ECHO Single Form

Guidance note

Please find below the new ECHO Single Form in word version. ECHO now only uses the E-Single Form in pdf that for practical reasons DRRM Brussels has decided not to systematically roll out at field level. DRRM Brussels has therefore prepared a word version of the pdf to facilitate the proposal writing process.

In italic: Guidance on what information to provide, which should be deleted once, you have filled in the relevant section.

In black: Sections to be filled in at the proposal stage only and that cannot be modified at the interim and final report stages.

In blue: Sections to be filled in at the interim report stage only [INT].

In green: Sections to be filled in at the final report stage only [FIN].

Sections	Content
1. General Information	
1.1 Name of the Humanitarian organisation	UNHCR
1.2 Title of the Action	*Provide the title. Keep it general* **Enhancing coordination of humanitarian shelter response**
1.3 Narrative summary	*Short overview of the Action. Write here what you would like ECHO to say about your Action (e.g. the links with the needs identified; the expected results, and the objectives which the Action is aiming to reach).* This Action will advance towards the goal of the Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) Strategy 2013-2017. This Action builds upon the achievements made in 2013-2014 and upon the increased sustainability attained by the cluster. It also introduces a number of innovative approaches to address the challenges identified in previous years: • The **deployment of surge capacity in the short and medium term** will be enhanced to ensure the continuity and predictability of country-level cluster coordination. The GSC surge capacity model will be strengthened by reinforcing and adapting the existing immediate surge capacity (Global

	Focal Points and Roving Focal Points (previously known as Regional Focal Points)) and by creating two additional new approaches that will enhance medium term surge capacity. The cluster's capacity to engage with national actors will be enhanced with a view to increasing national capacity and reducing dependency on international resources. • The GSC will also reinforce **integrated systems to inform improved practice and foster innovation**: Closer links will be established between assessments, monitoring, and evaluation (AME) that will allow better quantification and qualification of the responses provided by cluster partners to meet shelter needs. Learning from these responses will be captured at country level and disseminated at global level through training, the GSC website, the Shelter Projects website and publications. • This improved capturing of information will enable the GSC to better explain the situation of the country-level clusters and undertake **evidence-based advocacy**. This advocacy will be done through the enhanced network of cluster agencies that this Action will reinforce, and through specific projects. The GSC, including its Working Groups, will be strengthened to deliver functional tools and systems and promote consistency and accountability of shelter coordination.
1.3.1 [INT] Update the narrative summary	*This section is optional at interim stage. The narrative summary can be updated to record the changes in the Action since the submission of the proposal. This will section will not be used to report on progress.*
1.3.2 [FIN] Update the narrative summary	*Please fill this section and summarise the achievements of the Action.*
1.4 Area of intervention World area/country/Region/Locations & map	*Indicate the world area, country, regions and locations of the intervention.* **The activities of this project will benefit humanitarian operations worldwide according to need.** Annex 1 provides a map showing the 24 shelter clusters and cluster-like coordination arrangements as of 15 January 2015.
1.4.1 [INT] Update on area of intervention	*This section is optional at the interim stage and only needs to be updated if the locations have changed. If so, briefly explain the rationale behind the changes of location.*
1.4.2 [FIN] Update on area of intervention	This section is optional at the final report stage if no changes occurred. If changes occurred, please

	provide the rationale behind the changes.
1.5 Dates and Duration	Start date: *Indicate the actual starting date of the activities* **01/01/2015** Duration of the action: *Indicate the number of months of implementation* **24 months** Start date for eligibility of expenditure: *Eligibility date will be the same as the actual starting date* **01/01/2015**
2. Humanitarian Organisation in the area	
2.1 Presence in the area	*Describe your presence in the area (country/sectors) – e.g. number of years, type of intervention, and type of office set-up.* The GSC is an open platform with 35 partners participating consistently[1] at the global level. Country level shelter clusters or cluster-like coordination arrangements are currently active in 24 countries. Since 2006, the Shelter Cluster has been active in 86 emergencies in 28 countries. In 2013, a total of 5,7 million people were reached with Shelter and Non-Food Items (NFIs) in responses coordinated by shelter clusters. In 2012 the GSC adopted its **Strategy 2013-2017**. This Strategy has the following Goal and Strategic Aims: Goal: To more effectively meet the sheltering needs of populations affected by humanitarian crises by strengthening the shelter response of humanitarian actors through leadership, coordination and accountability in the humanitarian shelter sector. Strategic Aims: 1. Responsive and flexible operational support to country-level shelter coordination mechanisms.

[1] Current cluster partners include ACTED, Australian Red Cross, British Red Cross, Care International, CRS, Cordaid, Danish Refugee Council, ECHO, Emergency Architects Foundation, DFID, German Red Cross, Global Communities, Habitat for Humanity International, IFRC, IMPACT, InterAction, International Rescue Committee, IOM, Luxembourg Red Cross, Medair, NRC, OFDA, Oxford-Brookes University, ProAct Network, Relief International, RICS, Save The Children UK, Shelter Centre, Shelter for Life International, Shelter Box, Swedish Red Cross, UN-HABITAT, UNHCR, UNOCHA, UNRWA and World Vision International. The Global Shelter Cluster is open to participation by all not-for-profit agencies and institutions engaged in humanitarian shelter.

	2. An effective and well-functioning GSC. 3. Increased recognition of the shelter and settlement sector as an essential component of the humanitarian response through enhanced advocacy and communication. Under the overall leadership of UNHCR and IFRC as Global Cluster Lead Agencies, the GSC is structured as follows: - **Strategic Advisory Group (SAG)**: permanent body that works to advance the cluster strategic direction, overall work plan, and advocacy. The SAG is composed of self-selected agencies and institutions of the GSC based on agreed criteria, and reports to the GSC plenary[2]. - **Support Team**: a team of 15 personnel seconded by different cluster partners. This team is the support cell or secretariat of the GSC and provides surge and remote support to country level shelter clusters under the overall supervision of the GSC Coordinators. Its members identify, train, deploy, and support country-level cluster coordination teams. When not deployed, the members of the Support Team provide remote support to country-level clusters. They also facilitate the work of the GSC and provide inputs to inter-agency discussions and inter-cluster coordination at the global level, and contribute to building capacity and enhancing preparedness. - **Working Groups**: task-oriented and temporary structures with clear executable deliverables that are established by the SAG to address particular identified needs[3]. Some examples of recent outputs from the working groups include the following: the Coherence Working Group defined key policy documents such as its scope, structure, and key relations; the Accountability Working Group developed key indicators for the cluster, and common evaluation guidelines; the Working

[2] The members of the SAG for 2015 were appointed at the 2014 Global Shelter Cluster meeting with a one-year mandate. These members are: ACTED, Australian Red Cross, CARE International, Habitat for Humanity Int'l, Interaction, IOM, NRC, World Vision Int'l, UNHABITAT, and the co-leads IFRC and UNHCR.

[3] There are currently five Working Groups in the Global Shelter Cluster: Accountability, Shelter Recovery, Regulatory Barriers to the Provision of Shelter, Technical and Innovation, and Outreach and Capacity.

	Group on Regulatory Barriers to the Provision of Shelter produced a one-day training for shelter practitioners on Housing Land and Property issues. - **Communities of Practice**: thematic groups of professional/expert individuals that provide technical and surge support to Global or Country-level clusters, develop "good practices", and address critical issues within their areas of expertise[4].
2.2 Synergies with other actions	*Specify potential synergies with other initiatives, with other major donors present in the country, or other humanitarian actors.* **DG ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity Grant 2013-2014** The GSC received a contribution from the DG ECHO in 2013-2014 for the implementation of the first phase of the GSC Strategy. This contribution has enabled the cluster to enhance significantly the support provided to country-level clusters and increase its preparedness. The **main achievements** of the GSC during this period are the following: • The GSC deployed trained and experienced coordinators in less than 72 hours after the activation of new clusters and new emergencies requiring increased response by existing clusters. This has been achieved in spite of 2014 being a year with a record of five L3 emergencies, four of them at the same time. • The GSC Support Team has provided more than 950 days of in-country support through more than 54 missions to 14 countries. These missions have enabled the GSC to provide coordination expertise on the ground quickly which has resulted in several benefits. In some countries surge capacity was deployed to take on the early coordination of the cluster which is invaluable for a coherent response. This was the case in emergencies such as cyclone Haiyan in the Philippines, and the conflicts in Iraq, Chad, Ukraine and others. In other cases, the Support Team provided expert advice to clusters that were already active but where a new emergency required an enhanced response. This support enabled existing cluster coordinators to “change gear” and adapt their tools and methodologies from a protracted situation to a new acute emergency. This was the case in countries such as South Sudan, Central African Republic, Turkey in support to

[4] There are currently three communities of practice in the Global Shelter Cluster: coordinators, information managers and environmental advisors.

	Syria, and others. • All 24 country-level clusters and cluster-like coordination mechanisms feature on the GSC website shelltercluster.org including contact details and key documents. • More than 75% of the country-level cluster partners and global cluster partners expressed their satisfaction with the coordination services provided by the GSC through a recent anonymous survey involving 79 respondents[5]. **Sustainability** The DG ECHO contribution has also allowed the cluster to increase its sustainability. This has been achieved through the following: • Mainstreaming core activities: the value added by key GSC actions, and particularly the global support from Support Team members, has been demonstrated and their agencies (UNHCR, IFRC, IOM, and ACTED) are now fully funding or contributing more funding to these positions This mainstreaming allows for the utilisation of future funding to support additional activities and further strengthen the operational support capacity of the GSC. • Promoting a collaborative approach to resourcing the GSC: being advanced by the SAG, this approach aims at increasing the contribution to the GSC support mechanisms by partners other than the cluster co-leads as it has been happening in country-level shelter clusters in past years. This approach at the global level is still being defined but agreement has been reached already in collectively resourcing the Shelter Projects publication and website for 2015-2016. • Increasing efficiency: including working to reduce the cost of certain activities. For instance, the cluster website has been migrated from a privately owned platform to an open source platform. This is a significant one-off effort that will have long-lasting benefits such as a drastic reduction of hosting costs (one tenth of previous costs), better adaptation to low-band-width environments, and greater connectivity with other websites and social media tools.

