



	<p>in NFI (Section 5), rather in Sanitary and Hygiene conditions (Section 8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ As OCHA stressed, priority is “speed”. It is village-community-camp level, not HH and/or individual.</li> <li>✓ Assessment should “not have to be done by specialists”.</li> <li>✓ Questions should be framed such that they avoid space for errors/confusion or allow space for several different types of answers. One suggestion was use of images.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cluster partners to contact CC if they could help close winterisation this gap for Kachin &amp; Northern Shan:</b> Positive response from UNHCR and others partners liaising with colleagues at Kachin State level, notably ICRC and IRC. ICRC tentative commitment to meet needs of 2,000HH. No response from IFRC and/or UNICEF Child Protection. Written request to Emmanuelle Compingt (<a href="mailto:ecompingt@unicef.org">ecompingt@unicef.org</a>) 25 June, no response to-date. Subsequently confirmed that IFRC would not be able to contribute; efforts to explore still appreciated by Cluster Lead.</li> <li>• <b>CC to arrange web based forum discussion on NFIs and contact Cluster partners to determine interest:</b> Action <i>still</i> outstanding with CC although technical discussions around NFIs happening at Kachin State level. See technical meetings in Bhamo and Myitkyina, 30 May and 10 June, respectively: <a href="https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Technical-Working-Group-Minutes-(TWiG).aspx">https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Technical-Working-Group-Minutes-(TWiG).aspx</a>. CC has requested Rakhine based equivalent to initiate something similar.</li> <li>• <b>CC to liaise with Rakhine CCCM Cluster Lead to address at Rakhine State level, namely <u>vital</u> that all relevant/key sectors/clusters at Rakhine State level had buy-in to the complaints mechanism being rolled-out by camp management agencies:</b> CC flagged this issue up to Rakhine-based CCCM Cluster Lead colleague and discussed at today’s meeting with DRC’s CCCM Project Coordinator for Rakhine. DRC said that it is “informally working” but the “<i>need</i> sector feedback”. With the WaSH Cluster in Rakhine there has “already been a breakthrough”. LWF using the same tool. Noted that WaSH, health and food make up 95 per cent of complaints in camps. GenCap Advisor stressed the need for agencies staff to be conscious in terms of how they “behave when dealing with complaints”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CC to secure attendance of Lead of Cash Transfer Working Group:</b> Action taken, see below.</li> <li>• <b>Shelter partners to contact CC if they can help close shelter gap in Northern Shan:</b> Action taken, see below.</li> <li>• <b>CC to follow-up with Kachin Shelter, NFI and CCCM Cluster Coordinator that shelter construction plans for all shelter actors are shared with lead agency on WaSH to aid WaSH actors with their planning:</b> Action taken.</li> <li>• <b>CC to rearrange dates for REACH mission to Rakhine to conduct detailed temporary shelter assessment:</b> Action taken. Rescheduled for mid-late September, post rainy season. Communicated to Rakhine Shelter Cluster Coordinator. DRC noted examples of where shelters are collapsing in Say Tha Mar Gyi and OTG North. They are</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>OCHA to update questionnaire ASAP</b></p>
--	--	---

	<p>currently conducting full shelter assessments across all camps where they are camp management agency. CC underscored that they were deliberately temporary in nature but that <i>care and maintenance</i> (C&amp;M) programmes being rolled-out through Rakhine Shelter Cluster were vital. Also agreed that original shelter provider/builder must address elemental structural issues, as needed. For more details on latest C&amp;M activities in Rakhine see Rakhine Shelter Cluster minutes at: <a href="https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx">https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CC to follow-up with Rakhine CCCM Cluster Leads regarding feasibility of having such a report for all 21 of the 23 priority camps:</b></li> </ul> <p>CC flagged this issue up to Rakhine-based CCCM Cluster Lead colleague Olivia Wellesley-Cole (<a href="mailto:wellesle@unhcr.org">wellesle@unhcr.org</a>) to encourage across Camp Management actors. Despite its positives, DRC stressed that to produce such a document is “very time consuming”. Once a month is about as frequent as possible/reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Following two offers to address this outstanding and critical Camp Management gap in Pauktaw, CC to relay to CCCM Cluster Leads in Rakhine to take discussions forward as a matter of some urgency at Rakhine State level:</b></li> </ul> <p>Action taken. UNHCR Programme issued a <i>Call for Expression of Interest</i> - Pauktaw and Meybon Camps CCCM 17 June, deadline 4 July. DRC confirmed at meeting that they would not make a submission but LWF would.</p>	
<p><b>Meeting with WFP</b></p>	<p>Noting food distribution issues that had been raised by Camp Management actors over number of months, CC had bilateral meeting with WFP 1 July 2014. Points WFP stressed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To state any IDP has “died” due to lack of food is a <i>major</i> accusation and must be rigorously qualified, namely post-mortems. Otherwise it should <i>not</i> be made;</li> <li>• Overall, most IDPs targeted under food assistance get their rations regularly. There is a need to take the fear out of food. IDPs. WFP and its partners have been providing food assistance since the onset of the displacement without any major delays;</li> <li>• However, there are some challenges for the food sector, due to the lack of partners to aid with food distributions;</li> <li>• It was agreed that more could be done in terms of coordination, with support from Yangon if needed;</li> <li>• WFP or Food Sector partners should be at every distribution and off-loading costs should be covered and IDPs not required to-pay for offloading. However, voluntary payments for transport to their respective shelter might happen and needs to be carefully monitored;</li> <li>• There was a discussion about the post-distribution monitoring findings, which had also been presented in the food sector meeting;</li> <li>• Yes there are issues with Food Management Committees, but this also relates to Camp Committees, which comes under the direct responsibility of Camp Management actors;</li> <li>• WFP stressed that the lack of proper identification/verification of IDPs makes their role all the harder.</li> <li>• Suggested initial possibilities could include ration cards, with a pilot project in one small camp. Subsequently, a list of camps that already uses ration cards was developed</li> </ul>	

