



Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring Report and Action Plan

Cluster: Protection Cluster

Country: Afghanistan

Level: National and Sub-National

Survey completed on: 31 January 2021

CCPM meeting held on: 17 March 2021

Response rate amongst partners

Partner type	Numbers partners responding (national / sub-national level)	Total number of partners (based on last CDM)	Response rate (at national level)
International NGO	8	30	12%
National/local authority	1	0	100%
National/local NGO	10	45	13%
Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement	1	2	0%
United Nations	4	6	17%
International NGO	8	30	12%
Total	24	83	13%
Comments on response rate			

Core Function	Overall Score		
1- TO SUPPORT SERVICE DELIVERY	64.7	>75%	Strong
2- TO INFORM THE HC/HCT'S STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING	54.8	50-75%	Satisfactory
3- TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT CLUSTER STRATEGIES	56.8		
4- TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE RESPONSE	46.6	25-50%	Unsatisfactory
5- TO BUILD NATIONAL CAPACITY IN PREPAREDNESS AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING	51.8		
6- TO SUPPORT ROBUST ADVOCACY	47.0	<25%	Weak
7- AAP/ENGAGEMENT WITH COMMUNITIES	62.7		



Analysis of Performance

Core Function	Performance Status	Comments
1- TO SUPPORT SERVICE DELIVERY	64.7	<p>The Cluster has been conducting regular plenary meetings. The SAG has been reactivated with new memberships since November 2020. The aim is to hold more frequent SAG meetings in 2021.</p> <p>The Cluster is in the process of redesigning the service mapping template and develop a comprehensive service mapping of protection services. The service mapping will be updated on monthly basis and at minimum every quarter. Once service mapping is completed, the Cluster will work on developing harmonised referral pathways and will work on the inclusion of non-protection services provided by others clusters.</p>
1.1. Are you satisfied of the frequency of Cluster meetings?		
1.2. How often do you/your organisation attend Cluster meetings?	89.9	
1.3. Do you find the Cluster meetings useful and relevant?	73.9	
1.4. Are you a member of the Cluster's Strategy Advisory Group (SAG)?	50.0	
1.5. Do you find the SAG meetings useful and relevant?	50.0	
1.6. Does the cluster provide regular and systematic updates/feedback to the cluster members on SAG discussions, actions and decisions/recommendations?	72.2	
1.8. Do you contribute to the Cluster's 3W/4W/5Ws?	66.7	
1.9. Does the Cluster share 3-5Ws data or mapping regularly?	66.7	
1.10. Does the Cluster use 3-5W data or mapping during Cluster meetings to discuss operational gaps and overlap/duplication?	52.1	
1.11. How useful are the 3-5W data or mapping during Cluster meetings to discuss operational gaps and overlap/duplication?	79.2	
1.13. Does the Cluster share regularly updates on service mapping and referral pathways?	47.4	Comprehensive exercise to be undertaken, first including only protection services. Quarterly update at a minimum. Monthly update if possible once the system is in place, and inclusion of non-protection services provided by others clusters.
1.15. Are information sharing protocols within the cluster useful to facilitate / promote safe and appropriate data sharing among partners?	59.0	
1.17. How useful are cluster engagement with operational partners to address gaps and avoid overlap/duplication in the protection response?	57.9	



