

End of Mission Report
GCC Mission to Ukraine to support the Architecture Review
8-14 March 2016

Background

Since the activation of the clusters in December 2014 and the appointment of the Resident Coordinator as Humanitarian Coordinator in January 2015 followed by further fine-tuning the clusters in February 2015, the situation in Ukraine has evolved to the extent that the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and the Inter-cluster Group (ICG) agreed on the need to revise the coordination architecture to ensure that it is fit for purpose. In January 2016 the HCT established a Task Team to lead the review of the coordination architecture exercise and requested support from the Global Cluster Coordinators (GCCs) to undertake the process. The mission from HQ consisted of the Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator; Global Protection Cluster Coordinator; Global Focal Point for Shelter Coordination; representative of the Global Cluster for Early Recovery; representative of the GBV AoR Coordination Team; Danish Refugee Council Geneva Representative; OCHA Chief of Section for PAMS; OCHA ICCS staff member. The mission took place between 8-14 March 2016.

Mission Purpose¹

To support the HCT to review the coordination architecture including to facilitate consultations with stakeholders, to help the HCT to produce a roadmap to implement the agreed changes at the national and sub-national level, and to identify the support required from global level.

More specifically the mission objectives included:

- Facilitating the HCT's review current coordination architecture;
- Offering guidance and suggestions on contextualising the coordination architecture for Ukraine to better support operations, with an emphasis on the sub-national level and strengthening the linkages between national and subnational coordination mechanisms;
- Providing initial capacity strengthening for the Clusters and Inter-Cluster Coordination Group on key issues;
- Advising on how to strengthen the linkages between humanitarian and development actors, including reinforcing coherence between the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and the recovery response;
- Promote authorities' leadership.

Methodology

Prior to the mission taking place, the HCT Task Team developed a survey, with input from the mission team, which was distributed to operational partners donors, HCT members, cluster leads and coordinators. The survey results were compiled into a report which formed part of the pre-mission reading. The team also reviewed relevant documents relating to coordination and the humanitarian response in the Ukraine, including the Emergency Director's Group (EDG) mission report and action-points, HCT retreat documentation (July), the HNO and HRP.

During the in-country part of the mission, the team met with a broad range of interlocutors in Kyiv, Kharkiv and Kramatorsk and via Skype with partners in Donetsk and Luhansk.²

¹ See Annex B for the Terms of Reference of the Architecture Review including the Global Mission team.

² See Annex D for the mission programme with further details on interlocutors the mission met with.

The mission team concluded the mission with a de-briefing session with the HCT, ICG and donors in Kyiv. The team presented their findings and preliminary recommendations to this grouping, providing clarifications where necessary and engaging in a discussion on implications of the preliminary recommendations. This end of mission report capturing the key elements involved in the architecture review and the recommendations agreed at the workshop is shared with the HCT and, once approved, with the GCCs and the EDGs.

Mission Findings

A. Context

The mission concurred with previous findings and assessments that the situation in Ukraine has evolved since the activation of the clusters and the establishment of the coordination architecture. The clusters made great strides in coordinating the response in the early stages of the emergency and in filling a role which the national and local authorities were unable to play. However, the situation in March 2016 in government controlled areas (GCAs) appears to have now stabilized significantly. Although the mission team could not go into the specifics of each cluster and assess what work was humanitarian and what was recovery and developmental, the team found that in general the response in the GCAs is now focusing largely on recovery, including durable solutions, and development work and that humanitarian work was more focused on the contact line and the NGCAs. Therefore, the humanitarian coordination architecture needs to evolve and shift its focus to the East.

B. Coordination with the Government: identifying counter-parts

The clusters are coordinating with authorities at different levels and to varying degrees. The education, health and shelter clusters for example coordinate with the line ministry counter-parts. While the links at sub-national level with oblast & municipalities in the East are in some instances quite strong. However the mission found that in discussions around transition of clusters to national authorities or engaging with the Government on recovery and development work, there was less confidence that counter-parts could be identified at national level or that the coordination internally between national and local authorities was sufficient. Overall the mission found that the links with government (sharing of information, handover over of coordination, agreement on plans etc) needs to be strengthened to facilitate the transition and deactivation of the clusters.

Given the shift in focus to recovery and development work in the GCAs the lack of an inter-governmental platform to coordinate on the recovery side is a gap which requires attention. The HC and humanitarian community have made a number of efforts to identify an accountable counter-part in the Government for recovery and development without much progress to date. The team found the Donbass Recovery Agency to be a potential focal point for working with on recovery at national level, though recognizing the weaknesses within that Agency which would require attention. Inter-government platforms for coordination could also be identified at Oblast or even Municipal levels, where actors and operations are present.

Coordination in the NGCAs is a challenge particularly with the constant changes in the de facto authorities forming a practical impediment to establishing working relations with a counter-part. The main concerns for coordination with de facto authorities in the NGCAs are in relation to access, accreditation and the freedom to operate and carry out assessments. However planning for transition to recovery is not yet relevant for the NGCAs.

