#### Coordination Performance Monitoring: General Introduction

#### Why monitor performance?

Monitoring coordination performance at the national and sub-national level in both sudden onset and protracted crises is necessary to ensure that clusters are efficient and effective coordination mechanisms, which fulfill the core cluster functions, meet the needs of constituent members, and support delivery to affected people. It is also necessary for accountability purposes, as well as to demonstrate the added value and to justify the cost of coordination.

## What is the Coordination Performance Report?

The Coordination Performance Report<sup>1</sup> provides an in-depth assessment of the *quality* of cluster operations, focusing on the IASC six cluster core functions and an additional component on accountability to affected people. It enables the identification of areas for support and improvement, and can be used by cluster lead agencies in support of their accountability to the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator (R/HC) and national authorities. The report should be used in all humanitarian responses with activated clusters.<sup>2</sup> It does not replace existing cluster performance tools based on peer review.

The Coordination Performance Report and accompanying tools were developed under the IASC Transformative Agenda by an IASC subsidiary body for use by all country clusters. The coordination performance monitoring tools/process were endorsed by the IASC Working Group in August 2012, and shared with the IASC Principals in December 2012.

### How is the report completed?

The Coordination Performance Report is based on feedback collected through a consultative process, with inputs from each cluster's coordinator and partners, including cross-cutting issues focal points. The process consists of three components:

- 1. Three online questionnaires are completed by cluster partners or cluster coordinators. One questionnaire is a general description of the cluster structure to be filled out by each cluster coordinator, and the remaining two are generic self-assessment surveys asking information about cluster performance from the cluster coordinator and cluster partners respectively. The responses are anonymous.
- **2.** The results of these questionnaires are weighted and compiled into the Coordination Performance Report format.
- 3. Each coordinator receives their cluster's preliminary Coordination Performance Report, and holds a meeting with cluster partners to discuss the findings and to agree jointly on improvement actions, which should be detailed in the final report. Open analysis and discussion with cluster partners on the results and needed improvements should serve to strengthen transparency and partnership within the cluster. This is an opportunity for self-reflection by the cluster, identifying areas that are working well and those that require increased attention, and raising awareness on support needed from the cluster lead agency, partners, and/or global clusters.

The outcome of this process (i.e the agreed, final Coordination Performance Report) should be shared with the cluster lead agency, national authorities, the R/HC and the global cluster. The Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) should use the reports to maintain an overview of performance.

Version: 13 June 2013

Both the Coordination Reference Module, which includes the six cluster core functions, and the Coordination Performance Report format are available on clusters.humanitarianresponse.info.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Coordination Performance Report also is applicable to sectors.

#### Who should participate?

Cluster coordinators and cluster partners at the national level and where relevant, at the sub-national level.

# When should this exercise be undertaken and how long does it take?

If clusters are activated, the Coordination Performance Report process should be undertaken three months after the onset of an emergency and every year thereafter. In protracted crises, it is recommended that the tool be used immediately with each cluster repeating the process annually, except in cases where core functions have been registered as weak, requiring more frequent monitoring and follow-up on improvement actions.

The process includes the completion of a 20-30 minute online survey, the compilation of survey results, and a two-three hour cluster meeting to discuss results. These steps take place over a period of four-six weeks.

#### What about the sub-national level?

When there are 'major' sub-national response hubs, each sub-national cluster structure should be treated as a separate entity and reported against by the partners locally present in that cluster and the sub-national cluster coordinator. This is a separate exercise to that performed by the national cluster as it brings additional detail and insight.

#### What's needed?

At the field level, this exercise is fairly easy to do as it only requires Internet access, and time to complete the questionnaires and participate in a two-three hour meeting to discuss follow-up action based on the preliminary Coordination Performance Report.

At the headquarters level, the secretariats of the global clusters will provide support to each country process, manage the data from the questionnaire, and compile the responses into the report format to be sent back to the country clusters; OCHA will do the data management/processing tasks for the first few countries. The global approach to data management has been chosen as this would require less resources than if each country installs the software/database individually, and it will ensure that global clusters examine cluster performance across countries.

#### What about monitoring results?

The Coordination Performance Report assesses a cluster/ sector in order to improve performance of its coordination functions. Measuring delivery/results for project/programme implementation is a separate activity that will be defined by the IASC Steering Group on the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. In due course, coordination performance and sector delivery will need to be connected for their review side-by-side by the R/HC and HCT.