Sidr, November 2007	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led Shelter Cluster deployment (S Davidson)*
July 2008	Emergency Shelter Cluster Guidelines for Structuring Meetings	Shelter Department	*Guidelines for Field team*
Jul 2008	Clusters in Myanmar (Myanmar)	ERC	*Circular from ERC*
Jul 2008	Transfer of ESC to Early Recover Cluster	Shelter Coordination Team Myanmar (Myanmar)	*Handover Agreement signed with UN Habitat*
Jul 2008	ESC Survey 2008	Shelter Department	*Feedback and recommendations from field partner agencies*
Jul 2008	Information management workshop, Geneva	Shelter Department	*Field team training workshop*
Aug 2008	The International Federation's Shelter Coordination Role in Natural Disasters:	Shelter Department	*Standard Operating Procedures*

Aug 2008	ESC Coordinator's Cheat Sheets	Shelter Department	*Checklists for Field team*
Aug 2008	Global Shelter Programme	Shelter Department	*Programme update 01/01/08 – 30/06/08*
Sept 2008	Federation Shelter Coordination workshop	Shelter Department	*Workshop summary*
Sept 2008	Shelter Coordination: the Federation's role	Shelter Department	*Presentation*
Sept 2008	o Information Manager o Shelter Asst. Coordinator o Shelter Coordinator o Shelter recovery adviser o Shelter Technical Coordinator	Shelter Department	*Field team members' generic terms of reference*
Sept 2008	CAS and Operational Alliances	IFRC	*Lessons-learned conference report*
Oct 2008	Tajikistan Cold Wave February 2008	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led Shelter Cluster deployment (*T Foster)
Nov 2008	Transfer of ESC to Early Recover Cluster	Shelter Coordination Team Nepal	*Handover Agreement with UN Habitat*
Dec 2008	Operational Alliances	IFRC	*Collaboration manual for National Societies*
Dec 2008	Selecting NFIs for Shelter	Shelter Cluster	*Shelter Cluster publication (J Ashmore and T Corsellis)*
Dec 2008	Handbook for emergency shelter cluster co-ordination team training	Shelter Cluster	*Shelter Cluster draft publication*
2008	Shelter Projects 2008	UN Habitat	*Shelter Cluster publication (J Ashmore ed.)*
Jan 2009	Federation shelter operations and shelter coordination	Shelter Department	*Global shelter plan*
Jan 2009	Permanent cluster in Nepal	Shelter Department	*Report*
Mar 2009	The cluster process and the Federation's Shelter Cluster commitment	Shelter Department	*FAQs leaflet*
Mar 2009	Nepal Koshi Floods August 2008	Shelter Department	*External review of Federation-led Shelter Cluster deployment (J Kellett)*
Apr 2009	Philippines Red Cross Shelter Focal Person	IFRC Philippines Delegation	*Request to Geneva for national staff post member*
Apr 2009	Philippines Red Cross	WHO	*National Society team member terms of*

	Shelter Focal Person		*reference*
Apr 2009	Myanmar Cyclone Nargis, May 2008	Shelter Department	*Review of Federation-led Shelter Cluster deployment (J Alexander)*
June 2009	Shelter Programme Update		*Report 1 January to 30 June 2009*
August 2009	Bangladesh Cyclone Aila	Shelter Coordination Team Bangladesh	*Situation Report, Federation-led Shelter Cluster*
October 2009	Bangladesh Cyclone Aila	Shelter Department	*A Review of IFRC-led Emergency Shelter Coordination Group (S Walton-Ellery)*
Nov 2009	Leadership on shelter	IFRC	*General Assembly Agenda notes*
January 2011	Typhoon Ketsana, Philippines, 2009	Shelter Department	*Review on IFRC-convened shelter cluster (A Bains),*
April 2011	Haiti earthquake, 2010	Shelter Department	*A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster (S Davidson)*
Undated	Shelter Coordination Team Officer	Shelter Department	*Shelter Department job description and person specification*
Undated	Working partners	IFRC	*Webpage list of [30] IFRC Agreements with other organisations*
Undated	Partnerships and alliances	IFRC	*Webpage list of [5] national and global partnerships and alliances*
Undated	Movement Coordination Framework	IFRC	*Webpage and resources for movement coordination in major disasters*

Annex C

Review Informants

Michael Annear	IFRC Asia-Pacific
Lizzie Babister	CARE UK
Steve Barton	Shelter Coordination Team member / Australian Red Cross
Rick Bauer	Oxfam GB
Neil Baumann	Shelter Coordination Team member / Canadian Red Cross
Tiziana Bonzon	IFRC Geneva
Alan Bradbury	IFRC South-East Asia
Eelko Brouwer	Shelter Coordination Team member / Netherlands Red Cross
Xavier Castellanos	IFRC Americas
Matthew Cochrane	IFRC Southern Africa
Paul Conneally	IFRC Geneva
Tom Corsellis	Shelter Centre
Kate Crawford	Shelter Coordination Team member / CARE
Mark Cutts	OCHA
Pascal Desbiens	Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations
Umesh Prasad Dhakal	Nepal Red Cross
Graham Eastmond	Shelter Coordination Team member
Simon Eccleshall	IFRC Geneva
Hossam Elsharkawi	Norwegian Red Cross
Mario C. Flores	Habitat for Humanity International
Carmel Flynn	Australian Red Cross
Martin Gallagher	Permanent Mission of Ireland to the United Nations
Josse Gillijns	IFRC Geneva
Alessandro Giusti	ICRC
Francoise le Goff	IFRC Southern Africa
Irfan Hameed	Shelter Coordination Team member / Pakistan Red Crescent
Sayed Hashem	IFRC Geneva
Rod Imer	World Vision International
Rea Ivanek	IFRC Geneva
Christof Johnen	German Red Cross
Susan Johnson	Canadian Red Cross
Charles Kelly	ProAct
Ariel Kestens	IFRC PADRU
Rachel Lavy	Department for International Development
Esteban Leon	UN Habitat
Lucien Lefcourt	Shelter Coordination Team member
Dan Lewis	UN Habitat
Jamie McGoldrick	OCHA
Sajjad Malik	UNHCR
Lorraine Mangwiro	IFRC Geneva
Robert Mister	IFRC Geneva
Elyse Mosquini	IFRC Geneva

