


	<p>positive in terms of speed that Government was (re)building houses. This did not mean there were not needs and still some living in very poor displaced circumstances. On the matter of gaps Cluster Lead would continue to advocate.</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOM will/are conducting a DTM, which can/will be shared in due course; • LWF in Chin State have been assisting with NFIs and home repairs. The latter constitutes assistance of between 300 and 500 US\$. 	
<p>3. Update on Kyein Ni Pyin (KNP), Pauktaw Township, Rakhine State</p>	<p>Noting the action point from December's meeting and for the CC to update, the situation was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camp is made up of 1000 HH of IDPs from across five villages. Half the caseload is from KNP, as their village of origin, for which the RSG will provide individual houses. • As for the remaining approximately 500 HH issue is whether they be settled nearby or allowed back to their villages of origin. Major concern would be 1,000 HH in an area that previously supported 500 HH. TIKA, which is listed as part of their 4th phase to assist 248 HH of this 500 HH in place of origin has suspend their commitment until the situation is clearer. • Reports <i>just</i> before last month's festive break that the RSG was keen to settle <i>all</i> 1,000 HH in KNP. This led to direct written intervention with the Rakhine State Government (RSG) from the most senior UN person in Rakhine State, Chris Carter, plus briefing key embassies in Yangon 24th December. • TIKA position remains very clear (to the RSG). They will pay for 248 HH <i>if</i> those who would like to return to their village of origin are permitted. If not, even if their designated caseload of 248 HH are destined to settle in their place of origin (if not plot of origin) they will not <i>fund</i> anything. To-date no evidence of trying to settle the other 500 HH in KNP but the situation remains unclear. 	
<p>4. Rakhine State 2016 Priorities</p> <p>Introduction of new CCCM/NFI Cluster Coordinator for Rakhine State</p> <p>Camp Closures & IDP numbers</p>	<p>Gave CC great pleasure to introduce Richard Tracey (RT) (tracey@unhcr.org), new CCCM/NFI Coordinator in Rakhine State. RT was very well-known to the international/humanitarian community having previously been the Shelter Cluster Coordinator in Sittwe for 2+ years.</p> <p>Following the consultations within the Cluster during the last quarter of 2015 as part of preparations for 2016's Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) the CC did, for the sake of total clarity, ensure that all were aware that in due course for <i>this</i></p>	


<p>Future Depopulation/Camp Closures – Sittwe Township & Pauktaw Township</p>	<p>Cluster there would be a shift down in the caseload. Quoting those documents the background was as follows:¹</p> <p><i>“In March 2015, the Rakhine State Government assisted some 10,000 IDPs to build their own individual houses through a process of owner-driven construction. Bilateral donations then supported similar programs. By the end of 2015 approximately 25,000 individuals benefited through these IDP owner-driven housing schemes and approximately 30 of the original camps (or camp-like settings) are closed, a key step to ending displacement. The number of camps (or camp-like settings) decreased by 40 per cent with approximately 40 sites (in number) remaining. These returnees were assisted to build their own individual houses through a process of owner-driven construction. Efforts are being made by humanitarian and development actors to ensure that they are also assisted to restore their livelihoods and have adequate access to essential services, so that continued humanitarian aid to these people can be phased out.”</i></p> <p>Although precise numbers were being verified it could mean a reduction for this Cluster of approximately 25,000 people and closure of 25 camps. Again the CC stressed, if other sectors/Clusters deem it suitable to continue with humanitarian assistance to these areas that was fully understood. Still for this Cluster these areas were no longer deemed as camp or camp-like settings nor were they in need of more shelter assistance from an entity that was originally activated to meet the immediate humanitarian shelter needs. Most particularly this shift would be reflected in the first <i>Cluster Analysis Report</i> for 2016: http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/cluster-data-analysis. CC the requested for objections to this shift to be forthcoming. There were no objections from the 15 partners present.</p> <p>Noting the slide, CC was keen to ask if there maybe opportunities for other individual shelter solutions in 2016.² The example of the camp Basare in Sittwe T/ship was mentioned plus the matter of Meybon. On the latter the CC did NOT have the latest update. Still, in 2015 there had been efforts to explore solutions and to that end he wished to make the Cluster, at the national</p>	
---	--	--

¹ <http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/humanitarian-country-team-strategiesresponse-plans-2016>

