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## Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring

### Overall response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>54 %</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of partners</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### International NGOs
- **Total**: 57 %
- **Total number of partners**: 14
- **Number partners responding**: 8

#### UN Agencies
- **Total**: 100 %
- **Total number of partners**: 4
- **Number partners responding**: 4

#### National NGOs
- **Total**: 100 %
- **Total number of partners**: 14
- **Number partners responding**: 8

#### National Authorities
- **Total**: 0 %
- **Total number of partners**: 1
- **Number partners responding**: 1

#### Donors
- **Total**: 0 %
- **Total number of partners**: 4
- **Number partners responding**: 0

#### Other
- **Total**: 0 %
- **Total number of partners**: 0
- **Number partners responding**: 0
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Effective response rate (Based on the average number of organizations participating to cluster meetings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Agencies</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGOs</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Authorities</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring

## Overall Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Performance status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 75 %</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 % - 75 %</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 % - 50 %</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 26 %</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Supporting service delivery
   1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities | Good |
   1.2 Developing mechanisms that eliminate duplication of service delivery | Good |

2. Informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team
   2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis | Satisfactory |
   2.2 Analysis to identify and address (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication, and cross-cutting issues | Satisfactory |
   2.3 Prioritizing on the basis of response analysis | Satisfactory |

3. Planning and strategy development
   3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives and indicators that directly support HC/HCT strategic priorities | Satisfactory |
   3.2 Adherence to and application of standards and guidelines | Satisfactory |
   3.3 Clarifying funding needs, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC funding needs | Good |

4. Advocacy
   4.1 Identifying advocacy concerns that contribute to HC and HCT messaging and action | Good |
   4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and affected people | Satisfactory |

5. Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results | Satisfactory |

6. Preparedness for recurrent disasters | Satisfactory |

7. Accountability to affected populations | Good |
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Performance per function and review

1 Supporting service delivery

1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of partners regularly updated</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate frequency of cluster meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of cluster partners to cluster meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of decision making power of staff attending cluster meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for optimal participation of national and international stakeholders</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing of minutes of cluster meetings with action points</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of cluster meetings for discussing needs, gaps and priorities</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful strategic decision taken within the cluster</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance of cluster coordinator to HCT and ICC meetings</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/engagement of cluster with national coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicative characteristics of functions:
- Established, relevant coordination mechanism recognising national systems, subnational and co-lead aspects; stakeholders participating regularly and effectively; cluster coordinator active in inter-cluster and related meetings.

Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified

Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)
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### 1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Realised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities updated as needed</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs of health partners into mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of partners into analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping used by partners for decision-making</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicative characteristics of functions

- Cluster partner engagement in dynamic mapping of presence and capacity (4W); information sharing across clusters in line with joint Strategic Objectives.

#### Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified

- Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)
## 2 Informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team

### 2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of cluster agreed tools and guidance for needs assessments</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of partners in joint needs assessments</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing by partners of their assessment reports</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative characteristics of functions**

- Use of assessment tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, individual assessment / survey results shared and/or carried out jointly as appropriate.

**Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified**

- Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations done together with cluster partners</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations identified risk</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations identified needs</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations identified gaps in response</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations identified capacity in response</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of situations identified constraints to respond</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity – other than age and gender- (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection, including gender-based violence (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicative characteristics of functions

| Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |

Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)

Satisfactory
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Prioritizing on the basis of response analysis</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint analyses supporting response planning</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative characteristics of functions</td>
<td>Joint analysis supporting response planning and prioritisation in short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3 Planning and strategy development

3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives and indicators that directly support HC/HCT strategic priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Strategic plan based on identified priorities, shows synergies with other sectors against strategic objectives, addresses cross cutting issues, incorporates exit strategy discussion and is developed jointly with partners. Plan is updated regularly and guides response.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified

Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)
### Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring

#### 3.2 Adherence to and application of standards and guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Use of existing national standards and guidelines where possible. Standards and guidance are agreed to, adhered to and reported against.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National and international standards and guidance identified and adapted as required</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical standards and guidance agreed upon and used by partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified

Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)
### 3.3 Clarifying funding needs, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC funding needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of proposals against the strategic plan jointly determined with partners based on agreed transparent criteria</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization of proposals against strategic plan fair to all partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster supported and facilitated access to funding sources by partners</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular reporting on funding status</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicative characteristics of functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding requirements determined with partners, allocation under jointly agreed criteria and prioritisation, status tracked and information shared.

