

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 14 January 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: Arche Nova, CESVI, ECHO, ICRC, NRC, UNOPs, LWF, MRCS, IFRC, World Vision, DRC, ICRC, Philippines Embassy, UNHCR Programme/Donor Relations & Public Information

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	<p>The new CCCM/NFI Cluster Coordinator for Rakhine's arrival date was delayed by one week due to obtaining the visa. Richard Warren (RW) (warren@unhcr.org) was now scheduled to arrive in Myanmar 20 January. Two days of briefings in YGN would be followed by RW and the National Coordinator (CC) heading to Rakhine as part of his introduction. The CC would chair that week's CCCM/NFI meeting in Rakhine.¹ This meeting, 23 January, would mark the end of the CC serving as Acting CCCM/NFI Coordinator and RW would assume <i>full</i> responsibilities for the role, covering CCCM/NFI matters for Rakhine State.</p> <p>This meeting was joined by Shelter/NFI/CCCM Coordinator for Kachin, Kevin Socquet (KS). Much of today's discussion would be Kachin/Shan centric. This also followed since KS and the CC were on a joint-mission to Northern Shan in December and could share their findings.</p> <p>Minutes of previous meeting accepted and online: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting_Minutes.aspx.</p>	
2. Actions from Previous Meeting	<p><u>Kachin/Shan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC still had <i>not</i> given technical feedback on steel versus temporary wooden structures. • Joint Kachin/Shan shelter/NFI/CCCM and WaSH Cluster meetings, quarterly, going well, minutes online.² CC would aim to attend next one, scheduled for February in Bhamo. • Second round of camp profiling shared in soft/hard copy but still not uploaded, yet. • CESVI shelter program, CC answered, even though delayed. CESVI will reply soon with updated plans in case any changes. 	<p>Done (see below) Done</p> <p>CC ASAP Done</p>

¹ Minutes of this meeting can be located at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx>.

² Minutes of these joint shelter/NFI/CCCM and WaSH meetings, 23-24 October 2014 and 23-24 July 2014 can be located at:
<https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-meeting-minutes.aspx>.

Myanmar Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster www.shelternficccmmyanmar.org 2

	<p>be development (not humanitarian) focused. CC shared latest version of <i>CCCM Camp Management Agencies – Focal Points 23 Priority Camps Rakhine State 12th January 2015</i>.³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CC noted that Camp Management Agency reports for DRC and LWF were online, and could be located at: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Camp-Management-Agency-Monthly-Reports.aspx. However, was mentioned that the last report DRC had produced was August 2014, versus LWF who had produced one every month since July 2014. CC was also <i>still</i> pushing with Save/IOM to produce something comparable. <p><u>Disaster Response</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CC to upload Emergency Response Plan to website.⁴ Clarity on division of responsibility IOM/UNHCR/IFRC in event of natural disaster. CC written to IFRC and IOM. Feedback received from IFRC, once received from IOM, can be more formalised. <p><u>Myanmar 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both this and the <i>2015 Humanitarian Needs Overview</i> were now uploaded and available online at: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Humanitarian-Country-Team-Strategies-and-Response-Plans.aspx. CC stressed the positives, far his perspective, far better product that 2014, more concise and timely. <i>Impressive</i> that it was ready for the first day of 2015. 	<p>DRC to produce monthly report Save/IOM to produce monthly report</p> <p>Done IOM to feedback ASAP</p>
<p>3. Kachin/Shan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview 	<p>KS overview focused on five key elements that can impact areas for intervention in 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some emergencies and displacement, at varied scales, likely to happen again in 2015;⁵ Protracted situation, with status quo, to continue elsewhere; Some durable solutions (facilitated by the government or found on case-by-case basis by IDPs/communities themselves) likely to increase. Example of IDPs approaching authorities voicing they are willing to stay where they displaced if appropriate land can be provided, or even trying to put money together to purchase land themselves. Means that an overall general strategy, when needed, will also need to be able to increasingly adapt to a “case-by-case approach”. After four years situations are very different from place to place. This is challenging for an emergency response structure, such as a cluster, to work on “tailor made approaches”. The Cluster will need to evaluate where its area of responsibilities stop and where other kind for actors/structures, development oriented agencies for example, are more relevant. This was certainly in evidence at some of the sites visited in Northern Shan by KS and the CC. Tension is likely to increase during an election year as both sides are not likely to want to lose ground, ahead of this milestone. The extent of these tensions is difficult to predict but the need for emergency 	

³ Document can be located at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-documents.aspx>.

