

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Tuesday, 11 February, 2014

UNHCR Office, YGN

Attendees: ACTED, NRC, DRC, Turkish Red Cross, UNICEF, Solidarities International, WaSH (UNICEF), UNHCR, UN-Habitat, UNOPs, FSD, KMSS, UNHCR, Finn Church Aid & LWF

Unable to attend the meeting: Metta

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Introductions a. Astrid Arne, CCCM Cluster Coordinator for Rakhine arne@unhcr.org	<p>Cluster Coordinator (CC) welcomed all. Astrid Arne, one of the two new CCCM Cluster Coordinators for Rakhine, introduced herself. Like her predecessors she is deployed through NRC and here to support the resources of the Cluster.</p> <p>Another introduction included the new Gender Capacity Advisor, Matt Byrne (MB), who will be hosted by OCHA (byrne1@un.org). MB gave a brief overview of his role and responsibilities in Myanmar. It was noted he had already met bilaterally with the CC, which included discussing the Cluster's strategy documents.</p>	
Outstanding Actions/Updates from Previous Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CC completed and circulated 22 November minutes, available online at: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting_Minutes.aspx CC was liaising with KMSS and plan was for them to host next national Cluster meeting, likely to be week starting 3 March. UNHCR to proceed with provision of new walkways in Myebon, Taung Paw. Following this point, RI gave a brief to explain how the situation in Myebon had deteriorated again. 13 February a demonstration was planned, reference to a "call for arms" and that the "Bengali immigrants should leave". The TA had advised to "press pause" on RI's activities. Noting past advocacy efforts this recent regression would serve as a test as to how the State could address another spate of problems, plus what help could be provided by the OCHA-supported Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC). A wider discussion ensued, ECHO emphasised the power vacuum that exists in Rakhine, key persons at the Sittwe level have "limited powers" and even at the Union level, at a very high level, there appeared a "reluctance to get involved". The fact that general elections were next year was not helping. The CC noted that UNHCR had proposed "red lines" that if crossed, could trigger more proactive (advocacy) 	

	<p>actions by the international community. NRC noted the <i>Rights Up Front</i> efforts, which the CC said he would share across the Cluster.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LWF were still exploring the possibility of including the 4 Pauktaw Camps within its fire mitigation and response efforts (see below in LWF update). • The CC had received no feedback, comments/criticism to the Response Plan documents shared at the last meeting. • CC had followed up with ACTED since the last meeting as regards to data/IM gaps in Kachin and Northern Shan. ACTED explained that ‘while the profiling is useful, it cannot be used as a dashboard tailored to the needs of the end-users with a set of simple key information regularly updated in order to inform humanitarian action. This would mean first collectively identifying what is the key information needed from an operational point of view and what SOPs can be used collectively to collect, validate and analyse the information in a timely manner’. ACTED also stressed that there would be value in collecting more information on areas of origin and access to basic services at household level rather than having information limited to the camp level, which should be done in collaboration with other Clusters. As required, ACTED could provide concrete examples. 	CC to circulate <i>Rights Up Front</i> documents to Cluster partners.
Report on Cooking Energy Situation in IDP Camps in Rakhine	CC drew attention to two recent reports on the cooking fuel situation in Rakhine, which remained a serious issue. Both an ICRC report and a UNHCR funded consultant’s report point towards the use of rice husks as being a more viable alternative. However, there was considerable debate as to whether donors would be willing to fund cooking fuel (alternatives). Was there any scope for sustainability and should (if rice husk production was viewed to be the most viable option) this be something the early recovery (ER) sector should explore? Also, what was the Government’s responsibility? ECHO was clear that this was <i>not</i> something they would fund. It was noted that UNDP had or was supplying large numbers of stoves in Rakhine and Kachin. The latter the CC had seen during the recent cross-line mission to Laiza. The agreed action was that the two reports should be made available to all Cluster partners and the CC would follow-up with ER.	CC to disseminate two reports across Cluster and follow-up with ER sector.
Donor Visibility Among Cluster Partners Update	Following the last Cluster meeting and a presentation on donor visibility, the CC held up a draft example of how the sign, to be posted on the camp notice boards, could look. While there were some comments about the need to ensure the precisely correct logos, there was no objection to the sign or principle. It was agreed that the same draft should be discussed at the CCCM Cluster in Rakhine.	Astrid Arne to follow-up with CCCM Cluster partners at Rakhine State level.
NFIs	Noting DRC’s request from the last meeting, the CC was keen to discuss the matter of NFIs. Views expressed varied. Some felt that this sector had been well-coordinated, others less so. For the former, efforts at coordinating winterization items in Kachin and Northern Shan were an area where some felt the coordination had been “particularly good”. However, post distribution monitoring and the need for market surveys were areas that should be looked at. There was a consensual view that continuing to just do blanket distributions of the same items to the same beneficiaries was less and less needed.	