[5] This survey was open from August to October 2014, featured in the home page of sheltercluster.org and through Global Updates. It was linked to the Global Shelter Cluster meeting but it asked for general feedback on the cluster. The majority of the respondents were based in Africa (34%) and Asia (31%) while 20% were based at the global level. Most respondents work with UN agencies (38%), International NGOs (32%) and the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement (13%). More information can be found here: http://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/GSC_Survey%20Findings_0.pdf

	Synergies with other DG ECHO contributions The GSC lead agencies and partners often receive DG ECHO contributions at country level to enhance shelter response in a particular emergency. These contributions will benefit from the approaches and tools developed through this Action. The approach will be similar as the one taken in the past, some examples are: in Fiji, ECHO funded IFRC as cluster lead, and the tools and methodologies used in this cluster were in line with what was recommended at the GSC and the learnings from this cluster benefitted other clusters. REACH received ECHO support at country-level to facilitate shelter cluster assessments and the activities were undertaken in line with global guidance and served to advance the development of this guidance. UNHCR has received contributions from the DG ECHO ERC grant for other clusters it leads or co-leads and other global activities such as cash based initiatives. The tools and expertise used to manage these contributions have increased UNHCR's capacity to manage inter-agency grants more efficiently. This has been achieved by organizing lessons-learnt meetings among the different UNHCR units involved, sharing tools used to manage the different grants, and continuous feedback among the UNHCR grant managers. This Action will benefit from the knowledge already acquired by the organisation. Regular exchanges with other UNHCR grant managers and units managing ECHO grants will further benefit on-going and future similar actions. **Synergies with other components of the GSC strategy** The GSC co-leads and the SAG members will approach other donors to address other parts of the GSC Strategy 2013-2017 that are not covered in this Action. These activities include a document on the state of the humanitarian shelter and the creation of a Global Cluster coordination revolving fund to support early deployment of cluster coordination teams before funds are received for that particular emergency. Once the funds are received, they will replenish the global cluster coordination revolving fund.
2.3 [FIN] Report on synergies with other actions	*Report here only when the situation described in the proposal has drastically changed.*

3. Needs assessment	
3.1 Needs and risk analysis	
3.1.1 Date(s) of assessment	*Provide the date(s) of the most recent need assessment(s) relating specifically to this Action* GSC meeting 8-9 October 2014 and GSC SAG Retreat 8-9 December 2014
3.1.2 Assessment methodology	*Describe the methodology used and indicate whom, how and in which conditions the most recent assessment(s was/were carried out. Whether it was a joint/coordinated assessment and whether it was shared with other agencies.* *If needed, attach a copy of the most relevant assessment report* The resources and activities that will be secured through this grant build upon the significant development of the GSC structure in 2013-2014, and further support securing a sustainable operational model beyond the duration of this Action. The origin of the action dates from 2012 within the framework of the IASC Transformative Agenda process led by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) in an effort to improve the effectiveness of the humanitarian response. The IASC Cluster Approach Evaluation 2[6] published in April 2010 highlighted a number of key areas for improvement within the multilateral humanitarian response and set a series of recommendations that solicited the review of the existing cluster approach. The formulation of the IASC Transformative Agenda finalised in 2012 frames this review by establishing priorities to address challenges in three broad areas: 1. Cluster coordination 2. Leadership 3. Accountability Clear actions in this regard are endorsed by IASC and inform the strategic direction of the Clusters from 2013 onwards. In order to address the challenges highlighted by the transformative agenda, the GSC has

[6] Group URD and GPPi, *Cluster Approach Evaluation 2*, April 2010

	had to make some adjustments to the way it works. The GSC as a whole has a yearly meeting in Autumn where the activities of the cluster are reviewed and the cluster collectively plans for the future. The November 2012 meeting of the GSC was used as a forum to address some of the challenges highlighted by the Transformative Agenda. This meeting was open to all the cluster members with an invitation published on the cluster website six months before the date of the meeting and in the different updates sent to the entire cluster mailing list. The meeting was attended by 64 participants from 31 organisations including cluster coordinators from most of the country level shelter clusters, shelter cluster partners, donors (including ECHO) and other clusters. During this meeting, the cluster partners identified the main challenges to be addressed at the country and global levels, reviewed the work undertaken during the year, took stock of the implications of the transformative agenda and other initiatives, and provided strategic directions for the next five years. These strategic directions were later elaborated by the GSC's Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) to form the 2013-2017 **GSC Strategy** (Annex 1). This strategy has the following **3 Strategic Aims**[7]: 1. Responsive and flexible support to country-level shelter coordination mechanisms. 2. An effective and well-functioning GSC. 3. Increased recognition of the shelter and settlements sector as an essential component of the humanitarian response, through enhanced advocacy and communication. In order to better implement this 5-year strategy, the GSC divided the implementation of the strategy in the following phases: **Phase One** - April 2013 - December 2014, with support from a previous DG ECHO ERC grant. The GSC focused on enhancing the cluster core objective: coordinating the responses at country-level, through the deployment of experienced surge capacity and remote support. This surge capacity also put in place agreed coordination tools such as the coordination toolkit, which provided a harmonisation of country level shelter clusters. Assessment support was enhanced by carrying out in-country joint assessments and developing tools and an operational methodology. Contingency planning activities

[7] The 2013-2017 GSC Strategy can be found here: https://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/GSC%20Strategy%202013-2017.pdf

	were also undertaken and related tools developed. Preparedness and coordination at global level was enhanced with improved capacity to respond at country-level. The GSC improved its communication and advocacy, including the migration of its website to a new platform, increasing the awareness on shelter and settlement issues and the inter and intra cluster communication[8]- **Phase Two** - January 2015- December 2016: During this phase, the GSC will strengthen and solidify the capacities created to support country-level clusters as well as the sustainability of these core services. During this phase, mainly through the activities described in this project, the GSC will also enhance its monitoring and evaluation capacity of country-level clusters, and the sharing of good practices and lessons learned. Together with the work of the Support Team, the integrated system described in activity 1.3 will be the main tool to enhance the monitoring and evaluation of country-level clusters and the sharing of good practices and lessons learned. Furthermore, the GSC will further consolidate its communication and advocacy capacity as explained in activity 2.2. The implementation of the GSC Strategy 2013 - 2017 will be reviewed as described in activity 2.1.[9] **Phase Three** - January 2017- December 2017: This is the last phase in a process that will result in a sustainable operational model for an enhanced GSC. The GSC will plan for the future based on the level of sustainability achieved to deliver its core services and the needs identified. It will also finalise the implementation of the remaining components of the GSC Strategy 2013 -2017. The implementation of the GSC Strategy has been reviewed in the yearly GSC meetings in 2013 and in 2014. In preparation for the 2014 GSC meeting an anonymous on-line survey was produced inviting the partners of country-level clusters to provide inputs on issues to be addressed by the GSC. The

[8] During this phase the following outcomes of the GSC Strategy 2013-2017 were addressed: 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.10, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10 and partially 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7.

[9] The outcomes from phase 1 will be strengthened and the remaining outcomes will be addressed.

	implementation of the Strategy has also been periodically monitored by the GSC SAG during its meetings and more in particular during the SAG retreats that took place in Geneva in 2013 and in 2014. During these meetings, the GSC SAG drafted a plan for 2015 – 2016 to continue implementing the strategy. The SAG agreed to jointly approach donors in order to raise the funds required for the continued implementation of its Strategy. In particular, it was decided that a proposal would be submitted to the ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity Fund by UNHCR on behalf of the cluster. This proposal has been endorsed by the GSC SAG which is the body mandated by the GSC to facilitate the coordination of harmonized resource mobilization efforts as established in the SAG ToR[10].
3.1.3 Problem needs and risks analysis	*Describe the main problems and needs identified by the needs assessment within the geographical area and sectors concerned by the proposed Action. Include a brief gender and age analysis. Explain what are the underlying risk factors linked to the humanitarian crisis.* The implementation of the GSC strategy during 2013-2014 has encountered the following challenges: • The newly introduced approaches need adjustments to be fully mainstreamed. In particular, the surge capacity needs to be fine-tuned in order to cover the gap between initial cluster activation and the deployment of longer term coordination team members. The surge capacity model has been very successful and it has been used as follows: o Global Focal Points (GFP): provide a link between the global level and the country-level clusters. They establish close relations with a number of country-level clusters based on a defined area of responsibility. They provide key coordination support to country-level clusters to address issues that require the most advanced coordination expertise and the connection with the global level with timeframes of up to one month. o Regional Focal Points (RFP): provide deployable surge capacity and expertise in contingency planning. This surge capacity model can still be improved, particularly in two areas: o **Deployment time:** The deployment time for both GFPs and RFPs needs to be limited in

[10] The SAG ToR were approved on the 2012 Global Shelter cluster meeting (1-2 November) and can be found here: http://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/TOR%20-%20GSC%20SAG.doc

	order to maintain an overall perspective, keep their important linkage with the global level, and avoid the risk of burn-out and high staff turnover associated with excessive deployments. Experience has shown that the maximum deployment time per mission for GFPs is one month and for RFPs three months. There are many different types of emergencies and requirements for country-level cluster coordinators. There are cases when the requirements (such as languages, nationalities, trainings, and others) make it very complicated to find long-term capacity, meaning three months of surge coverage may not be enough to find long-term capacity. Experience highlights a need for additional approaches to cover longer gaps up to six months. ○ **Type of expertise**: The role and expertise provided by the GFPs is clear, consolidated, and well appreciated. The role of the RFPs has evolved over time. They have done less contingency planning than initially expected and more surge capacity missions to existing clusters. The regional role has not been in all cases as important as initially envisaged, some regions have a strong regional identity and others do not. Additional to the GFPs and RFPs, there has been a need for senior and experienced deployable capacity to operationalise cluster operations in complex crises including System-Wide Level 3 emergencies. In many situations, there has been a need for trained and experienced coordinators at a senior level often in security sensitive environments. These senior coordinators are not generally willing to be deployable as full time roving staff. An innovative approach is needed to ensure that the best expertise is available to activate and support cluster operations for the top tier emergencies. Additionally, the different types of emergencies, different country-level cluster lead organisations, and the different circumstances of each country require a wider range of deployment options in order to ensure effective coordination. The shelter and settlement sector is very broad and the 24 currently active country-level clusters work in differing contexts. The support country-level clusters need is very diverse: Some need only a short term highly technical or strategic support, others need a long term coordinator coming in for some time, and therefore a wide range of options is needed. On the other hand, country-level clusters are led by different organisations which have different processes for receiving staff. There is a need for a wider range of options that enable the deployment of staff across agencies or to the different lead agencies.

