

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 18 December, 2013

UNHCR Office, YGN

Attendees: UNHCR, ECHO, IOM, OCHA, Plan International, ACTED, USAID, MDCG, Care, Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator for Kachin & Northern Shan and UNHCR Information Management Officer

Unable to attend the meeting: LWF, Solidarites, Relief International, IFRC & FSD

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Introductions	<p>Welcome from Cluster Coordinator (CC)</p> <p>All attendees introduced themselves and minutes from the last usual Cluster meeting, 13 November, were circulated and approved. CC noted that he had yet to complete minutes from ad hoc meeting, 22 November, with ECHO/UNHCR & NRC joint monitoring mission (JMM).</p>	CC to complete & circulate minutes from 22 November
Feedback on ECHO-UNHCR-NRC-Global Shelter (GSC) and Global CCCM (GCCCCMC) Cluster JMM, 22 – 29 November	<p>CC mentioned that the meetings with JMM organised at YGN, Sittwe and Myitkyina levels were an opportunity for Cluster partners to voice their opinions on the strenghts or weaknesses of <i>this</i> Cluster. CC thanked everyone involved in the visit and reminded that ECHO is a major funder for this Cluster at the Global level, so it was important that JMM menbers could engage at every level with Cluster partners. Notably, NRC receives funds from ECHO and these funds pay for several of the Cluster coordinators here in MYN, here for <i>this</i> Cluster and deployed through NRC.</p> <p>Main findings:¹</p> <p>-The JMM judged the two clusters to be very well-functioning and well-organised, which has allowed it to deliver impressive and tangible results in a short timeframe. The support from the global level has been</p>	

¹ The CC noted that the report is yet to be finalised but was keen to share verbally some of the key findings; once finalised the report will be shared across all Myanmar Cluster partners.

	<p>visible and enabled the country level Cluster to implement the IASC Transformative Agenda (TA) commitments for a country-level Cluster. ECHO at the de-brief back in YGN viewed it to be thought by many as the best Cluster in the country and a very good one at the global level and has also brought up other clusters in Myanmar.</p> <p>-People at the field level, YGN, Rakhine and Kachin, were not fully aware of the support <i>this</i> Cluster receives from the Global Shelter & CCCM Clusters. There is a risk that that this support is assumed to have only been provided by the Lead Agency.</p> <p>-Fragility of <i>this</i> Cluster due to uncertainty for staff continuity in 2014, although noted how well-staffed this Cluster had been in 2014 and the major benefits this had brought.</p> <p>-Tools/guidelines are beneficial, but most important thing is to have qualified persons to use and implement them, as relevant to the situation.</p> <p>-Cluster partners did not know about the GSC and GCCCMC Strategies.</p> <p>-In Kachin there is the issue that it is difficult to distinguish between UNHCR and Cluster partners as opposed to UNHCR implementing partners (IPs). There is a risk that this forum appears as a meeting between UNHCR and IPs rather than a Cluster meeting. While the Cluster is currently addressing some of the shortcomings of the pre-Cluster Kachin response in shelter, more readily available shelter guidance would be useful. This guidance could address issues related to: quality, area/space, privacy, ventilation, rainwater harvesting, and other issues. This was indicative of the wider issue as to <i>why</i> the Cluster had been activated so late in Myanmar? The Cluster was deemed to be well-staffed with people of exceptional quality.</p> <p>-In Rakhine the JMM was highly impressed, especially in shelter, with how much has been achieved in less than a year since its activation. The role of the Government (GoM) has been vital but it is evident that the Cluster had a key role in advocating with embassies, donors, and other stakeholders to convince the GoM to take a bigger role. Standards have been respected due to a very effective relationship with the GoM. Relationship with WaSH could be improved and it is very important to continue the work of CCCM, particularly in the large settlements. Repair and upkeep of the shelters can be done by the IDPs themselves with the correct support. It would be good to look at alternative ways to meeting household</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>needs than simply repetitive and identical NFI distributions, with perhaps some market analysis to inform future ways to meet these needs.</p> <p>-Other overall findings included the surge capacity provided by the GCCCMC that has been instrumental in getting the Cluster effective but the lack of continuous support may jeopardize capacity and relations. Also, the distinction between UNHCR and Cluster can still at times be unclear. Some work done on contingency but more is needed. It would be useful to undertake some Cluster performance monitoring and <i>more</i> work could be done to engage IOM and IFRC noting their responsibility in shelter and CCCM clusters at the global level.</p> <p>-Other findings to the Myanmar Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster included: building and sustaining on the current success; building on the advocacy efforts by linking them with TA structures; advocating for additional partners to work in Kachin or existing partners to scale-up or reengage in shelter activities; explore ways for camp dwellers to be involved in the repair of shelters, the choice of NFIs, and the overall response; support local partners in preparing proposals by non-state actors for EU funding for capacity building and identify trainings needs that the Cluster can address with support from the global level.</p> <p>ECHO YGN commented that they wanted this visit to be neutral, so they did not follow the visit plus they were tied-up with the visit of their Director General to Myanmar. Still, they noted the challenge of ensuring the role of the Cluster Lead versus UNHCR's own programmes are clearly distinguished. However, ECHO recognised that these challenges were inherent to the system as UN agencies were (in the huge majority) Clusters Leads. ECHO underlined that the cluster is a "system" and it should not be based on individuals but rather on sustainable and strong systems. It is dangerous to have a system relying to strongly on individuals. Responding, the Cluster Coordinator Kachin (CCK) voiced that in Myanmar, and even more so in Kachin, systems need time to be put in place by individuals. Answering to ECHO's point on systems, CC stressed that systems were very vital but the right individuals are needed to put them in place and thus investment in continuity is also key.</p> <p>More widely, ACTED enquired whether this Cluster was considering a co-lead as a solution to tackle the issue of a distinction between the role of Cluster Lead and UNHCR? CC answered that DRC in February 2013 approached to be co-lead but while in theory the suggestion was welcome, there was a concern over sufficient capacity to support the considerable resources needed to share in the responsibility. Looking towards the start of 2014, currently no agency seems to have the resources to offer something towards an</p>	
--	--	--

