UNICEF | for every child

Tip sheet to monitor AAP performance in Clusters

Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM) is an opportunity to integrate Accountability to Affected Populations in Cluster coordination. This tool can support staff to monitor AAP integration in the 6 core functions of Clusters, identify gaps and propose actions to strengthen AAP.

Core functions and guiding questions	Current status	Proposed action
Support service delivery		
• Do Cluster meetings include a standing agenda item to discuss feedback from affected populations? • Do cluster meetings give enough space and time for all members, particularly local and national actors, to express their views and concerns? • Has a 4Ws analysis ('Who does what, where, when') on AAP been conducted in clusters meetings? The analysis should cover how members have engaged and consulted with affected populations, what affected populations are saying, what clusters could do to address the feedback, and when and how clusters will report back to communities on follow-up actions. • Are AAP and community engagement good practices and approaches from Cluster members regularly documented and shared?		
Inform the HC/HCT's strategic decision-making		
• Is a common approach to community engagement being promoted among all cluster partners? (this is usually supported by an AAP/Community Engagement Working Group operating across all clusters) • Has the AAP/CE Working Group, together with the clusters, defined the most appropriate methodologies to engage with affected people in assessments? • Do assessments include open-ended questions on people's perceptions and their priorities for the response? (who is most vulnerable; the most appropriate response; preferred information channels; the way communities want to participate and influence the response) • Is data collection carried out in collaboration with other clusters to ensure coherence of data, limit duplications and avoid overburdening communities? • Do all cluster members disaggregate data to include sex, age, disability and other diversities as part of assessments and monitoring? • Are gender, age, disability and other crosscutting issues, as well as measures to better address them, regularly discussed in clusters meetings?		

Strategy development		
• Have local key informants been engaged in the development and validation of response plans, ensuring that interventions are relevant and appropriate? • Does the strategy include indicators and benchmarks on the quality, satisfaction and effectiveness of the response? • Have affected populations been involved in establishing the criteria that determine success of coordination and responses? • Are the CHS (and the revised Sphere Standards) used by cluster members?		
Monitor and evaluate performance		
• Do cluster members carry out regular peer reviews and field monitoring exercises? • What are the common approaches to engage affected people in monitoring activities? • Is there a common approach to share feedback analysis and response to feedback (including corrective actions) with affected populations and close the feedback loop?		
Capacity building in preparedness and contingency planning		
• Have local key informants been engaged to identify risks, and review and update contingency plans? • Have affected populations been consulted on the most appropriate means to communicate around risks and contingency plans? • Have communications messages been tested and validated with communities?		
Advocacy		
• Is evidence generated from feedback and consultations with affected people been used in advocacy? • Have advocacy messages been tested and validated with communities to ensure they give accurate, respectful representations of affected people's concerns and priorities?		
Accountability to Affected Populations		
• Have affected people and local actors been consulted on the most appropriate approach to participation in programmes? • Are common approaches and methodologies in place to collect and analyse feedback, complaints and other data from affected populations (through an AAP/Community Engagement Working Group or similar platforms)? • Have affected populations and local actors been consulted on the most appropriate approach to address gender and protection issues? • Are affected people's views and concerns a standing agenda item in cluster meetings? • Has a common approach to "closing the feedback loop" been developed? This involves sharing an analysis of feedback with communities and informing them about actions taken in response to their feedback.		