SAG Meeting Notes

Date and time: Thursday, 28 August 2015. 13h00-14h00 Geneva time
Participants: ACTED, Habitat for Humanity, IFRC, IOM, UNHCR, CARE, NRC and Interaction.
Excused: Australian Red Cross, World Vision International and UN-Habitat.

1) *Revision and approval of minutes from previous meeting*
- The only comment to the previous meeting minutes was the inclusion of UNHABITAT as a participant. They are considered approved with this change.

2) *Update on the ECHO 2015-2016 grant*
- As discussed in the previous SAG meeting, the Support Team circulated a new call for expressions of interest in order to fill in the remaining 100% of an RFP. However, no additional expressions of interest were received.
- IFRC informed the SAG that their expression of interest (for 50% of an RFP) still holds.
- IOM informed the SAG that they withdrew their expression of interest. However, it was agreed that the remaining funds could be used for other initiatives, IOM expressed that they would need to consult internally on the status of their expression of interest
- The SAG decided to proceed with signing agreements between UNHCR and IFRC and UNHCR and IOM for remaining activities to avoid any further delays in the implementation of the ECHO project.
- The SAG decided to proceed with the arrangements in place regarding the RFP for the Americas, hosted by NORCAP and seconded to UN-Habitat.
- SAG members expressed the need to discuss the process of allocation of funds and capture lessons-learnt to inform future similar processes. This can be done during the SAG retreat.

Action:

1. UNHCR will prepare and share with IFRC and IOM the drafts of project documents in order to sign project agreements as soon as possible.
2. The Support Team will assess the consequences derived from having less than two full time RFPs, and will propose a way forward (to be discussed via email and in the next SAG meeting).
3. SAG Members are invited to suggest ways in which the unallocated funding can be utilized within the scope of the ECHO grant. The exact amount available was not mentioned during the meeting but it is the following:
   a. If IOM maintain the 50% of the RFP: **90,466 EUR** which is the equivalent to the ECHO contribution for 1 RFP as captured in the EoI: salary (75,000) and travel (15,466)
   b. If IOM do not maintain 50% of the RFP: **135,699 EUR** which is the equivalent to the ECHO contribution for 1.5 RFP as captured in the EoI: salary (75,000x1.5 = 112,500) and travel (15,466x1.5 = 23,199)

3) *Discussion on the GSC coordination workshop and meeting: agendas and external facilitator*
- The SAG decided to hire a facilitator for the events (Ms. Isobel McConnan).
- Given the potential lack of knowledge of the facilitator on the latest IASC and cluster-related guidance, it was suggested that the facilitator be briefed properly on these matters.
- The facilitator should also engage early on discussions around the different sessions and structuring the events' agendas in order to ensure a meaningful participation, and to guarantee there is an added value in having an external facilitator. The facilitator will also receive contact details of SAG members in order to get their feedback on what they expect

as outcomes of the meeting. The facilitator will be given access to the pre-meeting survey in order to understand well possible issues.

- The Support Team will share the details on the purpose of ALNAP's role in the Shelter Coordination Workshop as soon as those details are available.
- SAG members will get together on the evening of Tuesday 6 October to prepare for the GSC meeting.
- A tool has been designed to provide a "real time" overview of the activities of the members of the Support Team. The tool is not public yet and it has the information available at the moment, it can be found here: http://sheltercluster.org/node/7285.

Action:

4. IFRC to proceed to hire the proposed external facilitator. The Support Team to provide her with the briefing requested by the SAG.
5. SAG members should send their feedback on the proposed agendas by COB Tuesday, 1 September.
6. The Support Team will circulate a call for expressions of interest for shelter partners to participate in the SAG in 2016, as this decision will be made during the GSC Annual meeting.
7. SAG members to provide comments on the monitoring tool for GSC Support Team activities before COB 11 September.

4) *Cash Coordination*

- Discussion on the need to develop a common approach to cash and shelter, both from a technical perspective (i.e. how to do shelter response through cash), as well as from the point of view of coordination.
- It was suggested that the technical aspect of the issue could be discussed within the Technical and innovation working group.
- There is a GFP (Davide Nicolini – UNHCR/SDC) who has been engaging in cash-related discussions at the global level.
- It is recommended to include a section on cash coordination during the GSC coordination workshop unless there is another topic that appears very prominently in the survey.

Action:

8. Davide Nicolini to brief the SAG on the latest information with regards to cash and coordination (either via email or in the next SAG meeting).

5) *Update on cluster lead position regarding double hatting and agency visibility/co-branding in shelter cluster activities, and resulting operations/cluster separation or firewall*

- IFRC explained the organizations view of the "firewall" to ensure there isn't a conflict of interest between the CLA role and the Agency shelter operational role. This firewall is implemented through different means:
  - The coordination role will be undertaken by a separate Shelter Coordination Team specifically deployed for this task, full time dedicated to the cluster, with no responsibilities over IFRC shelter operations. The International Federation will also participate in the cluster as one of the shelter operational agencies through separate representatives, as one of several agencies within the cluster. In other words, the Shelter Coordination Team members deployed by IFRC do not "double-hat" with dual responsibilities, but are exclusively dedicated to the cluster.
  - The IFRC places the funding and financial management decision making as far as possible from the operational decision making. Therefore, funding for the cluster

role is represented in a separate column in the IFRC Emergency Appeal budget and donors are requested to make specific separate contributions to the IFRC shelter cluster lead agency role, so as to avoid a conflict of interest for the Appeal Manager in deciding the allocation of resources between IFRC operations and IFRC shelter cluster lead agency role. In addition, budget holder responsibility for the shelter cluster budget of the IFRC is held by the Deputy Global Shelter Cluster Coordinator based in the Geneva Secretariat Office, rather than by someone in the Country Office with a responsibility on IFRC operations. The Deputy Global Shelter Cluster Coordinator is exclusively dedicated to the shelter cluster role and has no responsibilities over IFRC country shelter operations.

- The Cluster Coordinator will report to the International Federation representative in country only for security issues, and the arrangement of required logistical and administrative support. The main reporting line is to the Geneva Secretariat Shelter Department, which can provide dedicated support and overall management and oversight of the country-level shelter clusters led by IFRC.

- The "firewall" policy is a different issue from "branding" or "visibility". There are currently no policies or guidance regarding agency visibility or branding in shelter cluster activities, nor there seems to be in other clusters. While the SAG has approved an "Endorsement Framework", this mostly refers to the use of the Shelter Cluster logo rather than agencies logos.

- IFRC is currently developing its own policy guidance regarding co-branding of shelter cluster activities and products in IFRC-led shelter clusters. This policy aims to ensure there is adequate recognition and profiling of agencies contributing significant financial or in-kind resources to the Shelter Coordination Team and shelter cluster activities without undermining the "firewall" policy as explained above.

- It was suggested that the GSC needs to develop and agree on a strategy and guidance on how to use cluster and agency branding, for thus far this is done on an ad-hoc basis.

- Such a policy on co-branding would allow for space for agency visibility whenever there is a direct contribution to cluster-related activities. Ideally, this policy would provide incentives to cluster agencies to contribute financial or human resources to cluster work.

9. IFRC will share the organization's policy on co-branding once finalized (currently under development), which could inform the development of the GSC's policy and guidance.

- Next SAG meeting will be held on the 24 September as planned.