	equitable sharing of responsibility. Being direct, co-leading needs to be strong and active, “not simply taking the minutes”. CCK emphasised that very pragmatically for his AOR, at this stage, no Cluster partner had the capacity to take on a co-lead role. CC underlined that staffing for international coordination will have continuity in 2014, apart from CCCM in Rakhine, where both internationals had completed their contracts. Two replacements had been identified, one due to start the first two weeks in January. ACTED reinforced the point that the co-lead option had been mentioned when the clusters were activated so, as a reminder, the Cluster should not to forget this possibility. The CC fully agreed.	
Feedback on ECHO’s Director General’s Visit	ECHO offered a short brief on their recent Director General’s (DG) visit in late November. He was not able to meet officials in Sittwe or Maungdaw, but visited camps that were on the plan, as well as communities in Maungdaw. It was his first visit, but for ECHO YGN who goes regularly to Rakhine it is noticeable that the situation is “not really evolving”. The visit helped the DG carrying out some strong advocacy, including a press release and some meetings with Ministers. It has also allowed the DG to debrief in Brussels, notably the Human rights Commission and some European MPs. ECHO would like to bring the DG to Kachin as this situation is not enough on the rader but it might be difficult to have him coming to Myanmar two years in a row.	
Humanitarian Strategy 2014	OCHA organised three meetings aiming at defining the 2014 Myanmar humannitarian strategy, one general and one for each area (Kachin and Rakhine). This Cluster has had its four key strategy documents out and circulating for the last few months. ² These will serve as the base, with necessary changes and input from Cluster members, following their input at the field level. For Kachin the Cluster will translate the two documents into Myanmar to facilitate participation/buy-in of local NGOs (LNGOs). CC underlined the importance of the participation of LNGOs in this strategy process but also the ongoing difficulties faced in engaging them. It was positive at least to have one LNGO present at this meeting plus the encouraging words voiced by one LNGO during the recent JMM to Kachin in regards to the utility of the strategy. Strategically, questions remained on how the Cluster positions itself in certain areas, notably shelter in	

