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Cluster aims & hierarchical objectives:

**Overall Goal**: FSL cluster contributes towards a timely, effective & well-coordinated humanitarian response within the inter cluster HRP during the current humanitarian crisis in South Sudan (US$ 1.7 billion)

**Specific objective**: to provide strategic guidance and direction for FSL cluster partners to respond in a coordinated & prioritized manner to address the severity & causes of food & livelihood insecurity in South Sudan (US$ 645 million or 43% HRP)
The FSL cluster

Seven core functions

1. Service delivery & coordination
2. Information Management
3. Needs assessment & IPC
4. Strategy, planning & appeals
5. Quality, standards & capacity building
6. Accountability to affected Persons
7. Advocacy

FSL Cluster Secretariat

The Team:
- Cluster coordinator (FAO/ WFP) x1
- INGO Co coordinator (World Vision) x1
- NNGO Co coordinator (RuCAPD) x1
- IMOs x2
- Food Security Assessment Officer x2
1. Service delivery & coordination for support to FSL service delivery

FSL cluster provides a platform to ensure service delivery is driven by agreed strategic priorities/mechanisms to avoid duplication

Key activities

- Weekly team meetings/ Monthly CLA meetings/ At least quarterly SAG meetings
- Weekly ICCG/NAWG meetings: engage on issues/ ensure partner prioritization reflected for optimal use of common services
- Fortnightly FSL cluster meetings – National
- Sub-national clusters – support missions
  - 13 WFP, 9 FAO sub-offices (FSL focal persons)
  - 8 OCHA state focal persons
  - 1 national cluster, 10 state sub-clusters
  - 14 county sub clusters/ 20 county focal persons
2. Reporting & Monitoring (information management)

Inform & support strategic decision making through data analysis to identify needs, response, gaps, duplications & reporting implementation of cluster strategy & results

Key activities

• Partner training on 5Ws
• Monthly reporting on 5Ws
• Product development: gap analysis/ partner presence maps/ dashboards/ bulletins/ information sharing/ capacity building to partners
• Regular communication flow with partners
• Product uptake survey with partners: mid & year end
• Review state/ county locations where targets over reached
• Website: https://fscluster.org/south-sudan-rep
3. Needs assessment & IPC

Data collection & analysis for emergency response and informing food security situation (IRNAs, FSNMS+ & partner assessments that contribute to response planning and both the IPC analysis & HNO).

Key activities

- Collation of needs assessment reports: input to IPC and Emergency response teams
- Participation in IRNA & other agency FSL assessment missions
- Support to FSNMS (capacity building & partner presence)
- IPC analysis
- Training on FS analysis & interpretation and IPC Level I in-country training;
- Training on the use of the IRNA tool (with FSAO trained 200 persons in 2021)
- Share collated reports with WFP & FAO sub offices & sub clusters
4. Strategy, planning & appeals

Cluster plans in line with HC/ HCT priorities/ Clarify funding requirements, prioritization & cluster contributions (HRP, SSHF, CERF etc.)/ Participation in cluster/ ICWG planning & preparedness

Key activities

- HRP planning: September IPC → HNO → HRP
- Famine & flood response strategies; SSHF strategies etc.
- South Sudan Humanitarian (Pool) Fund SA1 & SA2 for frontline & core pipeline + support partners with RA (SSHF) & RRF (IOM/ OFDA)
- Capacity building on proposal/ concept writing
- Reserve allocation for both frontline & pipeline in 2021
- HRP MYR (July)
- Juba IDP contingency planning
5. Quality, standards & capacity building

Application & adherence to existing standards & guidelines/ training & capacity building

Key activities

• Awareness raising at FSL meeting & information sharing to ensure accountability to affected population (AAP) and GBV prevention (awareness, referral pathways, mainstreaming)

• Technical Working Group: Agriculture, Livestock (future Fisheries) and Food Security & Marketing Analysis (TBC)

• Maintain links with the Cash Working Group (now inter agency not specific FSLC)

• Capacity building: cash based programming/ FSNMS enumerator training/ LEGS/ IPC analysis level I and GBV prevention with online AAP planned for 2021
6. Accountability to affected Persons (AAP)

