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**SINGLE FORM FOR HUMANITARIAN AID ACTIONS[[1]](#footnote-1)**

# 1 GENERAL INFORMATION

## 1.1 Name of Humanitarian Organisation/Country of registration:

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees / Switzerland

## 1.2 Title of the Action:

## Provide a title. (Keep it general and simple)

Mobilising collective efforts towards a greener and climate smart humanitarian shelter and settlements response.

## 1.3 Narrative summary:

Short overview of the Action. Please provide one or two short paragraphs summarising the action (objectives of the action, expected results).

In the current dramatic global context of environmental degradation and climate change, all sectors of society, including humanitarian action, need to reduce their environmental impact and adapt responses to the effects of climate change. Shelter and settlements assistance is live-saving and foundational for other sectoral support. It is essential for survival and recovery and it is often among the first priorities of people affected by humanitarian crises. Much of the emergency shelter and NFI assistance currently relies heavily on high-carbon emission and plastics interventions that have environmental impacts. The Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) will work with the Global Logistics Cluster (GLC), other clusters and related bodies to green the humanitarian response and make it climate smarter. This will be done in a two-pronged approach. Firstly, the GSC brings together the shelter advisors of the main humanitarian organizations. These shelter advisors have the responsibility within their organizations of defining the specifications of the most common humanitarian items delivered in-kind which are widely used by the shelter sector, as well as several other sectors such as WASH, Education, and Health. In collaboration with these sectors, the GSC will green the specifications of these items under the responsibility of shelter advisors. The following is implied with greening: undertake actions, collaborate with partners, private sector and specialists to thoroughly review the material specifications, manufacturing and supply processes so that significant improvements in environmental considerations and material content can be identified. The goal is to radically improve the specifications of critical shelter and non-food items without reducing the performance of the items.

Secondly, the GSC will support country-level shelter clusters to plan and implement operations that are as climate smart as possible. Localized and effective coordination teams, supported by surge capacity and global helpdesks, will promote the use of sustainable local solutions and materials that can help avoid international procurement, find options for reducing, repurposing, reusing, and recycling these solutions, promote an informed use of cash, and increased participation of affected population.

 **1.3.1 [INT] Update the narrative summary**

This section is optional at interim stage. The narrative summary can be updated to record the changes in the Action since the submission of the proposal. This section should not be used to report on progress.

**1.3.2 [FIN] Update the narrative summary**

Please fill this section and summarise the achievements of the Action.

## 1.4 Area of intervention (country, region):

Indicate the world area, country, regions and locations of the intervention.

Include a map of the project locations (not compulsory, but advisable)

The activities of this project will benefit humanitarian operations worldwide according to need.

This page ( [www.sheltercluster.org/operations](http://www.sheltercluster.org/operations)) provides a map showing the shelter clusters and cluster-like coordination arrangements. Impact is not limited to existing locations of activated clusters but across all areas of humanitarian intervention.

## 1.4.1 [INT] Update on area of intervention:

This section is optional at the interim stage and only needs to be updated if the locations have changed. If so, briefly explain the rationale behind the changes of location.

## 1.4.2 [FIN] Update on area of intervention:

This section is optional at the final report stage. If changes occurred, please provide the rationale behind the changes.

## 1.5 Dates and duration (at MR stage – including suspension periods)::

***Start date:*** Indicate the starting date of the activities (use 1st of the month) – can be retroactive

01/07/2021

***Duration of the action:*** Indicate the number of months of implementation

24 months

***Start date for eligibility:*** Eligibility date will be the same as the starting date

01/07/2021

# 2 HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATION IN THE AREA OF INTERVENTION

## 2.1 Presence in the area:

## Describe your presence in the area (country/sectors) – e.g. number of years, type of intervention, and type of office set-up.

The Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) is an open platform for the coordination of the humanitarian shelter and settlements sector, with more than 45 partners participating consistently at the global level. In 2018 the GSC adopted its [Strategy 2018-2022](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global-strategic-advisory-group/library/strategy)based onlearning from its Strategy 2013-2017. Country level clusters or cluster-like coordination arrangements are currently active in 30 countries (September 2020). Emergency shelter and Non-Food Items (NFIs) are a substantial part of the response by shelter actors, including the lead agencies, and of the coordination work. In 2019[[2]](#footnote-2), a total of 14.2 million people received shelter and NFIs assistance from 639 partners in the 30 countries where there are clusters or cluster-like coordination mechanisms. In the 21 countries with HRPs in 2020 there are 42.3M people in need of shelter support, of which 20.3M are targeted by the humanitarian community. A total of 1.5B USD are required to meet these needs, of which around 400M USD had been received by the 2nd quarter of 2020.

The Global Shelter Cluster is structured as follows:

- **Strategic Advisory Group (SAG)**: permanent body that works to advance the cluster strategic direction, overall work plan, and advocacy. The SAG is composed of the cluster lead agencies and ten agencies and institutions of the Global Shelter Cluster based on agreed criteria, and reports to the GSC plenary[[3]](#footnote-3).

- **Support Team**: a team of 16 personnel (38% female, 62% male)[[4]](#footnote-4)with different degree of dedication seconded by different cluster partners. This team is the support cell or secretariat of the GSC and provides surge and remote support to country level shelter clusters under the overall supervision of the GSC Coordinators. Its members identify, train, deploy, and support country-level cluster coordination teams. When not deployed, the members of the Support Team provide remote support to country-level clusters. They also facilitate the work of the GSC and provide inputs to inter-agency discussions and inter-cluster coordination at the global level, and contribute to building capacity and enhancing preparedness.

- **Working Groups**: task-oriented and temporary structures with clear executable deliverables that are established by the SAG to address particular identified needs[[5]](#footnote-5).

- **Communities of Practice**: thematic groups of professional/expert individuals that provide technical and surge support to Global or Country-level clusters, develop "good practices", and address critical issues within their areas of expertise[[6]](#footnote-6).

Over successive years, the GSC has been able to advance a number of initiatives by the lead agencies and partners to address the environmental challenges that the sector faces. The GSC has a number of working groups and communities of practice to advance on issues that are of essential importance to the sector, including a very active Community of Practice for Environment in recognition of the significant difference and impact that shelter and settlement responses have on the environment. This Action builds on the progress made by the GSC in general and this Community of Practice in particular with the recognition and confidence that the GSC is well placed to help reduce the environmental impact of humanitarian responses and change practices across the humanitarian shelter and settlements sector.

## 2.2 Synergies with other actions:

## Specify potential synergies with other initiatives, with other major donors present in the country, or other humanitarian actors.

The GSC has submitted a project to USAID/BHA to enhance the capacity and quality of the humanitarian shelter and settlements response. If approved by USAID this project will increase shelter and settlements emergency and transitional coordination and response capacity (pillars 1 and 4 of the GSC strategy) and improve shelter and settlements emergency and transitional evidence-base based response, informed by joint analysis, best practice, learning, and advocacy (pillars 2 and 3 of the GSC strategy). Thanks to this grant the GSC will be able to advance on the emergency components of its current strategy.

The GSC is working closely with the Global Logistics Cluster (GLC) to ensure synergies with their multi-year, multi-donor initiative on environmental protection in humanitarian logistics, focusing on the reducing the impacts of waste and transport linked to humanitarian operations. IFRC is one of the several large humanitarian agencies which will be a partner in this project with the GLC. Close collaboration is envisaged in activities related to the green procurement of shelter items, as well as disposal and reverse logistics of construction materials and the application of circular economy concepts to reducing building materials waste.

The Shelter Cluster, either directly or through its lead agencies or its Environment Community of Practice, is involved in a number of initiatives related to the environment and synergies and coordination will be sought with these initiatives. These initiatives include: the Joint Initiative for Sustainable Humanitarian Packaging Waste Management funded by USAID, the Nexus Environmental Assessment Tool, Life-cycle Analysis for Humanitarian Shelter, Sustainable Supply Chain Alliance Project, environmental Focus of Humanitarian Logistics, IASC Informal Working Group on Greening, UNHCR Clean Energy Challenge, and the Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations. There are other initiatives in which the Global Shelter Cluster is not directly involved but that are being mapped to avoid duplications and promote synergies as much as possible. Annex A includes a table prepared by the GSC Environment Community of Practice mapping 34 most relevant initiatives related with this project.

IFRC and UNHCR are also members of the Steering Committee (along with ICRC) on the newly initiated “Sustainable Tarpaulin” project, which is part of the Sustainable Supply Chain Alliance (SSCA), hosted by ICRC. This two-year project aims to establish a baseline and understanding of the environmental footprint of the tarpaulin, which is one of the most versatile and used non-food items in the humanitarian operations. The project also aims to explore where most meaningful and impactful improvements can be made to reduce the footprint and the waste produced by the tarpaulin, without compromising the functionality and performance of the item and to enable and empower the decision-makers to make well-informed and comprehensive programming choices in their humanitarian shelter operations. GSC will remain abreast the developments in this specific initiative to align methodologies, foster further partnerships and benefit from the progress to inform similar initiatives to green specification that will be undertaken as part of the ECHO grant. Similarly, GSC will follow and connect where possible with another project under SSCA (spearheaded by UNHCR, WFP and ICRC) which aims to look at improving and greening the packaging of humanitarian items and the ongoing multi-agency initiative on sustainable packaging and reducing packaging waste which had started in 2019 under the leadership of Joint Environmental Unit.

IMPACT Initiatives is supporting several global clusters including the GSC on developing analytical tools and protocols to classify and monitor the severity of humanitarian needs and support cluster activities to strengthen evidence-based responses. This work will build upon and strengthen the work of the GSC Vulnerability Classification Working Group. The GSC will ensure that this Working Group includes considerations to capture environmental information, impact on the environment, and related issues.

This action builds on the support received from **DG ECHO**’s Enhanced Response Capacity in 2013-2014, 2015-2016, and 2017-2018 for a total of 4.6M EUR for the implementation of the first and second phase of the GSC Strategy 2013-2017. This contribution has enabled the cluster to significantly enhance the support provided to country-level clusters making them well-functioning, effective, responsive, and well-prepared coordination mechanisms.



The GSC and its partners also received support from other donors during this period. These contributions have been very valuable to advance the understanding and development of the sector.