Good
## 4 Advocacy

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Concerns for advocacy identified with partners, including gaps, access, resource needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)

Issues requiring advocacy identified and discussed together with partners

100%

Good
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and affected people</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative characteristics of functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common advocacy campaign agreed and delivered across partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring

5 Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme monitoring formats agreed upon and used by cluster partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared by partners reflected in cluster reports</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular publication of progress reports based on agreed indicators for monitoring humanitarian response</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular publication of cluster bulletins</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in needs, risk and gaps highlighted in cluster reports and used for decision-making by partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response and monitoring of the cluster taking into account the needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Use of monitoring tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, regular report sharing, progress mapped against agreed strategic plan, any necessary corrections identified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 6 Preparedness for recurrent disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness for recurrent disasters</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National contingency plans identified and shared</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners contributed to initial or updated risk assessments and analysis</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners involved in development of preparedness plan</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners committed staff and/or resources towards preparedness plan</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early warning reports shared with partners</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>National contingency plans identified and shared; risk assessment and analysis carried out, multisectoral where appropriate; readiness status enhanced; regular distribution of early warning reports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7 Accountability to affected populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability to affected populations</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to consult and involve population in decision-making agreed upon and applied by partners</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints about assistance received agreed upon and applied by partners</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Accountability to affected population; agencies have investigated and, as appropriate, acted upon feedback received about the assistance provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Answer distributions and comments

0 General

Comments

We are an active member and work in collaboration with the health cluster coordinator in respect to identify the need and response areas.
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1 Supporting service delivery

1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities

1.1.1 List of partners regularly updated

Coordinator

Has the list of cluster partners (including members and observers) been updated as needed?

The list has been updated as often as needed

1.1.2 Adequate frequency of cluster meetings

Coordinator

Are you satisfied with the frequency of cluster meetings?

Completely satisfied

Partners

Has the list of cluster partners (including members and observers) been updated as needed?

No meetings have been held
Not at all satisfied
Rather unsatisfied
Fairly satisfied
Very satisfied
Do not know

0% 20% 40% 60% 80%
1.1.3 Attendance of cluster partners to cluster meetings

Coordinator
Have members and observers attended cluster meetings?
Most attended, including major actors

Partners
Are you satisfied with the frequency of cluster meetings?

Never
Rarely
Sometimes
Often
Always
Do not know

1.1.4 Level of decision making power of staff attending cluster meetings

Partners
Have minutes been taken at cluster meetings, with action points?

They had limited decision-making authority and some ability to follow-up on decisions made

They had full decision-making authority and were fully able to follow-up on decisions made

Do not know
1.1.5 Conditions for optimal participation of national and international stakeholders

Coordinator

Could members and observers participate fully in cluster meetings? (For example, did meetings occur in accessible locations? Were participants able to speak in a range of languages?)

It was easy to attend/participate in cluster meetings

Partners

Have members and observers attended cluster meetings?

It was very difficult to attend and participate in cluster meetings

It was quite difficult to attend and participate in cluster meetings

It was fairly easy to attend and participate in cluster meetings

It was very easy to attend and participate in cluster meetings

Do not know

1.1.6 Writing of minutes of cluster meetings with action points

Coordinator

Have minutes been taken at cluster meetings, with action points?

Minutes with action points have been taken at most meetings
1.1.7 Usefulness of cluster meetings for discussing needs, gaps and priorities

Coordinator

Have cluster meetings been useful in helping partners to discuss needs, gaps and priorities?
They have been very useful

Partners

Have cluster meetings been useful in helping partners to discuss needs, gaps and priorities?

1.1.8 Useful strategic decision taken within the cluster

Coordinator

Has the cluster taken strategic decisions about the direction of the humanitarian response?
Strategic decisions were taken and they were mostly useful

Partners

Have you regularly attended humanitarian inter-sectoral coordination meetings, such as inter-cluster coordination meetings or country team meetings?

