

## Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 13 May 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

**Attendees:** German Embassy, UNOPs, UNHCR Donor Relations, UNOCHA, LWF, Save the Children, WaSH Cluster Lead (UNICEF), DRC, World Concern, Royal Thai Embassy & Embassy of Sweden

**Apologies:** IFRC & WFP

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	Minutes of previous meeting, 1 April, accepted and to be posted online: <a href="http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4632">http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4632</a> . Cluster Coordinator (CC) stressed meeting might be a “bit rushed” since some of what he wanted to share/talk through he had only seen for the first time, yesterday.	
2. Actions from Previous Meeting	<u><b>Kachin/Shan</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second round of camp profiling shared in soft/hard copy but still not uploaded, yet.</li> <li>Still clarity from World Vision (WV) needed on whether they could address quality issues in Shan, name of location being “KBC Cultural Compound”. Cluster Lead in YGN had been chasing them for feedback but still no response. Said they would reply to CC 23 March.</li> <li>CC to circulate protection paper <i>Protection Sector Position Paper on Movement of IDPs from one Temporary Location to Another</i>.</li> </ul>	CC ASAP  CC obtain WV answer ASAP  Done
3. Contingency Planning/Preparedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noting the a/m minutes of 1 April, CC hoped it was now clear what the likely division of responsibilities between UNHCR, IFRC and IOM would be in the event of a large-scale natural disaster in terms of responding to shelter, NFI and CCCM needs.</li> <li>Additionally, standards on emergency shelter can be found in the document <i>Emergency Shelter Specifications &amp; Guidelines</i>, available at: <a href="http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/standards-and-guidelines-shelter">http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/standards-and-guidelines-shelter</a>.</li> <li>Additionally, the Cluster Lead has fed back to OCHA (who leads in this area) on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Contingency planning (CP) for a scenario of a cyclone in Rakhine;</li> <li>✓ Sector Minimum Preparedness Actions (MPA);</li> <li>✓ Cluster Members Available for Post Event Assessments in Rakhine State.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the OCHA requests, as Cluster Lead still the CC is required to:</p> <p><b>X</b> Compile a list of contingency stocks;</p>	

	<p><b>X</b> Produce an <i>Operational Response Plan</i>.</p> <p>CC noted the Cluster needs to make more headway, albeit the first is “work in progress”. He noted that he had received feedback from OCHA that the list of members available for assessments had been wrongly compiled since it was Rakhine, not nationwide focussed. Additionally the template the CC had used is what had been used in the past but now they required details such as “function”, “email”, “telephone number” and “languages spoken” for every person. CC asked OCHA if this meant such details for all 229 persons (as had collectively been pledged by Cluster partners) were required. Agreed that OCHA would revert to CC to clarify. As a wider point, questions emerged on what details there were available on relocation sites in Rakhine. CC noted this remained one of the most valid issues and the understanding was the action was with OCHA to determine with the Rakhine State Government (RSG).</p>	<p><b>OCHA to revert to CC on what level of detail is required on Cluster members available for post event assessments</b></p>
<p><b>4. Rakhine</b></p>	<p>Before proceeding CC wanted to “stress apologies” that slide show on IDP returns in Rakhine was branded with UNHCR logo. The images had only emerged yesterday and from a UNHCR Protection Officer, hence the reason. Were they to be circulated through this Cluster/that logo would be removed.</p> <p>Before proceeding to discuss some of the more specific issues (as per agenda), CC was keen to update on the last HCT, an Expanded HCT, 30 April, physically hosted at UNICEF and at which the Chief Minister (CM) for Rakhine State was present.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether intended or not, the sense was that the HCT was co-chaired by the RC/HC and the Government of Myanmar, setting a positive collaborative tone and message.</li> <li>Though nothing was shared on paper if words translate into actions, at least for the remainder of the year it gave the clearest sense of the direction of the RSG; which populations would remain in displacement this year and which would they seek to return and/or resettle in 2015.</li> <li>It sent a clear message that the Government is and <i>must</i> lead the search to find solutions to displacement. This is something the Cluster has argued since 2013, namely the direction that only they, the Government of Myanmar, have the scope and power to set.</li> <li>In-conjunction with the CM explaining what they have done to-date to support returns, see below, he explained where lack of funds may prevent them from continuing. Significantly, here was the RSG requesting support from the international donor community.</li> <li>The CM highlighted their assisting of 2,000 IDP households (HH) across six townships in Rakhine State, each family receiving US\$1,000 in cash to rebuild their house. He explained it was “proceeding well”. However, by the middle of May all funds totaling US\$2 million would be utilized. They would like to push forward with assistance for at least another 3,000 HH but here the money was less certain. The request was made for donor support. The CM also stressed that where returns were happening and displacement ended, humanitarian assistance, food rations specifically were mentioned, should cease after three to six-months. He also emphasised that humanitarian and/or other assistance to IDPs was not to be linked to citizenship and/or verification.</li> <li>The international community representation was positive and it was not solely the traditional western donor cohort. The last word was given to the Singaporean Ambassador, a poignant moment with comments from a regional Asian State and (after China) is the single largest investor in Myanmar.</li> </ol> <p>Responding, LWF who was also present noted that it “boded well” at least in the short-term. Yes it still left some questions unanswered and some targets remained moving but the “wheels were moving”. It underscored the deeply political nature of</p>	