The **main achievements** of the GSC during this period are the following:

* The GSC deployed trained and experienced coordinators in less than 72 hours after the activation of new clusters and new emergencies in existing clusters.
* The GSC website ([www.sheltercluster.org](http://www.sheltercluster.org)) has become the key platform to exchange information and share documents, tools, policy and guidance. The website is now recognised as the main global hub for information and guidance on humanitarian shelter response across all contexts.
* Increased satisfaction from cluster partners at global and country levels.
* Innovative programming was tested then mainstreamed on Cash, HLP, and area-based approaches.
* Mainstreaming of core GSC activities and increasing their efficiency. As an example, a one-off investment to migrate the website to a more advanced platform has enabled the cluster to save in maintenance and programming costs.
* Promoting a collaborative approach to resourcing the GSC. This is used, for instance, in Shelter Projects, a cluster publication resourced collaboratively by its partners.

The **main challenges** in the implementation of the GSC strategy have been:

* Some innovative approaches still require additional funding before they are mainstreamed. This is the case for **environment**, localization, research, advocacy, and other initiatives in the strategy.
* The newly introduced surge capacity approaches need time to be fully mainstreamed. Fully mainstreaming these roles will need more time given planning cycles, tailored contracting modalities, and the difficulty to retain the right candidates.
* The GSC has identified that more support is requested by country-level clusters apart from coordination. Surge capacity should be available for other more technical roles such as information management, cash and shelter, NFI responses, technical advice, housing, land, and property rights, and other sectoral issues.
* Fundraising for shelter operations and coordination has been consistently highlighted as the number one problem by those filling the GSC anonymous pre-meeting survey. Data indicates that shelter is among the most underfunded sectors worldwide. Advocacy on the cross-sectoral impact of shelter interventions is key.
* Some of the support received from donors other than ECHO has concentrated in projects and initiatives rather than in strengthening the overall cluster.

## 2.3 [FIN] Report on Synergies with other actions:

## Report here only when the situation described in the proposal has drastically changed.

# 3 NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND BENEFICIARIES

## 3.1 Needs and Risk analysis

### 3.1.1 Date(s) of assessment:

Provide the date(s) of the most recent need assessment(s) relating specifically to this Action

The [Report on Environmental Footprint of Humanitarian Assistance for DG ECHO](https://www.urd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Groupe-URD-Inspire-studypublic4.pdf) prepared by Groupe URD in May 2020 provides insight into the environmental impact of humanitarian assistance and the mitigation measures that can be put in place by different stakeholders and sectors including the Shelter and Settlements sector.

Feedback from GSC partners at global, regional and national levels has been collected and analysed continuously during the implementation and monitoring of the GSC Strategy 2018-2022[[7]](#footnote-7). Apart from being used to inform annual meeting agendas and SAG discussions, this feedback has allowed the GSC to identify gaps and set forth priorities for the strategic direction of the cluster. The latest [GSC Meeting](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global/events/global-shelter-cluster-annual-meeting-2019) (9-10 October 2019)[[8]](#footnote-8) provides recommendations that this Action seeks to address.

The GSC Environment Community of Practice (ECoP) has been very active and produced recommendations to country-level clusters and the global cluster on issues related to greening the response and reducing the environmental impact of shelter interventions. During the 2019 GSC meeting the ECoP held a [session](https://www.sheltercluster.org/environment-community-practice/documents/global-shelter-cluster-meeting-2019-ecop-session-energy) on energy and environment which advanced with GSC partners issues related to environment, shelter and energy. The GSC ECoP with the UNEP/OCHA Joint Environment Unit (JEU) commissioned a study from the London School of Economics and Political Science on [Environmental Mainstreaming in Humanitarian Interventions](https://www.eecentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/EMHIT_FINAL-REPORT-with-WWF-good-practice-2.pdf) published in 2020, as well as a study on cash and the environment[[9]](#footnote-9) in 2018. Environment and greening the response was also the first session of the 2020 Virtual Coordination Workshop which brought together coordination team members from all active clusters and the partners who deploy them.

### 3.1.2 Assessment methodology:

Describe the methodology used and indicate whom, how and in which conditions the most recent assessment(s) was/were carried out. Whether it was a joint/coordinated assessment and whether it was shared with other agencies. If available, attach a copy of the most relevant assessment report

Created in 2005 by the IASC, the GSC provides coordination services and brings together humanitarian shelter stakeholders at country and global levels. In 2013, the GSC published its Strategy 2013-2017, which was evaluated at the end of its period in order to inform a new GSC Strategy 2018-2022[[10]](#footnote-10).

 The GSC Strategy 2018-2022 is half-way through implementation and 2021-2022 are critical years to make progress on key aspects. A number of outstanding issues still need to be addressed, including shelter and environment, strengthening area-based coordination and settlement approaches, developing detailed methodologies and robust partnerships for effective research and advocacy, and increased localization of the response coordination. They will also be critical to build momentum for a new strategy prioritising environment as a prominent feature.

Environmental concerns have gained significant importance since the strategy was written. Environmental issues were originally featured, along with Protection, Gender, and Inclusion, as one of the four main cross-cutting issues to be mainstreamed in good shelter responses. However, the key role that shelter and settlement responses have in broad improvements across a range of environmental outcomes has become more apparent and urgent action is required from the humanitarian system. After the Paris agreement, the new urban agenda and the waves of activism that put climate change at the centre stage, there has been increasing focus on this subject.

In April 2019, the GSC SAG issued a statement calling organisations involved in shelter response to eliminate all but essential plastic packaging and advocated that changes be urgently made to specifications and procurement practices to reduce plastic content wherever possible and develop more options for use of products with recycled plastic and end of use recycling and upcycling approaches. This statement proved to be influential and gained momentum within cluster partners.

At the country level, the GSC deployed its first environmental advisor to the Haiti Shelter Cluster in 2010. Since then more advisors have been deployed to responses such as in the Philippines and Mozambique, and issues such as asbestos and energy have been considered more often. Energy for instance is a core element of the Venezuela Shelter, Energy and NFIs cluster, and environmental concerns are part of the IDP shelter strategy in the DRC.

### 3.1.3 Problem, needs and risk analysis:

### Describe the main problems and needs identified by the needs assessment within the geographical area and sectors concerned by the proposed Action. Include a brief gender and age analysis. Explain what are the underlying risk factors linked to the humanitarian crisis. Any particular issues in your country operation that are the subject of discussion with ECHO should be addressed in detail.

In the current dramatic global context of environmental degradation and climate change, all sectors of society, including humanitarian action, need to reduce their environmental impact. According to the study undertaken by UNEP/OCHA JEU and the GSC ECoP (mentioned in section 3.1.1), most humanitarian organizations have policies related to Environment, but these policies are often not consistently implemented, monitored and evaluated. Thus, their impact in practice remains unclear.

Shelter, settlement and infrastructure interventions are live-saving and foundational for other sectoral support. They are essential for survival and recovery and often among the first priorities of people affected by humanitarian crises. They involve the delivery of tangible actions, either through international or local procurement and provision of emergency shelter hardware and technical assistance. Both international and local approaches have impact upon ecosystems, predominantly land use, vegetation and natural resources. These interventions also represent a very large expenditure in terms of assistance in the humanitarian system. The shelter sector[[11]](#footnote-11) is also among the sectors that bring and use the largest amount of materials in a response. The Logistics Cluster reports that around 80% of their supply chain relates to shelter items. Decisions taken in the shelter sector can have an enormous influence in the cost and environmental impact of a response, in the short and long term.

Much of the emergency shelter and NFI assistance currently relies heavily on high-carbon emission and plastics interventions that have environmental impacts. As an example,UNHCR alonedelivers annually **31,000 metric tons of Core Relief Item[[12]](#footnote-12) products** of which **77%, or 24,000 metric tons is plastic which equates to approximately 210,000 tons of CO2 emissions including transport.** When considering the scale of procurement, multiplied across humanitarian shelter actors, these items represent a large proportion of the environmental footprint of the humanitarian sector and a critical opportunity to find innovative ways to improve existing and future approaches. The shelter sector is the custodian of many items and activities that are also used by other sectors involved in the built environment. Changes made in these items will green the shelter response but also that of other sectors.

Beyond the distribution of in-kind items, the shelter and settlement sector is often at the centre of key decisions that may have important environmental impact contributing to climate change, as explained in the report undertaken by URD for ECHO (mentioned in section 3.1.1). The decision to create new settlements or invest in improving existing ones has great implications on the environment. Shelter expertise often influences or at least informs this decision. The location where these settlements are built, the extent to which the land is excavated, roads are created, and existing vegetation is respected are decisions taken quickly and early on in humanitarian emergencies. These decisions which have a long-lasting impact in the environment are usually made by shelter actors. Additional decisions such as the location of the shelter units and other buildings (schools, health centers, WASH infrastructure), their design and choice of materials, the source of energy, and other related aspects are made later in the response by shelter actors in collaboration with other sectoral experts and also have important consequences for the environment. All these key decisions are often made with limited information and within short timeframes with limited opportunity for analysis. The humanitarian imperative, political issues, financial and logistical constraints, and many other aspects are taken into consideration often at the detriment of the environment and good shelter programming practices. Shelter practitioners need support to access and present these environmental considerations better to decision-makers and managers to ensure that their deliberations are well informed and consider both the short-term and at the long-term consequences of humanitarian action including environment.

The GSC, and particularly its lead agencies, have a key responsibility to find ways to green their operations, limit the impact of humanitarian shelter response on the environment and lead by example. Much work on a variety of issues around the environment has started, but redirecting the system to a sustainable approach, to mitigate climate change, requires clear direction, knowledge and expertise over a significant period of time. The [Sphere Shelter Standard 7](https://handbook.spherestandards.org/en/sphere/#ch001) focuses on the importance of limiting the environmental impact of shelter solutions, including methods which reduce the embodied and operational carbon of the materials selected. However, concrete tools to fulfil this standard need to be prepared.

At this critical juncture in time, with the appropriate support and commitment the GSC and its partners will be able to set critical steps to reduce the global carbon footprint and environmental impact of shelter programs by working to understand, analyse and improve the way interventions are planned, designed and implemented. Investment in research and development activities with existing and new suppliers, academia, partners and the private sector will be instrumental in identifying a range of effective solutions and new material and technical options. Promotion of appropriate local materials and local building techniques will help reduce the use of high-carbon and plastic materials, as well as transport-related emissions derived from bringing materials from far away.

Additionally, country-level clusters that are more effective, innovative and localized will be in a better position to understand how existing local capacities and traditional coping strategies can address the long-term issues. Then they will be able to combine this with external resources to come to the most effective and environmentally sound response.

### 3.1.4 Response analysis:

### Describe our strategy to address the identified problems and briefly explain why other responses were not chosen. Explain how the proposed response addresses the specific needs of the affected persons. Make sure you link this section with the results/sectors proposed in section 4.

