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Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring

Overall response rate (Based on the number of organizations that are part of the cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of partners</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |                         |                           |
| **International NGOs** |                         |                           |
| 60 %                 |                         |                           |
| 15                   | 9                        |

|                      |                         |                           |
| **UN Agencies**      |                         |                           |
| 75 %                 |                         |                           |
| 4                    | 3                        |

|                      |                         |                           |
| **Donors**           |                         |                           |
| 25 %                 |                         |                           |
| 4                    | 1                        |

|                      |                         |                           |
| **National NGOs**    |                         |                           |
| 58 %                 |                         |                           |
| 15                   | 9                        |

|                      |                         |                           |
| **National Authorities** |                         |                           |
| 67 %                 |                         |                           |
| 15                   | 10                       |

|                      |                         |                           |
| **Other**            |                         |                           |
| 50 %                 |                         |                           |
| 2                    | 1                        |

https://primewho.org/reports/publish?projectId=543&reportGenerator=ccpm
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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><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of partners</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International NGOs</strong></td>
<td>180 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UN Agencies</strong></td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donors</strong></td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National NGOs</strong></td>
<td>75 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Authorities</strong></td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number partners responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of partners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://primewho.org/reports/publish?projectId=543&reportGenerator=ccpm
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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

   Informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team

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

   Monitoring and reporting on implementation of cluster strategy and results
       Satisfactory

5 Preparedness for recurrent disasters
   Satisfactory

6 Accountability to affected populations
   Satisfactory
## 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>Description</th>
<th>Status</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>0%</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**

The good practices identified are regular updating of partners contact list, regular coordination meetings with Arabic translation and follow up on action points. Constraints: Some of the partners do not send decision makers in the Technical Working Group and only ensure attendance.

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

1. The Partners will be advised to ensure presence of knowledgeable and expert representative in TWGs within a month.  
2. Orientation of health partners on roles and responsibilities based on IASC Cluster functions at least twice a year.  
3. Feedback to the partners from other coordination fora such as ICCG and HLG.  
4. Develop and share calendar of events on quarterly basis.
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### 1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Cluster partner engagement in dynamic mapping of presence and capacity (4W); information sharing across clusters in line with joint Strategic Objectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>Good practice: online 4Ws and HeRAMS data base and regular preparation and sharing of Health Indicators and HeRAMS reports with the partners. The operational issues such as access constraints, gaps in service delivery etc. were openly discussed and addressed. Constraints: The provision of updated information to these tools is dependent on the partners and due to frequent change of staff (IMOs) in these agencies, sometime the information is not updated based on the ground realities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red) | Regular and frequent orientation of IMOs from the partners about the reporting tools (4Ws and HeRAMS) and value of updated information. This will be done on quarterly basis. |

---
2 Informing strategic decision-making of the Humanitarian Coordinator/Humanitarian Country Team

2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Use of assessment tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, individual assessment / survey results shared and/or carried out jointly as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>There is no standard need assessment tool used by the partners. Good practice: For HNO a standard needs assessment tool is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td>A task Force will be established to review and develop a standard tool for health needs assessment by all the partners. The tool will be developed within three months (before end of April 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>Percentage</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>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicative characteristics of functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint/Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint analysis for current and anticipated risks, needs, gaps and constraints; cross cutting issues addressed from outset.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- The obstacle to consider HIV/AIDS in analysis is lack of data on the prevalence in northern Syria.

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

- A training should be planned for the health partners on analysis of cross cutting issues in project/program management in Q2 2018.
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### 2.3 Prioritizing on the basis of response analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Joint analysis supporting response planning and prioritisation in short and medium term.</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):
- Improve analysis to anticipate future gaps with active involvement of health partners
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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>Indicator</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan developed</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners involved in the development of strategic plan</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral strategic plan includes objectives, activities and indicators</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral strategic plan reviewed against host government strategy</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity – other than age and gender- (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection, including gender-based violence (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in strategic plan</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan shows synergies with other sectors</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan used by partners for guiding response</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deactivation criteria and phasing out strategy formulated together with partners</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicative characteristics of functions**

- 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.

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

- Good practice: Consultation with Cluster partners in the development of a cluster strategic response plan.

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

- 1. Review the plan during mid year 2018.
- 2. Consult other sectors/cluster in the development of cluster strategic response plan.
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### 3.2 Adherence to and application of standards and guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</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>

**Indicative characteristics of functions**

- Use of existing national standards and guidelines where possible. Standards and guidance are agreed to, adhered to and reported against.

