



# FOOD SECURITY CLUSTER

*Strengthening Humanitarian Response*



**Global Meeting of  
Food Security Cluster Partners  
17 to 18 April 2013  
Rome, Italy  
DRAFT REPORT**

# Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Wednesday 17 April 2013 .....	4
Opening and Welcome.....	4
Report back from Technical Working Groups.....	4
Assessment Working Group .....	5
Food Security and Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group.....	6
Inter-cluster Food Security and Nutrition Working Group.....	7
Review of gFSC achievements 2012 –The Global Reporting Tool for Food Security Clusters .....	8
Response Analysis .....	10
Quality Programming - Learning from Country Experience .....	14
Thursday 18 April - Cash and Vouchers and Humanitarian Response Programming .....	17
Resilience: The Coordination Roles of the Food Security Cluster at Global and National Levels	20
Food Security Cluster Evaluation – Overview and way forward .....	21
Priority gFSC Activities from November 2012 to April 2013 .....	23
Meeting Action Points & Closure.....	24
Meeting Closure.....	26
Annex 1: Agenda .....	27
Annex 2: List of Participants .....	30

## Executive Summary

The global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) meeting of partners was held from 17 to 18 April 2013 in Rome, Italy. The meeting brought together more than 60 participants and observers representing approximately 49 different partner agencies. The meeting was facilitated by a variety of partners who guided specific sessions based on their technical knowledge and area of expertise.

The overall purpose of the meeting was to review the work of the gFSC throughout 2013 and to identify the strategic direction for 2013-2015. The specific objectives of the two day meeting were to:

- Assess progress and provide direction for the global Food Security Cluster's four Working Groups;
- Improve understanding and consensus on the role of agencies, country food security clusters, gFSC partners and gFSC secretariat in relation to food security response analysis;
- Increase engagement with partners for mainstreaming good practices on cross cutting issues and accountability to affected populations;
- Promote both global and national multi-sectorial coordination of Cash and Voucher interventions in emergencies;
- Agree on a methodology for addressing resilience within the food security cluster;
- Understand the purpose, suggested process and next steps involved for the Food Security Cluster Evaluation.

These objectives were achieved with active and productive presentations and discussion leading to specific practical input to the gFSC moving forward.

The meeting was especially rich in technical content. Partners from food security national clusters contributed to providing greater insight into the more intricate areas of the humanitarian programme cycle. NGO partners outlined their response analysis tools and it was agreed that a greater effort would be made in developing joint analysis frameworks to avoid duplication of efforts. Specific case studies were drawn from Afghanistan, Pakistan and Somalia to highlight the unified approach undertaken in mainstreaming issues regarding implementing the Accountability to Affected Populations Framework as well as addressing protection, gender, age and disabilities in national food security clusters. Participants also stressed the importance of resilience building mechanisms in development and in the later stages of an emergency. It was argued that a food security cluster has both a global and a national role to play in the coordination of resilience.

Overall, stakeholders gained a better appreciation regarding their roles and what they can expect from the cluster coordination systems.

Global partners reiterated their commitment to the gFCS and agreed to encourage their country colleagues to participate and fully commit to country food security clusters.

Discussions and recommendations from this meeting will form the basis of the two year strategic direction of the global Food Security Cluster.

It was agreed that the next meeting of partners of the global Food Security Cluster would be hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome in October or early November with the face-to-face technical meetings the previous day.

## Wednesday 17 April 2013

### Opening and Welcome

**Dominique Burgeon, Food and Agriculture Organization**

Dominique Burgeon officially opened the meeting on behalf of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Programme and expressed on-going commitment and support for the work of the global and country food security clusters and partners. In line with the purpose of the gFSC as well as the principles of the IASC Transformative Agenda, it is important that the gFSC keep the focus on the needs of the country clusters in order to support improved efficiency and response with increased accountability to affected populations. To achieve this, it is necessary to continue to adhere to the principles of partnership and ensure increased NGO participation and leadership at all levels of the cluster and coordination systems.

Dominique Burgeon praised the development of the IASC Performance Monitoring Framework which was co-lead by the global Food Security Cluster's (gFSC) and the global health cluster and its usefulness for national clusters. He also stressed the importance of capacity development in ensuring more sustainable interventions in all countries. The use of practical tools and guidance mechanisms, such as the 3W matrixes are important in ensuring a more targeted response and avoiding duplication of efforts.

The partner endorsement and commitment to the gFSC two year Strategic Plan 2013-2014 provides the overall directions for the gFSC. This global meeting of partners provides the opportunity to focus specifically on the activities and priorities of the next six months in order achieve shared strategic objectives.

The World Food Programme was warmly thanked for the support provided with the meeting arrangements and logistics.

### **David Kaatrud, World Food Programme**

David Kaatrud thanked the partners and the gFSC Secretariat for its work and continued commitment. He stated that the gFSC is moving in the right direction and he anticipated reviewing the 2014 formal cluster evaluation, commissioned by the co-lead agencies.

He noted the importance of quality programming in guaranteeing a better and more complete response intervention. Many new tools could assist in facilitating the process. In particular, he stressed the need to focus on operational discussions.

Partners were thanked for their continued commitment throughout the year and specifically during this meeting.

### Report back from Technical Working Groups

Tuesday 16 April, the day prior to the Global Meetings of Partners, was reserved for face-to-face meetings of the current technical Working Groups. The three current Working Groups and are:

- 1. Assessment Working Group**

Co-Chair: Vincent Annoni, ACTED

Co-Chair: Kathryn Ogden, WFP

- 2. Food Security and Nutrition Inter-cluster Working Group**

Co-Chair: Caroline Abla, International Medical Corps

Co-Chair: Hilary Dhliwayo-Motsiri, IFRC

### **3. Food Security and Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group**

Chair: Allister Clewlow, Samaritan's Purse

The gFSC Working Groups met to review the work of each group throughout 2012 and to identify / reaffirm priority areas for 2013 and further develop work plans as appropriate. An overview of the achievements to date and the strategic direction for the next six months were presented to plenary by the chairs and co-chairs. In order to ensure synergy between the Working Groups, specific meetings of all Co-chairs will be regularly scheduled. The Co-chairs will provide a brief overview of the work of the Groups and consider possible areas of synergy. The gFSC support team will provide secretariat support to these meetings.

The three gFSC Working Groups will aim to be more action-oriented and task driven. They will revise their action plans for April 2013 – October 2013 based on the feedback and outcomes of discussions during this meeting. All Minutes of the Working Groups will be shared with all gFSC partners. Upon completion of each of the assigned tasks, the Working Groups will meet again to decide whether there is still a need to continue meeting.

Another emerging priority concerns advocacy, communications and partnership-building, and how best to move these forward. The Advocacy Working Group has been de-activated at present, due to lack of sufficient capacity to implement activities. However it will re-awaken as soon as its members identify the time and resources to commit to it.

The gFSC partners are encouraged to continue (and in some cases) increase their commitment to the technical working groups.

#### **Assessment Working Group**

Co-Chair: Vincent Annoni, ACTED

Co-Chair: Kathryn Ogden, WFP

In 2012, the Assessment Working Group (AWG) of the global Food Security Cluster (gFSC) was mandated to compile a core list of humanitarian food security situation and performance indicators mapped against the four IASC phases of a humanitarian emergency response. To achieve this goal, the AWG looked at the indicators currently being used in humanitarian responses, both sudden-onset and protracted, as well as indicators used in CAP and Work Plan documents. The AWG then circulated the draft list to all gFSC partners and country cluster focal points for comments, additions and adjustments.

The resulting **Core List of Humanitarian Food Security Indicators** was presented to plenary. The purpose of this list is to provide country FS clusters and partners a guide to recommended indicators during the various phases of an emergency. Partners and clusters are not obliged to use these indicators. They were developed to provide a guide and to adapt as and if needed. It is planned to review and revise this list as necessary based on feedback and comments from field implementation every 6 months.

The next step will include field-tested feedback on the core indicators, which will then be adapted to fit the recommendations received.

During the next six months, the AWG will be developing a leaflet for each indicator in order to provide guidance and better illustrate its use. The leaflets will include reference information for each indicator, such as reporting purposes, methodology of data collection and calculation instructions.

The AWG will undergo a review period every six months to decide whether the co-Chairs will step-down or continue in their current roles. Vincent Annoni, ACTED, stepped down from the co-chair but will continue to contribute to be an active member of the group. Kathryn Ogden, WFP, will remain the chair of the group until October 2013 with Matthias Mollet, FAO and Jodi Blackham, Samaritan's Purse, will be taking the technical lead for the next major tasks of the Working Group. Any other members willing to join the Working Group at this point are more than welcome.

The Group presented a clear list of harmonized indicators, which were deemed to be very useful in updating situational analyses.

### *Plenary discussion*

Partners were interested in knowing which crisis would be used as an example in the field testing. It was suggested that a sample of different types of crises should be used, including sudden onset to protracted crises. The Group was waiting for partner feedback on the matter.

