


Q1 1. I am a (choose one) :

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



■ Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based
 ■ Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based
 ■ Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based
 ■ Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based


	Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based	Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based	Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based	Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based	Total
--	--	--	--------------------------------------	--	-------

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017


Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	100.00% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	0.00% 0	100.00% 14	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 36	0.00% 0	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	100.00% 36	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	6	14	36	36	92

**Q2 2. I participate in the following
Sector/Cluster (can choose more than one)**

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017



	Education	Food Security	Health	Nutrition	Protection	CCCM/Shelter/NFIs	WASH	Coordination and Common Services	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	7.61% 7
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	14.29% 2	28.57% 4	28.57% 4	35.71% 5	50.00% 7	21.43% 3	35.71% 5	35.71% 5	38.04% 35
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	22.22% 8	22.22% 8	38.89% 14 D	16.67% 6	27.78% 10 D	38.89% 14	36.11% 13	19.44% 7	86.96% 80
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	8.33% 3	11.11% 4	16.67% 6 C	16.67% 6	58.33% 21 C	38.89% 14	36.11% 13	25.00% 9	82.61% 76
Total Respondents	14	16	26	17	41	31	32	21	92

Q3 I. Supporting service delivery3. Is there a coordination platform with regular meetings and system for sharing information?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	100.00% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	100.00% 14	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	94.44% 34	5.56% 2	0.00% 0	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	88.89% 32	5.56% 2	5.56% 2	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	86	4	2	92

Q4 4. On average how many partners are attending cluster meetings (national and sub-national)?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Less than 10	Between 10 and 20	More than 20	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	33.33% 2	50.00% 3	16.67% 1	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	50.00% 7	50.00% 7	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	19.44% 7	72.22% 26	8.33% 3	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	36.11% 13	61.11% 22	2.78% 1	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	29	58	5	92



Q5 5. Have sector/cluster coordination resulted in decisions impacting operational response?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	71.43% 10	21.43% 3	7.14% 1	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	77.78% 28 D	5.56% 2 D	16.67% 6	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	52.78% 19 C	27.78% 10 C	19.44% 7	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	62	16	14	92

Q6 6. Does the sector/cluster coordination include input from sub-national groups, which where appropriate includes national actors?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	78.57% 11	14.29% 2	7.14% 1	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	80.56% 29 D	11.11% 4	8.33% 3	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	58.33% 21 C	16.67% 6	25.00% 9	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	66	13	13	92



Q7 7. Does the sector/cluster bring together humanitarian and development actors in an effort to forge linkages between relief and development?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	66.67% 4	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	57.14% 8	35.71% 5	7.14% 1	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	50.00% 18	38.89% 14	11.11% 4	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	41.67% 15	52.78% 19	5.56% 2	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	45	40	7	92



Q8 8. Are there other working groups on thematic or technical areas of work linked to sectors or inter-sector groups that have an effect on coordination and service delivery?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	66.67% 4	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	78.57% 11	21.43% 3	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	72.22% 26	8.33% 3	19.44% 7	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	66.67% 24	11.11% 4	22.22% 8	39.13% 36


Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

Total Respondents	65	12	15	92
-------------------	----	----	----	----

Q9 9. Does the cluster/sector duplicate or cover similar areas of work to other coordination groups?




Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	0.00% 0	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	57.14% 8	35.71% 5	7.14% 1	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	36.11% 13	52.78% 19	11.11% 4	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	30.56% 11	47.22% 17	22.22% 8	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	32	46	14	92

Q10 10. Does the sector/cluster coordinate or work jointly with other sectors/clusters to improve service delivery?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	100.00% 14	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	58.33% 21	11.11% 4	30.56% 11 D	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	63.89% 23	25.00% 9	11.11% 4 C	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	63	14	15	92

Q11 II. Informing HC/HCT decision-making
11. Does the sector/cluster effectively raise and respond to key issues within the ICCG forum to inform HC/HCT decision-making?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	100.00% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	42.86% 6	28.57% 4	28.57% 4	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	33.33% 12	19.44% 7	47.22% 17	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	22.22% 8	25.00% 9	52.78% 19	39.13% 36

