

Country Cluster Performance Monitoring (CCPM)	%	Upgradation/ down gradation	Partners Recommendations / Comments
FSAC Core Functions			
1. To support service delivery			
Q2.1 - How do you rate your satisfaction with the cluster meetings with regards to:			
Frequency		Upgrade	The frequency of meetings are fine and the invitation was also sent properly
Good	79%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	19%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	0%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Accessibility (in-person/remote)		Upgrade	People in field were not able to attend the meetings remotely due to various issues (electricity, internet)
Good	71%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	21%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	0%		
Weak/limited	7%		
Language spoken		Keep it the same	Consideration for the for Local NGOs as they might have some issues with English Languages as the meetings are always in English
Good	88%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	9%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	1%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Utility of information shared		Keep it the same	The question need some improvement - rewording - as the respondents may got confused with the question itself.
Good	67%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	25%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	3%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Composition of participants		Upgrade	The gender balance could be considered in the meetings. Also, there could be some comments section for each question when they choose other responses rather than Good.
Good	68%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	25%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	3%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Discussion on strategic priorities		Upgrade	There is enough meetings for discussion on strategic prioritize and even we have specific meetings for some specific prioritize such as HRP, HNO
Good	53%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	40%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Time dedicated to members' presentations/updates		Upgrade	
Good	63%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	31%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	3%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Sharing meeting minutes and action points		Upgrade	
Good	77%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	19%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	1%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Overall satisfaction with the meetings		Keep it the same	
Good	84%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	12%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	1%		
Weak/limited	1%		

Q2.2 - How would you rate these Food Security Cluster products			
Monthly dashboards		Keep it the same	The dashboards have to be regularly shared on monthly base. Also make it more user friendly.
Good	59%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	28%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	3%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Partners' Presence map		Upgrade	
Good	55%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	32%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	5%		
Weak/limited	2%		
Gap Analysis		Upgrade	The question is not very clear especially for those partners who are not involved the reporting process especially through report hub
Good	54%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	37%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Bulletin/Newsletter/etc.		Upgrade	
Good	53%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	29%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	10%		
Weak/limited	1%		
3/4/5 W datasets		Upgrade	Replace the Dataset with Map
Good	53%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	20%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	5%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Interactive dashboard		Upgrade	
Good	48%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	24%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Meeting minutes		Upgrade	
Good	80%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	15%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Overall satisfaction with cluster products		Upgrade	
Good	71%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	23%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	1%		

2. To inform the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian Country Team's (HCT) strategic decision-making			
Q3.1 - To the best of your knowledge, has the Cluster coordinated or supported in conducting any sectoral or inter-sectoral needs assessments and surveys (including rapid needs assessments during emergencies, IPC/Cadre harmonize, market assessment, MSNA, etc.) and shared the results?			
Good	48%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	37%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	7%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Q3.2 - How would you rate the process of involving the members?			
Good	37%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	53%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Q3.3 - Does the cluster conducts regular emergency/contingency plans, gap/duplication analysis?			
Good	33%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	41%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	16%		
Weak/limited	0%		
3.4 - To the best of your knowledge, has your Cluster addressed any of these crosscutting issues at different levels, including needs analysis HNO, response plan HRP, capacity building, guidance notes/policies, etc.:			
Age			
Good	47%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	23%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	12%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Gender			
Good	57%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	25%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	7%		
Weak/limited	2%		
Protection (incl. SGBV, Child protection)			
Good	41%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	31%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	8%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Environment/Climate change/DRR			
Good	43%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	28%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	8%		
Weak/limited	7%		
Disability			
Good	43%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	25%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	11%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Others (human rights, diversity, HIV/AIDS, etc.)			
Good	29%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	25%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	9%		
Weak/limited	8%		
Q3.5 - To the best of your knowledge, is the Cluster's response priorities based on specific assessment (IPC/CH, FS&L, Multi-Sectoral, etc.) and analyses of risks, needs, gaps, etc.			
Good	55%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	33%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	6%		
Weak/limited	2%		

3. To plan and develop strategy			
Q4.1 - Has the Cluster developed and agreed upon a response plan - such as the HRP (including strategic objectives, activities and indicators)?			Cluster should consul with partners and improve the coordination.
Good	64%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	20%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	5%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Q4.2 - To the best of your knowledge, has the Food Security section of the response plan been inclusive?			The plan was inclusive but limited by the situation in 2020 and major restriction in terms of implementation. More focus on gender and disability inclusive.
Good	59%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	33%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	4%		
Weak/limited	1%		
Q4.3 - To the best of your knowledge, does the cluster have common standards and guidelines (ex: unit costing, minimum distribution standards for food, crop and livestock, assistance modality)			No improvement required but just need to be shared with the partners regularly.
Good	67%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	23%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	5%		
Weak/limited	2%		
Q4.4 - If yes, how do you rate the usefulness and overall quality of these guidelines?			Frequently informed the partners about the guidelines.
Good	48%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	51%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	1%		
Weak/limited	0%		
Q4.5 - To the best of your knowledge, did the FS Cluster adopt an informed, clear criteria and transparent processes in the HC's overall funding plan (example: selecting HPC projects – for countries that follow Project-Based Costing or Activity costing for countries that follow Unit Costing)?			No major improvement just regularly consultation with the partners
Good	59%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	36%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	3%		
Weak/limited	2%		
4. To monitor and evaluate performance			
Q5.1 - Is information on needs and activities shared by your organization to the Cluster reflected in Cluster's Information products (bulletins, dashboards, gap analysis)?			
Good	61%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	19%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	11%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Q5.2 - Have Food Security Cluster information products and updates (bulletins, dashboards, gap analysis), needs analysis and response planning supported and influenced your organization's decisions?			Communication products should be improved. Make guideline videos for partners on how to report to the clusters and in what sort of format an frequency.
Good	48%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	39%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	6%		
Weak/limited	1%		