The need for greater consistency in the indicators was noted with regard to different types of targeting at community or household level. Partners applauded the multi-sectorial approach the Group had taken on assessments and highlighted it as a good practice.

Representatives from the country clusters welcomed this clear list of harmonized indicators, which were deemed to be very useful in updating situational analyses.

### *Food Security and Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group*

Chair: Allister Clewlow, Samaritan's Purse

The Food Security and Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group has approximately 5-6 committed representatives. Over the past six months it has accomplished a number of achievements including the mapping of partner urban activities, increased collaboration with other working groups and urban related initiatives, country level outreach, as well as a more targeted communication strategy and urban web-page management.

Numerous discussions have taken place with the IASC reference group as to how to channel urban issues within the humanitarian framework and how to best serve national clusters in urban contexts. The Working Group assessed ways of informing partners more strategically, via the use of sophisticated software systems. It was also agreed to work more closely with the IASC Task Team on meeting humanitarian challenges in urban settings, as well as with the ALNAP group. The latter has a webpage on urban vulnerability to which the Working Group will provide input and monitor closely.

Only eight partners have contributed to the mapping exercise, which only amounts to roughly 27% of partner contributions/inputs. The Group aims to muster much more engagement over the coming months. A dedicated person will be required to maintain the mapping database developed by NRC and other partners. Samaritan's Purse will work over the next few months to identify a candidate for the job.

### *Plenary discussion*

The Somalia Food Security Cluster is interested in creating a national working group on urban issues and requested further guidance in the form of a Concept Note clarifying what defines urban contexts in relation to rural ones and how to best address issues pertaining to both domains. The Somalia Food Security cluster has a very strong focus on the rural responses, but not as strong in the urban context. In particular, it was

requested that the guidance note address how to deal with displaced populations (IDPs) in urban contexts and what safety nets and psycho-social frameworks can be put into place to assist these people.

Oxfam recently conducted some work with Concern International in Kenya on response in urban areas. This report will be shared with the group with the goal of looking at possible entry points to be applied elsewhere by other partners.

### Inter-cluster Food Security and Nutrition Working Group

**Co-Chair: Caroline Abla, International Medical Corps**

**Co-Chair: Hilary Dhliwayo-Motsiri, IFRC**

The Inter-Cluster Working Group on Food Security and Nutrition was created with the intention of providing operational/coordination/technical direction and guidance to the gFSC on key areas of synergy between the Nutrition and Food Security Clusters in humanitarian responses. One of the objectives of the Working Group was the development of better joint coordination between field level food security and nutrition clusters.

Since the April 2011 Global Meeting of Partners, the Working Group has worked on a series of key activities and tools. It has developed and conducted a field survey for cluster coordinators in order to identify the present coordination field practices between the Food Security and Nutrition Clusters. Upon careful analysis of the survey results and the dissemination of key findings, the Working Group identified principal synergies and complementarities, gaps and limitations, as well as best practices regarding existing coordination mechanisms between Food Security and Nutrition Clusters at field level.

One of the issues that were highlighted as a result of this field survey was the need for guidance that is simple, practical, and concrete on how to more effectively work together. It was also felt that there needs to be greater guidance and support provided at the global level for country clusters on improving coordination in certain programme areas, such as Assessments.

The survey also outlined the challenges relating to agency mandates and understanding of different roles at field level. It was also acknowledged that various challenges pertaining to coordination and information sharing are in fact caused by personality clashes. It is therefore important to work with different actors to try to enhance their inter-personal skills and develop stronger consensus building mechanisms.

Throughout the Working Group's brainstorming session, numerous challenges were also highlighted. It was noted that throughout the past six months, levels of engagement had considerably declined. Greater commitment from other partners, including NGOs, is a priority.

The idea of joint teleconferences or joint meetings of Chairs, from the other Working Groups, was also promoted.

The Working Group, decided to sharpen the focus of its deliverables for 2013 by mustering greater support and engagement from global clusters. Joint trainings for the cluster coordinators, as well as joint missions will be promoted. The working group will ensure that the joint trainings, support missions and assessments are also multi-cluster in nature and that there is sufficient national capacity to address coordination issues between the two clusters, especially when the international workforce retreats.

It was also noted that there should be joint participation in both Global Nutrition and Food Security Cluster meetings and the possibility of scheduling a Joint-Inter-Cluster Meeting of Partners, was also explored. In order to foster greater engagement and more concrete deliverables, the Working Group committed to exploring joint inputs into funding proposals and greater participation in inter-agency initiatives.

Two key deliverables were identified for the coming six months. The first deliverable is to clearly define the roles mandates, roles and responsibilities of the gFSC and the GNC two clusters. This would in turn be shared with cluster coordinators and partners at country as well as headquarter level. It would be signed by Global Nutrition & Food Security Coordinators and addressed to the field coordinators of both clusters, as well as the field-level co-lead agencies, emphasizing the working principles and linkages between the FSC and GNC. The first draft would be completed by mid-May and the final draft by the end of May.

A Joint Guidance Note was also mentioned, containing concrete examples of Food Security and Nutrition coordination mechanisms and existing coordination best practices. The latter will only be collected after careful consultation with field coordinators. This Guidance Note will help the Group capitalize on the success stories stemming from joint coordination efforts. This action is however contingent on having an FAO colleague support us, as well on availability of funds, hence a specific deadline has not yet been set.

### **Plenary discussion**

It was noted that the emphasis of this Working Group is on the linkages – rather than on the different mandates of the two clusters - differences which can give the impression of diversion. In this connection, it was felt that there is a greater need for practical guidance at operational level. Oxfam highlighted the need for greater engagement with both WASH and Health clusters, building on common strategies. However, it was deemed important to keep the focus on the Group and not to create a parallel inter-cluster coordination group.

One possible reference for the Working Group could be the IPC indicators, as they help to complement information. It is also important to look at the same type of affected populations. In this connection, it could be useful to develop a matrix highlighting different principles/ linkages.

ECHO welcomed the idea of a joint guidance note and a letter of mandates, roles and responsibilities, but also questioned what would be OCHA's role in this regard. At present, OCHA is not directly involved, but the group would welcome OCHA support on coordination at country level.

The importance of establishing Working Groups that are task-driven and action-oriented was noted. Once the Inter-Cluster Working Group has accomplished its pre-established tasks, it should consider whether to disband or continue having an active role to play.

## **Review of gFSC achievements 2012 – The Global Reporting Tool for Food Security Clusters**

**Presenters:** Graham Farmer, Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator

*Background Document:* Global Food Security Cluster 2013-2014 Strategic Plan

*Expected Outcome:* Overview of gFSC achievements and challenges faced from October 2012 – April 2013

The final strategic plan 2013-2014 was briefly presented to the plenary (Annex 4 – gFSC 2013-2014 Strategic Plan). The key achievements of the global cluster for 2012 and 2013 along with some of the main challenges faced over the past six months were presented against the four identified priorities of the gFSC: capacity development in support of national clusters; information management and learning; operational and surge support to national clusters; advocacy, communication and partnership. The priorities had been revised in October 2012, to reflect the gFSC experiences in 2011 and 2012 (Annex 4 – gFSC 2013-2014 Strategic Plan).

The partners fully endorsed the current two year strategy and the way the gFSC support cell operates.



### *Capacity Development in Support of National Clusters*

This involves training at country level and for individuals. It includes development and application of specific tools, offering guidance and support to ensure delivery of quality programmes. The objective of this priority is to ensure that the gFSC is a learning hub that is able to reach all of its stakeholders. In 2012-2014, the global Food Security Cluster's capacity building efforts will focus on reaching a broader country level target audience through national level training, regional training and e-learning courses. As new entry points to learning, the gFSC will introduce national level training as well as e-learning modules that will open opportunities to a broader spectrum of stakeholders.

By providing relevant training and access to information to all stakeholders, the accountabilities and leadership of the global and country clusters can be strengthened, resulting in more efficient and effective food security preparedness, response and transition out of humanitarian emergencies.

### *Information Management and Learning*

This includes management of relevant data, learning and knowledge and compilation and sharing of best practices. All relevant information about cluster activities will be collected, stored and analysed, enabling partners to retain and build from the institutional memory of the gFSC. Work on lessons learned and good practices contributes to improvement of response, helps in the generation of new ideas and increases quality of food security preparedness, response and transition.

The accountabilities and leadership of the global and country clusters will be strengthened, resulting in more efficient and effective food security preparedness, response and transition out of humanitarian emergencies.

### *Operational and Surge Support to National Clusters*

This priority area includes support missions, surge development and response mechanisms. The GST and Cluster Partners will provide appropriate and timely backstopping and surge support to country food security clusters and sectors in response to anticipated or identified needs. This contributes significantly to improving humanitarian food security delivery.

There will be improved capacity at country level and in the gFSC as a whole for support to quality programming, allowing all gFSC partners to hone their experience and perspectives on providing a joint response.

