



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

Organisation des Nations
Unies pour l'alimentation
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الأغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

PROGRAMME COMMITTEE

Hundred and Twentieth Session

Rome, 7 - 11 November 2016

**Follow-up report on the Joint FAO/WFP Evaluation of the Food Security
Cluster Coordination (cf. PC116/8)**

Queries on the substantive content of the document may be addressed to:

Mr Laurent Thomas
Assistant Director-General, Technical Cooperation and Programme Management
Department

Tel. +39 065705-5042

*This document can be accessed using the Quick Response Code on this page;
an FAO initiative to minimize its environmental impact and promote greener communications.
Other documents can be consulted at www.fao.org*



mr745

1. The Food Security Cluster (FSC) was established to coordinate the food security response during a humanitarian crisis, addressing issues of food availability, access and utilization. The Cluster is based at WFP headquarters in Rome and is co-led by FAO and WFP. The Global Support Team includes FAO, WFP and NGO members. The FSC works directly with its partners and stakeholders that include international NGOs, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, other cluster lead agencies, UN organizations, Governments, academia and donors. The FSC was formally endorsed by the Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) on the 15 December 2010. The FSC works with national and regional cluster systems in both sudden onset disasters, be they from natural or human causes, and long-running crises. At the same time, the FSC is also committed to providing coordination support on preparedness in close cooperation with the Government and the partner organizations.

2. The FAO-WFP Joint Evaluation of the Food Security Cluster (2009-2014) of November 2014 made seven recommendations, which were integrated in the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) Strategic Plan 2015-16¹ within its six Results.

- Result 1: Strengthened and developed national clusters' capacity (addressed Recommendations 2, 3, 4 and 5);
- Result 2: Harmonized and globalized information management system (addressed Recommendations 2 and 4);
- Result 3: Improved operational and surge support to national clusters (addressed Recommendation 3);
- Result 4: Scaled-up advocacy, communications and resource mobilization (addressed Recommendations 1 and 6);
- Result 5: Deepened and diversified global partnerships and operational collaborations (addressed Recommendations 1, 5 and 7);
- Result 6: Systematized learning and knowledge management processes (addressed Recommendations 1, 2 and 7).

3. The following paragraphs represent a summary of the major actions undertaken by gFSC Global Support Team (GST) following the Evaluation Recommendations and the outcomes. The review of the evaluation was prepared in close consultation with OSE/WFP, also including the inputs received from the WFP Emergency Director.

Recommendation 1: Advocate with and support the IASC in revising standard system requirements to ensure they are lighter and more operationally focused. This Recommendation was partially agreed.

4. The gFSC regularly documented the experience gained and lessons learnt from the countries and shared them with Cluster Lead Agencies' (CLAs) Emergency Directors, mainly on the implementation of the ongoing humanitarian policies and practices on Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC), mainstreaming of early recovery activities, Level 3 emergencies, etc., which were further catered into EDG and IASC Principals meetings. The gFSC also regularly participated in different forums, such as Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG), Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team (STAIT) and Information Management Working Group (IMWG) and contributed to the HPC guidelines and other relevant issues.

5. The contributions and interventions made by gFSC largely contributed to the IASC endorsing a decision on the approach of differentiating between an L3 surge 'scale-up' phase and a 'consolidation' phase in December 2015. The IASC Principals also endorsed realignment of

¹ http://fscluster.org/sites/default/files/documents/gfsc_2015-16_strategic_plan_0.pdf

terminology on the L3 mechanism, from 'Level 3 Response' to 'Level 3 Surge' as well as adopted the proposal by the EDG to refine the role of the L3 mechanism in ensuring fit-for purpose humanitarian responses to protracted crises. Furthermore, gFSC's regular follow-up with the IASC reference group - Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas (MHCUA) eventually resulted in the inclusion of the urban agenda in the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) with gFSC facilitating the session.

6. The Recommendation has been implemented to the extent possible, given that the full implementation of the Recommendation is the result of collective IASC members' actions. Some initial impact has been observed; however, it is important to mention that IASC takes necessary actions swiftly on the Recommendations made and makes appropriate decisions accordingly on the important issues. The gFSC, therefore, considers the outcome of the actions as 'good' with a MAR Score of 5 for this Recommendation. In parallel, the gFSC continues lobbying at relevant forums on recurrent and emerging humanitarian issues and brings them to the attention of EDG and IASC Principals.