Global Protection Cluster

<p>2- TO INFORM THE HC/HCT'S STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING</p>	<p>54.8</p>	<p>The Cluster in 2020 developed a harmonised joint Protection Monitoring (PM) tools coded in Kobo for partners to use. Due to staffing and resources limitation, the Cluster was not able to produce regular monthly PM dashboards. The PM tools were updated again in December 2020 to integrate the COVID specific questionnaire annex to the original joint PM tools. So far few organisations (DRC, IOM, UNHCR, NRC, INTERSOS and IRC) have committed to use the joint monitoring tools. The first PM dashboard and Protection Brief (narrative report) will be published in April.</p>
<p>2.1. Do you contribute to the cluster-led or coordinated Protection monitoring system (tools, methodologies and reporting template/framework)?</p>	<p>47.6</p>	<p>Protection Monitoring template (=narrative report on Protection Monitoring findings) to be discussed with the GPC next week. Target to produce a PB every other month, and request to the HC to present them during HCT meetings to engage HCT members on substantive protection issues, raise awareness, but also make sure appropriate follow-up is made on specific recommendations. PC welcomes support for the drafting process. Each PB to be circulated with PM organisations and SAG members prior to publication.</p>
<p>2.2. Do you share monitoring data, information or reports in a timely manner (i.e. within a week) with the cluster?</p>	<p>54.4</p>	
<p>2.3. Do you contribute to the Cluster-led or coordinated Protection needs assessments (cluster or intercluster)?</p>	<p>61.5</p>	
<p>2.4. Do you share Protection needs assessments reports in a timely manner (i.e. within a week) with the cluster?</p>	<p>60.8</p>	
<p>2.5. Does the cluster regularly share collective Protection analysis updates and products (report, dashboards) with Cluster members?</p>	<p>55.0</p>	
<p>2.6. Does the cluster's collective Protection analysis address or cover the following points appropriately?</p>	<p>56.1</p>	
<p>2.7. Do you find the Cluster's collective Protection analysis useful/relevant to define cluster response or advocacy priorities?</p>	<p>50.8</p>	
<p>3- TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT CLUSTER STRATEGIES</p>	<p>56.8</p>	<p>Over the past year the PC consulted and included as many partners in the HPC process as possible. It was agreed that more partners should be invited to participate in both the HNO development process by submitting their assessments to the Cluster to be included in the analysis of the protection needs in addition to the Whole of Afghanistan Assessment (WoAA). Regional Cluster need to hold consultation meeting on priority action, areas and partners' capacity well in advance to feed into the HRP discussion at the national level. It was also agreed that the PC Regional Focal Points would be directly involved in the development of the HRP along with the national Clusters/AoRs.</p>



Global Protection Cluster

<p>3.1. Do you feel you were included and allowed to contribute adequately to the Cluster's 2021 strategic planning process (HNO/HRP)?</p>	<p>29.6</p>	<p>Recommendations to include partners for the HRP –to calculate activity costs, prioritise activities/response/geographical areas, etc. Push AoRs and GP Reg Coord to hold meetings well ahead of the HRP kick off to make sure all concerns and priorities are duly reflected. National level discussions for GP.</p>
<p>3.2. Do you feel the Cluster's 2021 HNO reflects appropriately the protection contexts, and key protection trends and needs in your operation?</p>	<p>75.9</p>	
<p>3.3. Do you think the Cluster's 2021 HRP objectives and priorities are appropriate, relevant, and clear?</p>	<p>61.7</p>	
<p>3.5. Was the 2021 HRP project submission and selection process clear and transparent?</p>	<p>51.9</p>	
<p>3.6. Did you/your agency staff participate in any training provided or organized by or with the Cluster on the following topics? (select all applicable)</p>	<p></p>	
<p>3.7. Did you/your agency staff find the/these training useful – are you/they integrating the training material into your/their work?</p>	<p>62.5</p>	
<p>4- TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE RESPONSE</p>	<p>46.6</p>	<p>The PC has often struggles with non-reporting or inconsistent reporting to the FTS and ReportHub. It was agreed that the PC should organise frequent trainings on FTS and ReportHub for partners to enable partners to correctly feed into the reporting tools. The PC is in the process of developing a reporting guide to ensure accurate reporting of activities to the ReportHub. Due to past mistakes of reporting development funding for humanitarian (especially MA related activities) in the FTS, the PC, through MA AoR is advocating for FTS to add an approval or a notification function to the system.</p>
<p>4.1. How useful are Cluster reviews of response progress and achievements against strategic objectives and indicators, identifying potential needs to adjust of protection response priorities?</p>	<p>50.0</p>	
<p>4.2. How effective and useful is the Cluster monitoring of the quality and impact of field protection activities?</p>	<p>58.7</p>	
<p>4.3. Do you report protection funding to the Cluster using the Financial Tracking System (FTS) or any other reporting framework?</p>	<p>31.8</p>	<p>The information from FTS are often not accurate reflection of the protection funding. Partners and donors may not report protection funding regularly or accurately. In the past, the MA AoR had issues distinguishing funding related to humanitarian and development MA activities</p>
<p>5- TO BUILD NATIONAL CAPACITY IN PREPAREDNESS AND CONTINGENCY PLANNING</p>	<p>51.8</p>	<p>The PC, as part of the joint ICCT efforts has contributed to the producing and dissemination of number of preparedness and contingency plans. However the PC will need to invest in more efforts on early warning systems and building the capacity of communities on positive coping mechanism in response to shocks</p>