Flemming Nielsen	IFRC Geneva
Ivana Mrdja Nikolic	IFRC Geneva
Øyvind Nordlie	Norwegian Refugee Council
Aoibheann O'Keeffe	OCHA
Birgitte Olsen	IFRC Geneva
Robert Piper	UNDP Nepal
Hanns Polak	Swiss Red Cross
Leon Prop	IFRC Europe
Jyri Rantanen	Shelter Coordination Team member/ Finnish Red Cross
Peter Rees	IFRC Geneva
Udaya Regmi	IFRC Bangladesh
Andrea Reisinger	IFRC Nepal
Francois Renaud	Shelter Coordination Team member / UNHCR
Pieter De Rijke	IFRC Geneva
Pepe Salmela	IFRC Pakistan
Rocio Sanz	International Organisation for Migration
Graham Saunders	IFRC Geneva
Selvaratnam Sinnadurai	IFRC Philippines
Christine South	IFRC Geneva
Fernanda Teixeira	Mozambique Red Cross Society
Miguel Urquia	IFRC Geneva
Jan-Willem Wegdam	Shelter Coordination Team member / Netherlands Red Cross

Annex D

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:5px; text-align:center;">Generic Terms of Reference for Sector/Cluster Leads at the Country Level</div>

The Cluster Approach operates at two levels. At the global level, the aim is to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to humanitarian emergencies by designating global Cluster Leads and ensuring that there is predictable leadership and accountability in all the main sectors or areas of activity. At the country level, the aim is to ensure a more coherent and effective response by mobilizing groups of agencies, organizations and NGOs to respond in a strategic manner across all key sectors or areas of activity, each sector having a clearly designated lead, as agreed by the Humanitarian Coordinator and the Humanitarian Country Team. (To enhance predictability, where possible this should be in line with the lead agency arrangements at the global level.)

The Humanitarian Coordinator – with the support of OCHA – retains responsibility for ensuring the adequacy, coherence and effectiveness of the overall humanitarian response and is accountable to the Emergency Relief Coordinator.

Sector/cluster leads at the country level are accountable to the Humanitarian Coordinator for facilitating a process at the sectoral level aimed at ensuring the following:

Inclusion of key humanitarian partners
- Ensure inclusion of key humanitarian partners for the sector, respecting their respective mandates and programme priorities

Establishment and maintenance of appropriate humanitarian coordination mechanisms
- Ensure appropriate coordination with all humanitarian partners (including national and international NGOs, the International Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, IOM and other international organizations), through establishment/maintenance of appropriate sectoral coordination mechanisms, including working groups at the national and, if necessary, local level;
- Secure commitments from humanitarian partners in responding to needs and filling gaps, ensuring an appropriate distribution of responsibilities within the sectoral group, with clearly defined focal points for specific issues where necessary;
- Ensure the complementarity of different humanitarian actors' actions;
- Promote emergency response actions while at the same time considering the need for early recovery planning as well as prevention and risk reduction concerns;
- Ensure effective links with other sectoral groups;
- Ensure that sectoral coordination mechanisms are adapted over time to reflect the capacities of local actors and the engagement of development partners;
- Represent the interests of the sectoral group in discussions with the Humanitarian Coordinator and other stakeholders on prioritization, resource mobilization and advocacy;

Coordination with national/local authorities, State institutions, local civil society and other relevant actors
- Ensure that humanitarian responses build on local capacities;

- Ensure appropriate links with national and local authorities, State institutions, local civil society and other relevant actors (e.g. peacekeeping forces) and ensure appropriate coordination and information exchange with them.

Participatory and community-based approaches
- Ensure utilization of participatory and community based approaches in sectoral needs assessment, analysis, planning, monitoring and response.

Attention to priority cross-cutting issues
- Ensure integration of agreed priority cross-cutting issues in sectoral needs assessment, analysis, planning, monitoring and response (e.g. age, diversity, environment, gender, HIV/AIDS and human rights); contribute to the development of appropriate strategies to address these issues; ensure gender-sensitive programming and promote gender equality; ensure that the needs, contributions and capacities of women and girls as well as men and boys are addressed;

Needs assessment and analysis
- Ensure effective and coherent sectoral needs assessment and analysis, involving all relevant partners

Emergency preparedness
- Ensure adequate contingency planning and preparedness for new emergencies;

Planning and strategy development
Ensure predictable action within the sectoral group for the following:
- Identification of gaps;
- Developing/updating agreed response strategies and action plans for the sector and ensuring that these are adequately reflected in overall country strategies, such as the Common Humanitarian Action Plan (CHAP);
- Drawing lessons learned from past activities and revising strategies accordingly;
- Developing an exit, or transition, strategy for the sectoral group.

Application of standards
- Ensure that sectoral group participants are aware of relevant policy guidelines, technical standards and relevant commitments that the Government has undertaken under international human rights law;
- Ensure that responses are in line with existing policy guidance, technical standards, and relevant Government human rights legal obligations.

Monitoring and reporting
- Ensure adequate monitoring mechanisms are in place to review impact of the sectoral working group and progress against implementation plans;
- Ensure adequate reporting and effective information sharing (with OCHA support), with due regard for age and sex disaggregation.

Advocacy and resource mobilization
- Identify core advocacy concerns, including resource requirements, and contribute key messages to broader advocacy initiatives of the HC and other actors;

- Advocate for donors to fund humanitarian actors to carry out priority activities in the sector concerned, while at the same time encouraging sectoral group participants to mobilize resources for their activities through their usual channels.

Training and capacity building
- Promote/support training of staff and capacity building of humanitarian partners;
- Support efforts to strengthen the capacity of the national authorities and civil society.

Provision of assistance or services as a last resort
- As agreed by the IASC Principals, sector leads are responsible for acting as the provider of last resort (subject to access, security and availability of funding) to meet agreed priority needs and will be supported by the HC and the ERC in their resource mobilization efforts in this regard.
- This concept is to be applied in an appropriate and realistic manner for cross-cutting issues such as protection, early recovery and camp coordination.

Humanitarian actors who participate in the development of common humanitarian action plans are expected to be proactive partners in assessing needs, developing strategies and plans for the sector, and implementing agreed priority activities. Provisions should also be made in sectoral groups for those humanitarian actors who may wish to participate as observers, mainly for information-sharing purposes.

