ESNFI Cluster Performance Evaluation analysis and recommendations done by Partner's Organizations and cluster Leads (based on results of 2015 survey)

CLUSTER SURVEY RESULTS	71	AVERAGE SCORE		ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
MEDIAN SCORES			Performance constraints/opportunities	Follow up action	REPORTING PROGRESS BY
1. Supporting service delivery	**77**	**GOOD**			
1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities	**79**	**GOOD**			
List of partners regularly updated	88	GOOD	Rules on attendance and coordination should be developed to ensure that Partners respect and fulfil their commitments.	If an Organization is consistently absent from meetings or not responding to Cluster's information requests, a notification will be sent to Organization's Representative. Only attending Cluster Partners should be included in Cluster's lists	Dec-15
Regular cluster meetings organised	75	SATISFACTORY	Cluster meetings are organised in a proper manner. There are several constraints (UNHCR email system, security threats), but these are external and hard to mitigate. Meetings should also be planned to maximize participation (i.e. avoiding dates where most of attendants may not be in Kabul)	Possible to request partners their planned absence dates for the following month prior to set up the meeting dates.	Dec-15
Attendance of cluster partners to cluster meetings	100	GOOD	See the two cells above	NIL	Dec-15
Level of decision making power of staff attending cluster meetings	50	GOOD	Not all organisations send staff with decision making power and knowledge of the strategic issues. The real balance is of 50% and needs to be improved.	Communicate to cluster partners that staff with this level of decision making is needed for cluster meetings. If organisations continue to send non-decision-making-authorised staff members to cluster meetings, communicate individually with this organisation to ensure improvement.	Dec-15
Conditions for optimal participation of national and international stakeholders	100	GOOD	Conditions are there, but most of National stakeholders do not attend. Language barrier has been noticed as the main constraint. National stakeholder have little knowledge of Cluster approach, humanitarian reform and transformative agenda.	Plan a dedicated session with simultaneous translation for those organizations whose main barrier is language	Dec-15
Writing of minutes of cluster meetings with action points	100	GOOD	NIL	NIL	Dec-15
Usefulness of cluster meetings for discussing needs, gaps and priorities	75	SATISFACTORY	Due to the fact that some of the organisations send non-decision-making-authorised staff members to the cluster meetings, the important discussions cannot be resolved during the meetings and require approval from someone at higher level in Partner's Organization. Thus, delaying decision making process, legitimacy of Cluster's decisions and affecting transparent process.	See suggestion in row 8	Dec-15
Useful strategic decision taken within the cluster	75	SATISFACTORY	SAG is active and has its own TORs. It discuss the important strategic issues prior to Cluster's meetings and report it back at this forum. Besides, strategic issues are again discussed among Partners in Cluster meetings	NIL	Dec-15
Attendance of cluster coordinator to HCT and ICC meetings	100	GOOD	NIL	NIL	Dec-15
Support/engagement of cluster with national coordination mechanisms	25	WEAK	Language barrier has been identified as the main problem here. Must be difficult for national staff to be depending on translation in their own country. Create better linkages with PDMC and OCT meetings (in the regions). Discuss outcomes of those meetings at capital level. Support these mechanisms by including them in national Cluster meeting, disseminating information to them, 3Ws, etc.	Facilitate translation and the chance for the national staff to get their voices heard. Strengthen the coordination with OCTs/PDMCs and asking OCHA to ensure the Field Offices keep informed Clusters on their discussions.	Oct-15

1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
Mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities updated as needed	75	SATISFACTORY	Updated but mostly not used. Calls for support and coordination mostly done through networks and not necessarily based on 3Ws (at least not in the provinces)	New mapping exercise prior to the preparation for the HRP 2016	Dec-15
Inputs of partners into mapping of partner geographic presence and programme activities	75	SATISFACTORY	Some of the main cluster partners are not reporting	Cluster to develop mechanism/TORs to clarify the responsibilities and commitments of Partners. Those not fulfilling the requirements should be notified and further not being considered in the forum.	Dec-15
Involvement of partners into analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping	100	GOOD	Partners are generally involved. Cluster provides sufficient and timely information. Data in natural Disasters should be routinely and timely available in cluster's website.	Cluster's gap analysis and potential overlapping tables should be connected and provide user-friendly access to Partners. Stock matrix should separate ES and NFIs kits email and published in cluster websites (Shelter and Humanitarianinfo).	Dec-15
Analysis of gaps and overlaps based on mapping useful for decisionmaking	75	SATISFACTORY	See above	See above	Dec-15
2. Informing strategic decisionmaking of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response	**70**	**SATISFACTORY**			
2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis (across other sectors and within the sector)	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**	The gap analysis and needs assessment are carried out in proper way but data needs to be available from main sources (RAF & PMT). Current stock information collection need more improvement to filter what is respecting the minimum agreed humanitarian standards from what is below.	Data should be timely available. PMT and RAF databases should be connected and provide user-friendly access to Partners. Stock matrix should separate ES and NFIs kits (as per Technical Standards) from single items.	Dec-15