Recommendation 2: Strengthen mentoring for and capacities of coordination teams to focus on operationally relevant activities. This Recommendation was agreed.

7. The gFSC carried out several country support missions since the Evaluation, providing direct support to cluster teams and Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs) as well as guiding the country clusters on issues related to the six clusters/sectors core functions, cluster/sector management, leadership and partnership arrangements. Several trainings were organized on cluster coordination, information management, protection mainstreaming; gender, age and sex disaggregated data analysis, and IPC at global, regional and country level to build the capacity of the country cluster teams as well as develop a strong pool of cluster coordinators and information management officers.

8. These activities largely contributed to the cluster performance at country level. Country Cluster Performance Monitoring (CCPM) shows some significant improvement in some of the countries, e.g. Afghanistan, Colombia and Chad (comparing 2015-16). Several countries were technically supported on developing key IM products and significant improvement on the quality of these products has been observed².

9. The Recommendation has, therefore, been implemented and the impact will be further documented in 2017 with the necessary monitoring. The gFSC therefore considers the outcome of the actions as 'adequate' with a MAR Score of 4 for this Recommendation.

Recommendation 3: Enhance the GST's capacity and improve the preparation of deployed teams in order to further strengthen coordination capacity. This Recommendation was agreed.

10. The gFSC regularly participated in donor briefings at both FAO and WFP, and mobilized significant funding through the CLAs as well as extra budgetary resources since the Evaluation. Resources were also mobilized yearly since 2015 from NGO partners (e.g. NRC, DRC, Samaritans' purse, Welthungerhilfe, GenCap, Thiessen Hilfswerk) through secondment or financing of trainings. The gFSC participated in high level global events, and facilitated several sessions as well as made significant contributions. The gFSC products, such as Strategic Plan 2015-16, Annual Reports 2014 and 2015, gFSC and country clusters profile dashboard were considered of very high quality. The gFSC also established a robust roster of Cluster Coordinators and Information Management Officers (IMO) and organized two annual retreats for the Cluster Coordinators. Cluster Coordinators and information Management Officers were briefed before departure and debriefed at the completion of the mission.

11. More robust roster maintenance led to quick and longer term deployments of Cluster Coordinators and IMOs in the countries ensuring effective coordination solution, high visibility and better resource mobilization at country level. The Cluster Coordinators retreats enabled efficient cross-fertilization of experience and ideas between countries on good humanitarian practices and clusters'

² The key IM products are also posted on gFSC Web site regularly (fscluster.org)

roles and responsibilities. Briefing and debriefing sessions largely helped strengthen the coordination capacity and analyse lessons learnt and experienced gained.

12. There is solid evidence that the Recommendation has had positive impact, more predictable funding resulting in more stable cluster coordination teams both at global and country level and more systematic/robust support to country clusters. The gFSC, therefore, considers the outcome of the actions as 'good' with a MAR Score of 5 for this Recommendation.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen nationally-led coordination mechanisms or increase the involvement of government actors in food security coordination mechanisms to enhance national ownership and sustainability. This Recommendation was agreed.

13. Since the beginning of 2016, all backstopping or scoping missions including in countries/regions where coordination is led by government included a review of national capacities. Trainings at country level covered important topics, such as GIS mapping, needs assessments, mobile data collection, food consumption score calculation, cyclone simulation exercise, IPC, and application of IM tool, in which 89 percent of the participants on average came from the national NGOs and the Governments.

14. Ten countries out of twenty-nine countries where cluster/sector is operational, and few countries in the Pacific Islands region (e.g. FSM, RMI, etc.) were completely led by the national authorities. CLAs and Governments co-led food security cluster/sector coordination in other seven countries plus few countries in the Pacific Islands region (e.g. Fiji, Vanuatu, etc.). This is a clear indication of involvement and ownership of cluster coordination by the local Governments. Furthermore, clusters in Liberia and Nepal were deactivated by the end of 2015 and transferred to the Governments, and the Ministry of Agriculture in Nepal is currently leading and chairing the food security cluster coordination regularly. Cluster transition plans are also being either finalized or under formulation in countries such as Ukraine, Mali and West Bank and Gaza Strip.

15. The Recommendation has been implemented and there is good initial evidence of its impact on the leadership role played by governments, particularly in sudden onset crises. The gFSC, therefore, considers the outcome of the actions as 'adequate' with a MAR Score of 4 for this Recommendation.