C. Coordination proximity to the response

Following the activation of the clusters the CLAs went to great length to staff the cluster coordination and IM functions and to identify staff who could double hat where dedicated personnel were not available. The ICG, including OCHA's inter-cluster coordinator and the cluster coordinators, were based in Kyiv from the early stages of the response. Not surprisingly the mission found that this contributed to a Kyiv-centric set up which became rather heavy. The distance from the contact line and NGCAs, where the majority of the humanitarian caseload is located, impacts the perception of what are the key operational issues. The team noted that the coordinators in Kyiv were spending on average 20-30% of their time in the field which further exacerbates the remoteness from the response and has led to a focus on process-related issues at the Kyiv level.

A further challenge to strong, focused, coordination in the field was the relatively ad-hoc development of coordination spots in the GCAs in the East. These were often located according to agency office location as opposed to proximity to the response. The mission team who were in Kharkiv noted that numerous clusters were meeting, and though they were defining activities as humanitarian, the work was focused more on recovery and development, .

Some clusters had looked to set-up cluster focal point or co-facilitation roles with cluster partners; the shelter cluster's arrangement with People in Need providing a dedicated co-facilitator at sub-national level being a good example. The focal point and co-facilitation approaches would still be relevant to clusters should they relocate closer to the contact line given that the cluster would still have to cover two or three hub/locations in the GCAs – Kramatorsk, Severodonetsk and possibly Mairupol – as well as link with the NGCA multisector coordination centres in Luhansk and Donetsk.

There is limited information on the assistance reaching NGCA and the unevenness of cross-line coordination in between NGCAs and GCAs is not helped by the lack of a presence in the field of the ICG. With cluster coordinators based in Kramatorsk and Severodonetsk the centre of gravity would shift from Kyiv-focused discussions to operational coordination issues directly linked to the humanitarian response such as coordination across the contact line between GCA and NGCAs for example.

The mission noted that there was general agreement among interlocutors that protection would require a continued presence at the national level given its important role in supporting the HCT on advocacy and in engaging with national authorities on protection issues. While maintaining this national presence, the protection coordination team would also move capacity to Kramatorsk to enhance focus on protection in the operational response and to continue its engagement with the ICG.

In relation to early recovery, the mission also found general support for a national level mechanism albeit one which should be focused on a Government-led recovery coordination model. While as part of the relocation to the East, the early recovery cluster should focus on mainstreaming early recovery with the other clusters in the contact line and NGCA and subsequently assess the remaining coordination needs and functions of the cluster.

D. Differentiated response – spectrum between Kyiv and the East and between humanitarian and development

The clusters appear to be coordinating humanitarian, recovery and development work contiguously and none of the clusters have a clear delineation of the activities between these

phases. The activities the mission heard about include reconstruction of schools and rehabilitation of houses, support government reform on health, rule of law support, large scale infrastructure support, water system reconstruction and repair. The type response also differs widely depending on the location from GCAs to NGCAs and the contact line.

The mission found that this broad spectrum of differentiated responses contributed to the difficulties of strictly focusing coordination on the humanitarian response in the contact line and NGCAs as a multitude of chronic and systemic challenges in Ukraine, which should otherwise be dealt with by recovery and development, were being taken up by the clusters.

The mission also found that the limitations in recovery and development coordination and planning and the lack even of a gap analysis between the phases as a further challenge in delineating between the phases.

E. Uneven delivery on coordination functions

The survey and feedback from partners showed a general feeling that clusters provide a good forum for coordination and sharing of information and networking. The steps the clusters have taken to have native speaking coordinators and communication in local language was also appreciated by operational partners. The team also heard positives from NGO cluster members in the field, specifically for the shelter cluster and the tools such as the 3Ws which it provides.

However it was a concern to note that some of the clusters did not have some of the basic deliverables such as ToRs, workplans or a 3Ws which is fit for purpose – one which cluster members in the field could use to help identify gaps and duplications in coverage. Given the operation in the GCAs has largely stabilised the fact that few of the clusters had made any progress on an exit/transition plan was also a concern. Further concerns around how clusters are functioning were noted, including a perception among some interlocutors that the cluster is simply the meeting and the uncertain numbers of cluster partners being represented in different documents – the figures provided in the description mapping, the HRP and the dashboard vary for some clusters.

The mission heard from the Cash Working Group based in Kyiv which had set up a number of task forces to deal with the various technical strands which need to be resolved on multi-purpose cash. Much progress seemed to have been made in this regard, however the expected volume of multi-purpose Cash programming likely to take place in 2016 is relatively low and the mission found the coordination structure overcomplicated for its purpose. Like the clusters the CWG was also felt to be too remote from the scene of the operational response and would benefit greatly from streamlining its structure and making the move to the field with the ICG.

F. System linkages

Stakeholders express frustration and perceived lack of transparency between the various bodies in the coordination architecture (HCT-ICCG-OCHA-Donors etc) which seems to be having an impact on a productive working environment. These findings are largely in line with problems in linkages in the architecture which the humanitarian community identified in the July 2015 retreat and the fact that the recommendations from that retreat were not perceived by some parties to have been implemented is indicative of the frustrations within the coordination system around its functioning on the basis of transparency and trust.