⁴ See **Emergency Response** section of website: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Emergency-Response.aspx>.

⁵ Subsequent analysis indicates that with Hpar Khan, Putao and others we would already be at close to 5,000 new IDPs in the first six weeks of 2015. That is, almost as much as the whole of 2014. While only a five per cent additional caseload, with four to five months of dry season remaining, the peak of cultivating season approaching, the signs are not positive.

	<p>responses should always be factored into planning. Large scale displacement is still unlikely but some argue people will move based on a desire to be in urban areas with greater access to employment/services. It is also very possible that increasing numbers of people moved towards camps and/or towns after four years of struggling. Farmers who have tried to remain on their lands/in their villages have grown increasingly vulnerable. They might decide that they cannot stay one more season even though fighting might not be directly threatening their location.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zin Chai (Waingmaw T/ship) 	<p>Fire destroyed (see photos below) 85 shelters and some communal buildings, no loss of life, “thankfully”. NFIs met by MRCS and UNHCR (with partners). Tents have been sent by UNHCR and are now in place, emergency phase needs met. Good quality UNHCR tents – additional winter items provided. We are looking at the ERF and KBC and UNHCR can/could stand ready to meet needs of most vulnerable. KBC has the human resource capacity. Will be covered in the “foreseeable future” and confident it will be before the rains. Aim is for ERF to cover these needs. LWF worked well with the fire-brigades, and share lessons learned from Rakhine. Fire brigades have been approached in BMO. Cluster in Kachin is trying to “use” good examples from Rakhine. However, much more difficult to replicate for remote camps.</p>	<p>KS to contact LWF to learn from Rakhine fire mitigation and response experience.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on winterisation items 	<p>Large distributions planned in October. Was able to use local partners for Border 8 and 6 areas (7 camps in total) north of Laiza, highest priority. However, Mansi, and Laiza – in short 2/3rds to 3/4s still in UNHCR warehouses; 60 to 70% of the material, despite UNHCR having approached several local partners. Progress with cross-line missions still no progress, which included UNHCR bilateral effort. ECHO asked if OCHA was compiling a list of humanitarian consequences. KS explained at field level, since the difficulties with the cross-lines have appeared, Cluster has regularly (more or less weekly) reported to OCHA about consequences. Less clear how reporting has been used further down the line. It was also noted that LNGOs were on leave during the festive period. ECHO wanted something from OCHA.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remaining shelter gap 	<p>Between Cluster appeal in March 2014 and March 2015, 3,500 units of standard temporary shelter built.⁶ 4,000 to 5,000 was the target. The most urgent needs are being addressed. Gap remains due to starting late, lost the first quarter of 2014, namely late to concretise the data. Also:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emergencies and security issues.⁷ 2. Inflation meant a new gap. Inflation and some improvement of the temporary shelters, general cost has raised by about 25 per cent, up to almost 50% in some areas. 3. Some areas demand more logistics. 4. Also, lack of wood available. Creative solutions, steel structures as an example. 75% was met, we need 	

⁶ For details of this meeting, which includes photos of shelters, see *Shelter-NFI-CCCM YGN Cluster Meeting Minutes*, 6.3.'14 at: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting_Minutes.aspx.

⁷ For example in April, all outside workers ran away when tensions flared in South Mansi/Northern Shan.

	<p>another 2,000 units will still be needed. 1,000 unmet plus new needs due to small displacement and old buildings cannot be renovated. Due to length of displacement, every year a certain % will need to be replaced, approx. 1,000/year. Some shortages were due to a crack-down on illegal logging. At local level tried solutions to leverage with the GoM but with no success. ECHO asked had this been raised with the HCT. Not that the CC was aware.⁸</p> <p>Going forward, key land issues are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Closing the shelter gap cannot be addressed if land issues are not. Land in many cases is exhausted and unless solutions are found, progress will be increasingly minimal. Has been raised in/on many levels/forums. 2. Many of the camps are on private land and owners are getting fatigued after four years. This presents real dilemmas since of we want to rebuild the camp yet to meet standards, we need more space. We have had more than six instances in the last six months, a notable increase on the previous year. 3. The wish to have reclaim land is genuine, for their faith/congregations, or in some case for farming. 4. In terms of land provided by GoM, other than relocation sites, cannot think of any GoM sites. 	
--	---	--

⁸ **Shelter Cluster's Position on Steel vs. Wooden Structures**

Justification for steel: Based on feedback from the field, the main reason to shift from wooden framed to steel framed shelter design is because of the shortage and extremely high prices of timber in the planned IDP camp locations, particularly Mansi and Momauk Townships.