Use of cluster agreed tools and guidance for needs assessments	75	SATISFACTORY	Since the tools are in place this year, is being done properly. Partners need training on RAF use/filling and data collection. This caused ERM partners to use and promote the use of their own forms as supplement to the RAF.	Improve data collection. Train partners in how to fill out the tools and obtain information (i.e. facilitate a one day workshop). Stress the importance of being there (see comments in row 17)	Dec-15
Involvement of partners in joint needs assessments	75	SATISFACTORY	Often partners are called to join needs assessments in the last minute. It is not the case for all provinces but in many. Proper and timely coordination (of course considering that it's emergency and we need to move fast) is needed.	Adhere to SOPs and Cluster Contingency Plans. Coordinators of joint assessments should take into account logistic, communication and security issues and ensure to inform Partners as earlier as possible. Last minute calls that impede Partner's participations should be reported to National Clusters that, in turn, should report/complain to OCHA.	Dec-15
Sharing by partners of their assessment reports	75	SATISFACTORY	The assessments are rarely shared with other partners. I t's sometimes shared with cluster leads and OCHA. This practice should stop and proper assessment rules needs to be agreed. The cluster coordinator has shared a matrix and insisted to partners for sharing their assessment plans without success. As the assessment are a core instrument for gap analysis and planning proper attention should be given to organize this activity and share its outcomes.	OCHA should share assessments results with all clusters that, in turn, should disseminate among cluster partners. If the assessment is coordinated by the ESNFI cluster maximum dissemination should be ensured.	Dec-15
2.2 Analysis to identify and address (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication, and crosscutting issues	**61**	**SATISFACTORY**			
Analyses of situations done together with cluster partners	100	GOOD	Situation analysis is done during cluster's meetings. Some Partners feel excluded as issues are discussed in cluster forums not by email.	Encourage larger participation in Cluster's meetings and discussions.	Dec-15
Analyses of situations identified risk	75	SATISFACTORY	Cluster provide necessary inputs for the analysis of risks during the preparation of the core humanitarian documents. At the regional/provincial level this exercise is less evident.	involve more partners in the analysis process	Dec-15
Analyses of situations identified needs	75	SATISFACTORY	Need analysis are done by the cluster with inputs by partners. Regional/provincial needs differ as well as the Cluster's capacity to respond.	Involve more partners in the analysis process	Dec-15
Analyses of situations identified gaps in response	75	SATISFACTORY	to some extend	involve more partners in the analysis process	Dec-15
Analyses of situations identified capacity in response	75	SATISFACTORY	to some extend	involve more partners in the analysis process	Dec-15

Indicator	Score	Rating	Comments	Recommendations		Date
Analyses of situations identified constraints to respond Age (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	to some extend	involve more partners in the analysis process		Dec-15
Gender (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	to some extend	involve more partners in the analysis process		Dec-15
Diversity other than age and gender (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Although some assessment tools include diversity issues, there is little evidence on need analysis. The Cluster's vulnerability criteria address to some extent the issue but it's insufficient.	Discuss how to improve the inclusion of diversity in need assessments. Involve more partners in the analysis process.		Dec-15
Human rights (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	to some extend	involve more partners in the analysis process		Dec-15
Protection, including genderbased violence (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Cluster included protection mainstreaming issues altogether with reporting indicators.	Results started to be monitored since June 2015 and information will be available soon. Involve more partners in the analysis process		Dec-15
Environment (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Although guidance and standards are available, few Cluster partners are using them or considering these in assessments and analysis	Promote the consideration of environmental issues. Environmental workshop done with support of UNEP/OCHA Geneva. Involve more partners in the analysis process.		Dec-15
HIV/AIDS (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	25	WEAK	CPs mentioned not seeing relevant/ locally adapted documents considering this topic. Encourage Cluster partners to include in analysis (e.g. in Baseline studies or assessment reports). Need more advocacy work.	Involve/invite organisations with relevant experience in the topic in Ad Hoc basis. UNHCR to share its experience/best practices & policy on HIV/AIDS		Dec-15
Disability (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Disability is given proper consideration on ESNFIs vulnerability criteria in the new Technical Standards, thus, results may not be visible yet as the practices are implemented since March 2015.	Ensure that Cluster partners adhere to their commitments and the agreed vulnerability criteria by giving disability the proper attention.		Dec-15
2.3 Prioritization, grounded in response analysis	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**				
