

Minutes of Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting

10:00 – 11:00/30, Wednesday, 16 December 2015



UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: UNHCR, OCHA, Swan Yee Development Foundation, MMRD, IOM, IFRC & freelance consultant. Nine individuals attended.

Apologies:

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Cluster Coordinator (CC) noted it was the last National meeting of 2015. Introductions were made. Floor given to <i>Myanmar Marketing Research and Development</i> (MMRD), a presentation regarding their work. The <i>Social Insight</i> branch of the firm specialise in surveys and impact assessments; offering research services to humanitarian and CBOs. They have numerous INGOs as clients but are looking for more UN agencies. Surveys in Rakhine camps was mentioned as a possibility. For more information contact their Senior Advisor Johannah Wegerdt (johannah@mmdrs.com). 	
2. Clear Minutes & Actions from Previous Meeting	<p>Various issues/actions from last meeting's minutes were flagged for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual housing solutions in Nidin, Rakhine State have been stopped as there were concerns over the inadequacy of the houses and location. Situation closely monitored by the Shelter Cluster and its partners and critically TIKA. TIKA subsequently halted its funding to Nidin. IDP community living in Nidin have "reputedly" found a more suitable plot of land but would require considerable infrastructure support. CC approached UNDP to find out if there were available funds; unfortunately no. CC also waiting to hear back from USAID concerning the same issue. Also noted that this maybe more than <i>just</i> an infrastructure issue in terms of why not this other IDP suggested site. Following last month's meeting CC welcomed the impromptu meeting between Swan Yee Development Foundation and TIKA. TIKA wanted to clarify with Swan Yee that their funding does not just serve Muslim populations but also Buddhist/Rakhines. It was a chance for TIKA to explain that it is a 	

	proportionality factor, proportionally there are more Muslims displaced.	
<p>3. 2016 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)</p> <p>Protection Analysis</p>	<p>CC announced that the HNO and HRP have been completed and has been sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Nay Pyi Taw. He suggested there should be a translation into the Myanmar language. Available on the Shelter Cluster website: https://www.sheltercluster.org/library/humanitarian-country-team-strategiesresponse-plans-2015</p> <p>CC urged everyone to read the Protection Analysis reports from Rakhine and Kachin/Shan; CC can be contacted for copies: Rakhine State > <i>Context Analysis & Concerns & Risks Analysis.</i> Kachin/Shan State > <i>Context Analysis & Concerns & Risks Analysis.</i></p>	
<p>4. Kachin/Shan States I. Central/Southern Shan – shelter/NFI needs</p>	<p>CC noted OCHA paper <i>Shan State Brief Analysis of Socio-Political and Conflict</i> by Richard Horsey, which would be circulated. CC then read overview of information on situation in Central Shan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RI has established that there are 4000 IDPs across three camps in three townships; Mong Shu; Mong Nawng; and Kyeth; • Military checkpoints are operating in the area making accessibility hard. There is an unknown number of IDPs living in host communities across 31 villages. • Host villages are getting to a point where they just do not have the resources to host more IDPs. Local communities, along with volunteers who can access the communities as well as the camps, have been providing NFIs in the form of blankets and, in some cases, basic cooking facilities. • RI stated that there is a gap of NFIs in both the camps and host communities. A suggestion/request was put forward to engage someone already working in the Shelter/NFI Cluster in NSS to provide technical expertise on exactly what NFIs are needed; • Regarding shelter; many people are currently camping on plastic sheeting under large tarpaulins; • WaSH and Health remain important needs/gaps. <p>OCHA > stated that they had a rough/estimated figure of 3,000 who were displaced and shelter was a priority, noting their December report.</p> <p>Aung Ko > noted in terms of WaSH, latrines were a severe gap, particularly in Monghsu Township, in Southern Shan, in the camps of Haik Par (about 1,500 in population) and Wan Wa (about 900 in population). They need toilets as diarrhoea cases are becoming a serious issue. Only one local organisation has been providing blankets but these are too thin for the cold weather in the area.</p>	<p>Action point CC to determine what gaps there are, in Central/Southern Shan, in terms of NFIs.</p>

	<p>RI has regular access to Central Shan and shall be contacted accordingly.</p>	
 <p>Myanmar Shelter Cluster ShelterCluster.org Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter</p> <p>CCCM CLUSTER SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES</p>	<p>I. Outputs from Northern Shan mission, including MDCG funding needs for solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camps reputedly shelled and were still vacated. Displaced still unable to return to this site. 	
 <p>Myanmar Shelter Cluster ShelterCluster.org Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter</p> <p>CCCM CLUSTER SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The result of not being able to return to the above site is IDPs <i>still</i> living in RC II Camp. As Cluster has been advocating for last 18 months, site is poor/inappropriate. 	