Supporting mechanisms for the feedback & consultation with primary beneficiaries including complaint mechanisms; supporting other mainstreaming and context priorities around gender equality and protection from sexual exploitation (GBV) & abuse are raised and discussed;

Key activities:
• WFP development of an online AAP/ CWC training (launch in 2021 TBC);
• Assess and map feedback mechanisms used by FSLC partners; identify gaps & opportunities to improve; capacity building & practical support to partners;
• Funding of training on GBV/ PSEA for FSL cluster partners at State level cluster/ ICWG
• Promotion of the Core Humanitarian Standards: 9 core standards including complaints, coordination and inclusive participation (flow of information);
7. Advocacy

Identify advocacy concerns to HC/ HCT and undertake advocacy activities on behalf of cluster participants & affected populations

Key Activities

- Close collaboration & support from the WFP & FAO communication teams for:
  - Advocacy points from FSNMS/ IPC analysis
  - Technical advocacy from TWGs
- Localization: support & empowerment of NNGOs – Grand Bargain: capacity building, SSHF recipients, Inclusion in SAG & other bodies etc.
- Continued engagement with ALDWG & PfRR for resilience type work: linking humanitarian & development interventions (NWOW)
- Top 20 INGO and NNGO meetings ‘finding a common voice’ for support & advocacy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Objectives</th>
<th>Type of Activities</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Conditionality</th>
<th>Counting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: Food Assistance</td>
<td>Food distribution</td>
<td>• Number of beneficiaries reached with food&lt;br&gt;• Number of beneficiaries reached with cash/voucher&lt;br&gt;• Number of beneficiaries reached with hybrid&lt;br&gt;• Quantity of food assistance distributed (tonnage)&lt;br&gt;• Total Cash/Voucher value</td>
<td>Cash/Voucher&lt;br&gt;In kind&lt;br&gt;Hybrid</td>
<td>Unconditional/Conditional</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: Livelihoods and Livestock support</td>
<td>Dry Season Agricultural Kits (Vegetables, Fish)&lt;br&gt;Main Season Agricultural Kits (Crop, Vegetables, Fish)&lt;br&gt;Livestock Vaccination&lt;br&gt;Livestock Treatment&lt;br&gt;Seed Fairs (Input Trade Fairs)&lt;br&gt;Kitchen Garden at Nutrition Facility</td>
<td>• Number of HH receiving agricultural inputs/vegetable &amp; fishing kits&lt;br&gt;• Quantity of food produced&lt;br&gt;• Number of animals vaccinated&lt;br&gt;• Number of animals treated&lt;br&gt;• Number of kitchen gardens setup at Nutrition facilities</td>
<td>Inputs&lt;br&gt;Vouchers</td>
<td>Unconditional/Conditional</td>
<td>HH&lt;br&gt;Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Resilience (Training)</td>
<td>Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs)&lt;br&gt;Agronomic (FFS, Demo plots, Post-Harvest, Pest and Pesticides, FAW,)&lt;br&gt;Fisheries Training&lt;br&gt;Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Natural Resource Management (NRM)</td>
<td>• Number of Community Health Workers trained&lt;br&gt;• Number of people trained on different agricultural practices&lt;br&gt;• Number of people trained on fishing related activities&lt;br&gt;• Number of people trained on DRR, NRM</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Resilience (Asset Building)</td>
<td>Bee Keeping&lt;br&gt;Water pumps&lt;br&gt; Ox Poughs&lt;br&gt;PHL Storage granaries&lt;br&gt;Processing Equipment&lt;br&gt;Tree plantation&lt;br&gt;Fuel efficient stoves&lt;br&gt;Canoe, Fishing, Boating materials/tools&lt;br&gt;Animal restocking</td>
<td>• Number of households receiving various asset building support&lt;br&gt;• Number of animals restocked&lt;br&gt;• Number of households provided with animals&lt;br&gt;• Number of people receiving training on preservation techniques and other businesses</td>
<td>Inputs/Training</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Resilience (Market Support)</td>
<td>Traders (Cash, credit, Market groups,&lt;br&gt;Aggregation&lt;br&gt;Village Savings/Loans Associations&lt;br&gt;Value addition (fish, meat, vegetables, fruit, milk preservation)&lt;br&gt;Other (Vocational), other enterprise/business related</td>
<td>• Number of people trained</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICCG prioritization: fortnightly Needs Analysis Working Group (close monitoring & EWS function)