Shelter and settlements assistance is live-saving and foundational for other sectoral support. It is essential for survival and recovery and it is often among the first priorities of people affected by humanitarian crises. Reducing the environmental impact of humanitarian action without compromising its effectiveness needs intervention at both global and country levels. At the global level, policies must be translated into concrete results. The shelter sector is very well placed to advance on this given its very tangible type of response which needs many materials and has a large impact on the environment. The progress made in this sector will already cover a significant portion of the environmental impact of the humanitarian response. It will also build momentum and help other sectors use similar approaches to cover the portion under their responsibility.

The humanitarian response has two very distinctive but complementary approaches. The first approach consists of the delivery of standardized manufactured and usually pre-positioned global solutions that are sent, most often from abroad, as part of a rapid response mechanism. These solutions are largely standardized with a small level of customization and have been refined over the years to save lives and reduce suffering in a large variety of contexts. The second approach is a more locally adapted response defined in country after a thorough assessment and consultation with local stakeholders. The negative environmental impact of both approaches can and should be reduced but they require different considerations. Focussing only on one of the approaches would be a missed opportunity as the gains made in one would limit the potential to bring a new dynamic of environmental accountability to the humanitarian response, which requires concerted actions both from the rapid, international ‘top-down’ approach and the subsequent locally developed humanitarian approach.

The first activity is to green this first approach of the humanitarian response by making these standardized manufactured global solutions greener and easier to recycle or repurpose. This will involve a change in the specifications of key humanitarian items that are distributed in-kind. The shelter actors at the global level are the custodians of the specifications of these items, many of which are also used by other sectors. And as the coordination body of the sector, with its biggest actors active in its decision making bodies, GSC is very well placed to initiate and accelerate change by setting policy and standards. In conversation with these sectors, the specifications of key items will be examined to review where good improvements can be made in the ingredients and composition of each item to get better environmental outcomes – or ‘greening’ the response. Secondly, options will be defined for recycling and repurposing them once they can no longer be used. Thirdly, the GSC will contribute to the efforts of the GLC in finding ways to manage waste through decommissioning and reverse logistics. And finally, energy solutions will be better explained to shelter partners so that they can use them in a more informed manner in their responses.

While the initial response may often be the most visible in the media, the bulk of the work of humanitarian shelter partners happens after that initial response or in protracted emergencies that have been going on for several years. The shelter responses in those situations can be planned more carefully to consider environment, synergies with other sectors, local solutions, and the longer-term impact of the strategies being proposed. The second and third activities of this Action will reduce the environmental impact of this second larger component of the humanitarian shelter response. This will be done in two ways: (1) providing global knowledge and tools for country-level clusters and responders to use and (2) strengthening country-level clusters so that they can make best use of the tools and methodologies developed in activities 1.1 and 1.2. Localized and effective coordination teams, supported by surge capacity and global helpdesks, will promote the use of appropriate local solutions and materials, find options for reducing, reusing, and recycling these solutions, promote an informed use of cash, and increased participation of affected population. These practices will be shared with other clusters in country and with other shelter clusters in other countries to inspire others and learn.

### 3.1.5 Previous evaluations or lessons learned exercise relevant for this action:

### List any previous evaluations or lessons learned related to this Action

The [Report on Environmental Footprint of Humanitarian Assistance for DG ECHO](https://www.urd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Groupe-URD-Inspire-studypublic4.pdf) prepared by Groupe URD in May 2020.

Feedback from Shelter Cluster Partners at global, regional and national levels. The latest [GSC Meeting](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global/events/global-shelter-cluster-annual-meeting-2019) (9-10 October 2019)[[13]](#footnote-13).

The GSC Environment Community of Practice (ECoP) held a [session](https://www.sheltercluster.org/environment-community-practice/documents/global-shelter-cluster-meeting-2019-ecop-session-energy) on energy and environment which advanced with GSC partners issues related to environment, shelter and energy. The GSC ECoP published with the UNEP/OCHA Joint Environmental Unit (JEU) commissioned a study to a consultancy team from the London School of Economics and Political Science on [Environmental Mainstreaming in Humanitarian Interventions](https://www.eecentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/EMHIT_FINAL-REPORT-with-WWF-good-practice-2.pdf) published in 2020.

#### 3.1.5.1 Brief summary

### 3.1.6 [INT] Update on needs assessment:

### If changes have occurred, please provide an update of section 3.1. In particular, provide information on new assessment(s) carried out since the submission of the proposal.

### 3.1.7 [FIN] Report on needs assessment:

### Provide as necessary, an update of section 3.1. In particular, provide information on new assessment(s) carried out since the interim report. Report on major changes and specific difficulties encountered in relation to the initial assessment.

## 3.2 Beneficiaries

### 3.2.1 Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the action

Indicate either the total number of individuals, or organisations targeted by the Action. In UNHCR’s case our direct beneficiaries are usually individuals. Please be realistic with the number of beneficiaries.

Number of individuals: XXXXX

Number of organisations: **639** (if applicable)

The total number of actors consistently engaging with the GSC at the global level is 45. However, the GSC is an open platform and any agency active in humanitarian shelter response can request to become a partner. In 2019, 65 organisations participated in the GSC annual meeting in Geneva, Switzerland while many other actors engage on an ad-hoc basis at the country, regional and global level.

At the country level, the GSC is currently providing support to 30 clusters and cluster-like mechanisms as well as to sectoral working groups. These clusters have coordinated 639 partners who supported 14.2 million persons in 2019 with shelter and/or NFI assistance for a total value of more than 403 million USD.

It should be noted that the 639 partners counted at country level includes the same organization working in different countries. As an example CRS working in Yemen will be counted as a different partner as CRS working in Afghanistan.

#### 3.2.1.1 [INT] Estimated total nr of direct beneficiaries targeted by this action

Please indicate how many individuals or organisations benefitted from the Action.

Number of individuals: XXXXX

Number of organisations: XXXX (if applicable)

#### 3.2.1.2 [FIN] Report on total nr of direct beneficiaries

Please indicate how many individuals or organisations benefitted from the Action.

Number of individuals: XXXXX

Number of organisations: XXXX (if applicable)

### 3.2.7 [INT] Update on beneficiaries

Please comment and provide, if needed, an update on the various beneficiary sections. You might want to explain the difficulties encountered with the selection and involvement of beneficiaries or any other issues in relation to the affected population (why the numbers are higher/lower etc).

### 3.2.8 [FIN] Report on beneficiaries

Please report on the beneficiary sections and on the involvement of the beneficiaries in the implementation and evaluation the Action. Report on major difficulties, challenges with the affected populations.

# 4 Logic of intervention

## 4.1 Principal objective

Please select **one** principal objective (and only 1) thinking of the principal objective as the long term benefits that cannot be reached with the proposed project alone.

Strengthened shelter and settlements responses that build resilient communities while improving environmental outcomes

## 4.2 Specific objective

### 4.2.1 Specific objective - short description

Please select **one** specific objective (and only 1) thinking of the specific objective as the short term benefits that will be achieved thanks to the intervention.

To strengthen the shelter response of humanitarian actors through more environmentally sustainable global response and localized and innovative country-level shelter clusters.

### 4.2.2 Specific objective - Detailed description

Use this section only if you want to provide more information on the specific objective. Do not repeat information provided in other sections.

### 4.2.3 Specific objective - Indicators

Write here the indicators relating to the specific objective + indicate the target value to be reached (number or %) + source of verification

### Indicator 1

Description: description of the indicator. Whenever possible please us the pre-defined Key Objective Indicator (KOI) which can be found in the drop down menu in the eSF online. But please only include a KOI if you’re sure that we can measure the KOI based on information that we gather within our existing UNHCR results framework. If we can’t measure the KOI, please include a custom (UNHCR) indicator.

Baseline (figures: nr or %): current situation (nr or %)

Target value: what we plan to achieve (nr or %, but you must include a figure)

Source and method of data collection: where would the information on the indicators be available? (IP reports, protection reports, distribution reports …..)

Comments on the indicator:

### Indicator 1

Description: **Reduction in the yearly CO2 equivalent footprint of shelter and non-food items**.

The impact of the project will be demonstrated by the reduction of the yearly CO2 equivalent footprint thanks to improved specifications of certain products, packaging practices, and greener shelter responses both at country and global level. The approach will include review of planning and prepositioning to reduce footprint contributions from airfreight, prioritization of the use of local resources, use of durable materials to avoid repeat distributions and wastage of low-grade products, and other means identified through detailed examination of processes. The objective is to continue meeting the shelter and settlement needs through greener and smarter responses, not to reduce the volume of the response or use products that are less effective but have smaller CO2 footprints. In this sense, it should be mentioned that in 2020, the 804 partners coordinated by the country-level shelter clusters reached 15.5 million people, (6.4 million with shelter interventions and 10.4 million with non-food items interventions) with an overall funding of 646.2 million USD, 41% of the 1.6 billion USD that was required. The indicator will be measured assuming a similar response. The indicator will be adapted should there be an important change in the volume or the nature of the response.

An initial approximation of the total amount of CO2 produced by shelter interventions has been made by collecting data on the main items from the six main shelter implementers (see Annex B for details). This estimation indicates that the total amount of CO2 equivalent produced is around 250,000 tons. A methodology for measuring CO2 equivalent emissions will be put in place through the project. It will be measured by calculating the reduction in CO2 made through the development of new specifications of each product and multiplying it by the total number of units delivered per year. It should be noted that this reduction will be theoretical and based on the 2020 procurement quantities. This methodology is necessary as many variable exist that are outside the control of this project, for example: Given the procurement processes of different organizations, length of frame agreements and lag time between procurement processes utilising revised specifications and delivery to the field, comparison of inventory records of new specification items that have been distributed versus old specification items and assumptions of how these inventory processes differ across organisations and from central, to regional, to field stock management. From such examples it is clear that within the project lifespan full uptake of changes and improvements may not be possible to record. It should be highlighted that this indicator and the methodology to measure CO2 equivalent in the humanitarian sector are still nascent therefore flexibility should be exercise in the project in regards to this indicator.Baseline (figures: nr or %): **0, this is a new indicator**

Target value: **63,000 tons**

Source of verification: **Calculations based on reduction of CO2 in specifications and reports of the number of items distributed.**

**4.2.3 [INT] Progress on indicator 1**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**4.2.3 [FIN] Achieved value**

Progress report on indicator: Please provide an overview on the level of achievement of this indicator.

### Indicator 2

Description: description of the indicator. Whenever possible please us the pre-defined Key Objective Indicator (KOI) which can be found in the drop down menu in the eSF online. But please only include a KOI if you’re sure that we can measure the KOI based on information that we gather within our existing UNHCR results framework. If we can’t measure the KOI, please include a custom (UNHCR) indicator.