	<p>While to operationalize would be extremely challenging, partners stressed the wish to see more flexibility in terms of what items beneficiaries could receive, perhaps through a cash or voucher system. The CC noted that at an HQ UNHCR level cash assistance was an area that was being encouraged, as did the ECHO, shelter & CCCM Global Cluster joint monitoring mission in November 2013. In summary, the CC noted there were two elements to the debate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Type or form of assistance should NFI be delivered, 'modalities'; 2. The need to revisit the agreed standards from 2013. <p>The CC agreed with partners just a meeting on these issues needed to be called, for those interested.</p>	CC to call Cluster meeting dedicated to NFI issues.
CERF Funding Update	<p>Since the last meeting and the sharing of the <i>Wash Cluster & Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Funding Priority Paper</i>, the target had been identified as 15,000 IDPs in Kachin and Northern Shan. US\$2.1 million for shelter and US\$1.35 for WaSH. Latest update from OCHA was shelter would receive US\$850,000, which would cover the needs of approx. 6,000 IDPs. Noting this it was important to "square the shelter gap facts" with the donors as soon as possible. With KMSS present it was agreed to have the next Cluster meeting focused on this temporary shelter gap. ECHO stressed that it was important WaSH was also present for this presentation/discussion. More generally, ECHO underscored how positive it was KMSS was present at this forum and their future engagement and sharing of information was encouraged.</p>	CC to liaise with KMSS regarding hosting next Cluster meeting, plus ensure strong donor participation. Likely to be week 3 March.
Myanmar Strategic Response Plan (MSRP) Update	<p>As above, CC had received no feedback on the draft submissions from Cluster partners. However, this was not viewed as a major lack of endorsement since these submissions were consistent with the four strategy papers that cover shelter, NFI and CCCM that were developed over 2013 and have been updated and revised accordingly. While the final consolidated version was still under review, at a recent Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster meeting in Myitkyina, explaining how this Cluster's strategic objectives correlated with the four overall MSRP strategic objectives was useful and helped provide a sense of overall coherency in terms of the humanitarian response. The CC also noted that OCHA's ambitions to share a draft version with the Government and certain key donors.</p>	
Kachin AoB	<p>The CC had partaken in the last OCHA organized UNICEF-led cross line mission to Laiza, 26-29 January.¹ Points of note included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three camps in Laiza urban area were visited plus two outside in the rural setting, Hpun Lum Yang and Je Yang 1-2 Camps. The latter two sites were part of a joint mission with IRRC to discuss shelter option; • Meetings were also held with the IRRC, RANIR and LNGOs that have a permanent present in Laiza; • While respect for minimum standards was more encouraging, quality of temporary shelter 	

¹ Rather than having to return with the convoy 31st, it was agreed that UNHCR could return independently two days earlier to Myitkyina. The UNHCR vehicle was escorted to the front line, thereafter return to Myitkyina was very straightforward. Such flexibility allowed a Cluster meeting in Myitkyina the following day to discuss the findings and possible next steps. Were this opportunity to cross the line independently indicative of increasing ease of access into non-Government controlled areas (NGCA), this would be significant. Particularly during meetings with KIO officials the CC stressed that far *more* can be achieved if access to NGCA eases, appreciating that it requires both sides' endorsement.