Accessed at
http://www.humanitarianreform.org/humanitarianreform/Portals/1/cluster%20approach%20page/Generic%20Terms%20of%20Reference%20for%20Sector.doc

Annex E

+C International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

TERMS OF REFERENCE

REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION'S
SHELTER CLUSTER COMMITMENT

Background

At the General Assembly in Seoul in 2005 the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies decided "to take up a leadership role in the provision of emergency shelter in natural disasters, on the basis of the conditions established by the Governing Board and an agreement to be negotiated by the Secretary General and to be ratified by the Governing Board".

This agreement, in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the International Federation and UNOCHA, was signed in September 2006 by the International Federation's Secretary General and the Emergency Relief Coordinator on behalf of UNOCHA, and ratified by the Governing Board of the International Federation.

Key commitments by the International Federation as defined by the MoU in support of the Inter Agency Standing Commission efforts to strengthen humanitarian response include:

1. Scaling up the operational capacity of the International Federation in emergency shelter.
2. Supporting enhanced preparedness in emergency shelter at a global level.
3. Coordinating the provision of emergency shelter assistance at country level after natural disaster.

The MoU recognizes the unique nature of the International Federation and respect for the Principles of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, notably the Principle of Independence. In this regard, the International Federation seeks financial support for its responsibilities under the terms of the MoU through its existing appeal mechanisms and in particular a dedicated Global Shelter Programme.

The commitments under items 2 & 3 above are reflected by the agreement of the International Federation to take on the role of convener of the shelter cluster at the global level and at country level as appropriate. This role is as defined in the IASC Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach (November 2006) which outlines the responsibilities of global cluster leads, sector/cluster leadership at country level, and the application of the cluster approach in both contingency planning for and in the event of major new emergencies.

In meeting this commitment, the International Federation with the support of its membership has accomplished the following:

- Established a Shelter Department within the Geneva Secretariat, with responsibilities within all staff for supporting the shelter commitment of the International Federation.
- Co-led the Global Shelter Cluster with UNHCR (the lead for shelter in conflict situations), including the oversight of Global Shelter Cluster preparedness activities (training, tools development etc.) and the convening of the cluster.
- Convened the shelter cluster at country level in response to the following natural disasters: Yogyakarta earthquake, Indonesia, 2006; Philippines typhoons, 2006-2007; Mozambique cyclone and floods, 2007; Pakistan floods, 2007; Bangladesh cyclone, 2007; Tajikistan cold wave emergency, 2008; Myanmar cyclone 2008; Nepal floods, 2008; Pakistan earthquake 2008.
- Developed standard operating procedures for convening the shelter cluster in rapid onset natural disasters in the form of a Shelter Coordination Team (SCT) with standardised terms of reference and the inclusion of representatives from cluster partner organisations.
- Supported the requirement for the convening of the shelter cluster at country level to undertake contingency planning and preparedness, through the awareness raising with relevant National Societies and the development of tools.
- Provided training for coordination team members – Movement and cluster partners - and coordination refection workshops.
- Developed a Shelter Coordination Toolkit which has been regularly revised.
- Commissioned independent reviews following each emergency that has required the International Federation to convene the shelter cluster.
- Initiated in country analyses of the shelter cluster contingency planning responsibilities in Nepal and the Philippines, and supported National Society leadership of this component of the Federation's shelter cluster commitment in Kyrgyzstan.
- Supported UNOCHA and IASC partners in raising awareness of the humanitarian reform process at global, regional and country level through actively participating in workshops and meetings, contributing to the development of common cluster tools, and engagement in working groups and task forces as appropriate.
- Mainstreamed the cluster roles and responsibilities within the International Federation's working modalities and funding raising mechanism as requested by the donors and agreed to by all cluster lead agencies.

The overall goal of the cluster approach, as defined by the IASC, is on

"…..**improving the effectiveness of humanitarian response** by ensuring **greater predictability and accountability**, while at the same time **strengthening partnerships** between NGOs, international organizations, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and UN agencies."

The cluster role is a new and additional responsibility for all cluster lead agencies, and a particular challenge for those lead agencies that are not part of the UN family. The humanitarian reform process is still a work in progress, with lack of awareness, understanding or recognition within both the UN and non-UN agencies despite many of the positive benefits that have been reflected in both the IASC cluster evaluations,

independent reviews and real-time evaluations and anecdotal feedback from recent emergencies.

The International Federation has embraced its cluster commitment at the global and country levels with the active engagement of National Societies subject to interest and resources. It has also engaged with interested partner agencies at the global level in addressing preparedness issues and with many of these partners at country level to enable appropriate coordination of shelter response activities. This commitment has expectations from cluster partners and donors, and demands on the International Federation, its membership and its resources. The Federation's cluster role is part of the humanitarian reform process, which is dependent on the active support and engagement of the humanitarian community including the UN system and the NGO sector as well as the donor community.

It is therefore timely to review and solicit feedback on extent to which the Federation has or is meetings its cluster commitment, how this relates to the overall progress on humanitarian reform and the contributions of all partners including the donor community, how the wider membership of the Federation has contributed to the cluster commitment and the impact of the commitment on the membership itself.

Key tasks

This consultancy will inform the International Federation's understanding and potential next steps with the National Societies, cluster partners, donors and others as appropriate by reviewing and providing recommendations on the following themes regarding its cluster commitment:

a) **Overall progress:** Progress against the formal cluster commitments of the International Federation and the expectations of cluster partners, donors and other stakeholders;
b) **Impact:** The benefits or otherwise of the International Federation's cluster role at global and country level to both cluster partners and the provision of shelter to affected households;
c) **Service provision:** Possible changes and improvements in the service provided by the International Federation;
d) **Partners:** The contributions of partners, donors and others to the overall cluster role at global and country level;
e) **Movement:** The impact on the Movement of the International Federation's cluster role;
f) **Mainstreaming:** The extent to which the International Federation has mainstreamed the cluster role through formalised operational methodologies, responsibilities and procedures.
g) **Resources:** The resource requirements to enable the International Federation meet the cluster commitment at global, regional and country level.