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

- Good Practice: The health cluster developed Essential PHC package for northern Syria and guidelines for mental health

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

- Ensure application of package by all the partners as soon as possible
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### 3.3 Clarifying funding needs, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC funding needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Funding requirements determined with partners, allocation under jointly agreed criteria and prioritisation, status tracked and information shared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>Good practice: Partner are regularly (quarterly) updated on funding status at health cluster coordination meetings and the bulletin and are involved in prioritization of needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td>All partners to be encouraged to report on FTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score: Good (75-100%)**

- Prioritization of proposals against the strategic plan jointly determined with partners based on agreed transparent criteria: 75%
- Prioritization of proposals against strategic plan fair to all partners: 75%
- Cluster supported and facilitated access to funding sources by partners: 100%
- Regular reporting on funding status: 100%
## 4 Advocacy

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues requiring advocacy identified and discussed together with partners</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicative characteristics of functions</td>
<td>Concerns for advocacy identified with partners, including gaps, access, resource needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>Best Practice: The Health Cluster partners identified advocacy concerns such as access to besieged areas, evacuation of critically ill patients from besieged areas, protection of health care etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and affected people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative characteristics of functions</th>
<th>Common advocacy campaign agreed and delivered across partners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Reactivation of Advocacy TWG within two months
2. Inclusion of advocacy messages in the monthly Health Cluster Bulletin as early as possible
3. Media visibility of Turkey Health Cluster partners in their webpages/sites

Satisfactory
### 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>100%</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>Good practice: 1. Agreed tools to monitor strategic plan and HRP 2. Monthly Health Indicators report produced and shared with all the stakeholders 3. Health Cluster information products are produced and shared with all the partners and donors Constraint: 1. There are no agreed tools to monitor quality of health services delivered at facility level among the partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</th>
<th>1. CLA should arrange training for the health partners on monitoring and reporting by July 2018 2. Task force to develop M&amp;R tool for assessment of health services at primary and secondary health care level by May 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 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>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners contributed to initial or updated risk assessments and analysis</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners involved in development of preparedness plan</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners committed staff and/or resources towards preparedness plan</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early warning reports shared with partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicative characteristics of functions

| National contingency plans identified and shared; risk assessment and analysis carried out, multisectoral where appropriate; readiness status enhanced; regular distribution of early warning reports. |

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

Best Practice:
1. Partners share experience, knowledge and time
2. Experts were mobilized by CLA for developing CP for example for Chemical Weapons Preparedness and Response Plan
3. Health related early warning were timely shared

Constraints:
1. Inadequate resources and less attention /advocacy to Preparedness than response
2. Not enough early warning for population displacement

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

1. Advocacy and resource mobilization for CP/preparedness planning
2. Coordination with other sectors on CP
3. Review of CP on quarterly basis
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#### 7 Accountability to affected populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability to affected populations</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to consult and involve population in decision-making agreed upon and applied by partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints about assistance received agreed upon and applied by partners</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicative characteristics of functions | Accountability to affected population; agencies have investigated and, as appropriate, acted upon feedback received about the assistance provided. |
|----------------------------------------|
| Constraints, unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified | Good Practice 1. Some health partners have good systems and mechanisms in place to involve beneficiaries in program planning and feedback and complaint mechanisms such as focus groups, committees, patient satisfaction survey, complaint box at health facilities etc. Constraints: There is no common agreed upon AAP framework among the health partners |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up actions, with timeline and/or support required (when status is orange or red)</th>
<th>1. Development of agreed upon AAP framework for the cluster partners by June 2018 2. Sharing of good practices by the partners by May 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Answer distributions and comments

0 General

Comments

ATAA humanitarian Relief Association

I'm an active member since 2014, and I represented NGOs and INGOs in the past.
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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% 25% 50% 75% 100%
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 generally been useful

Partners

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

- No
- To a limited extent
- Quite a lot
- Definitely
- Do not know

0% 20% 40% 60% 80%
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?

No coordination mechanisms exist; engagement is not appropriate; question is not applicable

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)?

Mapping has been done but my organization did not contribute

Mapping has been done and my organization contributed far less often than required

Mapping has been done and my organization contributed less often than required

Mapping has been done and my organization contributed almost as often as required

Mapping has been done and my organization contributed as often as required

Not applicable (for example, because my organization is a donor)

No mapping has been done

Do not know
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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
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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?

![Bar Chart]

Comments

We conducted many of WHO and UNICEF field assessments to support decision making in the cluster.

A major improvement was made in information sharing and I was able to get most of the picture of health services in Idleb for the first time in 4 years.

The SWs are updated on monthly basis while HeRAMS is live and quarterly HeRAMS report is produced. Gap analysis is presented in the report. The online contact list is regularly updates. Most observer to not submit information through 4Ws or HeRAMS.
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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?**
  - *No coordinated assessments have been done*

**Partners**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated assessments and surveys have been done but my organization has not been involved</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has rarely been involved in coordinated assessments and surveys</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has sometimes been involved in coordinated assessments and surveys</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has been involved in most coordinated assessments and surveys</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has been involved in all coordinated assessments and surveys</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (for example because my organization has observer status or is not engaged in this cluster activity.)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No coordinated assessments or surveys have been done</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

No

Yes

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?