	<p>The above points led to lengthy discussions and as a matter of priority agreed that CC would seek to arrange meeting between WFP's Head of Programme and DRC.</p>	<p><b>CC to arrange/propose meeting between DRC and WFP Head of Programme</b></p>
<p><b>Presentation from Cash Transfer Working Group, WFP</b></p> <p><b>a. Themes emerging from technical discussions around NFIs at field level</b></p>	<p>30 minute presentation given by WFP's <i>Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Officer</i>, followed by Q&amp;A. Presentation focused on <i>why</i> WFP is considering moving from food assistance (in-kind) to cash assistance. Highlighted cost benefit analysis, dietary and income research, rationale, feasibility assessments, pilot, mitigation strategies and risks associated with targeting food assistance. For more details see attached PowerPoint presentation.</p> <p>Noting cash assistance's relevance to NFI discussions, CC highlighted outputs of technical working group discussions in Bhamo (BMO) and Myitkyina (MYT), 30 May and 10 June.</p> <p>BMO discussions looked to revise the kits, design standard winterisation kits and have better targeted distributions. Since the conflict is protracted in Kachin, over three years, but also fresh emergencies, perhaps there could/should be two kits? Other findings of discussions were that tarpaulins and mats remain "very popular" and keeping it at 5 persons per family, although not perfect, "was probably best" For new items, pillows were suggested for comfort and utility and "thicker" mosquito nets. Generally they were in favour of targeted distributions but resource heavy and some felt that those "who have more complain more". For targeted distributions Camp Committees will be vital. There is also a need to consider income but also the expenses of the HH.</p> <p>For MYT discussions, similarly standard packaged kits are "great in emergencies but less good for more targeted assistance". Likewise tarpaulins remain popular and pillows/sleepers were suggested as new items. Distributions should be able to target better children and the elderly. Metta voucher system seems credible "in-between approach". Cash could mean less staff but naturally good assessment of local markets and more technical/formal training was needed. As above, see minutes of these technical meetings in Bhamo and Myitkyina at: <a href="https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Technical-Working-Group-Minutes-(TWiG).aspx">https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Technical-Working-Group-Minutes-(TWiG).aspx</a>.</p>	
<p><b>Northern Shan Mission Feedback (15-19 June)</b></p>	<p>Following five-day mission to Northern Shan with Protection Sector Lead, ten key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cluster partners view was that coordination overall, not necessarily just specific to <i>this</i> Cluster, had been "good in early response with good logistics and people working hard over the break";</li> <li>2. Need for site planning of new sites, action was with the Cluster Lead to share plans;</li> <li>3. Situation deemed to remain "fluid" with approximately "1000 new IDPs predicted (by partners) in the coming weeks". A list of possible relocation sites shared with Cluster Lead during mission;</li> <li>4. Differing shelter standards – Metta (US\$1,500) vs. MDCG/World Vision (US\$630). Cluster Lead was following-up with actors concerned. Remained key/vital to consult with beneficiaries;</li> <li>5. Notable amount of tents that were used but some discarded fast and questions as to why in some cases, particularly with rains now present, IDPs could not use pre-existing vacant large structures that were in</li> </ol>	