	the problems. The National WaSH Cluster coordinator, though not present, had equally heard positive reports of the meeting. The consensus was one that if this event contributed to greater transparency and sharing of information from all sides, this was a major positive.	
<p><b>a. Shelter</b></p> <p>i. Update on returns in accordance with <i>Shelter Options in Rakhine State</i> paper</p>	<p>Referring to the PowerPoint presentation the CC then worked through a series of images that visually explained how the assistance was being utilised by the IDP returnees, images as of 8 May. Points stressed were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 35 per cent of all IDPs in Zone 1, approximately 990 households (HH) assisted in returning home. Zone 1 constitutes the townships of Kyauk Taw, Mrauk U and Minbya, covering 22 villages.</li> <li>✓ Modality of assistance gives beneficiaries ownership of process/product and utilises the capacity of the displaced;</li> <li>✓ Swift and easy to deliver and also, discreet;</li> <li>✓ Land issues were being resolved at the local level;</li> <li>✓ Till now there were no major protection incidents observed;</li> <li>✓ In most cases the assistance had been cash based assistance, US\$1,000/household;</li> <li>✓ Assistance seemed to be working well due to combined bottom-up and top down approach, where the role of the State was clear and decisive.</li> <li>✓ Benefits were not just felt by the IDP returnees but also traders selling materials, engendering relationships of reciprocity between Muslim IDPs and Rakhine non-IDPs.</li> </ul> <p><b>X</b> However, despite the assistance no major change in access to basic services/freedom of movement and lack of livelihood opportunities.</p> <p><b>X</b> Lack of RSG funds had resulted in some back in the place of origin, out of the temporary shelter but just under makeshift shelter (see photo below). Makeshift shelters provide poor protection from rain/floods. IDPs complaining of sickness from living in hot shelters while lying on cold earth. <b>IDPs may find themselves in emergency situation again if adequate shelter assistance (materials/tents) is not provided before season is in full force.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ On WaSH needs in these areas of return, generally the needs were deemed to be “fine”.</li> <li>✓ CC was keen to stress that citizens were receiving the more proscriptive design of house, contractor built and at a cost of US\$2,400 (see photo below). While this could be analyzed through a prism of discrimination, the analysis from the protection officer was that it was a way for the RSG to manage the issue of backlash to large numbers of Muslims receiving assistance. Also, based on these first-hand accounts/photographic evidence, both were meeting minimum standards. Critically, the self-build approach was bringing additional benefits although the quality of the housing suggested that many Muslim IDPs were using some of their own/additional funds.</li> </ul> <p><b>Summary:</b> Citing the original <i>Shelter Options for Rakhine State</i> paper, available in Myanmar and English, which at its release in early March coincided with the 10 March <i>Embassies-States Shelter-NFI-CCCM Partners Briefing</i>, two differences as to what Shelter Cluster road map suggested were as follows. The RSG had mostly opted for cash-based rather than material-based assistance. Also, the Cluster set a standard of US\$1,500/HH for material assistance. However, these were RSG funds and US\$1,000 was what displaced persons in southern Rakhine State, citizens, had received in 2013. More importantly, the critical issue was the output/impact and there the results looked, at this stage, “encouraging”.</p>	







