

Rakhine CCCM Cluster Coordination Meeting

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, 18 December 2013

Time: 10.00 – 13.00

Venue: General Administration Department Office

Participants: UNHCR, LWF, DRC, SCI, SI, General Administration Department, Fire Brigades, Police & State Health Department

Agenda item	Discussion	Action/Actor	Due date
1. Opening remark from the District Commissioner	District Commissioner welcomed the participants and declared the meeting open.		
2. Operational Updates from the CCCM C.C. * CM vs. CA: roles and responsibilities, state of play and way forward - open discussion	<p>- CC stressed that the CCCM framework is successful only if the three instances CA-CM-CC work in synergy rather than in competition or in parallel. The dialogue established between CC and CA is still recent and challenges and constraints were expected to occur during the first months of working together. Joined coordination meetings represent a healthy mechanism whereby mutual expectations and compliance to the theoretical CCCM framework are discussed and eventually tuned and readjusted. C.C. recalled main ordinary tasks of CC, CA and CM, stressing some of the main responsibilities expected to be fulfilled by the Government/CA are still partially unaddressed, and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Civilian character of camps; * Transparent and accountable maintenance of law and order in camps; * Land occupancy rights and land compensation. <p>Furthermore, it has been underscored that the Government (CA) is still at the moment very much focused on Camp Management responsibilities (creation and dismantlement of committees, data collection, attempt of coordination of service provision etc.), creating in the camps a parallel unclear CM system, while discontent/dissatisfaction is flourishing within camp resident populations.</p>		
3. Camp Management	- District Commissioner asked directly to the INGO Camp Managers to share their experience and elaborate starting from practical examples linked to the points mentioned above:		

<p>Agencies:</p> <p>* Updates and issues to be raised with the CA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CMAs asked what procedure they should follow when they witness or IDPs report violation of code of conduct and rule of law from Police or Fire Brigade officials operating in the camps. DC replied that although the final responsible to discipline these episodes are the respective departments at State level, the Sittwe Township Administrator is mandated for coordinating all the Government Officials operating on daily basis in the camps of Sittwe. These complaints can be therefore addressed, with detailed information, on regular basis to the Deputy Township Administrator, when on duty at the Camp Management Office in Hamnzi Junction. - CC suggested that Police and Fire Brigades officers operating in the camps might be targeted with specific trainings on Rule of Law and Code of Conduct, in order to raise awareness and hold them more accountable in case of eventual violations. The DC supported the idea. - CMAs asked what procedure they should follow when encountering issues related to land use, land compensation or when episodes of threats and corruption are reported by service providers in reference to misconduct of land owners and contractors. - DC replied that although the Ministry of Development Affairs, through its dedicated bodies LRD (Land Record Department) and DRD (Rural Development Department) is the ultimate authority to discipline land related issues, the General Administration Department is in the position of supporting if duly informed about the disputes. The DC stressed the channel for sharing the information should be the same mentioned in the above, namely through the Deputy Township Administrator/Camp Management Office of Hmanzi Junction. The DC furthermore emphasized the need of having detailed information of the cases, including names of the alleged perpetrators of threats/corruption, in order to being able to effectively intervene. - DC additionally suggested, and in order to enable him to be on page, whenever agencies achieve the permission from the State competent authorities for constructing new infrastructures in the camps, they should copy the District Commissioner/GAD, for his information. This would facilitate eventual follow up with land owners and contractors in case of dispute. - CC raised the need, at this point of the work with the CA, of having better understanding of the Hmanzi Junction Camp Management Office' terms of reference. It represents, despite the name might lead to misconceiving, a key Camp Administration unit; it includes officials from the Immigration, Police, Fire Brigades, LRD, which are supposed to operate under the coordination of the General Administration Department (Deputy TA as focal point), and it has been now indicated as instrumental for addressing issues that falls under the CA responsibility. 	<p>CC to share with PWG & elaborate 'action plan' for ad-hoc training</p> <p>CC to advocate with DC to change name of office from 'Management' to Administration and draft with CA office ToRs</p>	<p>First Quarter 2014</p> <p>First Quarter 2014</p>
---	---	--	---

