

FOOD SECURITY & LIVELIHOOD CLUSTER

DATE	14 March, 2018
TIME	10:00
VENUE	Kyiv – Esplanadna 20, 3 rd Floor Conference Room (WFP Office)

AGENDA

1. Taking stock – FSLC Activities 2017
2. Coordination Tools
3. 2018 Projections of Cluster Partner Activities
4. 2018 Needs & Response – Food Security
5. Cluster Coordination 2018 – Update
6. AOB
 - *Update on FAO Studies / Reports*
 - *District Focal Points*
 - *Common Rapid Assessment Tool - Update*
 - *Mine Action*
 - *HDN Workshop 26-27 March (HCT and CCs)*
 - *FSLC presentation on 29 March.*

MINUTES

Cluster coordinator (CC) Line Rindebaek welcomed participants followed by a round the table introductions. CC explained the meeting's focus on stocktaking of 2017 activity trends, reminding partners on the available coordination tools, consulting partners on the key sector needs/issues and updating partners on the potential changes in the coordination structure in 2018. The group was informed that FSLC IMO, Anton Tovchenko will leave the cluster in end of March and CC will leave in end April.

1. Taking Stock – Cluster Activities and Achievements 2017

Cluster Information Management Officer (IMO) Anton Tovchenko provided an overview of partner activities and trends in Donbas as well as outside of the region for the whole of 2017 (and with a focus on the month of December).

For “access to food interventions” (HRP-2017 objective 1) in December, in-kind food and food vouchers/cash was provided to around 94,000 beneficiaries in **Donetsk and Luhansk GCA and NGCA**, and nearly 8,000 beneficiaries in other regions of Ukraine. In Donetsk region, there were eleven active partners who reached nearly 78,00 beneficiaries. In GCA Donetsk, the assistance was provided through food parcels and vouchers to 40,150 beneficiaries, while on the NGCA side 38,321 beneficiaries were assisted with in-kind food. In Luhansk region, there were nine active partners which reached nearly 15,464 in GCA and 386 beneficiaries in NGCA.

IMO provided a statistical overview of food assistance in 2017. A graph highlighting the monthly number of beneficiaries assisted with access to food interventions was shared. It was noted that between February-March 2017, food assistance overall declined by 89% in Donbas, reflecting a significant reduction in (non-HRP partner) food distributions in the NGCA. Going from around 500,000 beneficiaries in early 2017, between March-December, an average of 67,900 beneficiaries monthly across Donbas received some type of food assistance – in NGCA alone, the monthly average was only 24,200.

Partners mostly assisted females with 69% compare to 31% of males. Elderly people was the main group of assistance with 58% compare to 26% adults and 16% children. The statistics on assistance of sex and age disaggregation fits very well to cluster vulnerability criteria.

A list with the top 10 settlements in each of Donetsk GCA and NGCA and Luhanska GCA and NGCA was shared – the list highlights those settlements where most were assisted such as Donetsk, Makiivka, Horlivka, Luhansk in NGCA and Avdiivka, Toretsk, Mariupol, Stanytsia Luhanska, Shchastia in GCA.

For the agricultural inputs, (HRP-2017 objective 2), which include seeds and seedlings, fodder, other livestock, basic agricultural tools, and other agricultural inputs (through voucher or cash), livelihoods agricultural grants and which supports households with food production for sustainable results and food for assets activities, it was noted that for the period January – December 2017, some 36,000 HHs were provided with assistance by nine partners, two of them were active in December. Most of the assistance was provided in the area close to GCA contact line.

A statistical overview of monthly agricultural assistance in 2017 was presented. The biggest amount of assistance was provided in the spring and autumn, which fits well to the agricultural cropping season. In Donetsk GCA region, assistance was provided to some 23,000 HH while in Luhansk GCA to 12,900 HH. Verkhnotoretske, Luhanske, Stepne were one of the villages with the biggest assistance.