	• There are increased expectations from country-level cluster coordinators with the Transformative Agenda, thus increasing the need for support from the GSC. The Transformative Agenda and humanitarian practice in the last few years have increased expectations and added to the workload of country-level coordination teams in clusters, and in particular in L3 emergencies. These are some examples:
	  • Cluster coordination teams are expected to facilitate higher quality joint assessments to allow for evidence-based programming.
	  • Cluster coordinators lead the production of the Strategic Response Plan which requires a more elaborate process than the previous CAP.
	  • The role of cluster coordinators in the oversight of pooled funds has increased.
	  • New tools have been introduced to be implemented by clusters such as the Performance Monitoring Tool.
	Given this additional workload, the GSC Support Team has to provide support in a number of activities to country-level clusters. These activities include the facilitation of assessment support and information management, the revision of documents related to the Humanitarian Program Cycle such as Humanitarian Needs Overview or Strategic Response Plans, advice on pooled funding and briefing and support on the use of the Performance Monitoring Tools.
	
	• There is potential to capitalise more on the resources developed at country level. The links between assessment, monitoring, and evaluation are being strengthened but they could be further enhanced in order to make the most of the resources developed. Additionally, the response methodologies and the implementation tools that are developed in each response could be better shared with other shelter practitioners. The cluster website, the trainings and the members of the Support Team are already capturing and disseminating the most salient of these tools and methodologies. However, more could be shared in order to improve practice and foster innovation. Finally, by strengthening the links between all these processes and making them a single pre-defined system, it would be easier to capture valuable information to explain the situation of the cluster and advocate for its needs.

3.1.4 Response analysis	*Describe our strategy to address the identified problems and briefly explain why other responses were not chosen. Explain how the proposed response addresses the specific needs of the affected persons. Make sure you link this section with the results/sectors proposed in section 4.* This Action will advance towards the goal of the GSC Strategy 2013-2017. This Action builds upon the achievements made in 2013-2014 and upon the increased sustainability attained by the cluster. It also introduces a number of innovative approaches to address the challenges identified in previous years. **Mainstreaming of core activities** The GSC has strived to spread the cost of the core coordination services it provides, particularly surge capacity, remote support to country-level clusters, and the support to Global Cluster operational structures including the website, among a more diversified portfolio of donors, including unmarked resources from cluster leads and partners. Core to the logic of this new proposal is the expectation that further diversification will be possible and that a sustainable balance will be found between resourcing through predictable funding of partners and access to new funds from external donors. **Innovative approaches** The GSC is proposing innovative approaches to address the challenges identified. These are approaches that the GSC has not tried before, but that have been successfully used by other stakeholders or are new improvements to the current approaches, and include the following: • **Immediate Surge Capacity** (1-3 months): The model used in 2013-2014 has generally worked well, but some improvements will be made to further ensure appropriate support to field operations: o Global Focal Points (GFP): their main role will continue to be surge capacity with a maximum duration of 1 month. Four of them will provide general coordination support, two will concentrate on Information Management, and one on Assessment and Monitoring. Between deployments, they will continue supporting existing country-level clusters clearly allocated to each GFP. When not deployed and as a second priority, they will support the GSC structures and activities. o Roving Focal Points (RFP): The role of the Roving Focal Points (formerly Regional Focal Points) will be modified according to the lessons learned in the past two years as

	explained in the section 3.1.3. The name of this role will be changed to better reflect the revised responsibilities. There will be three RFPs, each having a direct reporting line to a GFP. Their main role will also be surge capacity with a maximum duration of 3 months. Between deployments, they will assist GFPs in providing remote support to country-level clusters, and will also help in providing support according to their skills in areas such as contingency planning, urban responses, settlement approach, and others. • **Dedicated Surge Capacity** (up to 6 months): While the support provided by the immediate surge capacity has been successful, resulting in the mainstreaming of surge positions, there have been situations where a different type of support would have been more appropriate or efficient. Given the different type of emergencies and the different organisations leading the cluster at country-level, a new approach will be introduced to ensure that skilled and experienced resources can deploy for more appropriate timeframes: ○ **Two senior roving cluster coordinators** on retainer contracts to enable fast deployments for up-to six months. These profiles will be experienced coordinators able to operationalise clusters in response to new crises. • **An integrated system to inform improved practice and foster innovation**: Closer links will be established between assessments, monitoring, and evaluation that will allow better quantification and qualification of the responses provided by cluster partners to meet shelter needs. Learning from these responses will be captured at country level and disseminated at global level through training, the GSC website (www.sheltercluster.org), the Shelter Projects website (www.sheltercasestudies.org) and publications. This system will also allow for better capturing of information that will enable the GSC to better explain the situation of the country-level clusters and undertake **evidence-based advocacy** for their needs and more generally for those of the sector. This advocacy will be done through the enhanced network of cluster agencies that this Action will create and specific projects and products.
3.1.5 Previous evaluation or lessons learned exercise relevant for this Action	N/A
3.1.6 [INT] Update on needs assessment	*Please provide as necessary, an update of section 3.1. In particular, provide information on new*

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>assessment(s) carried out since the submission of the proposal.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.1.7 [FIN] Report on needs assessment</td><td>Provide as necessary, an update of section 3.1. In particular, provide information on new assessment(s) carried out since the interim report. Report on major changes and specific difficulties encountered in relation to the initial assessment.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3.2 Beneficiaries</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.1 Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the Action</td><td>Indicate either the total number of individuals, of organisations targeted by the Action or both.
Number of individuals: XXXXX
Number of organisations: 35 organisations</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.1.1 [INT] Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the action</td><td>Please indicate how many individuals or organisations benefitted from the Action.
Number of individuals: XXXXX
Number of organisations: XXXX (if needed)</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.1.1 [FIN] Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the action</td><td>Please indicate how many individuals or organisations benefitted from the Action.
Number of individuals: XXXXX
Number of organisations: XXXX (if needed)</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.2 Estimated disaggregated data about direct beneficiaries (only for individuals)</td><td>Disaggregate the data about the beneficiaries indicated above
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Estimated % of target group %</th><th>% of female (F)</th><th>% of male (M)</th></tr>
<tr><td>Infants and young children (0-59 months)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Children (5-17 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Adults (18-49 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Elderly (> 50 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.2.1 [FIN] Disaggregated data about direct beneficiaries reached (only for individuals</td><td>Please update the table below.
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Estimated % of target group %</td><td>% of female (F)</td><td>% of male (M)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Infants and young children (0-59 months)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Children (5-17 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Adults (18-49 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Elderly (> 50 years)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.3 Does the action specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?</td><td>Yes ☐ No ☑</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.3.1 If yes, please specify</td><td>Women

Children

Etc.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.4 Beneficiaries: what are the selection criteria</td><td>Briefly explain the identification mechanisms and selection criteria

The Strategic Advisory Group will set the criteria for selecting the partners that will benefit directly from this funding. This will be based, but not exclusively, on the organization’s capacity, past engagement with the Shelter Cluster and institutional commitment to continue with the activity beyond ECHO’s timeframe of the Action. The SAG will share the ECHO proposal, the activities that are to be implemented by cluster partners and the criteria with all the cluster partners. The organizations will express their interest in participating, explaining how they fulfil the criteria, and the SAG will take the final decision based on recommendations from the GSC Support Team.</td></tr>
<tr><td>3.2.5 Beneficiaries: what is the involvement of</td><td>Explain the involvement of the beneficiaries and affected population in the Action.</td></tr>
</table>

beneficiaries in the action?	The ultimate target group and beneficiaries of the Shelter Cluster are the people affected by humanitarian crises, including host communities, whose lives depend on an efficient and effective humanitarian response to their needs. It is estimated that in 2013 the Shelter Cluster assisted around 4.8 million[11] beneficiaries from 18 different responses. The direct beneficiaries of the proposal will be the Shelter Cluster partners and other shelter stakeholders at the country and global levels. Participation in the Shelter Cluster at both country and global levels is open to any non-profit organisation working in humanitarian shelter. Beneficiaries are therefore self-selecting and profit from the outputs in different ways. In 2014, there were 35 partners of the Shelter Cluster at the global level and an estimate of 350 partners at country level. This Action is based in the GSC Strategy 2013 – 2017 which was drafted with the close involvement of the beneficiary organisations. The 2012 GSC meeting that set the foundation for the GSC Strategy 2013- 2017 was attended by 64 participants from 31 organisations including cluster coordinators from most of the country level shelter clusters, shelter cluster partners, donors (including ECHO) and other clusters. The GSC Strategy was approved by the GSC SAG. The implementation of the GSC Strategy has been reviewed in the yearly GSC meetings in 2013 and in 2014. The participants in these meetings remained quite similar to the one in 2012, increasing to 35 organisations. In preparation for the 2014 GSC meeting, an anonymous on-line survey was produced inviting the partners of country-level clusters to provide inputs on issues to be addressed by the GSC. A total of 79 respondents participated in this survey. The GSC SAG has been monitoring the implementation of the GSC Strategy through its meetings and during the two-day SAG Retreats that took place in 2013 and 2014. In 2014, the GSC SAG agreed on activities to be undertaken in 2015 and 2016 to continue implementing the GSC Strategy. The SAG agreed to jointly approach donors in order to raise the funds needed to implement these activities In particular, it was decided that a proposal would be submitted to

[11] Data estimated from Flash Appeals, Strategic Response Plans, and GSC Fact Sheets as follows: Philippines Cyclone Haiyan: 1,5 million, DRC: 0,9 million, Afghanistan: 0,7 million, Yemen: 0,4 million, Pakistan: 0,4 million, Myanmar: 0,25 million, Mali: 0,25 million, others: 0.4 million.

	the ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity Fund by UNHCR on behalf of the cluster. This proposal has been agreed by the GSC SAG which is the body mandated by the GSC to facilitate the coordination of harmonized resource mobilization efforts as established in the SAG ToR.[12]
3.2.6 Beneficiaries: more details on beneficiaries?	*When needed, provide more information on the specificities of the direct beneficiaries or potential indirect beneficiaries.* *Or explain, difficulties to capture valuable information* *Do not repeat information already provided in other sections.* Additional indirect beneficiaries include: 1. All the beneficiaries of the country level Shelter Clusters partners. The improved coordination achieved through this proposal will enable cluster partners to deliver better humanitarian responses to their beneficiaries. 2. Host governments both at the national and local levels. 3. Humanitarian actors, particularly those working in the shelter sector, will benefit from more predictable shelter coordination and leadership. 4. IFRC/UNHCR/IOM and other agencies leading clusters at country level. 5. Other clusters and interagency initiatives will also benefit from the publicly available outputs that will be developed in this action. 6. National agencies, including RCRC National Societies, who are not routinely part of the shelter cluster but who benefit from the enhanced coordination services. 7. Global, regional and national shelter agencies and sector practitioners, including private sector, who are not routinely part of the Shelter Cluster and its preparedness activities but who benefit