• In 2021 the prioritized locations for famine prevention scale up are the top six counties with Phase 5 HHs (Pibor ‘famine likely’, Akobo, Aweil South and Tonj East, North & South; plus the other four: Bor South, Twic East, Duk and Ayod (with 80 – 90% population in IPC 3+)

• NAWG reviews upcoming locations at risk based on established criteria e.g. IPC phase & > 5,000 persons affected; so far in 2021 included:
  • Fangak, Nyirol, Fashoda, Panyikang – due to flooding;
  • Locations in Central Equatoria – due to conflict/ insecurity/ cattle keepers; Kajo Keiji, Lainya & Wonduruba, and Yei
FSL Cluster Information Management Products
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sub-Cluster</th>
<th>Cluster Type</th>
<th>Coordination Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State level sub-clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>County level sub-clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Focal Point</td>
<td>Focal Points at county level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordination Type**
- **National**
- **State**
- **County**
- **Focal Point**

**Focal Points**
- Western Bahr el Ghazal
- Equatoria
- South Sudan

**Focal Points at County Level**
- Jonglei
- Western Equatoria
- Central Equatoria
- Eastern Equatoria
Monthly Dashboard – Food assistance (CO1)

Cluster Objective 1: Provide food assistance to prevent famine and improve dietary diversity and coping strategies for vulnerable people facing IPC-Phase 5, 4 and some 3.

7.4* Million People in Need
*Excludes 300,000 Refugees Population
4.7 Million Target under CO1

COUNTRY RESPONSE UPDATE

In the period January to April 2021, FSL cluster partners assisted about 2.5 million unique beneficiaries with emergency food assistance. 82% of beneficiaries received in-kind, 9% received cash vouchers and 9% received hybrid support.

In total, 39 partners carried out response in providing food assistance under CO1.

PEOPLE REACHED BY FOOD ASSISTANCE (CLUSTER OBJECTIVE 1)

KEY INDICATORS CO1

- 2,177,560 People reached with In-Kind Food Assistance
- 201,718 People reached with Cash/Voucher Assistance
- 182,599 People reached with Hybrid Intervention

RESPONSE BY MONTH (People reached)

- Apr: 2,087,628
- Mar: 1,468,490
- Feb: 849,821
- Jan: 743,187

CASH AND VOUCHER

201,718 beneficiaries were reached with cash/voucher to support food assistance in 20 counties by 16 partners.

HRP 2021 FUNDING

Required: USD 645 Million

$ 176 M Funded
27% Funded

$ 469 M USD

(IFS as of May 30, 2021)

RESPONSE BY MODALITY

- 85% In-Kind
- 7% Cash/Voucher
- 8% Hybrid

RESPONSE BY GENDER

- 33% Child
- 33% Adult
- 33% Elderly

RESPONSE BY STATE

PEOPLE REACHED BY STATE

39 Partners

ACADD, ACXSS, ACTED, AD, ADRA, AHF, AIOE,
APIAD, COGAD, CRS, CWW, FLDA, GAA, HBC, HEP,
IRC, JAM, M, NA, NF, NRC, OFCN, ORPO, OXAM,
PLAN, RAAD, SO, SCF, SI, FLDA, S, SRF, STO,
TEARFUND, UNIDIR, VSFG, WDA, WIP, YNH, WVI
Monthly Dashboard – Livelihood support (CO2)

COUNTRY RESPONSE UPDATE
As of November 2020, FSL cluster reached 45,161 households with livelihood kits (fishing, vegetable & crop kits) to improve food production. A total of 32,362 beneficiaries received different types of trainings to build their capacity and reduce dependency on food and agricultural assistance.

In the HRP 2020, a total of 8.0 million animals have been targeted for vaccination and treatment. As of end of November 6 million animals have been vaccinated/treated by FAO and FSL partners benefiting 252,883 households.