By providing appropriate, timely and quality-oriented operational and surge support, the gFSC will:

- strengthen the accountabilities and leadership of the global and country clusters, resulting in enhanced coordination and efficient humanitarian responses;
- improve humanitarian food security strategies and coordinated programming at global and national levels
- provide support needed to country-level clusters for preparedness, response and transition.

### *Advocacy, Communication and Partnership*

This pillar involves internal and external communications to influence policy and resource mobilisation to enhance coordination systems and building of partnerships. A major role of the gFSC is to disseminate timely, accurate information and messages to all relevant stakeholders. The gFSC will work with partners at the global and country levels to provide support to country-level food security clusters, so that they may in turn provide standards, guide on policy and build response capacity and operational support. Most importantly, such responses will emanate from a people-centred approach, which recognises, analyses and responds to the different needs of different people.

In order to achieve this, it is important for the gFSC to gather and share information, expertise and good practice on food security in humanitarian contexts among partners and stakeholders. The gFSC will develop, maintain and refine specific systems to facilitate exchange of information and coordination of responses in ways which maximise use of available resources and expertise.

Work under this priority area will enhance support, awareness and links between and among global and national food security partners, observers and associates as well as donors, other clusters and the wider IASC community.

By ensuring transparency and reinforcing communication systems, the accountabilities and leadership of the global and country clusters can be strengthened, resulting in enhanced coordination and efficient humanitarian responses.

### ***Information Management Tool developed with Support from Somalia Cluster***

The aim of the IM tool is to be able to report and track the different activities being conducted at national level in a systematic and standardized way. The plenary discussion addressed the issue of how to best deal with gap coverage and how to integrate multiple types of activities over different seasonal periods. The IM interactive tool will produce both cartographical and quantitative knowledge.

## **Response Analysis**

### **Panel members:**

Megan McGlinchy, **Catholic Relief Services**  
Emily Henderson, **Oxfam**  
Mark Gordon, **Somalia Cluster Coordinator**  
Miles Murray, **Save the Children**

**Facilitator:** Neil Marsland, Food and Agriculture Organization

### *Background documents:*

- Response analysis and response choice in food security crises: a roadmap. (Commissioned and published by the Humanitarian Practice Network at ODI)
- Guide to conducting an EMMA
- Pakistan Food Security Cluster Rabi Season 2011 – 12 Programming Guidelines
- Abstracts from a selection of articles describing response issues, early warning, the context and assessment information leading up to the famine response in Somalia.

*Expected outcomes:* Improved understanding and consensus on the role of agencies, country food security clusters, gFSC partners and gFSC secretariat in relation to food security response analysis

This session aimed to provide key examples on core issues, challenges and priorities relating to the coordination roles and responsibilities of national and global clusters. The results of the discussion were intended to shed light on how the gFSC partners can better support country clusters more systematically in response analysis, in order to improve beneficiary targeting and aid modalities (i.e. cash & vouchers) to be used in the humanitarian response.

### ***Megan McGlinchy, Catholic Relief Services – “Response Analysis in Food Security Crisis: A ‘Road Map’”***

Megan McGlinchy, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), presented a summary of the findings presented in the *Response analysis and response choice in food security crises: a roadmap*. (Commissioned and published by the Humanitarian Practice Network at ODI). She outlined the disconnect that exists between information provided by assessments and information needed to determine the appropriate response option. Response Analysis is meant to facilitate appropriate intervention during emergencies. The Response Analysis Roadmap outlines the decisions that need to be made in choosing a response and the various factors that shape this choice. The roadmap is not intended to replace existing tools, but can provide guidance on which tools are available and appropriate for different stages of the analysis. To the extent possible, information that informs response analysis should be collected pre-crisis as baseline data.

Several questions were posed to the plenary concerning this issue. These included:

- What type of information should be monitored pre-crisis including baseline and contingency planning?
- Can implementation of responses become more evidence-based? How can this be facilitated and what are the gaps?
- Has investment in improved tools/analysis led to an improved response?

### *Plenary discussion*

The partner discussions outlined the potential role that could be played by the global cluster in facilitating the analysis of the results. Cluster partners are charged with data collection in an effort to promote a common understanding of the evidence gathered. The global Food Security Cluster's role could therefore be to educate people on what the information needs are.

The importance of identifying different partner needs in order to be able to devise thresholds for intervention was stressed. The more field experiences partners have, the more adept they will be conducting evidence-based needs assessments. It is difficult to gauge what interventions are needed in different crises and the possible consequences of response. It is therefore important to draw on international support. The gFSC could ensure that these links between national and international technical staff are made.

DFID suggested that it was important to highlight this evidence-based response analysis when seeking funding.

In addition, it was noted that the cluster and global and country levels could provide greater guidance and prioritization regarding the use of different response analysis tools in specific national contexts.

### *Emily Henderson, Oxfam – “Engaging with Markets in Humanitarian Responses”*

Emily Henderson's presentation focussed on market-based programming and strengthened the notion that humanitarian interventions need to be aware of market fluctuations. It was also acknowledged that while the degree to which agencies actually engage with markets depends on partner capacity in the field, there should be at least minimal engagement.

An Oxfam-led Market Learning Event took place at the end of March 2013 which was very useful in promoting awareness of market impacts on local livelihoods. A Haiti case study was used to demonstrate the negative effect that disregard for market-based interventions may have on household consumption levels. It was agreed that market analysis can help ensure cost effectiveness and enhance peoples' dignity as well as assist in the delivery of basic recovery needs and support economic activity.

In this endeavour, the global cluster could have a role to play in building national capacity, developing strategies, market tools, baselines and a mapping repository to better catalogue existing knowledge and channel lessons learned. It was also suggested that a formal Community of Practice be established, to avoid duplication of efforts.

### *Plenary discussion*

It was suggested that the gFSC develop a consensus-based response guidance document. This could be done via a multi-partner process that includes seasonal analyses of the food security situation to be translated into IPC cases.

The example of the Somalia Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) and Secretariat was highlighted. The SAG has defined its priority objectives for this year based on the causes of vulnerabilities at household level. This called for a combination of response options that addressed targeting people with different livelihoods. Localized assessments, when possible, may assist in better formulating response options.

It was also noted that there was a need for greater comparability of data. Household access to food can be improved through a better understanding of the specific Kcal requirements needed. Good programming examples should be marketed as success stories and models for better performance. Discussions with local actors and national governments should further be enhanced.

It is also important to integrate market awareness in their response plan. For example, in the Philippines cluster response where the Philippine Government has an extremely strong influence on the response analysis, Oxfam conducted a baseline market analysis in the Philippines, finding that markets were capable of performing in first three months. The initial cluster response strategy was for a period of three month strategy for food distributions which received an additional three month extension period from the government. The initial plan allowed time for further contingency planning and advocacy. However, greater negotiation efforts needed to be undertaken with the national authorities. It was felt that there should be a prerequisite for baseline information and advocacy to authorities.

Overall, it was decided that the role of the gFSC should be to keep a record of the needs to be fulfilled during the initial stages of an emergency, actively promote market baselines and analysis in disaster prone countries and also serve as a forum for an inventory of food security initiatives. It was argued that the gFSC has a huge potential for taking stock of initiatives and providing guidance to countries.

#### ***Mark Gordon, Somalia Cluster Co-Coordinator***

Mark Gordon recounted his experiences in implementing humanitarian responses in Somalia starting with the caveat that the Somalia Food Security Cluster is atypical given that it undertakes multiple seasonal responses, allowing for a variety of contingency plans. Responses are based on the IPC phases and a multi-dimensional analysis informs decision-making on how clusters should respond. The Somalia Cluster also encourages its members to undertake localized assessments to understand the most appropriate and feasible methods of responding.

He elaborated on the role the global cluster could have in ensuring that transfers be comparable around minimal response standards, such as number of Kcal, seeing as this would guarantee response comparability. The gFSC could also monitor technical guidance and ensure that the activities implemented, be of the highest technical standard. Finally, the gFSC could disseminate best practices and good examples of programming in particular areas. These notes could then be made available to other like-minded agencies to establish some common baselines. The gFSC provides the enabling environment for agencies to determine the best response that is in line with their capacities.

Somalia presently has eleven field clusters that implement technical responses. The cluster has had over 60 meetings in the field. However the most technically adept members only partake in 10% of the meetings and they are unable to lead. It is also worth understanding why field level engagement is not occurring and if there is some scope to encourage INGOs to facilitate discussions and align themselves more efficiently. A further issue is how to support national agencies so that they engage at sub-national level in Somalia.

#### ***Plenary discussion***

Some of the challenges relating to the levels of commitment were noted. Often, partners that sign up for inclusion in the cluster, do not necessarily result in effective participation. There is a need for greater partner commitment and engagement with the other cluster partners and working groups. The

global Food Security Cluster Coordinator highlighted that the cluster is only as good as its members. Clusters are entities facilitating the response options. If there is an identified need, the cluster may flag the issue, and advocate on behalf of it at global and national level. However, it should be the onus of the cluster's members at country level to fulfil these expectations.

