|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring Report and Action Plan** | | | | |
|  | | **Cluster:** Shelter/NFI Cluster Ethiopia  **Country:** Ethiopia  **Level:** National/Subnational  **Survey completed on:** 6/12/2019  **CCPM meeting held on:** TBD | | | | |
|  | |  | | | | |
|  | | **Response rate amongst partners** | | | | |
| Partner type | Numbers partners responding (national / sub-national level) | | | Number of Coordination Team members\* | Total number of partners  (based on last CDM) | Response rate  (at national level) |
| International NGOs | 13/3 | | | 1/0 |  |  |
| National NGOs | 3/0 | | |  |  |  |
| UN organizations | 9/2 | | | 3/0 |  |  |
| National authority | 0 | | |  |  |  |
| Donors | 0 | | |  |  |  |
| Others (Red Cross) | 3/0 | | |  |  |  |
| Total | 28/5 | | |  |  |  |
| Comments  on response rate |  | | \*No members of coordination team indicated responses for the subnational cluster. | | | |
| Other comments |  | |  | | | |

**National Cluster**

| Core cluster functions | Performance status at national level (Partners) | Difference in perception partners vs. coordinators  Result= Partners –Coordinators | Constraints, unexpected circumstances, good practice | Follow-up action and support requirements | Deadline | Responsible for follow up |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Supporting service delivery | **75% Satisfactory** | -12.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Informing strategic decisionmaking | **74% Satisfactory** | -7.25 |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Planning and implementing cluster strategies | **75% Satisfactory** | -12.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Monitoring and evaluating performance | **69% Satisfactory** | -6 |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Building nat’l capacity in prep. and cont. planning | **59% Needs Improvement** | -9.75 |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Supporting robust advocacy | **63% Needs Improvement** | -18.25 |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Promoting accountability to affected populations | **66% Needs Improvement** | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |

**Additional comments or information on cluster performance from national partners**

* A lot of work needs to be done. Though some of the actors are doing their best, it seems we are well behind other countries.
* Continuing partnership in 4 manner is highly important
* Coordination between the national and regional clusters to be strengthen further. Occasionally information shared by the regional clusters contradicts with that of National cluster.
* Ethiopian Clime induced Areas ignored
* N/A
* NIL
* No
* No.
* Now a days, the cluster coordination is getting improved from time to time so please keep on working more on capacity building of partners
* Please keep up the good works
* The cluster co-ordinator should have to work together with the woreda and kebele administrators and the correct number of gap should have to be verified before informing the number to us in the cluster meeting.
* The cluster has improved in the past year and is definitely one of the 4er cluster in Ethiopia. I believe more funds should be allocated to the cluster in order to ensure enough funds to carry out proper monitoring activities and ensure alignment and enforcing of the strategy to the partners on ground. Sub national cluster co are fundamental and need to be maintained.
* The cluster is currently improving its performance at increasing rate. But it need to organise partners to develop joint planning based on shared intervention gap information.
* The cluster should arrange joint performance field monitoring , advocate for more funding as the need is huge, facilitate capacity building trainings or experience sharing for implementing agencies
* The national Shelter cluster is poorly performing on most of the core functions. The performance is 1en since the year of 2018. As a result there is poor participation from partners, doesn’t encourage national NGOs to take part on the cluster meeting, poor follow-up and capacity building and never tried to ensure accountability to affected people. Hence major change is required on the Shelter cluster.

**Comments from Cluster Coordinators**

* No
* Our organisation is engage in multiple sectors (health, nutrition, WASH, Shelter & NFIs, Protection, and Agriculture). In my opinion, the ESNFI Cluster is one of the 4est Clusters in Ethiopia. Regular data and assessments are shared with partners and is well organised, with access to online site where all docs are stored. Guidance is provided for planning, budgeting, recommendations (e.g. BoQs) which is extremely helpful. The Cluster places high emphasis on accountability and is well linked with Protection, HLP and mainstreaming issues. All Cluster members are pleasure to deal with and the Cluster Coordinators have consistently been 4 in leadership and support. Meetings are held regularly. Cluster lead is always willing to support the development of proposals for other Donors (i.e. not just EHF). ESNFI Cluster is probably one of the better funded (and this is in line with the needs), thanks to the excellent advocacy. Congratulations to the ESNFI Cluster for their leadership over the past 3 years, especially during IDP crisis.

**Subnational Cluster**

| Core cluster functions | Performance status at national level (Partners) | Difference in perception partners vs. coordinators  Result= Partners –Coordinators | Constraints, unexpected circumstances, good practice | Follow-up action and support requirements | Deadline | Responsible for follow up |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Supporting service delivery | **75% Satisfactory** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Informing strategic decisionmaking | **70% Satisfactory** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Planning and implementing cluster strategies | **70% Satisfactory** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Monitoring and evaluating performance | **65% Needs Improvement** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Building nat’l capacity in prep. and cont. planning | **65% Needs Improvement** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Supporting robust advocacy | **70% Satisfactory** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Promoting accountability to affected populations | **70% Satisfactory** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Additional Comments From Subnational Cluster partners:**

As the cluster have not clear and perfect Decision on time, Organization are safer a lot even after they secure funds to implement (because implementation sites may be changed, while we are in the mid of implementation). So that fully destroy trust between needy communities and Agencies, between agency and gov't/clusters.

Improving prepositioning of the ESNFIs for immediate responses

No

The cluster need to bring new emerged partners and developmental actors on boards to avoid duplication.

The coordination with government stakeholder should be improved for proper planning and implementation.