<p>ii. Update on shelter repair and maint. for wet season</p>	<p>As encouraging as the previous item was, the reality was the vast majority of the total IDP caseload, notably in Sittwe and Puaktaw Townships would remain in temporary shelter for the rest of this year and into 2016. On this issue there remain considerable discussions and frequent meetings with the RSG.<sup>1</sup> The main actors in addressing these needs being LWF, DRC, UNHCR, ICRC and critically the RSG. It was important to stress that while such work needed to happen for people's basic dignity, the shelters were designed for two years and they were two years old. The work being proposed could make them viable for another year but that would mean, one year from now, similar discussions/decisions and funding would have to happen, depending on the circumstances. <u>All recognised that this was a less than perfect scenario but in terms of strategic planning the consensual view was that it was hard to plan for more than a year since the situation remained fluid.</u> This could be negative fluidity or positive fluidity. As an example, a year ago IDP returnees were "not in a position to receive a plastic bucket and now they were rebuilding their original homes". The view was the <u>work required for these temporary shelters should be done with a view to make them viable for another year.</u> As one partner commented, it was a "no brainer".</p>	
<p><b>B. CCCM</b> "preparing for life after displacement"</p> <p>i. Camp Population Data (accurate data from the camps)</p> <p>ii. Access to livelihoods (fishing &amp; farming)</p> <p>iii. Dependency</p>	<p>On this issue, significant progress has been achieved with HH surveys done by LWF, DRC and RI/supported by UNHCR. Save the Children had opted not to undertake these surveys. Note, since likely NFI distributions would occur post the HH survey/utilising this latest data, this could be a concern for Save the Children managed camps. Lack of HH surveys could mean no reliable basis for which the Cluster Lead to provide NFIs. It was important to stress that the individual position of Save the Children in Rakhine <i>must</i> be respected. However, the consequences of this decision would also be for them to manage with their caseload.</p> <p>On the theme of access to livelihoods, LWF gave an update/overview on how they see the situation. Not least they had recently participated in a USAID chaired event in YGN. It was stressed that the humanitarian and the development should not be viewed as two different dichotomies, rather need for a "twin approach". However it was recognised that currently there was a need for more operational actors and donor support for the development sphere. Too much mistrust still existed and it required someone or a series of actors to "take the first step".</p> <p>Citing recent discussions with his CCCM colleagues in Rakhine, the CC was keen to stress three central strategic areas of focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harmonisation between host and IDPs;</li> <li>2. Transition of service support from international agencies to government (health, education &amp; social services);</li> <li>3. Transition of governance structures.</li> </ol> <p>For points 2 and 3, the critical point being transition to the RSG. With time limited CC stressed that progress at the Rakhine State level can be followed through reading minutes of the Rakhine CCCM Cluster meetings.<sup>2</sup></p>	
<p><b>C. NFIs</b> i. Distributions</p>	<p>With time pressing there was little mention of this issue except that it was encouraging to observe during his most recent mission to Rakhine State large quantities of NFIs were being distributed. This marked a notable shift and was viewed positively.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed understanding of these discussions, minutes of all Rakhine Shelter Cluster meetings can be located at: <http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/meeting-minutes-2014-2015-shelter>.

<sup>2</sup> Minutes of all Rakhine CCCM Cluster meetings can be located at: <http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/meeting-minutes-cccm>.

<p><b>5. AOB</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was stressed again that Save the Children need funds for salaries to continue their CCCM responsibilities in Rakhine State, which will run out as of the end of June. They require “at least US\$60,000”. The CC had been pushing this issue for weeks, not least it was stressed at the 10 March a/m brief but with no positive feedback.</li> <li>End of May saw the departure of Kevin Socquet (KS) from UNHCR Myitkyina, having handed in his notice since he was due to be a father. KS has led the Cluster for UNHCR at the Kachin State level for close to two years. He brought significant expertise in terms of his years of experience living and working in Myanmar. His contribution has been significant and the CC thanked him for all his work. As of June, the general Cluster Coordination &amp; CCCM Focal Point for Myitkyina was <b>Maran Tan Nau</b> (<a href="mailto:maran@unhcr.org">maran@unhcr.org</a>) and for Bhamo, <b>Seng Pan</b> (<a href="mailto:pan@unhcr.org">pan@unhcr.org</a>). CC had started the process to find a successor to KS in February yet the position remains vacant. Part of the problem remains how funding for the post can be achieved. If funds are not found, a key gap in terms of this Cluster’s responsibility will emerge and much of the hard work to reach a good understanding of a caseload scattered over 130 camps and all their needs, will star to be eroded, rapidly. <b>The need for donor support for this position continues to be stressed.</b> No money has been forthcoming, yet. It is now fully accepted there would be a staffing gap.</li> <li>Before finishing there was some regression to the issue of donors financially supporting shelter returns, with direct assistance to the RSG? Put succinctly, the Embassy of Sweden was not forthcoming, expressing significant reticence and would rather the funds were channelled through an entity such as UNHCR. Another mechanism for channelling funds that was briefly mentioned was the <i>Emergency Response Fund</i>.</li> <li>DRC noted that while progress had been slow, the intention remained for them to try and address some of the cooking fuel needs in Rakhine (through financial support from FAO). Additionally their <i>Global Cash Advisor</i> would soon be visiting Myanmar.</li> </ul>	
----------------------	--	--

The next meeting will be scheduled in June; as ever, at least a week before 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, 1.4.’15.*

**HCT-OCHA**

- Myanmar 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan Quarterly Monitoring Report January - March 2015;*
- OCHA ICC Meeting, 27 April '15;*
- TORs-Early Recovery Network- Final version, May 2015.*

**Kachin-Shan-Kokang**

- OCHA ICC Kachin-Shan State Meeting, 28 April '15;*
- Meeting with Deputy Minister of Social Welfare (Kokang) & OCHA, 6th May 2015;*
- Coordination Meeting, WFP Lashio Office, 8 May 2015;*
- Coordination Meeting, WFP Lashio Office, 22 May 2015;*
- WFP Kachin Cash Assessment Report.*

### **Rakhine**

- *Shelter Options (paper) for Rakhine State (including water & sanitation);*
- *Annex VI & VII Latrine Options;*
- *Protection Sector Update on IDPs movements in Rakhine 8 May 2015.*