	<p>implementation in some cases clearly needs addressing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult decisions as to whether IDPs living within sub-standard accommodation in Market 3 camp should be relocated to rural areas, against what seems to be their wish to remain in urban centrally located areas where they have the benefits and services that an urban location brings. • Having visited one of the boarding schools and further to earlier statements, the CC was clear that first and foremost this was an education and child protection issue. <i>This</i> Cluster was happy to give technical support on shelter matters but boarding schools are not a CCCM issue. <p>Having listened to feedback from Cluster partners as to the camp profiling's utility, plans are underway to update the data in 2014. The mechanism to achieve this would lean on the Lead Agency's CCCM implementing partners and camp focal points, both building their capacity and making this and future updates more sustainable. From the outset it is clear this will not be easy. The ambition is to hold a workshop in Myitkyina to discuss the data collection modalities, week starting 24 February.</p>	
Rakhine AoB	<p>IOM updated on their wish to get more involved in Rakhine and at this stage, capacity building in the area of CCCM. Week 3-7 February colleagues from Bangkok office visited, which included a visit from USAID's OFDA office. Aim was to explore ways for IOM to support camp management actors in Rakhine, "on the job" support. Terms of reference for such a relationship as to how IOM could support the CCCM Cluster were drawn-up by Cluster Lead. During the mission and at a meeting with CC, IOM, USAID and Save the Children, latter expressed clear interest in receiving in-house support. Offer could be open to others who are comparably involved in camp management in Rakhine. Similar CCCM support for the CCCM Cluster in Kachin and Northern Shan is another possibility.</p> <p>As part of temporary shelter care and maintenance efforts in Rakhine, Cluster Lead would be distributing 600 tool kits plus training in association with the Department for Rural Development.</p> <p>Since the last Cluster meeting Solidarities International had written to the CC to clearly disassociate themselves with any involvement in camp management activities in camps where they are service providers, both in Sittwe and Pauktaw Townships. CC would update, circulate and upload the <i>CCCM Camp Management Agencies</i> list, <u>stressing that these camp management gaps in Rakhine desperately needed to be filled.</u>²</p>	<p>CC to would update, circulate and upload the <i>CCCM Camp Management Agencies</i> list.</p>
AOB	<p>In the coming weeks OCHA would be organising contingency planning w/shops, plus a possible simulation exercise. More details would be provided in due course.</p>	

² See CCCM Camp Management Agencies Rakhine State 27th February 2014 at <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-documents.aspx>

	<p>LWF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a new leader in Sittwe. Bob Thelen has left and Bhoj Khanal is the new Project Coordinator, effective March 1, 2014; • Fred Otieno, CCCM Advisor will end his tour in early March. LWF will soon be advertising for his replacement. We will be looking for someone to lead CCCM and Protection in all our work in Rakhine. We hope this will allow us to mainstream community based psychosocial support. • Contemplating arrangements with IOM to strengthen our CCCM capacity; • Launched the one year ECHO funded <i>Children of Peace Initiative</i> which focuses on education in emergencies. FinnChurchAid (FCA) is the applicant and LWF the implementer; Henrik Fosseldorff, FCA is the Project Manager, to be included on the Cluster contact list; • Finalizing agreement with UNHCR for the first half of 2014, which includes looking into expanding fire safety to Pauktaw and CCCM to Set Yone 1 and Set Yone 2, the latter two being Buddhist Camps in Sittwe; • Exploring opportunities to be more inclusive in their approaches so as to include all sectors of society in need in the Sittwe area; • Exploring opportunities to increase DRR within the Relief and Resettlement Department plus vulnerable communities and camps; • Looking at ways to improve on education throughout, in and outside the camps and ready to explore partnerships of all type and in this regard have been in contact with the Education Sector and MRC. <p>CC was on leave for a week, from his evening, returning 18 February. As needed he could be contacted by/through field-based Cluster Lead colleagues who had his contact details.</p>	<p>CC to include FCA on Shelter-NFI-CCCM National (Yangon) Cluster Members Contact Details list.</p>
--	--	---

For next YGN meeting partners were encouraged to check the http://themimu.info/Meeting_Schedule/index.php. Also 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:

- *GenCap Steering Committee Letter to Humanitarian Coordinator, Myanmar 2014;*
- *UNOCHA Updates on events in Maungdaw, Rakhine State (23-29 January 2014);*
- *Under-Secretary-General Amos Statement on Myanmar, 23rd January 2014*
- *Statement of the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar, 19th February 2014;*
- *“Rights Up Front” - Summary - General Assembly - 17 Dec 2013;*
- *“Rights Up Front” Detailed Plan of Action, 9.7.'13;*
- *Report on Cooking Energy Situation in IDP Camps in Rakhine, December 2013 - Final Report, v.2;*
- *Rice husk fuel stick – Pilot project, ICRC;*
- *CCCM Camp Management Agencies Rakhine State, 27th February 2014;*

- LWF & Finn Church Aid Press Release *Children of Peace Project Launch* to Stakeholders, 29.1.'14 – English & Myanmar;
- *Myanmar Inter-Cluster Meeting*, 20th January '14;
- *OCHA Ad Hoc Meeting on Rakhine - Meeting Summary*, 20.2.'14;
- *Metta's Regeneration Initiative Bi-annual Report, 1st April - 30th September 2013*;
- *Myanmar, Camp Profiling in Inaccessible Areas*, CCCM Sector Case Studies Vol.1.