MONTHLY RESPONSE TREND
Total Number of Households reached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>45,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>78,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>84,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>72,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>118,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>187,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>283,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLUSTER OBJECTIVES
CO2: Enhance Emergency Food Production
CO3: Reduce dependency on food and agricultural input

2020 ANNUAL TARGET
800,000 households
2,000,000 people

HRP 2020 COVID-19 Addendum
1.6 Million
Additional targeted people affected by COVID-19 and Desert Locust
US$174.7
Required
9% Funded

ANNUAL TARGET VS CUMULATIVE RESPONSE – CO2

NOVEMBER RESPONSE BY MODALITY
100% In Kind
0% Cash
0% Vouchers
Training Dashboard (CO3)

COUNTRY RESPONSE UPDATE
In 2020, FSL cluster partners supported a total of 251,101 people through various types of trainings to reduce dependency on food assistance so as to build capacity and resilience to enhance livelihood. The trainings mainly focused on agronomic practices, post and disease management, post harvest management, community animal health works, income generation and village savings/loans association.

PEOPLE TRAINED BY STATE

Village Savings and Loans Association 12%
Value Chain 3%
Post Harvest Management 9%
Post & Disease Management 8%
Income Generation Activities 10%
Agricultural Training 9%
Community Animal Health 8%
Plant Health 7%
Farming Field School 5%

PEOPLE TRAINED BY ACTIVITY

Agricultural Vocational Trainings 52,352
Value Chain 4,094
Post Harvest Management 25,686
Income Generation Activities 26,366
Post & Disease Management 43,277
Farming Field School 703
Village Savings/Loans Association 52,049
Post Harvest Management Training 57,436
Value Chain Training 7,064
Income Generation Activities Training 26,366

FSL PARTNERS PRESENCE MAP - 119 partners

http://fscluster.org/southsudanmap

Production date: December 2020, Prepared by FSL Team
Data sources: FAO, WFP & FSLC Partners
Contact: info@fscluster.org
In 2020, FSL cluster partners assisted a total of 1.3 unique beneficiaries through cash-based interventions (cash, vouchers and hybrid modalities). Of the total Cash-based modalities, 74% was Cash, 15% Hybrid and 7% Voucher. 83% of these beneficiaries received unconditional cash-based services while 17% of the services were conditional. Cash-based interventions constituted 13% of the total FSL support provided in 2020.

Key Figures:
- 57 Partners
- 65 Counties covered
- 2% cash from
- 98% food assistance

Response by Objective – Cash & Voucher:

Response by Delivery Mechanism:
- Cash for work
- Cash delivery
- Exchanges
- Money transfer agent
- Paper voucher
FSL Partners Resilience Programming in 2020
As of 31st December 2019

2019 Resilience activities in South Sudan

FACTS & FIGURES

1,974,965
Number of beneficiaries assisted as of December 2019 based on partner submissions (the figure doesn’t account for double counting). The activities are either ongoing or completed.

83.4M (USD)
Resources used for the implementation of activities based on partner inputs (figures do not account for double counting). Through generous contribution and support of the following countries and agencies: ADB, BMZ, DANIDA, ECHO, EU, France, Germany, IAT, Japan, Netherlands SDC, UNDP, UNHCR, USAID.

Summary overview of resilience programming

- FSL Cluster partners have assisted nearly 2 million beneficiaries in 2019 with resilience type interventions that enhance the ongoing food assistance and emergency livelihood support activities, addressing better some of the underlying causes of food insecurity, and strengthening the ability of beneficiaries to better absorb the effects of shocks.
- This support is also in line with the South Sudan HRP 2020 towards the use of greater conditionality, promoting less dependency on humanitarian food assistance and more self-reliance in transitioning towards more resilience and developmental interventions over time.
- From the data collected, 34 partners provided resilience type interventions in 2019 (some projects are multiyear) across all 10 states in 57 countries with an estimated USD 83.4 Million budget.
- Activities that were undertaken and considered for resilience programming in 2019 include but not limited to: conditional food for assets, good practices on vaccination and treatment, animal restocking programmes, vocational training, deworming campaigns, livestock diversification, village savings and loans associations, micro finance activities, strengthening market connections and the provision of small business start-up grants.

To be updated with 2020 dashboard later
Monthly Bulletin

- Situation updates
- Innovative partner products
- Highlight partner projects
- Share beneficiary stories

We have a space for you every month!!!!

Send us your story.