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

Total Respondents	32	20	40	92
-------------------	----	----	----	----

Q12 12. Does the communication link between the ICCG forum and the HC/HCT effectively facilitates informed decision-making by the HC/HCT?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	50.00% 3	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	7.14% 1	35.71% 5	57.14% 8	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	19.44% 7	22.22% 8	58.33% 21	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	13.89% 5	33.33% 12	52.78% 19	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	16	28	48	92

Q13 III. Planning and implementing cluster strategy13. Does the cluster/sector have a response plan?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	100.00% 14	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	69.44% 25	5.56% 2	25.00% 9	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	61.11% 22	19.44% 7	19.44% 7	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	66	10	16	92

Q14 IV. Monitoring and evaluating performance
14. Has the cluster released cluster performance monitoring results in the last six months?




Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	66.67% 4	33.33% 2	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	28.57% 4	71.43% 10	0.00% 0	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	58.33% 21 D	13.89% 5 D	27.78% 10	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	33.33% 12 C	41.67% 15 C	25.00% 9	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	41	32	19	92

Q15 V. Contingency planning and preparedness
15. Has the cluster worked with national authorities and/or OCHA to update contingency plans in the past 12 months?

Answered: 32 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	100.00% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	92.86% 13	0.00% 0	7.14% 1	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	66.67% 24	0.00% 0	33.33% 12	39.13% 36

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	63.89% 23	11.11% 4 C	25.00% 9	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	66	4	22	92

Q16 VI. Advocacy16. Has the cluster advocated on key issues at national level in the past 12 months?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	71.43% 10	7.14% 1	21.43% 3	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	61.11% 22	5.56% 2	33.33% 12	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	58.33% 21	16.67% 6	25.00% 9	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	58	10	24	92

Q17 17. Has the cluster developed joint advocacy messages/products with other sector/clusters in the past 12 months?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	50.00% 3	50.00% 3	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	50.00% 7	35.71% 5	14.29% 2	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	41.67% 15	8.33% 3	50.00% 18	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	55.56% 20	16.67% 6	27.78% 10	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	45	17	30	92

Q18 VII. Inter-cluster function18. Does inter-cluster coordination add value in facilitating a multi-sectoral approach to the humanitarian programme cycle including the implementation of the response?



Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	83.33% 5	16.67% 1	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	57.14% 8	14.29% 2	28.57% 4	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	61.11% 22	16.67% 6	22.22% 8	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	41.67% 15	33.33% 12	25.00% 9	39.13% 36

Total Respondents	50	21	21	92
-------------------	----	----	----	----

Q19 19. Are linkages between sub-national and national, HCT-ICCG working effectively?

★.

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0




	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	33.33% 2	66.67% 4	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	14.29% 2	50.00% 7	35.71% 5	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	16.67% 6	30.56% 11	52.78% 19	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	16.67% 6	44.44% 16	38.89% 14	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	16	38	38	92



Q20 20. Is there clarity on purpose, delegation of authority and roles and responsibilities?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	16.67% 1	66.67% 4	16.67% 1	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	28.57% 4	50.00% 7	21.43% 3	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	25.00% 9	33.33% 12	41.67% 15 D	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	44.44% 16	38.89% 14	16.67% 6 C	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	30	37	25	92

Q21 21. Is communication/ lines of communication between sub-national and national, HCT- ICCT clear and effective?


Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	33.33% 2	66.67% 4	0.00% 0	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	21.43% 3	42.86% 6	35.71% 5	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	13.89% 5	27.78% 10	58.33% 21	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	22.22% 8	41.67% 15	36.11% 13	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	18	35	39	92

Q22 22. Should the current humanitarian coordination architecture be revised?

Answered: 92 Skipped: 0



	Yes	No	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based (A)	33.33% 2	66.67% 4	6.52% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based (B)	64.29% 9	35.71% 5	15.22% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based (C)	50.00% 18	50.00% 18	39.13% 36
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based (D)	72.22% 26	27.78% 10	39.13% 36
Total Respondents	55	37	92

Q23 If yes, what is your suggestion?