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



On more positive note CC noted examples of where IDP camp residents/structures are now taking responsibility for care and maintenance of their temporary shelters. Noted positives of these new initiatives being:

- IDPs have a vested interest in doing the work themselves/ownership;
- Sets a positive trend of self-reliance;
- Counterweight to dependency syndrome;
- Cheaper than more contractor-based approaches.

These initiatives are consistent with one of the key CCCM indicators set for this Cluster's 2015 HRP:

Number of IDPs in Kachin/Shan that benefit from repairs / maintenance / upgrading of their temporary shelters



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



Note various images of temporary shelters. Made of steel, much better durability and likelihood of need for care and maintenance (C&M) much reduced. Still, heat and noise may be other concerns.

- See bottom left hand, some IDPs demanding hinges are fixed. CC asked is this something organisations should be dealing with? Should this be the responsibility of the shelter provider or the owner?
- Regarding the bottom right hand image; this is clearly a structural issue that provider of shelter should address. Some noted that sometimes IDPs are afraid to fix shelters as they see them as the property of the organisation who provided it, rather than as their own home. Organisations should clarify to IDPs that the shelter is their property; ownership should be given. IFRC stated that some sort of ownership paper could be given to the IDPs so that they recognise it as their own property? This issue needs to be clarified so that organisations are not inundated with minor R&M requests.
- OCHA stressed there needs to be some quality assurance at the point of delivery but after that it should be the responsibility of the IDP community. CC fully agreed.



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



- Note some of the shelters in urban/congested settings in Shan, see top right hand image. Communities have opened up the roofs of their shelters to allow for natural light. Viewed as a positive/innovative modification.



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



- CC by this photo was just keen to underscore how positive it was to see the sub-national Shelter/NFI/CCCM meeting in Muse being led by two national staff colleagues *and* conducted in Myanmar language. Minutes of this 18th September meeting can be located at:
https://www.sheltercluster.org/library/meeting-minutes-northern-shan-shelternficcm?sort=date&sort_direction=DESC



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



- Since November CC had been advocating for donor support for local NGO MDCG to support this community of IDPs in a deplorable situation and yet a permanent solution is now possible, if funding supplied. Land has been identified and MDCG has proven track record of delivering shelter solutions in Shan, see bottom right hand photo. To-date no response/interest from *any* donors. For more details contact CC at benson@unhcr.org.

Shelter & NFIs

Camp	Access	New	Replacement	Repair	Remaining
1. BN-8			182		
2. Wiphal		33		236	
3. BN-8		80			
4. Hlaga Yang	NGCA		305		
5. Ngum Lom Yang		30			
6. Lu Yang		180		220	
7. Duntung			41		
8. Lanaw-la			800		
Total		325	1118	456	

Winter Items

- 23 camps covered (priority 1&2), 2011-2014 (GCA, NGCA & NSS)
- High correlation between “received” & utility
- Blankets, mattress, mosquito nets, clothes (adult & child)
- Priority: winter clothes, mattress & winter blankets
- All camp said need to buy NFI (all the NFI items) and almost all the camp said they don’t have enough
- Priority: winter clothes, mattresses, winter blankets & mats

Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter



II. NFIs – winter items

- As per adjacent slide, for winter items this year there are 23 priority 1 & 2 camps being covered by the Cluster.

Management of Camps

- **SELF Management** – small camps are not getting much attention and have better social cohesion. Smaller camps are “more” likely to stay given that it has now been 3 years?
- **TA Management** – Government should take more responsibility and this is more feasible for them when camps are near to urban areas. This can link to NRCs work on UDOC.
- **NGO Management** – Business as usual. Bigger camps that are more complex to manage and usually further away from township centres. Many in NGCA areas where NGCA authorities may not have the capacity to take over support. Under these camps a lot more effort should be going to building capacity of camp management.
- **Stats to justify**
 - 50% of total IDP population lives in just 20 camps
 - 27% of IDP camps have a population of less than 100 people
 - 26% of IDPs live within 3km of a township centre

III. CCCM Costs

- In conjunction with national WaSH counterpart, ideas were being considered in terms of how best to focus what will likely be diminishing resources in 2016 for camp management across Kachin/Shan?
- Three types of management for the camps were explained by the Cluster Coordinator: SELF, TA or NGO.
- Decision tree, as provided by WaSH counterpart, was also explained to the group, which could allow one to determine which option. Stressed still in the early stages of discussion.

