

South Sudan Country Cluster Performance Monitoring (CCPM) survey 2019 conducted: February – March 2020

In total 132 FSLC members responded to the gFSC survey: 40 INGOs and 81 NNGOs; 72% were members of the national FSL cluster and 28% were members of a sub national cluster; the survey was open to all operational NGO (42 INGO & 117 NNGO) partners + UN (11) + Red Cross (1) + Donors (10) + National Authority (1) in total 182 partners with a response rate then of 73%.

| Organisation | Total | % | Cluster type | Total | % | Summary results | |
|--------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|--|---------------------|
| INGO | 40 | 30 | | | | Function 1: service delivery | Good |
| NNGO | 81 | 61 | National | 95 | 72 | Function 2: strategic decisions | Satisfactory |
| UN | 9 | 7 | sub National | 37 | 28 | Function 3: implement strategies | Satisfactory |
| Red Cross | 1 | 1 | | | | Function 4: M&E | Satisfactory |
| National Authority | 0 | 0 | | | | Function 5: Preparedness capacity | Good |
| Donor | 1 | 1 | | | | Function 6: Advocacy | Good |
| Other | 0 | 0 | | | | Function 7: AAP | Satisfactory |
| TOTAL | 132 | 100% | | 132 | 100% | Overall score (DFID target 75%) | M&E Unit |

Legend for CCPM report:

| |
|----------------|
| Good |
| Satisfactory |
| Unsatisfactory |
| Weak |

Annex 1 shows the disaggregated results for ALL the questions asked in the CCPM survey

Annex 2 shows: **follow up improvement plan priorities (TBC)**;

1. Supporting service delivery

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Supporting service delivery | | Good | |
| 1.1 Providing a platform that ensures service delivery is driven by Humanitarian Response Plan and strategic priorities | Q2.1: How do you rate your satisfaction with the cluster meetings with regards to frequency, location, language, information shared, participants, strategic priorities, time for partner updates, sharing minutes, overall satisfaction? | Satisfactory | All scores strong & satisfactory: Frequency (94%); location accessibility (95%); Language (99%); Utility of information shared (95%); strategic priorities (87%); time for partner updates (84%); sharing minutes (93%); overall satisfaction: (89%) |
| 1.2 Developing mechanisms to eliminate duplication of service delivery | Q2.2: How would you rate the 'Who does What Where When' (4/5W) database established by the Cluster? Q2.3: How would you rate these FSC products? | Good | 88% – 70% respondents scored satisfactory (the top category permissible) for the 5W database used by the cluster. 5W is the basis for developing the operational presence maps: for humanitarian actors, resilience actors and donors; and the quarterly HRP monitoring & reporting through OCHA. The EU in 2019 adopted the cluster 5W tool in the establishment of their own CIIS (Community Intervention Information System) partner monitoring & reporting tool. 87% - 64% respondents scored satisfactory (the top category permissible) for the monthly dash board, presence maps, gap analysis, bulletin, 5W dataset, Meeting minutes & overall satisfaction of the cluster products (85%); 64% scored satisfactory for Interactive dashboard but in fact we are designing one but do not have one currently. |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster **supports service delivery**:

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting meeting, rapid assessment and information sharing; • IPC reports & updates; we as national organization operating in NBEG, Aweil we thanks food security cluster for update; the cluster supports services delivery is good I have no complaint about it; continue with that spirit; • effective in notifying partners about opportunities that emerge; • The FSC is really plays a great role in South Sudan crisis, it updates all humanitarian agencies with the information as well agencies also provid the information to cluster through cluster meetings; • Through the TWGs; • The cluster is always willing to welcome bilateral information sharing; helpful in solving challenges; simplifying access to information; • Cluster has been regular in support of timely schedule meetings, updating partners on HRP yearly transitioning applications. Informing the partners on life saving criteria and objectives, as well as about humanity, impartiality, independence and neutrality • Yes the cluster encourages partners' participation whenever possible and as long as it depends on them. The cluster also shares a lot of products including assessment reports, minutes, updates, bulletins etc. on the website open to the public. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support services should consider more of national NGOs than now majority INGOs; Lack of supporting national Organization is very high; My suggestion is that FSL cluster should collect the view of cluster member at the time of developing tools such as 5W reports. • The FSL Cluster should have clear on what who does what, where and when to avoid duplication reference particular to Torit county you may find that two or three partners are working in one Boma of the same Payam, which needs to be corrected. • The cluster should kindly find out those partners that have capacity to implement FSL projects but lack donor support and link or recommend them to the trusted donors. The IPC has shown that many places in Upper Nile and Equatoria fall under IPC 3 and 4. It need the urgent humanitarian assistance. • The 5Ws information needs to be shared regularly with partners. We send reports but have not seen the end product. The cluster should facilitate meeting between partners to address issues of gap and overlaps in a timely manner • Cluster need more improvement especially at States particularly on minutes sharing and updates. • Allegation of bribery by FSL cluster supporting other NNGOs; • Confusion around 5W reporting re: seasonal v monthly reporting and that NGOs are penalized if they don't report monthly; • Lack of funding challenge • More attention need to be given to monitoring and field visit. |