[12] The SAG ToR were approved on the 2012 Global Shelter cluster meeting (1-2 November) and can be found here: http://www.sheltercluster.org/sites/default/files/docs/TOR%20-%20GSC%20SAG.doc

	from the freely available online information, tools and training. 8. Refugees involved in UNHCR shelter and settlement projects will benefit because UNHCR will improve the coordination and performance of these intervention using tools, and lessons learned from the IDP shelter and settlement operations. 9. Academic, professional and technical bodies with whom tools, methodologies, lessons learned and other outputs developed will be shared with or jointly developed.
3.2.7 [INT] Update on beneficiaries	*Please comment and provide, if needed, an update on the various beneficiary sections. You might want to explain the difficulties encountered with the selection and involvement of beneficiaries or any other issues in relation to the affected population.*
3.2.8 [FIN] Report on beneficiaries	*Please report on the beneficiary sections and on the involvement of the beneficiaries in the implementation and evaluation the Action. Report on major difficulties, challenges with the affected populations.*
4. Logic of intervention	
4.1 Principal objective	*Please fill in (only 1 principal obj.) thinking of the principal objective as the long term benefits that cannot be reached with the proposed project alone.* To more effectively meet the sheltering needs of populations affected by humanitarian crises, by strengthening the shelter response of humanitarian actors through leadership, coordination and accountability in the humanitarian shelter sector.
4.2 Specific objective	
4.2.1 Short description	*Please fill in (only 1 specific obj.) thinking of the specific objective as the short term benefits that will be achieved thanks to the intervention.* To strengthen the shelter response of humanitarian actors by improving the GSC surge capacity, preparedness, and advocacy.
4.2.2 Detailed description	*Use this section only if you want to provide more information on the specific objective. Do not repeat*

	information provided in other sections.
4.2.3 Indicators Specific Objective	*Add below as many indicators as you see fit and provide for each indicator a description, the target value and source of verification:*
4.2.3 Indicator 1	*Write here the indicator relating to the specific objective + indicate the target value to be reached (number or %) + source of verification* Description: **Average number of hours in which a trained and experienced coordinator is deployed to newly activated shelter clusters.** As a reflection of the surge capacity that is foreseen under Result 1, the GSC will be able to respond more quickly to the first needs of a response after the cluster activation. With the surge capacity in standby, and not including the constraints with issuing visas, security, and other similar administrative or logistic constraints, the GSC will have a trained and experienced coordinator deployed within 72h, to set up the country-level shelter cluster. This indicator has been maintained from 2013-2014 in order to able to track progress. However, a number of new mechanisms have been put in place particularly in activities 1.1 and 1.2 in order to strengthen the achievements measured by this indicator. Target Value: **72h after the cluster activation** Source of verification: **Deployment reports by the surge capacity**
4.2.3 [INT] Progress on indicator 1	*Please report on progress made on the indicator by indicating the target value*
4.2.3 [FIN] Achieved value	Achieved value: *Please report on the achieved value* Progress report on indicator: *Please provide an overview on the level of achievement of this indicator.*
4.2.3 Indicator 2	*Write here the indicator relating to the specific objective + indicate the target value to be reached (number or %) + source of verification* Description: **% of shelter cluster partners including the government counterpart that are satisfied with the coordination services provided.** This indicator will measure the satisfaction of the shelter cluster counterparts with the services provided

	by the cluster. This satisfaction will include the GSC's capacity to quickly respond to the emergency, the coordination process, and if the cluster timely addressed the needs of the population of concern. Target Value: 75% Source of verification: **Feedback from partners at the yearly GSC meeting. Country-level cluster performance management and reviews.**
4.2.3 [INT] Progress on indicator 2	*Please report on progress made on the indicator by indicating the target value*
4.2.3 [FIN] Achieved value	Achieved value: *Please report on the achieved value* Progress report on indicator: *Please provide an overview on the level of achievement of this indicator.*
4.3. Results	
Result 1	
Title	*Insert here the description/title of the result. In case of regional actions, please add the country before the description*
	Global and regional shelter cluster capacity and resources are strengthened to provide responsive and flexible **support to country level coordination mechanisms**.
Details	*Specify the sector corresponding to the result as well as the estimated total cost for this result* Sector: **Shelter and NFIs** Subsector: **Other, Coordination** Estimated total cost of the result (in EUR): **EUR 3,159,952**
[INT]	Total amount spent:
[FIN]	Total amount spent:
4.3.1 Estimated total number of direct	*Indicate the number of beneficiaries targeted by the result. The number can be expressed as either*

beneficiaries targeted by the result	*individuals, or organisations or households or a combination.* Individuals: Organisations: **35 organisations** Households: Individuals per household: Grand total individuals:
[FIN] 4.3.1.1 Actual number of direct beneficiaries reached	*Indicate the number of beneficiaries reached* Individuals: Organisations: Households: Individuals per household: Grand total individuals:
4.3.2 Beneficiary type	IDPs ☐ Refugees ☐ Returnees ☐ Local population ☐ Other ☑
4.3.3 Does this result specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?	Yes ☐ No ☑
4.3.4 Comments on beneficiaries	*Please add any comments you might have on the targeted beneficiaries*
[INT] 4.3.5 Update on beneficiaries	*Please indicate how many beneficiaries have been reached over the reporting period. Indicate whether there is a need to revise the number of beneficiaries.*
[FIN] 4.3.6 Report on beneficiaries	*Please report on the details of beneficiaries. Have we reached the planned numbers? If not, why not?*
Indicators	*Add max 5 indicators per result. Provide all the information requested:*

	- *Description* - *Base line and target value* - *Source of verification* - *Comments, if needed* *The baseline is the value of the indicator at the beginning of the action before any activities. The data relating to the baseline can come either from official sources, from our own needs assessment or other sources. Baseline data allow assessing the progresses and comparison between the start and the end of the Action. The target is the level of result to be achieved within the duration of the action.*
Indicator 1.1	• Indicator/description: **% of existing Shelter Clusters with the harmonized basic coordination tools (Strategy, Factsheet, and Technical Guidelines and Standards) in place.** • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **100%** • Target value (figures: nr or %): **100%** • Source of verification: **Documents available on sheltercluster.org website** • Possible comments: **The harmonized coordination tools provide a standard of core coordination services that cluster partners can expect of country-level shelter clusters. These harmonized coordination tools vary depending on the status of the cluster (active or in preparedness mode). They provide the key coordination needed for a shelter cluster. This indicator has been maintained from 2013-2014 in order to be able to track progress. The harmonized coordination tools will be enhanced and will be better linked with the support from the GFPs and RFPs and through the systems put in place in activity 1.3.**
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification*

	• Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:
Indicator 1.2	• Indicator/description: Number of countries in which assessment surge capacity is deployed, enabling the organisation of interagency assessments in order to feed into humanitarian funding milestones such as Flash Appeals, CERF, or SRP. • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **6** • Target value (figures: nr or %): **8** • Source of verification: **Flash Appeals, CERF, SRP documents. Assessment reports** • Possible comments: **Interagency joint assessments provide an important foundation for joint strategic planning and set a baseline for monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. They also give ownership of the process to cluster partners and set a culture of collaboration and accountability that can be maintained through the implementation of the strategy. These assessments will be undertaken using the methodology and lessons learnt in the last years. This methodology will be further improved as explained in activity 1.3**
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification* • Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:
Indicator 1.3	• Indicator/description: **Average % of time of the Surge Capacity spent on support to country-level clusters (whether in-country or remotely)** • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **70%**

	• Target value (figures: nr or %): **70%** • Source of verification: **Surge Capacity Monthly Activity Report** • Possible comments: **The core activity of the Surge Capacity (Global Focal Points and RFP) is to support country-level shelter clusters. The GSC Surge Capacity aims to spend an average of 70% of their time dedicated to supporting activities at the country level, either remotely or in country. They also contribute to enhance global cluster preparedness, capturing good practices, developing or updating guidelines and tools, and supporting GSC initiatives and priorities. This indicator will be measured through monthly reports produced by the surge capacity on their activities and time dedicated to global and country-level activities.**
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification* • Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:
Activities	*Add as many activities as necessary. Add the main activities that will support the achievement of the result. A title that summarizes the activity as well as a description of the implementation of the activity need to be provided.*
Activity 1.1	Title: **Immediate Surge Capacity** (1-3 months) supports country level clusters Detailed description: This Action will strengthen the linkages between the global and local coordination of shelter response efforts in emergencies. The GSC will continue using the model that was in place in 2013 – 2014 with some improvements to further ensure appropriate support to field operations. The GSC Support Team is the backbone that provides the immediate support to country-level clusters both as surge capacity and by

	providing remote guidance and support. This Action will contribute to ensuring that the Support Team works to its full extent, providing effective and pre-qualified management of the shelter cluster at country level at the onset of an emergency and upon request through punctual missions. The decision on which shelter cluster partners will be involved in the secondment of members of the support team will be done according to criteria decided by the SAG. The GSC Support Team will consist of the following members: - 2 GSC Coordinators (dedicated 50% of their time to the cluster) – Not included in this action - 2 Deputy Coordinators (one 100% dedicated to the cluster and one 90% dedicated) – covered with own funding from GSC co-leads. ECHO funds will not be used to cover these costs. - 4 Global Focal Points (GFP) for Coordination (1 of which 100% dedicated, two 90%, and one 80%) - 2 GFP for Information Management (one 90% and the other one 80% dedicated to the cluster) - 1 GFP for Assessment and Monitoring (50% dedicated to the cluster) - 3 Roving Focal Points (RFP) for Coordination (100% dedicated to the cluster) one of them Regional Cluster Coordinator for the Americas (100% dedicated) - 1 Grant Management Assistant (100% dedicated to the cluster) – Budgeted under Other costs, not in Activity 1.1 These roles are explained as follows: **GSC Coordinators** The GSC Coordinators represent the co-leads IFRC and UNHCR. They provide the strategic direction to the GSC advised by the SAG and engage regularly in the Global Cluster Coordinators Group. In addition, the Coordinators inform the Emergency Directors, the IASC Working and Principals groups assuring a well-established Cluster management and strengthening the effectiveness of the responses. The Global Cluster Coordinators also advocate on behalf of the cluster by engaging at various levels in the Cluster Lead Agency, with cluster partners, donors, and other stakeholders. **GSC Deputy Coordinators** Two Deputy Coordinators assist the GSC on behalf of IFRC and UNHCR. They are alternates to the GSC Coordinators in the Global Cluster Coordinators Group and in other inter-cluster coordination fora. This