5.1. How effective/relevant is the Cluster effort on preparedness & contingency planning (whether specific to the Cluster, Protection Cluster or part of intercluster/HCT intersectoral plan) for	50.0	
5.2. How clear is the implementation role of your agency for any of those preparedness/contingency plans?	56.3	
6- TO SUPPORT ROBUST ADVOCACY	47.0	The Protection Cluster has started a few initiatives in 2020 including producing protection briefs, briefing notes and protection priority papers. However, the PC doesn't have advocacy strategy as a guiding document for its public or private advocacy initiatives.
6.1. Do you feel you were included and allowed to contribute adequately to the development of the Cluster's advocacy strategy?	27.5	Need for the PC to develop an advocacy strategy. Possibility to include the advocacy component into the general PC work plan (no need for a separate advocacy strategy). Importance of follow up on recommended actions to make the strategy impactful. Possibility to organise a protection cluster retreat as the first step, then develop the work plan based on the outcomes of the retreat.
6.2. Do you feel the Cluster's advocacy (strategy) reflects appropriately the priority protection issues for advocacy in your operation?	61.9	
6.3. Do you think the Cluster's advocacy (strategy) objectives are appropriate, relevant, and clear?	64.1	
6.4. Did you contribute to any advocacy action or product led by the Cluster or coordinated by the Cluster?	27.8	The child labour advocacy note that was produced by the Cluster, good number of partners were consulted or directly involved in the preparation of the note. The PC is following up with respective partners and stakeholder on the progress of recommendations
6.5. How effective or relevant are the advocacy actions or products led by the Cluster or coordinated by the Cluster?	53.8	
6.6. How participatory and transparent are the Cluster engagements with donors – i.e. are partners included in such engagements and/or kept informed?	51.1	
6.7. How effective or relevant are the Cluster engagements with donors?	48.9	Continue to produce the quarterly Protection Priorities Papers to be circulated to donors, donor briefings and bilateral discussions. Need to raise more awareness about Cluster engagement with donors and report on fundraising achievements.
6.8. If you did take part in any Cluster-led engagement with donors, which of the following topics were addressed? (select all applicable)		
6.9. How supportive was the Cluster in helping you raise funding for your 2020 HRP project or any other protection project/activity supporting the Cluster's priorities?	51.0	
7- AAP/ENGAGEMENT WITH COMMUNITIES	62.7	



7.1. Does your agency have any of the following policies and systems in place?		
7.2. Have you or staff from your organisation participated in training facilitated or organised by the Cluster on the following topics this year?	82.3	
7.3. Have you used Cluster/cluster/intercluster harmonized/standard/joint approaches or tools for Risk Communication and Community Engagement (RCCE)?	29.8	The RCCE working group has shared harmonised tools and messages to all humanitarian partners conducting RCCE activities. The PC has agreed to start harmonising protection related messaging and awareness raising activities.
8- Programmatic/Operational Footprint Benchmark		



CCPM Priorities & Action Plan

Core Function Indicators (number)	Priority action	Lead organisation	Focal person (name)	Focal person (email)	Deadline	Comment (if useful)
To support service delivery- 1.13	1. Produce a comprehensive Protection service mapping. 2. Comprehensive sectoral service mapping	Protection Cluster, UNAMA Human Rights,	Cluster Coordinators		End of April: Protection Service Mapping End of June: Sectoral service mapping	The Cluster is in the process of redesigning the service mapping template and develop a comprehensive service mapping of protection services. The service mapping will be updated on monthly basis and at minimum every quarter. Once service mapping is completed, the Cluster will work on developing harmonised referral pathways and will work on the inclusion of non-protection services provided by others clusters.



