

Country :
South Sudan

 Year :
2023

 Date of launch of the CCPM process
 (sharing of the online survey):
February 2024

 Date of the survey results revision and
 action plan meeting: **August 2024**

 Date of completion of the CCPM (sharing of the
 action plan at the GSC): **August 2024**

Cluster Core Functions	Performance Status	Prioritisation	Actions agreed	Timeframe agreed	Responsible to follow up	Constraints and challenges	Good practices and lessons learned
1. Supporting service delivery	88.22 (Strong)	Top priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building of new and existing partners (e.g. Proposal Writing, roles and responsibilities, technical capacity) Partners to enhance attendance of national and state level meetings Timely review and approval of reports from partners Continue with engagement and responses through the cluster coordination mechanism Strengthen state level coordination mechanism Re-define prioritization criteria for responses Durable solution for existing IDP sites and returnees Improve on logistics arrangements Address funding gaps Advocacy for NNGO and localization Continue coordination with other clusters for integrated programming Improve on dissemination of information 	Ongoing/Immediate	Cluster Coordinators and partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding Access/ Insecurity/ Flooding & rainy season Logistics Delayed approvals /communication gap Lack of adequate capacity from local partners Coordination and attendance of meetings Joint decision making (involving of all members) Poor internet/phone network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quick approval of reports and core pipeline requests TWG formed during the Sudan crisis Good coordination – State and National Quality service delivery Accountability to all
2. Informing HC/HCT strategic decision-making	84.44 (Strong)	Top priority – 10 Medium priority – 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quick decision making Strengthen localization Funding mobilization – address budget constraints Improve on evidence-based response Deep field focal points at country level (volunteers) Focus on durable solutions Improve needs assessment and strengthen coordination mechanism Have all partners participate in IRNAs without discrimination Tools to capture needs of the community 	Ongoing/Immediate	Cluster Coordinators and partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding Delayed response from donors Jointly addressing cross cutting issues Donors dictate on interventions/priorities Poor internet/phone network Access/ Insecurity/ Flooding & rainy season Logistics Delayed approvals /communication gap Lack of adequate capacity from local partners Coordination and attendance of meetings Decision making (involving of all members) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SFPs verify information from counties/in the field Better coordination among partners Indepth sector specific needs analysis Community engagement with beneficiaries before responses Joining IRNAs Collaboration with other clusters Information collected from needs analysis used in decision making
3. Planning and implementing cluster strategies	88.89 (Strong)	Top priority – 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner involvement in decision making, developing and reviewing cluster SOPs, annual plans, sector strategies Strengths need assessment and data collection. Planning should be based on available resources and be area-specific Continue with having standard indicators Revise and contextualize response packages to address realistic needs Having technical groups engage widely Good coordination to avoid overlaps Information sharing with cluster partners The plan should be relevant to the funds available to minimize raising community expectations Review the package of core pipeline items to fit context Build on the lessons learned from previous shelter projects In case of a call for proposals on NFI explaining to the partners the necessary requirements for the funding Joint reviews of SoPs, response modalities are time consuming Training for monitoring tools is needed most We need to focus more on local based NGO's by giving them required capacity Misunderstanding community preferences and cultural nuances may lead to inappropriate choices in NFI offerings. 	Dec 2024	Cluster coordinators, field focal points, partners, donors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of/limited funding Training on cluster monitoring tools is needed Lack of interest in the cluster Technical guidance on developing a strategy plan Lack of effective communication Poor coordination Diverse interest at community level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reporting tools availability Support and coordination provided by the cluster Sharing information on time Proper coordination Improving on 5Ws reporting Partners engagement Early planning which is objective and based on available or expected resources Adequate data. Improved communication among the cluster FPs n IPs Proper coordination and awareness giving Online MEAL sessions Have a response package designed and tailored to different crises categories and scenarios Timely communication
4. Monitoring and evaluating performance	71.11 (Satisfactory)	Top priority – 10 Medium priority - 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training on cluster monitoring tools Set clear objectives for measuring performance Improve on the tools for collecting qualitative data Baseline data and cluster tools should be reviewed regularly Developing tools for monitoring and evaluation Involve partners in monitoring visits Build the capacity of the partners The cluster should continue encouraging partners to conduct the PDMs after every response Continue maintaining 5Ws reporting on monthly base Improve data collection. A standardized monitoring tool in place for SNFI partners field visits by cluster coordinators Listening more to community organizations since they understand better 	Ongoing/Dec 2024	Cluster Coordinators, IMO, SFPs and partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of monitoring tools by new IPs Lack of streamlined tools No M&E plans by partners Poor internet to collect inputs from field level Funding limited to offer M and E training Low skills and capacity building Failure to achieve objectives as a result of factors beyond the control of the members Lack of good security in the area Resource constraints due to funding gaps Compliance issues Lack of review meetings and learning events Inaccessibility due to insecurity in some locations Low Inputs from field level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking corrective actions PDM Regular monitoring and evaluation of the projects Online MEAL trainings Field visits by the cluster, informs future improved implementation and planning Good feedback 5Ws and Need Assessment Coordination at the national level Timely feedback PDMs for interventions Transparency in data collection Introducing M and E tools aligned with the context of South Sudan