	dedicated role is essential for the cluster as the Deputy Cluster Coordinators ensure the day to day running of the cluster. Under the guidance of the Global Cluster Coordinators, they provide support to the cluster by: • Deploying the Shelter Coordination Teams (SCT) that coordinate country-level shelter clusters. • Overseeing the work of the Support Team (which includes the surge capacity) and of the Working Groups. • Liaising with UNHCR and IFRC country offices to ensure that the cluster coordination role is well understood and fits with the structure of the office. • Advocating for and overseeing the financial resources that the lead agencies dedicate to the cluster and those that are received from other sources (including this ECHO proposal). • Chairing and organising SAG meetings, the GSC meeting, the mid-year teleconference, and the annual Cluster Coordination Workshop. • Providing inputs or leading cluster coordination trainings that contribute to expanding the cluster surge capacity. All these activities are part of the Action or closely related to it. In their daily work, the Deputy Cluster Coordinators will be implementing the part of the Action related to the co-leads, helping the partners to implement their part of the Action, and ensuring that the Action is connected with the GSC. The Deputy Cluster Coordinators will also build synergies between the Action and other activities undertaken outside this proposal by the cluster as a whole, by individual cluster partners or the co-leads, or by other clusters or entities. The role of the Deputy Cluster Coordinators is key for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all activities in the Action, having oversight and lead responsibilities in ensuring adequate management of the deliverables under this Action. **Global Focal Points for Coordination, Information Management, Assessment and Monitoring** Their main role will continue to be surge capacity with a maximum duration of 1 month. Between

	deployments, they will continue supporting existing country-level clusters clearly allocated to each GFP. When not deployed and as a second priority, they will support the GSC structures and activities. Predictable, timely and effective shelter cluster coordination at the country level requires immediate availability of dedicated, trained, and experienced staff to deploy within 72 hours of cluster activation. The employment of a dedicated team of GFPs enhances the standing capacity of suitably qualified individuals to provide strong leadership and coordination of the shelter cluster response at field level. This approach has been successfully used by the GSC in 2013 – 2014 and before. Outside of emergencies, the GFPs contribute to enhance Global Cluster preparedness for response by capturing best practices and feeding them back into SCT (Shelter Coordination Team) deployments and trainings, by developing or updating guidelines and tools, and by supporting GSC initiatives and priorities. According to their expertise, the GFPs will provide support to country-level clusters in specialized areas such as Contingency Planning, Urban Response, Settlement Planning, and others. They will also ensure appropriate linkages with other clusters. The GFPs will work in close collaboration in order to ensure that their work is coherent, coordinated, and useful for the overall cluster. Additional to the four GFPs for Coordination, there will be two GFPs for Information Management and one GFP for Assessment, Monitoring, and Evaluation. This will be a total of seven GFPs. The GFPs have an important role in ensuring consistency in the approach and tools used, thus, continuity in this role is essential. The GFPs will be deployed for a maximum of one month as the key resource with the highest level of expertise in their subject matter. An important part of the support they will provide to country-level clusters will be done remotely to assist the cluster coordinators or other members of the team that are present in-country. **Roving Focal Points for Coordination** There will be three Roving Focal Points (RFP) for coordination, each having a direct reporting line to a GFP. Their main role will also be surge capacity with a maximum duration of 3 months. Between deployments, they will support GFPs in providing remote support to country-level clusters and in

	providing support according to their skills in areas such as contingency planning, urban responses, settlement approach, and others. The RFPs will be hosted by cluster partners. The RFPs for Coordination report to the Global Focal Points for Coordination and have a similar role to them in being deployed as surge capacity. However, the RFP will be deployed for a longer period, up to 3 months, while the long-term cluster coordinators are identified and deployed. They will support national and sub-national shelter clusters through improved cooperation and coordination between clusters, national capacity mapping/baseline, national actors and development actors at every stage from preparedness to response and through the facilitation of national and local NGO participation. Similar to the GFPs and according to their expertise, the RFPs will provide support to country-level clusters in specialized areas such as Contingency Planning, Urban Response, Settlement Planning, and others. The RFP will also organize and attend the global, regional and national coordination workshops undertaken to capture and share good practices, they will contribute to the trainings, and will upload tools and documents in sheltercluster.org. Their knowledge and experience will thus be shared with others. A particular case of RFP is the Regional Shelter Cluster Coordinator covering the Americas region. Given the importance of the regional shelter network in the Americas, this role will maintain a regional role.
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
Activity 1.2	Title: **Dedicated Surge Capacity** (up to 6 months) is provided through an innovative approach to sustain essential country-level cluster coordination through to the securing of longer term profiles. Detailed description: The support provided in 2013 and 2014 by the immediate surge capacity has been successful and has resulted in the mainstreaming of these surge positions. However, there have been situations where a different/additional type of support would have been beneficial to ensure a consistent level of coordination expertise is maintained in emergency affected countries. Given the different types of emergencies and the different organisations leading the cluster at country-level, a new approach will be

	introduced to widen the choice of options and ensure that skilled and experienced resources can be deployed for more appropriate timeframes. **Two senior roving cluster coordinators** on retainer contracts to enable fast deployments for up to six months. These profiles will be experienced coordinators able to operationalise clusters in response to new crises. They will be very experienced top cadre coordinators retained for immediate deployment in response to complex crises requiring senior expertise. These roving coordinators will supplement the surge capacity provided by GFPs and RFPs with a longer term focus in order to minimize the turn-over of cluster coordinators at country level. The senior roving coordinators will be deployed to complex crises including system-wide level 3 emergencies where there is a need for senior coordination capacity. They will also be deployed to emergencies where it is envisaged that it will take more than 3 months to identify longer-term coordination capacity and thus the GFPs and RFPs will not be able to provide the required continuity in the role. In these cases, the senior roving cluster coordinators will provide senior expert coordination until the longer-term coordination capacity is deployed. The senior roving cluster coordinators will minimize the rotation of country level cluster coordinators by providing both the surge capacity and medium-term capacity. •
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
Activity 1.3	Title: Operational analysis **informs improved practice and fosters innovation** through an integrated system. Detailed description: The GSC is committed to the systematic analysis and assessment of its activities and to a culture of transparent accountability to its stakeholders. In order to fulfill this commitment, an integrated system of assessment, monitoring, evaluation, capturing learning, and disseminating learning will be put in place.

	This system will include the following: - 8 assessment and monitoring activities - Evaluations undertaken as defined by the GSC M&E strategy - Practice is captured and disseminated 2 global coordination workshops - Practice is further disseminated through 2 global coordination trainings, and the Shelter Projects web and publication. Below is an explanation of each of these items: **Assessment and monitoring activities** With the support from REACH and building on the partnership of 2011 to 2012 and 2013 to 2014, shelter cluster assessments will be implemented in the aftermath of a disaster by (1) providing dedicated human resources; (2) facilitating interagency assessments coordination and roll-outs in the field; (3) ensuring timely assessment data analysis and diffusion of its results to enable quick and informed decision making. The Action will also promote relevant use of satellite and remote sensor data by providing direct linkages between the country-level shelter cluster and UNOSAT analysis and satellite imagery resources. In at least 2 crises, the initial assessments will be followed up by sector progress evaluations. These will be conducted by interagency teams, approximately 3 months after the conduct of the initial assessment. They will enable to capture best practices, lessons learnt and remaining gaps in the shelter response, in order to inform revised planning and to enable better global capitalization. Finally, a GSC MIS system will be further developed and implemented in at least 2 crises. The MIS will enable the collection, analysis and dissemination of cluster and cluster-members data through dedicated web-(and in relevant off-line) portals. All information will also be available inof dedicated web dashboards, enabling tailored geographical analysis of data. **Evaluations** The GSC has developed common guidance to review country-level clusters Monitoring and Evaluation

	Strategy. Once this strategy is finalised, it will set criteria for the different types of evaluations or reviews that will be conducted according to the type of emergency or cluster. These evaluations will be conducted using the common guidance already developed. Independent reviews have been commissioned in the past in country-level clusters led by IFRC and are publicly available in sheltercluster.org[13]. UNHCR has also undertaken evaluations of its role as cluster lead but from a more institutional perspective. Other country level cluster leads have evaluated their role in different ways. This Action will enable the undertaking of evaluations using the developed common approach to review country-level shelter clusters. This will allow for better learning and accountability, and for the possibility to undertake meta-evaluations to study trends and other useful information. These reviews will be informed by the Information Management System developed by REACH for the Shelter Cluster identifying and measuring key performance and impact indicators at country level, and capturing them in interactive web maps. These key indicators will be linked to the assessments indicators used in the Shelter Cluster - REACH methodology. The cluster leads will work closely with interested partners of the GSC, such as ACTED and IMPACT, in defining a monitoring methodology in line with the Shelter Cluster assessment methodology. **Global Coordination Workshops** Predictable coordination at field level requires consistent delivery of high-quality coordination services regardless of the individual knowledge and expertise of staff and agencies participating in any given SCT deployment. The continuous gathering and dissemination of best practice and improvement of existing methodologies, tools and strategies through regular reflection among practitioners constitute a key factor in ensuring consistency in coordination products and services by shelter cluster agencies. Global coordination workshops provide the primary forum to address detailed shelter coordination issues