2. Strategic Decisions informing HC and HCT:

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|---|--|---------------------|---|
| Strategic Decisions informing HC and HCT | | Satisfactory | |
| 2.1 Preparing needs assessments and analysis of gaps (across and within Clusters, using information management tools as needed) to inform the setting of priorities | <p>Q3.1: To the best of your knowledge, has the Cluster coordinated or supported in conducting any sectoral or inter-sectoral needs assessments and surveys (including rapid needs assessments during</p> <p>Q3.2: How would you rate the process of involving the members?</p> <p>Q3.3: How often do you receive assessments and analysis from other partners through the cluster?</p> | Satisfactory | <p>-80% respondents answered yes;</p> <p>This is part of our role as ICCG & NAWG member;</p> <p>-74% of respondents answered satisfied</p> <p>-50% of respondents answered sometimes</p> |
| 2.2 Identifying and finding solutions; gaps, obstacles, duplication, cross-cutting | <p>Q3.4: Does the cluster conducts regular emergency/contingency plans, gap/duplication analysis?</p> <p>Q3.5: To the best of your knowledge, has your Cluster addressed any of these crosscutting issues at different levels, including needs analysis HNO, response plan HRP, capacity building, guidance notes/policies</p> | Satisfactory | <p>-55% state yes;</p> <p>-Mainly 'mostly addressed' for: age, diversity, human rights, protection, environmental change & disability;</p> <p>-Gender 'fully addressed' (42%)</p> <p>-HIVAIDS only partially addressed as was the case also for 2018!</p> |
| 2.3 Formulating priorities on the basis of analysis | Q3.6 To the best of your knowledge, is the Cluster's response priorities based on specific analyses (of risks, needs, gaps, etc., and taking into consideration relevant crosscutting issues). | Satisfactory | <p>-51% of respondents stated 'mostly';</p> <p>-More than 80% of the response is based on planned IPC severity derived from the analysis. A greatly improved re-prioritization system was introduced in 2018 & operating in 2019, lead by an FSLC partner REACH and the FSLC resulting (1) in the fortnightly NAWG prioritization; and (2) following the four-famine clusters' minimum package integration workshop (Nutrition, Health, WASH & FSL) with significant input from REACH an Integrated Needs Tracking (INT) system (interactive map which became available in 2019) was developed to act as an Early Warning system;</p> |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster **informs decisions of the HC/ HCT:**

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparedness for emergency needs assessments in terms of resources and logistics • Yes, the cluster encourages partners' participation whenever possible and as long as it depends on them. The cluster also shares a lot of products including assessment reports, minutes, updates, bulletins etc. on the website open to the public. • Through cluster meeting and e-mail communication. • The HC/HCT are informed through their mail contacts across the operational areas. • This is done satisfactory through coordination meetings by involving FSL Partners. • Through cluster priorities and guidelines. • Through IPC reports. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of all partner in to decision plan. • The cluster needs to inform the rest of the members on assessment reports and fully involve member during assessment and after • There is no good focus on disability • There is need for cluster to involve all partners including those who may not afford to contribute financially to IPC/ HNO assessment even if they are willing to get involve those rapid need assessment works. • The Cluster need to share more information from HC/HCT • Cluster relies on 5Ws submitted at National level to assess gaps in service delivery. Information provided through 5Ws especially by National NGOs is rarely accurate. Cluster should strengthen monitoring mechanisms, deploy teams to various locations to verify information provided at National level • Conducting joint assessments on pressing humanitarian situations at sub-national FSL cluster level should be encourage as it can informs the decision making of HC/HCT. • Things like emergency contingency plan have never being read out in the cluster meeting. Hence this need more improvement (FSLC agrees). • National organizations should be trained more and considered doing assessment as these will continue building their capacities. • The rights of persons with disabilities are not yet considered during assessment and programs implementation they should also be included during assessment but also during distribution and service delivery • cluster is using gender only as white wash why not considering women organization in FSL, Education, GBV and other projects • why the project evaluators are not giving priorities to women led organizations the cluster decisions of the HC/HCT need to be adjusted • Cluster at the sub-national is poor coordinated and interest based where substantive issues are not being considered well • Need for more robust measures for Environmental protection/ climate change. |

