

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 23 April 2014

UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator (Kachin & Northern Shan) (UNHCR), CCCM & NFI Cluster Coordinators Rakhine (UNHCR), Field Associate (CCCM) Rakhine (UNHCR), UNHCR Senior Programme Officer, Senior Protection Officer, Protection Officer (Bhamo), Associate Public Information Officer & Information Management Officer, Child Protection Specialist & Child Protection Officer (UNICEF), WaSH Cluster Support Consultant (UNICEF), OCHA, Solidarities International, ACTED, IOM, DRC, USAID, World Concern, KMSS, Metta, NRC, Intersos, FSD, ECHO, UNOPs & Save the Children

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster Coordinator (CC) presented agenda and documents distributed - see foot of minutes for latter. Meeting would be Kachin centric. Rakhine issues could be raised in AoB. High attendance, almost 40 people, notably good presence of local NGOs was viewed as <i>particularly</i> positive. Following last year's joint monitoring mission (JMM) of <i>this</i> Cluster, report finally signed-off, copies included in handouts, would also be made available via website. ECHO specified that team had been impressed by documentation produced by this Cluster, encouraged other clusters to use as example. Regarding previous meeting minutes, DRC questioned the point made on three missing pieces of camp infrastructure. CC was clear, unless the matter of the Camp Management Committee (CMCs) demanding a cash payment of \$350 per structure could be resolved, which the contractor refused to give, progress was unlikely. Construction may be reconsidered if the camp manager (DRC) can resolve the problem with the CMC. Ommission from minutes 23 April in regards to more detail on IOM's CCCM training in Rakhine, woud be included in finalised/online version. 	<p>CC to upload JMM report to website.</p> <p>Camp Manager DRC to address issue of CMCs in Baw Du Par 1 & 2 and Da Paing.</p>
Boarding Schools	<p>CC noted uncertainty around Boarding School issue and how <i>this</i> Cluster was being approached from various actors/sectors for possible support. CC was keen to clarify/square the matter with partners hence presentation given by Child Protection Specialist Emmanuelle Compingt (EC) (ecompingt@unicef.org):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross-line missions have been used to visit boarding schools; to-date eight assessed. Overall living conditions are "bad". To help the intervention, the Protection Sector has produced "guidelines". Boarding schools are a common practice in Myanmar, mainly for High Schools, but not so common for boarding schools to have lodging on/at the location of the school. However, this has increased with the quantity of displacement. People like this system as they see it as safer and providing better education; more and more IDP families and 	

	<p>communities sending children to boarding schools. Some were created specifically for IDP children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ones assessed were sub-standard in terms of care-givers (numbers and skills) and living conditions, mainly WaSH but also housing. • Communication with family could be difficult but they do not contain separated children. Parents willingly sent their children and often some sort of communication is still maintained (through phone calls for example). However, with secondary and tertiary displacement happening, links with families sometimes become increasingly difficult and limited. • Also, education and protection sectors have produced a check-list to check for all sectors in relation to boarding schools. That does not mean for other sectors/Clusters to wait for a green light from protection/child protection but rather to take initiative to support more sector centred analysis. However, other sectors are encouraged to consult with protection before implementing activities in boarding schools. • Note children in boarding schools are not necessarily more vulnerable than the ones in communities, so actions to help those in boarding schools, without actions in communities, could create a pull factor and/or tensions. • Protection will use Ah Lein Bum boarding school as a pilot and in this respect conduct a complete assessment during the next cross-line mission to Laiza with other concerned sectors. • Cluster Coordinator Kachin (CCK) mentioned that the “hardware” sectors, such as this Cluster, would like to receive a clear “please go” from protection once the situation is confirmed as OK from a protection point of view because if we start site planning we create huge expectations. For Ah Lein Bum space would likely be a constraint in terms of improving the situation. • UNHCR Protection stressed that the intervention was emergency, despite the protracted nature of the situation, so even though boarding schools might “not be perfect the general situation calls for taking actions now” and explained it <i>why</i> it would be good if LNGOs could attend Humanitarian Protection Working meetings where these kinds of decisions are being made. Next one to be held in YGN 25 April. • Metta <i>stressed</i> the need to talk with local organisations since boarding schools are being supported by local organisations and LNGOs participated in the development of the guidelines and action points. • UNHCR Protection asked if it should it be shelter or education intervening for buildings UNICEF specified that the idea would be for shelter to intervene when it comes to living quarters. CCK underlined that the action of shelter would be limited to boarding schools as an emergency measure and there would not be resources to intervene in host communities, so it could create the unbalance that was mentioned earlier as a concern if education cannot (at the same time) address the more general education issues. However, the Shelter Cluster could try to do something, emergency driven, to improve the current situation. Again, if we take Ah Lein Bum as an example it would likely be sub-standard given the current resources and space constraint. Shelter would also need support/advice from education and child protection to ensure that buildings are suitably adapted. • EC confirmed their sector is only 30 per cent funded. 	
<p>Recent Displacement in Kachin/N. Shan</p>	<p>CC stressed significant appreciation to people who have been operational in Kachin/Northern Shan during the recent crisis in Southern Mansi. Giving a short chronology of events, key general points as of 21 April were:</p>	