With regard to these themes, the review should consider the following issues:

a) **Overall progress:**

What progress has the International Federation made against its formal responsibilities as articulated in the relevant cluster guidance notes and terms of reference, in the following areas:

- Global level responsibilities, including:
  - Establishing a broad partnership base in accordance with the focus of the cluster on improving humanitarian response at field level.
  - Coordinating standards and policy setting, including the consolidation and dissemination of standards and where necessary, the development of standards and policies and the identification of 'best practice'.
  - Coordinating the building of response capacity, including:
    - training and system development at the local, national, regional and international levels;
    - establishing and maintaining surge capacity and standby rosters;
    - establishing and maintaining material stockpiles.
  - Coordinating the support for operations, including:
    - assessment of needs for human, financial and institutional capacity;
    - emergency preparedness and long term planning;
    - securing access to appropriate technical expertise;
    - advocacy and resource mobilization;
    - pooling resources and ensuring complementarity of efforts through enhanced partnerships
- Country level responsibilities during a rapid onset natural disaster, with an initial focus on:
  - The inclusion of key humanitarian partners and the promotion and coordination of the following:
    - establishment and maintenance of appropriate humanitarian coordination mechanisms.
    - coordination with national/local authorities, State institutions, local civil society and other relevant actors.
    - participatory and community-based approaches.
    - attention to priority cross-cutting issues (e.g. age, diversity, environment, gender, HIV/AIDS and human rights).
    - needs assessment and analysis.
    - emergency preparedness.
    - planning and strategy development.
    - application of standards.
    - monitoring and reporting.
    - advocacy and resource mobilization.
    - training and capacity building.
    - provision of assistance or services as a last resort
- Strengthening partnerships and complementarity amongst humanitarian actors.
- Ensuring appropriate links with Government/local authorities, State institutions, local civil society and other stakeholders.
- Appropriate accountability to the humanitarian system – in country and at global level.

- Addressing the needs for assistance, services and the required advocacy with regard to the concept of "provider of last resort".
- Rationalising meetings.
- Linkages with OCHA at country, regional and global level.
- In addition, although not defined in the formal ToRs, developing appropriate handover procedures to other agencies to coordinate the transition/recovery phase.

b) Impact:

What impact has the International Federation made through its cluster lead role in the following areas:

- At the global level through its co-leadership of the Global Shelter Cluster in the following areas:
    o The structure, role and business processes of the Global Shelter Cluster (incl. projectisation of the original workplan; meetings format, content and facilitation; consultation process; thematic reference groups etc.).
    o Engagement of leading shelter agencies.
    o Initiation of key preparedness, operational and accountability systems and procedures including coordination training, the development of a shelter coordination toolkit, the development of defined information management capacity and tools, performance management systems and regular review mechanisms.
    o Representation of the cluster in Global Cluster Lead meetings, cluster donor meetings etc.
    o Humanitarian reform processes and awareness raising including tool development, humanitarian action training etc.
    o Support for informed use of the cluster approach at country level through engagement with UNOCHA in Geneva and New York and with other cluster lead agencies.
    o Support and engagement with collaborative intercluster initiatives and other cluster lead agencies.
    o Oversight of financial contribution to global cluster initiatives and advocacy with donors on behalf of the cluster.
    o Promoting framework agreements with key cluster partners to clarify commitments and to provide greater predictability and preparedness.
    o Advocating for greater definition of the shelter and settlement sector within the cluster approach and an inclusive shelter cluster, in consultation with UNOCHA, the Early Recovery and Camp Coordination & Camp Management clusters.
    o Development of communication tools and awareness raising on the cluster commitment within the membership of the International Federation.
- At the country level on the working of the country level shelter cluster in rapid onset natural disasters in the following areas:
    o Rapid provision of dedicated shelter coordination services in emergencies.
    o Development of a clearly defined shelter coordination methodology to provide the required predictability and preparedness.

- o Inclusion of cluster partners in country level shelter coordination teams and the development of standardised deployment and funding arrangements to provide predictability and preparedness.
- o Establishment of country level communication tools for the cluster including Google Groups and common information tools.
- o Development of standard cluster operating methodologies including Strategic Advisory Groups, Technical Working Groups, and the use of standardised templates for operational frameworks and strategies.
- o Integration of early recovery through the inclusion of dedicated shelter recovery advisors from the outset.
- o Inclusion of dedicated support for key and cross cutting issues including environment through the support and commissioning of dedicated environmental advisors and proposed housing, land and property rights advisors.
- o Defined coordination timeframes, with target handover dates and the development of standardised handover procedures.
- o Flexible handover including the provision of overlapping support for the incoming coordinating agency.
- At country level on the meeting of shelter needs of affected populations in the following areas:
    - o Advocating for greater attention to UN RC countries and awareness raising on humanitarian reform.
    - o Supporting pilot studies in key multi-hazard prone countries where permanent clusters have been proposed to develop an appropriate operating model for the International Federation – National Societies and Secretariat.
    - o Active engagement at country level to initiate and support cluster-based sector preparedness, including support for meetings and activities and the development of appropriate tools.

c) Service provision:
What has been the level of service provided by the International Federation through its role as shelter cluster convener in the following areas:
- At the global level as co-lead of the Global Shelter cluster to the following partners and stakeholders:
    - o UNHCR as co-lead of the global cluster.
    - o Operational shelter agencies within the global cluster – UN and NGOs.
    - o Service providing agencies within the global cluster.
    - o Research institutes, representatives of professional bodies and the private sector.
    - o UNOCHA in its role as intercluster coordinator.
    - o Donors.
    - o Interested National Societies.
    - o ICRC.
    - o Zone and regional representations.
    - o Other Geneva Secretariat departments.
    - o Senior management within the International Federation and Governance.

- To country level clusters where IFRC is NOT the cluster convener, for example in conflict situations or where another agency is designated shelter cluster lead.
- At the country level in rapid onset natural disasters as convener of the in country shelter cluster to the following partners and stakeholders:
  - Host Governments.
  - UN HCs & RCs.
  - Operational shelter agencies within the cluster – UN and NGOs both international and national.
  - Service agencies.
  - The International Federation as an operational shelter agency and PNS.
  - Host National Societies as operational shelter agencies.
  - Research institutes, representatives of professional bodies and the private sector.
  - UNOCHA in its role as intercluster coordinator.
  - Donors.
  - ICRC.
  - Zone and regional representations.
  - Other Geneva Secretariat departments.
  - Senior management within the International Federation and Governance.
  - To agencies to whom IFRC handover the coordination role for the transition/recovery phase.
- At the country level, in countries vulnerable to rapid onset natural disasters, as convener of the in country shelter cluster to address sector-based interagency contingency planning and preparedness to the following partners and stakeholders:
  - Host Governments and established sector coordination mechanisms.
  - UN HCs & RCs.
  - Host National Societies.
  - Operational shelter agencies within the cluster/sector group – UN and NGOs both international and national.
  - Service agencies.
  - PNS present in country..
  - Research institutes, representatives of professional bodies and the private sector.
  - Donors.
  - ICRC.
  - Zone and regional representations.
  - Other Geneva Secretariat departments.
  - Senior management within the International Federation and Governance.