3. Planning and implementing Cluster strategies

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|--|---|---------------------|---|
| Planning and implementing Cluster strategies | | Satisfactory | |
| 3.1 Developing sectoral plans, objectives and indicators that directly support realization of the overall response's strategic objectives (e.g. of an HRP) | <p>Q4.1: To the best of your knowledge, is the Cluster's response priorities based on specific analyses (of risks, needs, gaps, etc., and taking into consideration relevant crosscutting issues)?</p> <p>Q4.2: Response plan guide your organization's activities</p> <p>Q4.3: Did your organization contribute to the Cluster's response plan?</p> <p>Q4.4: To the best of your knowledge, has the food security section of the response plan been inclusive?</p> | Satisfactory | <p>-85% respondents stated yes</p> <p>-40% 'fully agree' but 54% stated 'mostly' or 'partly';</p> <p>-42% 'very much' but 51% 'quite a lot' and 'very little';</p> <p>-40% 'very much' but 51% 'quite a lot' and 'very little'</p> |
| 3.2 Applying and adhering to common standards and guidelines | Q4.5: To the best of your knowledge, does the Cluster have common standards and guidelines (ex: unit costing, minimum distribution standards for food, crop and livestock, assistance modality identification, etc.)? | Satisfactory | -42% 'fully' but 54% 'quite a lot' and 'very little'; |
| 3.3 Clarifying funding requirements, helping to set priorities, and agreeing Cluster contributions to the HC's overall humanitarian funding proposals | Q4.6: To the best of your knowledge, did the Cluster adopt an informed, clear criteria and transparent processes for selecting projects to be considered for the HC's overall funding plan? | Satisfactory | -55% state yes; |

Comments from respondents on **planning & strategy development**:

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is well done • The cluster has been calling out for partners to support in the selection of the SAG members is very important to avoid biasness which is a good practice • There is Transparency in project awards • Taking part in cluster meeting has added much to our capacity in the FSL. • Actually, planning and strategy development within the FSL cluster is done on time. • The cluster has been so supportive in terms of planning and strategy development. • The cluster outlines its yearly strategy and share with members ahead of time. • The clusters approach has been fairly inclusive/ transparent • The cluster have its objectives and shares it with all of us. • The cluster have the SAG that represents all NGOs in terms of decision. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is not well thought of in terms of agriculture seasons here in South Sudan. Especially of this SA1 allocation 2020. • There was Bias in selecting partners to be eligible for SSHF SA1 • The cluster should definitely improve in funding and planning mostly and development of gaps recognition as well • Inclusivity is very important while making planning and strategy development and this inclusivity must capture the ten states, gender, people with disabilities, religion and political differences • Cluster should ensure planning and strategy development considers both immediate, medium and long term interventions in food security and Livelihoods • There is still more need for more transparency and strategic plans in this field. • The current INGO and NGO co coordinators need capacity building on the process. The FSL cluster Coordinator is the only one who has sufficient capacity; • Strategic review process to some extend exhibits biasness. organizations with representatives in the review teams or organizations who have close association with representatives in the review teams always have a higher possibility of having their projects selected for funding which in itself is a bias. • The county sub-national FSL cluster has not yet grown to that level, guidance from the national FSL cluster are needed in order to contribute in planning and strategy development. • No effective consultations with sub-national partners regarding the strategy development processes. • There should be FSL policies formulated. |

4. Monitoring and evaluation performance

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Monitoring and evaluation performance | | Satisfactory | |
| 4.1 Monitoring and reporting on activities and needs | Q5.1: Is information on needs and activities shared by your organization to the Cluster reflected in Cluster's Information products (bulletins, dashboards, gap analysis)? | Satisfactory | -37% fully; but 65% 'quite a lot' and 'a little' The 5W monitoring and reporting system was established by the gFSC and adapted to meet the needs and context on the ground; regular training is provided always at the beginning of each new year; occasionally at cluster meetings if changes have been made; and on an ad hoc one to one basis especially for new NNGO members (many new members however do not report); |
| 4.2 Measuring progress against the Cluster strategy and agreed results | Q5.2: Have Cluster information products and updates influenced your organisation's decisions? | Good | -55% very regularly; Each month the IM team deliver: two dash boards (one for food assistance and one for livelihood support) plus two corresponding gap analyses; and one cash dash board; every quarter county level partner presence maps are produced; periodically a resilience dash board and donor presence maps are produced. Bulletins are not produced monthly (7 were produced in 2019). |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster has **monitored and reported its strategy & results:**