It was agreed that cluster partners should be leading the process and outlining what they expect from clusters as well as what they will contribute and commit to. At national level, the expectation is that project managers and deputy managers lead the discussions. In the case of the Somalia Food Security Cluster, prolonged consultations helped to determine what the cluster should accomplish over the next eighteen months. This consultation will feed into a process of constant revision of emerging priorities.

### ***Miles Murray, Save the Children - "Slow-Onset Food Security Crises: Situation & Response Analysis"***

Miles Murray's presentation focussed on the process for linking existing analysis tools and roadmaps and also spoke of ways for determining which tools to use, when and where. He stated that the first level response analysis and contingency planning is useful, but requires further attention and strengthening.

He evaluated a research project undertaken Tufts University and replicated their road map for different responses. In this respect, CRS assisted with the analysis of the surveys. Careful attention was given to developing guidelines for response analyses that would then be field tested. Proposals were submitted before the response analysis and contingency plans had been developed. Partners who could cater to different livelihoods were selected and detailed scenarios were developed.

Two questions were posed to plenary:

- How could your agency stimulate contingency planning before the cluster is activated?
- Do the benefits of coordinated contingency planning and response analysis outweigh the costs?

### ***Plenary discussion***

UNHCR noted that needs assessments should be across a broad range of sectors to best address different obstacles and household challenges. In urban contexts especially, one needs to consider the broader picture and non-food expenditures. The benefit of doing contingency planning will include a more comprehensive inclusion of expenditures. Response analysis would occur after an evaluation of food security needs. Initial assessments would be done via a multi-sector approach, but would eventually be followed by more targeted food security needs that would lead to a more focused response analysis. Other needs not related to food security, would be incorporated into later stages of the response, when considering modality.

Save the Children in October 2012 proposed to run an inventory of all the existing food security tools in order to better substantiate decisions regarding response plans. The template was sent to the Secretariat that will follow-through.

DFID, similarly, conducted much global work on emergency preparedness, building on existing livelihood baselines. Likewise, HelpAge developed an online system, called "ALERT," detailing scenarios and minimum preparedness actions to undertake in order to allow countries to monitor their response progress. This software system will be shared with the gFSC.

### ***Concluding Discussion***

Programme choices should be driven not by organizational ethos but by evidence. Country clusters should move toward a more evidence-based approach.

It is vital to have a minimum understanding of government policies surrounding food security in order to determine the appropriate response. A more structured methodology for addressing response analysis that incorporates minimum standards, best practices and a prioritization of the response objectives could further enhance levels of performance.

Tools could assist in the collection of community market experiences to be used in country/global programming - IASC Coordination Reference Modules were highlighted as examples. Regarding the time period and people involved in contingency plans- during a cluster's deactivation/transition phase, the first step should be to identify the institutions and focal points responsible for contingency planning. In many instances, this would involve the government or Cluster Lead Agencies unless the national governments may hinder humanitarian objectives. Where a cluster has not been activated, but the early warning report alludes to the country's imminent vulnerability; it is the cluster's responsibility to support the national authorities via contingency plans.

### *Next steps*

- It was recommended that in order to provide greater technical guidance on response analysis in the context of contingency planning/baselines or after analysis of existing needs assessments, the gFSC Handbook section on Preparedness and Contingency Planning could be updated to specify how it should take place and whether it should occur.
- The gFSC Assessment Working Group was asked to explore the possibility of creating a catalogue with links to the various tools for different phases of the response analysis. It was agreed that the gFSC could consider developing a body responsible for creating a market analysis inventory. Experiences on urban response analyses could also be collected and technical guidance provided.

## **Quality Programming - Learning from Country Experience**

**Presenters:** **Samantha Chattaraj**, global Food Security Cluster  
**Barb Wigley**, WFP, AAP and Policy and Strategy Division

**Facilitator:** **Patricia Colbert**, WFP

### ***Background documents:***

- Closing the gaps. Gender Equality: Policies and Practices in Afghanistan. FSAC. 2013
- Report on Accountability to Affected Populations. Joint mission by WFP, FAO and gFSC to Pakistan 2012
- Report from gFSC partners meeting on protection in Geneva. December 2012

### ***Expected Outcomes:***

- An improved understanding of the comparative advantage on the common and unified approaches taken in mainstreaming cross cutting issues by gFSC and national FSC.
- Increased engagement with partners on good practices for mainstreaming age, gender, disabilities and protection; practices on feedback mechanisms.

### ***Samantha Chattaraj – A case study of the experience of taking a common and unified approach in mainstreaming gender, protection, age and disabilities in Afghanistan***

Gender, age, disabilities and protection are four of the key components of quality programming. When age, disabilities, gender and protection mainstreaming processes are translated into concrete actions for

programming, a few core activities remain the same. If these core activities are properly identified, targeted and addressed/integrated into programming, then significant progress can be made towards mainstreaming the four issues. This approach was taken in the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster in Afghanistan.

Samantha Chattaraj recounted her experiences in Afghanistan where she spent 2 months, working with the National Food Security and Agriculture Cluster on mainstreaming gender, age, disabilities and protection as per the unified approach explained above. FSAC Afghanistan had planned a gender study in which components of protection, age and disability were incorporated as participating agencies felt the need for having this holistic approach. Thus, a pathway was created identifying activities from the programme cycle where a combined approach could be taken to make the recommendations easier for practitioners to implement. The common areas identified were:

- Policies
- Assessment phase: Sex and Age Disaggregated Data collection, analysis and use, Inclusive assessments engaging representative sample from gender, age and other categories, Do No Harm analysis.
- Designing phase: application of minimum humanitarian standards targeting methodology and beneficiary selection criteria
- Implementation phase: inclusive delivery mechanisms and modalities
- Monitoring and Evaluation: On-going feedback and complaint system  
Referral pathway for specialized assistance and coordination with partners in specific areas relating to food security and agriculture, such as Housing; Land and Property; child protection and Gender Based Violence.

The study then mapped capacities and gaps with a sample of 18 partners and made recommendations to tap into partners capacities for coaching/exchanging ideas on the gaps. Based on the findings and recommendations made by this study, FSAC in Afghanistan has now developed an age, gender, disability and protection tool kit that will be used by partners in their food security programme. The tool kit emanates from local experiences and practices and consists of documents such as capacity mapping matrix, examples of Do No Harm, list of good practise, briefing on older people and for cash and voucher working group. The comparative advantages of this approach is that a common thread was identified to link four cross cutting issues through concrete activities by engaging local capacities, which ensured various Cluster partners could be engaged in leading as per their capacities and good practices. This approach can be replicated in other National Clusters as per demands and can be adapted to various contexts.

### ***Barbara Wigley – Gender Equality Programming***

Barbara Wigley stressed the importance of gender equality programming and its inclusion in the Transformative Agenda as well as the IASC Commitments (leadership/governance, transparency, feedback & complaints, participation, design, monitoring and evaluation).

The example of the Joint Accountability Mission to Pakistan which provided an inter-agency perspective and integrated the notion of accountability and gender equality programming was highlighted.

Rome based agencies FAO and WFP, along with the global Food Security Cluster, undertook an interagency mission to Pakistan in September and October, 2012, in order to support IASC activities on accountability to affected populations (AAP), investigate the current status of AAP amongst humanitarian agencies, with a particular focus on gender equality and protection programming, propose means to strengthen AAP at an interagency level, and to develop a model for an interagency level approach to AAP that could be applied in other situations and country programmes.

The specific recommendations from this mission in relation to the roles to the cluster include:

- Ensure that AAP is on the agenda through coordination mechanisms.
- Build AAP into monitoring and reporting mechanisms.
- Promote the fostering of more equal partnering relationships through an AAP Framework.
- Promote a stronger profile for quality standards.

The role of the global cluster is to promote quality standards, ensure that the Accountability Framework is on the agenda throughout different coordination mechanisms, build accountability into monitoring and reporting tools as well as promote equal partnership relationships.

FAO has also been working with partners, and GenCap, to mainstream AAP into the emergency response and provide inputs on accountability to affected population. Under this project there have been capacity development workshops on AAP and gender mainstreaming, with a desire for the gFSC to support the initiative. AAP has implications with regard to resilience and ties with support to programming; it is also an overarching issue in the Transformative Agenda, linking both global and national realities.

### *Plenary discussion*

A wide range of data on accountability contributes to the notion of impartiality. Minimum standard reporting mechanisms ensure comparability. There is a need to go beyond the purely conceptual analysis used in trainings. Accountability can only provide a broad framework from which individual agencies manage their issues. One misinterpretation is that Accountability equals compliance mechanisms.

The plenary discussion addressed numerous questions including:

What kind of support can be provided to partners to ensure that clusters move beyond the feedback and complaints mechanisms for accountability to promote ownership of the process and monitor the effectiveness of existing mechanisms?

The elderly and disabled must have physical access to such accountability mechanisms. There is a need to consider what other clusters are doing and establish a standard architecture for the next five to ten years.