Recommendation 5: Engage national and local civil society organizations and non-traditional humanitarian actors more closely in food security coordination. This Recommendation was agreed.

16. The gFSC Strategic Plan 2015-16 was developed to clearly focus on global partnerships and operational collaborations (Result 5). Food Security Clusters at country level ensured participation of national civil societies and NGOs to the extent possible, and regular exchange of information was carried out with Government and civil society representatives during backstopping missions. In 2016, gFSC initiated a partnership with Welthungerhilfe/ German Federal Foreign Office on the development of a video on the importance of partnership with local NGO partners. The gFSC also started strategic partnerships and collaborations with academia in 2016, namely with the University of Tulane, United States of America, Bocconi University, Italy and University of Bochum, Germany. Joint activities included field or global research, guest lectures, inclusion of cluster coordination in the course modules, internship, thesis writing and inclusion of the university graduates in cluster capacity building initiatives. The FSC in Fiji collaborated with University of South Pacific (USP) and the FSC in Whole of Syria is collaborating with John Hopkins University on different activities at country/regional level in 2016.

17. Thanks to the proactive type of partnership the gFSC has shown, more international NGOs (World Concern, INTERSOS, PIN, Premiere Urgence) and academia joined the gFSC in 2015 and 2016 and some of them also participated in the June 2016 Global Partners' Meeting. Decentralized cluster coordination systems were adopted in Nepal, Nigeria and Ukraine as appropriate, which ensured higher level of participation of and contribution from local civil societies. The gFSC is

exploring opportunities to possibly also invite some lead national NGOs in forthcoming Global Partners' Meetings.

18. The implementation of the Recommendation has therefore significantly progressed and some new strategic partnerships with national and non-traditional partners have been established. However, the change process would take time and it is still difficult to establish a direct action-effect relationship. The gFSC therefore considers the outcome of the actions as 'adequate' with a MAR Score of 4 for this Recommendation.

Recommendation 6: Take action to ensure a more consistent commitment and capacity of lead agencies to support food security coordination and advocate for enhanced donor commitment to food security coordination. This Recommendation was agreed.

19. The gFSC held systematic briefing and interactions with FAO Representatives and WFP Country Directors regularly. CLAs ensured increased gFSC's participation in their global and regional events, e.g. El Niño event, regional resilience workshops, etc. CLAs provided quick financing facilities since mid-2015 to cluster/sector coordination (e.g. FAO SFERA), which enabled gFSC to field immediate demand-driven surge and backstopping missions to the countries. The gFSC also established a dashboard system for advocacy purposes with specific messages on food security coordination such as "When donors contribute USD 100 for a food security intervention in any given crisis, USD 0.3 is required to ensure a comprehensive, coordinated, efficient and effective response".

20. The gFSC advocacy message increasingly raised the awareness of donors at country and global level. New donors became interested in supporting the gFSC, e.g. through secondment of a JPO from Germany starting from October/November 2016. Deployment duration of cluster coordination staff has increased thanks to the CLAs' commitments and support from standby partners, which is interpreted as increased funding predictability. Some solid evidence on enhanced donors' commitment to food security cluster coordination is experienced thanks to gFSC's more robust and systematic analysis of activities vs. targets and needs. The gFSC continues with the efforts and closely monitors the impact to confirm whether the donors' decision on funding is increasingly influenced through cluster/sector products (since the funding of country clusters/sectors at the country level on average is still at around 50 percent).

21. The Recommendation has been fully implemented and there is good evidence of its impact. The gFSC, therefore, considers the outcome of the actions as 'good' with a MAR Score of 5 for this Recommendation.

Recommendation 7: Work with the IASC, OCHA and other clusters to further clarify roles and responsibilities in the coordination architecture and promote more efficient coordination solutions. This Recommendation was agreed.

22. The gFSC is actively participating in Global Cluster Coordinators Group (GCCG) activities promoting cluster inter-operability and joint programming. The gFSC is also participating in the GCCG-donors meetings whenever organized. The gFSC has been participating in discussions with OCHA and other clusters on joint and multi-sector analysis approach, such as Humanitarian Population Figures, Severity of Needs and analytical framework based on seasons and livelihoods. The gFSC was involved in a number of joint cluster coordination architecture review missions and conducted specific scoping or backstopping missions in different countries in collaboration with OCHA and other partners. The gFSC and Global Nutrition Cluster established a working group with joint work plan, outputs and deadlines. The gFSC in consultation with and support from the Global Cluster for Early Recovery (GCER), developed guidelines to FS cluster coordinators on FS early recovery activities. The gFSC in consultation with field FSC Coordinators also provided concrete feedback on the HNO/HRP templates prepared for 2016 to OCHA. Meanwhile, the CLAs exchanged letters at high level with OCHA on the inclusion of livelihood activities in Strategic/Humanitarian Response Plans in August 2015.