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cluster has monitored progress through the 5W and the end of the project narrative reports. Through sharing the reports or assessment. Through clusters meeting where updates on mission findings, best practices and major events is shared with us. Regular updates on the different operations carried by partners. Though dashboard, presence Map has greatly helped the monitoring of the cluster strategy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the cluster should consider building capacities of its implementing partners in monitoring and evaluation because it's the part where most of the partners perform poorly The cluster should get involved in joint monitoring of activities rather than depending only on 5Ws which at a times does not give accurate information. Cluster has done its work and shared with partners mainly with focal persons but should stress needs to extend such knowledge to entire staff in their institution department of food security Remote monitoring not okay, cluster need to pay visit to the field regularly |

5. Building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|--|--|---------------------|--|
| Building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning | | Good | |
| 5.1 National contingency plans identified, updated and shared | Q6.1: To the best of your knowledge, an updated national contingency plan exists that addresses hazards and risks? | Satisfactory | 42% yes but 30% 'to some extent' 9% No and 18% Don't know; There is no national contingency plan; contingency plans are developed by the State level ICWG partners; In Central Equatoria there is the Juba CP around the influx of IDPs (reaction to the July 2016 crisis); it is reviewed annually involving WFP/ WV/ CW (for POC1 & 3) and WFP/ WV/ SAADO/ MaCDA/ CARITAS/ AFOD (for 15 collective centers). Multiple FSLC partners are involved at State level but only 7 here in Juba; |
| 5.2 Cluster roles and responsibilities defined and understood | Q6.2: To the best of your knowledge, has the Cluster discussed what partners might do to strengthen the response capacity in country? | Good | 73% Yes; This has not been discussed at the national cluster except with the 7 members who do have roles clearly specified in the Juba influx of IDPs CP. We have done a lot on the cluster role & responsibilities in general but not on contingency planning: this is at the heart of the role/ function of the FSLC: encouraging coordination/ dissemination of information/ assessing needs/ developing strategies based on needs including the HRP & bi annual SSHF allocations/ supporting capacity building, standards, quality (including AAP/ GBV prevention) & advocacy. |
| 5.3 Early warning reports shared with partners | Q6.3: To the best of your knowledge, has your Cluster shared and discussed early warning reports? | Good | 70% Yes; FSLC three times per year presents the IPC key messages and projections/ assumptions that forecast an outlook; between IPC we invite FEWSNET to give food security outlooks; since 2018 the Needs Analysis Working Group meets fortnightly to identify locations for response prioritization; this is presented at the cluster and disseminated to the full mailing list (with detailed location specific maps etc.); less frequently WFP/ VAM and NBS produce a six monthly EW bulletin which is disseminated and has been presented in 2017 & 2018 at the national meetings. Note that all products disseminated also go to the state and county level cluster partners (to all members not just the focal persons) but not everyone has access to internet. |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster is **building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning**:

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cluster provides Training to the partners. • Sharing of information as early warning. Like for Ebola virus, fall army worm and COVID-19 as well as the desert locust. “We got the information before it invasion in South Sudan that is why attending cluster meeting is very important for us and the whole community in south Sudan.” • The FSL cluster is doing its best to see into it that building national capacity in preparedness and contingency planning is being implemented. • The cluster has been in support of national capacity building by developing disease surveillance system and reporting to reduce livestock disease outbreak • The cluster is doing a good job | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cluster Advocacy and Building the Capacity of National NGO to Reach Down to the People in need of Humanitarian Assistant and Development. • Request for more training to the new entrant NNGO are requested from cluster. • Cluster should improve in gathering and sharing of early warning information in major and common events of disasters in the country. • Capacity building should be considered for national staff as future preparation to safe-guide this country. • There is need to include the local communities in information sharing to improve their response to for example climate change (floods/drought) • Need to share national contingency plan with other stakeholders • The cluster need to support building national capacity in preparedness • IRNA coordination and staff capacity building especially of NNGOs. • Cluster should build the capacity of nationals by information for funding they put lot of conditions you should be member of NGOFORUM without funding how can you pay 50 dollar every year if you are not in NGOFORM you will not get most of the information and your organization will not be selected for funding Now My organization is 4 years cluster is not recommending and active member attending meeting. • The food security cluster partners should strengthened their network with other cluster partners to have collective ideas during the planning process |