Baseline (figures: nr or %): current situation (nr or %)

Target value: what we plan to achieve (nr or %, but you must include a figure)

Source and method of data collection: IP reports, distribution reports????

### Indicator 2

Description: **Reduction in the amount of virgin plastic distributed per year in shelter and non-food items**.

The impact of the project will be demonstrated by the reduction of the amount of virgin plastic distributed per year thanks to improved specifications of certain products, packaging practices, and greener shelter responses both at country and global level. By virgin plastic we mean plastic that ha never been used or processed before as opposed to recycled plastic. The overall reduction will happen in three ways: 1) by changing shelter and settlement interventions so that they rely less on plastic-based products, 2) by reducing the overall amount of plastic present in items (including packaging), and 3) by replacing as much as possible virgin plastic with recycled plastic in globally-defined items. As explained in Indicator 1, the objective is to continue meeting the shelter and settlement needs through greener and smarter responses, not to reduce the volume of the response or use products that are less effective but have less virgin plastic. This indicator will also be measured assuming a similar response as the one undertaken in 2020. The indicator will also be adapted should there be an important change in the volume or the nature of the response.

An initial approximation of the total amount of virgin plastic present in shelter interventions has been made by collecting data on the main items from the six main shelter implementers (see Annex B for details). This estimation indicates that around 30,000 tons of plastic are provided per year. A methodology for measuring the amount of plastic present in shelter operations will be put in place through the project. The reduction in virgin plastic will be measured by calculating reduced virgin plastic in new specifications of each product compared to old specifications and multiplying it by the total number of products delivered per year. It should be noted that this reduction will be theoreticaland the reasons for this are the same as those described for Indicator 1. As much as possible, the new specifications will include an indication of the percentage of virgin plastic and recycled plastic the product should contain.

Annex B includes a rough estimation on the amount of single-use plastic used by the sector. This amounts to 335 tons, 1% of the total amount of plastic in the entire sectoral response. These amounts will be more accurately measured during the implementation of the project and actual numbers will be provided at the end of the project. Whenever available and possible, the project will disaggregate the amount of plastic between packaging and material or single use and multiple use.

It should be highlighted that this indicator and the methodology to measure CO2 equivalent in the humanitarian sector are still nascent therefore flexibility should be exercise in the project in regards to this indicator.

Baseline (figures: nr or %): **0**, this is a new indicator

Target value: **7,000 tons**

Source of verification: **Calculations based on reduction of plastic in specifications and reports of the number of items distributed**

**4.2.3 [INT] Progress on indicator 2**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**4.2.3 [FIN] Achieved value**

Progress report on indicator: Please provide an overview on the level of achievement of this indicator.

### Indicator 3

Description: description of the indicator

Baseline (figures: nr or %): current situation (nr or %)

Target value: what we plan to achieve (nr or %, but you must include a figure)

Source of and method of data collection: IP reports, distribution reports????

Comments on the indicator:

### Indicator 3

Description: **% of country clusters in response mode which have used the tools and found them useful support to green the shelter response.**

Coordination team members need to have the tools, training, and support to implement effective, greener, and more climate-smart operations. Through this indicator they will report whether these resources have been provided and that they have used them. As these tools are new, it will take time and effort for them to be adopted and used and for impact to be evident.

Baseline (figures: nr or %): **0%** this is a new indicator

Target value: **60%**

Source of verification: **Country-level cluster websites, HRPs, annual survey to coordinators.**

**4.2.3 [INT] Progress on indicator 3**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**4.2.3 [FIN] Achieved value**

Progress report on indicator: Please provide an overview on the level of achievement of this indicator.

##  4.3 Results

**Add ONE Result per each SECTOR (listed in the drop down menu of the ESF under tab ‘Sector/amount’)**

**Result 1**

**Title:** Insert here the description/title of the result. In case of regional actions, please add the country before the description

**Shelter responses become more environmentally sustainable at country and global level**

**Sector:** specify the sectors covered by this result (chose ONLY ONE from following list: food security and livelihoods, WASH, health, nutrition, shelter and settlements, disaster risk reduction/preparedness, protection, coordination, support to operations, mine actions, education in emergencies, multi-purpose cash transfer).

**Sub-sector:** automatically linked to a Key result indicator

**Estimated total cost of the result (in EUR):** please enter total cost for this result in EUR

1.38M USD

**[INT] Total amount spent:** xxx **EUR** (report on interim cost)

**[FIN] Total amount spent:** xxx **EUR** (report on final cost)

### 4.3.1 Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the result

Indicate the number of beneficiaries targeted by the result. The number can be expressed as either individuals, or organisations or households or a combination.

Individuals: nr of individuals you plan to reach through result 1

Organisations: **639**

Households:

Individuals per household:

 **[FIN] 4.3.1.1 Actual number of direct beneficiaries reached**

Indicate the number of beneficiaries reached

Individuals: report on the nr of individuals you have reached

Organisations:

Households:

Individuals per household:

### 4.3.4 Comments on beneficiaries

Please add any comments you might have on the targeted beneficiaries (not compulsory)

These 639 organisations are the approximate number of partners of all the activated clusters and cluster-like mechanisms. The same organisation will be present in many of these clusters but they are considered different as they are counted at country-level. As an example, CRS in Nepal will be counted as being a different beneficiary from CRS in Iraq. The number of organisations is calculated by adding all the organizations reported by country-level clusters in their factsheet.

**[INT] 4.3.5 Update on beneficiaries**

Please indicate how many beneficiaries have been reached over the reporting period. Indicate whether there is a need to revise the number of beneficiaries.

**[FIN] 4.3.6 Report on beneficiaries**

Please report on the details of beneficiaries. Have we reached the planned numbers? If not, why not?

**Indicators**

*Add* ***SMART*** *indicators, if possible one per activity. Select Key Result Indicators (KRI) if possible (and at least one per result). Provide all the information requested:*

Indicator 1.1

Description: **Number of commitments made to using the new greener specifications developed.**

* Baseline (figures: nr or %): **0, new indicator**
* Target value: **10**
* Source of verification: **Commitment from partners.**
* Comments on the indicator: The new greener specifications will only be useful if they become widely used, which relies on adequate advocacy, dissemination and understanding of the improvements possible. This indicator will identify which partners have adopted or have committed to adopt the new specifications and when this occurs. Each partner that adopts one specification will be counted once, for example, if NRC adopts the specifications of two different items (blanket and mat) it will be counted as two commitments. Each NFI type will be counted from the existing NFI list per agency. An indicative list of these items includes blanket, sleeping mat, tarpaulin, family tent, kitchen set.

 **[INT] Progress value**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**[FIN] Final indicator**

Indicate the value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification

Indicator 1.2

Description:  **Number of countries that have a recent environmental profile.**

* Baseline (figures: nr or %): 1
* Target value: 10
* Source of verification: **GSC website.**
* Comments on the indicator: Key operations will be supported with country environmental profiles. These profiles will be available in the GSC website. The operations will be selected according to their size (larger operations will be prioritized), the criticality of environmental issues in the operation (operations in more fragile environments will be prioritized), and the interest from partners (operations where cluster coordinators and partners express an interest will be prioritized).

 **[INT] Progress value**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**[FIN] Final indicator**

Indicate the value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification

Indicator 1.3

Description: **Number of local shelter response modalities for which options for reducing, reusing and recycling have been developed.**

* Baseline (figures: nr or %): **0**
* Target value: **5**
* Source of verification: **GSC website.**
* Comments on the indicator: Five local shelter response modalities will be analysed and options for reducing, reusing, and recycling materials will be developed. The guidance provided will be new guidance. The operation will be supported to implement the guidance through the organization of webinars, remote support, face-to-face trainings, exchanges of practices, development of additional materials, and other modalities as required. Response modalities will be selected according to the size of the operation (larger operations will be prioritized), the criticality of environmental issues in the operation (operations in more fragile environments will be prioritized), the commonality of the shelter response modality (shelter response modalities that are more commonly found will be prioritized), and the interest from partners (operations where cluster coordinators and partners express an interest will be prioritized). The operations will be selected in different regions so that the response modalities can cover a broad geographic scope. Linkages to other local efforts on waste reduction and recycling will be described as part of the reporting process. These options will be available in the GSC website for use by other countries where similar responses are used.

 **[INT] Progress value**

Please report on progress made on the indicator by reporting the value achieved so far

**[FIN] Final indicator**

Indicate the value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification

**Comments on all indicators for this result**

Add any additional comments you might have on the indicators

**[INT] Progress report on the indicators of Result 1**

Provide an update on all the indicators by stating whether we are on track or not, whether there is a need to revise the indicators and if so indicate which changes in the target values are required.

**[FIN] Report on indicators**

Provide a report on the level of achievement of the result and how this achievement was verified and/or measured by the indicators.

**Activities**

*Add as many activities as necessary. Add the main activities that will support the achievement of the result. A title that summarizes the activity as well as a description of the implementation of the activity need to be provided.*

Activity 1.1

Title: **Shelter partners green their response**

Detailed description:

The GSC will work at the global level with its partners informing and collaborating with other clusters through the Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) and other fora to **analyse and change the specifications** of the most purchased emergency shelter and non-food items so that they become greener without a reduction in their performance. This will be done through an increased use of recycled plastic, reduction in plastic, and other methods. This will result in improving the sustainability of emergency shelter products. These changes will be shared at the GCCG encouraging other clusters to take a similar approach with the specifications of products they oversee. The GLC will be a key stakeholder in this given the role that logistics departments have in implementing these decisions taken by technical roles. A methodology will be put in place to measure the CO2 footprint of shelter and NFI responses. This will help measure over time how responses become greener. Additionally, the GSC will put in place a mechanism to monitor the implementation of the SAG statement on the reduction of single-use plastic.

Good practice and lessons learned on **recycling and repurposing options** of some of the main global shelter solutions (plastic sheeting, blankets, tents, shelter kits, Refugee Housing Units, and others) will be captured and shared through national/ regional workshops, global technical meetings, and in the GSC website. Based on learning from the field, clear options, practices, and lessons learnt on recycling and repurposing of these main global shelter solutions will be defined and made publicly available to the humanitarian community. The GCCG will be kept informed of this initiative and collaboration with other clusters will be sought.

**Sustainable energy options**, including solar, will be better understood and made available to global shelter partners in order to include them better in their responses. The GSC is already collaborating different initiatives linked with energy such as the UNEP/OCHA Joint Environment Unit, and the [Global Plan of Action for Sustainable Energy Solutions in Situations of Displacement](https://www.humanitarianenergy.org/) (GPA). These collaborations will be strengthened, and further coordination will be sought with other stakeholders. As a result, cluster coordinators and shelter partners will have the means to select the energy option that is most sustainable and climate-smart for their context.