![Bar chart showing responses to risk analysis]

- Not identified
- Partially identified
- Mostly identified
- Fully identified
- Do not know
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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?

- Not identified
- Partially identified
- Mostly identified
- Fully identified
- Do not know
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?

- Not identified
- Partially identified
- Mostly identified
- Fully identified
- Do not know
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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?

![Bar chart showing different levels of identification: Not identified, Partially identified, Mostly identified, Fully identified, Do not know. The Mostly identified category is the highest, followed by Fully identified, Partially identified, and Do not know. There is a 40% response rate for Mostly identified, 30% for Fully identified, and 20% for Partially identified. Not identified and Do not know have lower response rates.]

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?

- Not considered
- Partially considered
- Mostly considered
- Fully considered
- Do not know
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?*

- Not considered
- Partially considered
- Mostly considered
- Fully considered
- Do not know
2.2.9 Diversity – other than age and gender- (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

Partially considered

Partners

Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

Not considered

Partially considered

Mostly considered

Fully considered

Do not know
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?

Not considered

Partially considered

Mostly considered

Fully considered

Do not know
2.2.11 Protection, including gender-based violence (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

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

Partners
   Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

   Not considered
   Partially considered
   Mostly considered
   Fully considered
   Do not know
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?

![Bar Chart]

- Not considered
- Partially considered
- Mostly considered
- Fully considered
- Do not know
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2.2.13 HIV/AIDS (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

Coordinator
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?
Not considered

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of responses for different categories:
- Not considered: 10%
- Partially considered: 30%
- Mostly considered: 40%
- Fully considered: 0%
- Do not know: 20%]
2.2.14 Disability (cross-cutting issue) considered in analyses

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

Partners
Have these analyses considered cross-cutting issues?

![Chart showing disability consideration levels](chart.png)

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?

![Chart showing prioritization levels](chart.png)
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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 involved to a large extent 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?

The host government lacks a strategy
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?
Partially 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?
Partially 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?
Not 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 to a large extent
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
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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 and partners jointly prioritized proposals to some extent

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

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?*

Almost 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)?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about how often the cluster reported on funding status.]

Comments

Partners are updated on funding status based on FTS.
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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 most 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 advocacy concerns identified are related to attack on health care, inadequate funds and sometime access related matters. Advocacy is a continues activity and conducted at different level.
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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?

As often as needed

https://primewho.org/reports/publish?projectId=543&reportGenerator=ccpm
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? *

Mostly

Partners

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

Mostly

Fully

Not applicable

Do not know

Comments

The partners are reporting on selected indicators on monthly basis and Health Indicators report is produced and shared with all the stakeholders. The Periodic Monitoring report of HRP 2017 also produced. The reports are analysed and decisions are taken if the progress is not on right track.
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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 and the cluster has 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 most 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 most 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
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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:

Most 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

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 often been shared

Comments

SIMRO established NPM project inside Syria in 12 governorates, NPM is an OCHA tool to highlight population figures, needs, and fash reports that help in addressing preparedness plans.

A number of good examples include the cholera preparedness plan, the chemical attacks contingency plan, for which my organization contribution during the planning was taken to a large extent, in addition to the Idleb and Raqqa response plans.

As its XB operation and there is no national government. The Preparedness and Response planning is done in consultation with the partners for various events/crisis. The Cluster did planning for Allepo, Ar Raqqa, East Ghouta, Northeast and north west Syria and for cholera etc.
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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?*

Mechanisms for consulting/involving affected people have been agreed and some partners have applied them

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
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?*

An investigation/complaint mechanism has been agreed and some partners have applied them

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

My organization was invited to share mechanisms of investigation/complaints, but couldn't participate due to the short duration for receiving the inputs.

Some partners are using various methodologies to ensure AAP and quality of care such as complaint box at health facilities (feedback/complaint mechanisms) WhatsApp group etc.
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8 Others

Comments

The cluster witnessed a major structural improvement over the past 3-6 months. New mechanisms and guidelines were developed, and a higher level of interaction and commitment from partners was observed. INGOs decreased their level of presence, and this can be linked to the changing working environment in Turkey, but SNGOs have significantly scaled up which is a natural and encouraged improvement. The cluster made a big step towards organizing information sharing and standard products, which now represent a key source for information which I use in decisions on regular basis.

- Cluster meetings are very crowded.
- Coordination between NGOs seems remaining to be a problem, even if getting better. - Cluster Coordinators have an hard task, and they do it with energy and conviction; Quality of the contact is high.
- For a little NGO, it is difficult to be involved inside all activities of the cluster, which can make you feel yourself beside, at times.

...شكرا لكم ...

Cluster meetings are slightly interactive and became traditional. Engagement of partners in strategic planning is limited. Partners were not consulted in discussing their HPF proposals.

Its a cluster that operates from cross border. The partners are mostly Syrian NGOs.