For the livelihood income generating activities (HRP-2017 objective 3), the IMO presented an overview of the number of households receiving different kinds of employment trainings, business grants, cash for work and other assistance for sustainable livelihoods. Activities were undertaken in almost all regions of Ukraine, mainly in oblast city centres.

For the period January – December 2017, fifteen partners assisted a total of 28,340 HHs with different income generation activities. From this number, nearly 9,900 HHs were assisted in Luhanska GCA, 9,760 HHs in Donetsk GCA and 8,660 IDPs and host communities HHs were assisted with different income generation activities in other regions of Ukraine. Urban cities such as Kramatorsk, Severodonetsk, Popasna. Lysichansk were assisted the most.

Please find the **activity overview** including maps of partner presence for each objective and the statistical overviews of the three objectives for the whole of 2017 in the PowerPoint presentation: <http://fscluster.org/ukraine/document/severodonetsk-meeting-presentation-2017>

2. Coordination Tools

Cluster IMO reminded partners of the IM coordination tools that was developed in December 2017 (partners were strongly encourage to use these tools for their planning and to aid their bilateral coordination efforts):

FOOD & AGRICULTURE Coordination Tool for the PLANS on access to food and agricultural emergency activities in the area for of 5km near the contact line

- Sheet 1: Geographical overview of partners plans for the access to food and agricultural (objective 1 and 2) activities for the 5 km area near the contact line on the settlement level.
- Sheet 2: Geographical overview of partners plans for the access to food and agricultural (objective 1 and 2) activities at raion level for all Luhansk and Donetsk oblast.
- Sheet 3: Overview of Activities per Partner & Contact list

Please find the most updated tool here:

[https://www.dropbox.com/s/qgyk1c75ux5opk4/Coordination tool 5km Raion PLANS F.XLSX?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/qgyk1c75ux5opk4/Coordination%20tool%205km%20Raion%20PLANS%20F.XLSX?dl=0)

It was commented from the group that it would be helpful if ICRC locations/activities, a major FSL assistance provider funded outside of HRP, was reflected in the tool. CC clarified that though FSLC does not include such activities in partner activity overviews, as is standard given ICRC's observer status, the cluster has aided bilateral coordination between ICRC and partners in areas with known overlaps in 2017 based on activity overviews shared by ICRC with FSLC partners. CC noted the cluster team is hoping ICRC

will share overviews of locations assisted, as was done previously, to aid further bilateral coordination in 2018.

LIVELHOODS Livelihood Coordination Tool

- Sheet 1: Geographical overview of partners doing (objective 2 and 3) livelihood grants/activities by rayon (Luhanska and Donetska GCA Oblast)
- Sheet 2: Geographical overview of partners doing (objective 2 and 3) livelihood grants/activities by rayon (Rest of Ukraine)
- Sheet 3: Overview of future plans
- Sheet 4: Overview of Activities per Partner & Contact list.

Please find the most updated tool here:

https://www.dropbox.com/s/0eaqmaxfh59bm4u/FSLC_Livelihoods_Coordination%20Tool_November%202017_Final.xlsx?dl=0

ACTION POINTS: FSLC team will update the tools before IMO leaves by end of March

3. Projections of Cluster Partner Activities

FSLC team has prepared an analysis of critical needs for both partners (in terms of activity levels) and for coordination in 2018 to assist Cluster Leads FAO and WFP in their decision making on the future cluster structure. This analysis includes an overview of activities projected to take place in 2018 (based on confirmed or expected funding). The overview was compiled based bilateral conversations with all partners during February. Below is the overview presented:

