



Camp Coordination & Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster Meeting

“Consultation”

14:00 – 16:00, Friday, March 8, 2013

OCHA Sittwe

Attendees: MSF, OCHA, Save the Children International, WFP, UNFPA, FXB, ACF, UNICEF & UNHCR

Unable to attend: International Rescue Committee (IRC)¹

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<p>Introductions, including Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator (CC), based in YGN & UNHCR Information Manager based in Sittwe</p> <p>Muted attendance was noted albeit CC acknowledged that this was the first CCCM Cluster meeting in Sittwe, the meeting date and time had to be changed due to demonstrations in Sittwe Town and perhaps some humanitarian actors were not aware of the role of CCCM.</p>	<p>Edward Benson (EB), Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator benson@unhcr.org</p> <p>Alicia Ortega (AO), UNHCR Information Management (IM) Officer ortega@unhcr.org</p> <p>Acknowledged by the CC that in the area of CCCM UNHCR had taken longer to mobilize than it would have liked. With camps being constructed (some to house approximately 10,000 persons) the need for CCCM is <u>imperative</u>. A recent donor mission from ECHO had noted its real concern in terms of potential for “ghettoization”.</p> <p>CC underscored appreciation for being able to host this meeting at OCHA and for their support in terms of IM as the CCCM Cluster assumes its responsibilities and increases its capacity.</p>	<p>CC noted this was his second trip to Rakhine upon taking up this role at the end of January 2013. This time he was here for a week, which allowed for (amongst other things) to have this consultation.</p> <p>Alicia Ortega in her 2nd week in Rakhine.</p> <p>Designated CCCM Cluster Coordinator to be assigned to Rakhine, Andrea Paiato. ‘Hopefully’ to be on post within the next 14 days.</p>
Information Management	Camp list for CCCM shared, totaling some 89 camps, which	Confirmed that AO is as of this meeting the focal point for

¹ IRC explained prior to the meeting they were unable to attend but we keen to be a member of this Cluster and details were shared in the attendees list.



	<p>includes Maungdaw. Support from Unicef, WFP and OCHA was stated in terms of rectifying some of the confusion of the list, primarily with camp names.</p> <p>Presentation given to show how location of camps can be easily obtained (across 10 Townships) with the use of <i>Google Earth</i>. AO explained that she can easily install on other agencies' computers, plus give basic briefing on how to use the software, which is "not difficult".</p> <p>Also noted that <i>polygons</i> have been used to help define certain camp areas since difficult in some cases to pin point the camp to a precise location.² Noted by AO that camp Ohn Taw Gyi (P Code MMRO12CMP043) has been classified for the purpose of the camp list as one camp although appreciated for the purpose of shelters being built it is referred to as Ohn Taw Gyi 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>Responding to a question, the word camp has a broad meaning. It can mean camp or <i>camp like setting</i>. Types of camps include:</p> <p>Planned Camp or Settlement;</p> <p>Self-settled Camp;</p> <p>Collective Centre;</p> <p>Individual (non-hosted);</p> <p>Privately hosted;</p> <p>Reception/Transit Site.</p>	<p>maintenance of the CCCM Camp List. <u>Should other humanitarian actors have information that indicates that any of the information needs changing they should contact AO.</u> As required AO will circulate an updated list. Underscored that what other humanitarian actors choose to do with the Camp List is their prerogative but clearly stated that the official CCCM Camp List is now with AO/CCCM Cluster.</p> <p>To avoid confusion over different camp names being used, actors were encouraged to use the names as per the list, plus the <i>Camp P Code</i>. The <i>Camp P Code</i> should be the quickest way to avoid confusion since there is one individual 12 character code for each camp, a combination of letters and numbers.</p> <p>Underscored that data and information management is a fluid process and CCCM Cluster acknowledges that the Camp List is very unlikely to be perfect at this juncture but <i>in-time</i> the quality and accuracy of data should improve and refine.</p> <p>Other key pillars of data that CCCM Cluster will focus on in the coming weeks and months will be:</p> <p>Basic demographic data on the camps, in conjunction with the camp list;</p> <p>Shelter progress and gaps, in conjunction with the camp list;</p>
--	--	---

² The utility of polygons become evident when using *Google Earth*.