Answered: 46 Skipped: 46

	If yes, what is your suggestion?	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based	100.00% 2	4.35% 2
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based	100.00% 6	13.04% 6
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based	100.00% 21	45.65% 21
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based	100.00% 17	36.96% 17
Total Respondents	46	46

#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based	Date
1	Clear lines of communication and roles outlined	5/24/2017 5:35 PM
2	Need to clarify if clusters cover NRS, whole of Shan and other areas of the country (asked to provide info after floods in dry zone and do preparedness for Mandalay earthquake); intercluster work on HRP data needs to be strengthened, need more IM support for clusters	5/24/2017 9:17 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based	Date
1	Not sure but has to be streamlined -- bilateral inter-cluster consultations are scattershot; ICCG doesn't provide enough structure in terms of guidelines for joint review of selected sector/cluster products, which could be a start.	5/30/2017 4:25 PM
2	To review OCHA and ICCG/GCM ToRs at field level; To improve coordination between the national and sub-national level; to improve coordination between and participation of clusters and sectors and the AHCT at sub-national level; to strengthen managers/senior staff capacity on coordination in IDP response; to establish a system of sanctions for those coordination bodies and staff responsible for it (including the HC/HCT/AHCT and cluster/sectors coordinators) if they fail their responsibility	5/24/2017 9:54 PM
3	Close all Clusters in Rakhine State - return to sectors	5/24/2017 5:00 PM
4	Clarify the authority of ICCG and/or relevant coordination structures at subnational level. If such a group exists, then inputs to the subnational level coordination mechanism does not necessarily have to have the approval of the national level counterparts before subnational level approval or endorsement. Otherwise if the subnational level would always seek approval from individual agency, national level counterparts then might as well abolish the subnational mechanism.	5/24/2017 4:40 PM
5	My real answer to above question is "don't know", but that was not an option. But I also don't have suggestions for improvement.	5/24/2017 9:27 AM
6	There are clusters meeting, GCM and ICCG whereby for Kachin context the ICCG will be an adhoc while the cluster and GCM will be on monthly basis. Each sector has shared their concerns, minutes, inputs, challenges etc. with its national cluster but the messages didn't seem to be transmitted well to HCT or HC. We were told that HCT has no time to look at all inputs but highlighted issues and concerns as bullet points for time to time will be sufficient?	5/24/2017 9:26 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based	Date
1	Don't change the setup, just fix it.	6/2/2017 3:47 PM
2	as a member of EiE working group, really want to hear how the working group will link with national for policy review or reform or building. should provide clear coordination instruction for the partners	6/2/2017 11:48 AM
3	The architecture is not the problem. The problem is that everyone is mining sharing information, but the flow of information is most from bottom up and there are few decisions made and the action taken if any at the top is not effectively feedback to any other levels.	6/1/2017 5:12 AM
4	Strengthen and empower sub-national architecture. Properly articulate scope of HRP with broader sector with proper linkages to relevant govt departments	5/31/2017 12:07 PM
5	The humanitarian coordination architecture seems good however, the service provision are overlapping in some area and no providers in some area which the equity for the beneficiaries is lost. Need to do service provider mapping and manage effectively	5/31/2017 8:59 AM
6	Participation of the government to the cluster is still need to improve.	5/30/2017 1:57 PM
7	Need more national staff involvement	5/30/2017 1:19 PM

