



## Food Security Clusters/Sectors

### CCPM 2020 OVERALL RESULTS

#### Total Respondents

(1,736 partners<sup>1</sup>, 1,308 surveys received, 940 surveys completed\* – 54% response rate)

\*Each respondent counts for one result, responses from same organizations are counted individually

	Country/Hub	# completed surveys	Response Rate
1	Afghanistan	75	49%
2	Bangladesh – COX'S BAZAR	19	45%
3	Bangladesh – DHAKA	39	80%
4	Burkina Faso	23	74%
5	Burundi	17	47%
6	Cameroon NWSW	21	53%
7	CAR	31	53%
8	CHAD	16	62%
	Colombia <sup>2</sup>		
9	DRC	8	14%
10	Ethiopia – FOOD	3	75%
11	Haiti	38	63%
12	Iraq	12	46%
13	Lebanon	25	43%
14	Libya	4	80%
15	Mali	45	161%
16	Mozambique	18	41%
17	Myanmar	9	23%
18	Niger	26	35%
19	Nigeria	37	56%
20	oPT	61	97%

<sup>1</sup> Active partner: organization/agency that has submitted their progress report through the 4/5 Ws in 2019 as well as other organizations/agencies that the coordination structure in country deems as relevant partner to the cluster/sector (example: government counter parts, inter-cluster/sector coordination, donors, Red Cross/Crescent Movement, etc.)

<sup>2</sup> 2020 CCPM was undertaken as part of the global Nutrition Cluster

	Pacific <sup>3</sup>		
21	Pakistan	22	36%
22	Somalia	49	55%
23	South Sudan	92	59%
24	Sudan	35	52%
25	Syria – NORTH EAST	23	61%
	Syria – NORTH WEST	54	46%
	Syria – WoS	18	113%
26	Ukraine	22	65%
27	Venezuela	7	15%
28	Yemen	60	67%
29	Zimbabwe	31	53%

International NGOs	National NGOs/CBOs	UN Organizations – CLAs (WFP/FAO)	UN Organizations - Other	ICRC/IFRC/Red Cross/Crescent Society	National Authorities	Donors	Other
<b>415</b> (44%)	<b>343</b> (36%)	<b>77 (8%)</b>	<b>36 (4%)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 1: Supporting service delivery

Cluster meetings	
Frequency	<b>STRONG</b>
Location Accessibility	<b>STRONG</b>
Language Spoken	<b>STRONG</b>
Utility of Information shared	<b>STRONG</b>
Composition of meetings	<b>STRONG</b>
Discussion on strategic priorities	<b>STRONG</b>
Time dedicated for partners presentations/updates	<b>STRONG</b>
Sharing meeting minutes and action points	<b>STRONG</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>STRONG</b>
FSC products	
Monthly Dashboards	<b>STRONG</b>
Partners' Presence Map	<b>STRONG</b>
Gap Analysis	<b>STRONG</b>
Bulletin/Newsletter/etc.	<b>STRONG</b>

<sup>3</sup> A separate cluster partners' satisfaction survey was launched in December

3/4/5W datasets	<b>STRONG</b>
Interactive Dashboard	<b>STRONG</b>
Meeting Minutes	<b>STRONG</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>STRONG</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 2: Informing strategic decisions of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT)

Coordination or support in sectoral or inter-sectoral needs assessments	<b>STRONG</b>
Partners Involvement	<b>Satisfactory, to some extent and require minor improvement</b>
Conducting regular emergency/contingency	<b>Satisfactory,</b>
Address Cross-cutting issues	
<i>Age</i>	<b>STRONG</b>
<i>Gender</i>	<b>STRONG</b>
<i>Protection</i>	<b>STRONG</b>
<i>Environment/Climate Change/DRR</i>	<b>Satisfactory,</b>
<i>Disability</i>	<b>Satisfactory,</b>
<i>Others (human rights, diversity, HIV/AIDS, etc)</i>	<b>Satisfactory,</b>
Cluster's response priorities based on specific analyses	<b>STRONG</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 3: Planning and implementing Cluster strategies

Development of agreed upon response plan	<b>STRONG</b>
Response Plan been inclusive	<b>STRONG</b>
Common standards and guidelines for the cluster	<b>STRONG</b>
Usefulness and quality of guidelines	<b>Satisfactory,</b>
Clear and transparent process in projects selection	<b>STRONG</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 4: Monitoring and evaluating performance

Consideration of partners' information on needs and activities reflected in Cluster information products	<b>STRONG</b>
Cluster information products and updates influenced your organization's decisions	<b>STRONG</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 5: Building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning

Facilitates emergency/contingency plans to address potential needs	<b>STRONG</b>
Developed contingency plans	<b>STRONG</b>
<i>Aligned with government protocols</i>	<b>STRONG</b>
Strengthening response capacities	<b>STRONG</b>
Sharing and discussion of early warning reports	<b>STRONG</b>

## CORE FUNCTION 6: Advocacy

Discussion on advocacy messages	<b>STRONG</b>
Cluster undertaking advocacy activities	<b>STRONG</b>




## CORE FUNCTION 7: Accountability to affected people

Mechanisms to involve affected people in decision making	<b>STRONG</b>
Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance	<b>STRONG</b>
Sharing of information related to other sectors or response-wide AAP mechanisms	<b>STRONG</b>
Discussion on issues raised by affected people	<b>STRONG</b>

## OVERALL SATISFACTION

<b>Strong</b>	<b>42%</b>
Satisfactory, require minor improvement	<b>51%</b>
Unsatisfactory, require major improvement	<b>6%</b>
Weak	<b>1%</b>

### LEGEND

- Strong 
- Satisfactory, require minor improvement 
- Unsatisfactory, require major improvement 
- Weak 