All these efforts will be led by the GSC Support Team which will be reinforced with a **Global Focal Point (GFP) for Environment** and by the **GSC Environment CoP**. This GFP will work closely with other Support Team members such as the **Technical GFP** and with their counterparts in other clusters, particularly the Task Force of environmental specialists that is being proposed by the Global Logistics Cluster. Where possible, the workplans will be aligned and GFP can support the Task Force with sector-specific knowledge.

**[INT] Progress report on the activity**

**Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.**

**[FIN] Final report on the activity**

Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.

Activity 1.2

Title: **Environmental research and advocacy available** **to make country-level shelter responses greener and climate smart.**

Detailed description:

Through activity 1.1 emergency response solutions will become greener. These solutions are part of the initial urgent response to new emergencies or sudden spikes in existing crises. However, the bulk of the work of humanitarian shelter partners happens after the initial response or in protracted emergencies that have been going on for several years. The shelter responses in those situations can be planned more carefully to consider environment, synergies with other sectors, local solutions, and the longer-term impact of the strategies being proposed. Activity 1.2 will provide the global knowledge needed to help design country-level shelter responses which are greener and climate-smart.

**Advocacy** messages will be drafted, and tools prepared to make the existing and new knowledge related with the impact of shelter in the environment available to shelter practitioners in the field. This will help them inform management decisions and advocate for shelter and settlement solutions that are more environmentally sustainable and climate smart. This will allow for more robust and longer-term planning of shelter assistance, which reduces the use of short-term high-cost high-environmental-impact interventions.

**Environmental profiles** will be drafted for key operations. These profiles will provide an overview of the main threats to the environmental in the operation, key environmental focal points, an analysis from an environmental perspective of the different shelter options most-commonly used in country including where possible environmental impact calculators and analysis of the total life-cycle amount of CO2 produced by these interventions.

All these efforts will be led by the GSC Support Team, the Environment GFP, the GSC Environment CoP as indicated in activity 1.1. They will work closely with the GSC Support Team and with other clusters, particularly the Task Force of environmental specialists of the Global Logistics Cluster.

Activity 1.3

Title: **Country-level shelter clusters effectively design and implement greener and climate-smart shelter and settlement responses**

Detailed description:

This activity will strengthen country-level clusters so that they make best use of the tools and methodologies developed in activities 1.1 and 1.2. Strong and effective clusters will be able to assess the needs with an environmental perspective and design and implement shelter responses that are greener and climate smart.

Environmentally sustainable shelter and settlement strategies will need to maximize the local capacities both in terms of the participation of affected population and the appropriate local building practices and materials. A **localised cluster** will increase its chances of understanding the context and connecting with the population. A **greater participation of the affected population** will be promoted through the GSC two-way communication app, and pilots of environmental shelter solutions.

**Well-designed market interventions** have the potential to empower affected population and reduce the environmental impact of the response. The GSC partners through its cash champions initiative, started with a previous ERC grant, will continue promoting and providing capacity and methodology to implement well-designed cash and shelter responses.

Country-level clusters will be supported to identify and use **appropriate local solutions and materials**. Through the relation that the GSC has with specialized institutions such as CraTerre as well as local institutions such as mason schools, local building practices will be mapped and analysed for key responses. As much as possible all this work will be done in preparedness exercises. Early coordination with the Logistics Cluster will be promoted so that they can prepare well in advance the supply chain for the materials that will be needed.

To help inform full life-cycle environmental impact of materials and techniques, the GSC will collaborate with institutions with environmental expertise such as BRE[[14]](#footnote-14) to support countries with **methods for calculating CO2 emissions** of different shelter solutions. Additionally, key clusters will receive additional support to identify **options for** **reducing, reusing, repurposing and recycling** or other end-of-life alternatives, for local shelter solutions. This will be done learning from the global level initiatives developed in activity 1.1 and practices from other countries. The Logistics Cluster and other clusters such as WASH, Education, Health, and CCCM will be informed of these options.

In certain countries **innovative and more environmentally sustainable shelter solutions** or approaches will be **piloted**.

 Good practices and lessons learned on all these activities will be disseminated through Coordination Workshops. The GCCG and other relevant stakeholders will also be kept informed of the learning. Synergies will be sought with other GSC initiatives to maximize the impact of the project.

**[INT] Progress report on the activity**

**Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.**

**[FIN] Final report on the activity**

Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.

## 4.4 Pre-conditions

Please fill this in by answering the following question: which conditions outside of our direct control need to be met for us to start implementing the activities.

A list of bullet points is sufficient. (eg: sufficient funding of the operation, sufficient staffing levels, signature of an MoU etc..)

* Full engagement of GSC partners and in particular GSC SAG members. This engagement is expected to continue given the collaborative history of the GSC and the fact that this Action has been discussed during the GSC SAG meetings.
* Cluster lead agencies continue their commitment to co-lead the GSC with the same level of support as expressed when this proposal was written.
* No major changes will take place in the administrative rules and regulations of UNHCR and the partners implementing the ERC grant.
* No major changes will take place in the human resources currently involved in the management of the GSC.
* The COVID-19 pandemic or other similar pandemics will not evolve in a dramatically different way than expected in September 2020

## 4.5 Assumptions and risks (including risks of occurrence of fraudulent activities)

Please fill this in, keeping in mind that these should be the conditions to be met for our operation to be successfully implemented. Please list ALL risks. These should be external factors that we cannot control. They should be formulated in a positive way and can be formulated in a general manner so they encompass all risks. . Bullet points are fine. (eg: the government of xx maintains an open-border policy, the security situation remains stable in the neighbouring countries etc)

* Sufficient funding available from other donors.
* The number of activated shelter clusters will remain similar to the current one with no dramatic increase particularly of Scale-Up and Sustain emergencies (previously known as System-Wide Level 3 emergencies).
* No major changes in the IASC humanitarian architecture will take place.
* Partners implementing the grant will fulfil their commitments as outlined in the Project Agreements that will be signed.
* No major changes will take place in the administrative rules and regulations of ECHO, UNHCR and the partners implementing the Action.
* No major changes will take place in the human resources currently involved in the management of the GSC.
* The exchange rate between EUR and USD will remain at a similar level during the implementation of the grant.
* Visas and other logistical constraints will not cause significant delay in deployment of cluster coordination team members.
* Security restrictions will not have significant influence on the access and what nationalities can be deployed, thus limiting the number of candidates that can the chosen and possibility to deploy surge capacity.
* The inter-agency environment continues supporting clusters in a similar way as done until 2020.
* The humanitarian environment does not change drastically to the way it has been operating in the last two years.
* The COVID-19 pandemic or other similar pandemics will not evolve in a dramatically different way than expected in September 2020 and it will be possible to continue working at least as it is being done in September 2020.

## 4.6 Contingency measures taken to mitigate the risks described under chapter 4.5

Please fill this in by indicating which measures we would take should the risks and assumptions materialize so that the result can still be achieved?

* The GSC SAG is working to increase the cluster’s donor base and other sustainability mechanisms.
* The organizations previously committed to implement the GSC Strategy, and those participating in the SAG were consulted when developing the Action.
* To avoid the risk of deployments not happening due to visa and nationality constraints, the surge capacity staff will be selected thinking of the diversification of nationalities of the team.
* If the assumed risks materialize, security issues and/or visa restrictions, the Global Cluster will need to re-evaluate where Shelter experts can be deployed to, and determine whether or not is it feasible to provide technical assistance remotely.
* If the security situation affects a planned training event, an alternative venue will need to be arranged. Agency mechanisms are in place to identify and respond appropriately to changes of circumstances.
* In relation to COVI-19 or other similar pandemics, online and remote work and local resources will be prioritized as much as possible to implement this Action.

## 4.7 Additional information on the operational context of action

If necessary, please use this section to provide additional information on specific issues raised in sections 4.4 to 4.6. It should not, however, repeat information already provided in other sections.

## 4.8 [INT] Report on preconditions, assumptions and risks

Please provide an update on the assumptions, preconditions and risks. Have they changed? Did they materialize? Are they still the same?

## 4.9 [FIN] Report on preconditions, assumptions and risks

In the final report, you will explain whether the preconditions were met, whether any risks materialised and how we reacted to secure the success of the Action.

# ~~5 Quality Markers~~

# 6. Implementation

**6.1 Human resources and management capacities**

Please provide the list of staff (both expatriate and local) mobilised to ensure an effective and efficient implementation of the Action. Then specify the staff funded by ECHO.

For example: the Tanzania operation is composed of XX international staff, xx national staff and xx UNOPS. This contribution will contribute to the cost of: 1 protection officer, 1 programme officer, 2 programme assistants.

**Grant Management Assistant**

The Grant Management Assistant will ensure that the Action is implemented in full compliance with the donors and UNHCR regulations. In order to do this, s/he will:

* Build the partnership between UNHCR and implementing partners, through the creation and monitoring of Partner Partnership Agreements;
* Provide support in all areas of grant implementation (programme, finance, reporting);
* Monitor the use of resources, particularly of the members of the Support Team, through the monthly monitoring reports;
* Ensure timely achievement of grant deliverables and outputs;
* Prepare the narrative and financial reports required by the donor.
* Ensure that the donor’s principles and regulations are included in the Agreements and in the activities to be implemented by the partner organizations;

**6.1.1 [INT] Update on Human resources and management capacities**

This section is optional at interim stage. You should provide an update only in case of changes or in cases where Human Resources aspects of the Action have a negative effect on the implementation of the Action.

**6.1.2 [FIN] Human resources and management capacities**

Please provide an update on the human resources and management capacities and whether we faced any issue on this front.

**~~6.2 EU Aid Volunteers~~**

**6.3 Equipment and goods**

In the majority of cases this section is not required. It concerns the purchase of equipment/goods which are **NOT** included in any of the results above.

Eg special equipment or goods to be purchased, special transport equipment etc. Please specify if there are possible constraints linked to this procurement (e.g. lengthy, complex procedure).

No major equipment or goods will be purchased through this action.

**6.3.2 [INT] Equipment and goods**

This section is optional. The partner should provide an update only in case of changes or in case where equipment and goods aspects have a negative effect on the implementation of the Action.

**6.3.3 [FIN] Report on equipment and goods**

Report on the equipment and goods purchased.