6. Advocacy

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|---|---|--------------------|--|
| Advocacy | | Good | |
| 6.1 Identify concerns, and contributing key information and messages to HC and HCT messaging and action | Q7.1: Have issues requiring advocacy messages been discussed during Cluster meetings? | Good | -66% Yes; IPC and food security; plus integration; |
| 6.2 Undertaking advocacy on behalf of Cluster, Cluster members and affected people | Q7.2: Have advocacy activities been undertaken on behalf of the Cluster and its members and affected people in different forums? | Good | -54% yes; Value in the smaller top 20 INGO and NNGO meetings; |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster is working on **advocacy activities**

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clusters members are responsible for raising concerns of the communities at the high level which is well done by the cluster through IPC and the different assessments. Sub-national FSL cluster has been conducting advocacy on pests and diseases control and prevention methods to farmers introducing the new thing means advocating for the new item or risk to come avoiding duplication of work & cross cutting issue had been discussed in cluster meeting The cluster is doing well in advocacy. The cluster shares assessments and gaps and listen to partners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time for meetings is limited need adjustments It need more efforts to be put on advocacy, Advocacy for and by the cluster is still very weak and needs to be strengthened. This can be done by cluster allowing members contribute ideas on how this can be done. And involvement of the real target. By sharing the complains/information's collected from the communities during partners visit to the field More forums are needed for advocacy Development of advocacy policies |

7. Accountability to affected people

| Core Functions | Questions | Performance status | Performance status Constraints: unexpected circumstances and/or success factors and/or good practice identified |
|--|---|---------------------|--|
| Accountability to affected people | | Satisfactory | |
| 7.1 Mechanisms to consult and involve affected people in decision-making agreed upon and used by partners | Q8.1: To the best of your knowledge, have the cluster and its partners discussed and implemented mechanisms to consult and involve affected people in decision-making? | Good | -76% stated yes; Each year this has been presented by guest speakers at the FSLC meeting and will again in 2019; Moving beyond complaints and considering greater feedback in general the importance of participation (types of participation) has been discussed. Since late 2017 the resilience agenda has been discussed amongst FSL actors and donors; the importance of community engagement has been regularly discussed especially around the design of more resilience oriented projects requiring considerably greater contextual/ conflict sensitive understanding of risks and vulnerabilities, inequalities (service delivery, gender, marginalized social groups etc.) and community / household assets of different social groups and ways to increase the return on those limited assets. |
| 7.2 Mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance received agreed upon and used by partners | Q8.2: To the best of your knowledge, have the cluster and its partners discussed and implemented mechanisms to receive, investigate and act upon complaints on the assistance? | Satisfactory | -42% respondents stated fairly often and 8% rarely with 39% very regularly Especially in terms of food insecurity (IPC phase 3, 4 & 5 households); Issues specific to CRMs has largely come from the WFP and FAO monitoring systems; and from other cluster partner presentations e.g. on rationale and benefits of fuel-efficient stoves and their experiences of incorporating GBV and gender equality into FSL programming. |
| 7.3 Key issues relating to protection from sexual exploitation and abuse have been raised and discussed | Q8.3: Has your Cluster discussed with partners the key issues raised by affected people? | Satisfactory | -49% stated fairly often and rarely; with 44% very regularly Issues around gender/ gender inequality (GBV and PSEA) have been discussed through the development in 2018 of a GBV action plan in collaboration with the GBV sub cluster; one FSLC meeting was dedicated solely to the topic of PSEA. |

Comments from respondents on how the cluster is working on **accountability to affected people**

| Positive/ appreciation | Negative/ critical |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cluster have held sessions on AAP. “AAP is at the heart of all FSL interventions. The cluster has really invested in partners being informed and understanding our role here. We have had sessions dedicated to this in the cluster meeting. They also share with us material on this. No proposal goes through unless the partner is able to clearly show how they are going to undertake the cross-cutting issues including AAP.” • Regular trainings • Accountability is well done at the cluster | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues concerning accountability to affected populations have largely been seen to be a concern of the protection cluster. To some extent, accountability to affected population is left to individual implementing agencies. The cluster needs to pay a keen interest on this matter • Presentations on PSEA should be done in every monthly sub-national FSL cluster meeting. • Towards the end of 2019 the issue of accountability to the affected people became clearly but previously it was low towards the end of 2019. • More training in is needed APP • Feedback system need to be enforced; The need to integrate more the complaint feedback mechanisms; Cluster projects should include accountability to affected populations; Always the information is one way with no feedback; • There is need to share Shared Accountability to Affected People (AAP) guideline with cluster members |