No strategic decisions were taken
Strategic decisions were taken but they were not useful
Strategic decisions were taken and they were somewhat useful
Strategic decisions were taken and they were mostly useful
Strategic decisions were taken and they were very useful
Do not know
1.1.9 Attendance of cluster coordinator to HCT and ICC meetings

Coordinator

Have you regularly attended humanitarian inter-sectoral coordination meetings, such as inter-cluster coordination meetings or country team meetings?

I have always attended meetings

1.1.10 Support/engagement of cluster with national coordination mechanisms

Coordinator

Has the cluster supported or engaged with coordination mechanisms of national authorities in its sector?

National coordination representatives have often participated in cluster meetings

1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery

1.2.1 Mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities updated as needed

Coordinator

Has the cluster regularly mapped what partners are doing and where they are working (via 3W and similar mechanisms)?

Mapping was done and always updated as often as required

1.2.2 Inputs of health partners into mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities

Coordinator

How many partners have helped to map programme activities and their geographical presence?

Most

Partners

Has the cluster regularly mapped what partners are doing and where they are working (via 3W and similar mechanisms)?
1.2.3 Involvement of partners into analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping

**Partners**

*How many partners have helped to map programme activities and their geographical presence?*

- Analyses have been done but my organization was not invited to participate
- My organization was invited to participate but did not do so
- My organization participated but its contribution was not adequately taken into account
- My organization participated and its contribution was taken into account somewhat adequately
- My organization participated and its contribution was adequately taken into account
- Not applicable (for example, because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)
- No analyses of capacity and complementarity have been undertaken
- Do not know

1.2.4 Analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping used by partners for decision-making

**Coordinator**

*Has the cluster used information on programme activities and partners’ geographical presence to analyse capacity and complementarity (gaps and overlaps). Has that information influenced cluster partners’ decisions?*

- Analysis has been done and has been used by some partners for decision making

**Partners**

*Has the cluster used information on programme activities and partners’ geographical presence to analyse capacity and complementarity (gaps and overlaps). Has that information influenced cluster partners’ decisions?*

- Never
- Seldom
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always
- Do not know
The information and analysis provided by the cluster are important for our agency to better plan, respond to humanitarian conditions, and avoid duplication of efforts including resource mobilization and proposal submission.

Sometimes health cluster and other clusters such as Nutrition and WASH provide a conflicting decision which we put them in doubt.

We are faced with a bit of a task harmonizing the donors & Cluster’s priorities and response approaches. There’s a lot that should be done to strengthen the linkages between government/development and humanitarian programs. Sub-national coordination and support as close to the emergency event as possible is not at the best.
2 Informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team

2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis

2.1.1 Use of cluster agreed tools and guidance for needs assessments

Coordinator

Have cluster partners used jointly agreed sectoral needs assessment tools and guidance?

The cluster has agreed tools and guidance and a few partners have used them

Partners

Have cluster partners used jointly agreed sectoral needs assessment tools and guidance?

Assessment tools and guidance have been agreed but my organization has not used them

Assessment tools and guidance have been agreed but my organization has seldom used them

Assessment tools and guidance have been agreed and my organization has sometimes used them

Assessment tools and guidance have been agreed and my organization has often used them

Assessment tools and guidance have been agreed and my organization has always used them

No assessment tools and guidance have been agreed

Do not know
2.1.2 Involvement of partners in joint needs assessments

Coordinator

Have cluster partners been involved in coordinated sectoral needs assessments and surveys?

Partners have been involved in some coordinated assessments

Partners

Have cluster partners been involved in coordinated sectoral needs assessments and surveys?

Coordinated assessments and surveys have been done but my organization has not been involved

My organization has rarely been involved in coordinated assessments and surveys

My organization has sometimes been involved in coordinated assessments and surveys

My organization has been involved in most coordinated assessments and surveys

My organization has been involved in all coordinated assessments and surveys

Not applicable (for example because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)

No coordinated assessments or surveys have been done

Do not know

2.1.3 Sharing by partners of their assessment reports

Coordinator

Have cluster partners shared their own surveys and assessments with the cluster?

Survey and assessment reports have been shared by most partners

Partners

Have cluster partners shared their own surveys and assessments with the cluster?