Objective	Number of Partners with projected funding (HRP & Non-HRP)	HRP Targets - number of beneficiaries	Based on current funding projections: actual # of beneficiaries:	Main Activities	Area
Objective 1 Food Assistance	11 organizations → RAF, PIN, Caritas, NRC, CWBF, Vostok-SOS, Emmanuel, Save Ukraine, ASB/ACTED, PAH	143,330 (GCA: 81,690 and NGCA: 61,640)	45,500	Food in kind, vouchers/cash	Mainly GCA contact line with some minor activities outside of Donbas. Less than 4000 bens. in NGCA.
Objective 2 Agricultural inputs	7 organizations → NRC, FAO, Caritas, Dorcas, Emmanuel, PIN, IFRC	86,370 (GCA: 48,010 And NGCA: 38,360)	20,800*3= 62,400	Seeds, fodder, livestock, and 800 grants	Mainly contact line (FAO) and rest of GCA (Donbas).
Objective 3 Livelihoods / income generation	7 organizations → DRC, IOM, NRC, Caritas, Save the Children, ADRA, IFRC	46,600 (GCA: 40,530 and NGCA: 6,070)	8,780 *3= 26,340	Trainings, grants, vocational trainings, cash for work, etc.	All over Ukraine, GCA Donbas not very close to contact line – mainly urban cities.
<i>Total</i>		<i>275,430</i>	<i>134,240</i>		

4. 2018 Needs & Response – Discussion on Needs, Gaps, Key Issues

Given the projected activities for 2018 based on actual or expected funding, which highlights the shortfalls, FSLC Team encouraged partners to share their thoughts and views on humanitarian needs, on

gaps / needs, key issues, key obstacles and potential ways forward in 2018 and beyond. *Partners provided the following inputs:*

ACTED noted that they use cluster tools to target beneficiaries and has completed a more general vulnerability assessment for MPC. This found that there was no major difference in vulnerability based on geography between 5 – 10 km etc. and highlighted the need for organisations to be mindful not to focus exclusively on the 5 km zone. New groups for vulnerability targeting were also identified: It was also found that the lowest incomes in the assessed areas were male headed HHs with no income and aged 50 or over. The average income was 50% below the average in the area (which already is 50% below the subsistence level) – the second lowest income was that of single mothers. ACTED noted that in terms of coping, the current list is not appropriate as some coping mechanisms have become normal after four years. ACTED will use focus group discussions to refine the coping strategies. It was noted that during recent phone assessments, people are distressed and in need of support – especially as with the end of winter stocks have been depleted. ACTED are receiving referrals from other partners (more than they can absorb). CC emphasised that FSLC does include HHs with no employment as a key vulnerability group as per the HNO 2018 but confirmed that this was a point also made by several partners during the field meetings with reference to “invisible groups”, which fall between the cracks and that one approach to avoid this suggested in the field, is to use the food consumption score as a targeting approach.

Ukrainian Charity "Turbota pro Litnih v Ukraini" noted that their target group is older people (70 plus) in the buffer zone and emphasised that older people remain whilst other groups leave the conflict affected areas. The number of old and immobile people is growing and this group is unable to use vouchers and seeds. Information was shared on a specific case where the chair of a citizen organisation of former nazi prisoners in Horlivka had written to the NGO with information that the situation was very serious for elderly people with some dying and hungry. In this case, the elderly cannot access pensions in GCA because they are unable to move. The NGO provided food to this category of people until 2016 after which it became impossible. At the moment the NGO has 20MT food which will be distributed to some 1100 in the buffer zone (GCA side). CC noted that NGO and FSLC have been coordinating with OSCE to visit the location. OSCE will follow up with ICRC in case of needs.

NRC confirmed the information shared by both ACTED on the vulnerability groups and from "Turbota pro Litnih v Ukraini" on the situation of many elderly people.

CRS noted they are shifting away from small grants and now have more focus on “case management style” or long term targeting of people that are difficult to employ (not only IDPs) e.g. single mothers and older people etc. A project targeting women in Kharkiv is currently testing this approach. In addition, Caritas is undertaking activities under a three years plan with longer term focus. When asked to explain the shift in focus, CRS noted that funding restrictions was one reason but they also found that within half a year, up to 30% of recipients had received business grants from other organisations. In addition, previously they provided job creation grants for IDPs as they were being discriminated against, however, this is now less of a problem.

