

## Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

14:00 – 16:00, Wednesday, 14 May 2014

UNHCR Office, Yangon

**Attendees:** UNHCR Donor Relations Officer, OCHA, Solidarities International (SI), DRC, Merlin, NRC, FSD, ECHO, Save the Children (SCI) & Arche Nova

**Unable to attend the meeting:** Intersos & IOM

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<b>Introduction/Actions from Previous Meeting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cluster Coordinator (CC) presented agenda and documents distributed - see foot of minutes for documents shared.</li> </ul> <p><b>Actions</b> (unless stated elsewhere) <b>from Previous Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No news/update on DRC addressing CMC issue in Baw Du Par 1, 2 and Da Paing in relation to providing camp infrastructure.</li> <li>CC to upload joint monitoring report of Cluster to website, done. See under “Cluster Performance” at <a href="http://www.sheltercluster.org">www.sheltercluster.org</a>.</li> <li>Cluster partners to contact CC (<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>) for details of multi-sector assessment in relation to events in Kachin/N.Shan. No request from partners for data, yet.</li> </ul>	
<b>Revision of Caseload Figures for Myanmar Strategic Response Plan</b>	<p>CC noted that a recent request has come from OCHA in regards to issues over some of the caseload numbers for the Myanmar Strategic Response Plan. Main concern had been over non-IDP figures for <b>Rakhine</b>. Now, the caseload is the usual 140,000 IDP figure but the change elsewhere is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 70,000 for food insecure/vulnerable people;</li> <li>✓ 50,000 for people in isolated villages;</li> <li>✓ 50,000 for people in host communities.</li> </ul> <p>140,000 IDP figure is taken from the Cluster’s <i>Cluster Analysis Report</i> 1 September. In terms of the submission for <i>this</i> Cluster for Rakhine, for CCCM the change does not impact CCCM or shelter since these sectors are focused on the 140,000 IDPs. NFIs have seen a slight shift. If financial requirements are met it would allow for half of the people in isolated villages, 25,000, and half the people in host communities, 25,000, to receive NFI assistance as/if required. In the event of an emergency these stocks can also be deployed to meet such immediate needs. This explains <i>why</i> for the shelter and NFI Rakhine submission the “people targeted” is 140,000, the IDPs, while the “people in need” is 240,000. 240,000 include the 140,000 for shelter/NFIs but also factors in the caseloads for people in “isolated</p>	

	<p>villages” and “host communities” to receive NFIs. For the CCCM submission of the Rakhine section the “people targeted” is 111,000, focused on the 23 priority camps that contain almost 80 per cent of the 140,000 IDPs. The “people in need” is 140,000, which includes <i>all</i> IDPs. If some CCCM assistance as/if needed for this balance of 29,000 IDPs is required then resources permitted efforts can/will be made.</p> <p>For <b>Kachin</b> the shift was less, 91,000 IDPs and 20,000 in host communities. The 91,000 IDP figure is also taken from the Cluster’s <i>Cluster Analysis Report</i>, this one dated 1 October. For shelter and NFI people targeted is 95,000 and the “people in need” 111,000. Again, the “people in need” includes host communities, some who may require NFIs, but the priority focus for shelter and NFIs is the 95,000. For CCCM, “people in need” is the 91,000 IDP figure but the focus in terms of where the <i>target</i> is for CCCM is lower, 87,000 IDPs based in the Cluster’s analysis of the total CCCM needs.</p>	
<p><b>Kachin &amp; Northern Shan Update</b></p> <p>a. Shelter</p> <p>b. NFIs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CC, noting action points from the last meeting raised the need, as point of advocacy, to prioritise issue of provision of suitable land for IDPs. Since last meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Issue has been raised at the HCT;</li> <li>2. A meeting held between the Joint Strategy Team (JST) and the UNHCR Representative a.i.</li> <li>3. UNHCR Representative now on mission to Northern Shan, well-briefed on the situation and accompanied by the UNHCR Regional Representative.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• From JST discussion, population at Lagat Ynag deemed to be “most exposed”. More generally IDPs do not want to move from camps where they are, namely remain close to place of origin. Important not to build temporary shelter <i>if</i> protection issues are not clear, note KMSS-BMO on outskirts of MWG. Situation of land in Nam Hkam precarious but perhaps some scope for a solution.</li> <li>• Strategically the Cluster is hesitant to advocate for the construction of temporary shelter until the suitability of sites is clearer. A position SI supported. Merlin responded by noting that the rains had arrived and suggested temporary structures that are mobile.</li> <li>• CC noted the map, showing movement, <i>latest JST Humanitarian Situation Update – as of 7 May</i>, details of UNHCR’s shelter/NFI response and two UNHCR reports on Muse and Man Wing Gyi, Lagat Yang, Nam Hkam and Muse, dated 8 and 10 May, respectively. Save had data that suggested 650 in China, less than the UNHCR figure of 950. The total number of people displaced, including those in China, appears to be between 5,000 to 7,000 persons.</li> <li>• SI expressed their particular concern for the situation between Lana Zup Ja and Bum Tsit Pa and the potentiality for around 5,000 to be displaced in this area.</li> <li>• Comments that large quantities of military hardware seen at Laisho airport. <i>This</i> despite the fact that there were talks between the parties this week albeit stated that the Tatmadaw were not represented.</li> <li>• SCI deployed someone from Child Protection to Muse, already onsite. Attendee at today’s meeting hoped to be there “within a few days”.</li> <li>• OCHA confirmed they deployed a national staff person to Nam Hkam.</li> <li>• For those interested to see photos of people displaced into China, specifically the Lung Krauk settlement,</li> </ul>	<p>CC to discuss concept of temporary yet mobile structure with Kachin Cluster Lead colleague.</p>