My organization has shared none of its survey or assessment reports

My organization has shared few of its survey and assessment reports

My organization has shared some of its survey and assessment reports

My organization has shared most survey and assessment reports

My organization has shared all its survey and assessment reports

Not applicable (for example because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)

No surveys or assessments have been done

Do not know

2.2 Analysis to identify and address (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication, and cross-cutting issues
2.2.1 Analyses of situations done together with cluster partners

Coordinator
Have you done situation analyses together with cluster partners?
Yes

Partners
Have you done situation analyses together with cluster partners?

Yes
No
Do not know

2.2.2 Analyses of situations identified risk

Coordinator
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?
Mostly identified

Partners
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?
Not identified
Partially identified
Mostly identified
Fully identified
Do not know
2.2.3 Analyses of situations identified needs

Coordinator
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?
Mostly identified

Partners
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?

2.2.4 Analyses of situations identified gaps in response

Coordinator
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?
Mostly identified

Partners
Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?
2.2.5 Analyses of situations identified capacity in response

Coordinator

Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?

Mostly identified

Partners

Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?

Not identified

Partially identified

Mostly identified

Fully identified

Do not know

2.2.6 Analyses of situations identified constraints to respond

Coordinator

Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?

Mostly identified

Partners

Have these analyses identified risks, needs, gaps, capacity to respond, and constraints?

Not identified

Partially identified

Mostly identified

Fully identified

Do not know
2.2.7 Age (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Mostly considered

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

2.2.8 Gender (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Mostly considered

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
2.2.9 Diversity – other than age and gender- (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Mostly considered

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

2.2.10 Human rights (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Mostly considered

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
2.2.11 Protection, including gender-based violence (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Partially considered

Partners

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

2.2.12 Environment (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Partially considered

Partners

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
2.2.13 HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Partially considered

Partners

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

2.2.14 Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Partially considered

Partners

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

2.3 Prioritizing on the basis of response analysis
2.3.1 Joint analyses supporting response planning

Partners

Have these analyses supported response planning and prioritization?

- Never
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always
- Do not know

Comments
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3 Planning and strategy development

3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives and indicators that directly support HC/HCT strategic priorities

3.1.1 Strategic plan developed

Coordinator

Has a cluster strategic plan been developed?
Yes

3.1.2 Partners involved in the development of strategic plan

Coordinator

Did cluster partners help to develop the cluster’s strategic plan?
Cluster partners were fully involved in developing the plan

Partners

Has a cluster strategic plan been developed?

- A plan has been developed but my organization was not asked to participate
- My organization was asked to help develop the plan but it did not contribute
- My organization helped develop the plan but its contribution was not adequately taken into account
- My organization helped develop the plan and its contribution was taken into account somewhat adequately
- My organization helped develop the plan and its contribution was adequately taken into account
- Not applicable (for example, because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)
- The cluster has not developed its strategic plan
- Do not know

3.1.3 Sectoral strategic plan includes objectives, activities and indicators

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan include objectives, activities and indicators?
Fully

3.1.4 Sectoral strategic plan reviewed against host government strategy

Coordinator

Has the cluster’s strategic plan been reviewed against the host government’s strategy?
Yes

3.1.5 Age (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?
Mostly addressed
3.1.6 Gender (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Mostly addressed

3.1.7 Diversity – other than age and gender- (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Mostly addressed

3.1.8 Human rights (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Mostly addressed

3.1.9 Protection, including gender-based violence (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Mostly addressed

3.1.10 Environment (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Partially addressed

3.1.11 HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Partially addressed

3.1.12 Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan

Coordinator

Does the cluster’s strategic plan address cross cutting issues?

Mostly addressed

3.1.13 Strategic plan shows synergies with other sectors

Coordinator

Does the sectoral strategic plan show synergies with other sectors, in line with the strategic objectives of the HCT?

The cluster’s strategic plan addresses synergies with other clusters fully
3.1.14 Strategic plan used by partners for guiding response

Coordinator

During the last six months, how many partners have used the cluster’s strategic plan to guide their response?

Most

Partners

Does the cluster’s strategic plan include objectives, activities and indicators?