ACTED informed the group that the ACCESS Consortium are undertaking quarterly market monitoring which was presented at the Cash Working Group. This shows that there are market gaps that could be addressed by private sector if they were nudged (e.g. coal, firewood, fertilizer). Working with the private sector in other parts of Ukraine with a focus on a cost share of risk could be a way forward in the long-term.

ACTION POINT: ACTED will share the Market monitoring PPT with FSLC with the purpose of circulating to the meeting group. FSLC partners not at the meeting can contact nataliya.chervinska@acted.org to receive a copy.

IOM noted that they intend to continue with their current project activities but maybe increasing the number of livelihoods. IOM is also considering introducing loan / business credit which could sustain itself for many years. They will undertake a feasibility study of the Ukrainian loan market (which will start in April). The group noted that the loan issue has been an issue in the East for a long time - even if available, the interest rate is so high. IOM encouraged the group to share experience and knowledge and confirmed that the study will be shared when ready. ACTED emphasised the legal obstacles for micro finance sector which means this is a challenging without strong government program

CRS flagged Western NIS Enterprise Fund (WNISEF) – which is a Chicago based company but with opposites in Ukraine with experience in investing in small and medium-sized companies. WNISEF was funded by the U.S. government via USAID. CRS recommended IOM to speak to them. FAO also stressed that it is important to go beyond humanitarians to access information – as for example EU is funding activities improving access to finance – and suggested to speak to the world bank etc. FAO recently undertook a study of Donbas (more development dimensions than humanitarian) and one of the key obstacles named by farmers is access to credit and their ability to use their assets as collateral given that the value of assets have changed in the East due to conflict.

5. Cluster Coordination 2018 – Update (Potential changes in FSLC structure)

CC explained that the current cluster structure planning period covers the period until end of April and that Cluster Leads (WFP/FAO) currently are discussing the discussing different scenarios and options going forward. A decision is likely to be taken at the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) meeting in early April. CC explained the potential approaches the Cluster Leads are likely to take although emphasising that the final option might be a combination of two options depending on the Cluster Leads/HCT:

One option is that the FSLC Team is not replaced / no dedicated coordination team once IMO and CC leaves (end of March and end of April respectively). In such a scenario very basic IM structures could be absorbed by existing structures although this is pending capacity.

A second option is that a "Light" FSLC structure is maintained, with for one combined Coordinator / Information Manager and with prioritisation of activities.

A third option is that a full FSLC structure is maintained with a new Coordinator and Information Management Officer.

FAO Cluster Lead noted that the projected activity overview confirms the needs for coordination structures and that partner inputs also confirm this. FAO (and WFP) are looking into different possibilities and confirmed that the final structure may be a combination of the scenarios.

ACTED noted that donors have indicated that they are not keen to fund coordination and that clusters would be best served not competing. Therefore, in the longer term, a “basic needs” coordination structure might be able to cover shelter / MPC / food assistance and combining sectors into in single coordination structure. CC noted that although this might be an option in the longer term, there are concerns attached to such an approach at the activity level of the FSLC partners in 2018 given the lack of technical expertise usually available within basic needs coordination mechanisms.

Priority Activities

FSLC already discussed the priority cluster activities with partners in the field, which was subsequently included in the FSLC Team analysis for the Cluster Leads of critical needs for the cluster and for partners. CC went through main overall activities currently undertaken by the FSLC team ([see below](#)). The group subsequently completed a questionnaire scoring each activity from 1 (low priority) to 5 (highest priority).