Joint analyses supporting response planning	75	SATISFACTORY	For natural disasters it's mainly based on the RAF (that has been pointed weak on inputs). CPs see that responses are more aligned to organisations' mandates instead of actual needs	Response should be done according to identified needs. Information should be cross-checked among active organisations to improve coordination and cooperation.		Dec-15
3. Planning and strategy development	**72**	**SATISFACTORY**				
3.1 Develop sectoral plans, objectives and indicators directly supporting realization of the HC/HCT strategic priorities	**65**	**SATISFACTORY**				
Strategic plan developed	100	GOOD	Done for 2015	NIL		Dec-15
Partners involved in the development of strategic plan	75	SATISFACTORY	Participation was ensured for all partners and contributions were received from committed/active ones. Language barriers for national partners has been highlighted as the main challenges for wider participation of local stakeholders.	Considering translation. Encourage local stakeholders to include staff that can communicate in English.		Dec-15
Sectoral strategic plan includes objectives, activities and indicators	75	SATISFACTORY	Done	NIL		Dec-15
Sectoral strategic plan reviewed against host government strategy	0	WEAK	The major challenge is that as the cluster is dealing with IDPs and affected populations (natural disasters and conflict), there is not a single GIRoA designated body to handle that caseload. Instead, there are various departments and Ministries engaged, all of them with different plans and agendas. The Government have development plans and emergency response framework (with no "plan").	MoRRD strategy shared and being considered as reference. ANDMA general mandate could be considered as reference. HC & OCHA may identify reference plans and guide clusters accordingly (i.e. ANDP)		Dec-15
Age (crosscutting issue) considered in strategic plan	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL		Dec-15
Gender (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL		Dec-15
Diversity other than age and gender (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL		Dec-15
Human rights (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes, as shelter assistance is promoted as basic human right (protection, dignity, social space, property, life, etc)	NIL		Dec-15
Protection, including genderbased violence (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	See Row 35	Ibid Row 35		Dec-15

Environment (crosscutting issue) considered in strategic plan	50	UNSATISFACTORY	Environmental issues should be included in the strategic plan. Discuss environmental impact of the ES/NFI standardized items/shelters. Discuss impact of relocation of population under ES projects.	Include Environmental issues and guidance references in the Cluster Strategy and future plans.	Dec-15
HIV/AIDS (crosscutting issue) considered in strategic plan	25	WEAK	See Comments in row 37	Ibid Row 37 for Strategic planning	Dec-15
Disability (crosscutting issue) considered in analyses	75	SATISFACTORY	See comments in Row 38	Ibid Row 38 for Strategy Planning	Dec-15
Strategic plan shows synergies from with other sectors	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Strategic plan guided response from partners	50	UNSATISFACTORY	Partners highlighted that organisations commonly refer to their own strategies instead of given proper attention to include the cluster one.	Encourage partners to provide feedback on strategic plan. Cluster to hold separate/individual discussions on each partner organization's strategy and verify its alignment with the cluster one.	Dec-15
Deactivation criteria and phasing out strategy formulated together with partners	25	WEAK	CPs highlighted that almost none of the organisations in this country has that. Absence of inputs/guidance to plan (i.e. how to phase out, who's in charge, etc).	Hold a dedicate workshop to discuss potential phase out strategies with partners and Government representatives in the Cluster	Dec-15
3.2 Application and adherence to existing standards and guidelines	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
National and international standards and guidance identified and adapted as required	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Technical standards and guidance agreed upon and used by partners	75	SATISFACTORY	As the Technical Standards were only made in March, CPs expect that the score is going to increase.	Inform Donors of the current standards and remain them that according the principles of good partnership and the ones for donorship only projects that are aligned with cluster's strategy and standards should be funded. Cluster standards should be translated in local languages.	Dec-15
3.3 Clarify funding requirements, prioritization, and cluster contributions to HC's overall humanitarian funding considerations	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
Prioritisation of proposals against the strategic plan jointly determined with partners based on agreed transparent criteria	75	SATISFACTORY	Cannot be implemented under the current HRP approach (project-less). This is only applicable for CHF proposals. In this case, yes, the procedure is followed 100% as per regulations. This include gender and environmental issues. Organisations are preparing/developing proposals based primarily on their networking skills (not according to their use of strategic plans) and experience in a given operational area (not based on its access to areas of implementation).	Cluster to promote the use of hybrid approach for HRP 2016 that will include the ESNFI common workplan as reference for planning partner's interventions	Sep-15
Prioritisation of proposals against strategic plan reflected interest of partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Cannot be implemented under the current HRP approach (projectless)	Cluster to promote the use of hybrid approach for HRP 2016 that will include the ESNFI common workplan as reference for planning partner's interventions	Dec-15