² All four key strategic documents can be located under **Key Documents** at:
<https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/default.aspx>

- *Shelter Cluster Strategic Operational Framework Kachin and Northern Shan States v1.4 27th September 2013*
- *CCCM and NFI Cluster Strategic Operational Framework Kachin and Northern Shan States v 1.1 12th September 2013*
- *CCCM and NFI Cluster Strategic Operational Framework Rakhine State v 1.1 2nd September 2013*
- *Shelter Cluster Strategic Framework Rakhine State v 1.1 1st September 2013*

	Kachin, i.e. focus on shelter based on returns to place of origin versus outstanding temporary needs.	
Overview & Update on Kachin & Northern Shan from Cluster Coordinator, including a. Mansi	<p>CCK offered a few updates on Cluster activity in Kachin and Northern Shan, and more generally on the humanitarian situation:</p> <p>Mansi remains difficult to assess clearly the situation due to fluidity of movements. Many IDPs still have not settled. In Man Wing Gyi for example, some IDPs arrived, left a few days later for Bum Tsit Pa and then some returned. Therefore, analysing exactly needs is challenging and greater stabilisation should allow for better analysis. The previous week the WaSH and <i>this</i> Cluster compared their figures of new displacement and agreed that 3,500 to 4,000 IDPs had been displaced up-to Dec 11th. However, just before this meeting CCK received from UNHCR Bhamo Office a new table that estimated approx. 5,000 IDPs. This testifies of two things: displacement is still on-going and establishing a clear picture of the number of IDPs very difficult. ACTED confirmed this remark from their field presence.</p> <p>NFI, mainly winterisation items, have been provided to IDPs by various agencies. The Cluster is in the process of analysing assistance provided to-date and possible remaining gaps. Some IDPs have already displaced up-to four times during the last six weeks, and might not always have been able to move with winter items, so taking the raw number of IDPs and the number of items distributed is not sufficient to assess exact needs.</p> <p>In terms of shelter, UNHCR provided 600 family tents in Man Win Gyi/Lagayant area. To-date the situation is too fluid for the Cluster to exactly plan further shelter assistance. However, by now most IDPs who have displaced would have lost their harvest, or most of it, and are therefore likely to remain displaced for the coming 12 to 18 months, making the construction of temporary shelters necessary.</p> <p>The issue of access to these new areas of displacement was raised. So far official access has not been secured by OCHA and although Nam Lin Pa area was part of the TA for cross-line missions in Oct-Nov, it was later on denied locally. ECHO underlined that this can be understandable as there were movement of troops and potential fighting. OCHA said that so far nothing has been heard regarding next round of cross-line missions, including Mansi, which was submitted at the end of November. CCK said that when access to NGCA remained extremely important it should not be forgotten that international staff, and in some cases even national staff, still does not have regular and unhampered access to various GCA areas. For</p>	