- A strategic plan exists but it has not been shared with my organization
- The strategic plan has been shared but my organization has not used it
- The strategic plan has been shared and my organization has sometimes used it
- The strategic plan has been shared and my organization has often used it
- The strategic plan has been shared and my organization has always used it
- Do not know

3.1.15 Deactivation criteria and phasing out strategy formulated together with partners

Coordinator

Have partners helped to identify deactivation criteria and a phase-out strategy for the cluster?

Deactivation criteria and a phase-out strategy have not been identified or discussed with partners

3.2 Adherence to and application of standards and guidelines

3.2.1 National and international standards and guidance identified and adapted as required

Coordinator

Have national and international standards and guidance been identified, adapted in consultation with national authorities (when necessary), and shared with partners?

Standards and guidance have been identified, adapted and shared
3.2.2 Technical standards and guidance agreed upon and used by partners

Coordinator

Have technical standards and guidance been agreed and have partners used them?

Technical standards and guidance have been agreed and some partners have used them

Partners

Have national and international standards and guidance been identified, adapted in consultation with national authorities (when necessary), and shared with partners?

- No technical standards/guidelines have been agreed
- Technical standards/guidelines have been agreed but my organization has not used them
- Technical standards/guidelines have been agreed and my organization has sometimes used them
- Technical standards/guidelines have been agreed and my organization has often used them
- Technical standards/guidelines have been agreed and my organization has always used them
- Do not know

3.3 Clarifying funding needs, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC funding needs

3.3.1 Prioritization of proposals against the strategic plan jointly determined with partners based on agreed transparent criteria

Coordinator

Have cluster partners participated in prioritizing proposals against the strategic plan? Were transparent criteria agreed?

Transparent criteria were agreed but partners did not jointly prioritize proposals

Partners

Have cluster partners participated in prioritizing proposals against the strategic plan? Were transparent criteria agreed?

- No transparent criteria were agreed and partners did not jointly prioritize proposals
- Transparent criteria have not been agreed but partners jointly prioritized proposals
- Transparent criteria were agreed but partners did not jointly prioritize proposals
- Transparent criteria were agreed and partners jointly prioritized proposals to some extent
- Transparent criteria were agreed and partners were fully involved in prioritizing proposals
- Do not know
3.3.2 Prioritization of proposals against strategic plan fair to all partners

Coordinator

Were proposals prioritized against the strategic plan in a manner that was fair to all partners?

Proposals were prioritized in a manner that was fair to the majority of partners

Partners

Were proposals prioritized against the strategic plan in a manner that was fair to all partners?

Proposals were not prioritized against the strategic plan

Proposals were prioritized but in a manner that was unfair to partners

Proposals were prioritized in a manner that was unfair to the majority of partners

Proposals were prioritized in a manner that was fair to the majority of partners

Proposals were prioritized in a manner that was fair to all partners

Do not know

3.3.3 Cluster supported and facilitated access to funding sources by partners

Coordinator

Has the cluster assisted partners to access funds (for example by including their proposals in appeals or applications to the Emergency Response Fund or Common Humanitarian Fund)?

The cluster has given partners very good support
3.3.4 Regular reporting on funding status

Coordinator
How often have you reported on the funding status of the cluster against needs?*

As often as needed

Partners
Has the cluster assisted partners to access funds (for example by including their proposals in appeals or applications to the Emergency Response Fund or Common Humanitarian Fund)?

Comments
Delay of funding release and inadequate project period and allocated budget not considering admin cost

for the last 3-6 months there was no proposals and criteria discussed in health cluster meetings, but it is the culture to discuss these criteria for EHF application. Agencies have their additional bilateral resource mobilization activities and strategies. however, this is based on the needs and plans which is driven from cluster assessments and country humanitarian response plans

The planning/strategy cycle should be aligned to international calendar, There’s need for more cohesion between humanitarians, government and donors, Very big step to have HNO introduced this year.
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4 Advocacy

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

4.1.1 Issues requiring advocacy identified and discussed together with partners

Coordinator

Has the cluster identified issues requiring advocacy and discussed them with partners?

The cluster has identified advocacy issues in consultation with all partners

Partners

Has the cluster identified issues requiring advocacy and discussed them with partners?