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan individuals partners monitoring • Set a Clear objectives to measure performance • Understanding the tools to have good results of monitoring system • M&E basic training to IPs • Carry the assessment monthly • M\$E plans • Technical gaps 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for coordinated and more streamlined reporting and activities tools • Poor feedback from beneficiaries • Bulky tools for multiple questions for IRNA 	
5. Building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning	77.78 (Satisfactory)	Top priority – 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely prepositioning beyond the few field hubs. • Mobilization of resource • Pre-positioning of pipeline items early • Preposition NFI at state level • Put a side contingency funding for the emergency • Field level coordination with IPs • Support local partners in preparedness and responses mechanism • More capacity building sessions at field level, quick update on the preposition plan • Regular info sharing on crises around country • Open more warehouses in hard-to-reach location • Timely preposition of items to existing warehouse • Localization needs to be prioritized for quick response • More oversight and mentorship • Timely planning , coordination and program execution • Improve on providing comprehensive training to partners and policy and framework development. • the cluster should continue to identify and sharing contingency plans; clearly defining the role of the cluster and partners in the contingency plan; and discussing how to strengthen response • simplified communication 	Dec 2024	Cluster Coordinators, IMO, SFPs and core pipeline team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor coordination • Logistical challenges including transportation of NFIs • Access issues; Poor road access to preposition items to hard to reach locations • Resistance by partners to more oversight and mentorship • Limited funding/reduced funding for emergencies & training • Lack of adequate stocks and insecurity • Limited capacity for the foot soldiers, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Prepositioning of NFI in the field facilitates timely response • Inter-cluster coordination • Adequate logistical arrangements/linking with the logistics cluster to support IPs • Delays in supplies delivery by log cluster • Low response to emergency due to funding. • Lack of capacity building due to funding limitations. • Timely information sharing • Trained cluster coordinators • Shelter cluster always lobbied for approval of items. • Perfect cluster tools • partners supporting smaller partners during interventions
6. Supporting robust advocacy	73.33 (Satisfactory)	Top priority – 17 Medium priority - 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Join all IRNA's taking place across the country • Advocacy for more funding for NNGO • Prioritize the localization agenda in all funding allocations • Look for more donors outside South Sudan • Enhanced stakeholder engagement and data-driven and advocacy. • Online platforms with donors • Joint advocacy • Improve NFI cluster presence during IRNA 	Immediate	Cluster Coordinators, IMO, NGO forum, partners, donors, government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in priorities for donors • Donor fatigue due to unending needs and man-made crises • Competing priorities • Funding challenges. • Hesitation from the donors to the field to listen directly from the implementors/beneficiaries • Transparency in term of allocating funding • Donors not reaching the hard-to-reach locations. • Limited capacity by the local NGOs to conduct advocacy activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shelter cluster has been able to lobby for local funds with ease eg, SSHF, RRF • Ensuring that projects are implemented as per donor requirements and as per humanitarian principles • Cluster partners' participation in the IRNA • Advocacy leads to funding hence more lives are saved • Localization is emphasized and promoted during fund release and allocation hence increased funding for local NGOs • Inter cluster coordinations and Area based interventions • Proper coordination within the cluster is a tick, localization is improving • Reporting on funds (FTS) • Regularly meeting with partners to strengthen funding • Planning together to ensure implementation
7. Promoting accountability to affected populations	91.11 (Strong)	Top priority – 19 Medium priority - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training • Stick to the humanitarian principles • Involve the beneficiaries of the projects in all the phases of intervention • Advocating for more training on AAP to local NGOs • Should be emphasized on more as it is very vital; training of more partners on AAP • Use of Community feedback mechanism, GBV referral pathway • Report AAP issues on time • Monitoring and evaluate AAP actions • Incorporate APP in the M & E framework • Lessons learnt on feedback mechanisms should be shared with partners to develop corrective mechanisms • Establish feedback mechanism for reporting, and PSEA reporting mechanism. • Involving the local authorities and community leaders 	Ongoing	Cluster Coordinators, IMO, SFPs, partners, donors, government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor network to collect feedback using other online tools. • Cultural practices • Lack of timely actions to the complaints raised • Lack of technical know-how from the beneficiaries making it hard to involve them on technical issues • Lack of Funding for capacity building for partners and beneficiaries • Trust issues at the community level • Insecurity • Unskilled reporting due to lack of understanding by some partners particularly the local partners • Influence of local authorities • Distorted information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified tools - including AAP • Addressing issues that arise by AAP immediately to mitigate escalation • Use relevant data to implement projects • -Using the information from the needs assessment to inform our decisions • Local ownership Knowledge sharing and awareness raising on cross cutting • The AAP Committee formation leads to project success as the Committee helps in complains handling and problem solving throughout the project life span • Needs analysis tools are inclusive • Community participation promotes skills development • Maintenance of suggestions boxes for our beneficiaries to freely express their opinions. • Considerations of Community needs

8. Capacity Building		Top priority – 17 Medium priority - 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train local and new partners on SNFIs tools and methodology • Quality proposal writing • Training on the different shelter designs • Cluster SoPs and response recycle plan • Strengthening capacity on M& E. • Cash based interventions • MEAL - training mainly baseline and endline. • Refresher training on 5Ws • Capacity on AAP actions • Best practices sharing, technical support and resources sharing, regular trainings • Partners reporting on finance (FTS) 	October 2024	Cluster coordinators, TWIGs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding limitations • Human resources; lack of skilled human resources • Lack of willingness to change • Contextual differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cluster was able to train subnational cluster coordinators. • Will improve the capacity of partners • The trained persons can train others and cascade it to the communities • Improvement in the quality of proposal and advocacy • Improvement in delivering of our work • Better reporting and improved accountability • Better understanding of SNFI tool and approach • Mentorship at the field level by SFPs through joint IRNAs and integrated programming
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--------------	-----------------------------	--	--