

## Minutes of Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting

10:00 – 11:00/30, Wednesday, 18 November 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

**Attendees:** UNHCR, HRC, Shelter for Life (US), MEET, ECHO, Australian Embassy, Trocaire, MRF, IOM, TIKA, NRC, Swan Yee Development Foundation, IFRC, 141 Plus, LWF & UCLA Graduate Student

**Apologies:** DRC & WaSH Cluster

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<p><b>1. Introductions</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendees introduced themselves. Mikhail Tasmemir from TIKA and Phoeber Brauer, a graduate student from UCLA, got specific introductions due to their particular role in this meeting.</li> <li>Cluster Coordinator (CC) had had meetings with Muslim/Rakhine diaspora in Yangon; discussions were had regarding permanent encampment of IDPs/consequences.</li> <li>CC also had had meetings with Rakhine NGOs that have presence in Yangon and welcomed their attendance at today's meeting.</li> <li>CC announced the expansion of national forum mailing list, which (amongst others) now included India, France and UNHCHR. Cluster Lead continues to pursue one or two other entities.</li> <li>Staffing issue in Rakhine was discussed in regards to Richard Warren's (RW) hasty departure, which leaves <i>no</i> international at the Rakhine State level to lead the CCCM/NFI Cluster. Tya Maskun of IOM is <i>also</i> leaving. Combined this is a <u>serious issue</u> in terms of the leadership of the CCCM/NFI Cluster at field level. Noting the almost zero forewarning of RW's departure, no immediate or quick-fix solution was likely. CC stressed that the position was vacant and that <i>if</i> any partners knew of any possible/likely candidates they should be in touch, directly and forthwith. Still, the CC had had a debrief from RW that lasted from 12.30 to early evening the day before he left and RW had stressed that he could be contacted as needed. They had discussed many issues, not least the strategic direction for 2016. The <i>Rakhine State, CCCM Cluster Strategic Outlook 2015 - 2016 (November 2015)</i> would be shared as part of these minutes and as ever, made available on the website.</li> <li>Comprehensive update from the IFRC-SCT regarding their "<i>8 Build Back Safer Key Messages</i>", from their morning meeting. These have been translated into the Myanmar language and located at: <a href="http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/standards-and-guidelines-shelter">http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/standards-and-guidelines-shelter</a>. If the interest was there from field-based colleagues' copies in both languages would be printed and made available to support ongoing owner-driven housing schemes across Rakhine State.</li> <li>At the same link was another useful document, "<i>Bamboo Fact Sheet</i>", again available both in English and Myanmar.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Clear Minutes &amp;</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes of 21<sup>st</sup> October were discussed; there were no concerns. Will be uploaded onto the Shelter Cluster</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Actions from Previous Meeting</b></p>	<p>website: <a href="http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/national-cluster-meeting-minutes-2015">http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/national-cluster-meeting-minutes-2015</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions from the previous meeting had been addressed and as part of this Trocaire’s presence at the meeting was acknowledged and appreciated.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) &amp; Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) - Update</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest version of the HNO was shared, which included what the Cluster had fed to OCHA.</li> <li>• The “One Million in Need” on the cover of the HNO draft was noted. This figure has doubled since the estimated 535,000 people in need in the 2015 HNO. The increase in the figure is based solely on findings from the Food Security Sector in relation to the floods.</li> <li>• CC stressed that <i>if</i> solely a humanitarian approach continues progress will remain short-term. Whilst there are many needs and possible solutions these cannot <i>just</i> be addressed just with a humanitarian response. Put differently, “we cannot solve political problems with humanitarian solutions”. Like 2013, this year the Government had shown its critical and central role in delivering or creating space such that programmes could operate, this <i>must</i> continue in 2016. Equally compared to other humanitarian crises around the world, Myanmar is fairly stable. The IDP population has shifted less than one per cent in Rakhine State in the last 24 months and around five per cent in Kachin/Shan.</li> <li>• As part of this shift the CC emphasised the following text in the HNO: <i>The measures taken by the Government since March 2015 [in Rakhine State] in assisting some IDPs to return to their places of origin is a positive step towards addressing internal displacement in Rakhine State and ending dependency on humanitarian assistance. These IDPs were assisted to build their own individual houses through a process of owner-driven construction. Bilateral donations to support more returns continue. Projections indicate by the end of 2015 approximately 20,000 individuals will have benefitted through these IDP owner-driven housing schemes and almost 30 of the camps or camp-like settings will be closed, a key step to ending displacement. The Government has a plan to support additional 26,000 individuals with similar housing solutions. A critical issue is where they reside. The international community is willing and able to support returns to areas of origin and the surrounding communities, regardless of ethnicity or religion. If not feasible relocation or local integration in the place of displacement may be explored. Any movement must be voluntary and safe and should take place in a dignified manner. It should ensure an environment of safety and personal security of the concerned IDPs. Measures for social cohesion should be considered in selecting sites so as to encourage intra-community reconciliation and peaceful coexistence.