d) **Partners:**
   What have been the contributions of the following cluster partners, IASC agencies, donors and others to the work of the cluster at global and country level and how has this impacted or otherwise on the role of the International Federation:
   - Global Shelter Cluster co-lead for conflict situations – UNHCR, regarding:

- o The structure, role and business processes of the Global Shelter Cluster.
  - o Engagement of leading shelter agencies.
  - o Identification of, support for and leadership of key global cluster initiatives.
  - o Development of clear operating models for convening the cluster in conflict situations.
  - o Support for the inclusion of cluster partners in preparedness activities and country level coordination.
  - o Flexible financial support to maintain the activities of the global cluster.
  - o Clear institutional commitment to prioritise global shelter cluster responsibilities.
  - o Dedicated and responsive capacity to providing the ongoing leadership of global cluster activities and business processes.
  - o Commitment to meeting the obligations under the terms of the Letter of Understanding with the International Federation regarding the cluster responsibilities.
- Shelter sector agencies and related institutions, regarding:
  - o Clear and consistent commitment to support global cluster preparedness activities.
  - o Active engagement on agreed global cluster initiatives, and the promotion of these activities at country level.
  - o Active engagement at country level in participating in and supporting country level clusters, including involvement in cluster working groups and providing capacity for the coordination team.
  - o Support for the required predictability through framework agreements with the global cluster leads.
  - o Supporting and contributing to related activities to improve capacity, resources and the standardisation of systems and procedures where appropriate.
- The United Nations system and the interagency support and coordinating bodies, regarding:
  - o Support from UNOCHA (Geneva, New York and regional offices) to promote a consistent understanding and adoption of humanitarian reform, the cluster approach, and the role of cluster partners in particular the International Federation.
  - o Support by the UN system for the principle of partnership which underpins humanitarian reform, and the implicit engagement with understanding and working with the different UN partners and their differing mandates and structures.
  - o Support and promotion of interagency coordination at global, regional and country level, in particular across clusters and between cluster lead agencies.
- Other partners, including professional institutions and the private sector, regarding:
  - o Involvement of professional institutes to improve the technical application of the sector and engagement as appropriate with governmental processes and procedures.

- o Involvement with the private construction sector through representative bodies e.g. WEF/DRN to addresses issues of human resource capacity and technical expertise in response activities.

e) Movement:

What has been the impact on the following components of the Movement and Movement structures of the International Federation's cluster role at global and country level, and how has the International Federation's membership contributed to meeting this commitment:

- Host National Societies where the International Federation has convened the in country shelter cluster.
- Host National Societies where the International Federation is expected to convene the shelter sector to address contingency planning and preparedness.
- Partner National Societies, who have contributed to the International Federation's shelter cluster role or who have been operational in countries where the International Federation has convened the shelter cluster.
- ICRC at the global level regarding both interagency and Movement coordination.
- ICRC at the country level where the International Federation has convened the in country shelter cluster.
- Zone and regional representations.
- Other departments within the Geneva Secretariat.
- The Shelter Department within the Geneva Secretariat.

f) Mainstreaming:

To what extent has the International Federation mainstreamed the cluster role in accordance with the expectations on all global clusters, and in the following areas:

- Responsibilities and accountabilities:
  - o Global cluster lead representational responsibilities, support for global cluster activities including capacity building, and support for in country coordination.
  - o Zone, regional and country level responsibilities for awareness raising amongst National Societies, UN agencies and cluster partners and in supporting cluster-related capacity building and in country coordination.
  - o Support from the National Societies, in particular Participating National Societies, in resourcing the cluster role in particular in country cluster coordination teams and global level cluster responsibilities including financial resource mobilisation with back donors.
- Standardised operating procedures, capacity development and maintenance, monitoring and evaluation:
  - o Development of standard operating procedures.
  - o Development of standardised in country cluster modalities, with appropriately defined management and accountabilities.
  - o Structured capacity building, maintenance and review.
  - o Standardised monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and the application of recommendations.

- Financial resource mobilisation for the International Federation and the cluster:
  - Incorporation of financial resource mobilisation mechanisms within established International Federation funding raising mechanisms.
  - Standardised narrative and financial reporting in accordance with established International Federation mechanisms on cluster funding received.

g) Resources:
How and to what extent has the International Federation resourced its shelter cluster role in the following areas, what are the recommendations regarding appropriate resource requirements – human, financial, technical, support services – and at global, Zone and country level:
- Convening the global cluster, and supporting global cluster activities.
- Convening the country level cluster in rapid onset natural disasters.
- Convening the country level cluster to coordinate sector-based contingency planning and preparedness.

Methodology

This consultancy should focus primarily on interviews with key informants and reference to reports, evaluations, tools, material available on interagency and cluster related websites, and other information that can be sourced by the consultants or as advised by key informants.

Structured interviews are not required – the consultants can determine their preferred methodology to ensure that the review is comprehensive and that resulting recommendations are provided with substantive supportive information.

A formal meeting in Geneva with key informants from the International Federation is required at the outset of this review, and a second meeting following the submission of the first draft. These Geneva meetings, in particular the first meeting, will also provide opportunities for meetings with other Geneva-based key informants, in particular with UNOCHA.

A formal presentation of the final report and key findings at the IFRC Geneva Secretariat is also required.

The consultants, through the team leader, should keep the IFRC Head, Shelter Department, regularly informed of progress and key issues arising that may require additional direction or suggestions for other key informants or reference material.

Proposed resources and key informants

Suggested resources include:
- IFRC General Assembly 2005 decision on shelter.
- IFRC-UNOCHA Memorandum of Understanding.
- IFRC Global Shelter Programme.