It is important to develop stronger trust mechanisms so that the affected communities feel safe to voice their concerns. It is essential to intervene directly at national level. There is a need to move beyond the more mechanistic approach to accountability, feedback and complaints by working in country, strengthening capacity development and demonstrating how to turn abstract concepts into practical operations, making those links to resilience. There are also elements from the SPHERE Handbook and the Do No Harm Approach that could be applied to the Accountability Framework, as well as first hand inputs from disaster affected communities.

### *Next Steps*

There are multiple ways in which the gFSC can support the Accountability to Affected Populations Framework (AAP) and ensure stronger mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues in programmes:

- The gFSC can provide reference sources; building local capacity; developing e-learning training modules; networking and advocating on behalf of the issue in global forums;
- The gFSC can help people understand the literature behind the framework and how it can make their work more efficient, however the practicalities of the matter, remain confined to field level.
- The Accountability Concepts should be fully embedded in partner agreements and inter-agency Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs). This indeed was the strategy adopted by a FAO SIDA funded project on capacity development. The donor ensured that the Gender Marker was addressed in their proposals.
- The integrated approach for mainstreaming cross cutting issues can be taken in other national clusters
- There is a need for better advocacy work on AAP and mainstreaming cross cutting issues.



- For specialized issues that food security actors cannot address, linkages should be fostered. For example, - if food security actors are not in a position to address Housing, Land and Property issues or child labour issues in their Food for Work activities assistance from the Protection Cluster can be sought.

## Thursday 18 April

### Cash and Vouchers and Humanitarian Response Programming

**Facilitator:** Megan McGlinchy, **Catholic Relief Services**

**Panel Members:**

Annalisa Conte, **Director, Cash for Change**

Francesco Baldo, **Somalia Food Security Cluster Co-Coordinator**

Jessica Saulle, **Save the Children**

**Expected Outcomes:**

An understanding/agreement on the level of engagement required from the global food security cluster to be appropriately engaged at the national and global level in coordinating Cash and Vouchers interventions in emergencies.

**Background Documents:**

- Agriculture and Livelihoods cluster and WASH cluster Drought Position paper
- Guidance Note on Food Vouchers
- Drought Response Position Paper

**Annalisa Conte, Director, Cash for Change**

Annalisa Conte provided a WFP perspective on the coordination of cash & voucher transfers. WFP is currently in the process of scaling up its use of cash. The WFP footprint in Cash & Vouchers is very large, and recently the use of in-kind contributions has also increased. At present 15% of all cash-related work for 2013 has been approved. This amounts to roughly \$650 million.

The need to ensure appropriate coordination of a vast number of different cash-related initiatives among humanitarian and development actors is increasing. Clusters have a role to ensure strong communication within and across clusters. The first step is to work together to assess the needs and response options readily available and those most appropriate for intervention.

At present, donors are very interested in funding cash transfer projects. However, it is also essential to look at the other response modalities available and identify those that are most suitable for the particular national context. It is very important that decisions are based on the complete picture of the situation on the ground and how to best meet the food security needs of the targeted populations, whilst enhancing their livelihoods.

Cash is not always a universally applicable modality in all situations. Organizations need to adapt different humanitarian tools to the various situations. Cash is very useful in serving the different needs of the affected populations in many sectors, including food security, shelter, water & sanitation, health and nutrition. It is therefore up to the cluster partners to work together in partnership to ensure complementarity of response and maximum coverage of disaster affected areas.

Many organizations, including WFP, have not yet achieved complete familiarity with the use of cash. Cluster partners may prefer one response tool over another, which may result in a disjointed intervention

with no common platform. Many partners are using market-based tools for analysis. The question of how to best channel the different cash assistance efforts, whether they be cash for food, water or shelter, was raised.

Cash is a means to an end and not an end in itself. The opportunity of working more closely with cluster and humanitarian partners to implement interventions with multiple response modalities is welcomed by WFP.

It is important to understand the financial context and local capacity for cash transactions.

#### *Francesco Baldo, Somalia Cluster Co-Coordinator*

Francesco Baldo noted that between US\$ 800 million to US\$ 1.3 billion come into Somalia every year as remittances from the Somali community living abroad, while the humanitarian budget in terms of cash and vouchers, with the intention of ensuring that beneficiary living standards do not further deteriorate, is around 70/100 million US\$ per year. Cash & voucher transfers were implemented for the first time in Somalia in 2003. Efforts were made by sectors to coordinate the various partner-led responses. The present Somalia Food Security Cluster guidelines are drawn from those of the previous agriculture and livestock cluster coordination entity, which stress inter-agency collaboration and joint responses.

Although, the overall coordination during the response to the 2010 famine in Somalia could have been stronger, the first coordinated response was planned 3 months before the declaration of famine with a group of international and local NGOs distributing food vouchers to the affected population utilizing emergency reserve funds of the CHF, following this initial pilot response the INGOs received additional funds from bilateral donors scaling up substantially the response. It is important that the lessons learned and challenges faced of the 2010 Somalia response show highlight the added value of coordination on food security and livelihoods and that these lessons can serve to improve all future responses.

Minimum standards for the coordination of cash interventions should be set in order to circumvent the potential negative side effects this modality may have. There is also a need to coordinate cluster and inter-agency interventions.

#### *Jessica Saulle, Save the Children*

Jessica Saulle mentioned that in November 2012, she participated in an inter-agency meeting in Geneva, with partners from OCHA, IRC, other global clusters, UN agencies and NGOs. She discussed a research project she developed, commissioned by CALP. The study was on the coordination of cash transfer programming in Haiti and the Horn of Africa. Her presentation was based on her experiences in these two regions (please see Annex 3 – Background Documents).

She outlined the deleterious effect that too many meetings may have on inter-agency coordination. It is very important to hold strategic meetings that will actually enhance joint efforts. For the most part this was a major gap in her experiences in Haiti and the Horn of Africa.

#### *Plenary Discussion*

The need to have different cash coordinators within each country food security cluster was debated. It was agreed that although an actual cash coordinator would be unnecessary, it is essential to ensure some level of facilitation within the cluster system in order for the partners to work in unison.

The cluster can only recommend implementing joint cash responses because ultimately, the cluster system does not have the power to enforce such policies on its partners.

The link between cash and improved livelihoods, particularly in urban settings as well as the need to promote more evidence-based and cross-sectorial initiatives on cash was emphasized.

The *need* to ensure response comparability across different regions was stressed. The monetary cost could be equated to the Kcal value. There is no need to be too prescriptive regarding the response modalities to be used, so long as there is a minimum economic basket (MEB) that ensures the needs of the affected populations are being met.

The effectiveness of informal aid networks in channelling humanitarian support was highlighted. It may be of use to analyse cash expenditures at intra-household level to verify the different effects it may have on the livelihoods of men, women, boys and girls.

It is important to develop good risk analyses before intervening at national level. Effective coordination of conditional and non-conditional cash transfer programmes have a huge role to play in linking development and emergency issues.

### *Next steps*

The plenary session concluded by identifying some next steps.

- It was recommended that the **gFSC develop minimum standards on the use of cash transfers for food security responses**. Use of modalities such as cash and vouchers should derive directly from the response analysis. There is a need to identify tools that can help disseminate already existing knowledge on cash at both global and national levels.
- The value of inter-cluster coordination was highlighted in relation to cash and vouchers as a means of response. **It was suggested that discussions be held at global and country levels with other clusters and experiences documented regarding the use of cash and vouchers in other sectors**. Inter-cluster coordination on cash often fails when there has been no previous national level training on how to develop joint cash response plans. As a result, it is useful to analyse some of the activities undertaken by the NGO-led, Cash Training Partnership Initiative. They have developed a few trainings on level 1 CALP, and the level 2 Training is already taking place. There is also a role for OCHA to play vis-à-vis national authorities, in persuading them to collaborate with clusters and improve the communication flows. It was also suggested to liaise with national communities to better understand how the local communities are using their cash expenditures.
- There is a need for Cluster Coordinators to review their assessments and to co-ordinate with other clusters to devise joint response plans. The Cash Learning Partnership, CaLP, could serve as one of the coordination platforms. 3W matrixes could also facilitate gap analysis. Despite the fact that Coordinators may not have authority at national level, they should continue to advocate regarding outstanding issues at both global and national level. **Country Technical Working Groups on cash and vouchers could provide the necessary expertise and guidance indispensable for operationalizing cash and the processes for delivery.**
- **A roster of “cash facilitators,” could be developed and be deployed at national level after having undergone specific training.** The cash facilitators deployed to different national clusters would then have to work in partnership to ensure the delivery of a comprehensive response.
- It was agreed that there was a need for more efficient coordination around Cash and Voucher interventions, through more communication with CALP and other inter-agency initiatives. **The gFSC was asked to explore the possibility of establishing or being part of a global platform for assisting different partner agencies in the implementation of their cash and voucher responses.**

## Resilience: The Coordination Roles of the Food Security Cluster at Global and National Levels

**Facilitator:** Jeff Tschirley, Food and Agriculture Organization

**Panel members:**

Rana Hannoun, oPt Food Security Sector  
Erik Kenefick, Sudan Food Security Cluster  
Jean-Martin Bauer, World Food Programme

**Background documents:**

The EU Approach to resilience: learning from food security crises  
Summary of the Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement for Food Security

**Expected Outcomes:**

- Agreement on method and extent of continuing dialogue on what resilience means for the food security cluster.
- Identification of focus countries where the gFSC can support national commitments towards resilience.