</i> Particularly the CC emphasised the underlined text. If individual shelter solutions were delivered, people were voluntarily settled in their place of origin or a new location and the long houses vacated, the camp or camp-like setting was deemed closed, namely engagement from the CCCM Cluster would cease.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Cash Based Assistance for Shelter Solutions – Lessons Learned</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noting the degree to which cash-based programming was being utilised in Rakhine State to support owner-driven individual housing solutions, Cluster felt there could be value in drawing on some of the key lessons learned from other cash-based responses around the world.</li> <li>• UCLA Graduate Student Phoebe Brauer, currently in Myanmar on a State Department scholarship, having conducted consultations through the Global Shelter Cluster network, shed light on some key themes that emerged: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Common shelter realities;</li> <li>✓ Cash grant distribution;</li> <li>✓ “Market-driven” approach;</li> <li>✓ Local “area driven coordination approach;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Common challenges.</li> <li>• Concise two-page paper entitled “Cash-Based Assistance for Individual Shelter Solutions” was shared and would be made available on the website on the page <b>Standards and Guidelines: Shelter</b>.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Rakhine State</b> <i>TIKA Shelter Solutions Update</i> <i>Shelter Mapping Pilot Project</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mikhail Tasdemir (MT) is the Myanmar Program Coordinator for TIKA. In 2013 he was tasked with the aim of funding construction and infrastructure in Rakhine State on a budget of US\$30 million following the 2012 violence. Following significant demonstrations in Rakhine State in early 2013 the projects were cancelled.</li> <li>• With the situation improving in 2015 under the strong leadership of the Chief Minister and following the Rakhine State Government’s (RSG) request for more funding support, TIKA agreed to a project to construct individual houses and adequate sanitation for IDP households (HH) in their “place of origin”.</li> <li>• The RSG’s proposal contains six phases, totalling approximately 3,750HH, some in their place of origin and some to be resettled.</li> <li>• Phase one began mid-September, in Kyauk Taw Township and in places of origin, across six locations, approximately 500HH. Four locations proceeded well. In one site <i>all</i> work was suspended and TIKA refused to fund due to serious concerns over the quality of housing, which was contractor not beneficiary built, and whether the IDPs had agreed to the new location or not. This meant the cancellation of 85 units. In another site 24HH out of 52 HH/units refused to be funded by TIKA due to concerns over adequate space at the site and/or quality of the units. Note the site of Kaung Toke, of 97HH, was not place of origin but a site of relocation that was determined pre-2012 violence.</li> <li>• Despite some of these challenges, MT was keen to stress the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ TIKA had developed a positive working relationship with the RSG.</li> <li>✓ TIKA appreciated monitoring as supplied by the Shelter Cluster and Protection Sector.</li> <li>✓ TIKA noted with appreciation that UNHCR, which was pencilled-in to provide individual shelter solutions with their partner LWF had stepped aside noting that TIKA could fund the entire/current caseload, as agreed bilaterally between TIKA and the RSG.</li> <li>✓ Beneficiaries have 15 days to construct their houses, which “works as a motivation”. Where “manpower is limited they encourage community participation, helping one’s neighbours”.</li> <li>✓ In-conjunction with the UNICEF-led WaSH Cluster, TIKA had also committed to deliver latrines. Carpenters were distributed to each house being constructed. TIKA stressed the high quality of the toilet materials.</li> <li>✓ For Phase II, Kuauk Taw and Mruak-U Townships, again another approximate 500HH were planned for similar assistance. TIKA noted that 50 per cent of the funds for this phase “were released”.</li> <li>✓ Phase III is for Minbya and Kyauk Phyu Townships, again another approximate 500HH were planned. However, for the 100HH Kyauk Phyu Township there were already signs that due to “complications” over the site progress may <i>not</i> happen.</li> <li>✓ In summary, TIKA stated approximately 1,500HH would seek to be completed by the end of 2015 or early 2016. Beyond these first three phases solutions were likely to get more complicated with the Townships of Myebon and Pauktaw listed.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Equally the CC noted that for the site in Phase I where all 85 units were cancelled, there was another location where the</p>	<p><b>Partners to contact CC if</b></p>