IV. Camp profiling – “round four”

- This was now complete and IM colleague was in Kachin sharing this latest round of data.
- This data could be located at:

Kachin: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/library/individual-camp-profiles-kachin-2015-round-4>

Shan: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/library/individual-camp-profiles-northern-shan-2015-round-4>

Place of Origin Maps: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/library/individual-camps-profiled-kachin-northern-shan-camps-profiled-analysis-place-origin-maps>

V. Laiza Shelter Gap

Current gap as follows:¹

- Hpun Lum Yang – 170 households (HH) units needed, but commitments already for 70;
- Je Yang – 150 (HH) needed;
- Woi Chyai – 250HH needed, Metta secured funding from USAID for “some”. First priority is for 40 HH still in the warehouse plus remaining units are targeted people living in makeshift shelters. IRRIC will adjust the available space

¹ CC should be contacted directly for detailed shelter plan for 2016 shelter and 2015 achievements.

	<p>within camp area but stressed that limitation of land space means there might be a need to adjust shelter type such as 4 units, twin units and single unit. Again, if Metta is constructing the shelter sustainable maintenance should be introduced to the communities since it will be metal structure and interested IDPs should be trained how to for small repair work.</p>	
<p>5. Rakhine State I. Risk Analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At a recent cash-based interventions training in Bangkok CC noted an exercise involved a risk assessment of the individual housing solutions programme in Rakhine State. The risk rating that emerged, noting all factors, was “medium to high”. This underscores that it remains a highly difficult State in which to operate. Less than a year ago non-Rakhines could not receive basic NFIs, say a plastic bucket and now houses were being built.² 	
<p>II. Early Recovery for <i>all</i> communities</p>	<p>As an update, TIKA’s third phase of their six-phase programme should be finished by year-end/first month of 2016. With exception of two sites in Kyautaw, where in one site all construction was suspended (see page above/page 1) and in another only partially done, all other 12 sites across Kyautaw, Minbya and MraukU T/ships would soon be done, assisting approximately 1,500 HH.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citing input from the UNDP early recovery (ER) network, interaction between groups in these areas has “progressively improved”, including during housing construction. In terms of actual ER support, across these three T/ships 750 villages are being supported. 70% are Rakhine, 9% are Muslim and 21% other. This is essentially short-term assistance, one year and does NOT include USAID funds. 2016 ER ambitions are to expand and mobilise economy beyond just conflict-affected areas to bring wider benefits. Continued/careful approach in terms of DO NO HARM. One participant noted that fishermen in Buthidaung, Rathidaung and Pauktaw were unable to working. Fearful to go to sea in case of attack from Muslim communities. Stressed that the tensions in the area are not just affecting those in camps. Cluster <i>must</i> be aware of these groups as well. 	

² Noting various ERC ‘guidelines’, ‘recommendations, protection risks, outcomes and tips’ for cash-based interventions had recently emerged, CC should be contacted for copies.



Myanmar Shelter Cluster
ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter

III. Kyein Nyi Pyin (KNP) > Pauktaw T/ship

- Update on KNP: Camp is made up of 1000 HH of IDPs from across five villages. Half the caseload is from KNP, as their village of origin, for which the RSG will provide individual houses (see bottom left-hand photo). As for the remaining approximately 500 HH issue is whether they be settled nearby or allowed back to their villages of origin? Major concern would be 1,000 HH in an area that previously supported 500 HH? TIKA, which is listed as part of their 4th phase to assist 248 HH of this 500 HH in place of origin has suspend their commitment until the situation is clearer.
- Positive news regarding the distribution of tool kits; see top right hand photo. Again a *modest* step forward since distribution to Muslim communities was banned for almost two years due to Government stating their fears that tools could be used as weapons. This ban has been lifted.
- Bottom right-hand picture denotes use of coloured roofing to give visibility of who is providing assistance to whom. This could help show to Rakhine communities that not all aid is being given to Muslim communities.

Action point
CC to continue to update Cluster on this development



- Adjacent image is in regards to latest IDP housing developments in Mingan Ward. Relocation site for the 151 HH in SYS-3 IDP Camp IDP in Sittwe T/ship. To be implemented by Rakhine State Government, GAD.
- This IDP group is the *last* batch of Rakhine IDPs currently living in temporary shelters.
- Relevant technical information (gathered from MoT and GAD offices) about the individual houses are as follows:
 - House type: short leg design (18' x 17' x 12'), timber structure, 5"x5" timber post with concrete block footings, color roofing, timber walling and flooring.
 - Estimated cost of each individual house: MMK 2.4 Million (including family latrine).