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

8	Rethink of the HRP as an efficient tool for coordination and fundraising. Have one platform for humanitarian and development could be better	5/30/2017 12:20 PM
9	Humanitarian coordination should be linked with development programs to improve resilience of community	5/29/2017 3:10 PM
10	Stronger linkages between sub-national and national systems	5/29/2017 11:09 AM
11	Clearer lines of communication and reflective listening to the field (all partners, not just 1 person/agency)	5/25/2017 2:20 PM
12	IASC recommendations should be implemented instead of the current blurring of responsibilities	5/24/2017 1:25 PM
13	To continue all efforts for successful achievements of activities.	5/24/2017 12:03 PM
14	current humanitarian coordination needs to extend coordination and collaboration with central government and also support government to have govt led humanitarian coordination mechanism.	5/24/2017 12:01 PM
15	Stronger role to OCHA and dismantle RCO structure in Rakhine	5/24/2017 11:39 AM
16	informative	5/24/2017 11:05 AM
17	Increased integration with the government disaster management system, and development actors	5/24/2017 10:49 AM
18	Need more local NGOs, private organizations/foundation (if possible)	5/24/2017 10:14 AM
19	No need for a large revision but more of a tidying to ensure that the architecture is functioning as it should, with a particular focus on: strengthening communication between sub-national and national clusters; ensuring the HCT is a decision-making body and makes decisions based on input from the sub-national level; strengthening civ-mil coordination at the national and sub-national level; and reviewing the architecture in Sittwe and Northern Rakhine, to ensure that UN agencies (in particular UNHCR and OCHA) are filling/not overstepping their mandated roles;	5/24/2017 10:05 AM
20	1) There needs to be better linkages between sub national and national clusters. 2) Efforts need to be made to better engage national actors - this includes conducting meetings in other languages/having a translator present 3) Cluster leads need to have accountability mechanisms	5/24/2017 9:39 AM
21	Mine action actors are not officially included in the cluster system and a sub-cluster for mine action should be more formally established	5/24/2017 9:07 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based	Date
1	Creating an more effective, and direct link between central and sub level. Reduce the bureaucratic aspect in order to be more effective	5/31/2017 4:35 PM
2	Emphasis on clarity of roles need to take place	5/30/2017 6:17 PM
3	Cluster leads should be part of AHCT in order to strengthen decision making and not be merely information sharing. Also - more proactive steps should be made to bring together humanitarian and development actors.	5/30/2017 11:58 AM
4	UNOCHA should more active in humanitarian coordination role not only UN and INGOs but also with local NGOs and CSOs.	5/29/2017 8:35 PM
5	It is not the architecture that should be revised but the way it is operationalized. Do we need three coordination agencies plus the different mechanisms for a handful of partners? A good start would be holding cluster coordinators accountable	5/29/2017 12:47 PM
6	no more clusters.	5/27/2017 2:49 PM
7	Ask whether we need clusters in the light of a protracted crises. Look at cluster lead positions, where people are doing more than one role establish if it is efficient. do a 360 degree appraisal of cluster and coordinators	5/27/2017 11:03 AM
8	UN staff should be more aware about the fact that they have two hats. One as members of agencies and another one as members/leaders of clusters. The clusters should be directly represented in the AHCT and HCT, at least Protection.	5/26/2017 12:28 PM
9	Review the humanitarian coordination architecture based on evolving environment in the over-all framework of development.	5/25/2017 2:21 PM
10	The staff in charge of the Cluster should be participating in the AHCT and HCT. It should be granted that the voice of INGOs and NGOs is represented in the Clusters and AHCTs and HCTs. Currently the Head of Offices of different UN agencies are mainly representing the interests of their offices and not the clusters	5/24/2017 6:41 PM
11	There needs to be a revision of roles between Clusters and OCHA. ICCG meetings are not yielding any resolutions to inter-Cluster issues, and OCHA's role is largely unclear. It is also unclear who to raise security issues with, and most issues have to be dealt with through informal communications because the formal structure is ineffective.	5/24/2017 12:59 PM
12	In aiming at bridging with development assistance here the coordination needs to be more specific and involving.	5/24/2017 12:01 PM
13	a) Enhance communication flow and follow up to action points between HCT/AHCT and between GCM and AHCT b) Re establishment of ICCG in Kachin	5/24/2017 10:50 AM
14	Capacity development for cluster members should be considered in that architecture.	5/24/2017 10:32 AM

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

15	none	5/24/2017 10:18 AM
16	Not necessarily revised, but clarify the existing roles and responsibilities and empower the clusters to take strong decisions and actions (with the support of HCT/ICCG), rather than allowing everything to be driven from top down.	5/24/2017 9:39 AM
17	Better coordination and oversight over IPs activities, outstanding needs and gaps. There is no clear or even incorrect information on 3Ws, so challenging for new agencies to understand where to focus. Also, there is very little technical support available for especially WASH cluster - no mainstreamed approach on sanitation etc.	5/24/2017 9:24 AM

* Govt. Quality;
Military to Civilian;

Q24 Do you have any additional comments?