- | | |
|--|---|
| ■ Identifying common strategic priorities | <i>implementation of cluster strategy and results)</i> |
| ■ Information management, activity overviews and mapping / 4W? (<i>monitoring the</i> | ■ Coordination tools (<i>to avoid duplication / improve targeting</i>)? |

- Coordination – regular cluster meetings are organised
- Coordination - emergency response
- Coordination - referral case coordination
- Coordination - HRP processes
- (dashboards, facilitation of mid-year review and HRP planning process – including funding requirements, prioritisation etc.)
- Guidelines / Standards / Methodology (e.g. voucher value)
- Needs assessment and gap analysis (e.g. food security assessment report)
- Advocacy
- Coordination – Local authorities / MTOT

The results of the questionnaire show the following activities are prioritised (scored from 1-5, 5 being the highest priority) – top 5 will be referenced in the analysis:

Area	Kramatorsk	Severodonetsk	Kyiv	Final
Coordination tools (to avoid duplication / improve targeting)?	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.8
Information management, activity overviews and mapping / 4W? (monitoring the implementation of cluster strategy and results)	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4
Needs assessment and gap analysis (e.g. food security assessment report)	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.1
Coordination - emergency response and referral case coordination?	4.3	3.4	4.4	4.0
Guidelines / Standards / Methodology (e.g. voucher value)	3.8	3.8	4.3	4.0
Coordination – Local authorities / MTOT	4.2	3.8	3.8	3.9
Coordination – regular meetings are organised	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.8
Coordination - HRP processes	3.7	3.5	4.1	3.8
Identifying common strategic priorities	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.7
Advocacy	3.1	3.6	3.9	3.5

CC noted that in the field, as the FSLC team had anticipated, there had been a clear indication that partners prioritised the type of activities which directly assists partners in doing their jobs in terms of planning, targeting, coordinating etc.

Added after meeting: When analysing the inputs from Kyiv with those from the field, it is interesting to see that Kyiv prioritise “Guidelines / Standards / Methodology (e.g. voucher value)” whereas the field partners prioritise “Coordination with local authorities/ MTOT”. Below is the result without Kyiv inputs.

Area	Kramatorsk	Severodonetsk	Final
Coordination tools (to avoid duplication / improve targeting)?	4.8	5.0	4.9
Information management, activity overviews and mapping / 4W? (monitoring the implementation of cluster strategy and results)	4.2	4.5	4.4
Needs assessment and gap analysis (e.g. food security assessment report)	3.9	4.1	4.0
Coordination – Local authorities / MTOT	4.2	3.8	4.0
Coordination - emergency response and referral case coordination?	4.3	3.4	3.9
Guidelines / Standards / Methodology (e.g. voucher value)	3.8	3.8	3.8

Coordination – regular meetings are organised	3.7	3.7	3.7
Coordination - HRP processes	3.7	3.5	3.6
Identifying common strategic priorities	3.4	3.7	3.5
Advocacy	3.1	3.6	3.4

6. AOB

■ **Update on FAO Studies / Reports**

FAO reminded the group that Socioeconomic impact and needs assessment in Donetsk and Lugansk regions (2017) (<http://www.fao.org/3/a-i8171e.pdf>) is available and noted that FAO also will be ready to share the report “The Agriculture Sector in Eastern Ukraine: Analysis and Recommendations in near future.

■ **District Focal Points - Reminder: In case of Emergency / Flare Up / Field Coordination**

CC reminded the group that the cluster in December prepared a Guidance Note (<http://fscluster.org/ukraine/document/reference-overview-coordination-case>) in case of a sudden escalation of needs on the contact line. This flags the key steps in case of an escalation and provides a complete contact list of food assistance partners and local authorities.

CC noted that the online document will be updated in the coming month as FAO will replace WFP colleagues as the main district focal points once the WFP field offices close in end of March. CC raised concern that after this point, FSLC will have no focal points in NGCA and therefore limited information on needs etc. Partners are encouraged to take on the role as district focal point in NGCA – even if mainly for information sharing purposes to ensure the cluster receives important updates on needs etc.

ACTION POINT: CC to update and upload a District Focal Point overview. Partners in NGCA encouraged to contact FSLC team if interested.

■ **Common Rapid Assessment Tool – Update**

FSLC IMO updated the group on the ongoing exercise on the rapid assessment framework, undertaken by Inter Agency Working Group (under ICG/IMWG). The scope of the exercise is to define the framework, which will give indication of sector needs within the 72 hours after escalation/flare up/emergency.