- IASC cluster guidance note and generic terms of reference, operational guidance notes and related standard operating procedures.
- IASC draft terms of reference for in country leads.
- IASC cluster evaluation.
- IFRC cluster FAQ booklet.
- IFRC shelter coordination toolkit.
- IFRC independent reviews of Shelter Coordination Team deployments.
- Global Cluster Lead summary reports to cluster donors.
- Real Time Evaluations of specific emergencies.
- IFRC Shelter Coordination Team end of mission reports.
- IFRC coordination workshop summary of outputs.
- Global cluster leads retreat – outputs.
- Global Shelter Cluster workplan and key project documents.
- Global Shelter Cluster strategy documents and summary of operating model including 2007-2008 projectisation and 2009 thematic reference groups.
- Standard terms of reference for IFRC Shelter Coordination Team personnel.
- Global Shelter Cluster training schedule, training modules and roster.
- Global Shelter Cluster Performance Management System and outputs.
- Global Shelter Cluster consultation project – outputs and follow-up.
- IFRC-UNHCR Letter of Understanding.
- IFRC standard handover process documents.
- UNHCR cluster summary operating model – to be advised by UNHCR.
- Global Shelter Cluster advocacy and media messages on specific emergencies.
- Formal notification by UN ERC to Global Cluster Leads on activation of cluster approach in specific rapid onset emergencies.
- Correspondence between IFRC as global cluster lead and in country cluster lead where not IFRC.
- Summary documentation on Humanitarian Country Teams.
- Global Humanitarian Platform Principles of Partnership.

Suggested key informants include:
- IFRC Geneva senior management
- IFRC Geneva Shelter Department
- IFRC Geneva Secretariat – incl. Operations Coordination, Interagency Coordination, Movement Cooperation, Legal, Finance, Risk Management, Resource Mobilisation, Logistics, Relief & Recovery, Communications and Media.
- IFRC zone and regional representatives.
- IFRC New York
- IFRC Heads of Operations.
- Members of IFRC-led Shelter Coordination Teams – IFRC personnel and personnel from partner agencies.
- Participating National Societies
- ICRC Geneva incl. WatHab Unit & Multilateral Diplomacy & Humanitarian Coordination Unit
- ICRC country delegations where the cluster approach has been applied for natural disasters
- Host National Societies in countries where IFRC Shelter Coordination Teams have been deployed.

- Host National Societies in countries where IFRC is expected to coordination shelter contingency planning and preparedness
- UNOCHA Geneva
- UNOCHA New York
- UNOCHA regional offices
- UNHCR – as global shelter cluster co-lead
- UNHCR regional/country offices where IFRC has collaborated in the cluster role.
- UN Habitat – Geneva, Nairobi and select counties where IFRC has handed over to UN Habitat
- Global Shelter Cluster partner agencies – UN, NGOs, service agencies.
- Other Global Cluster Lead agencies in particular CCCM, WASH and Early Recovery
- IASC Task Force representatives incl. Information Management.
- Cluster donors – global and regional
- Independent shelter sector technical advisors
- In country cluster partner representatives
- In country host Government representatives

Profile of consultancy team

The primary consultants should be independents without formal affiliation to IFRC, global cluster partners or UNOCHA. Complementary input from the perspective of the Movement may be sought through the inclusion of a team member with experience of the Movement and the IFRC cluster role.

The consultants should be familiar with the humanitarian reform process and in particular the cluster approach, through involvement in country level clusters, global cluster activities (shelter or other), and participation in previous country level reviews of evaluation. One member of the team will be nominated as team leader by IFRC with responsibility for overseeing the final drafting of the written report and its submission.

Expected outputs/deliverables

A written report, structured around the thematic issues as identified in the key tasks but this can be modified to reflect the issues emerging from the review as appropriate. The report should comprise an executive summary including a summary of key recommendations on the thematic issues; a concise series of detailed observations and recommendations; and a complementary annex with consolidated substantiation of the issues identified.

All comments in the body of the report will be unattributed, and key informants should be made aware of this. In the annex, issues should be attributed to the type of agency the informant or information providing the opinion, for example Red Cross Red Crescent National Society, UN agency, global cluster partner NGO, donor etc. A list of key informants contributing to the review and their roles and responsibilities should also be included.

Timeframe

The final version of the report as approved by IFRC is to be submitted at the latest by September 30th. However, an earlier submission date is acceptable.

The consultants can structure the required interviews and analysis as they prefer around the availability of the key informants and workload as appropriate. The team leader is responsible for overseeing the work planning of the team to ensure the required interviews, analysis and reporting drafting, as well as feedback to IFRC, can be accomplished.

Annex F

Select bibliography

Web references correct at 31.08.2011

Adinolfi, C., et al., (2005), *Humanitarian Response Review,* United Nations

Alexander, J., (2009), *Emergency Shelter Cluster Review Cyclone Nargis, Myanmar*

Ashdown, P. et al., (2011), *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review*, Humanitarian Emergency Response Review

Bains, A., (2011) *Review on IFRC-convened shelter cluster,* Typhoon Ketsana, Philippines, 2009

Corsellis, T., (2009) Rapid onset disasters, the aid community and shelter responses, Oxford Brookes University, power point

Davidson, S., (2011), *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

Department for International Development, (2011), Multilateral Aid Review, Department for International Development

Fisher, M., et al., June 2010, *The Haiti Earthquake Operation: Real Time Evaluation for the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*

Foster, T., (2008), *Review of the Tajikistan Cold Wave Response Shelter and NFI Working Group in Tajikistan*

Graves, S., et al., (2007), *Lost in translation: Managing coordination and leadership reform in the humanitarian system*, HPG Policy Brief 27

Houghton, R., (2007), *Surge Capacity in the Humanitarian Relief and Development Sector*, People In Aid

IFRC and HelpAge, (2011), IFRC and HelpAge, (2011), International Guidance on including older people in emergency shelter programmes

IFRC, (2011), Mid-*Year Report, Shelter and Settlements*, MAA00019, 11 August 2011

IFRC, (2010), *Mid-Year Report, Shelter and Settlements*, MAA00019, 6 August 2010

IFRC, (2009), *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment*

IFRC, (2008), *Report 2006-07, Global Shelter Programme*

IFRC, (2008), *Global Shelter Programme Plan 2009/2010*

IFRC, (2008), *Shelter: Beyond Tents and Tarpaulins*

IFRC, (2007), *Handbook for coordination: Working together in international disaster response* (internal)

IFRC, (2007), *Disaster Response and Contingency Planning Guide* (internal)

IFRC, (2007), *CAS Guidelines and Toolkit for more effective cooperation* (internal)

IFRC, (2006), *Global Shelter Programme Plan 2007/2008*

IFRC-UNOCHA Memorandum of Understanding, signed September 19th 2006

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 15th Session of the General Assembly, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 11-14 November 2005, Decision Sheet,

IFRC, (1997), *Development Cooperation Policy*

Kauffmann, D and Krüger, S, (2010), *Myanmar, IASC Cluster Approach Evaluation, 2nd Country Study,* April 2010, Groupe URD and GPPI