5. To build capacity in preparedness and contingency planning.			
Q6.1 - Does the cluster facilitates the work around emergency/contingency plans to address potential Food Security needs as a result of hazards and risks?			Satisfied no improvements regularly follow up the partners
Good	47%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	34%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	14%		
Weak/limited	3%		
Q6.2 - To the best of your knowledge, has the contingency plan been developed with other clusters/Inter-cluster?			Coordination b/w the cluster . Contingency plan should be communicated and consulted with partners during preparation.
Good	52%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	29%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	15%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Q6.3 - To the best of your knowledge, has the contingency plan been developed / aligned with government protocols?			No Recommendation
Good	49%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	33%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	12%		
Weak/limited	6%		
Q6.4 - To the best of your knowledge, has the Cluster discussed what partners might do to strengthen the response capacity in country?			Frequent capacity training to partners on the contemporary and improved tool technique and evidence based knowledge
Good	34%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	41%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	14%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Q6.5 - To the best of your knowledge, has the Food Security Cluster shared and discussed early warning reports and capacity to pre-position for the response?			No comments by partners
Good	41%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	36%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	8%		
Weak/limited	7%		
6. Advocacy			
Q7.1 - Have issues requiring advocacy messages been discussed during Cluster's meetings?			
Good	34%	Agree	the reason is that during the cluster meeting the participant have received less advocacy message, the recommendation is if cluster did advocacy for the partners should be shared during the cluster meetings and include advocacy messages in the agenda of monthly cluster meetings
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	42%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	14%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Q7.2 - Have advocacy activities been undertaken on behalf of the Cluster and its members and affected people in different forums?			
Good	33%	Agree	
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	31%		At least include advocacy messages in the agenda of different Cluster meetings and other forums of coordination . separate group of advocacy from the partners to be established . it would be good to have advocacy coordination meetings at least quarterly among the Partners and FSAC and ad-hoc based on the needs
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	12%		
Weak/limited	7%		

7. Accountability to affected populations (AAP)			
Q8.1 - To the best of your knowledge, has the cluster facilitated discussions and experience sharing among partners on effective mechanisms to consult and involve affected people in decision-making / communication with communities?			
Good	54%	Agree	agree with the result because the technical working group is established, and they update the clusters. But it seems that majority of the cluster members not aware of this technical working group and further improvement is required to be involved and the result of their discussions and activities to be shared with the partners in the monthly cluster meetings.
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	23%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	16%		
Weak/limited	5%		
Q8.2 - To the best of your knowledge, has the cluster facilitated discussions and experience sharing among partners on effective mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance?			
Good	37%	Agree	because AAP is active and Awaz is also working to share the complain of BNFs with humanitarian actors, but as seen among the participants no one were aware that Cluster has coordination with AAP and AWAZ and their messages has not reflected in the coordination meetings.
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	39%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	8%		
Weak/limited	9%		
Q8.3 - To the best of your knowledge, has the cluster facilitated the sharing of information related to other sectors or response-wide AAP mechanisms, e.g. GBV hotline, PSEA reporting systems, etc. (if these exist in country)?			
Good	33%		The cluster had less rule in the accountability in the cluster level and information have not shared properly to the members during the cluster meetings and other. The members are not aware if the AAP is established, or at least the information is not shared properly.
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	28%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	16%		
Weak/limited	5%		
Q8.4 - Has the Cluster raised and discussed with partners the key issues raised by affected people?		Agree	It seems the cluster solved the problem of affected populations, but cluster is weak and not shared such data to the partners
Good	46%		
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	31%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	19%		
Weak/limited	4%		
Q9 - Based on all the above core functions, how do you rate your overall satisfaction with the Food Security Cluster in your country?			Groups 1 Overall satisfied Group 2 did not give any comments. Group 3 is agree with same marks.
Good	37%	Agree	the recommendation is to consider the above mentioned points and orientation to the new members need further improvement
Satisfactory, Needs minor improvement	56%		
Unsatisfactory, needs major improvement	5%		
Weak/limited	1%		