	<p>the compounds where tents were located. Cluster Lead needed to understand issue in more depth before any conclusions could be reached yet keen to probe;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Shelter gap appears to be around 200 units, with Cluster Lead following-up at State level;</li> <li>7. On the land issue, “generally solutions are being found” although RC2 New Camp in Man Wein Gyi is a major concern due to its congested nature, prone to flooding and lack of fresh air/natural light;</li> <li>8. Particularly in urban locations, electricity rather than wood s/could be explored as an alternative cooking means; safer, cleaner/healthier. However as SI explained, wood burning stoves do provide heat during winter months;</li> <li>9. Generally <i>very</i> positive feedback from beneficiaries in relation to individual temporary shelters in Galeng Kachin and Ma Yu Lay Camp, Kutkai Township.</li> <li>10. Partners still viewed the situation as an “emergency” and would like monthly meetings. CC had explained that due to no permanent presence once a month would be hard but Cluster would aim, as needed, for one every six weeks. Next meeting planned mid-August. For details of 17 June meeting in Muse see minutes: <a href="https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-meeting-minutes.aspx">https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-meeting-minutes.aspx</a> Also, see foot of these minutes for some photos shown during meeting.</li> </ol>	
<b>Rakhine</b>	See above.	
<b>AoB - Updates</b>	<p><b>Cluster Lead/UNHCR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cluster Lead met Secretary-General Michel Roy of Caritas International who was visiting Myanmar. Positive words of support given by Michel Roy in terms of efforts of this Cluster to coordinate with local NGOs, and these efforts by the Cluster to be reciprocated.</li> <li>• Global Shelter Cluster shares on an ad-hoc basis updates on events, tools and highlights with all of those subscribed to their mailing list. Some of the information shared is also of interest to members that are in-country, who are currently not receiving the updates. Cluster members here in MYN should contact CC if they wish to be included on the Global Cluster mailing list.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding recent developments in Thailand and migrant workers and whether this would have any impact on Myanmar refugees in Thailand. NO change of policy in terms of Myanmar refugees remaining in Thailand. See footnote below.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> Reference made to a recent article in the Irrawaddy which suggested that there had been a change in the Royal Thai Government's policy in relation to refugee repatriation, based on a meeting that was convened by the RTG / ISOC (Internal Security Operations Command) in Mae Sot on 17-19 June. Further news reports from other sources included similar statements, which understandably created some anxiety. For the sake of clarity, there has been *NO* change in policy on the issue of refugee repatriation. The title of the ISOC seminar was “Developing the Quality of Life of Displaced Persons Fleeing Fighting and the objective was to discuss durable solutions for this group. The agenda included a presentation on migrant issues in Mae Sot, and a guest speaker, Senator Udon Tantisoopthorn (the Father of the Thai-Myanmar Friendship Bridge) shared his thoughts on the history of the refugees and the social developments that are taking place inside Myanmar. UNHCR was consulted on the draft agenda and was subsequently invited to the seminar. UNHCR Thailand briefed the participants on the applicable international standards as well as the protection and humanitarian assistance strategies that are focused on identifying and supporting all possible durable solutions for the 120,000 +/- persons living in the camps. As already mentioned, NO policy decisions or policy changes were announced or made during the seminar, although we have since been informed that existing policy restricting freedom of movement outside the camps will now be strictly applied, and steps have since been taken to enforce this. UNHCR thought it worth re-confirming this in view of the media speculation and rumors. Any further questions on this subject should be relayed to Vicky Tennant ([tennant@unhcr.org](mailto:tennant@unhcr.org)).

	<p><b>NRC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving talks ahead in Kachin/CCCM support to LNGOs and camp focal points with KMSS, KBC and Shalom;</li> <li>• Require feedback (as matter of some <i>urgency</i>) from Save regarding NRC's support to their CCCM team/initiative. Funds only to 31 December, every day/week counts. Keen to stress to IOM that no wish to overlapping/duplicate, rather compliment with their posting and provide holistic support as best as possible, and on Cluster Lead's recommendations;</li> <li>• Keen to translate key CCCM docs into Myanmar. Rakhine and Kachin (Cluster as a whole) could benefit from this action.</li> </ul> <p><b>LWF</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current vacancies in Myanmar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <i>Education Coordinator</i>, Myanmar, Rakhine State, LWF Department for World Service (DWS);</li> <li>➤ <i>Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) and Protection Coordinator</i>, Myanmar, Rakhine State, LWF Department for World Service (DWS).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>For more information visit: <a href="http://www.lutheranworld.org/what_we_do/op/vacancies.html">http://www.lutheranworld.org/what_we_do/op/vacancies.html</a></p>	
--	--	--

The next meeting would be scheduled for first or second week in August. 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*, 4.6.'14;
- *Initial Rapid Assessment Form*, English, 11.6.'14;
- *Emergency Response Plan Myanmar*, 25th June '14 – FINAL;
- *Annex 1 - Sector Minimum Preparedness Actions*, June 2014;
- *Annex 2 - Sector Contingency Response Plans, Cyclone Scenario for Rakhine*, June 2014.
- *Use of Cash in Food Assistance in Kachin*, WFP.
- *WaSH Cluster Snapshot*, Myanmar-Kachin, June 2014.
- *CCCM Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine* (6th June – 13th June 2014);
- *UNOCHA Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine* (20th June – 4th July 2014);
- *Working Differently in Rakhine*, (Final HCT Endorsed) – 13 June 2014.
- *OCHA Mission Report to Meikhtila*, 29 to 30 May 2014;
- *OCHA ICC Meeting*, 13 June '14;
- *OCHA ICC Meeting*, 27 June '14.



Man Waing Gyi, KBC Cultural Compound – World Vision shelters



Man Waing Gyi, KBC Camp - Metta shelters



Man Waing Gyi, RC New-2 Camp (KMSS) – MDCG shelters



Tents vs. pre-existing structures/buildings



Pre-existing structures/buildings vs. tents



Individual temporary shelters, Ma Yu Lay Camp, Kutkai Township