	<p>internationals generally TA's include only MTY, BMO and parts of Waingmaw and Momauk.</p> <p>MDCG mentioned they will re-direct around 30 units of shelters from their projects in Northern Shan State towards Man Win Gyi for new arrivals, and that they are keen on pursuing their shelter projects in 2014, if funds allow.</p> <p>CCK concluded by voicing the need to put Kachin much more on the map of advocacy. Indeed, the Mansi situation proved at many levels that humanitarian actors had no strong channels to raise concerns. Also in both GCA and NGCA there is a need to understand better the reasons behind displacement. There was a view that humanitarian actors need more contact with both sides to know the forces at play and increase visibility.</p>	
<p>a. Shelter</p> <p>b. NFI</p> <p>c. CCCM</p> <p>d. Camp Profiling</p> <p>e. Coordination with local NGOs (LNGOs)</p>	<p>For shelter across Kachin and Northern Shan the Cluster has assessed that approximately 2,000 to 2,500 families are still living without any sort of proper shelters (in collective spaces such as warehouses or very basic unsuitable emergency makeshift shelters). This includes the 1,000 families from the recent displacement and another 1,000 to 1,500. Another 2,000 to 2,500 family-units will be needed for camps where people are still living at several families in one family shelters and/or where families still live in the shelters they received at the onset of the crisis and that are too far sub-standards to be retro-fitted or adapted. Therefore, <u>a total of 4,000 to 5,000 family unit of shelter will be needed in 2014 as a minimum to serve 20,000 to 25,000 persons.</u> <u>Currently there are no funds available for these needs.</u> This is not taking into account possible new large displacement due to renewed fighting and/or advance of the governmental army.</p> <p>Another approximate 2,000 units will need renovations and retro-fitting to meet minimal standards. 2,800 are currently in the process of being upgraded. Needed renovation might be minor (roof fixing for example) or so major that it might be preferable to take down some shelters and re-build.</p> <p>So far these estimations are mainly based on <i>this</i> Clusters' direct assessment to over 80 camps since July 2013 in both GCAs and NGCAs. The Cluster is actively engaging local partners in Kachin to refine these estimations and establish priorities. However, this remains challenging since despite three meetings organised in MTY and BMO on this subject the Cluster still has yet to receive clear and precise feedback from Cluster partners engaged in shelter.</p>	

	<p>ECHO inquired about the vision of the cluster on possible returns to place of origin and what would the Cluster consider as a sign that this process should be seriously considered. CCK mentioned that 5 major hurdles currently exists: a) IDP have clearly voiced that the situation is not satisfactory for them to go back; b) peace talks aside some level of fighting is still on-going; c) some areas have landmines d) houses that are now dilapidated and/or overgrown with vegetation e) IDPS have lost their lands, otherwise termed 'land grabbing'. Indeed, IDPS have <i>not</i> been able to register their lands that have then been taken over by companies. Several pre-existing villages are now mining sites, and this is likely to get worst as time passes. CC specified that during his recent visit to Kachin as part of the JMM, when he mentioned with IDPs the potentiality of return this land grabbing issue was each time mentioned as one of the <i>main</i> obstacles to return.</p> <p>CCK concluded saying that so far none of these five issues give sign of getting solved satisfactorily in 2014. Therefore for the Cluster at this stage, return in significant numbers is not likely; ECHO agreed. However, some level of relocation might be happening (such as in Northern Shan State where IDPs voiced the willingness to remain on their place of displacement and have received land to do so, and MDCG is building individual housing) and the shelter strategy allows for such initiatives.³ Such small scale relocation is possible and on an ad-hoc basis the Cluster will work on such initiatives. USAID inquired if the Cluster had developed shelter standards for return? CCK answered that so far the possibilities for return in acceptable conditions are so limited and the situations so different (some villages have been all but entirely destroyed where in some others no damage as occurred and even in some cases part of the population remained for "maintenance") that currently this is not being considered, rather the Cluster will rather assess opportunities on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>For NFI the cluster is currently focusing on compilation of data regarding winterisation items and defining needs in this area for 2014. The general approach for NFI will be to try and find ways to provide a much more targeted NFI assistance as opposed to regular blanket distributions of similar items, which loses utility over-time as most IDPs have now received the basic items at least once.</p> <p>For CCCM the main objectives of the Cluster are to improve standardisation of CCCM procedures and strengthening of systems and rationalisation of the use of CCCM. Camp sizes are very different and so CCCM needs to adapt. In some cases, mainly urban areas, where several very small camps are within small</p>	
--	---	--

³ See *Shelter Cluster Strategic Operational Framework Kachin and Northern Shan States v1.4 27th September 2013*