[13] They can be found here: http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/cluster-evaluations-0

	by practitioners and their shelter cluster agency representatives that can inform and improve future response. These workshops result in revised templates, tools, methodologies, greater clarity of roles and responsibilities, and improved support systems for addressing finance, security, and human resources issues. The knowledge gained and good practice captured through global and regional coordination workshops is further disseminated through the cluster website and informs improved content of future coordination surge capacity trainings. By holding two global coordination workshops over the timeframe of this Action, cluster agencies will achieve greater global alignment and enhance specific ways to work better as one shelter cluster. **Global coordination trainings** There is a lack of trained and experienced shelter cluster coordinators and more qualified personnel need to be trained and maintained. The GSC co-leads currently host two types of coordination training. UNHCR runs a joint tri-cluster coordination and leadership training (co-lead) for the Protection, CCCM, and Shelter clusters with a focus on conflict. IFRC delivers training on shelter coordination for natural disasters. Both trainings are open to cluster partners which regularly send participants. In order to address the shortage of trained Shelter Cluster Coordinators through this Action, three sessions of the shelter coordination training will be delivered with a focus in both conflict and natural disasters bringing together participants from UNHCR, IFRC, and cluster partners. **Shelter Projects web and publication** Shelter Projects is a compilation of shelter projects both in natural disasters and conflict that started in 2008 as a cluster product and continued thereafter as a sector initiative led by IFRC, UNHABITAT, and UNHCR. Shelter Projects gather experiences from many actors pointing out the successes and challenges of its implementation but without mentioning the organisation implementing them. These experiences are presented as case studies in a website (www.sheltercasestudies.org) and in a publication. The website has a tagging and search function that allows searching by countries, and themes. The partners contributing to this initiative and the GSC SAG agreed that Shelter Projects would benefit from becoming

	a cluster initiative. Shelter Projects is currently published bi-annually and the next edition will cover 2015 – 2016.
[INT] Progress report on all activities of Result 1	*Please provide an overall update on the progress made in the implementation of the activities. Highlight major challenges or change of plans. Please make sure that an update is provided for all the activities.*
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
[FIN] Conclusions on the result	*Please present your conclusions on the overall achievement of the result.*
Result 2	
Title	*Insert here the description/title of the result. In case of regional actions, please add the country before the description* The preparedness and predictability of shelter coordination and responses is enhanced through an **effective and well-functioning GSC**.
Details	*Specify the sector corresponding to the result as well as the estimated total cost for this result* Sector: **Shelter and NFIs** Subsector: **Others, coordination** Estimated total cost of the result (in EUR): **EUR 154200**
[INT]	Total amount spent:
[FIN]	Total amount spent:
4.3.1 Estimated total number of direct beneficiaries targeted by the result	*Indicate the number of beneficiaries targeted by the result. The number can be expressed as either individuals, or organisations or households or a combination.* Individuals: Organisations: **35 organisations**

	Households: Individuals per household: Grand total individuals:
[FIN] 4.3.1.1 Actual number of direct beneficiaries reached	*Indicate the number of beneficiaries reached* Individuals: Organisations: Households: Individuals per household: Grand total individuals:
4.3.2 Beneficiary type	IDPs ☐ Refugees ☐ Returnees ☐ Local population ☐ Other ☑
4.3.3 Does this result specifically target certain groups or vulnerabilities?	Yes ☐ No ☑
4.3.4 Comments on beneficiaries	*Please add any comments you might have on the targeted beneficiaries*
[INT] 4.3.5 Update on beneficiaries	*Please indicate how many beneficiaries have been reached over the reporting period. Indicate whether there is a need to revise the number of beneficiaries.*
[FIN] 4.3.6 Report on beneficiaries	*Please report on the details of beneficiaries. Have we reached the planned numbers? If not, why not?*
Indicators	*Add max 5 indicators per result. Provide all the information requested:* - *Description* - *Base line and target value* - *Source of verification*

	- *Comments, if needed* *The baseline is the value of the indicator at the beginning of the action before any activities. The data relating to the baseline can come either from official sources, from our own needs assessment or other sources. Baseline data allow assessing the progresses and comparison between the start and the end of the Action. The target is the level of result to be achieved within the duration of the action.*
Indicator 2.1	• Indicator/description: **% of SAG members that are satisfied with the transparency, accountability, and effectiveness of the GSC** • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **Unknown** • Target value (figures: nr or %): **70%** • Source of verification: **Anonymous survey undertaken by SAG members.** • Possible comments: SAG members follow very closely the developments of the cluster at global level. Since they are also in most of the cases the shelter advisors for important shelter actors they also see the impact of the GSC in country-level shelter coordination. Thus, they are very well placed to provide an accurate picture of how the GSC is working and the services that it is providing to country-level clusters.
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification* • Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:

Indicator 2.2	Indicator/description: **% of activated shelter clusters for which sheltercluster.org provides updated contact details and key documents related to the shelter response.** • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **100%** • Target value (figures: nr or %): **100%** • Source of verification: contact details and key documents available in www.sheltercluster.org • Possible comments: Since 2011 the platform www.ShelterCluster.org supports communications and dissemination of information among cluster stakeholders in active deployments. Updated information will be maintained on the website in a timely manner, ensuring that the platform is a reliable tool for the cluster and partners.
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification* • Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:
Indicator 2.3	• Indicator/description: **% of Shelter Coordinators on the Global Coordination Workshop that classified the workshop as useful for their work at country level.** • Baseline (figures: nr or %): **80%** • Target value (figures: nr or %): **80%**

	• Source of verification: • Possible comments: The Global Coordination Workshop is the primary forum to address detailed shelter coordination issues by practitioners and their shelter cluster agency representatives, to inform and improve future response. It is essential that the workshop continues to be field driven, aiming on the enhancement of country level responses through the support of the global level shelter cluster and, therefore, useful for shelter cluster country coordinators.
[INT] Progress value	*Indicate the progress made on the target value of the above indicator, if available.* • Progress on Target value (figures: nr or %):
[FIN] Final indicator	*Indicate the achieved value reached by the end of the implementation period as well as the source of verification* • Achieved value (figures: nr or %): • Source of verification:
Comments on all indicators for this result	*Add any comment you might have on the indicators*
[INT] Update on all indicators	*Please provide an update on all the indicators by stating whether we are on track or not, whether there is a need to revise the indicators and if so indicate which changes in the target values are required.*
[FIN] Report on indicators	*Provide a report on the level of achievement of the result and how this achievement was verified and/or measured by the indicators. When the indicators are no longer verifiable and measurable, explain how the achievement of the result can be measured.*
Activities	*Add as many activities as necessary. Add the main activities that will support the achievement of the result. A title that summarizes the activity as well as a description of the implementation of the activity need to be provided.*
Activity 2.1	Title: The **GSC increases its effectiveness and accountability.**

	Detailed description: The GSC will continue the progress made in the last years in terms of defining its structure. In this sense, a document will be drafted explaining the roles and responsibilities of the different GSC bodies and how they contribute to the GSC Strategy. In order to increase its sustainability, the GSC will also define further approaches for sustainable resourcing of the GSC core structures and services. These approaches will include concrete commitments from cluster partners to resource some global cluster activities in a similar way as it has been happening in country-level shelter clusters in past years. The GSC will enhance the monitoring of its activities. A mid-term review of the GSC Strategy 2013-2017 will be undertaken in order to assess the progress made and any changes in the strategy that might be needed. This revision will include considerations on how to establish better links between the global and country-level clusters to promote more input to the Global Cluster from country-level clusters and higher awareness at country-level of global level issues including the strategy, as relevant. A mechanism will be put in place to monitor the progress made in the implementation of the strategy. An essential part of the Strategy is the support provided by the GSC Support Team to country-level clusters. In order to measure this support in a more concrete way, the monitoring dashboard showing the services provided by the surge capacity will be updated regularly and shared with the SAG. This Action will contribute to the organisation of two GSC meetings and two SAG retreats. The GSC meetings bring together all GSC partners, typically in Autumn, with the objective of revising the progress made during the year and defining the priorities for the coming year. The SAG retreat happens one month after the GSC meeting and has the objective of defining a concrete work plan for the incoming year based on the feedback received during the GSC meeting. The SAG retreat is also an occasion to advance substantive issues that cannot be dealt with during the monthly one-hour SAG teleconferences. The Action will also contribute with funds for the GSC SAG and Working Groups to implement their activities. These GSC bodies have been making good progress over the last years. The introduction of some funding in 2013 for these bodies to maximize their outputs meant a substantial increase in the quality of the outputs produced.
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*

Activity 2.2	Title: Evidence based information is gathered and disseminated through the GSC website and other means. Detailed description: The shelter and settlement sector has more potential to contribute to the humanitarian community than is often understood by some senior decision makers. Early decisions have an enormous influence in the development of an emergency response and this is particularly the case for the shelter and settlement sector. The sector is very expensive by nature but there are a wide range of options with very different cost implications that are not always considered at the beginning of a response. As the operation evolves, the number of response options available reduces. Additionally, the investment made in some of the options can make it difficult to change course. Decision makers need to be made more aware of the implications of their decisions. In order to do this, more evidence should be gathered to better explain the implications of the different response options and their linkage with early recovery and reconstruction. Common advocacy messages will be identified and public communication products will be produced for advocating on behalf of the sector at country and global levels. The GSC website will also be used to advocate and pass these identified messages. Reliable, widely accessible and predictable sharing of information is one of the cornerstones to effective coordination. Since 2010, IFRC, in partnership with UNHCR, has developed a web platform called "www.ShelterCluster.org" to support communications and dissemination of information among cluster stakeholders in active deployments. It also serves as the cluster "memory" and knowledge management system for past responses. Within the platform, members of the cluster can intuitively navigate to a particular response and retrieve the most current strategic and technical guidance and activity updates, while also capitalizing upon lessons learned and products developed in previous responses in the same country or region. This website aims to be the virtual embodiment of the principles and values that the cluster approach represents: inclusiveness of all stakeholders, transparency, and collaboration in the effort to better coordinate between agencies and improve responses. The creation and use of sheltercluster.org was

	agreed with OCHA who welcomes it. The website is currently capturing data from all activated shelter clusters and countries where cluster-like coordination mechanisms exist. Additionally, a large body of archived and reference material from previous cluster deployments from 2006 to 2013 has been uploaded and made publicly available on the site for potential use in future responses. In 2014 this website was migrated to a new platform which brought considerable improvements. The site became more usable in low-bandwidth environments and mobile devices, better integrated with other coordination platforms (other clusters), and improved its usability for end users. The new platform allowed for greater synergies between sheltercluster.org and websites created by OCHA for inter-cluster coordination to enable easy ways of exchanging information. Because ShelterCluster.org is a living, evolving web platform, it will require ongoing maintenance, upgrading, development, technical support, and hosting. Adequate financial and human resources will be required to facilitate the following: • Training of field based information managers to upload content and tailor country-level sub-sites to suit the needs of the local context. • Global-level remote support for country-level information managers to ensure a high level of consistency, adherence to best practice, and uploading of content from global level resources. • Third-party technical support agreements with a competent IT company in case of site failure or as backup and to assist with ongoing site development. • Ongoing development and evolution of site functionality to better support the needs of the cluster partners. • Take full advantage of its multi-language functionality to have the country-level cluster websites in the local language and other languages needed. • Dedicated web-hosting in an environment that is at low risk for down-time and high fluctuations in usage. The global cluster leads will work closely with other agencies leading the cluster at country level to ensure coordination and coherence in the country level sites. At the global level, the Global Cluster leads will

	continue sharing responsibilities to efficiently develop, populate, and maintain the website in a joint manner. The website will be managed by the GFPs for Information Management with support from a Web Support who will be dedicated to supporting the sheltercluster.org website in the following functions: uploading of documents from country-level clusters and the Global Gluster to the website; creation and management of webpages particularly supporting country-level clusters; training of country-level information managers and others in the management of the website.
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
Activity 2.3	
[FIN] Final report on the activity	*Please report on the implementation of the above activity and explain what went well, what did not, which challenges we faced and what measures we took to mitigate these challenges.*
4.4 Preconditions	*Please fill this in by answering the following question: which conditions outside of our of direct control need to be met for us to start implementing the activities. A list of bullet points is fine. Additional information can be provided if needed in the section Additional information on the operational context of the Action (4.7) below.* - Full engagement of GSC partners and in particular GSC SAG members. - Cluster lead agencies continue their commitment to co-lead the GSC with the same level of support as expressed when this proposal was written. - No major changes will take place in the administrative rules and regulations of UNHCR and the partners implementing the grant. - No major changes will take place in the human resources currently involved in the management of the

