

include printing and dissemination) is a valid humanitarian activity, and can be particularly useful in emergency and preparedness stages. There are often resources available at global and regional levels to promote and implement these guidelines. GBV coordinators and their members should reach out to REGAs, the global level GPC and GBV AoR and agency headquarters for support. Some examples of support include: reviewing of strategic documents to ensure inclusion of the appropriate standards; conducting assessments of training needs on particular guidelines; and supporting short-term in-country trainings on particular resources.

## 3.5 Core function #4: Ensuring monitoring and evaluation

**Monitoring** refers to systematic data collection on specific indicators, used to measure the progress made against an objective. **Evaluation** refers to assessing ongoing or completed projects, programmes or policies. Evaluation looks at the design, implementation and results and determines whether these are relevant, effective and sustainable.

### Monitoring of the Humanitarian Response Plan

Monitoring of the HRP looks at measuring the progress made against the objectives (and its accompanying indicators and targets). This type of monitoring also involves tracking the costs and funding available for implementation of the strategic objectives and activities. OCHA may initiate and support this type of monitoring and can conduct “spot check” visits to GBV projects that are funded through the humanitarian pooled mechanisms.

To measure the progress made against set indicators and targets, 3/4/5Ws monitoring is often used. By regularly collecting data on the response through this and other tools, the sub-cluster can analyse whether people in need are receiving services. (See Section 3.2 on the spreadsheet matrix about who, what, where, when and to whom.)

To effectively support monitoring and evaluation of the humanitarian response, the GBV sub-cluster’s leadership needs to regularly check-in with its members to determine how it can improve the process (including 3/4/5Ws reporting). The sub-cluster should make particular efforts to support local partner participation in monitoring and evaluation, which may mean providing opportunities to attend training sessions on the 3/4/5Ws matrix and HRP reporting requirements (sometimes sponsored by OCHA). These efforts may also include advocating for skill-building or funding for equipment to support use of technologies to assist in monitoring and reporting. Where feasible, it is recommended that the GBV coordinator and/or IMO visit partners at their offices, particularly if they regularly miss reporting deadlines. GBV sub-clusters may consider creating a system of onsite check-ins or peer-to-peer mentoring to support partners in their efforts to meet the reporting and accountability demands of the monitoring and evaluation process.

Reports on the outcomes of monitoring and evaluation processes will be shared with the GBV coordinator(s) and Protection Cluster Coordinator(s), who will have opportunities to comment and analyse the results as part of a mid-term review of the HRP. This is useful for identifying problematic areas of response or planning that need revision, supporting project implementation and funding appeals.

### Response monitoring and evaluation

The GBV sub-cluster may evaluate its strategic work in humanitarian response in other ways, to look at broader aspects of the response that are not constrained by the HRP annual timeline, indicators and limited set of partners. Such an exercise does not have to be elaborate: it can be as simple as reviewing the work plan table or GBV Sub-Cluster Strategy and its indicators together on

a quarterly basis in a coordination meeting. This review can be followed up with a one-page report and recommendations that partners review and endorse when it is finalized. Another option is a more robust process led by the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) for the GBV sub-cluster on an annual or mid-term basis, with the GBV Coordination Team (GBV coordinator, IMO, etc.) or lead agency supporting as secretariat. This process is self-initiated by the GBV sub-cluster.

**Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring**

Specific monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are used for assessing the “coordination” aspects of a humanitarian response (as opposed to the overall services delivered as part of the humanitarian response). Monitoring and evaluation of the GBV sub-cluster’s performance may be done through Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM), which is a self-assessment. Humanitarian leadership initiates this process.

In the CCPM, the cluster evaluates itself on the six core cluster functions discussed in this chapter (see the checklist at the beginning of Part Two) and the additional criteria of “accountability to affected people”. This exercise may occur simultaneously across all the clusters, or can be initiated by demand for a specific cluster. The process is constructive, leading to identification of a cluster’s strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement. It is led at the country level but can be supported by global clusters/AoRs. All members of the coordination group have an opportunity to answer a survey on how they participate in the execution of the six core functions and how they utilize the outcomes of the work (the related deliverables for each function).

The CCPM may become part of a larger review of the humanitarian architecture to determine if it is appropriate for its context, and if the current configuration of clusters is required. These reviews are related to changes in the humanitarian context and can assist in cluster transitioning or de-activation.

**Extract of a Cluster Coordination Preliminary Performance Response**

| <b>Supporting service delivery</b>  |                |
|---|----------------|
| 1.1 Provide a platform to ensure that service delivery is driven by the agreed strategic priorities     | Good           |
| 1.2 Develop mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery                                     | Unsatisfactory |
| <b>Informing strategic decision-making of the HC/HCT for the humanitarian response</b>                  |                |
| 2.1 Needs assessment and gap analysis (across other sectors and within the sector)                      | Satisfactory   |
| 2.2 Analysis to identify and address (emerging) gaps, obstacles, duplication, and cross-cutting issues. | Weak           |
| 2.3 Prioritization, grounded in response analysis   | Satisfactory   |

This table, as well as more detailed information about the CCPM process, is available in the *IASC Reference Module for Cluster Coordination at Country Level* (IASC 2015).

The test of the strength of a GBV sub-cluster is its ability to make changes based on the learning from these various monitoring and evaluation processes. Make monitoring and evaluation reports available to the GBV sub-cluster members, and discuss in meetings to identify follow-up actions. Overall, these are processes to improve the quality of coordination and response to beneficiaries.