Q&A

IDPs were reputedly keen to settle but it required a greater investment in community infrastructure. UNDP's funds were exhausted so the CC was referring the matter back to USAID to see if through their partners they could support. Any other partners should contact the CC if they could equally support.

1. In response to a question from ECHO concerning almost 900HH who had been allowed vacate their temporary shelter and settle in their place of origin, yet had not received funding as part of the initial RSG roll-out that assisted approximately 1,760HH, MT was clear, now their needs were or had been addressed. 311HH have already received support across three villages in Kyauktaw Township. Another 500HH are receiving support as part of TIKA's Phase II. Photos below illustrate example of this transition in Goke Pi Htaung, Kyauk Taw Township, TIKA's Phase I.



2. Local NGO *Swan Yee Development Foundation* (SYDF), which operates across Rakhine State, raised their concern that Muslim IDPs and communities were being “favoured” when it comes to aid from the international community. MT ensured him that this was not the case. He pointed out that it is simply an issue of relativity – there are more Muslim IDP communities that have been displaced; the proportion of aid delivered is proportional to those impacted the most. He stressed TIKA's neutrality and they remain intent on assisting *both* Buddhist and Muslim communities. Note, after the meeting TIKA and SYDF met one-to-one. They exchanged more information and agreed to further one-to-one discussions, including SYDF visiting TIKA offices to discuss possible collaboration.
3. On the wider issue of perception and during various consultations with Rakhine-focused NGOs in Yangon it was striking to the CC how continuation with the camps produced few, *if any*, benefits:
  - i. Life for the inhabitants 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;
  - ii. Equally camps are extremely expensive to run, running into tens of millions of US\$ per year;
  - iii. 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

they can support  
funding /  
implementation of  
community  
infrastructure in Kyauk  
Taw Township

	<p>another 20,000 IDPs with an individual housing solution and adequate sanitation and having made an important step towards ending displacement.</p> <p>iv. 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.</p> <p>Such points underscored <i>why</i> depopulation of camps must remain <i>the</i> strategic and operational priority in 2016.</p>	
<p><i>Other Rakhine Shelter Updates</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 150 carpentry tool kits had in recent weeks been distributed across Rakhine State. 21 in Pauktaw Township, 20 in Kyauk Taw Township, 39 in Minbya Township and the balance, 70 in the camps in rural Sittwe Township. Previously, this had not been permitted due to RSG assertions that they feared they could be used as weapons.</li> <li>• MRF updated on their individual housing in Rakhine State, NOT those affected by the 2012 violence but due the earlier cyclone/flooding. They have completed 60 houses in total; Da Paing Village, Maw Si Nyar Village, Lat Thama Village No.2 and No.4 in Sittwe Township and Thet Kay Pyin Village in Pauk Taw Township, Rakhine State.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Shelter Mapping Pilot Project</b> <i>A collaboration between Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and a UCLA Graduate Student of Urban and Regional Planning, this project uses mapping to collect qualitative information about the lived experience in temporary IDP camps in Rakhine state.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UCLA Graduate Student Phoebe Brauer (PB) and Myint Aung (MMA), LWF’s Gender and Protection Officer, presented their “Shelter Mapping Pilot Project”; a project that uses mapping to collect qualitative information regarding the living experience of temporary IDP camps in Rakhine State. The mapping tool, in this context, can support the humanitarian community to bridge the gap between planned and lived experience in the camps. Other specific benefits:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Empower women by giving them a means to communicate their experiences;<sup>1</sup></li> <li>II. Provide an insight into the functionality of the camps for the adult female residents;</li> <li>III. Open new questions about the role of mapping in the management of IDPs.</li> </ol> <p>On points I and II, PB stressed the need for tools with a gender perspective to ensure that women are not excluded from decision-making processes. Furthermore it is important that we advocate for improved female engagement opportunities as rules have prevented more formal female leadership.</p> </li> <li>• All the participants were involved in the marking of maps to provide information on security and perceptions of safety within the camp; mobility and access inside the camps; clustering of daily life activities; livelihood participation; and the use of the shelter. Other things taken into consideration were that of health and safety in regards to WaSH issues in terms of where the community was disposing waste water, and the proximity of this to shelter units.</li> <li>• Lessons learned/summary analysis were shared with the Cluster, which includes a two-page summary document entitled <i>Shelter Mapping Pilot Project Background, Rakhine State</i>, which would be shared with these minutes.</li> <li>• Going forward they foresee this being an advocacy and engagement tool for practitioners. The hope is that it will improve the lives of women in the camps; open up new ways of thinking about camp improvements; to bridge top-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partners who wish a copy of PowerPoint, Shelter Mapping Pilot Project (presentation) Rakhine State contact CC directly</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> This was the *first* time that these women had ever been involved in such a project. As there were literacy concerns, drawing, as a way of marking the maps, became a form of literary interaction. However, there needs to be better training put in place, for staff and volunteers, to be able to facilitate these mapping projects for the future; there are concerns such as the readability of the maps and the way the women interact with them.

