Coordinators Cluster Performance Assessment

This questionnaire will take around 15 minutes to complete

Please note that while the source will be kept anonymous, all comments provided in the survey will be displayed in the report

The Cluster Performance Assessment Questionnaire allows cluster coordinators to assess the performance of the cluster in achieving its 6 core functions, as determined by the IASC. It is articulated around the core functions and sub-functions of the cluster and the accountability of the cluster to affected populations. Where two cluster/sector coordinators exist, the questionnaire should preferably be answered jointly.

The results of this questionnaire will be used together with the results of a similar questionnaire filled in by cluster participants. The findings will be discussed with participants, including cross-cutting focal points, during a cluster meeting in order to decide on appropriate actions to be taken for improvement, if needed. The outcome of this meeting will be shared as appropriate with the cluster lead agencies, national authorities, the humanitarian coordinator and the global clusters.

0.(1) General Information

1 [0.11]Date: *

2 [0.12]Which country are you working in*? *

○ Afghanistan
○ Aland Islands
○ Albania
○ Algeria
○ American Samoa
○ Andorra
○ Angola
○ Anguilla
○ Antigua and Barbuda
○ Argentina
○ Armenia
○ Aruba
○ Australia
○ Austria
○ Azerbaijan
Cuba
Curaçao
Cyprus
Czech Republic
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Estonia
Ethiopia
Faeroe Islands
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)
Fiji
Finland
France
French Guiana
French Polynesia
Gabon
Gambia
Georgia
Germany
Ghana
Gibraltar
Greece
Greenland
Grenada
Guadeloupe
Guam
Guatemala
Guernsey
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Republic of Moldova
Réunion
Romania
Russian Federation
Rwanda
Saint-Barthélemy
Saint Helena
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia
Saint-Martin (French part)
Saint Pierre and Miquelon
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
San Marino
Sao Tome and Principe
Sark
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Serbia
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Singapore
Sint Maarten (Dutch part)
Slovakia
Slovenia
Solomon Islands
Somalia
South Africa
South Sudan
Spain
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Suriname
Svalbard and Jan Mayen Islands
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan
Thailand
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Timor-Leste
Togo
Tokelau
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Tunisia
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Turks and Caicos Islands
Tuvalu
Uganda
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America
United States Virgin Islands
Uruguay
Uzbekistan
Vanuatu
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Viet Nam
Wallis and Futuna Islands
Western Sahara
Yemen
Zambia
Zimbabwe

*in cases where the cluster is supporting a country remotely, this question refers to the country supported by the cluster*
3 [0.13] Do you lead the cluster at? *

- National level
- Sub-national level

4 [0.14] Please provide the name of the sub-national level? *

- Some example answer option
1.(1) Supporting service delivery

1.1 Coordinating to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 [1.11]</td>
<td>Has the list of cluster partners (including members and observers) been updated as needed? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No list established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List updated far less often than needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List updated less often than needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List updated almost as often as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List updated as often as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 [1.12]</td>
<td>Have you organized regular coordination meetings, as needed? *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings organised far less often than needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings organised less often than needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings organised almost as often as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings organised as often as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 [1.13] Have cluster meetings led to the writing of minutes with action points? *

- No minutes
- Minutes but no action points
- Minutes with action points for some meetings
- Minutes with action points for most meetings
- Do not know

8 [1.14] How was the attendance of partners and observers to cluster meetings? *

- Few attended
- Some attended
- Most attended, but few major actors
- Most attended, including major actors
- Do not know

9 [1.15] Have cluster meetings been useful in general for discussing needs, gaps and priorities? *

- Not useful
- Somewhat useful
- Mostly useful
- Very useful
- Do not know
10 [1.16] Have you regularly attended humanitarian inter-sectoral coordination meetings, such as inter-cluster coordination meetings and/or humanitarian country team meetings? *

- No meetings - Not applicable
- Have not attended
- Have rarely attended
- Have sometimes attended
- Have often attended
- Have always attended
- Do not know

11 [1.17] Has the cluster supported or engaged with sectoral/national coordination mechanisms, if appropriate? *

- No sectoral/national coordination or engagement not appropriate / Not applicable
- No support or engagement, even if appropriate
- Representatives of national coordination rarely participate in cluster meetings
- Representatives of national coordination often participate in cluster meetings
- Representatives of national coordination co-chair cluster meetings
- Cluster partners are fully engaged under national coordination
- Do not know