To support service delivery- 1.15	Develop Cluster's data sharing protocols	Protection Cluster, UNHCR, OCHA			End of May	
To inform the HC/HCT's strategic decision making -2.1	1. Protection Monitoring dashboard 2. Protection brief/narrative report 3. Protection situation analysis presentation to HCT in each two-months, TBC.	Protection Cluster team + UNHCR, DRC, IOM, NRC, INTERSOS, IRC			PM Dashboard- End of March Protection narrative report: End of April	
To plan and implement Cluster strategies -3.1	1. Strengthen partners' inclusion in the HPC Process 2. HRP consultation at regional level	Protection Cluster, Regional Clusters	Cluster and AoR Coordinators,		May	
To monitor & evaluate response- 4.3	Improve Protection Funding reporting to FTS through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advocate with FTS for creating notification system for the Cluster and Sub-Cluster Coordinator whenever partners and donor report in the system 2. Plan for additional and systematic capacity building on Report Hub and FTS. 	Protection Cluster, OCHA	Cluster Coordinators and MA AoR Coordinator		By June	
To support robust advocacy- 6.1	Developing the Cluster's advocacy strategy	The PC + SAG	Cluster's Coordinators		June	Update the protection cluster's strategy by



						<p>focusing more on the advocacy elements. The Cluster is also planning for the protection cluster retreat where discussion will be held on steps for effective advocacy</p>
<p>To support robust advocacy- 6.7</p>	<p>Information sharing and reporting on Cluster's engagement with donors, on quarterly basis</p>	<p>The PC</p>			<p>End of April</p>	<p>Continue to produce the quarterly Protection Priorities Papers to be circulated to donors, donor briefings and bilateral discussions. Need to raise more awareness about Cluster engagement with donors and report on fundraising achievements.</p>
<p>AAP/Engagement with communities- 7.3</p>	<p>Harmonised RCCE/Awareness raising messaging</p>	<p>SAG + RCCE WG</p>			<p>July</p>	<p>the protection cluster will work with partners and the AoRs to harmonise the</p>



						protection related messages.

Support required from GPC/AoRs

- 1. Support to advocate for permanent IMO position for the Cluster**
- 2. Support on developing referral pathways SOPs**
- 3. Support in following up with the FTS to create push notification of entries for the Cluster/SCs coordinators**
- 4. Support to develop the Cluster's advocacy strategy**
- 5.**

(guidance – see next page)



Guidance

1. Analysis of performance

- **Comments:** Please indicate following points on performance
 - Achievements & good practice
 - Challenges & mitigating circumstances explaining level of performance
 - Any other relevant comments
- You can also decide to provide comments for the whole core function rather than for each question
- Section 8 of the online survey related to the Programmatic/Operational Footprint resulted in little to no data. Please use the opportunity of your workshop with partners to update the information related to program implementation in the GPCData.im section on “Operational Footprint” to ensure that basic information is available.

2. Priorities & Action Plan

- **Core Function Indicator:** Please indicate the number of the indicator/question you are addressing – referring to number in table above
- **Priority action:** Please provide brief description of the priority action
- **Lead organisation:** Identify actions to be taken by the coordinators, the CLA and/or Co-coordinating agency, and/or cluster partners
- **Focal person:** Please provide name and email of focal person who will lead/follow up on priority action
- **Deadline:** Please indicate when you expect the action to be done/finalized – you can simply indicate the trimester – e.g.: “Q3 2021”
- **Comments:** Add any relevant comments as you see fit

3. Support required from GPC & AoRs

- **Support required:** clarify technical or other support needed from GPC or AoRs for your priority actions