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|  This report provides the findings of the Cluster Performance Monitoring and allows the reporting of good practices, constraints and action points that will be identified and agreed upon by the cluster during the revision of the preliminary report. |
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| ***This is a template of the final report to be filled in and shared publicly. The performance status is filled from the results of the survey. The last 2 columns need to be filled according to discussions held with partners during the meeting reviewing the results of the cluster performance*** |
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| **Table 1. Response rate among partners** |

 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner Type** | **Number of responded partners** | **Total number of partners** | **Response Rate (%)** |
| **Donors** | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| **International NGOs** | 11 | 7 | 157.1% |
| **National Authority** | 1 | 0 | 0.0% |
| **National NGOs** | 4 | 8 | 50.0% |
| **ICRC/IFRC** | 0 | 1 | 0.0% |
| **UN Organizations** | 3 | 4 | 75.0% |
| **Total** | 19 | 20 | 95.0% |

 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2. Score matrix** |

 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Functions** | **Indicative characteristics** | **Performance status** | **Performance status****Constraints: unexpected  circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified** | **Follow-up action, with timeline,** **(when status is orange or red) and/or  support required** |
| **1. Supporting service delivery**  |
| 1.1 Providing a platform that ensures service delivery is driven by Humanitarian Response Plan and strategic priorities | *Established, relevant coordination mechanism recognising national systems, subnational and co-lead aspects; stakeholders participatingregularly and effectively; cluster coordinator active in inter-cluster and related meetings.* | Good |  |  |
| 1.2 Developing mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery | *Cluster partner engagement in dynamic mapping of presence and capacity (4W); information sharing across clusters in line with joint Strategic Objectives.* | Good |  |  |
| **2. Informing strategic decisions of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT)** |
| 2.1 Preparing needs assessments and analysis of gaps (across and within Clusters, using information management tools as needed) to inform the setting of priorities  | *Use of assessment tools in accordance with agreed minimum standards, individual assessment / survey results shared and/or carried out jointly as appropriate.* | Satisfactory | Assessment team is not qualified enough.The approach and methodology of assessment is not reliable to reflect what’s going on the ground  | Select qualified team to conduct any assessment  **)within 3months) team should be selected by partners and be trained by sub national cluster)** Identify reliable approach and methodology of the appropriate assessment to get more information on what’s happening on the ground. **)within 3months- sub national cluster)** |
| 2.2 Identifying and finding solutions for (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication and cross-cutting issues | *Joint analysis for current and anticipated risks, needs, gaps and constraints; cross cutting issues addressed from outset.* | Satisfactory | Rarely conducted real or fully joint assessment that all partners participate even by information.Weakness of sharing information system to let partners participate in joint assessment from starting even by information.  | * Planning to conduct real and fully joint assessment that all partners participate even by information. **)within 3months- sub national cluster)**

Establish the sharing information system to let partners participate in joint assessment from starting even by information. **)within 3months - sub national cluster)** |
| 2.3 Formulating priorities on the basis of analysis  |  *Joint analysis supporting response planning and prioritisation in short and medium term* | Unsatisfactory | Lack of government participation.Weakness of participation of active of partners. | Enhance the participation of the government **(within one month by MoPHP)**Improve the active participation of partners**.( within 3 months by cluster partners)** |
| **3. Planning and implementing Cluster strategies**  |
| 3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives and indicators that directly support realization of the overall response’s strategic objectives | *Strategic plan based on identified priorities, shows synergies with other sectors against strategic objectives, addresses cross cutting issues, incorporates exit strategy discussion and is developed jointly with partners. Plan is updated regularly and guides response.* | Satisfactory | Partners involvement limited, central decision making without proper consultation with sub-cluster | Bilateral/collaborative cluster meeting and regular (Health & Nutrition together) - Quarterly (CCs and CPs)Micro planning: as there are special considerations/factors at specific areas - at setting HRP (CC and CPs)Sharing of minutes from different clusters - Monthly (CC) |
| 3.2 Applying and adhering to common standards and guidelines  | *Use of existing national standards and guidelines where possible. Standards and guidance are agreed to, adhered to and reported against.* | Good | Partners are not aware of the lates guidelines | Updated guidelines (CHVs module) need to be shared, discussed and approved jointly (regionally) - MoPHP and CCs (ASAP before approval of new guideline) |
| 3.3 Clarifying funding requirements, helping to set priorities, and agreeing Cluster contributions to the HC’s overall humanitarian funding proposals  | *Funding requirements determined with partners, allocation under jointly agreed criteria and prioritisation, status tracked and information shared.* | Satisfactory | Criteria/methodology of funds estimations is vague/not clarified |  Involvement of Aden sub-cluster in all steps of planning for the HNO/HRP ASAP, CCSharing of funding estimation manual (transparency), CC |
| **4. Monitoring and evaluating performance**  |
| 4.1 Monitoring and reporting on activities and needs | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Third party monitoring tools/indicators not available to CPs | Aden CC to share the third party monitoring tools with all cluster partners ASAP |
| 4.2 Measuring progress against the Cluster strategy and agreed results | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Monthly analysis is not shared with the cluster partners | Aden CC to regularly (monthly) share the national and Aden-specific analysis, that is produced at the national level, with the cluster partners |
| 4.3 Recommending corrective action where necessary | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Partners not aware of current status of the activities and progress towards targets | Aden CC re-share the Aden scale up plan with partners for their review – ASAPAden CC to share with the partners workplan progress for the Aden hub (national IMO to support) for their review – Aug 2018 |
| **5. Building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning** |
| 5.1 National contingency plans identified, updated and shared | *N/A* | Good |  |  |
| 5.2 Cluster roles and responsibilities defined and understood | *N/A* | Satisfactory | The training on Cluster Approach was conducted, however tehre is a need to finalise the ToR | Coordination with GHO before finalizing the TOR. – Aug 2018Translation of TOR to Arabic. – Aug 2018 |
| 5.3 Early warning reports shared with partners | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Regular (weekly or monthly) reports on burning issues to be shared at the meetingCreating a way to provide updated information from the field. | Add to the cluster meeting updates from partners on the burning issues – CC, ASAPCreate a Dropbox folder with access by all cluster partners to the Aden documents - Aden IMO, ASAP |
| **6. Advocacy** |
| 6.1 Identify concerns, and contributing key information and messages to HC and HCT messaging and action | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Advocacy is not happening at satisfactory level with gaps inside the cluster, as well as to external parties | Aden CC to add to agenda of cluster meeting discussions on the issues that require advocacy from the Aden hub and identify follow up actionsAden CC to raise any issues required support from national level with the National CC – regularlyAden CC to share NC advocacy final draft for comments once received from the national level |
| 6.2 Undertaking advocacy on behalf of Cluster, Cluster members and affected people | *N/A* | Good |  |  |
| **7 Accountability to affected people** |
| 7.1 Mechanisms to consult and involve affected people in decision-making agreed upon and used by partners | *N/A* | Good |  |  |
| 7.2 Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance received agreed upon and used by partners | *N/A* | Good |  |  |
| 7.3 Key issues relating to protection from sexual exploitation and abuse have been raised and discussed | *N/A* | Satisfactory | Accountability happening on ad-hoc basis, with not many partners having an open dialog with the population | Aden NCC to share AAP guidance that was developed by the national level – ASAPConduct a Cluster meeting dedicated to AAP where discuss and agree on the way forward and present the AAP guidance - Aden NCC, ASAP |

 |  |