

Coordination



Performance Monitoring

Guidance: Cluster workshop to discuss the preliminary Coordination Performance Report, and agree on recommendations for improvement where indicated.

The Preliminary Coordination Performance Report displays the combined results from the recent anonymous self-assessment questionnaires completed by both cluster coordinators and partners. Detailed information on the 'scoring' or weighting of survey responses can be found in the following document: [Explanatory Note on Questionnaire Analysis](#). The report reflects the feedback from partners on the cluster's core functions, how partners are involved in, contribute to, and make use of its processes and deliverables. For more information on the IASC six cluster core functions, please see the Coordination Reference Module on <https://clusters.humanitarianresponse.info/>. The completed Cluster Description Questionnaire provides information on the cluster structure and processes, and the availability of the key deliverables, as background information for this performance monitoring exercise.

The next step in the process is for the country cluster coordination to circulate the preliminary Coordination Performance Report and the Cluster Description to cluster partners, and to schedule a cluster meeting to discuss the results. Ideally, the cluster meeting (or teleconference-call where applicable) should happen within two weeks from the receipt of the report.

Purpose: The meeting is an opportunity for self-reflection by the cluster, identifying areas that are working well and those that require additional attention, and raising awareness for support needed from the cluster lead agency, partners, and/or global clusters. Open analysis and discussion with cluster partners on the results and needed improvements should serve to strengthen transparency and partnership within the cluster.

Timing: As noted above, a cluster meeting should be scheduled within 2 weeks of receipt of the preliminary Coordination Performance Report. It is recommended that 3 hours be allotted for the meeting.

Participation: All cluster partners, including government counterparts, should be invited. Partners that have not completed the self-assessment questionnaire should be encouraged to contribute to the cluster performance monitoring process in the cluster meeting. Participants also should be encouraged to read the preliminary Coordination Performance Report before the meeting, and to come prepared to discuss improvement actions, including how they can specifically support these.

Meeting format (total approximately 3 hours):

Preparation: The cluster secretariat should have hard copies of the cluster description for all participants, and hard copies of the responses for each of the functions, to hand out to the respective working groups.

15 minutes: A general introduction on the process and results, including the importance of monitoring cluster performance and the opportunity it presents to partners to have their voices heard, and agree together on how to improve the cluster.

10 minutes: Assign partners to working groups (e.g. ask participants to count from 1-6) It is then recommended that participants be divided into groups with each group assigned to review results and comments, as well as to propose improvement actions, for one of the seven sections of the report (six core functions and a component on accountability to affected populations). The number of groups will be dependent on the number of participants attending the meeting, but to keep it manageable, no more than 6 working groups. It would be desirable to have at least 5-6 partners per group. If the number of

participants is less than 30, one group can look at 2 functions (for example combine functions 4 with 5, and function 6 with 7, as these are generally less complicated compared to the other functions).

30- 45 minutes: Group work: Each group should:

- Review and amend the Cluster Description as relevant to the function assigned to them (for example the related deliverables, or the mechanisms to manage the functions, such as the SAG, TWG, or committees to review proposals and funding allocation).
- Review the performance status of the function (detailed scoring of the various questions related to the function)
- Identify what worked well for that function (good practice, questions that scored 100%)
- Discuss possible constraints as well as support requirements for that function (look at questions that scored 75% or below)
- Identify other issues relevant to cluster performance that were not included in the survey
- Identify and prioritize any improvements for that function, add inputs from the plenary feedback

Coffee/tea break: 20-30 minutes

6 x 15 minutes: The groups should report back in plenary (15-20 each);

- (i) Seek feedback and endorsement on the recommendations from each of the working groups for each of the functions
- (ii) Jointly agree on up to 5 priority follow-up actions to improve performance of any weak core functions (prioritise recommendations, but at least address all functions that are below satisfactory performance). While the groups may pinpoint many recommendations for improvement, it is important to prioritize and limit the number of follow-up actions included in the report to focus cluster capacity on, for example, activities that will most benefit the population or which can be done without requiring additional resources.
- (iii) Identify who is following up on each recommended improvement action and by when. It is important to allocate responsibilities at the meeting.
- (iv) Identify opportunities, constraints and/or request support, if needed.
- (v) Then in plenary, a presentation should be made of the cluster description, and discussion on any changes required that did not already come out of the discussion on the functions (e.g. new TWG, seek inclusion of more partners, etc.)

10 minutes: wrap up and next steps

Note about the possibility of making changes to the color-coded performance status: *It is not recommended to discuss the colour scoring for each of the functions, as it simply reflects the mean scores of those who responded. It is more relevant in the limited time available to look at the responses and identify what may be improved. However, in some exceptional cases, the cluster meeting may find that it is necessary to amend (by improving or worsening) the performance status of a core function if it is not seen to reflect the reality (perhaps due to a low response rate to the questionnaires or bias in responses). The meeting would then be used to validate the scores and the performance status, with amendments to the status made if there is clear consensus among the majority of participants, and if the meeting is composed of a 'representative' group of cluster partners. If there is no consensus, the performance status should remain unchanged and any differences of opinion on why a certain function may be over- or under-evaluated could be noted in the final report. If a particular core function is not relevant to a specific cluster, this should be noted in the report.*

Expected output: Based on the conclusions/agreements reached at the meeting, the cluster coordinator (or designated focal point) should complete the table included in **Annex I** of the attached document and circulate it to participants for validation within one week of the meeting date. Cluster partners should have up to one week to comment. The agreed final Coordination Performance Report should be shared with all partners, as well as with cluster lead agencies, national authorities, the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) and the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT).

Next steps: The cluster should keep track of the implementation of the recommendations, and where necessary seek support for this. The RC/HC and the HCT should use the reports to maintain an overview of cluster performance. The inter-cluster coordination mechanism should review the final reports of all assessed clusters to see the types of follow-up action proposed and to pinpoint common weaknesses across clusters that need to be addressed systematically. Each cluster should repeat this process annually, except in cases where core functions have been registered as red/orange, requiring more frequent monitoring and follow-up on improvement actions.