

Level: National and Sub-National (Rakhine CCCM/NFI, Rakhine Shelter and Kachin/Shan)

Survey open from: 14 - 28 March 2016

Partner type	Numbers partners responding (all levels)	Total number of partners	Response rate (%)
International NGOs	7	N/A	N/A
National NGOs	3	N/A	N/A
UN organizations or Int. Org.	11	N/A	N/A
IFRC/ICRC	1	N/A	N/A
National authority	0	N/A	N/A
Total	22	N/A	N/A

CCPM report - Core function results

	COORDINATOR (NATIONAL)		PARTNERS (NATIONAL)	
	Score	Performance status	Score	Performance status
1. Supporting service delivery				
1.1 Providing a platform that ensures services delivery is driven by the Humanitarian Response Plan and strategic priorities	75%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	78%	Good
1.2 Developing mechanisms that eliminate duplication of service delivery	63%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	91%	Good
2. Informing strategic decisions of the humanitarian coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian country team				
2.1 Preparing needs assessments and analysis of goals (across and within Clusters, using information	80%	Good	50%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement
2.2 Identifying and finding solutions for (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication and cross-cutting issues	27%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	63%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement
2.3 Formulation priorities on the basis of analysis	100%	Good	100%	Good
3. Planning and strategy development				
3.1 Developing sectoral plans objectives and indicator that directly support realization of the overall	53%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	44%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement
3.2 Applying and adhering to common standards and guidelines	80%	Good	58%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement
3.3 Clarifying funding requirements, helping to set priorities, and agreeing Cluster contributions to the HC's overall humanitarian funding proposals	33%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	27%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement
4. Monitoring and evaluating performance				
4.1 Monitoring and reporting on Activities and needs : measuring progress against the cluster strategy and	93%	Good	43%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement
5. Building National capacity in preparedness and contingency planning				
5.1-3 National contingency plans identified and shared, an partners contributing; role of the cluster and partners are clearly defined and understood in teh contingency plan; cluster has discussed how to strengthen response capacity in country	82%	Good	50%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement
6. Supporting robust advocacy				
6.1 Identifying concerns and contributing key information and messages to HC/HCT messaging and action	67%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	63%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement
7. Accountability to affected populations				
7.1-3 Mechanisms to consult and involved affected people in decision making; agreed mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints; key issues relating to protection from sexual violence and abuse raised and discussed	69%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	42%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement

Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring Report

Myanmar - March 2016

CCPM report - Core function results

CCPM report - Core function results		PARTNERS (RAKHINE SHELTER)		PARTNERS (KACHIN SHAN)		PARTNERS (RAKHINE CCCM/NFI)	
1. Supporting service delivery	Score	Performance status	Score	Performance status	Score	Performance status	
1.1 Providing a platform that ensures services delivery is driven by the Humanitarian Response Plan and strategic priorities	86%	Good	67%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	72%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
1.2 Developing mechanisms that eliminate duplication of service delivery	88%	Good	69%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	88%	Good	
2. Informing strategic decisions of the humanitarian coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian country team							
2.1 Preparing needs assessments and analysis of goals (across and within Clusters, using information	69%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	33%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	67%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
2.2 Identifying and finding solutions for (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication and cross-cutting issues	64%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	59%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	70%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
2.3 Formulation priorities on the basis of analysis	100%	Good	50%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	75%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
3. Planning and strategy development							
3.1 Developing sectoral plans objectives and indicator that directly support realization of the overall	54%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	53%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	61%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
3.2 Applying and adhering to common standards and guidelines	100%	Good	100%	Good	100%	Good	
3.3 Clarifying funding requirements, helping to set priorities, and agreeing Cluster contributions to the HC's overall humanitarian funding proposals	42%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	33%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	33%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	
4. Monitoring and evaluating performance							
4.1 Monitoring and reporting on Activities and needs : measuring progress against the cluster strategy and	63%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	69%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	73%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
5. Building National capacity in preparedness and contingency planning							
5.1-3 National contingency plans identified and shared, on partners contributing; role of the cluster and partners are clearly defined and understood in teh contingency plan; cluster has discussed how to strenghten response capacity in country	68%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	50%	Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	54%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	
6. Supporting robust advocacy							
6.1 Identifying concerns and contributing key information and messages to HC/HCT messaging and action	75%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	79%	Good	96%	Good	
7. Accountability to affected populations							
7.1-3 Mechanisms to consult and involved affected people in decision making; agreed mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints; key issues relating to protection from sexual violence and abuse raised and discussed	65%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	75%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	53%	Satisfactory, needs minor improvement	

Responses to open ended questions (National and Sub-National)

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster co-lead/co-chair has affected coordination.

- The Shelter Cluster is not a functional coordination body. While the CCCM cluster has suffered from serious gaps and capacity in lacking a cluster coordinator or poor cluster coordinators, meaning that NGOs had to step in to fill the gaps.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster supports service delivery.

- Given the volatile environment committed services are sometime impossible.
- The coordinator is open for discussion. There is a forum that can be used as a platform for agreement.
- The cluster only consists of direct implementers of CCCM/Shelter services. For a proper cluster coordination to take place all camp based actors should be encouraged to attend, however with the serious gaps in coordination staff, this rarely happens. For the shelter cluster this meeting is held in front of government officials, which makes discussing very sensitive topics surrounding the shelters difficult do to the potential repercussions from the government.
- The cluster works well in Myanmar, but it could work better with more participation from local NGOs and more information from Government. Also, although the Donors and Embassies sometimes attend they seem more intent on learning from others than sharing any information or plans they might have. The UN has humanitarian needs and plans but these lack weight when there is no UN comprehensive strategy or plan for the Country. More needs to be done to link Relief, Rehabilitation and Development across all sectors.