John S. Oakland, (2004), *Oakland on Quality Management*, Elsevier, Oxford

Mowjee, T., et al., (2009), October 2009, *Synthesis Report Review of the engagement of NGOs with the humanitarian reform process*, The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, ICVA

Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, March 2001, Supporting gender mainstreaming, accessed at http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/report.pdf

Penrose, A., (2000), *Partnerships in Managing Development: Understanding Inter-organisational relationships*, SAGE, London

Research voor Beleid, (2008), *"Selling" innovations: manual for mainstreaming project results*, SZW - Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, accessed at http://equal.orangeworlds.com/system/files/SellingInnovations_ManualMainstreaming.pdf

Steets, J. et al. (2010), *Cluster Approach Evaluation 2 Synthesis Report, Groupe URD and GPPI*

Stoddard, A. et al., (2007), *Cluster Approach Evaluation Report*, OCHA

Stoddard, A., (2003), *Humanitarian NGOs: challenges and trends*, HPG Briefing, No. 12, July 2003, ODI, London

The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, (2009), *Synthesis Report Review of the Engagement of NGOs with the Humanitarian Reform Process*

UNDP, (September 2000), Gender Mainstreaming (draft), accessed at
http://www.gdrc.org/gender/mainstreaming/8-Mainstreaming.doc

United Nations, (2009), *Report on Implementation of Global Capacity Building, 1 April 2007-31 March 2008,*

United Nations, (2007), *Report on Implementation of Global Capacity Building, 1 April 2006-31 March 2007*

Ververs M., July 2009, *Review, lessons learnt and recommendations on the use of products developed by the Global Nutrition Cluster*, accessed at
http://oneresponse.info/GlobalClusters/Nutrition/publicdocuments/Review%20GNC%20Products%20and%20Tools.pdf

Walton-Ellery, S., 2009, A Review of the Cyclone Aila Response 2009 IFRC-led Emergency Shelter Coordination Group

Endnotes

Web references correct at 31.08.2011

[1] International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, 15th Session of the General Assembly, Seoul, Republic of Korea, 11-14 November 2005, Decision Sheet

[2] IFRC-UNOCHA Memorandum of Understanding, signed September 19th 2006

[3] C. Adinolfi et al., 2005, *Humanitarian Response Review*, United Nations

[4] IFRC, October 2008, *Shelter: Beyond Tents and Tarpaulins*

[5] IFRC, *Global Shelter Programme Plan 2009/2010*, p 5

[6] Corsellis, T., 2009, Rapid onset disasters, the aid community and shelter responses, Oxford Brookes University, presentation

[7] IFRC, 1997, *Development Cooperation Policy*, objectives, pp 1-2

[8] IFRC-UNOCHA Memorandum of Understanding, signed September 19th 2006

[9] IFRC, *Global Shelter Programme Plan 2009/2010*, p 5

[10] IFRC, *Global Shelter Programme Plan 2009/2010*, p 14

[11] Corsellis, T., 2009, Rapid onset disasters, the aid community and shelter responses, Oxford Brookes University, presentation

[12] IFRC, 2007, *Handbook for coordination: Working together in international disaster response*, pp 8-10; 37 (internal)

[13] IFRC, 2007, *CAS Guidelines and Toolkit for more effective cooperation*, pp 6-7; 10-11 (internal)

[14] Constitution, Revised and adopted by the 16th Session of the General Assembly, Geneva (Switzerland), IFRC, 20–22 November 2007, p 8

[15] Constitution, Revised and adopted by the 16th Session of the General Assembly, Geneva (Switzerland), IFRC, 20–22 November 2007, p 8

[16] IASC Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Response, Annex 1: Generic Terms of Reference for Sector/Cluster Leads at Country level, November 2006, p 13

[17] IFRC, 2009, *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment*, p 4

[18] CAS Lessons 99-06, IFRC (internal)

[19] Fisher, M., et al., June 2010, *The Haiti Earthquake Operation: Real Time Evaluation For the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies* p 16

[20] Alexander, J., April 2009, *Emergency Shelter Cluster Review Cyclone Nargis, Myanmar*

[21] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[22] Archi-Urgent, Care, CHF, CRS, DFID, Habitat for Humanity, IOM, Medair, NRC, OFDA, Oxfam, ProAct, ProVention, RedR, Relief International, RICS, Save The Children, Shelter Centre, SKAT, UN Habitat, UN OCHA, UNRWA, World Vision. Source*:* IASC Global Shelter Update, presentation, May 2009, accessed at http://www.sheltercentre.org/sites/default/files/SM09a_Day1-IASC%20Emergency%20Shelter%20Cluster%20Update.ppt

[23] Penrose, A., 2000, *Partnerships in Managing Development: Understanding Inter-organisational relationships*, SAGE, London

[24] Stoddard, A., 2003, *Humanitarian NGOs: challenges and trends,* HPG Briefing No. 12, July 2003, ODI, London

[25] IFRC, November 2006, Emergency Shelter Cluster Field Cluster Coordinator

[26] Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Response, 24 November 2006, pp 6, 13

[27] IFRC, 2007, *Disaster Response and Contingency Planning Guide*, pp 31-2, 35

[28] IFRC, 2009, *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment*, 2009, p 9

[29] Written correspondence from M. Urquia, 13 July 2011

[30] Mowjee, T., et al., (2009), October 2009, *Synthesis Report Review of the engagement of NGOs with the humanitarian reform process*, The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, ICVA

[31] Philippines SWG review 2007 (location of meetings p 22), Mozambique SWG review (language, resource mobilization, pp 17, 20, 21) Pakistan Floods SWG Review 2007 (location of meetings, resource mobilization, pp 15, 18), Yogyakarta SWG review 2006 (language, p 8),

[32] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[33] See e.g. Stoddard, A. et al., 2007, *Cluster Approach Evaluation Report*, pp 29, 59, 62, 66; Background note for the Global Cluster/Donor Meeting on 30 October, The Cluster Approach: Reflections on Field Impact, Mainstreaming and Challenges Ahead, OCHA/HRSU, 2007; Report from IASC Global Nutrition Cluster Meeting 16-18 September 2008 Nairobi, Kenya, 14 November 2008, p 29

[34] Written communication from G. Saunders, 23 November 2009

[35] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[36] Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, March 2001, Supporting gender mainstreaming, accessed at http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/report.pdf

