

Cluster Performance Summary July - December 2018

Sr. no	Category	Indicative characteristics of functions	Value	Performance / Satisfactory Status	Performance Status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified
1	Supporting Service Delivery		82%	Good	
	1.1. Coordinating to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Established relevant coordination mechanism - recognizing national system, sub national and co-lead aspects Cluster coordinators active in inter-cluster and related meeting	87%	Good	Regular cluster meeting is functional and effective. The regular cluster meeting is open to all partners; the information, analysis and updates shared and discussed during the meetings. Information shared with relevant stakeholders both at national and sub-national.
	1.2. Developing mechanisms that eliminate duplication of service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cluster partners engagement in dynamic mapping of presence and capacity (5W), information sharing across the clusters in line with the joint strategic objectives in the Humanitarian Response Plan 	77%	Good	Cluster activities mapping is existing and useful to support the decision making. The cluster collect, analyze and map the partners activities every two weeks and discuss it further all together with the partners during the bi-weekly operational working group meeting to coordinate the responses, identify the needs, capacities and gaps.
2	Informing strategic decisions of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT)		76%	Good	
	2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of assessment tools in accordance with agreed minimum standard, individual assessment/survey results shared and/or carried out jointly as appropriate 	76%	Good	<p>The needs assessment tools and analysis have been developed by the cluster, agreed and widely used by the partners. Partners shared their assessment report to the cluster for endorsement before responding the needs to avoid duplication. The cluster established the assessment working group to evaluate the existing assessment tool and revise it based on their experiences on the ground.</p> <p>In 2018, the Assessment Working Group has finalized the new assessment tools (need analysis tools) mainstreaming the cross-cutting issue (protection, AAP and HLP).</p>
	2.2 Analysis to identify (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication and cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint analysis for current and anticipated risk, needs, gaps and constraints; cross cutting issues addressed from outset 	76%	Good	<p>Anticipating the dynamic in South Sudan, the cluster working together with partners and other sector/stakeholders analyze the current and anticipated risk, needs, gaps and constraints by developing/updating the contingency planning.</p> <p>The cluster actively participated on the Need Analysis Working Group (NAWG) to</p>

					inform the analysts about the needs of SNFI.
2.3	Prioritizing on the basis of response analysis	- Joint analysis supporting response planning and prioritization in short and medium term	81%	Good	The prioritizations have been included in to the cluster response plan and agreed among the partners.
3	Planning and strategy development		87%	Good	
3.1	Developing sectoral plans, objectives, indicators that directly support HC/HCT strategic priorities	- Strategic plan based on identified priorities, shows synergies with other sectors against the strategic objectives, addresses cross cutting issues, incorporated exit strategy discussion and is developed jointly with partners. Plan is updated regularly and guides response	76%	Good	- Strategic plan have been developed and discussed with the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG). Partners are well informed about the cluster strategic plan and requested to reflect it to their proposal and their response plan. - Partners regularly received information being shared with and/or from HC/HCT.
3.2	Adherence to and application of standards and guidelines	- Uses of existing national standards and guidelines where possible. Standard and guidelines are agreed to, adhered to and reported against	89%	Good	Cluster guidelines, standards and other strategy documents are exist and agreed among the partners, 90% of partners adhere to the cluster standards and guidelines. The cluster as much as possible to provide info-session ensuring partners are well informed with the cluster standards. <i>The cluster made all the standards, guidelines and other resources available online at the cluster website (http://sheltersouthsudan.org/documents).</i>
3.3	Clarifying funding needs, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC funding needs (for example, CAP/Flash Appeals, ERF/CHF, CERF)	- Funding requirements determined with partners, allocation under jointly agreed criteria and prioritization, status tracked, and information shared	87%	Good	The cluster periodically updating partners with the fund status and funds availability whenever new allocation is coming.
4	Advocacy		68%	Satisfactory, (need minor improvement)	
4.1	Identifying advocacy concerns that contribute to HC/HCT messaging and action	- Concern for advocacy identified with partners, including gaps, access, resources needs	68%	Satisfactory, (need minor improvement)	Concern/issues require advocacy were periodically discussed with partners mainly during the cluster meeting and/or bilaterally and if it necessarily, the cluster brings it to the ICWG, donors and/or HCT meeting. All the developments and updates are regularly informed to the partners

	4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and affected people	- Common advocacy campaign agreed and delivered across partners	69%	Satisfactory, (need minor improvement)	The cluster continue to help partners in advocating to OCHA and/or relevant stakeholders in negotiate access to deliver humanitarian assistance to the affected population in hard to reach areas. The cluster also lead the coordination with the Logs cluster to transport the cargo to the distribution site.
Sr. no	Category	Indicative characteristics of functions	Value	Performance Status	Performance Status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified
5	Monitoring & Evaluation		76%	Good	
	5.1 Monitoring and reporting on implementation of the cluster strategy and results; recommending corrective action where necessary.	- Use of monitoring tools in accordance of minimum standards, regular report sharing, progress mapped against agreed strategic plan, any necessary corrections identified.	82%	Good	The cluster monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools has developed in line with the cluster strategic plan, shared and used widely by the partners. In 2018, The cluster Programme Quality Working Group (PQWG) finalized the PDM toolkit and endorsed by the SAG.
6	Contingency Planning and Preparedness		82%	Good	
	6.1 Preparedness for recurrent disasters (when feasible and relevant)	- Contingency plan (at national and sub-national level) are identified and share; risk assessment and analysis carried out, multisectoral where appropriate; readiness status enhanced; regular distribution of early warning report	76%	Good	The contingency plan has been developed among the cluster, partners and the inter-cluster working group. The contingency plan consists of various scenarios where the risks, capacities and resources have been identified.
7	Accountability to Affected Population		78%	Good	
		- Affected population conduct or actively participate in regular meetings on how to organize and implement the response; agencies have investigated and, as appropriate, acted upon feedback received about the assistance provided	78%	Good	Accountability to the affected populations are mainstreamed in to all response cycle. Guidelines on how to improve the accountability to the affected population have been developed. The affected populations are involved as much as possible during the when partners are planning for response. Complain desks are there during the distributions; need to improve the complaint and feedback mechanism during the distribution and its follow-up.
8	Capacity Building		81%	Good	

1. Cluster info-
session
2. Training/Workshop
3. Knowledge
Management

- Partners are actively involved during the capacity building activities.

81%

Good

The cluster continue to support partners to increase their capacity in responding the needs in South Sudan. The cluster regularly conducting the cluster info-sessions to discuss specific topics that partners want to know better. The cluster provide training on cluster response methodology to the new local partners and refresher to all partners. The State Focal Point (SFP) workshop being conducted every 6 months bringing together all the SFPs, SiFPs and area focal points to discuss the challenges, strategic planning and sharing their experiences. The cluster will also provide more space to the partners to share their experiences, project and lesson learn during the cluster meetings.

DRAFT