Q&A	<p>down data collection with the realities of daily life; to provide qualitative evidence for new interventions; and to inspire innovative approaches to long-standing challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When questioned on whether the mapping was conducted just among Muslim communities, they clarified they visited two Muslim camps, two Rakhine camps and one Maramagyi camp. LWF stressed that “diversity” is part of their work.</li> <li>• On whether livelihoods within the camps had evolved in the camps and/or related to their life before displacement, LWF noted it was an organic process, which was evolving in the camps.</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion it was suggested that the presentation/findings could be given at an ICCG meeting as well as a WaSH Cluster meeting.</p>	
6. AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trocaire is looking at partnering with NRC in Camp Management. They are piloting in Kachin and will, potentially, in Shan. IOM and UNHCR have been supporting CM agencies to take to CMCs. They have piloted trainings, with KMSS, in Bhamo in accountability, information management and participation. More information will be circulated, implemented by NRC with Trocaire and KMSS supporting.</li> <li>• The displacement issue in Central/Southern Shan is high on the agenda. Particularly there are concerns for this Cluster in terms of NFI gaps, which are being followed-up on.</li> </ul>	Cluster Lead to determine what gaps there are, in Central/Southern Shan, in terms of NFIs.

**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, 21.10.'15.*

**OCHA**

*Draft HNO 2016 (including pages from the HRP 2016 relevant to Shelter/NFI/CCCM);  
Accountability Review, Myanmar 2015 (English);  
Accountability Review, Myanmar 2015 (Myanmar);  
CERF Myanmar Country Review, October 2014;  
Recommendations made under PAF Country Study Myanmar 2014.*

**Rakhine**

*8 Build Back Safer Key Messages (English);  
Cash-Based Assistance for Individual Shelter Solutions;  
Protection Sector Update on IDPs movements in Rakhine, 18 November 2015;  
Shelter Mapping Pilot Project Background, Rakhine State;  
Shelter Mapping Pilot Project PowerPoint Presentation, Rakhine State;  
Rakhine State, CCCM Cluster Strategic Outlook 2015 - 2016 (November 2015).*

**Kachin-Shan**

*HPA Assessment Report, Kokang (returnees), September '15;*

*JST's Urgent Key Messages Release on Kachin and Central Shan States Humanitarian Crisis, 20th November '15 (English);*  
*JST's Urgent Key Messages Release on Kachin and Central Shan States Humanitarian Crisis, 20th November '15 (Myanmar);*  
*Peace Update, 15th October to 27th November '15;*  
*Peace Process Update, Myanmar Peace Centre, October - November 2015;*  
*Protection Sector Situation Update for Displacement in Sumprabum Township, Kachin State, 18 November 2015;*  
*KEY PROTECTION ADVOCACY ASKS, Kachin & Northern Shan, December 2015.*

**Flood Response**

*Flood 2015 Shelter Cluster Strategy;*  
*DTM Round 1 Report, Cyclone Komen, Chin State, 17 September 2015;*  
*Flood Impact Assessment Buthidaung, November '15.*