12 [1.18] Has the cluster created conditions for optimal participation of national and international stakeholders in meetings, e.g. location of meetings, language? *

- Poor conditions
- Average conditions
- Good conditions
- Very good conditions
- Do not know
13 [1.19] Have useful strategic directions been agreed within the cluster? *

- [ ] No strategic directions agreed
- [ ] Strategic directions not useful
- [ ] Strategic directions somewhat useful
- [ ] Strategic directions mostly useful
- [ ] Strategic directions very useful
- [ ] Do not know
1.(2) Supporting service delivery

1.2 Developing mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery
Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 [1.21] Has the mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities, e.g. 3W and other similar mechanisms, been regularly updated, as needed? *</td>
<td>Not established, Established but not updated, Established but not updated as often as needed, Established and mostly updated as often as needed, Established and always updated as often as needed, Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 [1.22] Have partners provided inputs into the mapping of their geographic presence and programme activities as required? *</td>
<td>No partners providing inputs, Few partners providing inputs as required, Most partners providing inputs as required, All partners providing inputs as required, Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 [1.23] Has the mapping of partners geographic presence and programme activities been used for the analysis of capacity and complementarity, i.e. gaps and overlaps, and for decision making by cluster partners?

- No analysis
- Analysis but not used for decision making
- Analysis used by few partners for decision making
- Analysis used by some partners for decision making
- Analysis used by most partners for decision making
- Do not know

17 [1.24] Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about the cluster’s support to service delivery:
2.(1) Informing strategic decision-making of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response

2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis
Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

18 [2.11] Have needs assessment tools and guidance - agreed upon by cluster partners - been used by cluster partners? *

- There are no agreed upon assessment tools and guidance
- Cluster agreed upon tools and guidance not used by partners
- Cluster agreed upon tools and guidance used by few partners
- Cluster agreed upon tools and guidance used by some partners
- Cluster agreed upon tools and guidance used by most partners
- Do not know

19 [2.12] Have cluster partners been involved in joint sectoral needs assessments and surveys? *

- No joint assessment done
- Joint assessments undertaken but partners not involved
- Partners involved in some joint assessments
- Partners involved in most joint assessments
- Partners involved in all joint assessments
- Do not know

20 [2.13] Have cluster partners shared with the cluster reports of surveys and assessments they have undertaken? *

- No survey or assessment done
- Survey and assessment reports not shared by any partner
- Survey and assessment reports shared by few partners
- Survey and assessment reports shared by most partners
- Survey and assessment reports shared by all partners
- Do not know
2.(2) Informing strategic decision-making of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response

2.2 Analysis to identify (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication and cross-cutting issues

*Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21 [2.21] Have analyses of situations been done together with cluster partners? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 22 [2.22] To what extent have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity and constraints to respond? * |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not identified | Partially identified | Mostly identified | Fully identified | Do not know |
| Risks | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Needs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Gaps in response | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Capacity to respond | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Constraints to respond | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
23 [2.23] To what extent have cross cutting issues been considered in joint analyses? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not considered</th>
<th>Partially considered</th>
<th>Mostly considered</th>
<th>Fully considered</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (other than age and gender)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection, including sexual and gender based violence</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.(3) Informing strategic decision-making of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response

2.3 Prioritization grounded in response analysis

Please note: the questions of this section refer to the preceding 6 months

24 [2.31] Have joint analyses supported response planning and prioritization?

- Joint analyses done but not used to support response planning and prioritization
- Joint analyses sometimes used to support response planning and prioritization
- Joint analyses often used to support response planning and prioritization
- Joint analyses always used to support response planning and prioritization
- Do not know

25 [2.32] Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about the role of the cluster in informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team for the humanitarian response:
3.(1) Planning and strategy development

3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives, indicators directly supporting HC/HCT strategic priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 [3.11] Has a sectoral strategic plan been developed? *</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 [3.12] Does the sectoral strategic plan include objectives, activities and indicators? *</td>
<td>Strategic plan but objectives, activities and indicators not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 [3.13] Has the sectoral strategic plan been reviewed against host government strategy? *</td>
<td>No government strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29 [3.14] Have cluster partners been involved in the development of the sectoral strategic plan? *

- Cluster partners not involved
- Cluster partners partially involved
- Cluster partners mostly involved
- Cluster partners fully involved
- Do not know