<p>Numbers/Location of Displacement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armed conflict erupted in southern Kachin, 10 – 18 April, heaviest in Man Win Gyi of Mansi T/ship & SE areas of Momauk around Ta Gaw village and on Momauk to Lwegel road, and NE areas between Momauk and Bhamo; • Myanmar military imposed restrictions on the use of certain routes including the road between Momauk and Lwegel; • No indications of renewed fighting in the areas SE of Momauk or along the Myitkyina-Bhamo road since 19 April; • Commercial transporters/private vehicles using Myitkyina-Bhamo route with no reported difficulties; • Conflict had subsided but tensions remained high, moderate likelihood of renewed clashes. It was assessed that renewed outbreaks were more likely to occur in the areas north and SE of Momauk and those located to the south and east of Mansi. • Solidarites International (SI) specified that the Bhamo-Loi Je road, temporarily closed after the fighting around Momauk, was open but that the situation was still tense along the road. <p>Discussion then moved into four key themes: <u>numbers/location of displaced</u>, <u>assistance</u>, <u>assessments</u> and <u>advocacy</u>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In an effort to explain complex nature of displacement, CC drew attention to map as circulated in hard copy titled <i>Map of Mansi Situation, 10.4.'14</i>. ➤ After a discussion on numbers displaced and efforts to reconcile various figures/sources, agreed from all attendees that so far 3,000 to 4,000 persons have displaced, mostly going to Man Win Gyi and some continue to Namhkan in Northern Shan State (NS), and around 600 currently in China, with other small groups in different areas. A few dozen families have reportedly reached camps in Bhamo Town or headed there. Fighting around Momauk has led to the displacement of only 10 to 20 families. Most IDPs can be easily accessed from Northern Shan State, by both local and international organisations. ➤ If tensions remain high, even with limited fighting, further displacement likely. Many villagers are trying to remain close to their field, harvesting the sugar cane or trying to prepare the fields for the next rainy season. If the situation remains tense and heavy military presence, even in absence of active fighting, people will not be able to continue livelihood activities and will head towards the IDP camps or towns within next three months. In some cases, groups of IDPs, or even small IDP camps, are close to military bases, a situation they may find fearful and encourage further displacement. ➤ Concerns were raised by this Cluster in late 2013 that IDPs have been pushed further and further towards the South-East of Mansi T/s, ending in a situation where IDPs are “trapped” in a corner between China, areas from which they escaped in Mansi T/S and Northern Shan State. Also, if people cross in high number into Shan State, creates risks of tension between existing communities. Tensions in Namhkan have been reported and where local communities have voiced that they did not welcome IDPs too close to centre of the town. 	
	<p>Assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ In terms of assistance, UNHCR has sent several trucks from YGN carrying NFIs and emergency tents, sufficient to face the needs of the current caseload, and with 10 to 15% extra in case of more displacement. 	

