

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 13 August 2014

UNHCR Office, Yangon



Attendees: LWF, SI, DFID, German Embassy, ICRC, WFP, DRC, Metta, IFRC, SCI, MRF, UNHCR Programme & Information Management

Apologies: IOM & Royal Thai Embassy

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Introductions & Staffing Updates	<p>Round of self-introductions initiated by National Cluster Coordinator (CC).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New UNHCR Representative, Giuseppe de Vincentiis had arrived and if feasible, for next meeting would introduce him to the YGN forum at the start of the meeting; 2. CCCM/NFI Coordinator Rakhine – Tom Bamforth (DFAT), again has restated his wish to take-up the position but arrival date was looking more likely to be late October; 3. CCCM/Rakhine Jolanda van Dijk (IOM) – six-months (minimum), initially to support Save the Children in-house in Rakhine. CC was informed she would arrive late July, to-date no news; 4. Shelter Expert Kachin/N.Shan, Albert Spiteri (Red-R), initially three months but strong need/desire from Cluster Lead to have six-month deployment. Due to arrive within couple of weeks. 5. CCCM/Kachin, Amina Saoudi (IOM) – six-months (minimum). CC was informed she would arrive late July, to-date no news. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNOCHA training on Humanitarian Architecture (2 September), details circulated by Cluster Lead for those interested; • Emergency response simulation SIMEX (3-4 September), details circulated by Cluster Lead; • Mid-year review of all four Cluster strategies – on-going; • Mid-year review of 2014 Myanmar Strategic Response Plan, submission made by Cluster plus dashboard requests. 	
Actions from Previous Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster Lead to finalise <i>Roles and Responsibilities in CCCM</i> • Cluster Lead to finalise consolidated list of contingency stocks available • OCHA to update Multi-sectoral Needs Assessment Form for IDP Camps / Villages • CC to propose arrange/propose a meeting between DRC and WFP Head of Programme <p>Since last meeting, 2 July, WFP explained that food sector coordination in Rakhine was “much better”. WFP YGN</p>	<p>CC to finalise ASAP CC to finalise ASAP CC followed-up with OCHA (Luis Sena Esteves senaesteves@un.org)</p>

	<p>had spent time in Rakhine. Had hosted well-attended meetings/briefings and ambition was now to have a food sector meeting “once a month” in Sittwe. Also, composition of food basket might be modified, with less pulses and exploring possibility of “cash top-up”. Looking ahead, WFP was exploring for greater engagement from FAO and overall scaling-back in terms of their activities.</p> <p>On the subject of food MRF explained their method to avoid corruption. Currently they feed 4,000 HH in Rakhine; in the middle of six-month programme, scheduled to end October 2014. Wider discussion on scope and means of Muslim I/NGOs working in Rakhine, with reference to Muslim Aid UK and Mercy Malaysia. MRF noted their strong track-record of working across/with both communities, including workforce.</p>	
Update on Second Round of Camp Profiling (Kachin/N.Shan)	<p>Nearing completion of second round of camp profiling, this time 129 camps profiled, last year 126. Various slides shown by UNHCR Information Management Officer to explain how the data would be displayed and how partners could access. Like the previous round, would be accessible via the website, see: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-campprofiling.aspx, plus it would also be made available on a flash drives, for those who wanted. Difference with this round of profiling was the degree to which Camp Management Cluster partners had done the work, with a view to build longer-term capacity and make future rounds more sustainable.</p> <p>Three key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners encouraged to feedback on how useful they found the data, make suggestions; 2. Next round likely to be launched in the last quarter of 2014, and as had already been discussed with protection sector, other sectors that wanted to garner information should contact CC directly; 3. Pressing need for something comparable to emerge from Rakhine, at least for the 23 “priority camps”. 	CC to follow-up with CCCM Cluster Coordinator in Rakhine.
Kachin/N.Shan Overview a. Shelter	<p>Maximum Capacity: Cluster would caution for new/more plans for temporary shelter construction in the North in 2014. Since the start of the year, once gap became more clearly defined with better data, Cluster raised significant interest on the subject. LNGOs have taken on a lot of commitments for this year. Sense is that implementing capacity is reaching its maximum for most. Perhaps Metta and Shalom have a bit more margin, but would need to be assessed. Some need will remain in 2015 so Cluster Lead encourage projects/plans that can run into the beginning of 2015, November 2014-June 2015 to ensure full coverage of any remaining gaps before next rainy season.</p> <p>Metta, present in the meeting, were keen to stress that they still had “quite a lot of capacity” to build shelters in the Bhamo and Laiza areas. They explained they had moved into metal structures in Northern Shan due to the lack of natural materials available. Contrary to CC and IFRC’s understanding, Metta said beneficiaries would be able to take all the materials from metal structures, as and when they left the camp. The CC and IFRC’s understanding was that particularly for those in compounds, the owner of the compound, often a church, would retain the materials/structures. It was unclear if this new position was just applying to the newer metal structures or had wider ramifications for older/natural material shelters.</p>	