The ICCG to HCT link is one of a number of crucial links in the coordination architecture and the mission heard from both groups about weaknesses in this link which could be addressed by having stronger representation of ICG interests in the HCT. The cluster coordinator to cluster

lead agency relationship is another crucial strand supporting the HCT-ICG link and more broadly the operational with the strategic arms of the response. The mission found a lack of familiarity on the part of some on the roles and responsibilities of those within the coordination system, which could also be contributing to the concerns around trust and the strength of the working relationship between the groupings.

There needs to be stronger and more coherent engagement between the HCT and the donors on strategic issues of concern and the HC/HCT should work to identify the right model to achieve this.

G. Coordination and response capacity

The humanitarian needs are likely to be greatest in the contact line and the NGCAs; this is where the response capacity is required and where coordination should be focused. The mission team found however that impediments to access and issues around accreditation were keeping the numbers of actors in the NGCAs low. The team also heard of the difficulties in undertaking assessments in the NGCAs and the lack of compatibility between the 3Ws which is required for the NGCAs and the 3Ws being used by the clusters in the GCAs.

H. Review and discussion of coordination structures

Finally the team notes that the mission to support the coordination architecture review follows on from a series of missions, retreats and discussions in Ukraine, many of which are identifying the same issues: the need for stronger humanitarian coordination where the operations are taking place in the East; and, the need for steps to be taken to strengthen the linkages in the coordination architecture.

The mission noted interest in addressing these key issues varied among the stakeholders: some were already considering deactivation of clusters or exit strategies; some cluster coordinators have expressed interest in moving closer to the field; while OCHA expressed a commitment to begin moving staff to offices close to the contact line.

Conclusion

The mission heard differing views on many of the core issues around de-centralization, linking with the authorities and linkages within the coordination architecture, which sometimes contradicted each other. In formulating its conclusions and recommendations, the mission recognized that though there is no consensus among the humanitarian community in Ukraine on the specifics however there was general agreement that the situation has evolved and change is needed. The mission found that there are clear pointers to the best path forward to relocate and re-orientate the architecture on the humanitarian response in the East; strengthen the links and further build trust within the system and take the necessary steps to strategically engage with the Government on recovery in the GCAs. The following recommendations are intended to provide concrete steps to achieve these ends

Recommendation One:

- i. **Each cluster to develop a transition plan to handover to the Government in GCAs**³. This is a critical first step for all clusters to engage in. Broadly the plan should be based on

³ See the following link to a folder with examples for transition plans for clusters and the coordination architecture in general from other contexts:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/2jrqrqv6uhl2pcz/AABInPbj55hRWzWqbHUfFOqAa?dl=0>

an assessment of government counterpart capacity, elaborating what cluster work they can take over at present and which areas they need capacity development to take on cluster functions. As part of the process of developing a transition plan, each cluster should identify the residual/continuing humanitarian needs which will require coordination, for example this could include the prevention of IDPs situation deteriorating and returning to emergency assistance. The GCC team will share examples from Nepal and OPT of cluster transition frameworks as well as examples of individual cluster plans from other contexts.

- ii. **Collectively identify and work with an inter-governmental platform on recovery and rehabilitation in the GCAs e.g. Donbass Recovery Agency.** As noted in 1.i., each cluster will have to identify counterparts either at national or local level for handing over critical cluster functions as part of the cluster transition plan. The mission however also noted the need for the UN, intergovernmental and INGO humanitarian, recovery and developmental actors to identify and work with an inter-governmental platform on recovery and development, including on matters relating to coordination, the establishment of a comprehensive recovery 3Ws, the need for humanitarian plans (HRP) to link with a potential recovery plan and with the upcoming UNDAF.

Recommendation Two:

- i. **For those clusters expected to continue: National cluster coordination teams and ICG to relocate to Kramatorsk / Severodonetsk.** The location should be agreed at HCT however the mission team suggests that Kramatorsk could be the main location with coordinators moving between there and Severodonetsk (and maybe Mariupol) when necessary. A further suggestion would be to undertake an MSNA following relocation to help the clusters to 'Right size' their work.
- ii. **Coordinators to spend at least 50% of time in field until relocation is complete.** The mission recognises that the development of transition plans and the procedural steps required to move staff duty stations will take a couple of months, in the meantime however refocusing the coordination architecture on the humanitarian response in the East could begin immediately. Therefore the mission is recommending that coordinators and OCHA begin increasing the amount of time spent in hubs closer to the contact line until the relocation is complete.
- iii. **Each cluster to undertake Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring.** The CCPM will assist clusters to assess how they have been performing and, as part of the relocation and refocusing of their work on the East and the humanitarian response, the outcomes from the CCPM can help to identify areas for improving the functioning of the remaining clusters. The Global clusters will assist in distributing the survey and generating the report. The key step in the process is the workshop which each cluster should have with partners to review the results and develop an action plan to address any weaknesses.
- iv. **Maintain multi-sector coordination hubs in the NGCAs.** Given the relatively few numbers of partners on the ground in NGCAs, the current practice of having a multi-sector coordination approach should be maintained and continued until such time as there is a need (due to number of partners and/or volume of work to be coordinated) to move to a cluster model. The sector-focal points in the NGCAs should be clearly identified to facilitate linkages in the coordination between NGCAs and GCAs.
- v. **Reduce to multi-sector GCM with Government in the lead in Kharkiv, Dnipro, Zapor, etc.** Given the limited number of partners and of humanitarian work to coordinate there

appears to be little need for cluster coordination meetings in locations. The mission recommends that coordination groupings be reduced to multi-sector GCMs with Government in the lead. A focal point system could serve the purpose of linking these hubs and the few partners there with the clusters in Kramatorsk.