	GSC.
4.5 Assumptions and risks	*Please fill this in keeping in mind that these should be the conditions to be met for our operation to be successfully implemented. These should be external factors that we cannot control. They should be formulated in a positive way. Bullet points are fine.* - Other donors will contribute funds to the proposal to complement ECHO's contribution. - The number of activated shelter clusters will remain similar to the current one with no dramatic increase particularly of System-Wide Level 3 emergencies. - No major changes in the IASC humanitarian architecture take place. - Partners implementing the grant will fulfil their commitments as outlined in the Project Agreements that will be signed. - No major changes will take place in the administrative rules and regulations of ECHO, UNHCR and the partners implementing the grant. - No major changes will take place in the human resources currently involved in the management of the GSC. - The exchange rate between EUR and USD will remain at a similar level during the implementation of the grant. - Visas and other logistical constraints will not cause significant delay the deployment of GFP or RFP. - Security restrictions will not have significant influence on the access and what nationalities can be deployed, thus limiting the number of candidates that can the chosen and possibility to deploy GFPs or RFPs.
4.6 Contingency measures (plan B/mitigating actions to be taken if risks and assumptions	*Please fill this in by indicating which measures we would take should the risks and assumptions materialize*

materialised)	*so that the result can still be achieved?* The GSC SAG is working to increase the cluster's donor base and other sustainability mechanisms. The organizations previously committed to implement the GSC Strategy, and those participating in the SAG were fully involved in developing the Action. This reflects the full engagement of the cluster members on implementing the Action and willingness to strengthen the cluster capacity. To avoid the risk of deployments not happening due to visa and nationality constraints, the Global Focal Points and Roving Focal Points will be selected thinking on the diversification of nationalities of the team. If the expressed risks materialize, security issues and/or visa restrictions, the Global Cluster will need to re-evaluate where Shelter experts can be deployed to, and determine whether or not is it feasible to provide technical assistance remotely. If the security situation affects a planned training event, an alternative venue will need to be arranged. Agency mechanisms are in place to identify and respond appropriately to changes of circumstances.
4.7 Additional information on the operational context of action	*If necessary, please use this section to provide additional information on specific issues raised in sections 4.4 to 4.6. It should not, however, repeat information already provided in other sections.*
4.8 [INT] Report on preconditions, assumptions and risks	*Please provide an update on the assumptions, preconditions and risks. Have they changed? Did they materialize? Are they still the same?*
4.9 [FIN] Report on preconditions, assumptions and risks	*In the final report, you will explain whether the preconditions were met, whether any risks materialised and how we reacted to secure the success of the Action.*
5. Quality markers	*The Gender-Age Marker is a new tool ECHO has developed in its proposals to assess to what extent each funded humanitarian action integrates gender and age considerations.*
5.1.1 Gender / Age markers - Marker details	*Please reply to the below questions. ECHO wants partners to assess the proposed activities by answering the 4 quality criteria and selecting the relevant answer: Yes, or not sufficiently. Based on the answers, each Action will be marked with a score (0-2) by ECHO.*

	1- Does the proposal contain an adequate and brief gender and age analysis? Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐ **2 - Is the assistance adapted to the specific needs and capacities of different gender and age groups?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐ **3 - Does the action prevent/mitigate negative effects?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐ **4 – Do relevant gender and age groups adequately participate in the design, implementation and evaluation of the Action?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐
5.1.2. Additional comments and challenges	*When relevant provide specific examples of adapted assistance, details on measures to prevent/mitigate negative effects of our intervention, challenges encountered in integrating gender and age in to the Action.* The GSC promotes adapting shelter support to the specific needs and capacities of different gender and age groups and the participation of gender and age groups in the design, implementation and evaluation of shelter support. IFRC, UNCHR and IOM have committed to achieve 100% gender marker code 2a/b for all the projects of shelter clusters led by these organizations. This initiative shows the continuous progress in the shelter cluster commitment to promote gender equality. This pledge was made in August 2013, and the organizations are working on processes and tools to facilitate this achievement with the support of IASC GenCap advisors.
5.1.3 [INT] Report on Gender & Age marker	*Please provide an update if anything new since the proposal was submitted.*

5.1.4 [FIN] Report on Gender & Age marker	*Please report in case of changes in the markers and comments provided in section 5.1 and 5.2. Information on improvements and setbacks in efforts to integrate gender and age should also be reported.*
5.2.1 Resilience marker	*Please reply to the below questions. ECHO wants partners to assess the proposed activities by answering the 4 quality criteria and selecting the relevant answer: Yes, or not sufficiently. Based on the answers, each Action will be marked with a score (0-2) by ECHO.* **1- Does the proposal include an adequate analysis of shocks, stresses and vulnerabilities?** Yes ☐ Not sufficiently ☑ **2 - Is the project risk informed? Does the project include adequate measures to ensure it does not aggravate risks or undermine capacities?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐ **3 - Does the project include measures to build local capacities (beneficiaries and local institutions)?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐ **4 – Does the project take opportunities to support long term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerability and risks?** Yes ☑ Not sufficiently ☐
5.2.2 How does the Action contribute to build resilience or reduce future risk?	*Please give details how the action will contribute to build resilience or reduce future risk.* The beneficiaries of the Action are organizations working at the global level, so the resilience considerations apply in a different way than for country-level Actions. The GSC promotes that country-level clusters and shelter actors undertake risk analysis, adapt shelter support to the different risks, include measures to not aggravate risks, build local capacities, and take opportunities to supporting long term strategies to reduce humanitarian needs, underlying vulnerabilities and risks.
5.2.3 [INT] Report on resilience marker	*Please provide an update if anything new since the proposal was submitted.*
5.2.4 [FIN] Report on resilience marker	*Please report in case of changes in the markers and comments provided in section 5.1 and 5.2.*

	Information on improvements and setbacks in efforts to integrate resilience should also be reported.
6. Implementation	
6.1 Human resources and management capacities	*Please explain briefly how human resources (both expatriate and local) will be mobilised to ensure an effective and efficient implementation of the Action. Explain for instance the organisational and management structure put in place (e.g. at the Action's locations, at capital level, at regional level, or in exceptional cases the structures in place for remote management).* **Grant Management Assistant** The Grant Management Assistant will ensure that the project is done in full compliance with the donors and UNHCR regulations. In order to do this, s/he will: • Build the partnership between UNHCR and the implementing partners, through the creation and monitoring of Implementing Partners Agreements; • Provide support in all areas of grant implementation (programme, finance, reporting); • Monitor the use of resources, particularly of the members of the Support Team, through the monthly monitoring reports; • Ensure timely achievement of grant deliverables and outputs; • Prepare and submit for consideration the narrative and financial reports required by the donor. • Ensure that the donor's principles and regulations are included in the Agreements and in the activities to be implemented by the partner organizations; These activities represent a large amount of work that will need the full dedication of the Grant Management Assistant through the Action. The Grant Management Assistant will need to know or learn

	how to use the UNHCR specific programming tools (MSRP and Focus) and regulations related to agreements with implementing partners; and learn how they relate with the donor's reporting regulations. This work needs to be done by a UNHCR employee in order to access the systems and requires time, attention, and dedication. Past experience in the management of similar numbers of implementing partners shows that a full time person will be needed.
6.1.1 [INT] Update on Human resources and management capacities	*This section is optional at interim stage. You should provide an update only in case of changes or in cases where Human Resources aspects of the Action have a negative effect on the implementation of the Action.*
6.1.2 [FIN] Human resources and management capacities	*Please provide an update on the human resources and management capacities and whether we faced any issue on this front.*
6.3.1 Equipment and goods	*Please provide information on major equipment and goods to be purchased. Please specify if there are possible constraints linked to this procurement (e.g. lengthy, complex procedure).* No major equipment or goods will be purchased through this action.
6.3.2 [INT] Equipment and goods	*This section is optional. The partner should provide an update only in case of changes or in case where equipment and goods aspects have a negative effect on the implementation of the Action.*
6.3.3 [FIN] Report on equipment and goods	*We have to report here on the equipment and goods purchased. Mention any issue we might have had. Should there be some remaining items at the end of the Action, please provide an annex explaining the end use of the remaining supplies.*
6.5. Work plan	Work plan is included in Annex
6.5.1 [INT] Update work plan	*Optional. Only update the work plan if changes have taken place or are required.*
6.6. Specific security constraints	*Please fill in should security be a key element for the success of the intervention.* Most of the preparation and work being done to build the Global Cluster's capacity is happening at the global level, therefore there are no immediate security concerns. Security will, however, play a major role