	<p>Information Gaps: As Cluster Lead recognize current difficulty to estimate the exact locations of the remaining needs. Most large camp needs have commitments but the remaining needs are much more dispersed, hard to pinpoint and concern old shelters that will need being replaced “here and there”, which require detailed technical assessment - key priority for new Shelter Expert, following in the work of his predecessor last year.</p> <p>Care & Maintenance Capacity Gaps: This year, until now, huge priority on filling construction gap, yet very limited commitments on repair/care and maintenance/LNGO capacity building aspects. These will likely become central as response will be reasonably successful in filling outstanding gaps. However, as/if the situation gets more and more protracted we need to find ways for shelters to last.</p> <p>Following June mission to Northern Shan, CC keen to meet bilaterally with FSD and World Vision</p> <p>Total Temporary Shelter Coverage: <i>If</i> all current commitments are honoured and no new large displacements occur, end 2014 with a remaining gap of 1,500 to 2,000 units (½ we could not fill this year and ½ new needs as more old shelters need to be replaced).</p> <p>MRF keen to know what shelter gaps are in Kachin and Northern Shan, and perhaps support. Agreed that they should meet with Metta, in their capacity of the <i>Joint Strategy Team</i>, plus CC would connect them with the Kachin-based shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator.</p>	
Shelter/WaSH Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noting requests by LNGOs for less meetings, joint WaSH-Shelter meeting in BMO, July 23-24 	CC to meet FSD and World Vision
NFI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revision of core kit complete; Creation winter item standard list complete; Winter item gaps - most urgent needs covered and outstanding gap of general needs should be at 15-20,000 persons. Key contributors will be ICRC and UNHCR, the latter diverting stocks originally for Rakhine plus an in-kind donation from UNIQLO. Following the meeting UNICEF responded with a tentatively positive response that they could support/contribute. 	CC to connect MRF with KS
CCCM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation of CCCM performances at CMA at Camp level is on-going led by CCCM Cluster Focal Point Maran Tan Nau (maran@unhcr.org). Close to complete. Results will be fed into Amina’s Saoudi’s capacity building plan, plus 2015 strategy. 	CC to received/load minutes to website
Potential Areas for Further Displacement	SCI’s field team has done some rough analysis/contingency planning on areas at risk of further displacement in Northern Shan in the short to medium term. Potential for displacement is approx. 1,000 people or 200-250 HHs at a time, similar to Man Pu (in July). According to the analysis less likely to be shelter needs as most will be housed in	CC to continue to liaise with UNICEF on possible support

	<p>monasteries, host communities or Ta'ang community centres/building in Namkham and/or Nam Hpat Kar in Kutkai.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mang Wee village, 20 KMs southwest of Namkham and on the same road as Man Pu village (can be accessed on the main road from Namkham). 2. Pang Hsay village, (approximately 12km from Namkham) and other villages directly south of Namkham town (12-40km south of Namkham). 3. Nawng Ma Ta village, approximately 10 km north of Namkham town on the Chinese border and has a population of approx. 1,000. <p>Metta equally underlined the tense and fluid situation in and around Namkham.</p>	
Je Yang Landslide	<div>   </div> <p>Landslide Impact at Je Yang Chinese Red Cross tents for affected population</p> <p>Landslide killed 5 persons in Ja Yang camp. Key issues had focused on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mobilizing necessary resources from a shelter point of view, and also coordinating with colleagues from WaSH sector to ensure necessary latrines and water points could be provided. 2. IRRC and Camp Management Committee was of the view to relocate 127 HH to another camp called Hpun Lum Yang, and asked OCHA's assistance, 3. Cluster Lead had stressed that in case that no agency was willing to take up this urgent project, UNHCR could consider including meeting shelter needs in their plans. 4. Cluster Lead also stressed the need for IDPs themselves feel comfortable with these plans, mainly when it means moving from one camp to another. Vital that the IDPs can make voluntary and informed decisions for themselves, and to give them time to go through the process of accepting the situation. Cluster Lead 	