- vi. **Relocate and streamline Cash Working Group to Kramatorsk.** The Cash WG should move with the ICG to Kramatorsk to be closer to the operations. It should also reduce the number of task forces in-line with the relatively low volume of programming in multi-purpose Cash in 2016. The WG may phase out due to the trend of reductions in funding and programming.

Recommendation Three:

Proposals on cluster deactivation and merging should be part of the final transition plan. Subject to each cluster to undertaking a transition plan to handover to Government in GCAs, as per recommendation one, the mission noted from its meetings with various interlocutors that some clusters are likely to deactivate. While the protection cluster and its sub-clusters could look at merging meetings to streamline its work and reduce the “meeting-load”. The following table was presented in the Architecture Review Workshop and presents preliminary proposals and the missions understanding of the likely next steps for each cluster.

As part of developing a transition plan, it is important for the clusters to keep the following critical steps in mind:

- Each cluster should identify the residual and continuing humanitarian needs requiring coordination as part of the development of the cluster transition plan.
- De-activation of a cluster does not mean humanitarian funding is no longer required.
- The CLA maintains accountability until deactivation and the transition plan should detail how and when accountability shifts to Government.

Table: Missions assessment of clusters present work focus and likely next step following transition plan.

Cluster	Hum/Dev spectrum finding ⁴	Suggested next step
Education	Recovery and Development	Review and deactivate
Food Security	Humanitarian for CL, NGCA	Review and focus on CL and NGCA
Health & Nutrition	Recovery and Development	Review and deactivate
Protection	Humanitarian	Maintain a national level presence, merge meetings with sub-clusters and continue
Child Protect sub-cluster	Humanitarian	Merge meetings with protection and continue
GBV sub-cluster	Humanitarian	Merge meetings with protection and continue
Mine Action sub-cluster	Programme focus (limited No. partners)	Merge meetings with protection and continue
Shelter/NFI	Humanitarian for CL, NGCA	Review and focus on CL and NGCA

⁴ As noted in Finding D – clusters are coordinating humanitarian, recovery and development work – this is the mission’s assessment

WASH	Humanitarian for CL, NGCA	Review and focus on CL and NGCA
Logistics	Programme focus (limited No. partners)	Review and deactivate ⁵
Early Recovery	Humanitarian and Recovery	Mainstream ER into clusters in CL, NGCA; assess the remaining work of ER cluster to subsequently deactivate (IASC Policy)

Recommendation Four:

- i. **All activities and proposals in NGCA to be compiled and regularly reported on.** OCHA and the clusters should work with all relevant actors to get as comprehensive a picture as possible of humanitarian work being undertaken in the NGCAs. If actors are concerned about public exposure for their humanitarian activity across the contact line, one suggestion would be to look into anonymizing data, an approach used in the Whole of Syria coordination.
- ii. **Reinforce exchange of info through IMWG.** The compatibility of 3Ws and ensuring that it provides sufficient detail to identify gaps, duplications and partners response down at administrative level.
- iii. **Invite NGCA partners to GCA meetings in good time.** This recommendation is one of a number of steps which should be taken to ensure that actors working in the NGCAs and the sector focal points in particular are linking to the clusters in Kramatorsk and Severodonetsk. Since there are logistical, bureaucratic and security impediments to moving from the NGCAs to GCAs to attend meetings – practical steps such as having a fixed meeting agenda, sequencing meetings and finding technological solutions could all help to bridge the divide.

Recommendation Five:

Implement all recommendations from July 2015 Retreat, EDGs etc⁶. Many of the recommendations particularly from the July 2015 retreat were intended to address weaknesses in how the ICG and HCT are linking.

Recommendation Six:

- i. **Hold regular HCT meetings in the East.** The intention is to address this disconnect between the HCT and ICG and the operational response in general and the approach of moving the HCT to meet in the field or to undertake field missions as a group has been shown to be effective in other contexts, such as OPT and South Sudan. The mission is also making this recommendation as with the ICG moving to Kramatorsk the geographical distance could serve to exacerbate the disconnect between the two mechanisms.
- ii. **Continue NGO Forum representation on ICCG and HCT.** Having the NGO Forum representative on the ICCG and HCT could ensure the oversight on linkages between the two bodies.