Advantages of the timber shelter design:

- Consistent with strategic the objective of the shelter response being “temporary”;
- Wood more adaptable and conducive to summer and winter seasons as compared to metal;
- Timber easy to work rather than metal, requires only simple tools;
- More people can be involved in the construction, which gives livelihood support to the IDP community;
- Empowerment (active and strong participation) of the community and sense of ownership to support the construction of their own dwellings;
- IDPs gain some skills and knowledge in carpentry and other related construction work;
- Cheaper by approximately \$400 per unit compared to steel framed shelter design.

Steel framed shelters are obviously more durable than timber-framed shelters. Plus, with the combination of plywood material for the walls and floors and without the use of masonry can mean it is not deemed to be a permanent structure. Difference from between Cluster Lead design and Metta design is that Metta uses Aluzinc iron sheets (blue) for the walls. If the shelter has no ceiling and walls/no interior insulation, could be very cold in winter and hot in summer. To-date, no current regulations/objections from the local authorities in building the steel framed shelters in the IDP camps plus calling it temporary or permanent appears not an issue with them. Considering all the above, **there seems to be no other solution in some areas but to shift temporarily from timber framed shelter to steel framed shelter design.**

In future, and with considerable effort, steel frame design can be developed to be more effective by:

- Substituting rigid hollow steel (RHS) with ‘C section’ light gauge steel (LGS);
- Substituting proposed construction method (framing members are individually measured, cut and welded on site) with prefabrication of LGS framing members for precise and rapid build. Framing members are quickly assembled on site and fixed with metal cutting screw. No welding is required.

National partners insist that the availability of the quantity and quality of timber is one of the main issues facing shelter construction in NGCA, specifically for Mansi and Momauk Townships. (Possible) reasons being: a. it is legally impossible to transport milled timber from GCA to NGCA; b. machinery for milling is very basic; local bush mills, chainsaws; c. land mines within the forests restrict access to lumber and; d. military activities into forested areas restricts access to lumber.

	5. ECHO suggested buying lands.	
Shelter Quality	<p>During the previous month's mission to Northern Shan by CC and KS, two camps of particular in terms of shelter quality: Man Win Gyi RC 2 and KBC Cultural Compound in Mansi T-ship.</p> <p><u>KBC Cultural Compound</u> was entirely done by World Vision. Immediately after <i>this</i> Cluster meeting the Cluster Lead met World Vision (WV). Agreed two weeks from now, clarity from WV as to what they wanted to do or could do required by Cluster Lead. One option was for World Vision to fund KBC to improve the quality of the shelters. Noting past meetings between Cluster Lead and WV, it was understood why WV had built the shelters to the standard they had but that was the past and quality issues need to be addressed, as a matter of urgency.</p> <div data-bbox="546 499 1090 909" data-label="Image"> </div> <div data-bbox="1182 499 1727 909" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>KBC Cultural Compound – poor quality temporary shelters</p> <p><u>RC 2</u> is more complicated. The land itself is insufficient anyway and shelters were built by a consortium of organisations and serious concerns as to what capacity is there to make the necessary improvements. The site remains highly problematic and something the Cluster has raised at field and national level, see National Cluster Minutes 2 July 2014. One option is to see if MDCG could support. Bottom line, <u>if we do not find a good solution before next rainy season we will really have people living in clearly undignified situations a year after their displacement, which is not acceptable.</u></p>	<p>By 28 January World Vision to clarify position to Cluster Lead</p> <p>Cluster Lead at field and national level to continue advocate for improved shelter/site for RC2 Camp</p>

