

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 23 October, 2013

UNHCR Office, YGN

Attendees: Embassy of Japan, TIKa, DRC, UNHCR Senior Programme Officer (SPO), UNOCHA & Care

Unable to attend: AusAID, ACTED, HelpAge & UNDP (Early Recovery)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Actions from Previous Meeting	<p>Minutes from the previous two meetings, 4 September and 2 October, were circulated and all actions points were cross-checked to see if the 17 action points had been addressed.</p> <p>The three outstanding issues all concerned Kachin (& Northern Shan):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boarding schools in Kachin and where responsibility lay between Shelter Cluster, education and child protection sectors. <p>A meeting was being organised between child protection and education sectors and following this meeting, CC would seek to feed back to this forum at the next meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Uploading of latest CCCM/NFI and Shelter strategies for Kachin and Northern Shan. <p>CC noted that after further consultations through the Cluster at the Kachin State level, CCCM/NFI strategy should be uploaded to the website <i>this</i> week.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. ACTED to share more details (as per minutes of 2 October) on details of IDP movements. <p>CC to continue to pursue with ACTED on any further details they had on these reported movements.</p>	
Rakhine		

<p>a. <i>Thandwe Update</i></p>	<p>To save considerable time, reference was made to the two documents that were shared in hard copy with all attendees to the meeting (see below for details). In very brief summary the situation was reported as “calm” and in terms of immediate material shelter/NFI assistance MRCS had served as the key provider. Strategically for this Cluster there were three central/key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Government of Myanmar (GoM) was not of the view that camps needed to be created, which the Cluster strongly welcomed; 2. Should the displaced wished, they would be supported to return to their place of origin and rebuild their homes, which the Cluster strongly welcomed; 3. <i>Minimum</i> standards for permanent housing (PH) would be run through Sittwe noting its relevance to the Rakhine State Government (RSG). From a Shelter Cluster perspective this was a vital issue noting the increasing focus on PH now the majority of temporary needs were met. For more details on these Shelter Cluster discussions at the Rakhine State level, recent meeting minutes can be found at the following link: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx 	
<p>b. <i>Myebon Update</i></p>	<p>In conjunction with Cluster partner DRC, the CC with CCCM and Shelter Cluster Lead Rakhine colleagues had spent all of the previous week in Rakhine. This included visits to various camps in Pauktaw and Myebon. Noting the discussions on Myebon at the last meeting, various efforts led by OCHA at the Rakhine State level were cited. However, and having attended the OCHA Inter-Cluster Coordination in Rakhine the week before, OCHA had stressed at this meeting that space or scope for any progress was producing little results. Following, they requested an update from this Cluster on what their findings to Myebon had shown. In summary, while the Cluster Lead was now in discussions with DRC as to possible ways forward, the consensual view was that unless certain elements within the Rakhine community were addressed, likely progress would be very hard if not impossible to achieve. It was striking that during their visit it was reported that Rakhines who had shown willingness to engage with the Muslim camp were being threatened by other members of the Rakhine community. While the Cluster Lead remained in discussion with DRC as to possible operational modalities, how to frame and centre the issue of obstructions or objections from within the Rakhine community was as much the priority. Aside,</p>	

	<p>listening to local authorities during the mission to Myebon “perception” remained vital to appreciate. The <i>perception</i> from the Rakhine community was that Muslims in Myebon were being disproportionately aided versus the Rakhine communities as compared to their living standards before the violence last year.</p> <p>A wider discussion then ensued as to what pressure donor/diplomatic pressure could be brought to bear with the CC stressing the huge value in having high-level diplomats visit Rakhine in April this year and the tangible results it had achieved. While accepting this approach, it was noted that different states had different modalities. The Cluster did not disagree but noted that it was the job and responsibility of <i>this</i> Cluster to advocate for the shelter/NFI and CCCM needs for the displaced in Rakhine and as part of, the situation in Myebon in the Muslim camp remained chronic. What this mission had shown was that while at least shelters had been built for Muslims in Myebon, the provision of shelter is only the nub of the issue. Yes a shelter is now over their heads and under their feet but if IDPs are confined and have no prospect; its value is acutely limited. IDPs need access to services, the possibility of some livelihood and some freedom of movement. This point is made none more so strikingly than if you see the current and very different situation for Rakhines in Myebon versus the Muslims in Myebon. This, despite the fact that from Cluster partner UNHCR, both communities received the identical shelter support. Finally, reports of around 200 persons from the Rakhine communities celebrating within a few hundred yards of the Muslim camp the one-year anniversary of violence was another insight into highly challenging nature of <i>this</i> particular context.</p>	
c. <i>Camp Management Actors</i>	<p>During the mission it was encouraging to meet LWF, DRC and Save the Children, namely camp management actors in Rakhine, and hear about their on-going work to upscale their CCCM activities in Rakhine. In summary, while all the camps in rural Sittwe were now covered, gaps still remained in some of the camps in Pauktaw and Myebon.¹ Judging the situation ‘in the round’, noting the withdrawal of Solidarities and aforementioned issues relating to Myebon, Rakhine State was still one CCCM actor short to cover all the priority needs and continued to request any agency interested to contact the Cluster Lead.</p> <p>Aside from capacity issues, the matter of achieving representative and democratically elected camp</p>	<p>Any Cluster partners that had any possible CCCM ambitions to contact the either CC (benson@unhcr.org) and/or Rakhine CCCM Cluster Lead Jolanda Van Dijk</p>