23. All these actions have largely helped develop more efficient coordination architecture and solutions, promote complementarity and avoid contentious situations or overlaps between FS Cluster and other Clusters, and highly facilitated the works of the field cluster coordinators at the country level. Thanks to the high-level communication and a close cooperation with OCHA, nearly 95 percent of country clusters/sectors had early recovery activities included in their cluster/sector plans. The gFSC is also part of the global debate on cash-based transfer modality coordination systems, including with OCHA, CaLP, WFP, FAO and other clusters, and this has largely facilitated the works of the cluster coordinators in the field on coordination of cash transfer programme. Furthermore, the close collaboration with other clusters, OCHA and IASC also contributed to the reflection of the importance of cluster coordination during the Grand Bargain at the World Humanitarian Summit and the commitment to strengthen the coordination system.

24. The Recommendation has been implemented and there is some initial evidence of its impact. The gFSC, therefore, considers the outcome of the actions as 'good' with a MAR Score of 5 for this Recommendation.

Detailed progress in in the implementation of each accepted Recommendations

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>Recommendation 1: Advocate with and support the IASC in revising standard system requirements to ensure they are lighter and more operationally focused.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the IASC principals and IASC working groups with feedback on experiences with the coordination protocols for level 3 emergencies and help to make these protocols lighter, more realistic and more focused on operational benefits. • Advocate with the IASC to also revise the standard requirements for non-level 3 emergencies. | <p>Partially agreed.</p> <p>Analysis will be needed to identify the protocols that need to be lighter.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gFSC regularly documented the experience gained and lessons learnt from the countries as well as compiled relevant information through necessary backstopping of country clusters, and shared them with Emergency Directors, mainly on the implementation process of the ongoing policies and practices (e.g. HPC process, MIRA, Appeals, Clusters activation, mainstreaming of Early Recovery, L3, etc.), which were further catered into EDG and IASC Principals meetings; • gFSC is playing an active role in the Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG), including on issues related to HPC guidelines and lessons learned. • gFSC is playing an active role in the Information Management Working Group (IMWG), including on issues related to the Humanitarian Profile Support Guidance for Humanitarian Population Figures. | <p>5 - Good</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the IASC Principles meeting on December 11, 2015, the approach of differentiating between an L3 surge ‘scale-up’ phase and a ‘consolidation’ phase was endorsed. IASC Principals also endorsed realignment of terminology on the L3 mechanism, from ‘Level 3 response’ to ‘Level 3 surge’³. • The IASC Principals adopted the proposal by the EDG in order to refine the role of the L3 mechanism in ensuring fit-for purpose humanitarian responses to protracted crises (December 2015). • An OCHA-led Expert Technical Group on inter-sectoral needs and severity of needs analysis in humanitarian contexts was set-up. • Urban agenda was included in the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and a side event was organized with gFSC facilitating it. |

³ IASC needs to take action on the decisions made.