Please write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster informs decisions of the HC/HCT.

- The gap analysis and analysis of capacity to respond for Rakhine has informed HCT decision-making at various critical junctures. The link between situation analysis and decisions at HCT regarding Kachin and Northern Shan is less evident and clear.
- In shelter, the assessment tools and methodologies to date have only been decided by the cluster lead not well discussed around the partners. I do not feel any cluster from the Sittwe level gives good comment, analysis or information to the Yangon level for decision making.
- I am an INGO Member of the HCT Core Group. The cluster provides relevant information to the HCT. The cluster is much more helpful to our organization than the HCT in providing useable information. HCT is largely a political and information body without much day to day impact in the field.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add about planning and strategy development.

- For Shelter there has not been a proper 2016 meeting, when UNHCR did do a 2016 planning meeting, it was already Feb 2016! Neither cluster seems to have an overall strategy and spend most of the time reacting to current issues instead of protectively engaging.

Myanmar - March 2016

- The cluster is still struggling with its partnership with Government. The Government doesn't share information in a regular or timely manner and this makes planning very difficult. But the Cluster is clear on its strategy to hold government accountable. The situation in Myanmar is a protracted crisis. It requires longer term planning, yet UNHCR continues to insist on just 6 month contracts with cluster members. This is not good planning or very strategic at all. The siloed thinking and structure of the UN system hinders cross sector/cluster planning, funding and strategizing. It is obsolete in that regard.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster has monitored and reported its strategy and results.

- Have worked closely with the coordinator on reporting against indicators and results on CCCM.
- The cluster seems to feel that putting bulletins on-line is more important than listening to the needs of the cluster members and acting.
- It is easy and helpful to work with the Cluster. Much easier than the Education in Emergency Sector.

Please write here any other comments or information you wish to add on preparedness and contingency planning.

- Contingency planning for camps has been raised by the cluster and being addressed by partners.
- The cluster has not taken a proactive lead in any of this but has taken part in meetings on contingency planning.
- Most discussion focuses around the risk of floods and typhoons.

Write here any other comments and information you wish to add on the Cluster's role in advocacy activities.

- Need to balance/focus equal level of advocacy for both locations (Rakhine & Kachin) as well as for the both sectors Shelter and CCCM.
- Advocacy has been weak across all sectors, however the gaps/weakness in leadership in CCCM and particularly Shelter cluster have made advocacy more challenging.
- The cluster could probably do more to involve embassies, donors, HC, RC/HC in our advocacy issues. We seem to feed them lots of information but we never hear back from those mentioned above on how or if they use our information for advocacy and what the results are if any. It is one way information flow and that makes our advocacy plans and actions less effective.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on Cluster accountability to affected women, girls, men and boys, and how feedback systems are performing.

- The clusters have not made any movement on accountability.
- Protection is a central part of the discussions in the Cluster.

Responses to open ended questions (Rakhine)

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster co-lead/co-chair has affected coordination.

- The Cluster co-lead/co-chair managed to bring cluster members to regular coordination meetings in which information can be shared and issues can be raised to find out solutions. The Cluster co-lead/co-chair implemented the projects through direct implementation and implementing partners. The efforts of the Cluster co-lead/co-chair were impressed by authorities at all levels and the partners.
- 1- The cluster members should be engaged more in the decision making process of the Cluster, particularly in drafting annual strategy and camp closure protocols (for example organizing more workshops). 2- The Cluster lead needs to make sure that an appropriate info-sharing system, harmonized M&E tools, reporting and communication systems are in place and followed by the cluster members. 3- There is a lack of standardized operating procedures which is affecting the field work (e.g. NFI distributions, etc.). 4- In order to have an effective coordination strategy, the cluster should be co-chaired by one UN and one NGO representative. Particularly if the agency that is leading the cluster is the same agency which is funding the cluster members. In that case, it's advisable that an external and neutral member could co-lead the cluster.
- Sharing relevant updates and useful information.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster supports service delivery.

- Even standard 4W formatted yet in cluster, in every cluster meetings members shared updates and information similar to 4W.
- Through consultation.

Please write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster informs decisions of the HC/HCT.

- The Cluster usually brings the issues to the attention of HC/HCT to have wider discussions in solving the issues.
- Report sharing.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add about planning and strategy development.

- The planning and strategy phases should be drafted in collaboration with the cluster members. Indicators should be set up at the beginning of the planning phase in order to monitor trends and implementation of activities.
- Based on needs assessment.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster has monitored and reported its strategy and results.

- Harmonized M&E tools should be developed and agreed by the cluster in collaboration with partners.
- Very good.

Myanmar - March 2016

Please write here any other comments or information you wish to add on preparedness and contingency planning.

- There is a lack of an operational contingency plan breakdown by location.
- Discussed yearly.

Write here any other comments and information you wish to add on the Cluster's role in advocacy activities.

- Very good in advocating with partner agencies as well as Government counterpart.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on Cluster accountability to affected women, girls, men and boys, and how feedback systems are performing.

- Report sharing.

Responses to open ended questions (Kachin Shan)

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster co-lead/co-chair has affected coordination.

- Data sharing, we can know who cover which camp, reduce gap.
- We are facing the gap of Cluster Co-lead/Co-Chair in our area and Cluster is not able to provide the coordination or sharing information with Shelter construction organizations. We hope from the cluster to get update and gap information.

Write here any comments or information you wish to add on how the Cluster supports service delivery.

- Cluster need to share all the designs, update information of shelter gaps and 4w update. Cluster meeting also need to have well plan or agenda (e.g. discuss about the update organizations' plan, how to coordination with WASH cluster, share update design according the feedback of beneficiaries).
- There are information but it is not mentioning the real gap. Example 4W says who does what, where but it doesn't say if the gaps or needs are really covered by those working on.