² As was discussed in previous meetings, life for the inhabitants of Rakhine camps remains extremely challenging with lack of privacy, movement, access to services and zero scope for people to be self-reliant. Rather, inhabitants remain “hooked/dependent” on humanitarian aid. Also:

- Camps are extremely expensive to run, running into tens of millions of US\$ per year;
- Budget for essential repairs to temporary shelter is US\$3.5 million for 2016. Should (international) donors fund this work, which will offer “some” relief for only two years? Alternatively, it would be *far* more preferable to assist another 20,000 IDPs with an individual housing solution and adequate sanitation and having made an important step towards ending displacement.
- The camps by their very nature concentrate large Muslim population in confined areas, which due to the large quantity of aid that is required to make life for the inhabitants viable, fuels the perception amongst the Rakhine communities that Muslims are being disproportionately assisted.

Such points underscored *why* depopulation of camps where responsibly feasible should remain a strategic and operational priority in 2016.

<p>Camp Profiling (JiPs)</p>	<p>level, simply aware.</p> <p>Noted that DRC at the Sittwe-level had approached JiPs in Geneva to conduct camp profiling in Rakhine State, notably Sittwe Township. Feedback from Geneva was tentatively positive and to this end CCCM Cluster was hugely appreciative and supportive of this prospect. Further updates would be given in due course.³</p> <p>As part of wider Q&A and discussion the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the conflict, Rakhine fishermen cannot fish due to fear of Muslim attacks. This meant Rakhine people losing their livelihood/becoming poorer. Although Rakhine people are not living in camps they also suffer, “much”. • The number of Muslims affected by conflict is not as high as the number living in the camps, meaning some are there to benefit from the aid. This includes the problem of those who got assistance reselling aid in local markets. • The prevailing view is that while the international organizations provide some assistance to Rakhine people, it is minimal (about 1 to 2%) as compare to 98% for Muslims. • The people responsible for the original riots in 2012 were “not” local people. No one knew them and local people think it was outsiders. • The recommendations to the international organizations who want to implement activities is they should provide both Muslims in camps and impoverished Rakhine people living by the sea shore with appropriate percentages addressing the needs of both communities. <p>CC appreciated the frankness of these comments and whether others in the room agreed or not if this is what people felt they be respected, listened to and discussed. While not disagreeing on the matter of large amounts of aid going to the Muslim camps, citing the previous month’s minutes the CC did note that in terms of early recovery assistance across Kyautaw, Minbya and MraukU T/ships, 750 villages are being supported of which 70% are Rakhine, 9% Muslim and 21% other.</p>	 <p>Solutions?</p>
<p>5. AOB CCCM Training</p>	<p>CC was delighted that IOM was delivering week-long CCCM “Train the Trainers” training here in YGN, which would be attended by camp management agencies from Rakhine and Kachin/Shan. One of the trainers was Jennifer KVERNMO Jennifer, who had delivered similar training in late 2012. Details of the agenda would be circulated.</p>	<p>CC to circulate agenda</p>

³ In 2014 the CCCM Cluster had approached JiPs to conduct a similar exercise but been unsuccessful since they had supported Myanmar in 2013 for camp profiling in Kachin/Shan.