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gFSC is more connected with the Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team (STAIT), including through the participation to a STAIT mission to Niger. • gFSC actively participated in the IASC reference group - Meeting Humanitarian Challenges in Urban Areas (MHCUA) | | |
| <p>Recommendation 2: Strengthen mentoring for and capacities of coordination teams to focus on operationally relevant activities.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that coordination activities are based on demand, adopt a participatory approach, use adequate formats and follow a clearly defined agenda and purpose. • Strengthen activities related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the analysis and use of data (including needs assessment and analysis, response analysis, gap analysis and gap filling); | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>However, while activities should be demand-based, coordination must also produce deliverables in line with the IASC cluster coordination reference module.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 country support missions since the Evaluation (Bangladesh, Burundi, CAR (2), Chad, Iraq, Mali, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, oPt, Pacific Islands, South Sudan, Ukraine, WoS (2)) providing direct support to cluster teams and Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs) were organized, which guided the country clusters on issues related to the 6 clusters/sectors core functions, and matters related to cluster/sector management, leadership and partnership arrangements. • 8 country-based (Bangladesh, Pakistan, Afghanistan, DRC, Mali, Niger, Ukraine, Nepal) and 2 global IM trainings were carried out since the Evaluation. • IM compendium was developed and shared with the country clusters. | 4-Adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country Cluster Performance Monitoring (CCPM) show good improvement in some countries, e.g. Afghanistan (comparing 2014-15-16), Colombia (comparing 2014-16), Chad (comparing 2015-16) but it also demonstrated that gains are not homogenous to all countries. • 55% of Humanitarian Appeals were informed by IPC and a process was initiated for the Whole of Syria. • A good pool of qualified cluster coordinators has been developed, and many of the trained ones have been deployed with very good |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the cluster's normative role; - mutual/joint learning; and - networking/trust-building. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen mentoring and guidance for coordination teams at country and local level to help them cope with system-wide demands and focus on operationally relevant issues. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 IPC training Level 1 for cluster coordinators (Nairobi - 07/15) and (Jordan - 11/16) were conducted and guidelines for linking more systematically IPC and clusters were finalized and disseminated. • 5 Cluster Coordinators trainings were conducted since the Evaluation (4 in English and 1 in French). • 3 capacity building missions/trainings on gender and age disaggregated data analysis (CAR, WoS, Regional Dakar) were carried out. • 2 cluster coordinator retreats were organized aiming at strengthening cross-fertilization between countries on good humanitarian practices and cluster's normative role, including awareness-raising on sex, gender and age, and protection mainstreaming. • Country Cluster Coordinators participated in different protection mainstreaming trainings (Bangkok; Panama; Dakar; Brazzaville; Beirut, Nairobi– 2015). | | <p>performances, including in L3 situations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At global level, a tracking system of all countries and the three key information products to be produced regularly was established. Countries have been prioritized based on L3/L2/monitoring status. There is already a good improvement on the quality of the information products developed by the countries, and they will be further supported and monitored during the remainder of 2016 to determine further impact of the training on the production of IM products in country. |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|---|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion and participation of field Cluster Coordinators in different gFSC technical working groups largely increased, which are chaired by NGO cluster partners, ensuring effective cross-fertilization of field experiences and better knowledge management • The global FSC IM team has established a tracking system of all countries to produce the three key information products (newsletter, dashboard, advocacy piece) on a regular basis. Countries have been prioritized based on L3/L2 status, and those that are of high profile (e.g. Somalia, Lake Chad) were prioritized, though all country clusters/sectors are included. These countries will be monitored for the remainder of 2016 and remote follow-up will be offered on a targeted basis to determine how well the training has materialized into production of IM products in country. The outcome of this effort will determine the future structuring of the gFSC IM work as of 2017. | | |
| Recommendation 3: Enhance the GST's capacity and improve the preparation of deployed teams in | Agreed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USD 1.3 to 1.4 million were mobilized yearly by CLAs through | 5-Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More frequent mentoring of country coordination teams and backstopping missions have become possible due to more |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|---|--|-----------------|--|