Kitchen Quality		<p>Communal Kitchen Spaces</p> <p>Another recent technical concern to emerge was at least at two sites in NGCA partners building communal kitchens (for unknown reasons) altering the height of the roof. This, despite what was agreed with the Cluster Lead. While there may be ventilation advantages, during rainy season and with high winds they could be unusable. This could affect 200 units. This new concern over respecting quality and design exemplifies what the Cluster has stressed can be one of the most serious consequences of the stoppage of cross-lines: quality and accountability, less so quantity. These have been built without the Cluster Lead being able to monitor in-person. Potentially weeks (or months) of work will need to go in fixing, and likely some money, in large part because the Cluster Lead could <i>not</i> monitor. While not the largest issue, plus engineers have done impressive work where they can in terms of monitoring remotely, it exemplified another consequence of less than five-months of no cross-line missions.</p>	
2015 Strategy	<p>There was no major discussion on this agenda point but for a synthesised version of the priorities in shelter, NFI and CCCM for Kachin/Shan see pages 14-15 for CCCM and 28-29 for shelter/NFI of <i>Myanmar 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan</i>. Noted that individual sector plans also needed to be updated. Overall, in short, the strategy of the Cluster in all three sectors is to find <i>at least</i> sustainable solutions <i>if</i> durable solutions cannot be achieved. It will be done by strengthening camp committees, and for example, in the case of shelter putting in place repair and maintenance projects through CCCM structures.</p>		<p>Cluster lead to update individual Cluster strategies</p>
Update on shelter/NFI/CCCM response to humanitarian situations in Kachin/Shan	<p>From mid-January to mid-February, Kachin and Northern Shan State have seen a significant increase in the level of conflict. When this was anticipated due to the context, the scale has gone beyond what was foreseen, with large scale fighting having occurred in at least three locations: Hpar Khant in Kachin State, Mogoke in North of Mandalay Division/Northern Shan State and the so-called Kokang area East of Muse in Northern Shan State. On each occasion, credible reports of civilians being located between the conflicting parties, and numerous small-scale skirmishes. Within five weeks this has led to the verified displacement of over 5,000 people. Some estimates suggest over 10,000, but it is difficult to verify, a large part having reportedly crossed directly to China from North Muse and for which cross-checking figures is impossible.</p> <p>However, the large majority of these displacements was temporary (mostly migrant workers from other areas of Myanmar who went home) or resulted in people crossing to China, meaning that so far the caseload of IDPs for <i>this</i> Cluster is not considered as having significantly increased. This Cluster has been following very closely the situation and providing emergency assistance in the form of core NFI kits and/or UNHCR tents as necessary and relevant. At this stage, and facing such a high level of tensions and instability, compounded by access difficulties due to either security or authorisations, it is not yet possible to plan a longer term intervention. Further, the</p>		

	<p>Cluster does not want to encourage longer than necessary settlement of people in camps by intervening rashly if a quick return to place of origin is feasible. For example, in Mogoke over 90 per cent of the up to 2,000 people who originally displaced were back to point of origin within one week.</p> <p>However, it is all but certain that in the coming weeks when the precise details are clearer, a temporary shelter intervention will be needed. The scale of it is very difficult to estimate but according to best information available, the Cluster would (at this stage) estimate between 1,000 and 2,000 newly displaced people in need of longer term support. As fighting is on-going, and signs are not pointing to an easing, increase of this estimation is likely until rainy season.</p>	
Update on fire of 7/8th February and shelter/NFI/CCCM response	<p>A fire broke out in Pa Dauk Myaing Camp, close to MTY town, Saturday 7 February, early morning. Apparently it started from a kitchen. It resulted in the complete destruction of all 30 units of kitchens and shelters in the camp. On the same day a UNHCR and OCHA team visited the site for a first assessment, noticing that on top of KMSS-MTY (CCCM agency in charge), emergency support was provided by the government and the MRCS. 9 February a second assessment included the UNHCR/Cluster Shelter Engineer, who worked with KMSS-MTY on a site plan in view of re-construction plus an NFI assessment to identify possible gaps after initial distributions. UNHCR protection colleagues as joined.</p> <p>Trocaire has confirmed that it is most likely to be in a position to finance the re-construction, quickly. However, as it seems like IDPs might be willing to resettle in this area; this Cluster has brought into the discussion the Protection Sector to assess with Trocaire and KMSS-MTY if a more durable solution could be found. This, either with authorities providing land or the Church donating the land on which the camp is currently settled. With an increasing number of cases there might be a situation where longer term shelter solutions could be envisaged but not on a privately owned land. As a longer term solution, the Cluster is planning to increase its fire prevention activities, building on some initiatives that have proved efficient in Rakhine. Discussions with all Cluster members have started.</p>	
CCCM/NFI	Other than what was already discussed in the above, NTR.	
4. MRCS 'Emergency Preparedness & Response in Myanmar'	MRCS gave an extensive presentation to the Cluster on <i>Emergency Preparedness & Response</i> . This 27-slide presentation covered, amongst other things: mission statement, operational presence and office structures, main disaster management activities, emergency response capacity and stocks, early warning, emergency response structure and coordination, emergency relief, shelter and finally recovery and linkages with Government Agencies.	Cluster partners to contact CC if they wish copy of presentation, too heavy to send via email
5. Shelter/NFI/CCCM pressing issues in Rakhine - 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On shelter the focus remained on this on-going consultation phase around care, maintenance and improvements to temporary shelter, and particularly what role the Rakhine State Government would play. NRC expressed their interest in shelter solutions. While such expressions were welcome, the CC gave the experience of the Cluster Lead in terms of starting any shelter solution construction an example of the time that things could take to materialise. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On NFIs, noting there had largely been a suspension of core item distributions since last June, what were the humanitarian consequences? At the Rakhine State Cluster level this was something being investigated. On the matter of fuel sticks ICRC were still seeking to assist in Myebon Township camp(s). Health issues in the camps for the camp management agencies (CMAs) remains a major concern and at the national level the CC is engaging with his Health Cluster equivalent. The aim/ambition is to connect the latter, in person with the CMAs in Rakhine. Elemental issues include to whom in Sittwe do they report and even if they do, what if anything can or might be done to respond to the need or issue. CCCM, as above, CC would be chairing next CCCM/NFI meeting in Rakhine, next week. Details of previous meeting, 9 January and the next one, scheduled for 23 January, available at: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx. 	<p>ASAP CC to arrange/support meeting between Head of Health Cluster and CMAs</p>
6. AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CC noted recent meeting with DFID, who raised the issue of “malfunctioning” camp management committees (CMCs). This includes concerns over inaccurate data, influence when choosing contractors and food for favours. CC had stressed that Cluster continues to be fully cognoscente of problems around CMCs. Attempts and elections and trainings appeared to have had little impact. Certainly an area where committed support of NRC to the Cluster could have potentially significant benefit, not simply a question of training but much <i>more</i> extensive capacity-building. 	