⁵ Probably by mid-year according to the cluster

⁶ See Annex C

- iii. **Ensure a place for a cluster coordinator, on rotation for 3 months at a time, on HCT.** This is a reaffirmation of a previous recommendation which could really help strengthen the linkages between the groups.
- iv. **Stream line and generate coherence in the series of meetings of ICG, HCT, GCM, CC meetings and other meetings.** Streamline and reduce the number of meetings across the board, where the same people are meeting multiple times under different mechanisms look at the possibility of streamlining. Sequencing of meetings, for example having the ICG before the HCT or in the hubs having cluster meetings one after another on one day allows those involved to reduce time travelling back and forth and strengthens the links between groupings.
- v. **Establish regular interface between donors and HCT.** Having a donor representative on the HCT or establishing a regular donor-HCT meeting are options which have been used in other contexts. They may not necessarily be appropriate for Ukraine, however the HCT should identify a means to establish a regular interface to strengthen this crucial link.

Recommendation Seven:

There are a few key strategic issues which the HCT should make decisions on:

- **Develop a comprehensive HCT protection strategy.**⁷ This should be an overarching strategy which builds on the HRP and provides the HCT with a framework to address the most urgent and serious protection risks and violations. HCT tasks protection cluster in consultations with other clusters and protection actors beyond the clusters to develop the strategy.
- **Develop common rules of engagement for NGCAs.** This should be signed off by the HCT to ensure all humanitarian actors are aware of the rules of engagement with de-facto authorities in the NGCAs for access of humanitarian goods and personnel.
- **Suspend Review of 2016 HRP until all recommendations have progressed.** In order to allow the clusters to move to Kramatorsk and focus on the operational response there it is recommended that the Review of HRP be suspended until all recommendations have progressed.
- **Decision on 2017 HRP is subject to a fresh multi-sector needs assessment in NGCA and contact line.** The previous MSNA was in March 2015 and most stakeholders agreed that a new MSNE was needed. The relocation of clusters and strengthening of linkages between the NGCAs and the relocated clusters in Kramatorsk and Severodonetsk is an opportune moment to undertake a multi-sectoral assessment in order to have a common understanding of needs and set the basis for 2017 HNO and HRP (if they are needed).

⁷ Draft Guidance Note on HCT Protection Strategy being developed by GPC. Support from GPC including deployment of ProCap available.

ANNEX A: Table of Recommendations, suggested timelines and those responsible

Recommendation	By When	Who is responsible
1.i Each cluster to develop a transition plan to handover to the Government in GCAs.	End of May	All clusters
1.ii Collectively identify and work with an inter-governmental platform on recovery and rehabilitation eg. Donbass Recovery Agency.	End of May	HC and HCT
2.i For those clusters expected to continue: National cluster coordination teams and ICG to relocate to Kramatorsk / Severodonetsk.	End of July	CLAs and OCHA
2.ii Coordinators to spend at least 50% of time in field until relocation is complete.	Immediately	Cluster coordinators
2.iii Each cluster to undertake Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring.	Survey end of March; Workshop end of April	All clusters
2.iv Maintain multi-sector coordination hubs in the NGCAs.	Immediately	OCHA all agencies
2.v Reduce to multi-sector GCM with Government in the lead in Kharkiv, Dnipro, Zapor, etc.	Immediately	OCHA all agencies
2.vi Relocate and streamline Cash Working Group to Kramatorsk.	End of July	OCHA
3. Proposals on cluster deactivation and merging should be part of the final transition plan.	End of June	All clusters
4.i All activities and proposals in NGCA to be compiled and regularly reported on.	Immediately	OCHA & sector focal points/cluster coordinators
4.ii Reinforce exchange of info through IMWG.	Immediately	OCHA & sector focal points/cluster

		coordinators
4.ii Invite NGCA partners to GCA meetings in good time.	Immediately	OCHA & sector focal points/cluster coordinators
5. Implement all recommendations from July 2015 Retreat, EDGs etc	End of March status of recommendations presented to HCT	Parties responsible for recommendations from July 2015 retreat
6.i Hold regular HCT meetings in the East.	Immediately	HC and HCT
6.ii Continue NGO Forum representation on ICCG and HCT.	Immediately	HC and HCT
6.iii Ensure a place for a cluster coordinator, on rotation for 3 months at a time, on HCT.	Immediately	HC and HCT
6.iv Stream line and generate coherence in the series of meetings of ICG, HCT, GCM, CC meetings and other meetings.	Immediately	OCHA
6.v Establish regular interface between donors and HCT.	Immediately	HC
7. HCT decisions on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a comprehensive protection strategy • Develop common rules of engagement for NGCA • Suspend Review of 2016 HRP until all recommendations have progressed • Decision on 2017 HRP is subject to a fresh multi-sector needs assessment in NGCA and contact line. 	Begin immediately with decisions to develop protection strategy, common rules of engagement and suspension of 2016 HRP review. Timelines to be established for delivering each.	HCT

ANNEX B: Terms of Reference for Architecture Revision and Mission

Ukraine - Revision of the coordination architecture

The HCT- led exercise intends to produce an operational roadmap to implement agreed changes in the coordination architecture through a participatory process on the basis of best practices. This includes providing of capacity strengthening on key issues; advising on how to strengthen the linkages between humanitarian and development actors, including reinforcing coherence between the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and the recovery response and promote authorities' leadership.