| <p>order to further strengthen coordination capacity.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the GST's capacity and ability to mentor country coordination teams and deploy its team members to emergencies by advocating for donor funding, dedicating lead agency core resources and mobilizing further secondments from partner organizations. • Systematically provide newly deployed teams with briefings and a food security coordination starter kit. • Reduce general trainings and strengthen mentoring and coaching, as well as targeted trainings. • Develop a stronger human resource strategy for food security coordinators and information managers. • Deploy coordination team members for longer periods of time and increase the involvement of | <p>The lead agencies are already implementing most of the actions listed.</p> | <p>core funding since the Evaluation (47% of gFSC annual budget).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Around USD 1 million were mobilized yearly by CLAs through extra-budgetary resources since the Evaluation (35% of gFSC annual budget). • Around USD 0.5 million were mobilized yearly since 2015 from NGO partners (NRC, DRC, Samaritans' purse, Welthungerhilfe, GenCap, THW) through secondment or financing of trainings since the Evaluation (18% of gFSC annual budget). • Contributions were made to the development of several advocacy events and products in partnership with CLAs since the Evaluation , including the participation the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Events: (i) WHS global consultation (Oct. 2015) and Side Event (May 2016); (ii)ALNAP global events (annual meeting); (iii) Global Forum for Improving Humanitarian Action (June 2015); (iv) Global Cluster Coordination Group meetings; (v) Launch of the Global Hunger Index | | <p>predictable staffing and activities implementation (trainings and backstopping missions in particular) thanks to more stable financial resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer deployments of Cluster Coordinators and IMOs have also become possible (e.g. deployment from roster: 89 days on average in 2014; 158 days on average in 2015; and the same trend in 2016). Similar trend has materialized on deployment through Stand-by Partners (73 days on average in 2014; 132 days on average in 2015; and the same trend in 2016). |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>national staff members in coordination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen learning among coordination teams. | | <p>2015; (vi) STAIT Webinar on inter-cluster efficiency (02/2015), and (vii) Donors briefing during WFP operational brief (01/2016) and FAO partners consultation (02/2015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Products: (i) gFSC Strategic Plan 2015-16; (ii) gFSC annual report 2014 and 2015; (iii) gFSC and country clusters profile dashboard (2 updates per year); (iv) global funding dashboard (quarterly), and (v) regular letters to donors. • In addition to providing briefing kits to all cluster coordinators, they were also regularly briefed and debriefed in Rome by the gFSC team. • More robust roster and deployment process is in place for Cluster Coordinators and IM Officers. It includes CV screening, reference check, interviews, simulation training and performance Evaluations. • As mentioned under Recommendation 2, two cluster coordinator retreats were organized since the Evaluation aiming at strengthening cross-fertilization of experience between countries on good | | |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | | humanitarian practices and clusters' normative role. | | |
| <p>Recommendation 4: Strengthen nationally-led coordination mechanisms or increase the involvement of government actors in food security coordination mechanisms to enhance national ownership and sustainability.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the role of FSCs or the lead agencies in preparedness, including informal government capacity assessments and scenarios for scaling up coordination support. • Better utilize existing contacts between the lead agencies and government offices to facilitate links with the food security coordination mechanism. • Engage early in transition and exit planning, regularly review the coordination set-up and, where necessary, include capacity- | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>The lead agencies are engaged in preparedness activities in line with the IASC's emergency response preparedness approach, and will seek to strengthen the FSC's role.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 2016, all backstopping or scoping missions including in countries/regions where coordination is led by government included a review of national capacities (against the indicators of the 6 core coordination functions). • gFSC Emergency Preparedness Planning Guidelines were published in October 2015 and circulated to all country cluster coordinators. • Cluster deactivation processes were reviewed with cluster coordinators during the 2015 and 2016 cluster coordinators retreats. • In 2015, 8 country clusters conducted 32 trainings on issues related to GIS mapping, needs assessments, mobile data collection, food consumption score calculation, cyclone simulation exercise, IPC Level 1, IM tool, etc. In total 1200 people were trained in 2015 (out of which 89% came from national NGOs and Government counterparts). | 4-Adequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government-led FS coordination in 10 countries out of 29 countries, plus few countries in the Pacific Islands Region (e.g. FSM, RMI, etc.) with FS coordination solution (37%) is currently functional. • CLAs and government co-led FS coordination in 7 out of 29 countries plus few countries in the Pacific Islands Region (e.g. Fiji, Vanuatu, etc.) with FS coordination solution (23%) are currently functional. • CLAs-led FS coordination in 12 countries out of 29 countries with FS coordination solution (40%) is currently functional. • Clusters were deactivated in Liberia (12/15) and Nepal (12/15) and handed over to the Government. • Cluster transition plans are finalized or under formulation in |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-------------------|---|