	<p>had requested support from IRRC and the camp management to have open discussions with the IDPs in Je Yang and Hpum Lung Yang, the latter because for they need to be well-informed if a new caseload was to arrive. Noted that IRRC had demonstrated in the past its understanding of the various issues, not just seeing the matter solely as a shelter/material issue. Market 3 and being open and listening to what IDPs wanted, taking time to communicate with them, was cited as a past example.</p>	
<p>Final Update on Displacement in northern Shan State</p>	<p>Following updates shared by CC during July, latest was as follows (as of 31 July):</p> <p>Heavy fighting between the Government of Myanmar Army and the Ta'ang National Liberation Army (TNLA) during the period 19 – 21 July displaced over 800 people from Man Pu village to Nam Kham Town, in northern Shan State. According to humanitarian organizations, no fighting has been reported in the past week. However, security incidents continue to be reported in the area</p> <p>As of 31 July, organizations reported that almost all of the 800 IDPs returned to Man Pu village. Only several households remain in Nam Kham and are likely to also return soon. Assistance was provided in the form of NFIs (KBC Muse, UNHCR), temporary latrines (Save the Children International). WFP also provided a two-week food ration to 807 IDPs in Nam Kham on 24 July.</p>	
<p>Rakhine Shelter</p> <p>Camp Management</p> <p>Pilot Project for Individual Shelter Solutions</p> <p>Ponds/Safety</p>	<p>Judging by the Rakhine Shelter Cluster minutes, care & maintenance generally seemed to be “going well”: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puaktaw Camp Management – LWF, awaiting UNHCR feedback on sub-agreement, with a view to cover another 10,000 IDPs in Pauktaw; to start in October. • DRC monthly report was well-received, and LWF's also shared. SCI and Relief International produce something similar? SCI explained that until the IOM position, Jolanda van Dijk (JvD), arrived they did not have capacity to produce. • There was a report available on CCCM w/shop in Rakhine, 10-11th June, English & Myanmar. • Following a question from DFID, general discussion on efforts to have elected camp committees but despite this, plus two rounds of trainings and monthly Cluster meetings now being chaired by the District Commissioner, no progress. This emphasised why camp complaints mechanisms are important, even if committees were not formed/selected in the preferable way. Currently all Camp Management Agencies or Focal Points continue to work with existing Camp Committees. <p>Shared the/a leaflet, 18ft x 17ft with a 9ft x 6ft kitchen. Unit cost is US\$2,250 (zinc aluminium roof) and US\$2,000 (thatch roof). Leaflet available in English & Myanmar.</p> <p>In Pauktaw another child was reported as having died by drowning in one of the ponds. SI noted efforts/talk of bringing in the Department of Irrigation and who have the necessary heavy earth moving equipment. However,</p>	<p>CC to follow-up on (JvD)'s arrival date in MYN, was scheduled to be late July. CC also to discuss with Rakhine CCCM Cluster Coordinator scope for Relief to produce a monthly report.</p>

<p>Cooking Fuel</p>	<p>timelines were uncertain, despite the pressing protection concern. The main problem is the “location of the ponds” and they, SI, were looking into immediate/local solutions; fencing off of ponds and signposts. CC offered Cluster Lead’s support as/if needed. Tangentially, SI underscored their appreciation and “good support from UNHCR” in Rakhine as regards to their support on land ownership issues.¹</p> <p>Stressed by various actors how <i>serious</i> the issue remains and some concerns that Bernard Cartella of FAO, (Bernard.Cartella@fao.org), who was leading on this issue, might have left Myanmar. CC agreed that it needed to be brought to UNCT/HCT/RC/HC level, issue required leadership. DFID stated they would also aim to raise awareness of this issue to RC/HC, through their channels. ICRC noted their “fuel stick” targeted support for priority camps had been well-received but had a shelf-life in terms of funds available. A quick calculation based on ICRC’s costs indicated the need for US\$200,000 <u>per month</u>, if the entire 140,000 IDP caseload were to be covered.</p>	<p>SI to give update at next Cluster meeting.</p> <p>CC/DFID to raise through Cluster Lead channels to UNCT/HCT/RC/HC level</p>
<p>AoB</p>	<p>Frequency of Meetings? No strong views, but at the suggestion at continuing with every three to four weeks there was modest nodded agreement.</p> <p>German Embassy Stressed that other humanitarian situations around the world, notably Syria and Iraq, would limit what support could be given to Myanmar efforts.</p> <p>ERF OCHA will keep a cushion of \$600k and expects a \$1.2 million early recovery allocation for Rakhine, leaving about \$1.9 million. We would encourage proposals for winter clothes in Kachin, shelter repair, and any other gaps partners may wish to fill. However, it does and must require good preparation; do not just rush since money is available.</p> <p>DRC <u>Various on-going initiatives:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shelter contract for roofing in all DRC camps complete – still to distribute “home repair – metal tape” ➤ Emergency Shelter renovations due to weather on-going. ➤ Priorities for next stage of maintenance being agreed with Shelter cluster. ➤ Community services – sports activates, library days, cooking competitions in full swing in august. ➤ Training on CCCM – to CMCs, Leaders, women’s groups. ➤ Access to Service monitoring - Sector specific tool development on going. ➤ Communication with communities – FGD with communities on how they would like best to receive information from service providers. ➤ Camp Coordination meetings – now inclusive of Q&A sessions with CMCs, Group Leaders and women’s 	