HCT Task team

On 21 January, the HCT decided to establish a task team to lead the revision of the coordination mechanisms exercise. Participants include:

- OCHA – Barbara Manzi
- UNICEF/Giovanna Barberis
- UNHCR/Vanno Noupech
- WHO/Patricia Kormoss
- NGO forum/Fred Larsson
- Mercy Corps/Stuart Willcuts
- UNDP/Jess Garana

Secretariat: OCHA – Anastasiya Buha, Zeljko Nikolich, Ivane Bochorishvili

Group email

TO: manzi@un.org, gbarberis@unicef.org, noupech@un.org, kpj@euro.who.int, swillcuts@field.mercycorps.org, seniorcoordinator@ngoforum.org.ua, jess.garana@undp.org

CC: buha@un.org, bochorishvili@un.org, nikolich@un.org

Task Team TOR

- Guide the process and actively participate in collection, preparation of materials, events and analysis of findings.
- Support preparations /participate in the HQ support mission, including field visits.
- Engage (online) with the HQ mission prior to deployment in
 - Provide contextual analysis;
 - Review of retreat and survey findings, EDG mission reports and related information on Ukraine's coordination system including cluster-specific evaluations;
 - Design a light coordination architecture review process;
 - Identify requirements for training during the mission;
 - Revise best practices and identify the most appropriate for the Ukraine context;
 - Organize pre-consultations with partners (HCT; Cluster Leads/Coordinators/members; NGO Forum; donors; authorities) on current and desired coordination arrangements, including at subnational level, including possible administration of survey(s);
 - Identify the need for/administer surveys as appropriate.

HQ mission tentative program (8-17 March)

Participants TBC. OCHA, UNDP, WFP expressed interest as of 30 Jan

<i>Event</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
Tuesday 8 March (national and UN holiday)	
HQ Team arrives	Logistics to be organized
Wednesday 9 March	
<u>AM</u> - Briefing with the HC, HCT taskforce on revision of coordination mechanisms, Inter-cluster group	All mission members
<u>PM – Team 1</u> – meetings with Kiev-based stakeholders	
<u>PM – Team 2</u> – travel to Kramatorsk (train – 6 hrs)	
<u>PM – Team 3</u> – travel to Dnipropetrovsk (train – 5 hrs)	Could also be done by team 1 online
Thursday 10 March	
<u>Team 1</u> – meetings with Kiev-based stakeholders, HCT	
<u>Team 2</u> – workshop/consultations with field-based stakeholders (Kramatorsk)	Stakeholders from Non-Government Controlled areas to travel to Kramatorsk
<u>Team 3</u> – workshop/consultations with field-based stakeholders (Dnipropetrovsk)	Could also be done by team 1 online
Friday 11 March	
<u>Team 1</u> – meetings with Kiev-based stakeholders, preparation of ICG and expanded HCT workshop	
<u>Team 2</u> – travel to Severodonetsk, workshop/consultations with field-based stakeholders	
<u>Team 3</u> – return to Kiev (5 hrs), join team 1	
Saturday 12 March	
<u>Team 1,3</u> - preparation of ICG and expanded HCT workshop	
<u>Team 2</u> – return to Kiev (2 1/2hrs drive, 6 hrs train)	
Sunday 13 March	
Preparation workshops	
Monday 14 March	
<u>Expanded ICG workshop</u> (training plus discussion on revision of findings from the field trips etc)	Consideration to be given if to include some members of the clusters who could potentially be focal points in the field?
Tuesday 15 March	
Consolidation finding, inputs, preparation of expanded HCT workshop	
Wednesday 16 March	
<u>Expanded HCT workshop</u>	Donors, NGO forum, key cluster partners (esp those present in the field) to be considered, at least to present recommendations in the last session
Thursday 17 March	
Draft recommendations and way forward report ready	
Team departure	

Terms of Reference⁸ - Coordination Support Mission to Ukraine

The conflict triggered the establishment of the HCT and of the cluster system⁹ in October/November 2014 in order to better organize the response. The Resident Coordinator was appointed as Humanitarian Coordinator in January 2015.

As the situation evolved, the HCT and the Inter Cluster Group agreed on the need to revise the coordination architecture in place to ensure it is fit for purpose, and driven by HRP strategic objectives. Such revision was indicated as a priority in the July HCT retreat and during the elaboration of the 2016 HRP. Four areas for attention emerged, namely:

- Increase/scale-up presence in the field
- Decentralization of coordination structures
- Revision of clusters
- Need for strengthened communication among the different coordination bodies, e.g. HCT-Cluster.

The Ukraine Humanitarian Country Team has formed an HCT task team, led by OCHA on behalf of the HC, to work on the issue and has requested an inter-agency HQ-level mission to support the revision of coordination architecture in Ukraine, on the basis of the work already done.

Mission purpose:

Support the HCT to review the coordination architecture, facilitate consultation with stakeholders and help the HCT to produce a roadmap to implement agreed changes at the national and sub-national level, and support required at global level.