<p>Assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Concerns raised about more protection centric incidents. CC encouraged them to a/m Humanitarian Protection Working Group meeting 25 April. ✓ SI mentioned that the WaSH issues mentioned early in the crisis were by now generally dealt with and no major WaSH issue were remaining, as it stands. ❖ In terms of assessments, a multi-sector assessment will take place in Nhamkhan-MWG during the last few days of April as well as a protection assessment. <i>Multi-sectoral Rapid Needs Assessment Form for IDP Camps/ Villages</i> would be the template for the multi-sector assessment. Agencies interested in the details of these findings should contact CC directly. Metta stressed that for any assessment, a conflict sensitive approach needs to be taken into account, the tension being high. ❖ <u>Due to the previously mentioned issues and the geography, with more and more IDPs concentrating in this area, more than 5,000 IDPs already, finding appropriate land to build shelter is a pressing issue. Metta reported that around Namhkan some IDPs are currently sheltered in tents in paddy fields, which will flood within a couple of months. Despite the need for temporary shelter, difficult to plan when appropriate land is not secured.</u> The CC noted the pressing issue of land availability and would prioritise this issue at the national level. It was agreed that advocacy at State level was needed and Cluster agreed to follow-up with <i>Joint Strategy Team</i> and offer support in advocacy as/if needed. CCK stressed we are speaking about Northern Shan State authorities, where UN has very limited presence and impact of advocacy limited, underlining once more the gap in presence in Northern Shan. 	<p>Cluster partners to contact CC (benson@unhcr.org) for details of multi-sector assessment.</p> <p>CC as point of advocacy to prioritise issue of provision of suitable land.</p>
<p>Advocacy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CCK stressed that beyond organising assistance, real need for stronger advocacy, not only regarding the land issue but more generally because if fighting continues in that area it could result in a high number of displaced people trapped within a very small area, creating risks for civilian population. Cluster already reported some protection concerned about some IDP camps in the MWG-Namhkan due to their locations, either too close to what could become a front line or due to the position in isolated areas outside towns (such as Namhkan Jaw) exposing IDPs to drug dealing gangs that operate in the vicinity of the camp and drug users crossing the camp compound at night. 	
<p>Shelter Update</p>	<p>CCK explained that before most recent crisis, funds were secured to cover about 50% of the temporary shelter gap presented at the beginning of the year, reducing the priority needs to about 2,000 to 2,500 family units for 10,000 to 12,000 individuals, and signs were “reasonably good” to close the gap further by the end of the year but not yet assured.</p> <p>Unfortunately, once again, the new crisis puts all that into question and at various levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Needs will increase with new displacement (probably around 800 to 1,000 additional family units needed); 2. Implementing agencies will be occupied with the emergency, taking limited resources in Kachin away from the task of filling the already existing gaps. This is a recurrent issue in Kachin, where there are some outstanding needs still unaddressed at the same time of renewed emergency and due to limited resources and logistical complexities it extremely challenging to address both, in parallel. 	

<p>CCCM Update a. Camp Profiling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCK informed that (at least up to the recent crisis) the updating of camp profiling, extended to around 140 camps from the 124 from the first round in 2013, was “well on track”. After workshops in MTY to decide on the process, in March and first week of April, 3 Training of Trainers (ToT) has been provided to CCCM Coordinators among implementing agencies, who in turned trained CCCM Focal Points in the camps under their responsibilities. Before the Water Festival, data collection at camp level had started and it was hoped to be completed by end of May/beginning of June. At that stage it is impossible to say what will be the impact of the current crisis on the camp profiling, both in terms of re-focusing the resources on this emergency and making access more difficult. • More generally, a round of basic trainings for CCCM Focal Points and CCCM Coordinators among implementing agencies was conducted in MTY, BMO, Laiza and NS during the last 3 months. Another one is planned in May for CCCM Focal Points (FPs) coming from the western part of Kachin State, mainly Hpar Khan. This was needed as at the end of 2013 the FPs extended from around 80 camps to 134, and due to a gap of funding in July-September 2013, a lot of previously trained FPs had been lost. Many FPs had close to no experience and even CCCM Coordinators still have only limited knowledge about CCCM financial management. • With above round of training, and thanks to existing community management capacities within the LNGOs dating back to 2011, a “reasonably good level of basic camp management is reached”. However, efforts to offer further capacity support continued to be explored with NRC and IOM. Subjects where there were notable gaps included gender issues, coordination with authorities and complaint mechanisms. 	
<p>NFIs – Winter Items</p>	<p>Winter items (gap and standardisation)</p> <p>CCK noted there will be a gap in provision of winter items. Despite large distributions at the end of 2013 not all needs were covered. For regular blankets coverage was close to 100%, but about 50% of the needs remained uncovered in regards to warm clothes and thicker blankets for particularly cold areas. For more details see <i>Kachin NFI Coverage & Gaps</i> sheet in <i>Shelter-NFI-CCCM Kachin & Northern Shan Cluster Analysis Report, 1st March 2014</i>.¹ Further, when it comes to warm clothes it can be considered that after a year they need to be replaced. With this and additional displacement happening the gap for winter items is for about 50,000 people, representing an estimated budget gap of \$ 600,000 - 800,000. Also, in 2013, two of the main actors were donor ECHO and SI as implementing partner; neither will be involved in meeting this need in 2014.</p> <p>The Cluster is trying to work with implementing agencies on standardisation of winter items, but it proves particularly difficult for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Necessity of each item is directly dictated by the profile of the household. For example, it is not relevant to 	<p>Cluster partners to contact CC (benson@unhcr.org) if they can help/support close this NFI winter item gap.</p>