	<p>Furthermore, it has been explained that a Complaints Response Mechanism to be implemented in planned camps has been drafted in the past weeks and, at this juncture, a channel for addressing relevant complaints to the Camp Management Office has to be included and agreed upon by relevant parties.</p> <p>- CC pointed out that similar problems (land related issues for construction, corruption and threats) also affect service providers (and especially WASH), operating in Pauktaw camps; the example of Solidarites in ANY clarified. CC stressed it is not always easy for the agencies get in touch with the Pauktaw TA and regular meetings for unblocking outstanding matters might be instrumental for the smoothness of the operation. CC requested the support of the DC for initiating this practice. The DC noted the request.</p> <p>- CC pointed out that in the majority of the planned camps Camp Management Committees are still not elected therefore IDPs do not feel represented and CMCs are still composed of a mix of IDPs and host community members, including prominent subjects of the GAD. On this note, DRC mentioned the example of STMG camp, where the Village Administrator is also the leader of the CMC, creating an evident unacceptable conflict of interest. It has been recalled that the attempt of having proper elections in Bah Du Pah camp was only partially sustained by the Government, until new committees have been appointed directly, jeopardizing the agreed upon process leading to a more participative exercise. In light of this, CC asked whether it is still reasonable expecting support from the CA for organizing elections in camps where groups of IDPs are grossly excluded from any decision making process. The example of Maw Thi Nyar camp has been mention as self-explanatory, given groups of IDPs from Aung Mingalar are still completely out of camp governance dynamics. It could be considered as pilot for a new attempt of elections.</p> <p>- DC replied positively, giving room for further development of the suggested initiative.</p> <p>- DC informed that during a recent visit in some camps, he noticed a very high number of “volunteers” receiving salary from service providers. He pointed out volunteers should not be paid, but offering their time for the only</p>	<p>CC and CMAs to integrate referral into Camp Management Office and Complaints Response Mechanism</p> <p>CC to advocate with DC and liaise with Pauktaw TA for regular coordination meeting between TA and operational agencies</p> <p>CC and CMAs/Save to discuss ways forward for elections in Maw Thi Nyar Camp</p>	<p>First Quarter 2014</p> <p>First Quarter 2014</p> <p>First Quarter 2014</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>benefit of the community. He added some of the volunteers were disrespectful of the Government authority and appearing idling while on duty. Furthermore, they should also work for the Government when requested. He therefore asked CMAs to involve the respective Government departments for selecting the volunteers/employees when recruiting their staffs.</p> <p>- CMAs commented there are different categories of people involved in camp management activities, some are not paid e.g. members of CMCs, while others do receive incentives as employees of the Agency (outreach workers or other skilled staffs); and those cannot work for the Government in addition to their duties performed for the INGO.</p> <p>CMAs also added they have to be compliant to specific HR policies when recruiting staffs and they do not foresee joined selection with the Government. In terms of behaviour, employees are held accountable as trained and signatories of an agreed upon code of conduct. They are furthermore sanctioned in case of violation.</p> <p>- DC requested CMAs to share those policies/methodologies for recruitment and inform when opening vacancies. It has been stressed that service providers e.g. Health and WASH should liaise with the respective Line Ministries when recruiting new staffs, for sake of transparency.</p> <p>- DC requested to be informed of Camp Management Agencies main activities e.g. trainings for CMCs</p> <p>- DC requested to have detailed contacts of Camp Management Agencies for better coordination</p> <p>- DC requested translation of the latest version of the CCCM Cluster Strategic Operational Framework</p>	<p>CMAs through CC to share summary of their HR policy/recruitment methodology</p> <p>CMAs through CC to share training calendar</p> <p>CC to share contacts with DC</p> <p>National CC to provide translated version</p>	<p>Next DC chaired meeting</p> <p>Next DC chaired meeting</p> <p>Next DC chaired meeting</p> <p>Next DC chaired meeting</p>	DC
4. Information Management	- DC informed Government house-hold survey is still underway and main purpose is collecting the right figures of people living in camps and clear knowledge of their status (IDPs vs. host community vs. economic migrants); this	CC to work with CMAs	First Quarter of 2014	

	<p>should be instrumental for more specific provision of assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CC stressed that common understanding and criteria for defining the current population/figures occupying emergency shelters would be instrumental for more consistent aid delivery. This is still unmet and GAD, Camp Managers and IDP Camp Management Committees still refer to different lists and apply parallel methodologies for data collection. The DC noted the remark. 	<p>pursuing harmonization of circulating beneficiary lists and seeking cooperation with GAD for figures' sharing</p>	
5. AoB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CC informed this has been his last meeting in Sittwe and a new CCCM Cluster Coordinator will be deployed in January. During the window period, in case of urgent matters concerning camp management, the HoO of UNHCR can be contacted by the CMAs. Furthermore, the DC has been asked whether CMAs could eventually approach directly his office in case of not deferrable matters, without the filter of UNHCR; the DC agreed on the suggestion. - Date and time of the next CCCM Cluster meeting will be confirmed in January by the new CCCM Cluster Coordinator. 		