This includes:

- Facilitating the HCT's review current coordination architecture;
- Offering guidance and suggestions on contextualising the coordination architecture for Ukraine to better support operations, with an emphasis on the sub-national level and strengthening the linkages between national and subnational coordination mechanisms;
- Providing initial capacity strengthening for the Clusters and Inter-Cluster Coordination Group on key issues;
- Advising on how to strengthen the linkages between humanitarian and development actors, including reinforcing coherence between the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and the recovery response;
- Promote authorities' leadership.

Methodology:

- Phase 1: Remote preparation and consultations
- Phase 2: in country support.

The mission will comprise OCHA and two to three Global Cluster Coordinators and/or IASC members.

Phase 1 – Preparation, first stage of consultations

⁸ Approved and disseminated on 22 Jan 2016.

⁹ The following clusters were activated: Education (UNICEF lead); Emergency Shelter & NFIs (UNHCR lead); Food Security (WFP lead); Livelihoods / Early Recovery (UNDP lead); Logistics (WFP lead); Health and Nutrition (WHO led; Nutrition as a sub-cluster led by UNICEF); Protection (UNHCR-led); WASH (UNICEF lead). There are several sub-clusters activated as well. OHCHR co-leadership of the Protection cluster was discontinued as of January 2016.

- Pre-mission - Review of retreat and survey findings, EDG mission reports and related information on Ukraine's coordination system including cluster-specific evaluations;
- Pre-mission - Support the HCT in designing a light coordination architecture review process based on best practice/experiences from other contexts leading to improved overall coordination and enhanced linkages between sub-national coordination mechanisms (hubs, sub-national clusters, etc.) and national mechanisms (inter-cluster group, HCT, clusters);
- Pre-mission - Analyse existing materials already available concerning the current coordination structure;
- Telephone/online consultations with partners (HCT; Cluster Leads/Coordinators/members; NGO Forum; donors; authorities) on current and desired coordination arrangements, including at subnational level, including possible administration of survey(s);
- Review of retreat and survey findings, EDG mission reports and related information on Ukraine's coordination system, including materials produced to date.

Phase 2 – Identification of finalization and production of recommendations

- In-person consultations with HCT/ICG/Clusters members/NGO forum/government/donors on results of discussion to date to finalize workshop preparation, including (but not limited to):
 - Bilateral/group meetings in Kiev;
 - Teleconferencing with the field (possibility for field trip to be discussed, perhaps with part of the visiting team going to the field while the other remains in Kiev);
- Facilitate workshop(s) with ICG and other key stakeholders on coordination, roles of HCT, ICG, cluster responsibilities, engagement with non-traditional partners, including sharing of best practices and linkages between humanitarian and recovery action; at Kiev and field levels.
- Especially convened one-day ICG meeting to consider coordination and issues related to ICCG/cluster performance at national/sub-national level.
- Facilitation of expanded HCT one-day workshop to present recommendations for Ukraine coordination architecture based on consultations and best practice/experiences from other contexts leading to improved overall coordination and enhanced linkages between sub-national coordination mechanisms (hubs, sub-national clusters, etc.) and national mechanisms (inter-cluster group, HCT, clusters);/way forward;
- Feedback and report.

End of Mission Report:

Mission members shall draft a concise report to be shared with the HCT and – once approved – with the Global Cluster Coordinators and the IASC EDG capturing the key elements involved in the architecture review and the recommendation agreed at the workshop. Upon its return to Geneva, the mission will brief the Global Cluster Coordinators providing an overview of the draft report and identifying specific follow-up required by individual clusters and the ICG.

ANNEX C

Humanitarian Community Retreat Dnipropetrovsk, 30-31 July 2015

STREAMLINING COORDINATION

- **Improve coordination with NGOs.** Appoint a dedicated Inter-Cluster Coordinator (Chair). Systematically share HCT Meeting Minutes with ICG - Cluster Coordinators and vice versa, same between IMWG and ICG. ICG Cluster Coordinators should be informed of sensitive political issues discussed at HCT Meetings, for example a 5 minute standing session. Any rephrasing and revision of Minutes/Agenda/Decisions to be endorsed by Cluster Coordinators in writing
- **Improve field coordination** and ensure good information flow between Kyiv and field.
- **Improve dialogue and coordination with authorities in NGCA** – shift of coordination to NGCA. Ongoing dialog on Humanitarian Assistance with the de-facto authorities. Systematic sharing of information. Deploy more experienced senior level staff to NGCAs. Provide relevant training to staff in the fields.
- **Improve coordination with donors.** Meetings on the regular basis will be set up. Advocacy plan. Request to be a part of HCT.
- **Improve linkages and communication flow between ICG and HCT.** Share HCT minutes with ICG. Share political analyses with ICG. Cluster Coordinators to be informed in writing.
- **Streamline Cluster reporting.** Carefully revise the objectives, priorities and purposes of the meetings. ICG Chair represents ICG at General Coordination Meetings. Insure that the Field is not overloaded with bureaucratic procedures. Proper analysis of procedures to confirm their absolute necessity. Create simple templates for reporting procedures. Insure full understanding of the reporting staff of the reporting purposes and strategic importance behind this.

Summary of HRP workshop Kyiv, 27-28 October 2015

Coordination architecture

- Increase/scale-up presence in the field
- Decentralize the coordination structures
- Revise clusters
- Strengthen communication among the different level of communication, e.g. HCT-Cluster.