No advocacy issues have been discussed

Advocacy issues have been discussed but my organization was not invited to participate

My organization was invited to discussions of advocacy issues but did not participate

My organization participated in advocacy discussions but its views were not adequately considered

My organization participated in advocacy discussions and its views were adequately considered

Not applicable (for example, because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)

Do not know

4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and affected people
4.2.1 Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with partners

Coordinator

Have advocacy activities been agreed and undertaken together with partners?
Advocacy activities have been agreed and some partners have taken part in them

Partners

Have advocacy activities been agreed and undertaken together with partners?

The cluster has undertaken no advocacy
The cluster has undertaken advocacy but my organization was not invited to participate
The cluster invited my organization to participate in its advocacy, but it did not do so
My organization has participated in some of the cluster’s advocacy activities
My organization has participated in most of the cluster’s advocacy activities
Not applicable (for example, because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity)
Do not know

Comments

The cluster coordinator is usually consulting our agency on advocacy issues and areas, and the agency supports
The high sensitivity to government sometimes weakens the collective humanitarian voice
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5 Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results

5.1 Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results

5.1.1 Programme monitoring formats agreed upon and used by cluster partners

Coordinator

Have partners used programme monitoring and reporting formats that cluster partners have agreed?

Standards have been agreed and most partners have reported regularly

Partners

Is the information that partners send reflected in cluster bulletins and updates?

No standards for monitoring and reporting have been agreed

Standards have been agreed but my organization does not use these formats for reporting

Standards have been agreed and my organization has sometimes used these formats when it reports

Standards have been agreed and my organization has regularly used these formats when it reports

Standards have been agreed and my organization has used these formats very regularly for reporting

Do not know

5.1.2 Information shared by partners reflected in cluster reports

Coordinator

Is the information that partners send reflected in cluster bulletins and updates?

Information has been shared and has been taken into account fully

5.1.3 Regular publication of progress reports based on agreed indicators for monitoring humanitarian response

Coordinator

Has progress on programmes or the strategic plan been reported using agreed indicators for monitoring the humanitarian response? *

As often as needed

5.1.4 Regular publication of cluster bulletins

Coordinator

Have cluster bulletins or updates been published?

Less often than needed
5.1.5 Changes in needs, risk and gaps highlighted in cluster reports and used for decision-making by partners

Coordinator

Have cluster bulletins or updates highlighted risks, gaps and changing needs, and has this information influenced decisions?

Changes in needs, risks and gaps have been highlighted and have sometimes been used for decision-making

Partners

Have partners used programme monitoring and reporting formats that cluster partners have agreed?

Cluster bulletins and other reports have not highlighted risks, gaps and changing needs.

My organization has not used cluster information on needs, risks and gaps for decision-making

My organization has sometimes used cluster information on needs, risks and gaps for decision-making

My organization has often used cluster information on needs, risks and gaps for decision-making

My organization has always used cluster information on needs, risks and gaps for decision-making

Do not know

5.1.6 Response and monitoring of the cluster taking into account the needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys

Coordinator

Has your cluster taken into account the distinct needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys, in its response and monitoring?*

Partially

Partners

Has progress on programmes or the strategic plan been reported using agreed indicators for monitoring the humanitarian response? *

No

To a small extent

Partially

Mostly

Fully

Not applicable

Do not know
The first issue of bulletin just went out this month, which is a big step, but too early to comment on quality, reach, and impact.
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6 Preparedness for recurrent disasters

6.1 Preparedness for recurrent disasters

6.1.1 National contingency plans identified and shared

Coordinator

Have national preparedness or contingency plans (sectoral or multi-sectoral) been identified and shared?

A national plan has been identified but the cluster has not discussed it

6.1.2 Partners contributed to initial or updated risk assessments and analysis

Coordinator

Have cluster partners contributed to initial risk assessments and analysis (including multi-sectoral), or updates?

Risk assessment has been done and some partners have participated

6.1.3 Partners involved in development of preparedness plan

Coordinator

Have cluster partners helped to develop or update preparedness plans (including multisectoral ones) that address hazards and risks?

Preparedness plans have been written/updated and some partners have participated

Partners

Have national preparedness or contingency plans (sectoral or multi-sectoral) been identified and shared?