■ **Mine Action**

On behalf of Protection Cluster, CC shared hard copies of an advocacy note on mine action, which stresses the cross cutting nature of the impact of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERWs) across all areas of people’s lives in eastern Ukraine. CC stressed that the direct impact on food security and livelihoods with land mines affecting the access to means of income generation, especially for **agriculture and farming**. The group was also informed of a **public event on 4 April in Kyiv** (International Mine Awareness Day) and CC encouraged partners to contribute by sharing photos and information material that can be used in the event. Contact: Anna Rich (rich@unhcr.org) and Martin Oubrecht (martin.oubrecht@undp.org).

The advocacy note is also available at humanitarianresponse.info website in [English](#), [Ukrainian](#) and [Russian](#).

■ **HDN Workshop 26-27 March**

CC informed the group that there will be a 2-day humanitarian-development nexus workshop with HCT members, donors and cluster teams. CC is hoping that FSLC will be able to bring one or two livelihoods partners due to their technical expertise.

■ **FSLC Presentation of Analysis → Save the Date:**

On Thursday 29 March, 14:30-16:30 at Esplanadna 20, 1st floor conference room, FSLC will provide a presentation on the Socio-Economic and Food Security Trend Analysis on the Protracted Conflict in Donbas. The analysis will be a combined update of the joint Food Security Assessment and the Socio-Economic Analysis (September 2017) with the main focus on food security trends since the beginning of the conflict and highlighting the main trends in macro economy indicators, labour force, business statistics, poverty, household income and expenditure, social protection indicators (including pensions).

■ **Information Management** – all partners are encouraged to contact Anton asap in case of any IM related questions.

■ **Next Meeting** – it is not certain when the next regular cluster meeting will be. Information will be shared through email.

PARTICIPANT LIST:

#	Name	Organization*	Designation
1.	Artem Dikhtiaruk	Adventist Development and Relief Agency	Program Director
2.	Sebastien Lambroschini	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development	Country Director
3.	Yulia Malich	Akhmetov Foundation for Development of Ukraine	External Communications Manager
4.	Kateryna Budz	Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund	ASB Emergency Aid Project Manager Ukraine
5.	Sean Griffin	Catholic Relief Service	Programme Manager
6.	Lesya Kuzmenko	Child Well-Being Fund	Project assistance
7.	Yana Voitovska	Food and Agriculture Organization	Information Management Officer
8.	Farrukh Toirov	Food and Agriculture Organization	Coordinator
9.	Line Rindebaek	FSLC	Cluster Coordinator
10.	Anton Tovchenko	FSLC	Information Management Officer
11.	Katheryna Filatova	Hungarian Interchurch Aid	Program Coordinator
12.	Roman Lyubchenko	International Organization for Migration	Emergency and Stabilization National Officer
13.	Sasa Marusic	NRC	Livelihood and Food Security PDM
14.	Khushnid Sattarov	Polish Humanitarian Action	Head of PAH Mission in Ukraine
15.	Kaththerine Henshow	REACH	Assessment Officer
16.	Igor Nebava	Save Ukraine	Project Coordinator
17.	Galina Poliakova	Ukrainian Charity "Turbota pro Litnih v Ukraini"	Executive Director
18.	Oleksandra Malukalo	World Food Programme	Programme Assistant
19.	Ganna Bryedova	World Food Programme	Communications Assistant

* Agencies listed in alphabetic order

FOOD SECURITY CLUSTER CONTACTS:

Line Teilmann Rindebaek
 Cluster Coordinator
Food Security and Livelihood Cluster
 Kyiv, Ukraine
 Mobile: +38 050 465 77 85
 Email: line.rindebaek@fscluster.org

Anton Tovchenko (until 30 March)
 Information Management Officer
Food Security and Livelihood Cluster
 Kyiv, Ukraine
 Mobile: +380 50 465 77 85
 Email: info.ukraine@fscluster.org