<p>6. Flood Response</p> <p>I. ECHO Funding</p> <p>II. Housing Response in Northern Rakhine State</p> <p>III. IFRC-SCT Exit</p>	<p>OCHA shared information from ECHO regarding funding for the floods. DG ECHO has committed six million euros to Myanmar of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two million euros has gone to IOM for the flood response: Build Back Better and wash (with ACF); CCCM, winterization, psycho-social and livelihood supports; - 850,000 euros has gone to ICRC indirectly contributing to flood response in Rakhine State; total DG ECHO contribution: 2,75 million euros; - 1.65 million euros has gone to WFP indirectly contributing to flood response; total DG ECHO contribution: 3.45 million euros. - 750,000 euros has gone to ACF to adjust to the increase in severely malnourished patients caseloads; total DG ECHO contribution: 2.35 million euros. <p>UNHCR completed distribution of MMK 299,720,000 CERF funds to 472 cyclone-affected households by the end of 2015 as planned (206 in Maungdaw and 266 in Buthidaung, including nearly 30% for non-Muslims). Each family received MMK 635,000 in two installments in coordination with the village administrators on the basis of verified repair progress. Most of the reported cases of extortion and harassment were successfully addressed at the local level thanks to careful but robust interventions.</p> <p>As per preceding meeting Chaired by IFRC-SCT, IFRC-SCT now exiting Myanmar. See below under Flood Response for various/key documents. Agreed by CC with OCHA, when the latter arranged next visit to worst affected areas, CC would join.</p>	<p>Action point CC to go on mission January/February to worst flood affected areas</p>
<p>7. AOB</p> <p>Rakhine camp management reports</p> <p>Land-slides in Ah Pauk Wa, Kyautaw Township, Rakhine State</p> <p>Land-slide in Ayeyarwaddy</p>	<p>DRC camp management reports had been uploaded onto Relief Web (RW) without any request to the Cluster Lead. Cluster Coordinator favours putting things online – the transparency approach – but this is the first time that this has happened. RW reacted swiftly and removed them but it was a point of concern.</p> <p>One IDP killed, 5 houses taken by the river, including one TIKA funded house; 10 more houses dismantled and evacuated as risk of more slides; 3 TIKA houses among them and 7 from host community. Protection and shelter assessed the situation mobilized ICRC through the Shelter Cluster). Immediate assistance included UNHCR tents/NFIs.</p> <p>Occurred 14 December at Nga Won river, close to Aing Tha Pyu Village, Lemyethna T/ship (Ayeyarwaddy Division). 49 houses from Aing Tha Pyu village affecting 190 persons. Living in makeshift tents and got limited support food/relief support from</p>	

<p>Trocaire is looking at partnering with NRC in Camp Management</p>	<p>T/ship GAD and Social Welfare. Most of them are poor and requested assistance. For more clarification contact to U Aung Kyaw Thein (Damanandi, local CBO), 09782233095 (or) U Khin Zaw (Village Administrator) 09421163515.</p> <p>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 support CMCs. They have piloted trainings, with KMSS in Bhamo, on accountability, information management and participation.</p>	
<p>Request from ECHO - Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs)</p>	<p>“Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), also known as “drones”, are used more and more in various fields for imagery, transport and other purposes. Humanitarian organisations, but also actors not traditionally involved in humanitarian action have started to use these tools in humanitarian settings as well. Hopes are high that drones will strongly improve humanitarians' capacity to assess needs, monitor changes on the ground and even to deliver relief items. At the same time, critics voice their scepticism regarding the actual usefulness of drones in humanitarian settings. As part of a project managed by Fondation Suisse de Deminage (FSD) in collaboration with CartONG, UAViators and Zoi Environment Network and funded by ECHO, the following survey is looking at the current perception and use of UAV/drones by professionals working in humanitarian action. Kindly ask you to spare a few minutes of your time to respond to the survey available here: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Humanitarian_Drones.”</p>	

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, 18.11.'15.

OCHA

Finalised Shelter-NFI-CCCM section from HNO 2016;

Finalised Shelter-NFI-CCCM section from HRP 2016.

Flood Response

National Situation Report – Final, 17.12.'15;

Shelter Cluster Minutes, Central Area Flood Response, 16.12.'15;

INDEX of Guidelines Information Products – Myanmar FLOODS RESPONSE – 2015;

IOM DTM Report, Chin State, 9 December 2015;

Protection Sector - Flood Response Update - December 2015.

Kachin/Shan

Context Analysis & Concerns & Risks Analysis – will be shared on request;

HCT Protection Analysis Briefing, Kachin, Shan and Rakhine States, December '15 – will be shared on request;
“Shan State: Brief Analysis of Socio-Political and Conflict Context and their Humanitarian Implications”, Richard Horsey, 23 October 2015;
“Listening to the Shan Communities in Bhamo District, Caught-up-in-between”, LNGO report, October 2015

Rakhine State

Protection Sector Update No.6 on Ending Displacement in Rakhine State, 8th January 2016;
Protection Sector Context Analysis & Concerns & Risks Analysis – will be shared on request.

CCCM

Guidelines for Integrating GBV Interventions in Humanitarian Action, CCCM – will be shared on request.

Shelter

Guidelines for Integrating GBV Interventions in Humanitarian Action, Shelter, Settlement and Recovery – will be shared on request.