### **Rana Hannoun, oPt Food Security Sector**

Rana Hannoun outlined some of the difficulties in strengthening resilience-building mechanisms in national contexts using oPt as an example. The development of social safety nets, psycho-social support and stability initiatives are at times haphazard and it is necessary to understand the obstacles stemming from both internal and external factors. It is also important to ensure that government have a strong role in the development, monitoring and evaluating of all resilience-building mechanisms.

### **Erik Kenefick, Sudan Food Security Cluster**

Eric Kenefick detailed the role played by the Sudan Food Security Cluster in promoting resilient livelihoods, stressing that the situation in Sudan was atypical and not necessarily conducive to implementing such initiatives. This is because the continued conflict in many areas resulting in limited access and information and communication gaps.

Eric Kenefick felt that the best strategy to resilience building is a multi-sectorial approach, whereby clusters increase their coordination in longer term programming. Although it may be difficult to develop benchmarks and indicators to measure resilience, objectives should reflect resilience building in all programmes.

Resource mobilization is greatly needed to facilitate long-term resilience building. Resilience activities can be difficult to implement in conflict-ridden national contexts where displacement is rampant and the affected populations are susceptible to a changing environment. The gFSC could serve as a global advocacy platform to push this agenda forward with donors. In instances where clusters have 2 year strategies or CAPs, such as the Somalia, it is easier to embed resilience in programming.

### **Jean-Martin Bauer, World Food Programme**

Jean-Martin Bauer outlined some of the challenges relating to resilience, including issues of measurability, trend analyses, indicators, methodologies, frequency and scale of programming. Some of these issues can be addressed through monitoring and evaluation of programs. Shocks resulting from drought, for example, can now be predicted with new programmes facilitating the process of embedding resilience-building mechanisms in emergency preparedness and contingency plans.

It is worth identifying cluster priorities in relation to resilience in order to begin monitoring resilience in terms of the household dimension. In some contexts in the Sahel, it is very difficult to introduce resilience measures because of the conflict ridden situation or simply due to inaccessibility. Therefore, local capacities, both human and economic, need to be taken into account in the implementation phase.

### *Plenary discussion Next steps*

Plenary discussion focused on what needed to be done at the global level to assist country level clusters in building resilience.

- It was agreed that resilience should be embedded from the outset in emergency preparedness and contingency plans. The gFSC could capture the experiences from the 7-NGO consortium on resilience, drawing on their lessons learned and technical expertise in developing longer-term guidance for country clusters. It is important not to exclusively invest in seasonal plans, but rather encourage agencies to develop consortia on resilience. Community-based partnerships could enhance and maximize technical expertise. It is important to encourage a grassroots approach to resilience; ensuring inputs are received directly from the affected populations.
- gFSC has a global advocacy role in promoting greater dialogue on resilience by bringing forward questions such as how to tackle resilience in protracted crises and what mechanisms can be implemented to increase national capacity. Many of these issues are outlined in the DFID paper promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: A DFID Strategy Paper (Annex 3 – Background Documents). The gFSC could serve as a global advocacy platform to push this agenda forward with donors.

## **Food Security Cluster Evaluation – Overview and way forward**

**Presenter:** Lori Bell, Office of Evaluation, **Food and Agriculture Organization**  
Ross Smith, Office of Evaluation, **World Food Programme**

### ***Background documents:***

*Joint FAO/WFP Food Security Cluster Evaluation. Draft Concept Note (5.4.2013)*

### ***Expected Outcomes:***

An understanding of the purpose, suggested process and next steps involved for the Food Security Cluster Evaluation.

The purpose of this session was to discuss the methodology for undertaking the Food Security Cluster Evaluation, commissioned by the two cluster co-lead agencies (WFP and FAO). The Evaluation was specifically requested by the WFP Executive Board and the FAO General Secretariat to assess the way food security clusters perform at national level. The two-page document summarizing the purpose of the evaluation exercise and expected outcomes for the way forward was presented (Annex 3 – Background Documents).

The Joint Evaluation will commission a team to take on the reporting as well as a reference group to strategically direct the course of the project to provide opportunity for greater inclusiveness of cluster partners. The Evaluation will be in line with the principles of the global food security cluster and the IASC Transformative Agenda.

As many of the country Food Security Clusters are a marriage between two previously existing clusters, it is important to assess and combine all of the different learning objectives, results, achievements, challenges and recommendations for improving the system. The relevance of having a food security cluster at national level and the impact that the global cluster at headquarters has had on improving the coordination at national level will be addressed.

The Evaluation team sought to define key audiences and stakeholders to be involved in this exercise. A process for defining benchmarks and baselines was also outlined. It is also important to define issues

relating to measurability and comparability. The food security clusters will be evaluated as they compare to other cluster systems in their different national contexts.

Mechanisms for evaluating the cluster impact on both urban and rural affected populations will also be addressed, as well as ways to monitor the effectiveness of national communication and advocacy strategies. It will be important to clearly outline what components to assess with respect to the project cycle and the cluster's overall life span.

The Evaluation Team will look into capitalizing on existing forums in different national contexts to collect as much information as possible across different regions.

Further questions that will be addressed in the evaluation include the following:

- What are the costs of cluster and inter-cluster coordination?
- How much is paid for by WFP/FAO/Other Partners?
- What are the overall costs of undertaking Food Security Assessments?
- What is the added value of having a Global Cluster?
- How do national clusters look like when the international workforce retreat?

It is anticipated that the evaluation will be finalised by the end of 2014.

### *Plenary discussion*

It will be important to distinguish between the needs involved in an emergency in the preparedness phase, onset and implementation phase. Setting a specific time-frame for the data collection is important.

It was suggested that the issue of barriers to participation and lack of resources as well as national capacity be addressed in the evaluation. Questions that could assist in formulating these statements refer to the levels of engagement at global as opposed to national level, and how to best meet the needs of the affected populations. The important factor is to make the framework measurable through the use of viable indicators and tangible human and financial resources to undertake the evaluation. Mapping available resources and time required for each activity and challenges to be addressed could provide a solid base.

Questions were raised as to what mechanisms would measure the impact of the evaluation on both national and global cluster entities? It was suggested to measure performance areas separately including how much time had been dedicated to information management and cluster coordination.

It is important to collect information on the actual costs of participation in activities from both a co-lead agency standpoint, as well as from a partner stance in both national and global contexts. This area is particularly important due to the fact that some elements in the project cycle (i.e. Assessments) would take place, regardless of whether the cluster system existed. Extrapolating those kinds of costs can help verify the actual impact that food security clusters have on the ground.

There is a lot to learn from the logistics cluster evaluation that took place in 2012. This evaluation demonstrated the importance of soft skills in enhancing national delivery and coordination mechanisms. There are many key groups that could be part of this evaluation, including the IPC steering committee, in its role as a consensus gathering and information sharing entity and groups that could assist in providing an alternative perspective.

It was suggested that other criteria for the evaluation could be to look at the way the food security cluster system directly impacts on the lives and livelihoods of the affected populations. This would in turn allow some scope for comparability with the community work undertaken by other clusters.

### *Next steps*

The FAO/WFP evaluation team will circulate the final concept note to gFSC partners and country focal points for additional inputs and comments. The Evaluation Office will identify selection criteria for both the steering committee and the reference group and partners will be invited to join these groups. A questionnaire will also be devised for each of the national cluster focal points requesting their input into the selection criteria to be used in the evaluation process.

### **Priority gFSC Activities from November 2012 to April 2013**

***Moderator:*** Graham Farmer, Global Coordinator, Food Security Cluster

***Expected outcomes:***

Identification of priority activities and responsible entities to be achieved in 2013.

Capacity development in support of national clusters remains the key deliverable and number one priority of the gFSC. The gFSC focus will be on increasing levels of engagement between global and national partners, and targeting the areas covered in the gFSC Strategic priorities as identified in the gFSC 2013-2014 Strategic Plan.

Over the six months, the gFSC will be involved in capacity development/surge support activities as needed.

The Food Security Cluster learning and trainings will be rolled-out at national level with greater support from NGOs in deepening the breadth and scope of the cluster system. The gFSC will aim to undertake eight trainings over the next two years. The gFSC will schedule two trainings; one in Mali and one in South Sudan will be scheduled before October 2013. The gFSC support team is in the process of developing an e-learning package that will be a pre-requisite for coordinators and information managers to complete prior to deployment.