¹ Precise details of these current gaps can be found in document *CCCM Camp Management Agencies, Rakhine State, 9th November 2013* at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-documents.aspx>

	committees remains an enormous challenge in Rakhine.	(vandijkj@unhcr.org).
<i>d. Walkways</i>	During the aforementioned mission the problem with the walkways in some of the more raised shelter sites was in evidence. In short, through the destruction of walkways due to IDPs wishing to use the wood to cook, they were now extremely dangerous and not viable. Whatever the causes, a new solution had to be found and Cluster partners UNHCR and DRC were seeking to do as much. This problem concerned four sites, three in Pauktaw and one in Myebon.	
<i>e. Fuel Efficient Stoves</i>	Though not at the meeting, UNDP confirmed thereafter that they are distributing fuel efficient stoves in the form of blanket coverage to all IDPs in Rakhine and Kachin, coupled with training on making and maintenance. For Rakhine, distribution will be towards the last week of November or first week of December, for Kachin around the first/second week of November. The CC obtained details of the model and more precise plans for distribution locations and numbers. Additionally the Cluster Lead UNHCR intends to conduct a viability study to consider possible approaches to this major problem within the IDP camps in Rakhine.	Contact the CC at benson@unhcr.org to obtain more details.
<i>f. Site Plans</i>	24 separate site plans for all the key camps in Rakhine were now available online at the following link: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-CampSitePlans.aspx	
<i>g. Care & Maintenance</i>	With the temporary shelter construction phase largely complete and in conjunction with objective number two of the <i>Shelter Cluster Strategic Framework Rakhine State v 1.1 September 1st 2013</i> , more attention was being focussed on care and maintenance of shelters at the Rakhine State level. ² This included defining coordination areas of responsibility between CCCM and shelter and ways and means at the day-to-day level that beneficiaries could be supported to care and maintain their shelters. For more details of specific developments, interested partners should digest minutes and other related outputs of what was being agreed through the Shelter Cluster that continued to meet regularly in Sittwe. ³	
Kachin		
<i>a. Camp Profiling</i>	Since the last national Cluster meeting the CC noted that there had been no specific feedback on the cross-camp analysis from partners. Aside, UNHCR and DRC had met and the document was progressing. Additionally a workshop was planned for Kachin where there data would be shared via flash drive identical to what was available via the website but for ease of use where connections were poor to	

² *Shelter Cluster Strategic Framework Rakhine State v 1.1 September 1st 2013* can be located at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/default.aspx>

³ Details of this forum can be located at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx>

	non-existent. The CC continued to stress that the data was there for all to use and as an example, the Education in Emergencies sector had requested a flash drive of the 126 camps profiled, plus access to the full database.	
<i>b. Coordinating with Local NGOs (LNGOs)</i>	<p>Efforts to engage with LNGOs at the national level continued. The CC had joined the protection sector that gave a presentation on the Guiding Principles at a large gathering at Metta, and thereafter attended the YGN event <i>Local Humanitarian Response in Kachin & Northern Shan</i>. At the latter, points that had been made by the LNGOs included the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keen that coordination meetings were not simply be about information sharing but “action orientated”; 2. Overwhelmed by the number of meetings they have to attend; 3. Concerned that technical meetings are too technically obsessed and should “see the bigger picture”. <p>The CC had relayed these messages to his Kachin based colleagues and stressed that this was something they (including <i>this</i> forum) needed to digest and really hear the LNGO’s concerns. However, on technical matters when it came to <i>minimum standards</i>, particularly in shelter (not ignoring the herculean work for many months LNGOs had done and continued to do) <i>this</i> Cluster had a responsibility to promote standards, not least donors or prospective donors would and should expect as much.</p>	
NFI Standards	Currently discussions had been or were underway at the Rakhine and Kachin State levels as regard to what should be the standard NFI items for 2014. Particularly in Rakhine where the Cluster was well into its second round of distribution for the 140,000 IDPs, there was a danger that if identical items were given in 2014 they would simply end up on the market due to declining utility and those that received them last would receive the lowest prices even if the intention was at least to ensure equity for all IDPs.	
Cross Cutting Issues		
<i>a. GBV</i>	Mainstreaming GBV was gaining greater momentum and version 1 of the <i>GBV Strategy and Action Plan</i> was shared for partner’s information and feedback.	
<i>b. Age</i>	HelpAge were also planning training in Rakhine to interested agencies on the thematic of ageing in a humanitarian response, with a special focus on shelter and camp management (based on the findings	

	of a visit to Rakhine).	
Humanitarian Needs Overview	The CC had attended the OCHA organised w/shop around which this document had been centred. Immediate next steps were to be clarified but as with all such documents, copies were shared with partners for any comments or feedback they might have.	
6. AOB	<p>-A joint ECHO-UNHCR monitoring mission was scheduled to visit Myanmar, 22 November – 29 November, inclusive. The mission will split between Rakhine and Kachin but at the start they were keen for a meeting at the national level with partners. This meeting would be the afternoon of 22 November. More details would be given at the next national Cluster meeting. Primarily their concern was the support offered to <i>this</i> Cluster from the global level.</p> <p>-Though here to see the work of UNHCR rather than <i>this</i> Cluster, the CC noted the recent EXCOM (donor) mission to Myanmar, which visited Rakhine and Kachin. The CC attended the final brief and shared some of their impressions with the attendees. In very concise terms, generally the situation in Kachin was viewed positively while for Rakhine they were struck by acute, complex and particularity of the situation and any (pre)conceived notions that this could be addressed swiftly or that the needs were diminishing was misconstrued.</p> <p>-From 29 October 6 November, inclusive, the CC would be in GVA attending global Shelter and CCCM Cluster retreats.</p>	

For next YGN meeting partners were encouraged to check the http://themimu.info/Meeting_Schedule/index.php. Also 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:

Inter-Agency Mission to Thandwe Township in Rakhine State, 4th-6th October

Protection Assessment Thandwe, 14th October '13

Humanitarian Needs Overview document, November 2013

GBV Strategy and Action Plan, Draft v1, October 2013