The next meeting would likely be scheduled for February. Nearer the time the CC would send an email confirmation and as usual, an agenda.

Tent Installation Zin Chai (Waingmaw T/ship) Following Destruction of Temporary Shelters by Fire



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, 12.12.'14;*
- *UN General Assembly Resolution on MYN, 29.12.'14.*

2015 Humanitarian Response Plan

- *Camp Coordination and Camp Management section;*
- *Shelter & Non-Food Items (NFIs) section;*
- *DRAFT HCT Meeting Note, 30th Jan '14.*

Kachin & Northern Shan

- *Kachin & Northern Shan Shelter Coverage & Gaps, 1.1.'15;*
- *Kachin & Northern Shan NFI Coverage & Gaps, 1.1.'15;*
- *Kachin & Northern Shan CCCM Dashboard, 1.1.'15;*
- *Map of Lone Khin Village tract, Hpakan township, Kachin state (19 January 2015);*
- *Map of Conflict Locations in North Shan as of 6-Feb-2015*
- *SCI Kutkai Rapid Assessment, 7-8th Feb 2015;*
- *HelpAge report on situation of older people in Kachin State, November 2014;*
- *OCHA ICC Kachin-Shan State Meeting, 29 January '15;*
- *OCHA Myitkyina General Coordination Meeting, 30th January 2015.*
- *Faith-based humanitarianism in northern Myanmar, Forced Migration Review, Issue 48, November 2014 (<http://www.fmreview.org/faith/benson-jaquet>).*

Rakhine

- *CONCEPT NOTE (English and Myanmar) Shelter Repair, Maintenance & Improvements Partnership;*
- *Budget projection Maintenance & Repair Programme (2015);*
- *CCCM Camp Management Agencies – Focal Points 23 Priority Camps Rakhine State 12th January 2015;*
- *CAMP Report (SCI & IOM) –Sin Tet Maw December '14;*
- *CAMP Report (SCI & IOM) –Set Yoe Kya 1 December '14;*
- *CAMP Report (SCI & IOM) –Thet Kal Pyin December '14;*
- *Graphic showing relative size of the Muslim IDP camps in rural Sittwe, January 2015;*
- *DRAFT INGO Summary Perspective on Rakhine - Dec 2014;*
- *OCHA ICC Rakhine State Meeting, 7 January '15;*
- *OCHA ICC Rakhine State Meeting, 22 January '15 (DRAFT);*
- *OCHA Area Humanitarian Country Team Meeting, Sittwe, 20 January '15.*

Disaster Response/Contingency Planning/Emergency Preparedness

- *MRCS Emergency Preparedness & Response (presentation to Cluster).*