30 [3.15] To what extent does the sectoral strategic plan address cross cutting issues? *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Not addressed</th>
<th>Partially addressed</th>
<th>Mostly addressed</th>
<th>Fully addressed</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (other than age and gender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection, including sexual and gender-based violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 [3.16] Does the sectoral strategic plan show synergies with other sectors in line with Humanitarian Coordination Team strategic objectives? *

- Synergies with other sectors not addressed
- Synergies with other sectors partially addressed
- Synergies with other sectors mostly addressed
- Synergies with other sectors fully addressed
- Do not know
32 [3.17] Has the sectoral strategic plan guided response from partners in the last 6 months? *

- Strategic plan not used by partners
- Strategic plan used by few partners
- Strategic plan used by some partners
- Strategic plan used by most partners
- Do not know

33 [3.18] Have deactivation criteria and phasing out strategy of the cluster been formulated together with partners? *

- No criteria and strategy discussed
- Criteria and strategy identified but without partners
- Criteria and strategy identified with some partners
- Criteria and strategy identified with most partners
- Criteria and strategy identified with all partners
- Do not know
3.(2) Planning and strategy development

3.2 Application and adherence to existing standards and guidelines

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

34 [3.21] Have national and international standards and guidance been identified, adapted as required together with national authorities and shared with partners? *

- No standards and guidance identified
- Standards and guidance identified but not adapted as required and not shared
- Standards and guidance identified and shared but not adapted as required
- Standards and guidance identified and adapted as required but not shared
- Standards and guidance identified adapted as required and shared
- Do not know

35 [3.22] Have technical standards and guidance been agreed upon and used by partners? *

- No technical standards and guidance agreed
- Technical standards and guidance agreed but not used
- Technical standards and guidance agreed and used by few partners
- Technical standards and guidance agreed and used by some partners
- Technical standards and guidance agreed and used by most partners
- Do not know
3.3 Clarifying funding needs, prioritization and cluster contributions to HC funding considerations (e.g. CAP/Flash Appeal, ERF/CHF, CERF)

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 [3.31] Have prioritization of proposals against the strategic plan been jointly determined with cluster partners based on agreed transparent criteria? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>No agreed transparent criteria and prioritization not jointly determined with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>No agreed transparent criteria but prioritization jointly determined with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Agreed transparent criteria but prioritization not jointly determined with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Agreed transparent criteria and prioritization somewhat determined jointly with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Agreed transparent criteria and prioritization fully determined jointly with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 [3.32] To which extent has the prioritization of proposals against the strategic plan reflected the interest of the partners? *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>No prioritization of proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prioritization of proposals not reflecting the interests of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prioritization of proposals reflecting the interests of few partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prioritization of proposals reflecting the interests of most partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prioritization of proposals reflecting the interests of all partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38 [3.33] Has the cluster supported and facilitated access to funding sources by partners, e.g. projects included in appeals and Emergency Response Fund/Common Humanitarian Fund proposals? *

- No support
- Poor support
- Average support
- Good support
- Very good support
- Do not know

39 [3.34] How often have you reported on funding status of the cluster against the needs*? *

- Never
- Far less often than needed
- Less often than needed
- Almost as often as needed
- As often as needed
- Do not know

* e.g. tracking of funds received against CAP and other appeals and proposals

40 [3.35] Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about cluster's role in planning and strategy development:
4.(1) Advocacy

4.1 Identifying advocacy concerns to contribute to HC and HCT messaging and action

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>41 [4.11] Have issues requiring advocacy been identified and discussed together with partners?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ No issues discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Issues identified but without partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Issues identified with some partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Issues identified with most partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Issues identified with all partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.(2) Advocacy

4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and the affected population

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

42 [4.21] Have advocacy activities been agreed on and undertaken together with partners? *

- [ ] No advocacy activities agreed upon
- [ ] Advocacy activities agreed upon but not undertaken with partners
- [ ] Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with some partners
- [ ] Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with most partners
- [ ] Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with all partners
- [ ] Do not know

43 [4.22] Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about cluster’s role in advocacy activities:
5. Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the cluster strategy and results

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months.