	<p>see: <a href="https://www.dvb.no/news/in-pictures-kachin-idps-look-for-shelter-in-china-burma-myanmar/40161">https://www.dvb.no/news/in-pictures-kachin-idps-look-for-shelter-in-china-burma-myanmar/40161</a>. Merlin commented that reports were the situation for those in China was “not good”. One participant explained their agency in China had been informed not to assist this caseload. Other than raising this issue at the HCT level the CC noted that there was not a huge amount he could envision <i>this</i> Cluster being able to proactively do; noted as a point of real concern.</p>	
<p><b>Rakhine Update</b></p> <p><b>a. Shelter</b></p> <p><b>b. Camp Infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>c. CCCM</b></p>	<p>CC drew attention to hard copy of work plan looking at the next stage in shelter support, with a particular focus on/in zone 1 and urban Sittwe. “Ground had yet to be broken” but ambition was to build between 100 and 200 units between May and September. Focus very much on this being a pilot project, lessons learned, done with the RSG. Thereafter, were there capacity, resources and it was feasible, propose a path for how scale-up could be achieved, having drawn on the lessons learnt from these pilots.</p> <p>Both for temporary shelter and camp infrastructure CC drew attention to hard copy of detailed <i>3W Shelter &amp; Camp Infrastructure - Rakhine State</i>, 9th May 2014. Completion rates were high and gaps low. Cluster partners who wanted soft copy of this detailed spread sheet should contact CC directly.</p> <p>Other than ensuring a camp management agency for the two camps in Pauktaw, Ah Nauk Ywe and Nget Chaung, which contain over 10,000 IDPs, the significant strategic priority is more clearly defining the roles and responsibility of the Rakhine State Government (RSG) versus the camp management agencies and the CCCM Coordinator, UNHCR. Efforts to clarify this had been done at the Rakhine State level, through the CCCM Cluster. CC was encouraged that this week the CCCM Cluster was meeting with the DC of the RSG. NRC underscored that lack of functional, well-represented camp committees will continue to seriously hinder such efforts to make headway in these areas.</p> <p>Updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ SI said they were at “about 20 per cent” of pre-evacuation capacity. Noted that Camp Committees in Dar Paing and Baw Du Pah were proving problematic. Particular issue being logistics and moving materials into the camps where they are active;</li> <li>➤ In comparison SCI and LWF said they were “more than 20 per cent” of pre-evacuation capacity;</li> <li>➤ Varied/mixed reaction in terms of whether actors were reshaping their response post evacuation, some more inclined others less so and some “not at all”;</li> <li>➤ Merlin noted that while 20 of 23 INGOs are reported back, two of three that are not back were key providers in the health sector, Malteser and MSF. DRC noted that in terms of needs in the camps where they are most active, in priority order, first it is health and food, then education and WaSH and then shelter and NFIs. Generally acknowledged across meeting that health is the “most pressing”, with reference to ICRC, Mercy Malaysia and IRC possibly aiming to try and cover some of the gaps. In response to CC’s question as to <i>why</i> Merlin is not engaged as a health agency, responded that they “lack the permission”? There was also a general sense that after what had happened to Malteser and MSF agencies were “reluctant to put themselves forward”.</li> <li>➤ General wider discussion on health and malnutrition issues. Expressed concern in some camps as to whether food was “getting through but hard to generalize”. Series of issues that had been raised by camp</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cluster partners to contact CC for copy of 3W Shelter &amp; Camp Infrastructure.</b></p> <p><b>CC to revert to CCCM Cluster with final draft of Roles &amp; Responsibilities in CCCM.</b></p>