¹ As interim measure Cluster Leads (shelter/WaSH) pushed for GAD to inform landowners that the situation was being reviewed and guarantee land owners would receive compensation for the current year (mid-2014 to mid-2015). Issues relating to land compensation are seriously affecting the timely implementation of WaSH activities in Rakhine. The most severely affected camps are those where Solidarites International currently implement in Pauktaw and Rathedaung, although Myebon also has the same issue. The problem had been escalating to the point where landowner in Nget Chaung threatened to destroy WaSH infrastructure unless compensation was paid plus the construction of new infrastructure being refused.

	<p>groups.</p> <p><u>CCCM broader issues:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Land Issues – camps now on land where “compensation” has run out, Government passing to Union Government, possible mitigation needs in mean time. ➤ Tented areas in camps – CCCM's position on inclusion. ➤ Trends: Increase in Host community / Camp tensions. <p>Although not the work of this Cluster, following last month’s minutes and the concerns regarding recent developments in Thailand and migrant workers and whether this would have any impact on Myanmar refugees in Thailand, NO change of policy in terms of Myanmar refugees remaining in Thailand. This included an update from DFID as part of their following of the issue.</p> <p>For Meikthila, SCI who have a presence there, explained that a ballot that was to determine who would receive already built permanent houses (as constructed in the most affected ward) was postponed. Due to happen 4-5 August. Additionally, no clear plan for 2,500 to 3,000 IDPs that still remain in temporary accommodation. CC requested that when they are occupied, any feedback information on what residences think of new houses, plus design details etc., would be well received by Cluster Lead.</p>	<p>SCI to feedback to Cluster Lead any information they obtain on occupants views on houses, designs & BoQs.</p>
--	---	---

The next meeting would be scheduled for first or second week in August July. Nearer the time the CC would send an email confirmation and as usual, an agenda.

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, 2.7.’14.*

Kachin & Northern Shan

- *Map of recent Northern Shan – Man Pu Conflict, 21.7.’14;*
- *Shelter-NFI-CCCM Kachin & Northern Shan Cluster Analysis Report, 1st June 2014*
- *Shelter-NFI-CCCM Kachin & Northern Shan Cluster Analysis Report, 1st August 2014*
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot, Myanmar-Kachin, July 2014;*
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot, Myanmar-Kachin, August 2014;*
- *4Ws WaSH Matrix, Kachin & North Shan, July '14;*
- *Peace Update, 3-19 August 2014;*
- *Peace Update, 16 August-2 September 2014.*

Rakhine

- *Shelter Flier for ECC (Pilot Project for 100 Individual Shelter);*
- *Shelter Flier for ECC (Pilot Project for 100 Individual Shelter), (in Myanmar language);*
- *DRC Record of Information for Programme Locations in Rakhine State, July 2014;*

- *LWF Camp Situation in the Month of July 2014;*
- *UN, INGO & Government CCCM W-shop, CCCM Cluster, Rakhine State, 10-11 June '14;*
- *UN, INGO & Government CCCM W-shop, CCCM Cluster, Rakhine State, 10-11 June '14 (in Myanmar language);*
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot, Myanmar-Rakhine, August 2014;*
- *4Ws WaSH Matrix, Rakhine, July '14.*

Inter-Cluster/Sector Coordination

- *OCHA ICC Meeting, 8 August '14;*
- *OCHA ICC Meeting, 22 August '14;*
- *OCHA Concept Note, Training on International Humanitarian Architecture, 2nd September;*
- *OCHA Concept Note, Humanitarian Country Team – Simulation Exercise.*