| <p>building activities for national institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cooperation with Humanitarian Coordinators and Humanitarian Country Teams, strengthen links with development actors and their activities, especially relating to capacity-building. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection mainstreaming trainings for national FSC partners were delivered by trained Cluster Coordinators in Colombia and Somalia. | | <p>West Bank and Gaza Strip, Ukraine and Mali.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation 5: Engage national and local civil society organizations and non-traditional humanitarian actors more closely in food security coordination.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen outreach to non-traditional humanitarian actors at headquarter and regional level. • Better utilize existing contacts of lead agencies and members with civil society and non-traditional humanitarian actors. • Adopt a more field-based, bottom-up approach to coordination to identify relevant actors. | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Efforts to increase collaboration with non-traditional humanitarian actors should be focused and in line with international humanitarian law and principles.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the development of its Strategic Plan 2015-16, gFSC made sure that a strategic result focuses on global partnerships and operational collaborations (Result 5). • In 2016 gFSC initiated collaboration with 3 universities in 2016 (Tulane/USA, Bocconi/Italy, Bochum/Germany). Strategic collaboration is under discussion (e.g. field or global research programmes, lectures, inclusion of cluster coordination in their course modules, thesis writing, internships, etc.) with these universities. FSC in Fiji is collaborating with University of South Pacific on assessment and FSC in Whole of Syria is collaborating with John Hopkins University on market feasibility study for cash transfer. | <p>4-Adequate</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gFSC delivered lecture on food security cluster coordination at Bocconi University as well as discussed on inclusion of cluster coordination works in the Master's degree curriculum. Similar discussion was made with University of Bochum in Germany. • The three universities attended the June 2016 Global Partners meeting. University of South Pacific (USP) in Fiji is an active cluster partner attending FSC meetings, and also participating in some monitoring works. USP will continue to partner in other island countries in 2016 and 2107 as well. • Discussion has been initiated to also invite few leading national |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer concrete, demand-based benefits to local civil society organizations and non-traditional humanitarian actors and ask them for specific inputs or contributions. • Adapt coordination formats and communication channels to the needs and preferences of local civil society and non-traditional actors. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular exchange of information was carried out with government and civil society representatives during backstopping missions. • Advocacy for partnering with national actors is initiated in form of a joint video production project (in partnership with Welthungerhilfe/ German Federal Foreign Office) aiming at developing mobilization videos adapted to different languages and cultures that will describe the importance of partnering with national actors (selected sites include: chronic crisis in Mali for African context and covering Francophone region; cross-border from South Turkey for conflict area covering protracted crisis in Near East; preparedness action in Bangladesh for Asian context and covering Anglophone region). The videos will be used during awareness campaign in all countries with coordination solutions. • Decentralized coordination system is implemented wherever relevant and feasible (e.g. Ukraine, Nigeria, Nepal, etc.). | | <p>NGOs to forthcoming gFSC Global Partners' Meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decentralized cluster coordination in the countries ensured better participation of local civil societies and their contributions. • Likewise, the impact of the global awareness and advocacy campaign will be measured only in 2017. |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|---|-----------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More international NGOs joined gFSC in 2015 and 2016 (World Concern, INTERSOS, PIN, Premiere Urgence) and also participated in the June 2016 global partners' meeting. | | |
| <p>Recommendation 6: Take action to ensure a more consistent commitment and capacity of lead agencies to support food security coordination and advocate for enhanced donor commitment to food security coordination.</p> <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase efforts to ensure that lead agencies' regional and country offices take responsibility for ensuring the availability of adequate human resources for coordination and for adopting a coordinated approach in their own operations, for example by including these aspects more strongly in performance appraisals and including coordination on the agenda of regional and global retreats. | Agreed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More systematic briefing and interactions were held with FAO Representatives and WFP Country Directors (All newly appointed FAORs are briefed by gFSC during their extended briefing at HQs level; meeting with WFP CDs were held during their participation in Executive Board sessions). • gFSC participation increased in CLAs regional events, including (i) participation in the FAO/WFP High level meeting enhancing inter-agency collaboration in SADC Region in response to El Nino (06/2016), (ii) participation in FAO Regional retreats (Dakar 09/2015, Nairobi 11/2015, Bangkok 07/2016). • Cluster performance is included in FAO Representative and WFP CD performance appraisals (PEMS and PACE respectively). | 5 - Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 2014, CLAs at country level, are more committed to cluster coordination. This is translated into an increasing number of countries (from 21 countries plus Pacific Islands Region in 2014 to 29 countries plus Pacific Islands Region in 2016), with coordination solutions aligned to the 6 core functions of the cluster system. • There is not yet solid evidence on enhanced donor commitment to food security coordination (funding of country clusters/sectors is still around 50%). However and as indicated under Recommendation 3, deployment duration of coordination staff has increased, and it is interpreted as increased funding predictability or CLAs commitments from their own funding sources. • A more robust and more systematic analysis of activities vs. |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|---|-----------------|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen FAO's country and field presence in emergencies, if necessary by developing or strengthening advance finance facilities. • Advocate with donors to consider analyses, priorities and standards developed by food security coordination mechanisms more strongly in their own decisions. • Advocate with donors to provide financial support for food security coordination teams, flexible coordination solutions and coordination activities where the situation requires. • Develop standard coordination cost scenarios for different contexts. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO advance financing facilities to cluster or sector coordination is further strengthened (SFERA allocation has been ensured to all cluster surge and backstopping missions since mid-2015). • A dashboard system is established for advocacy purposes, with specific messages on food security coordination (also included in gFSC Annual Reports) such as "When donors contribute USD 100 for a food security intervention in any given crisis, USD 0.3 is required to ensure a comprehensive, coordinated, efficient and effective response". • Standard coordination cost scenarios for different contexts have been analysed and findings were included in gFSC annual report 2015. | | <p>targets and needs is now implemented, which in time will allow gFSC to confirm if donors' decision are increasingly informed by cluster/sector products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New donors became interested in supporting gFSC, e.g. through secondment of JPO from Germany |
| <p>Recommendation 7: Work with the IASC, OCHA and other clusters to further clarify roles and responsibilities in the coordination architecture and promote more efficient coordination solutions.</p> | <p>Agreed.</p> <p>IASC emergency directors are exploring more structured approaches to inter-cluster coordination, including regular global meetings, if feasible.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gFSC participates actively in Global Cluster Coordinators Group (GCCG) activities (e.g. calling for retreat and setting agenda in January 2015; promoting cluster inter-operability and joint programming, GCCG is also meeting with donors (e.g. in 03/16 and follow-up in 09/2016). | <p>5 - Good</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decentralized coordination architecture has been implemented in a number of countries (getting closer to beneficiaries). • In-country roving coordinators approach has also been promoted as an intermediate solution between doubling CC positions (capital and |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|--|--|--|-----------------|---|
| <p>Suggested actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop models for linking sector-based and area-based coordination models (e.g. activation of clusters at national level, small number of merged clusters at hub level, integrated, area-based coordination at local level). • Continue to strengthen links between food security and nutrition coordination mechanisms (as well as with other clusters such as WASH and Health) and ensure that information-management tools of different clusters are compatible (e.g. 4Ws). • Allocate responsibilities for coordinating livelihoods activities and cash and voucher programming under different scenarios. • Strengthen compliance with guidance on early recovery as a cross-cutting issue. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gFSC also established a more regular working relationship with STAIT (field missions, panellist to STAIT Webinars, etc.) • gFSC participates in discussions with OCHA and other clusters on joint and multi-sector analysis approach. This includes (i) Humanitarian Population Figures, (ii) Severity of Needs and, (iii) analytical framework based on seasons and livelihoods. • gFSC has been involved in a number of joint architecture review missions (e.g. South Sudan, Ukraine) and has conducted specific scoping or backstopping missions as well aiming at reviewing FS Clusters/sectors architecture (e.g. Pacific Islands, Chad, CAR, Nigeria, etc.). • A gFSC and Global Nutrition Cluster working group has been established with clear work plan, outputs and deadlines (including joint field visits). • CLAs and the ERC exchanged letters on the importance of including livelihood activities in humanitarian | | <p>sub-national) and only centralized CC positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully dedicated sub-national cluster coordinators in place in 40% of countries (Source: Global overview of coordination arrangements, OCHA 2016). • 95% of country clusters/sectors have Early Recovery activities included in cluster/sector plans (Source: Global overview of coordination arrangements, OCHA 2016). • Less contentious situations or overlaps between FS Clusters and ER Clusters in 2016. • Reflection of the importance of cluster coordination during the Grand Bargain at the World Humanitarian Summit and the commitment to strengthen the coordination system. |

| Accepted Evaluation Recommendations (a) | Action agreed in the management response (b) | Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken (c) | MAR score (d) * | Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions (e) |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|
| | | <p>appeals and strategic response plans (August 2015).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A CashCap project funded by ECHO and implemented by NRC was approved in 2015, which emerged directly from the work of the gFSC Cash and Markets Working Group; gFSC chairs the Steering Committee. • gFSC is part of the global debate on cash-based transfer modalities coordination systems, including with OCHA, CaLP, WFP, FAO and other clusters. • gFSC in consultation with field FSC Coordinators provided concrete feedback on the HNO/HRP templates prepared for 2016 to OCHA. • gFSC in consultation with and support of the Global Cluster for Early Recovery (GCER), developed guidelines to FS cluster coordinators on FS early recovery activities. (http://fscluster.org/document/gfsc-early-recovery-interventions-and) | | |