## 6.5 Work plan

**2021**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Activity*** | ***Jan*** | ***Feb*** | ***Mar*** | ***Apr*** | ***May*** | ***June*** | ***July*** | ***Aug*** | ***Sept*** | ***Oct*** | ***Nov*** | ***Dec*** |
| ***1.1 Shelter partners green their response*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |
| ***1.2 Environmental research and advocacy available***  | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |
| ***1.3 Country-level clusters design greener responses*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |

**2022**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Activity*** | ***Jan*** | ***Feb*** | ***Mar*** | ***Apr*** | ***May*** | ***June*** | ***July*** | ***Aug*** | ***Sept*** | ***Oct*** | ***Nov*** | ***Dec*** |
| ***1.1 Shelter partners green their response*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |
| ***1.2 Environmental research and advocacy available***  | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |
| ***1.3 Country-level clusters design greener responses*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** | ***X*** |

### 6.5.1 [INT] Update work plan

Optional. Only update the work plan if changes have taken place or are required.

## 6.6 Specific security constraints

Please fill in should security be a key element for the success of the intervention.

There are no immediate security concerns for the preparation and work being done to green the response at global level. Security will, however, play a major role for activities happening in the fields and when deploying surge capacity and the long-term members of the shelter coordination teams. Security will also be important when selecting the locations where trainings and other events can be conducted. When deployed, these members will comply with the local security procedures of the cluster lead organisation or the organisation they are seconded to.

**6.6.1 [INT] Update on security**

Please provide an update on the security situation if applicable.

**6.6.2 [FIN] Report on security**

If the security situation has been unstable, highlight the challenges this has had on the implementation of the Action.

## 6.7 Implementing partners

**6.7.1 Are there any implementing partners?**

Yes X No ◻ Do not know yet ◻

**6.7.2 Implementing Partner added value**

**6.7.4 Coordination, supervision and controls**

**Please find below a text approved by ECHO. Only modify or add additional information if necessary.**

UNHCR selects its partners based on their expertise and capacity to handle the respective activities assigned to them. In order to partner with the most suitable organisation in a given operation for the implementation of projects, in order to provide quality protection and assistance to refugees and other persons of concern, UNHCR has launched in mid-2013 new procedures for the selection and retention of partners for the implementation of project agreements. The main steps for this procedure are:

* Establishment of a UNHCR multi-functional Implementing Partnership Management Committee (IPMC), responsible for evaluating the concept notes received by potential partners
* Call for Expression of interest by UNHCR
* Submission of Concept Notes by partners
* Preparation for the Committee Review and Recommendation
* Committee Review and Recommendation
* Decision by the Head of Office
* Communication of Decision to Applicant Partners

The above procedure will guarantee that the best partners for UNHCR are selected. UNHCR closely monitors and supervises the implementation of activities under the partnership agreements. Regular coordination meetings are held on the sector level and collaboration and referral mechanisms are established between partners. A standard UNHCR partnership agreement is signed with the IP outlining the activities to be carried out by the partner. Monthly progress reports, quarterly financial reports, semi-annual narrative and financial + narrative final reports are to be provided as per the signed agreement. Partnership agreements are also subject to external audit by an audit firm contracted by UNHCR.

Following a similar process as done with previous ECHO ERC grants, the GSC SAG will agree on a process and criteria to select beneficiaries which might be the following:

- A call for expression of interest to implement different parts of the proposal will be sent to the GSC partners through a global update.

- The Support Team will receive the expressions of interest, rate them against the agreed criteria, and propose them to the SAG.

- The SAG will agree on the final selection of beneficiaries.

- All the minutes of the SAG meetings related to the beneficiaries’ selection process will be available on a dedicated page of the Shelter Cluster website.

Once the beneficiaries are selected, a standard partnership agreement will be signed between UNHCR and each of the partners outlining the activities to be carried out by the partner. Monthly progress reports, quarterly financial reports, semi-annual narrative and financial + narrative final reports are to be provided as per the signed agreement. Partnership agreements could be also subject to external audit by an audit firm contracted by UNHCR.

UNHCR and IFRC as cluster co-leads closely monitor and supervise the implementation of activities under the partnership agreements. Regular coordination meetings are held on the sector level and collaboration and referral mechanisms are established between partners.

**6.7.4.1 [FIN] Coordination, supervision and controls**

Report on the mechanisms described above and explain, when relevant, the difficulties encountered.

### 6.9 Implementing partner list

Please provide the list of partners and their role in the action. For example:

MSF: medical assistance in camps A and B

XXX: WASH activities in xxxxxx

The list of partners has not been finalized yet. It will be provided as soon as it is agreed.

**6.9.1 [INT] Update on implementing partners**

Only report if there have been any changes in implementing partners, or challenges.

**6.9.2 [FIN] Final report on implementing partners**

Only report if there have been any changes in implementing partners, or challenges.

# 7 Field Coordination

### 7.1 Operational coordination with other humanitarian actors

Please describe the coordination structure in place both at local, national and regional levels.

The GSC is an active participant of the IASC Global Cluster Coordinators Group, and other IASC fora. The participation in these groups facilitates coordination between the GSC, other clusters and global level partners. Furthermore, it promotes coherence on the responses provided by the different clusters, on the monitoring and performance evaluation tools and on the information provided to the clusters’ stakeholders. Additionally, the GSC has bilateral coordination with clusters that are closely related such as Logistics, Protection, CCCM, and WASH.

When deployed to the field, GSC Support Team members will coordinate at national level with the existing coordination structures such as the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group, the Humanitarian Country Team or others. The Regional Focal Points will coordinate with regional coordination structures such as RedLac for the Americas or the Regional Humanitarian Country Team in the Pacific.

# 8 Monitoring and Evaluation

**8.1 Monitoring of the action**

**Please find below a standard text approved by ECHO. Please only modify or add information if necessary.**

Monitoring is based on the reports and observations by the partners and local authorities and on regular direct observation and ongoing assessment by UNHCR (e.g. on the spot visits to project sites) and the comparison of achievements and related financial expenditures with objectives. Monitoring activities are carried out at various levels (camp, household) by partners and agencies implementing subprojects, UNHCR Branch Office, Sub Office and Field Offices. Situation reports are submitted by all UNHCR Field Offices to their respective Supervising Office on a monthly basis and Branch Offices submit a corresponding report to Headquarters.

Mission reports and monthly monitoring reports will be submitted by the surge capacity on the development of their activities. These reports will be consolidated quarterly and submitted to the SAG and the Global Cluster Coordinators.

Monitoring activities will also be carried by partners and followed up by the Grant Management Assistant and the support team. Regular updates will be maintained to monitor and report on planned activities.

**8.2 Evaluations**

**Important: Do not tick anything**

¨ Internal evaluation of the action’s results

¨ External evaluation of the action’s results

¨ External audit (only if compulsory)

**8.2.1 Further details**

**8.3 Studies** **carried out in relation to the action (if relevant)**

¨ No ¨ Yes

**8.4 Is this action remotely managed?**

Please take note that if you select “yes” to this option, you will be requested by ECHO to fill in a remote management questionnaire, and Remote Management quarterly reports during the length of the action.

¨ No ¨ Yes- partially ¨ Yes-fully

**8.5 [INT] Update on changes and progress**

Please only provide an update on the monitoring and studies section if necessary.

**8.6 [FIN] Report on monitoring and evaluation**

Explain how the monitoring has been carried out and the main challenges encountered. Report also on the evaluations carried out and their conclusions.

# 9 Communication, Visibility and information activities

**9.1 Visibility**

**9.1 standard visibility**

1. Display of EU Humanitarian Aid visual identity on:

◻ Signboards, display panels, banners and plaques

◻ Goods and equipment

Provide additional info on what we plan to do

B. Written and verbal verbal acknowledgment of EU funding and partnership through:

◻ Press releases, press conference, other media outrach

◻ Publications, printed material (for external audiences, not operational communication)

⌧ Social media

⌧ Partner’s website (pages related to EU funded projects)

◻ Human interest blogs, photo stories

⌧ Audio-visual products, photos

⌧ Other: verbal mentions in different fora, mentions in GSC global updates

Please provide additional information on what we plan to do

The dedicated ECHO contribution page on the Shelter Cluster website will continue to be regularly updated. The page has the DG ECHO logo and a link to the DG ECHO website and it will be consistently mentioned in correspondence related to the project. The page will include the text of the proposal agreed with ECHO, a description of the process followed to agree on the proposal and those that will implement it, a summary of the activities that will be implemented as part of the proposal and who will do it.

The ECHO contribution will be explained by the members of the Support Team during their missions and when they participate in meetings, trainings and other events. During the GSC meeting, the coordination workshops, the SAG Retreats, the trainings and meetings that the members of the Support Team will have during their missions, a slide including the DG ECHO logo will be projected to physically show the ECHO contribution. This contribution will be mentioned in some of the GSC Global Updates that the cluster regularly sends to around 650 subscribers. These subscribers include shelter practitioners, members of country-level cluster coordination teams, senior staff in humanitarian organisations, donors, academia, governments and others. The GSC Twitter account will mention the ECHO contribution.

**9.2 Do you foresee communication actions that go beyond standard obligations?**

**9.3 [INT] Report on challenges and progress**

Please provide here an update on the implementation of visibility/communication activities listed in the proposal.

**9.4 [FIN] Report on challenges and progress**

Explain what type of visibility activities have been implemented and where. Evidence of those activities needs to be provided (pictures, articles, etc.).

# 10 Financial overview of the action

Please fill out the budget format attached.

**10.1 Estimated expenditures**

Implementation costs: **873,776** (total of all the results+ staff + visibility)

6,5%: 56,795 EUR

Total Costs: 930,571 EUR

Contribution requested from ECHO: 650,000 EUR (70%)

**Medium to long term financial overview**

Some of the interventions in this Action are one-off and therefore will not need to continue after they have been implemented. This is the case of the changes in the specifications and the tools for reusing, repurposing, recycling, and disposing of the main shelter solutions.

Other components of the Action will need to be mainstreamed. The GSC has a good track record of mainstreaming some of the innovative interventions either by partners taking on that new intervention and fundraising and implementing it on behalf of the cluster, or by collectively resourcing it. However, there may be some components of the intervention that may need more continuous support before it is mainstreamed. The GSC will continue fundraising with different donors for these initiatives until they are ready to be mainstreamed.

**[INT] Incurred costs**

Implementation costs: EUR

7%: EUR

Total Costs: EUR

**[FIN] Incurred costs**

Implementation costs: EUR

7%: EUR

Total Costs: EUR

**10.2 Percentage of direct eligible costs allocated to the support costs**

Please provide a % of direct eligible costs allocated to the support costs:

**10.2.1 [INT] Percentage of direct eligible costs allocated to the support costs**

% of support costs:

**10.2.2 [FIN] Percentage of direct eligible costs allocated to the support costs**

% of support costs:

**10.3 Financial Annex**

Please provide a budget by filling in the attached budget format.