Twice a year the gFSC will hold Global Partner Meetings as well as face-to-face meeting of the Working Groups.

The gFSC will roll-out the IASC Coordination Performance Monitoring Report in at least 3 countries.

A lessons-learned package and database on field experiences highlighting both successes and challenges will be developed.

The Information Management tool is also in the process of being finalized with the support of the Somalia and South Sudan cluster. Once developed, guidelines will be produced to assist country IM officers in using and implementing the tool.

It is anticipated that the gFSC will be involved in at least three surge support missions over the next six months.

Both regional and global partner teleconferences will continue to take place and we look forward to your engagement. Any institutional updates regarding the IASC architecture will be delivered via the global partner teleconference.

### *Plenary discussion*

Save the Children suggested incorporating a Cash and Coordination component into the e-learning course. This module could potentially draw from CALP guidance and trainings.

The possibility of having further dedicated NGO staff to join the gFSC support team was raised. Although due to funding constraints this is not possible at the moment, the gFSC support team will continue to explore all options for financing this initiative.

The priority activities for the next six months as well as the 2013-2014 strategic direction were fully endorsed.

## Meeting Action Points & Closure

### Technical Working Groups

Specific meetings of all Co-chairs of Working Groups will be regularly scheduled. The Co-chairs will provide a brief overview of the work of the Groups and consider possible areas of synergy.

The three gFSC Working Groups will aim to be more action-oriented and task driven. They will revise their action plans for April 2013 – October 2013 based on the feedback and outcomes of discussions during this meeting.

All Minutes of the Working Groups will be shared with all gFSC partners. Upon completion of each of the assigned tasks, the Working Groups will meet again to decide whether there is still a need to continue meeting.

### Response Analysis

- It was recommended that in order to provide greater technical guidance on response analysis in the context of contingency planning/baselines or after analysis of existing needs assessments, the gFSC Handbook section on Preparedness and Contingency Planning could be updated to determine how contingency planning should take place and whether it should occur.
- The gFSC Assessment Working Group was asked to explore the possibility of creating a catalogue with links to the various tools for different phases of the response analysis. It was agreed that the gFSC could consider developing a body responsible for creating a market analysis inventory. Experiences on urban response analyses could also be collected and technical guidance provided.

### Quality Programming: Learning from Country Experience

There are multiple ways in which the gFSC can support the Accountability to Affected Populations Framework (AAP) and ensure stronger mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues in programmes:

- The gFSC can provide reference sources; build local capacity; develop e-learning training modules; network and advocate on behalf of the issue in global forums;
- The gFSC can help people understand the literature behind the framework and how it can make their work more efficient.
- The Accountability Concepts should be fully embedded in partner agreements and inter-agency Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs). This indeed was the strategy adopted by a FAO SIDA funded project on capacity development. The donor ensured that the Gender Marker was addressed in their proposals.
- There is a need for better advocacy work on AAP and mainstreaming cross cutting issues. In Afghanistan, for example, some food security actors were not in a position to address land/property issues in food for work initiatives, so they dealt with the issue, via the Protection Cluster.



## Cash and Vouchers and Humanitarian Response Programming

The plenary session concluded by identifying some next steps.

- It was recommended that the **gFSC develop minimum standards on the use of cash transfers for food security responses**. Use of modalities such as cash and vouchers should derive directly from the response analysis. There is a need to identify tools that can help disseminate already existing knowledge on cash at both global and national levels.
- The value of inter-cluster coordination was highlighted in relation to cash and vouchers as a means of response. **It was suggested that discussions be held at global and country levels with other clusters and experiences documented regarding the use of cash and vouchers in other sectors**. Inter-cluster coordination on cash often fails when there has been no previous national level training on how to develop joint cash response plans. As a result, it is useful to analyse some of the activities undertaken by the NGO-led, Cash Training Partnership Initiative. They have developed a few trainings on level 1 CALP, and are working on developing the level 2 module. There is also a role for OCHA to play vis-à-vis national authorities, in persuading them to collaborate with clusters and improve the communication flows. It was also suggested to liaise with national communities to better understand how the local communities are using their cash expenditures.
- There is a need for Cluster Coordinators to review their assessments and to co-ordinate with other clusters to devise joint response plans. The Cash Learning Project, CaLP, could serve as one of the coordination platforms. 3W matrixes could also facilitate gap analysis. Despite the fact that Coordinators may not have authority at national level, they should continue to advocate regarding outstanding issues at both global and national level. **Country Technical Working Groups on cash and vouchers could provide the necessary expertise and guidance indispensable for operationalizing cash and the processes for delivery**.
- **A roster of “cash facilitators,” could be developed and be deployed at national level after having undergone specific training**. The cash facilitators deployed to different national clusters would then have to work in partnership to ensure the delivery of a comprehensive response.
- It was agreed that there was a need for more efficient coordination around Cash and Voucher interventions, through more communication with CALP and other inter-agency initiatives. **The gFSC was asked to explore the possibility of establishing or being part of a global platform for assisting different partner agencies in the implementation of their cash and voucher responses**.

## Resilience: The Coordination Roles of the Food Security Cluster at Global and National Levels

Plenary discussion focused on what needed to be done at the global level to assist country level clusters in building resilience.

- It was agreed that resilience should be embedded from the outset in emergency preparedness and contingency plans. The gFSC could capture the experiences from the 7-NGO consortium on resilience, drawing on their lessons learned and technical expertise in developing longer-term guidance for country clusters. It is important not to exclusively invest in seasonal plans, but rather encourage agencies to develop consortia on resilience. Community-based partnerships could enhance and maximize technical expertise. It is important to encourage a grassroots approach to resilience; ensuring inputs are received directly from the affected populations.

- gFSC has a global advocacy role in promoting greater dialogue on resilience by bringing forward questions such as how to tackle resilience in protracted crises and what mechanisms can be implemented to increase national capacity. Many of these issues are outlined in the DFID paper promoting innovation and evidence-based approaches to building resilience and responding to humanitarian crises: A DFID Strategy Paper (Annex 3 – Background Documents). The gFSC could serve as a global advocacy platform to push this agenda forward with donors.

### **Food Security Cluster Evaluation – Overview and way forward**

- The FAO/WFP evaluation team will circulate the final concept note to gFSC partners and country focal points for additional inputs and comments. The Evaluation Office will identify selection criteria for both the steering committee and the reference group and partners will be invited to join these groups. A questionnaire will also be devised for each of the national cluster focal points requesting their input into the selection criteria to be used in the evaluation process.

### **Priority gFSC Activities from November 2012 to April 2013**

- The priority activities for the next six months as stated within the gFSC 2013-2014 Strategic Plan were fully endorsed. Partners reiterated their commitment to the gFSC and agreed to encourage their country colleagues to participate and fully commit to country food security clusters.

### **Meeting Closure**

The meeting reflected the depth of experience in the room from twenty-eight different partner institutions as well as six country food security operations. All participants were thanked for providing expert presentation and comments.

The next meeting will be scheduled for October (back-to-back after the NGO consultation/ CFS – Committee on World Food Security Meeting).

# Annex 1: Agenda

## Global Meeting of Food Security Cluster Partners

17-18 April 2013

### Agenda

The purpose of the meeting is to review the work of the gFSC and to identify the strategic direction for 2013-2015.

**17 April 2013**

**09.00-17.00**

09.00-09.30	<b>Opening remarks and welcome</b>  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Dominique Burgeon</b> , Food and Agriculture Organization <b>David Kaatrud</b> , World Food Programme
09.30-10.00	Technical Working Groups <b>Report back from the Assessment Working Group</b>  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Kathryn Ogden</b> , Co-Chair Assessment Working Group <b>Vincent Annoni</b> , Co-Chair Assessment Working Group
10.00-10.30	<b>Coffee Break</b>
10.30-11.10	Technical Working Groups cont. <b>Report back from the Food Security &amp; Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group</b>  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Allister Clewlow</b> , Chair of the Food Security & Livelihoods in Urban Settings Working Group  <b>Report back from the Inter-Cluster Working Group on Food Security &amp; Nutrition</b>  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Caroline Abla</b> , Chair Inter-Cluster Working Group on Food Security & Nutrition  <i>Expected Outcomes:</i> Overview provided of the achievements to date Agreement of all partners on and priorities for the next 6 months of the Working Groups.
11.10-12.00	<b>Review of gFSC achievements October 2012 – April 2013</b> The global reporting tool for food security clusters  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Graham Farmer</b> , Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator  <i>Background document:</i> Global Food Security Cluster 2013-2014 Strategic Plan  <i>Expected Outcome:</i> Overview of gFSC achievements and challenges faced from October 2012 – April 2013 provided.
12.00-13.00	<b>Lunch</b>
13.00-13.15	<b>Introduction to the panel discussions</b>  <i>Presenters:</i> <b>Graham Farmer</b> , Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator
13.15-15.00	<i>Panel discussion</i> <b>Response analysis</b>

Panel members will be asked to provide concrete examples and highlight core issues, challenges and priorities of the coordination roles and responsibilities of national and global clusters. This will be followed by plenary discussions and questions and a summary.