A preparedness plan has not been written or updated

A preparedness plan was drafted/updated but my organization was not invited to participate

My organization was invited to help develop/update the preparedness plan but did not do so

My organization helped develop/update the preparedness plan but its contribution was inadequate

My organization helped develop/update the preparedness plan and its contribution was adequate

Not applicable (for example because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)

Do not know

0%  20%  40%  60%  80%
6.1.4 Partners committed staff and/or resources towards preparedness plan

Coordinator

Have cluster partners committed staff or resources that can be mobilized when preparedness plans are activated? Please choose only one of the following:

- Few partners have committed staff or resources that can be mobilized

Partners

Have cluster partners contributed to initial risk assessments and analysis (including multi-sectoral), or updates?

- No staff or resources have been committed
- Limited staff or resources have been committed
- Adequate staff or resources have been committed
- Not applicable (for example because my organization has observer status or is not engaging in this cluster activity.)
- Do not know

Do not know

6.1.5 Early warning reports shared with partners

Coordinator

Have you regularly shared and discussed early warning reports with cluster partners?

- Early warning reports have sometimes been shared

Comments

The organization has field presence through field offices with committed staff. Moreover, and where there is need, the organization recruit short-term emergency consultants to support and fill gaps.

Risk assessments mostly done by WHO/PHEM, Annual national and regional EPRP are hardly funded, Standard EWARS/IDS reports/bulletins not in use, EPHI occasionally provides IDSR/situation update at HCC meetings.
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7 Accountability to affected populations

7.1 Accountability to affected populations

7.1.1 Mechanisms to consult and involve population in decision-making agreed upon and applied by partners

Coordinator

Have cluster partners agreed and applied mechanisms (procedures, tools or methodologies) for consulting and involving affected people in decision-making?*

No mechanisms for consulting/involving affected people have been agreed

Partners

Have cluster partners agreed and applied mechanisms (procedures, tools or methodologies) for consulting and involving affected people in decision-making?*

Mechanisms have been agreed but my organization has not applied them
Mechanisms have been agreed but my organization has seldom applied them
Mechanisms have been agreed and my organization has sometimes applied them
Mechanisms have been agreed and my organization has often applied them
Mechanisms have been agreed and my organization has always applied them
No mechanisms for consultation/involvement have been agreed
Do not know

0% 10% 20% 30% 40%
7.1.2 Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints about assistance received agreed upon and applied by partners

Coordinator

Have cluster partners agreed and applied mechanisms (procedures, tools or methodologies) to receive, investigate and act on complaints about assistance received?*

No investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed

Partners

Have cluster partners agreed and applied mechanisms (procedures, tools or methodologies) to receive, investigate and act on complaints about assistance received?*

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed but my organization has not applied it

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed but my organization has seldom applied it

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed and my organization has sometimes applied it

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed and my organization has often applied it

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed and my organization has always applied it

No investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed

Do not know

Comments

For the accountability to affected population, there is general agreement within the cluster that affected population should be involved in planning and implementation, having their views and feedback on the response. However, there is no unified tool or guidance from the cluster and rather different agencies have different tools. OCHA has recently introduced a mechanism to receive and investigate on complaints but I am not sure if it is being used by partners or not.

Partners are individually implementing AAP with different tools but a structured conversation/training hasn't happened, ICCG has discussed formation of an AAP WG that will jointly train, roll out tools and monitor implementation.
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8 Others

Comments

Regular Cluster Meeting should be continued and budget allocation for health program should get attention like other cluster Nutrition, WASH and Protection

none

I would like to report a significant improvement in the health cluster coordination in the last 6 months. the cluster coordinator’ approach and understanding have improved the cluster’ performance. for example, government representative are regularly attending and co-leading the meetings for the first time; health cluster bulletin developed and published for the first time; SAG is reactivated; More consultations with partners are witnessed.

The cluster is doing great job in bring humanitarian agencies regularly to discuss on the issues of life saving activities but there must be a platform that brings humanitarian and development actors together so that the humanitarian nexus development will be more effective in bringing sustainable solutions.

The Health Cluster has been working well in the last one year In Ethiopia especially in the IDP response where the humanitarian need was huge. In this respect, the cluster was working tirelessly to prioritize the meagre resources available and provide the required support for the cluster partners.

A fully constituted and consistent coordination team with required capacity is necessary to steer the Cluster through its functions. The recently formed SAG should step up and play a bigger role in implementing the Cluster’s functions.