Answered: 26 Skipped: 66

	Do you have any additional comments?	Total
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based	100.00% 1	3.85% 1
Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based	100.00% 4	15.38% 4
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based	100.00% 14	53.85% 14
Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based	100.00% 7	26.92% 7
Total Respondents	26	26

#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, Yangon-based	Date
1	Clarity on the roles and responsibility and communication lines between AHCT/RCG and HCT would be needed. More clarity on the role of the GCM in Myitkyina would also be welcome	5/24/2017 9:48 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Coordinator, not Yangon based	Date
1	N/A	5/24/2017 9:54 PM
2	No	5/24/2017 8:06 PM
3	It is interesting for OCHA coordination mechanism.	5/24/2017 10:36 AM
4	no	5/24/2017 9:27 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, Yangon-based	Date
1	As clusters meant to be temporary, suggest have/allow more interaction with GoM, its efforts. Interaction to be monitored/adjusted in a way cluster's operation/role/attitude helps nation development	6/4/2017 9:46 AM
2	The HC needs to stop blocking the effective working of the humanitarian system. OCHA needs to be empowered to help the system start working.	6/2/2017 3:47 PM
3	Due to the complexity of the context and therefore there is no real strategy or vision for a constructive way forward. We are all contributing and managing, but no one is leading.	6/1/2017 5:12 AM
4	How do you ensure that individuals are not responding to this survey multiple times and thus you are getting a balanced and fair opinion??	5/31/2017 12:07 PM
5	A consolidated monthly calendar of cluster meetings	5/30/2017 8:51 PM
6	Need to consider to improve government participation in humanitarian coordination architecture	5/30/2017 1:19 PM
7	Take into account input from regional clusters more often and try harder to get representatives from local organisations to attend more often.	5/30/2017 12:52 PM
8	Advocacy, Intersectoral linkage and information sharing among cluster need to be improved	5/29/2017 3:10 PM
9	need to be reflected as well as documented feedback on issues/steps taken in order to lessen field level disenfranchisement with Yangon based cluster system.	5/25/2017 2:20 PM
10	OCHA should be more empowered to play its traditional role.	5/24/2017 1:25 PM
11	Difficult to provide recommendations whether to revise the humanitarian architecture or not if key questions such as # 18 to 21 cannot be answered.	5/24/2017 12:10 PM
12	NA	5/24/2017 11:05 AM
13	I think a likert-type scale for this surveys would have been better	5/24/2017 10:49 AM
14	Need more regular (quarterly or bi yearly) advocacy meeting with government/departments for the current issues and plan. (some clusters are doing but some are weak)	5/24/2017 10:14 AM
#	Q1: Sector/Cluster Partner, not Yangon-based	Date
1	None	5/25/2017 2:21 PM
2	I have been attending the nutrition sub cluster meeting in Sittwe for one time. May be some of the questions is out of my knowledge concern with cluster meetings.	5/25/2017 1:33 PM

Myanmar - Cluster/Sector Architecture Review May 2017

3	No tangible attempts to connect humanitarian and development assistance.	5/24/2017 12:01 PM
4	I have only been part of the health cluster for 1 month, so I do not know a lot of the dynamics yet.	5/24/2017 10:48 AM
5	Joint cluster coordination and collaboration was a key challenge in sub-national level.	5/24/2017 10:32 AM
6	none	5/24/2017 10:18 AM
7	Not suggested to revise the structure. But need to review the effectiveness of communication across clusters/sectors at different level.	5/24/2017 9:28 AM