SSHF Support to the FSL Cluster in 2020

In 2020, the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) provided resources for a timely critical, life-saving frontline activities, in line with the HRP 2020 needs and strategic priorities through multi-cluster and stand-alone FSL response. The multi-cluster programming was introduced to promote coordination, enabling partners to deliver a package of services through complementary activities while ensuring cost-effectiveness. The first allocation focused on main season and dry season response and partners utilized the FSL's core pipeline to provide beneficiaries with crop kits, fishing kits, and vegetable kits. As the year progressed, South Sudan faced unprecedented flooding prompting a further allocation of $600,000 to respond to beneficiaries in affected counties. The 3rd reserve allocation was specifically designed as a lifesaving emergency response to the 5 priority counties with a high number of HCR phase 4 and 5 populations from the November HCA analysis.

SSHF Allocation and Reserve Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation Type</th>
<th>Budget (US$)</th>
<th>N Paired Partners</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st standard allocation</td>
<td>4,900,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Reserve allocation</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Reserve allocation</td>
<td>1,540,399</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FSL Cluster Response 2020

For the period of January to December 2020, the FSL cluster partners reached 4.7 million unique beneficiaries with food assistance (45%) while 637,447 unique households were reached with livelihood support (42%). Partners using cash-voucher modality reached a total of 1.4 million unique beneficiaries, totaling 84% of the CBT modality covered food assistance activities, and 5% covered livelihoods support (seedfcntl and cash for kits).

Key Indicators

- Number of beneficiaries reached with food assistance: 4.7 million people
- Number of HH receiving agricultural inputs: 627,447 households
- Number of animals vaccinated/treated: 6.9 million animals
- Number of people reached with agricultural trainings and assets building activities: 231,000 people

Cash and Voucher Assistance

In 2020, 87% of FSL Cluster partners assisted a total 1.4 million unique beneficiaries across 54 counties through cash-based interventions. Of the total cash-based modalities, 71% was in cash, 26% hybrid and 3% voucher. 83% of these beneficiaries received unconditional cash-based services while 17% of the services were conditional. Cash-based interventions constituted 13% of the total FSL support provided.
Principles & practice of coordination
Linking State and County level sub clusters with the National cluster

Objectives for 2020: two way flow of information:

State & County to National:
- Send contact details of ALL your members (update on a monthly basis)
- Send your monthly/bi monthly meeting minutes
- Ad hoc needs assessments from any crisis events

National to State & County:
- Regular sharing of information by email & website updates: https://fscluster.org/south-sudan-rep/documents
- State focal points: receive national ICCG update twice monthly
- Bi-monthly share the Needs Analysis Working Group prioritization
- Monthly update of the 5W reported to national cluster
More detailed participatory mapping of the wider context e.g. context analysis map of NBEG

Understanding:
• Timelines & history of events & shocks
• Differing agro ecology & livelihood zones
• Past & current trade routes
• Locations of IDPs
• Past & current livestock migration routes
• Extent of shocks e.g. flooding, desert locusts etc.

Have knowledgeable members provide the information (KII & take notes) & have someone mapping;
The essentials of coordination:

1. Agree on the **problem** – consensus; document & communicate needs

2. Agree on a **solution** - elaborate strategy & response plan;
   - This can also include supporting State ICWG and the newly established Solutions Working Groups (SWGs)

3. **Identify a partner(s)** who can respond: capacity & experience

4. Do you have the **resources & capacity** – identify the gap & seek support via the FSL cluster, CLA, your own agency or directly with donor(s)

5. **Monitor & report** on a regular basis including 5Ws via your own agency
Avoiding duplication & potential conflict:

- **Principle I**: where at all possible *stay where you are* and scale up where you are already known, have a good track record, know the context well and have established good relations with the authorities;

- **Principle II**: as a new entrant, coordinate with the national cluster (partner presence maps) and *coordinate with ALL actors on the ground*; who is doing what where – identify the gaps; work around existing actions and interventions to complement the work of others; work closely with the sub clusters;

- **Principle III**: currently *needs are greater than any one actor to meet entirely*; (the humanitarian principle is to save lives) if needs are unmet can you *support/ fund/ provide capacity for existing actors* to meet those needs? Where this is not possible *work with existing partners & the sub cluster to scale up/ save lives* by complementing the work of other actors
Coordination activities at State & County level