	<p>geographical areas, re-grouping of CCCM resources will be considered.</p> <p>In terms of the camp profiling conducted in 2013, the CC was keen to know if Cluster members felt the camp profiling was useful? Should we update it? Should we conduct it again? Responding, ACTED deemed it useful but its limitations is that it is resource and time heavy in comparison to the now volatile situation. Plan International deemed it useful and asked what about undertaking the same exercise in Rakhine? MDCG said they found 75 per cent of it very useful but data does change often for it to remain fully relevant. ECHO equally underscored its relevance stating that having initiated the process “you are the custodian” but again this is not just UNHCR, rather an exercise conducted as a Cluster. ACTED noted the scope for REACH and its possible value added. Responding the CC noted that he had discussed REACH’s capacity with colleagues during the JMM and they had stressed its significant potentiality in terms of shelter assessments/data gathering.</p> <p>On the matter coordination with LNGOs the Cluster remains very committed to these efforts. However, it was concerning that during some recent ad-hoc meetings with certain LNGOs, some said “they might or they might not coordinate”. Concerning since efforts to coordinate do require some predictability from partners. While fully accepted the Cluster was not active for the first year and a half, the Cluster is working hard to digest their concerns or frustrations. Noting this latest and stated lack of predictability the Cluster intends to meet all LNGOs that have a YGN presence to clarify if this expressed position is shared by all LNGOs.</p>	CC (in-conjunction with CCK) to organise meeting in January with LNGOs in Yangon
<p>Update on Rakhine, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Nget Chaung b. Thandwe c. NFIs d. CCCM Capacity & 	<p>The Nget Chaung fire resulted in the destruction of temporary shelters and one death.⁴ In terms of next steps there is some discussion more generally that if IDPs are not far from their place of origin could they go back to their place of origin. Also one site in Pauktaw during a recent Ambassadorial trip to Rakhine led to the State giving assurance that it could happen. Commenting, USAID said they would support place of origin return but in modest numbers since caution was required. ECHO stressed that we needed to “seize this opportunity” but there must be security guarantees from the State. There were reports that in Thandwe IDPs have gone back to place of origin and given flexibility for reconstruction, either the State reconstructing the permanent house or IDPs opting to take the equivalent funds and self-construct. ACTED also mentioned Meiktila, where possible return to place of origin is being discussed. Not the same plot of</p>	

⁴ See site plan of *Nget Chaung IDP Camp Pauk Taw - Burnt Shelters, December 2013*

Gaps	<p>land, but same neighbourhood. This week the CC aims to visit Thandwe to understand precisely what has happened and will report back. On the wider issue of clearer Government plans, USAID confirmed that the Government had shared with them quite a substantial document but it was only shared during a meeting and then taken back.</p> <p>In terms of NFIs, there had been delays in getting NFIs out but the next round of blanket distribution planned for completion in/by February 2014.</p> <p>In terms of CCCM capacity and gaps there remains a <u>critical search</u> for the two remaining camps in Pauktaw. Referring to the <i>CCCM Camp Management Agencies, Rakhine State, 19th November 2013</i> document, Ah Nauk Ywe and Nget Chaung still lack an international camp management agency despite numerous efforts to find a willing actor through bilateral meetings at the YGN level with Save the Children, Solidarites, NRC and IOM. Also, the situation in Myebon does not seem to get any better and the aforementioned Ambassador's visit was equally disturbed by what they saw. A letter has come from the IDPs to the Government asking to be relocated because they cannot longer bare their conditions. Reflecting this ongoing dire situation, hard copies of the latest Protection Sector advocacy note were shared. Relief International (RI) is still committed to support Myebon as best they can, agreeing to serve as Camp Management <u>focal</u> point, which is distinct from and demands less of than is required of a Camp Management agency. USAID stated that <i>if</i> RI has to give up its presence in Myebon it should not be viewed as RI "giving-up" but rather the wider humanitarian community being unable to tackle this chronic situation. The CC agreed fully.</p>	CC to report back to Cluster at next National Cluster meeting on Thandwe mission
AoB	Nothing to report	

Documents shared in hard copy with the participants at the meeting or in soft copy to all Cluster partners:

CCCM Camp Management Agencies, Rakhine State, 19th November 2013

Myebon Muslim IDPs' relocation request, Protection Sector Advocacy Note, 17 December 2013

Site plan of Nget Chaung IDP Camp Pauk Taw - Burnt Shelters, December 2013