MIRA Modifications	Modifications to the MIRA were discussed. Partners must submit their suggestions by COB today. Thereafter CC would compile and send to OCHA.	CC to submit suggested revisions to OCHA ASAP
Feasibility Study for Cash Based Interventions (CBIs)	UNHCR explained the background to an extensive several month long study into the feasibility for cash based interventions. For a copy of the report contact CC (benson@unhcr.org). A key outcome was that while Kachin/Shan situation is potentially fertile for more CBI, Rakhine and particularly the camps are NOT. Note in the past the Cluster had at least discussed the idea of moving to a different form of NFI assistance, cash or voucher.	
Camp Profiling Kachin/Shan <i>Kachin & Shan Camp Profiling Cross Trend Analysis, 2013-2014</i>	At the next meeting, the Cluster Lead focal point for information management would give a presentation on the latest round of camp profiling. Note that JiPs had also conducted a cross trend analysis between profiling done in 2013 versus 2015. This report was now online. ⁴	
Clashes in Mogoke, Mandalay Region	CC noted from OCHA they had received information on NFI needs for 95 IDPs in Mogok, Mandalay Region, who fled recent clashes between Shan and Palaung armed groups. ⁵ Subsequently confirmed that MRCS already supported the IDP 33 HH (95 persons) in Mogoke 19 th January. Since then no further request made.	
ReciproBoo Shelter Kit	Shaun Halbert (shaunvet@hotmail.co.uk) who has presented at a national meeting may come to Myanmar to deliver training on his ReciproBoo Shelter Kit. For those who were interested contact Shaun directly. Training might include preparation of bamboo techniques. Contact Shaun for a link to a YouTube video of the first RSK bamboo shelter workshop in Nepal from 2013.	
NFI Winterisation Distribution (Kachin/Shan)	<p>Noting the season the Cluster Lead is requesting local NGO support for winter NFI distribution to Border Post 6 and 8. Rationale is that after a winter NFI assessment, undertaken October and November 2015 in high altitude areas, clear that IDPs suffer from the severe cold climate. Highlighted that winter clothes, mattress and winter blankets are essential items to protect against the cold. This year the plan is to target these camps. Pajau/Janmai:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Border Post (8), transportation and distribution by KMSS-MKN 2. Border Post (6), transportation and distribution by KMSS-MKN 3. Hkau Shau, transportation and distribution by KBC 	

⁴ <http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/kachin-shan-camp-profiling-cross-trend-analysis-2013-2015>

⁵ 95 new IDPs arrived in a Buddhist monastery in Mogok Town, Mogok Township, Mandalay Region evening of 19th January. All were from Lwe Zar village in Kyaukme Township, Northern Shan. Severe fighting happened between SSA/RCSS and TNLA near Lwe Zar village starting on 17th January. Civilians left their village 18th January. They were accommodated at Okh Pho Buddhist Monastery in Mogoke Town and COBs, MRCS and community leaders in Mogok Town provided assistance. Since the temperature in Mogok was almost down to the freezing point blankets were needed (according to a CBO in Mogok).

<p>Fire in Tanintharyi Region</p> <p>AOB+1</p>	<p>4. Hpare, transportation and distribution by KBC</p> <p>Confirmed there was a large fire in Myeik district. Apparent cause was child playing with a candle. Affected village is located about 25 nautical miles from Palaw Township and some villagers fled to another island by boat. Temporary shelter is in/AT the village administrator's office/compound.</p> <p>Details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13.2.2016 fire occurred Kyaukkar village, Palaw Township, Tanintharyi Region. 297 houses/415 households affected. • 55 RCVs where Kyaukkar, Palaw, Myeik and Dawei Townships involved in relief activities. Led by Grade (1) Officer. • MRCS distributed NFIs 17.2.2016 from their Myeik and Dawei warehouses. • Embassy of the Philippines, following fires in Namhsan and Ayeyarwaddy is donating clothes, towels and blankets through the Ministry of Social Welfare. <p>Concluding the meeting he said that <i>IF</i> the Cluster wishes to make further progress calculated risks will HAVE to be taken. The sentiments expressed in the following clip to this end, appealed: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FZJ5z9wSo1o</p>	
--	--	--

Documents shared in hard copy with the participants at the meeting or in soft copy to all Cluster partners:

Shelter-NFI-CCCM YGN Cluster Meeting Minutes, 16.12.'15.

OCHA

MIRA Initial Rapid Assessment Form, English, 30th December 2015;

Myanmar ERF-2015-Overview;

Myanmar ERF-Dec 2015-Leaflet;

HCT Meeting Note, 2 Feb 2016, Draft;

Restoring Humanity - Global Voices Calling for Action, World Humanitarian Summit;

Too Important to Fail-Addressing the Humanitarian Gap, Report to the Secretary General, January 2016.

Rakhine

8 Build Back Safer Key Messages (Myanmar);

Rakhine State Shelter Cluster Factsheet - December 2015;

DRC Success Story, Zar Hidar Begum (Grocery Tea and Snack Shop), 10 Nov 2015.

Kachin-Shan

Multi-Sector Early Recovery Assessment of Kachin & Northern Shan State, Early Recovery Network, December 2015

CCCM

IOM CCCM Training of Trainers, Agenda-2016

Development

World Bank Group, Myanmar Country Partnership Framework, 2015-2017