**10.3.1 [FIN] Final budget**

DRRM Brussels will ask Budapest for the expenditure report and will share it with you

**10.4 Explanation about 100% funding**

**10.5 Contribution in kind**

**10.6 Financial contribution by other donors**

**Please find below a standard text approved by ECHO. Please only modify or add information if necessary.**

The Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme annually reviews UNHCR's programs for approval. Funding, however, depends almost exclusively on voluntary contributions outside those provided through the United Nations Regular Budget. UNHCR, thus, has no guaranteed level of income to cover all of its approved and mandated activities. In addition, many voluntary contributions received by UNHCR either have no earmarking or are limited to a particular region/country. Such funds are thus allocated, as and when they are pledged and received, to the different operations according to requirements. Therefore, UNHCR can only state the identity of all donors to a specific operation once its annual accounts are closed. Information on the current year is published annually with UNHCR's Global Appeal (available on UNHCR web site: <http://www.unhcr.org>). This proposal is for a multi-donor action, and as such, no overlap or double funding can occur, except in the unlikely event of the operation being over-funded with earmarked contributions. Should this event take place, UNHCR will consult with ECHO an appropriate action.

**10.9 [FIN] Report on financial issues**

# 11 Request for derogation

**Derogation request #**

Explain the nature and the necessity of the derogation.

# 12 Administrative Information

**12.1 Name and title of legal representative signing the Agreement**

Mr Abdouraouf Gnon-Konde, Head of Unit, UNHCR Brussels

**12.2 Name, telephone, e-mail and title of the contact person(s)**

Add UNHCR representative’s name and contacts in the field.

# 13 Conclusions and Comments

**13.1 Comments at proposal stage**

If needed, add comments you consider relevant for the analysis of the proposals (not compulsory).

**13.2 [INT] Comments at interim report stage**

Not compulsory. You may include additional comments that are relevant to understand the state of play of the action and which are not covered by the interim report.

**13.3 [FIN] Conclusions**

Final report: please do not forget to include a conclusion (**compulsory**).

**13.4 [FIN] Lessons learned**

**Annex A: Environment and Humanitarian Assistance – What, Who, Where-to-Find-Out-More Matrix**

This matrix is intended to provide a quick mechanism for tracking environment-focused activities linked to humanitarian operations. The Matrix is being maintained by the Global Shelter Cluster Environment Community of Practice and updated on a periodic basis as new information becomes available.

Add link to tools

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What** | **Who is Involved?** | **Contacts** | **Web links**  | **Notes** | **Date of Info** |
| Joint Initiative for Sustainable Humanitarian Packaging Waste Management | USAID, WFP, UNHCR UNEP, JEU, Global Logistics and Shelter Clusters, IOM, IFRC, ICRC, Save the Children, CRS, UNHRD Lab | Erika Clesceri (eclesceri@usaid.gov), Greg Rulifson (grulifson@usaid.gov), Greg Olsen (golson@usaid.gov), Chris Pettit (Chris.Pettit@icf.com), Mandy George (george14@un.org), Michael Minkoff (Michael.Minkoff@cadmusgroup.com) | <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Fact-sheet-Joint-Initiative-On-Sustainable-Humanitarian-Packaging-Waste-Management.pdf> |  | 13 Jan 21 |
| Global Plan of Action (GPA) for Sustainable Energy Solutions in Situations of Displacement | UNITAR, UNHCR, IOM, GIZ, WFP, FAO, Mercy Corps, the Moving Energy Initiative, Practical Action, UNEP-DTU, UNDP, the Clean Cooking Alliance, and Sustainable Energy for All. | energy@unitar.org, Aimee JENKS (Aimee.JENKS@unitar.org) | GPA Website – soon to have a partners page to act as a database of global partners working on energy in displacement: <https://www.humanitarianenergy.org/> GPA Framework Document: <https://unitar.org/sites/default/files/media/file/gpa_framework_final-compressed.pdf>  | Humanitarian Energy LinkedIn group: <https://www.linkedin.com/groups/12310695/>Global humanitarian energy visualization of projects, policies, actors: <https://bit.ly/GPA-HEData>GPA Webinar Series – good practices from energy access work in humanitarian contexts: [https://energypedia.info/wiki/Webinar\_Series:\_Sustainable\_Energy\_in\_Humanitarian\_Settings](https://energypedia.info/wiki/Webinar_Series%3A_Sustainable_Energy_in_Humanitarian_Settings) IOM/Oxfam solar pumping webinar series: <https://energypedia.info/wiki/Capacity_Building_and_Learning_on_Solar_Powered_Water_Systems>Solarhub resources: <https://thesolarhub.org/> UNITAR Training on energy program design for humanitarian contexts: running in June 2020 – contact if interested in participating: aimee.jenks@unitar.org Inclusive Energy – GBV/Energy project design handbook for emergencies (Mercy Corps): [Handbook](https://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/Inclusive-Energy-Access-Handbook-2020.pdf) and [Assessment tools](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Byd0Q5dGp58wFXDWABP4iwwMPLixhEQg?usp=sharing) | 2 Feb 21 |
| Connectivity, Clean Energy and Sustainability Working Group | CCCM Cluster | Brian Mc Donald, bmcdonald@iom.int), Jørn-Casper Øwre (jorn.owre@nrc.no)  | <https://cccmcluster.org/global/Connectivity-Sustainability-and-Clean-Energy-Working-Group>  |  | 24 Jan 21 |
| Environment Community of Practice, Global Shelter Cluster | ECoP | C. Kelly (havedisastercallkelly@gmail.com), Anita Van Breda (Anita.VanBreda@wwfus.org)(Co-chairs) | https://www.sheltercluster.org/community-of-practice/environment | Community of individuals interested in engagement on shelter-related environmental issues. Also includes a Help Desk function.  | 23 Jan 21 |
| Environment and Humanitarian Action Network (EHA) | JEU  | JEU (ochaunep@un.org)Charlotta Benedek (benedek@un.org)  | <https://www.eecentre.org/partners/the-eha-network/>https://ehaconnect.org/ | Persons can join in an individual capacity, institutional membership also encouraged. Quarterly informational meetings and webinars on new EHA work organized. | 28 Jan 2021 |
| Nexus Environmental Assessment Tool - NEAT + | JEU custodian, produced under the “Coordination of Assessments for Environment in Humanitarian Action initiative”, in partnership with USAID, UNHCR, NRC, IUCN, WWF and other partners | JEU (ochaunep@un.org)Charlotta Benedek (benedek@un.org) | https://www.eecentre.org/resources/neat/ | Environmental screening tool for humanitarian projects. An urban version is currently under production. JEU looking into moving the NEAT to an online platform. | 24 Jan 21 |
| Life-cycle Analysis for Humanitarian Shelter | BRE, ECoP and WWF | George Foden (George.Foden@bregroup.com) | <https://www.bretrust.org.uk/knowledgehub/lca-for-the-humanitarian-sector/>  | Also see chapter on LCA and shelter in forthcoming Roadmap for Research book from InterAction.  | 24 Jan 21 |
| Environment and Disaster Management Program  | WWF | Anita Van Breda (Anita.VanBreda@wwfus.org) | <https://envirodm.org/>  | Also includes a Help Desk, Green Recovery and Reconstruction Training Toolkit and Flood Green Guide and other resources.  | 24 Jan 21 |
| Réseau Environnement Humanitaire (REH) | Groupe URD and others.  | Samantha Brangeon | https://www.urd.org/en/network/the-humanitarian-environment-network/ | Humanitarian organizations interested in mainstreaming environmental issues into their work. French speaking | 2 Feb 21 |
| NorCap Energy Advisors  | NRC | norcap@nrc.no | <https://www.nrc.no/expert-deployment/what-we-do/clean-energy/> | - | 24 Jan 21 |
| Swedish Civil Defense, Environment Advisors | MSB/SIDA | Hanna Sandström, hanna.sandstrom@msb.se | - | Provides trained advisors on environmental issues via request via UN system.  | 2 Feb 21 |
| Sustainable Supply Chain Alliance Project  | ICRC, IFRC and WWP | Carmen Garcia Duro, Sustainable Supply Chain Alliance Project Manager, ICRC, cgarciaduro@icrc.org  | <http://www.icrc.org> | - | 24 Jan 21 |
| Energy Needs Assessment Framework  | IOM | Eva Mach (emach@iom.int) |  | Other contacts: Adam Ostaszewski, (aostaszewski@iom.int), Anais Matthey-Junod (amatthey@iom.int), IOM Environmental Sustainability Programme | 24 Jan 21 |
| Guidance for Environment & Humanitarian Activitiesand Response Planning |  | Dan Stothart (dan.stothart@un.org), Marika Palosaari (marika.palosaari@un.org ) |  | “a practical, online resource that supports humanitarian practitioners to mainstream environmental considerations into response plans, strategies, programmes and projects.” The GEHARP will be incorporated into Environment and Humanitarian Action Connect (https://ehaconnect.org) | 24 Jan 21 |
| DG ECHO approach toreducing the environmental footprintof humanitarian aid | EU | European CivilProtection andHumanitarian AidOperations |  | Also see: <https://www.urd.org/en/publication/report-on-environmental-footprint-of-humanitarian-assistance-for-dg-echo-2020/> | 24 Jan 21 |
| Compilation of Assessment Tools | JEU | JEU (ochaunep@un.org)Charlotta Benedek (benedek@un.org) | - | In development.  | 28 Jan 21 |
| Sustainability Review of NFIs | UK/FCDO | Nicola Davey (nicola.davey@fcdo.gov.uk) | - | NFIs to be reviewed to be identified.  | 24 Jan 21 |
| Country Environmental Profiles to inform Shelter Response  | IFRC, Swedish Red Cross  | Ela SERDAROGLU ela.serdaroglu@ifrc.orgRobert.DODDS@ifrc.org  | https://www.sheltercluster.org/ar/node/17317 | First profile on Vanuatu. | 26 Jan 21 |
| Environmental Focus of Humanitarian Logistics | Global Logistics Cluster, IFRC, Danish Refugee Council, WFP, Save the Children |  bruno.vandemeulebroecke@wfp.org | Project starting up in 2021 | Focus on waste and greenhouse gasses ¬ Gather data on the sector’s impact ¬ Compile, collate and disseminate guidance on mitigation and handling ¬ Drive exchange through an open green logistics helpline ¬ Provide an environmental operational knowledge beacon | 26 Jan 21 |
| Inter-Agency Standing Committee Informal Working Group on Greening | Chaired by JEU, CAFOD, UNHCR, WFP, ICRC and IOM members | JEU (ochaunep@un.org)Charlotta Benedek (benedek@un.org) | - | Informal working group to develop guidance and lessons learnt on greening emergency response and humanitarian programmes. Guidance expected by June 2021. | 28 Jan 2021 |
| CRS Environmental Stewardship Tool | CRS, CAFOD, Caritas Australia, Trocaire  | Matthew Sarsycki (matthew.sarsycki@crs.org) | - | Includes a section on Existing Resources used to Develop Environmental Stewardship Tool.  | 24 Feb 21 |
| UNHCR Clean Energy Challenge  | UNHCR, UNITAR/GPA  | Anouck Bronee (bronee@unhcr.org)  | <https://www.unhcr.org/clean-energy-challenge.html> - | Campaign launched by UNHCR to increase partnerships and programs on sustainable energy in forced displacement situations. Working group of humanitarian/development actors, governments, private energy companies set up to develop public-private partnerships and mobilise resources for sustainable energy programs.  | 2 Feb 21 |
| Compilation of Donor Requirements | JEU/EHAN | JEU (ochaunep@un.org)Charlotta Benedek (benedek@un.org) |  | In development | 2 Feb 21 |
| CALP- Environment Community of Practice | CALP | Jose Jodar <Jose.Jodar@calpnetwork.org> |  | Network of cash practitioners interested in mainstreaming environment and climate change issues into their work | 15 Feb 21 |
| Climate Action Accelerator | CAA | Bruno JOCHUM <b.jochum@theclimateactionaccelerator.org> | <https://theclimateactionaccelerator.org/> | Initiative which aims to support organizations in reaching carbon neutrality | 15 Feb 21 |
| DEC Environmental Working Group |  | Crowley, Frances <frances.crowley@kcl.ac.uk> |  | Network of British organizations (DEC) interested in mainstreaming environmental issues into their work | 15 Feb 21 |
| Review of environmental impact of plastic sheeting and other shelter assistance commodities.  | USAID/BHA | Chuck Setchell, csetchell@ofda.gov  | - | Part implementing a green agenda.  | 17 Feb 21 |
| Building Material Selection and Use: An Environmental Guide (BMEG), | WWF/US and Northwestern Univ., USA | Hettiarachchi, Missaka <Missaka.Hettiarachchi@wwfus.org> | https://envirodm.org/ | Also see Environment and Disaster Management Program | 17 Feb 21 |
| Model Approach to Environmental and Social Standards in UN Programming | UN Environmental Management Group | emg@un.org | https://unemg.org/modelapproach/ | - | 17 Feb 21 |
| Statement of Commitment on Climate by Humanitarian Organisations | ACTED, Action contre la Faim, ALIMA (The Alliance for International Medical Action), CARE France, ÉlectriciensSans Frontières, Groupe URD, Médecins du Monde, Première Urgence Internationale, Secours Islamique France, Solidarités International | Samantha Brangeon, sbrangeon@urd.org | <https://www.urd.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/DeclarationEngagementONGClimat_2020_EN.pdf>  | See Réseau Environnement Humanitaire (REH) | 17 Feb 21 |
| Climate and Environment Charter for Humanitarian Organizations | ICRC. IFRC and others |  | <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2021/01/210127_EN-Charter-Draft-1-for-consultation.pdf> |  | 17 Feb 21 |
| Integrated Refugee and Forcibly Displaced Energy Information System | UNHCR | energy@unhcr.org. | http://www.unhcr.org/energy |  | 24 Feb 21 |
| Building Material Environmental Guide (BMEG) | Northwestern University-World Wildlife Fund Partnership | Missaka Hettiarachchi, missaka.hettiarachchi@wwfus.org, Mike McMahon, mike.mcmahon@northwestern.edu. | - |  | 24 Feb 21 |
| Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters (QSAND) | BREIFRC | George.foden@bregroup.com  | [www.qsand.org](http://www.qsand.org)  | Shelter and settlement sustainability self-assessment tool | 23 Mar 21 |