• Who is doing what and where:
  – Ask partners to submit their key bullet points and compile for the local cluster partners;
  – Regular updates

• Avoid duplication especially in context of resource scarcity (there is not enough so don’t waste what we have):
  – County level participatory mapping: who is doing what in each Payam;
  – For County sub clusters with fewer partners mapping at both Payam and even Boma;
  – Maps are your best tool for coordination;

• Map both humanitarian (food & livelihood support) & development / resilience activities:
  – Use a simple 2 x 2 matrix on a flip chart;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian actions by NGO/ UN</th>
<th>Integration of humanitarian actions with other sectors or NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience actions by NGO/ UN</td>
<td>Integration of resilience actions with other sectors or NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mapping FSL partner footprint & coverage:

- Include the main features: rivers, roads, towns & markets etc.
- Conduct at least two per year in South Sudan:
  - Post harvest for dry season (Sept/Oct)
  - Pre lean season (March/April)
- Plot the main Food Distribution Points;
- Plot the main locations/Payams for dry & main season livelihood response & identify areas of overlap;
- Plot the main locations for replenishment of cadres of CAHWs
- For Payam & Boma level often better to use a **simple table**

Make it a fun & interactive exercise
Evidence from the field: integration & transition mapping example

Integration/ transition matrix presented: example from field visit to Aweil (FSLC partners only included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving along the Integration continuum</th>
<th>Moving along the transition continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response:</td>
<td>Emergency response:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FAO ELRP: crops &amp; tools (via ITF modality), fish, vegetable kits (direct)</td>
<td>• Some integration with other WASH, HT &amp; Nut actors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HeRY (kits &amp; ITF)</td>
<td>• KUCDA: FSL &amp; WASH;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SPEDP: CBT</td>
<td>• IRC: FSL, Nut &amp; Protection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• VSFS: livestock &amp; DSR (fish &amp; veg kits)</td>
<td>• JAM: FSL &amp; Nut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WFP: GFD with WV, JAM, WHH</td>
<td>• WV: FSL, ED &amp; protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SPEDP: FSL, WASH &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• WHH: FSL (CAHWs), WASH, Nut &amp; ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CWW (OFDA): FSL, WASH, Nut &amp; HT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Importance of cash & vouchers increasing!**

Early recovery WFP/ FFA:
1. 2012 In kind \(\rightarrow\) Cash
2. 2013 BRACE I Cash & CFA
3. 2016 BRACE II + FAO livelihood/ ITF

Resilience:
• SPEDP: FSL & CBT
• JAM: BRACE II: CFA & kits/ ITF + DRR (dykes) & Ag extension services
• SCI: FSL? (details)
• WV: FSL? (details)

Early Recovery:
• CWW (Irish Aid): FSL (DRR: flood dykes/ dry spells via CFA) & NRM (trees), WASH, HT;
• JAM- Household food security- restocking, kitchen gardens Aweil South – FAO/World Bank – DRR
• WHH: FSL, ED (schools) & Nut education;
• SCI: WASH & FSL through livestock

Resilience:
• CWW (DFID) BRACED: WASH, NRM/ DRR, Education, FSL (FFS)
• WHH: FSL, DRR/ NRM & fuel efficient stoves & dykes; Education & Water supply
FSLC learning over past crisis years on sub cluster ‘best practice’

- State/county level function – liaise and **meet with Government** officials regularly
- Knows your **sphere of influence**: counties where partners know and report on (produce the maps)
- Partners know one another: collaborate and update **who is doing what and where**
- **Regular meetings** with spirit & vitality:
  - ‘Liven up the meetings’ with guest speaker; topical presentations; participatory exercises;
  - Draw topics for discussion from the National cluster meetings, the ICCG and the NAWG;
- Lead agency (WFP/FAO/NGO) must have **authority** to step in to avoid duplication;
- Espouse **humanitarian values**: impartiality, humanity, neutrality & independence;
- Espouse **partnership principles**: dignity & respect; get member ‘buy in’ & delegated roles e.g. minutes & informal TWGs
- Requires **leadership**: energy, vision, commitment, trust etc. inspire partners and ‘be there’ for them assisting them when you can;

Refer to the TOR for sub clusters & focal persons
Principles & practice of integration
Why integration?