**Facilitator:** Neil Marsland, Food and Agriculture Organization

**Panel members:** Megan McGlinchy, Catholic Relief Services  
Emily Henderson, Oxfam  
Mark Gordon, Somalia Cluster Coordinator  
Miles Murray, Save the Children

**Background documents:**

- Response analysis and response choice in food security crises: a roadmap. Commissioned and published by the Humanitarian Practice Network at ODI
- Guide to conducting an EMMA
- Pakistan Food Security Cluster Rabi Season 2011 – 12 Programming Guidelines
- Abstracts from a selection of articles describing response issues, early warning, the context and assessment information leading up to the famine response in Somalia.

**Expected Outcomes:**

Improved understanding and consensus on the role of agencies, country food security clusters, gFSC partners and gFSC secretariat in relation to food security response analysis

15.00-  
15.30

**Coffee Break**

15.30-  
16.45

*Panel discussion*

**Learning from country experience - Case studies: The experience of taking a common and unified approach in mainstreaming protection, gender, age and disabilities in national food security clusters; Accountability to Affected Populations in Pakistan.**

Accountability to Affected Populations, age, disabilities, protection and gender are, and continue to be, core components of gFSC's support to quality programming. For the gFSC, support to quality programming means ensuring that in humanitarian response, 'programmatic planning and implementation take into account all aspects (standards, indicators and cross cutting issues) that make up the humanitarian programme cycle and ensure that the services to beneficiaries provided, have the ultimate goal of an increased positive impact on the resilience and livelihoods of vulnerable human beings within affected populations.'

**Presenters:** Samantha Chattaraj, global Food Security Cluster  
Barb Wigley, World Food Programme

**Facilitator:** Patricia Colbert, World Food Programme

**Background documents:**

- Closing the gaps. Gender Equality: Policies and Practices in Afghanistan. FSAC. 2013
- Report on Accountability to Affected Populations. Joint mission to Pakistan. 2012
- Report from gFSC partners meeting on protection in Geneva. December 2012

**Expected Outcomes:**

- An improved understanding of the comparative advantage on the common and unified approaches taken in mainstreaming cross cutting issues by gFSC and national FSC.
- Increased engagement with partners for mainstreaming good practices on cross cutting issues and accountability to affected populations.

16.45-17.45	<b>Reception</b>
<b>18 April 2013</b> <b>09.00-16.30</b>	
09.00-09.05	<b>Summary of Day One</b>
09.05-10.15	<p>Panel discussion <b>Cash and Vouchers and humanitarian response programming.</b> Is there a coordination role for the global and national food security clusters?</p> <p><b>Facilitator:</b> Megan McGlinchy, Catholic Relief Services</p> <p><b>Panel members:</b> Annalisa Conte, Director, Cash for Change Francesco Baldo, Somalia Cluster Coordinator Jessica Saulle, Save the Children</p> <p><b>Expected Outcomes:</b> An understanding/agreement on the level of engagement required from the global food security cluster to be appropriately engaged at the national and global level in coordinating Cash and Vouchers interventions in emergencies.</p> <p><b>Background documents:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agriculture and Livelihoods cluster and WASH cluster Drought Position paper</li> <li>- Guidance Note on Food Vouchers</li> <li>- Drought Response Position Paper</li> </ul>
10.15-10.40	<b>Coffee Break</b>
10.40-12.00	<p>Panel discussion <b>Resilience: the coordination roles of the food security cluster at global and national levels.</b></p> <p>Geographic examples of how resilience is incorporated in cluster activities will be presented. Covering any existing roles of clusters as well as identified areas where the cluster should increase engagement</p> <p>Plenary discussions will focus on: what needs to be done at the global level to assist country level clusters.</p> <p><b>Facilitator:</b> Jeff Tschirley, Food and Agriculture Organization</p> <p><b>Panel members:</b> Rana Hannoun, oPt Food Security Sector Erik Kenefick, Sudan Food Security Cluster Jean-Martin Bauer, World Food Programme</p> <p><b>Background documents:</b> The EU Approach to resilience: learning from food security crises Summary of the Expert Consultation on Resilience Measurement for Food Security</p> <p><b>Expected Outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreement on method and extent of continuing dialogue on what resilience means for the food security cluster.</li> <li>- Identification of focus countries where the gFSC can support national commitments towards resilience.</li> </ul>
12.00-	<b>Lunch</b>

13.00	
13.00-14.00	<p><b>Food Security Cluster Evaluation: Overview and the way forward</b></p> <p><b>Presenter:</b> <b>Lori Bell</b>, Office of Evaluation Food and Agriculture Organization  <b>Ross Smith</b>, Office of Evaluation, World Food Programme</p> <p><b>Background documents:</b>  <i>Joint FAO/WFP Food Security Cluster Evaluation. Draft Concept Note (5.4.2013)</i></p> <p><b>Expected Outcomes:</b>  An understanding of the purpose, suggested process and next steps involved for the Food Security Cluster Evaluation.</p>
14.00-14.30	<i>Coffee Break</i>
14.30-16.00	<p><b>Priority gFSC Activities November 2012 – April 2013</b></p> <p><b>Presenters:</b> <b>Graham Farmer</b>, Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator</p> <p><b>Expected Outcome:</b>  Identification of priority activities and responsible entities to be achieved in 2013.</p>
16.00-16.30	<p><b>Conclusions and next steps</b></p> <p>Tentative dates, venue of next gFSC meeting</p>

## Annex 2: List of Participants

### Global Meeting of Food Security Cluster Partners

17-18 April 2013

	First Name	Surname	Organization
1	Helene	Deret	Action Contre la Faim
2	Alberta	Guerra	Action Aid
3	Donna	Muwonge	Action Aid
4	Faheem	Khan	CARE US
5	Adriana	Opromolla	Caritas Internationalis
6	Floriana	Polito	Caritas Internationalis
7	Megan	McGlinchy	Catholic Relief Services
8	Gabrielle	Smith	Concern Worldwide
9	Kate	Hart	DIFD
10	Susanne	Mallaun	ECHO
11	Piero Calvi	Pariseti	Helpage International
12	Marcus	Skinner	Helpage International
13	Agnès	Dhur	ICRC
14	Hilary	Motsiri	IFRC
15	Vincent	Annoni	Impact Initiatives
16	Caroline	Abla	International Medical Corps
17	Frances	Kimmins	IRC
18	Schlott	Roland	Lutheran World Federation

19	Quentin	Le Gallo	NRC
20	Philippa	Young	Oxfam
21	Emily	Henderson	Oxfam
22	Allister	Clewlow	Samaritan's Purse
23	Matt	Ellingson	Samaritan's Purse
24	Ruco	Van Der Merwe	Samaritan's Purse
25	Miles	Murray	Save the Children
26	Jessica	Saulle	Save the Children
27	Claire	Hancock	Tearfund
28	Therese	Fliesen-De Vuyst	Terre Des Hommes
29	Anne	Thurin	UN HABITAT
30	Hanna	Mattinen	UNHCR
31	Vivienne	Forsythe	UNICEF
32	Bettina	Iseli	Welthungerhilfe
33	Michelle	Clark	World Society for the Protection of Animals
34	Lindsay	Fyffe	World Society for the Protection of Animals

#### Country Food Security Cluster Participants

35	Eric	Branckaert	Ethiopia
36	Marie Joelle	Jean Charles	Haiti
37	Rana	Hannoun	oPt
38	Beatrice	Tapawan	Philippines
39	Francesco	Baldo	Somalia
40	Mark	Gordon	Somalia
41	Eric	Kenefick	Sudan

#### Cluster Lead Agencies

##### Food and Agriculture Organization

42	Lori	Bell	FAO
43	Martina	Buonincontri-- Hernandez	FAO
44	Dominique	Burgeon	FAO
45	Roberta	Canulla	FAO
46	Charlotte	Dufour	FAO
47	Neil	Marsland	FAO
48	Mathias	Mollet	FAO
49	Jeff	Tschirley	FAO

##### World Food Programme

50	Jean-Martin	Baure	WFP
51	Annalisa	Conte	WFP
52	Alexis	Hoskins	WFP

53	David	Kaatrud	WFP
54	Kathryn	Ogden	WFP
55	Ross	Smith	WFP

**Global Food Security Cluster Support Team**

56	George	Aelion	gFSC
57	Marina	Angeloni	gFSC
58	Deborah	Armeni	gFSC
59	Vanessa	Bonsignore	gFSC
60	Samantha	Chattaraj	gFSC
61	Patricia	Colbert	gFSC
62	Graham	Farmer	gFSC
63	Emma	Fitzpatrick	gFSC
64	Yvonne	Klynman	gFSC
65	Marjolaine	Martin Greentree	gFSC
66	Marisa	Muraskiewicz	gFSC
67	Miguel	Rodriguez Fernandez	gFSC
68	Romain	Sirois	gFSC