**Annex B: Estimation of CO2 equivalent and Plastic produced by the Shelter and Settlements sector.**

The Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) Environment Community of Practice (ECoP) undertook an estimation of the amount of CO2 equivalent produced by the shelter and settlements sector annually. The main suppliers of the global shelter and NFI items were contacted to understand their annual procurement of these items. The table below provides approximate annual numbers of plastic tarps, synthetic blankets and tents provided by the organizations listed. The data is, in general, based on multi-year averages and it should be noted that procurement volumes can changes remarkably as humanitarian crises are triggered and responses are activated. It is assumed that specifications for the items listed are similar, although there is a range of different types of tents used in humanitarian operations. Also see other provider-specific notes.

These numbers do not include tarps, blankets or tents purchased locally or through funding provided to field operations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **USAID OFDA** | **ShelterBox** | **DFID** | **IFRC** | **UNHCR** | **ICRC** | **Total** |
| **Tarps 4mx5m** |  500,000  |  45,977  |  36,468  |  164,000  |  2,000,000  |  327,750  |  3,074,195  |
| **Blankets, Synthetic**  |  2,000  |  84,507  |  4,640  |  267,000  |  4,500,000  |  1,925,000  |  6,783,147  |
| **Tents** |  -  |  7,784  |  304  |  3,000  |  70,000  |  312  |  81,400  |
| **Notes** | Tarps converted from 4x60m rolls | Also 2,283 boxes.  | Tarps as part of 18,234 shelter kits. | Number of tents reported was 3,000 to 3,500.  | Number of tents reported was 70,000 to 100,000, |  |  |

 Based on multi-year data, the six organizations procure on the order of 3,074,195 plastic tarps[[15]](#footnote-15), 6,783,147 synthetic blankets and 81,400 tents as a yearly average.

These figures represented 12,297 tons of tarps, 6,783 tons of synthetic blankets and 3,907 tons of tents[[16]](#footnote-16). Presuming these relief items are shipped by air over 3,500 km (e.g., from the Dubai [Humanitarian Response Depot](http://unhrd.org/) to Bangladesh), the estimated CO2 production would be on the order of 100,000 tons.[[17]](#footnote-17),[[18]](#footnote-18)

These calculations from the GSC ECoP were contrasted with UNHCR’s own internal calculations on the amount of CO2 equivalent and plastic it produces annually. UNHCR has calculated that their Core Relief Items response produce 210,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year and 24,000 tons of plastic. Therefore the following estimation was made:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  | Tents probably contribute heavily on CO2 and plastic so we will assume that UNHCR contribution of the total is |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Item** | **Total** | **UNHCR** |  |  |
| Tarps 4mx5m |  3.074.195  |  2.000.000  | 65% |
| Blankets, Synthetic  |  6.783.147  |  4.500.000  | 66% | 75% |
| Tents |  81.400  |  70.000  | 86% |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

It is assumed that UNHCR produces 75% of the CO2 equivalent and plastic of the sector.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Per year | UNHCR | Overall sector (inc refugees) |
| Tons of CO2  |  210.000  |  262.500  |
| Tons of plastic |  24.000  |  30.000  |

**Estimation of single-use plastic used**

UNHCR estimates that the following amount of single-use plastic is used per year:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Plastic (tons)** |
| Blanket and sleeping mat | 118 |
| Tents | 135 |
| RHU | 15 |
| **Total** | **268** |

Using the same the methodology as for the other items, it is estimated that UNHCR’s contribution is 75% of the total amount for the whole sector. Therefore it is estimated that the overall sector produces **335 tons per year of single use plastic**.

1. At proposal stage fill the numbered paragraphs, except those which start with [INT] (to be filled in at intermediate report stage) or with [FIN] (to be filled in at final report stage). At intermediate and final report stage, modify only key data in the numbered paragraphs (using strikethrough). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [GSC Achievements Report 2019](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global/documents/gsc-annual-achievements-report-2019) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The members of the SAG for 2020 were appointed at the 2019 Global Shelter Cluster meeting with a one-year mandate. These members are: ACTED/IMPACT, CARE Int’l, Catholic Relief Services, Danish Refugee Council, Habitat for Humanity, InterAction, IOM, NRC and the co-leads IFRC and UNHCR. More information: [www.sheltercluster.org/sag](http://www.sheltercluster.org/strategic-advisory/global-strategic-advisory-group) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The number and gender composition of the team reflects how [the team](https://www.sheltercluster.org/about-us/global-support-team) was in September 2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. In 2020, there were ten Working Groups in the Global Shelter Cluster: Shelter and Cash, Shelter Projects, Construction Standards, NFI Practices, Promoting Safer Building, Settlement Approaches in Urban Areas, Shelter Vulnerability Classification, the State of Humanitarian Shelter and Settlements, and Diaspora Engagement in Shelter Response. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. There are currently six Communities of Practice in the Global Shelter Cluster: Coordination, Technical, Information Management, Environment, Recovery, and Gender and Diversity. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. All documents related with these strategies and the evaluation of the 2013-2017 Strategy are available [here](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global-strategic-advisory-group/library/strategy). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Minutes from the GSC 2019 Meeting are available [here](https://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/gsc_meeting_meeting_minutes_final.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The document CTP: Looking Through an Environmental Lens - Implications and Opportunities can be found [here](https://www.sheltercluster.org/shelter-and-cash-working-group/documents/ctp-looking-through-environmental-lens-implications-and). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. All documents related with these strategies and the evaluation of the 2013-2017 Strategy are available [here](https://www.sheltercluster.org/global-strategic-advisory-group/library/strategy). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The term “shelter sector” is used as a short term for shelter, settlements, construction and NFIs for the purposes of this project [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Core Relief Items are the most essential NFIs used in emergency response. They do not include other non-emergency NFIs. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Minutes from the GSC 2019 Meeting are available [here](https://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/gsc_meeting_meeting_minutes_final.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. BRE, the world’s leading building science centre: www.bregroup.com [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Based on standard 4x5 meter tarps and 4x60 meter rolls converted into 4x5 meter tarp equivalents. USAID provides tarps in rolls while the other organizations provide individual 4x5 meter tarps. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Estimated weights: 1 tarp = 4 kg, 1 blanket = 1 kg, 1 tent = 48 kg., drawn from standard specifications. Weights exclude packaging and pallets. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Based on tarp, blanket and tent weights indicated and using the Shipco Transport CO2 Calculator - <https://www.shipco.com/webapps/emm-calc/emission-calculator.html>. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The cost for these tarps, blankets and tents is estimated at $103,000,000 US, based on a tarp = 10.4 SF, blanket = 3.7 SF and a tent = 450 SF, converted to USD @ 1 Swiss Franc = 1.1 USD. Costs are approximate and do not include packaging or shipping. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)