[37] UNDP, September 2000, *Gender Mainstreaming* (draft), accessed at http://www.gdrc.org/gender/mainstreaming/8-Mainstreaming.doc

[38] Research voor Beleid, 2008, *"Selling" innovations: manual for mainstreaming project results*, SZW - Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, accessed at http://equal.orangeworlds.com/system/files/SellingInnovations_ManualMainstreaming.pdf

[39] Sue Graves et al., July 2007, *Lost in translation: Managing coordination and leadership reform in the humanitarian system*, HPG Policy Brief 27, p 6

[40] Steets, J., et al., April 2010, *Cluster Approach Evaluation 2, Synthesis Report*, IASC, p 74

[41] IFRC, 2006, *Global Shelter Programme Plan* 2007/2008, p 11

[42] Research voor Beleid, 2008, *"Selling" innovations: manual for mainstreaming project results*, SZW - Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, p 7, accessed at http://equal.orangeworlds.com/system/files/SellingInnovations_ManualMainstreaming.pdf

[43] Written communication from G. Saunders, 23 November 2009

[44] The International Federation: The role of the shelter sector convenor within the cluster process, presentation; IFRC-UNOCHA Memorandum of Understanding, signed September 19th 2006, pp 3, 5, 6, 7; IFRC, 2009, FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment, p 3

[45] IFRC, 2006, Global Shelter Programme Plan 2007/2008, pp 3, 5, 11

[46] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[47] Written communication from G. Saunders, 23 November 2009

[48] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[49] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[50] IFRC, 14 August 2007, *Programme Update 2007, Global Shelter Programme*, p 2

[51] John S. Oakland, 2004, *Oakland on Quality Management*, pp 25, 26

---

[52] IFRC and HelpAge, (2011), IFRC and HelpAge, (2011), International Guidance on including older people in emergency shelter programmes

[53] Mija-tesse Ververs, July 2009, *Review, lessons learnt and recommendation on the use of products developed by the Global Nutrition Cluster*, accessed at http://oneresponse.info/GlobalClusters/Nutrition/publicdocuments/Review%20GNC%20Products%20and%20Tools.pdf

[54] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[55] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[56] Davidson, S., July 2008, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Coordination Group Bangladesh Cyclone Sidr Response 2007-2008*, p 6

[57] Houghton, R., 2007, *Surge Capacity in the Humanitarian Relief and Development Sector*, People In Aid, p 8

[58] Houghton, R., *Surge Capacity in the Humanitarian Relief and Development Sector*, People In Aid, p 10

[59] A typical Shelter Coordination Team includes Coordinator, Information Manager, Technical Coordinator, Shelter Recovery Advisor (Federation SOP, August 2008)

[60] Alexander, J., April 2009, *Emergency Shelter Cluster Review Cyclone Nargis, Myanmar*, p 13

[61] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[62] IFRC, 2009, *FAQ: the cluster process and the International Federation's shelter cluster commitment*, p 7

[63] IFRC, Press Release: Red Cross Red Crescent pledges more than 300 million US dollars to Haiti's recovery at U.N. donor conference *Geneva, New York, 31 March 2010*

[64] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[65] IFRC, 03 April 2008, *Report 2006-07, Global Shelter Programme*, p 4

[66] Written communication from G. Saunders, 23 November 2009

[67] IFRC, *Mid-Year Report, Shelter and Settlements*, MAA00019, 6 August 2010

[68] IFRC, *Mid-Year Report, Shelter and Settlements*, MAA00019, 11 August 2011

[69] United Nations, 2009, *Report on Implementation of Global Capacity Building*, 1 April 2007-31 March 2008, p 40

[70] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[71] The Shelter Department appears to be smaller in terms of FTE staff than some of the inter-agency humanitarian initiatives referenced in Section 3.5. These initiatives generally do not have operational responsibilities.

[72] Terms of Reference, Shelter Cluster Global Focal Point for Coordination, 2011

[73] United Nations, 2007, *Report on Implementation of Global Capacity Building,* 1 April 2006-31 March 2007, p 7

[74] Davidson, S., 2008, A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Coordination Group, Bangladesh, Cyclone Sidr Response 2007-2008; Walton-Ellery, S., 2009, A Review of the Cyclone Aila Response 2009 IFRC-led Emergency Shelter Coordination Group

[76] Walton-Ellery, S., 2009, *A Review of the Cyclone Aila Response 2009 IFRC-led Emergency Shelter Coordination Group*

[77] Davidson, S., 2011, *A Review of the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster, Haiti 2010*

[78] Tim Foster, 2008, *Review of the Tajikistan Cold Wave Response Shelter and NFI Working Group in Tajikistan,* p 4

[79] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[80] Tim Foster, 2008, *Review of the Tajikistan Cold Wave Response Shelter and NFI Working Group in Tajikistan,* p 4

[81] The shelter pages of OCHA's OneReponse website use the Sphere Project's shelter logo. http://oneresponse.info/GlobalClusters/Emergency%20Shelter/Pages/default.aspx

[82] RICS, 16 February 2009, RICS represented at UN Global Shelter Cluster, accessed at http://www.rics.org/site/scripts/news_article.aspx?newsID=294

[83] Written communication from G. Saunders, 23 November 2009

[84] Fisher, M., et al., June 2010, *The Haiti Earthquake Operation: Real Time Evaluation For the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies* p. 5

[85] Ashdown, P. et al., (2011), *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review*, Humanitarian Emergency Response Review, p 25

[86] Department for International Development, (2011), Multilateral Aid Review, Department for International Development, p 184

[87] 'The ultimate test for humanitarian reform will be the extent to which it improves the lot of crisis-affected people.' The NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, October 2009, *Synthesis Report Review of the engagement of NGOs with the humanitarian reform process,* p 5

[88] Research voor Beleid, 2008, *"Selling" innovations: manual for mainstreaming project results*, SZW - Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, p 21, accessed at http://innovation.esflive.eu/system/files/SellingInnovations_ManualMainstreaming.pdf

[89] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[90] El Salvador: Floods Emergency Appeal n° MDRSV002, 16 November 2009

[91] Written communication from G. Saunders, 14 December 2009

[92] IFRC, Mid-Year Report, Shelter and Settlements, MAA00019, 6 August 2010

[93] Steets, J., et al., April 2010, *Cluster Approach Evaluation 2, Synthesis Report*, IASC 2nd, p 21