¹ <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-DataAnalysis.aspx>

<p>Financial Resource Assessment</p>	<p>distribute the same amount of adult and children’s warm clothes to a family of one adult and four kids as to a family of two adults and three grown-up children.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the areas the need is not the same; simple additional clothes such as polar fleeces and a standard blanket might be enough in urban areas, which people can even access themselves but much more is needed in areas that have long periods of sub-zero night temperatures. <p>On more general NFI items, the need to move on from blanket distribution to more targeted distribution. CCK said to do this might require a form of “financial capacity assessment of IDPs”. In cases of new emergencies, such as Mansi, the needs are obvious, but in areas where IDPs have been displaced for perhaps three years, found a new livelihood, even though generally not as good as their original ones, continuing distributing of general NFI seems not relevant. It could do more harm than good by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Moving beyond saturation point, with negative impact on dependency and local markets; Hampering efforts made by some implementing agencies to move towards cash assistance, often through a voucher system (such as the quite successful one put in place by Metta around Laiza). <p>There have been inter-cluster discussions on the subject of conducting a financial resources assessment with the food, early recovery and WaSH sectors/Clusters. DRC underlined that cash support also needs to be “carefully considered” as it can lead to its own difficulties. There is an existing working group on such support, both in YGN and in Kachin. In YGN it is reportedly held every two months under the title cash transfer working group (CTWG).</p>	<p>CC to attend next CTWG meeting in YGN and report back to Cluster.</p>
<p>AoB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DRC Camp Manager(s) underlined that conditions are “still difficult” and staff cannot access accommodation in Rakhine to enable them to get back to work. NRC noted Camp Management training video is available on YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PT08-DKbxsU, perhaps helpful for Kachin or Rakhine States. NRC stressed that it “covers the basics well”.² NFI Cluster Coordinator for Rakhine Olivia Wellesley-Cole (wellesle@unhcr.org) noted that within two weeks of her return to Rakhine she would restart the NFI forum at Rakhine State level. CC stressed the need to at least explore other modalities of meeting non-food assistance needs rather than repeated blanket rounds of same items. Discussions on this would also be done at national, and as above, Kachin State level. Noted by UNHCR Associate Public Information Officer that IRIN journalist was writing an article on the Kachin situation. 	

The next meeting would likely be NFI focussed, scheduled for 14 May. 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, 26.3.'14;*

² Note the video does not reflect the “Cluster” since it was made at the launch of the Humanitarian Reform process, 2005-06.

- *Shelter-NFI-CCCM YGN Cluster Meeting Minutes, 10.4.'14;*
- *Shelter-NFI-CCCM Kachin & Northern Shan Cluster Analysis Report, 1st March 2014;*
- *Short Guidance Note Boarding Schools Kachin CPWG EiEWG, March 2014;*
- *Map of Mansi Situation, 10.4.'14;*
- *Map of Northern Shan Situation, 5.5.'14;*
- *Joint Strategy Team IDP Number Manwin Gyi & Namkham, 20 April 2014;*
- *Joint Strategy Team Statement Release on Current Kachin Humanitarian Crisis, 14th April 2014;*
- *Gen Cap Laiza Cross Line Mission Observations 2nd - 6th April;*
- *INTER-AGENCY ASSESSMENT MISSION – PUTA-O REPORT, Kachin State (UNICEF, UNHCR, DRC, UNFPA, OCHA & UNDP), March 2014;*
- *A Kachin IDPs Relief Monitoring Report, A joint Humanitarian Research by TAT and RANIR, Kachin State, 28 February 2014;*
- *Centrality of Protection in Humanitarian Action Statement by IASC Principles;*
- *Protection Sector - Information Note - Fires in Maungdaw, 10th April '14;*
- *Summary on Rights Up Front, 17th December 2013;*
- *Donor Group ECHO – GSC - GCCCM Joint Monitoring Mission to Myanmar (of Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster), November 2013 – ToR;*
- *Donor Group ECHO – GSC - GCCCM Joint Monitoring Mission to Myanmar (of Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster), November 2013 - Final Report;*
- *Donor Group ECHO – GSC - GCCCM Joint Monitoring Mission to Myanmar (of Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster), November 2013 – Timeline;*
- *2013 - 2017, Global Shelter Cluster Strategy;*
- *OCHA Summary of Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine (25th April - 1st May 2014);*
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot, Myanmar-Kachin, April 2014;*
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot, Myanmar-Rakhine, April 2014;*
- *Ad Hoc Inter-Cluster Coordination Meeting - Minutes, 4th April '14;*
- *IOM CCCM - Senior Programme Coordinator (CCCM) (P4) - Sittwe Myanmar;*
- *IOM CCCM - Programme Coordinator (CCCM) (P3) - Yangon-Myitkyina Myanmar.*