Note: In view of the previous points, there is a strong recommendation to review the humanitarian architecture in Ukraine once HPC is finalized.

ANNEX D

Mission on Revision of Coordination Architecture in Ukraine

08 – 15 March, 2016

Team I - Kyiv	Team II - Kharkiv	Team III – Kramatorsk
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Ignacio Leon - Chief of Section, PAMS, PSB 2. Ms. Astrid Haaland – GBV, Global Protection Cluster 3. Mr. Stephen Maurer - DRC Geneva Representative. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Jess Garana – Livelihood and Early Recovery Cluster Coordinator 2. Mr. Gregg McDonald - Global Focal Point for Coordination (in Shelter and Settlement Section) (UNHCR) 3. Mr. David Murphy - HAO, ICCS, PSB 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Rekha Das - Global Early Recovery Cluster cell (UNDP Crisis Response Unit) 2. Mr. Simon Russell - Global Protection Cluster acting Coordinator (UNHCR) 3. Mr. Cyril Ferrand - Global Food Security Cluster Coordinator (FAO)
<p>OCHA Focal Point Mr. Zeljko Nikolich +38 (050) 327 78 53</p>	<p>OCHA Focal Point Ms. Anna Sokolova +38 (095) 285 24 32</p>	<p>OCHA Focal Point Ms. Yanna Thay +38 (050) 318 20 08</p>

Tuesday, 8 March

Arrival of Mission members to Kyiv, Ukraine

Wednesday, 09 March

09:30 – 11:00	Briefing with the HC, HCT taskforce on revision of coordination mechanisms [Address: 1, Klovsyky Descent, UN House, Aleksanyan Room]
---------------	---

Team I, II and III split and continue on separate schedules

Team I - Kyiv		Team II – Kharkiv, Team III - Kramatorsk	
11:30 – 13:00	Meeting with Donors [Address: 1, Klovsyky Descent, UN House, Aleksanyan Room]	11:30 – 12:30	Lunch OR Possibility to be present at the part of the Meeting with Donors
13:15 – 14:15	Lunch	12:30 – 13:15	Transfer to the Train Station
14:30 – 16:00	Meeting with NGO Forum	13:35 – 18:11	Transfer to Kharkiv [Intercity Train 724 K]

	[Address: 28 Instytutaska St, OCHA Office]		
16:00 – 17:00	Meeting with Donbas Recovery Agency [TBC]	18:11 – 18:40	Transfer to the Hotel “Chichikov”. Overnight in Kharkiv

Teams II and III split and continue on separate schedules

Thursday, 10 March

Team I - Kyiv		Team II – Kharkiv		Team III - Kramatorsk	
				06:00 – 08:00	Transfer to Kramatorsk
09:30 – 11:00	Meeting with HCT	08:30 – 09:30	Meeting with selected partners (Gov, NGOs, UN)	09:00 – 10:30	“GCM” format meeting (Gov, UN, NGOs)
11:30 – 12:30	Meeting with ICRC [TBC]	09:30 – 11:00	“GCM” format meeting (Gov, UN, NGOs)	10:45 – 11:45	Meeting with authorities
13:00 – 14:00	<i>Lunch with OSCE</i>	11:30 – 12:30	Meeting with authorities	12:00 – 13:30	Lunch with Key Partners
14:00 – 15:00	Meeting with Heads of Parliamentary Committees: Committee on European Integration Committee on Veteran’s, Ex-combatant’s, ATO participants and People with Disabilities Affairs [TBC]	12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	14:00 – 15:30	Meeting with partners operating in GCA/Contact Line
		14:00 – 15:30	Meetings with UN agencies	14:00 – 15:30	Meeting with partners operating in NGCA
		16:00 – 17:30	Meeting with NGOs	15:45 – 16:15	Meeting with ICRC
15:30 – 17:00	Meeting with agencies operating in NGCA	17:30 – 18:00	Transfer to train station	16:15 – 16:45	Transfer to train station
		18:39 – 23:19	Transfer to Kyiv [Intersity Train 721O]	16:53 - 22:58	Transfer to Kyiv [Intercity Train 712 Д]
		23:19	Arrival to Kyiv, transfer to Hotel Natsionalnyi [5 Lypska st]	23:00	Arrival to Kyiv, transfer to Hotel Natsionalnyi [5 Lypska st]

Friday, 11 March

Team I, II and III re-join

09:00 – 10:30	Meeting with the HCT Task Team
10:30 – 11:30	Meeting with Cash Working Group
11:30 – 12:30	Preparations for the ICG Workshop

13:00 – 17:00	ICG Workshop
Saturday, 12 March – Preparations for the HCT workshop	
Sunday, 13 March – Free day	
Monday, 14 March	
09:00 - 12:00	Preparations for the HCT Work shop
12:00 – 13:00	<i>Lunch</i>
13:00 – 17:00	Expanded HCT workshop (Revision of findings, discussion on way forward, etc.)
Tuesday, 15 March	
09:00 – 10:30	Consolidation finding, inputs, recommendations for draft report
10:30 - onwards	Departure of Mission members