44 [5.1] Have partners used programme monitoring and reporting formats agreed upon by cluster partners? *

- No standards agreed for monitoring and reporting
- Standards agreed but not reported on regularly by most partners
- Standards agreed but not reported on regularly by some partners
- Standards agreed and reported on regularly by most partners
- Standards agreed and reported on regularly by all partners
- Do not know

45 [5.2] Is the information received from partners reflected in the cluster bulletins and other cluster reports? *

- No information shared
- Information shared but not taken into account
- Information shared and partially taken into account
- Information shared and mostly taken into account
- Information shared and fully taken into account
- Do not know
46 [5.3] How often have progress reports against work/strategic plan* been prepared based on agreed indicators for monitoring humanitarian response? *

- Never
- Far less often than needed
- Less often than needed
- Almost as often as needed
- As often as needed
- Do not know

*including Consolidated Appeal Process mid-year review

47 [5.4] How often have cluster bulletins and/or updates been published? *

- Never
- Far less often than needed
- Less often than needed
- Almost as often as needed
- As often as needed
- Do not know

48 [5.5] Have changes in needs, risks and gaps highlighted in cluster bulletins and other reports been used for decision making? *

- Changes in needs, risks and gaps not highlighted in any bulletins or reports
- Changes in needs, risks and gaps highlighted but not used for decision-making
- Changes in needs, risks and gaps highlighted and sometimes used for decision-making
- Changes in needs, risks and gaps highlighted and often used for decision-making
- Changes in needs, risks and gaps highlighted and always used for decision-making
- Do not know
To what extent have the monitoring and response of your cluster taken into account the distinct needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys, when applicable? *

- Not applicable
- Not considered
- Marginally considered
- Partially considered
- Mostly considered
- Fully considered
- Do not know

* Not applicable if cluster activities do not imply a direct contact with affected populations, and do not directly affect or determine the selection or use of resources, goods or services accessed by affected populations

Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about the monitoring and reporting of the implementation of the cluster strategy and results and provide examples of where this information has been used in decision-making where possible:
6. Preparedness for recurrent disasters whenever feasible and relevant

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 [6.1] Have the national contingency plans, for the sector or multi-sectoral, been identified and shared? *</td>
<td>- No national contingency plans identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National contingency plans identified but not shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National contingency plan identified and shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 [6.2] Have cluster partners contributed to initial or updates of risk assessment and analysis, multi-sectoral where appropriate? *</td>
<td>- Risk assessment not done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk assessment done without partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk assessment done with some partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk assessment done with most partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Risk assessment done with all partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 [6.3] Have cluster partners been involved in the development and/or updates of the preparedness plan, multi-sectoral where appropriate, for all risks/hazards? *</td>
<td>- Preparedness plan not done/updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparedness plan done/updated without partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparedness plan done/updated with some partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparedness plan done/updated with most partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparedness plan done/updated with all partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
54 [6.4] Have cluster partners committed staff and/or resources to be mobilised when preparedness plans will be activated? *

- No partners have committed staff and/or resources
- Few partners have committed staff and/or resources
- Some partners have committed staff and/or resources
- Most partners have committed staff and/or resources
- All partners have committed staff and/or resources
- Do not know

55 [6.5] Have you regularly shared and discussed with cluster partners early warning reports from available sources? *

- There are no early warning reports
- No early warning reports shared
- Early warning reports rarely shared
- Early warning reports sometimes shared
- Early warning reports often shared
- Early warning reports always shared
- Do not know

56 [6.6] Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about preparedness:
7. Accountability to affected populations

Please note: the questions in this section refer to the preceding 6 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 57 [7.1] Have mechanisms - agreed upon by cluster partners - to consult and involve affected populations in decision-making*, been used by cluster partners when possible? * | - No mechanism agreed  
- Mechanisms agreed but not used by partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by some partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by most partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by all partners  
- Do not know |

*in line with the IASC principals commitments on accountability to affected populations (CAAP)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 58 [7.2] Have mechanisms - agreed upon by cluster partners - to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance received*, been used by cluster partners? * | - No mechanism agreed  
- Mechanisms agreed but not used by partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by some partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by most partners  
- Mechanisms agreed and used by all partners  
- Do not know |

*in line with the IASC principals commitments on accountability to affected populations (CAAP)*
Please enter below any further comments/clarifications you might have about accountability to affected populations and any information on how feedback systems are performing:
8. Other information

60 [8.1] Please enter below other information you think are important to reflect the work of the cluster:
Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the Cluster Performance Assessment Questionnaire.