UNICEF Conceptual Framework of Malnutrition (adapted)

- **Intergenerational Consequences**
  - Short-Term Consequences: Mortality, morbidity, disability
  - Long-Term Consequences: Cognitive development, health, economic productivity

- **Maternal and Child Undernutrition**
  - Inadequate dietary intake
  - Disease

- **Immediate Causes**
  - Household food insecurity
  - Inadequate foods, feeding, and care practices

- **Underlying Causes**
  - Inadequate access to services
  - Inadequate financial and human resources

- **Basic Causes**
  - House, environment and health services
  - Sociocultural, economic and political context
Where? Every where across the country where there are FSL, Nutrition, WASH and Health needs!

Overlapping priority locations:
- IPC 4 (FSL) &
- Critical (AMN)
- Disease outbreaks
e.g. cholera
What are we integrating?

Trying to break the cluster silos!

- **Minimum package** for the main four famine prevention clusters:
  - **FSL**: food assistance/ livelihood & livestock support
  - **WASH**: clean water/ hygiene/ sanitation
  - **Nutrition** services: SAM & MAM
  - **Health**: facility service delivery, vaccination campaigns etc.

- **Geographical convergence** often already taking place in many areas where there is delivery of FSL, Nutrition, WASH and Health services – beneficiaries receive services from ALL four famine clusters is what we are aiming for;

- Ask yourself are the target beneficiaries accessing services from ALL the key famine clusters and if not why not? That is our business!
Sub national coordination/ collaboration/ co-location

How then can we support greater integration on-the-ground that can make a difference to programming outcomes?

• Map Health (PHCU etc.) and Nutrition (OTP/ TSFP) facilities and as FSL actors provide services (based on vulnerability targeting) within the catchment area of these facilities.

• Establish kitchen garden demonstration sites at every Nutrition facility and when conducting training on improved agronomic practices for vegetable production ensure the Community Nutrition Volunteer (CNV) also attends

• Map WASH facilities (boreholes) and encourage a division between human and livestock watering points; deliver services in the catchment areas of these boreholes; in communities without boreholes and hygiene promotion advocate for these services.

• Promote Colocation/ Collaboration/ Coordination at the lowest possible administrative level (Boma/ Payam) between to partners from ALL four clusters;

• Indicator: are poor & vulnerable HHs able to access services from multiple cluster/ partners?
  – do they access GFD, crop seed, nutrition & health facilities, schools & clean water (protected source)
  – If so, then we are well on the road to co located service delivery

• Work with colleagues within our own organisation in other sectors; work with other agencies where can you support; identify gaps in service delivery; can FSL support nutrition & WASH in taking key messages to ‘hard to reach’ locations especially when CAHWs can often get there;
Combined National/State/County actions for integration

**County:**
- **Strengthen existing coordination** mechanisms to support integrated programming;
- Involve local authorities/Multi cluster county coordination with integration standing agenda;
- Map operational actors: use simple participatory map;
- If possible **joint monitoring** (especially in your own organisation!)
- Ensure **information flow county to state** on integration gap analysis *(where are the gaps?)*

**State:**
- State ICCG and CC meetings to include integrated programming as a **standing item on agenda**
- **Agree simple strategies** to promote integration: produce a one-page fact sheet outlining entry points for other clusters; and Coordinators attend other cluster meetings
- Reinforce the **importance of multi sector assessment** on need/crisis event basis and ensure clusters do **analyse together** after assessment
- Identify how data from other each sector can assist other sectors and **share relevant data**
- **Is integrated programming happening**: case study/visits to any good examples & shared;
- National OCHA & CC **support visits** to State and County sub cluster / ICCGs

**National:**
- Share integration messaging & minimum package/strategy report → convert to PowerPoint
- Share multi cluster OCHA/HRP products showing multi cluster partners at county level;
- **Set priorities for integration** (locations e.g. based on famine prevention); identify champions for integration (case studies) for advocacy with donors;
- Integrated Needs Tracking (INT) and analysis set up (REACH) – how best to support integration (e.g. setting priorities)
- Document **existing integration activities/disseminate learning** & good practice
- Support **capacity building of partners**: minimum State & even County

**Commit to integration**: share follow up actions/responsibilities/ownership