Cluster supported and facilitated access to funding sources by partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Cluster has been active to invite Donors to monthly meetings, keeping them informed on the minutes, ongoing discussions and current strategy, standards and guidelines (including the current performance evaluation process).	Cluster to continue engaging Donors and support bilateral funding discussions	Dec-15
Regular reporting on funding status	75	SATISFACTORY	Only few partners report funding status to cluster and NO ONE reported this to FTS.	Cluster Partners are to be continuously requested to report funding status of relevant ESNFI activities	Dec-15
4. Advocacy	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
4.1 Identify advocacy concerns to contribute to HC and HCT messaging and action	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
Issues requiring advocacy identified and discussed together with partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Areas of advocacy were identified. Not sufficient advocacy actions done outside the cluster forum. At the field level good practices and lessons learned have been promoted and results were shared	Increase advocacy activities.	Dec-15
4.2 Undertaking advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants and the affected population	**75**	**SATISFACTORY**			
Advocacy activities agreed upon and undertaken with partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Not fully implemented, it would be necessary to discuss an advocacy plan. Activities may need additional resources. Inclusiveness of local counterparts/stakeholders would improve advocacy	Discuss the adoption of an advocacy plan. Support presence of local actors in cluster meetings/discussions (also see comments in Rows 8,9 and 14)	Dec-15

5. Monitoring and reporting	67	SATISFACTORY			
Programme monitoring formats agreed upon and used by cluster partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Developed in 2015, disseminated and in use	Continue promoting the use of developed reporting formats	Dec-15
Reports shared by partners taken into account in cluster reports	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Regular publication of progress reports based on agreed indicators for monitoring humanitarian response	63	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Regular publication of cluster bulletins	38	UNSATISFACTOR	The absence of dedicated Information management support is limiting the capacity of the cluster to provide better information products and services. Cluster coordinator is maintaining both websites (shelter & Humanitarianinfo) but this may distract him from other priority activities/ duties. To the extent that it's possible all related information has been published in dedicated websites.	A dedicated Information Managemnt Officer should be working full time for the ESNFI cluster to collect information, assessment results and reports plus timely provide information products.	Dec-15
Changes in needs, risk and gaps highlighted in cluster reports and used for decisionmaking	75	SATISFACTORY	Being done but need further improvement (See comments in Row 75)	Ibid Row 75	Dec-15
Monitoring and response of the cluster taking into account the needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys	75	SATISFACTORY	Partially done. It need more commitment of cluster partners to improve	Cluster partners to prioritize the monitoring and reporting on the needs, contributions and capacities of women, girls, men and boys	Dec-15
6. Contingency planning/preparedness for recurrent disasters whenever feasible and relevant	59	SATISFACTORY			
National contingency plans identified and shared	100	GOOD	Done in February 2015	NIL	Dec-15
Partners contributed to risk assessments and analysis	63	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Partners involved in development of preparedness plan	75	SATISFACTORY	Yes	NIL	Dec-15
Partners committed staff and/or resources towards preparedness plans	50	UNSATISFACTOR	Regarding commitment of resources (stocks) partners have been very responsive and supportive. Staff is not always available and responses may require increase of field presence for what resources/funds are needed. Stockpiling costs are not covered by CHF or similar relief funds. This issue need to be addressed as the international community is at the forefront of recurrent natural disasters and responding to the needs of conflict affected populations.	Necessary to prioritize the fully achievement of contingency stockpile and its replenishment after each emergency event. These stocks (and the corresponding number of potential beneficiaries) should be counted separately on gap analysis. Items that are already commited to programs other thatn responding to emergencies should not be included in relief stock lists	Dec-15
Early warning reports shared with partners	63	SATISFACTORY	Cluster keep informed partners on displacement trends, current events and projections	NIL	Dec-15
7. Accountability to affected population	75	SATISFACTORY			
Mechanisms to consult and involve population in decisionmaking agreed upon and used by partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Done internally by Partner's Organisations but results and lessons learned not routinely shared with other partners or clusters	Cluster to monitor Partner's compliance. Results to be shared with peers and relevant Clusters	Dec-15
Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance received agreed upon and used by partners	75	SATISFACTORY	Some Cluster partners have their own complaint mechanisms but there is no dedicated one at the Cluster level. This will require additional human resources capacities that are already limited.	Cluster Partners to share reports on their internal complaint mechanisms. Possible to select an Organization as the focal point?	Dec-15