	in determining the ability to deploy the GFPs, RFPs, and the long-term members of the shelter coordination team. Security will also be important when choosing the locations where trainings can be conducted.
6.6.1 [INT] Update on security	*Please provide an update on the security situation should you have filled 6.6 at the proposal stage.*
6.6.2 [FIN] Report on security	*Please provide on the overall security situation prevailing during the implementation period. Highlight the challenges this has had on the implementation of the Action.*
6.7. Implementing partners	*Please fill the sections below.*
6.7.1 Are there any implementing partners?	Yes ☑ No ☐ Do not know yet ☐
6.7.4 Coordination, supervision and controls	*Please find below a standard text approved by ECHO. However, please only modify or add additional information if necessary.* The GSC SAG revised and approved the concept note and the proposal to be submitted to ECHO. Additionally, the SAG will agree on a process and criteria to select beneficiaries which might be the following: - A call for expression of interest to implement different parts of the proposal will be sent to the GSC partners through a global update. - The Support Team will receive the expressions of interest, rate them against the agreed criteria, and propose them to the SAG. - The SAG will agree on the final selection of beneficiaries. - All the minutes of the SAG meetings related to the beneficiaries' selection process will be available on a dedicated page of the Shelter Cluster website. Once the beneficiaries are selected, a standard partnership agreement will be signed between UNHCR and each of the partners outlining the activities to be carried out by the partner. Monthly progress reports, quarterly financial reports, semi-annual narrative and financial + narrative final reports are to be provided as per the signed agreement. Partnership agreements could be also subject to external audit by

	an audit firm contracted by UNHCR. UNHCR and IFRC as cluster co-leads closely monitor and supervise the implementation of activities under the partnership agreements. Regular coordination meetings are held on the sector level and collaboration and referral mechanisms are established between partners.
6.7.4.1 [FIN] Coordination, supervision and controls	*Report on the mechanisms described above and explain, when relevant, the difficulties encountered.*
6.9 Implementing partner list	*Please include the list of partners in an annex. The list should include the name of the partner and its role in the action.* The list of partners has not been finalized yet. It will be provided as soon as it is agreed.
6.9.1 [INT] Update on implementing partners	*Please provide an overall update on sections 6.7 and 6.9. Indicate any changes or challenges.*
6.9.2 [FIN] Final report on implementing partners	*Report on the role of each implementing partner and indicate whether there has been any changes or challenges.*
7. Field coordination	
7.1 Operational coordination with other humanitarian actors	*Please describe the coordination structure in place both at local, national and regional levels.* The GSC is an active participant of the IASC Global Cluster Coordinators Meeting, and other IASC fora. The participation in these groups facilitates coordination between the GSC, other clusters and global level partners. Furthermore, it promotes coherence on the responses provided by the different clusters, on the monitoring and performance evaluation tools and on the information provided to the clusters' stakeholders. Additionally, the GSC has bilateral coordination with clusters that are closely related such as Protection, CCCM, and WASH.
7.2 Action listed in	☐ UN Consolidated Appeal Process ☐ Flash Appeal ☐ Red cross/red crescent appeal

	☐ Other - *Please specify* ☑ N/A
7.3 Coordination with national and local authorities	*Please briefly describe the type of relationship and coordination modalities that will prevail with national and local authorities during the implementation, or explain when this is not considered appropriate or relevant.* National and local authorities participate in country level clusters, and in many cases the cluster is co-led by a national authority. This provides the authorities with the opportunity to inform the Action at country level. The Action also incorporates a number of activities to benefit national and local authorities and response actors, who will directly participate in and similarly inform the activity.
7.4 Coordination with development actors and programmes	*Please describe the issues of transition, Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), exit strategy and resilience. Please describe, when relevant how the Action complements on-going development actions or programmes, how synergies are enhanced and contradictions avoided.* This proposal supports the implementation of the GSC strategy which promotes linkages with relief, rehabilitation and development. Activity 1.3 aims at enhancing the participation of national actors in the country-level which will support these issues. Activities 1.4, 2.2 and 2.3 promote the sharing of good practices, approaches, and better understanding of the sector which is a way of enhancing the coordination with development actors and programmes.
7.5 [INT] Update on field coordination	*Please provide updates on the coordination section, only when necessary. For instance in case of difficulties in coordination aspects of the Action which could have a significant impact on the implementation of the Action.*
7.6 [FIN] Report on field coordination	*Please report on* relevant and significant changes and/or problems in relation to the coordination sections above (7.1 to 7.5)
8. Monitoring and evaluation	
8.1 Monitoring of the action	*Please find below a standard text approved by ECHO. However, please only modify or add additional information if necessary.*

	Mission reports and monthly monitoring reports will be submitted by the GFPs and RFPs on the development of their activities. These reports will be consolidated quarterly and submitted to the SAG and the Global Cluster Coordinators. Monitoring activities will also be carried by partners and followed up by the Grant Management Assistant and the support team. Regular updates will be maintained to monitor and report on planned activities.
8.2 Evaluation of the action	*Tick the box if one or more of the following will be undertaken and charged to DG ECHO's contribution to the action's budget – Usually we do not tick anything.* ☐ Internal evaluation of the action's results ☐ External evaluation of the action's results ☐ External audit (only if compulsory)
8.3 Studies carried out in relation to the action (if relevant)	☐ Yes ☐ No
8.4 [INT] Update on changes and progress	*Please only provide an update on the monitoring and studies section if necessary.*
8.5 [FIN] Report on monitoring and evaluation	*Explain how the monitoring has been carried out and the main challenges encountered. Report also on the evaluations carried out and their conclusions. Annex copies of the evaluations/audits financed by ECHO funding.*
9. Communication, visibility and information activities	
9.1 Visibility	9.1 **standard** visibility: A. Display of EU Humanitarian Aid visual identity on: the ☐ Signboards, display panels, banners and plaques ☐ Goods and equipment

	Note: the above are minimum visibility requirements. If we don't tick the boxes, please explain why we can't provide these two forms of visibility Please provide additional details on section A: *Please provide details on what exactly we plan to do* B. verbal acknowledgement of EU funding and partnership through: ☐Press releases, press conference, other media outreach ☐ Publications, printed material (for external audiences, not operational communication) ☑ Social media ☑ Partner's website (pages related to EU funded projects) ☐ Human interest blogs, photo stories ☐ Audiovisual products, photos ☐ Other *Note: from the above please select those visibility activities which we plan to do. Please only select those we're sure to implement.* Please provide additional details on section B: *Please provide details on what exactly we plan to do* 9.2 Do you foresee communication actions that go beyond standard obligations? *Please describe what type of visibility activities will be carried out in case of above-standard visibility.* A dedicated page will be created for the ECHO contribution in the Shelter Cluster website. The page will have the DG ECHO logo and a link to the DG ECHO website and it will be consistently mentioned in correspondence related to the project. The page will include the text of the proposal agreed with ECHO, a description of the process followed to agree on the proposal and those that will implement it, a summary

	of the activities that will be implemented as part of the proposal and who will do it. Leaflets will be created explaining the ECHO contribution as well as the surge capacity, GFPs, and RFPs. These leaflets will have the DG ECHO logo following the Visibility, Information and Communication in the European Commission's humanitarian aid toolkit. These leaflets will be printed and distributed during the GSC meeting. They will also be distributed at the country-level in some missions of the Support Team and the links will be shared in different related emails. The leaflets will be visibly portrayed in the ECHO webpage of the cluster. The ECHO contribution will be explained by the members of the Support Team during their missions and when they participate in meetings, trainings and other events. During the GSC meeting, the coordination workshops, the SAG Retreats, the trainings and meetings that the members of the Support Team will have during their missions, a slide including the DG ECHO logo will be projected to physically show the ECHO contribution. This contribution will be mentioned in some of the GSC Global Updates that the cluster regularly sends to around 650 subscribers. These subscribers include shelter practitioners, members of country-level cluster coordination teams, senior staff in humanitarian organisations, donors, academia, governments and others. The GSC Twitter account will mention the ECHO contribution.
9.3 [INT] Report on challenges and progress	*Please provide here an update on the implementation of activities listed in the proposal.*
9.4 [FIN] Report on challenges and progress	*Explain what type of activities have been implemented and where. Evidence of those activities needs to be provided (pictures, articles, etc.).*
10. Financial overview of the Action	*Please provide the information for each sub-section below. DRRM Brussels will fill in the sub-section on the contribution requested from ECHO.*
10.1 Estimated expenditures **Initial budget**	1) Implementation costs : EUR 3,437,102 2) 7% : EUR 240,597 3) Total Costs (1+2) : EUR 3,677,699 ***Contribution requested from ECHO***: **EUR 1,500,000**

[INT] Incurred costs	1. *Implementation costs : EUR* 2. *7% : EUR* 3. *Total Costs (1+2) : EUR*
[FIN] Incurred costs	1. *Implementation costs : EUR* 2. *7% : EUR* 3. *Total Costs (1+2) : EUR*
10.2 Financial Annex	A budget is provided as an Annex
10.2.1 [FIN] Final budget	*Please annex the financial report by filling in the attached budget format*
10.6 Financial contribution by other donors	*Please find below a standard text approved by ECHO. However, please only modify or add additional information if necessary.* The Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme annually reviews UNHCR's programs for approval. Funding, however, depends almost exclusively on voluntary contributions outside those provided through the United Nations Regular Budget. UNHCR, thus, has no guaranteed level of income to cover all of its approved and mandated activities. In addition, many voluntary contributions received by UNHCR either have no earmarking or are limited to a particular region/country. Such funds are thus allocated, as and when they are pledged and received, to the different operations according to requirements. Therefore, UNHCR can only state the identity of all donors to a specific operation once its annual accounts are closed. Information on the current year is published annually with UNHCR's Global Appeal (available on UNHCR web site: http://www.unhcr.org). This proposal is for a multi-donor action, and as such, no overlap or double funding can occur, except in the unlikely event of the operation being over-funded with earmarked contributions. Should this event take place, UNHCR will consult with ECHO an appropriate action. No earmarked funding has been secured except for the partner' own contributions. However, as part of the sustainability strategy the GSC will actively try to get other donors on board.

10.9 [FIN] Report on financial issues	

11. Request for derogation	*This will be filled in by DRRM Brussels if need be*
Add a derogation	*Click to add a derogation request*
Derogation request #	*Explain the nature and the necessity of the derogation.*
12. Administrative information	
12.1 Name and title of legal representative signing the Agreement	Mrs Emmy Takahashi Head of Unit – Global issues EU/DRRM
12.2 Name, telephone, e-mail and title of the contact person(s)	*Add UNHCR representative's name and contacts in the field.*
13. Conclusions and comments	
13.1 Comments at proposal stage	*If needed, add comments you consider relevant for the analysis of the proposals.*
13.2 [INT] Comments at interim report stage	*You may include additional comments that are relevant for understanding the state of play of the action and which are not covered by the interim report.*
13.3 [FIN] Conclusions	*You may want to add final comments.*
13.4 [FIN] Lessons learned	*Any lessons learnt you would like to highlight?*