		<p>3W matrix for the camps;</p> <p>Camp Profiling;</p> <p>& NFI tracking.</p> <p>OCHA noted the work that it has already done on IM in the camps and thus stressed the need for AO and OCHA to work together as the CCCM Cluster takes on its responsibilities.</p>
CCCM Structures	<p>There was significant debate around what camp management structures currently exist or not in various IDP camps in Rakhine.</p> <p>UNFPA noted that there are examples of camp management committees, albeit how they have been formed is unclear and can differ from camp to camp;</p> <p>ACF noted that they had located women's groups or associations in the camps, seemingly made-up of elderly women who knew each other prior to displacement. However, they have found this in some but not all of the camps they have been working.</p> <p>The camp Baw Du Pha (MMR012CMP040) was noted for having different committees or groups within the same camp. Meanwhile for the camp(s) in Pauktaw committees were not deemed to exist.</p> <p>Also noted that some camps can be physically divided, which makes management harder plus the fact that in some camps the role of the 'village leaders'/'village administrators' can be significant.</p>	<p>It was questioned whether it would be possible to initiate a process whereby camp committees were democratically determined, if not done so already. However, the strong view was that CCCM should work with what is already formed. In short, it was "too late" for such an initiative.</p>



	<p>Save the Children stressed the need to distinguish between urban and rural camps and the need for “collective efficacy”. The question was also asked whether the responsibility for camp management should be on <i>us</i> (the humanitarian community).</p> <p>WASH Cluster lead for Unicef explained that in some camps there are <i>WASH Committees</i>. Similarly WFP explained that there are also <i>Food Management Committees</i>.</p>	<p>When CC proposed a coordination structure of having CCCM focal points in each camp, tapping into pre-existing regular presence by certain UN agencies & I/NGOs the response was uncertain. The need for regular humanitarian/CCCM focal points in each camp was agreed but the consensual view was that these individuals would need to be paid to fulfill such a task, which could hopefully support efforts to ensure regular presence, which was underscored as an important need.</p>
Role of Government	<p>The role of the Government in terms of camp management was agreed by all. However, the degree to which they were currently involved in individual camps was unknown.</p>	<p>Agreed that efforts <i>must</i> be made by the CCCM Cluster to initiate efforts in this regard.</p>
AoB	<p>WFP noted its wish for some form of registration, noting that in January and February this year it had gone from feeding 110,000 persons to 125,000 persons, an increase of 10+%.</p> <p>OCHA asked why it had taken “so long” to initiate CCCM activities in Rakhine. The CC acknowledged that it had taken longer to get sufficient capacity on the ground than was ideal, he had only been in country just over one month plus the Cluster had only been “activated” in December last year. Also it was stressed that the humanitarian sector of camps and</p>	



	<p><i>their</i> management appeared to be something new for this area of Myanmar. Additionally, there also seemed to be uncertainty as to what extent was there (previously) a view that where the shelters were being built and how they were being built would require a major investment in CCCM?</p>	
<p>Summary Points</p>	<p>CC summarized the main outcomes of the discussion.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CCCM Cluster should work/support with pre-existing camp management structures; 2. CCCM Cluster should seek to ensure regular presence in the camps; 3. CCCM focal points in the camps would likely have to be paid to fulfill this task, unrealistic to try and rely on pre-existing regular presence by certain UN agencies I/NGOs already working in the camps. 4. CCCM Cluster must work at engaging the Government and their vital role in the management of camps. 5. While accepting the fact this was the first CCCM Cluster meeting in Rakhine, the muted interest set against the displacement of over 100,000 persons and the prevalence of camps was concerning.
		<p>Next meeting date and location to be confirmed by CCCM Cluster</p>



		Lead, UNHCR
--	--	-------------

Document shared in hard copy with participants at the meeting:

Copy of Rakhine Camp List - draft