<p><b>d. Cooking Fuel</b></p>	<p>managers that CC would meet to discuss with WFP. Key counterpart was away on mission, as would be CC for the following two weeks. CC would aim to meet WFP bilaterally. As part of, fully accepted by CC that issues/problems with Camp Committees may be part of the problem, plus the lack of cooking fuel, which can encourage people to sell food for fuel. On health matters, see document from Health Cluster, <i>Places Visited by Mobile Clinics after March Incident 2014</i>.</p> <p>➤ CC welcomed the initiative being taken by FAO's Bernard Cartella (BC) (<a href="mailto:Bernard.Cartella@fao.org">Bernard.Cartella@fao.org</a>). Aim is to generate a forum at the Yangon for those interested in <i>this</i> issue. Cluster Lead has pledged its support to this forum and other interested agencies being ICRC, Relief International, WFP, DRC and UNDP. Meeting on 7 May postponed. Partners should contact BC directly for when first meeting will happen.</p>	<p><b>CC to meet WFP week 2 June.</b></p>
<p><b>NFIs</b></p> <p><b>a. Contingency Planning/Stocks</b></p> <p><b>b. Winterisation Items</b></p> <p><b>c. Standards</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agencies that could commit, UNHCR, DRC (3,000 NFI kits), Save the Children "potentially yes", ECHO in support of IFRC, LWF in the form of blankets and NFIs, SI hygiene kits (but coordinated by WaSH sector). Other members CC would target, based on their stated commitment last year being MRCS, Red Cross, Oxfam, Care, ICRC, AusAID and OFDA. Similarly in terms of staffing capacity support to help post disaster (event) assessments in Rakhine and based on their stated commitment last year, CC would target UNHCR, DRC, SCI and SI. However, this should not dissuade any member that thinks they could either support with contingency stocks or assessment capacity to contact the CC.</li> <li>▪ To-date NO Cluster partners have contacted CC (<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>) as regards to helping/support close this NFI winter item gap in Kachin &amp; Northern Shan. Agreed for CC to share, in the minutes/see below, what is the gap and partners would see if they could support.<sup>1</sup> Currently only potential channel for some support is through Cluster Lead UNHCR getting <i>in-kind</i> help from UNIQLO through donation of their second-hand clothes. Current gap, targeting IDPs in cold/remote areas &amp; new IDPs (Nam Hkam &amp; Muse) is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A. Adult men 10,000</b></li> <li><b>B. Adult women 10,000</b></li> <li><b>C. Children (including infants) 30,000</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Noting the hard copy of the NFI Core Kit, as circulated, CC was keen to get the opinion of others as to how suitable continued distribution of these items was across Rakhine and Kachin: plastic tarpaulin, blankets, rope, mosquito net, kitchen set, plastic bucket, plastic mat and clothing. Rather than detailed discussion now, via the Cluster website (<a href="http://www.shelternficccmmyanmar.org">www.shelternficccmmyanmar.org</a>) CC would create an online <i>forum</i> where ideas could be exchanged and discussed. Not be a public forum, open only to the Cluster and those who were interested, both in YGN and/or field.</li> </ul>	<p><b>CC to contact Cluster on contingency stocks and/or assessment capacity.</b></p> <p><b>Cluster partners to contact CC if they could help close this gap.</b></p> <p><b>CC to arrange web based forum discussion and contact Cluster partners to determine interest.</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> According to *Kachin & Northern Shan NFI Coverage & Gaps*, 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014:

Winter clothes for adults gap is **27** per cent;

Winter clothes for children gap is **75** per cent;

Winter items "other" gap is **68** per cent. "Other" refers to items such as gloves, socks and hats.

<p><b>d. New Modalities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CC attended 14 April Cash Transfer Working Group (CTWG) in YGN and report back to Cluster. Key points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Kachin (as opposed to Rakhine) cash as a medium of assistance, appears, at this juncture, <i>more</i> likely/suited;</li> <li>In Kachin WFP are planning to undertake a wealth ranking exercise across all camps to determine where the needs are most and the needs less. Between 31 May and 7 June WFP will be in Myitkyina to “meet all relevant stakeholders” as part of efforts to determine how this will be done.</li> <li>In Kachin across 53 camps in Government-controlled areas, according to WFP’s findings <i>only</i> 15 per cent of families are <u>totally dependent</u> on cash and food assistance. The balance 85 per cent has other forms/sources of income, which WFP stressed is “normal” after three years of (internal) displacement. However, what income they do have is generally “low”, seasonal and takes the form of casual labour. There are a minority of activities in some camps, notably amber cutting/polishing/making jewellery that are quite lucrative. Shalom provided the machines needed for this livelihood.</li> <li>WFP clearly of the view that repeated distributions of food that is <i>not</i> needed can do “more harm than good”, leads to increased dependency/apathy and people less inclined to “help themselves”. Some senior persons with Kachin community have concerns that <i>too</i> much assistance/aid can be counterproductive.<sup>2</sup></li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>Following, NRC noted that experience from elsewhere has shown that local NGOs can have serious reservations in terms of cash assistance, albeit not known if this applied to the Kachin context. FSD was strongly in favour of a voucher system but stressed that it must be closely monitored.</p>	<p><b>Kachin Shelter, NFI and CCCM Cluster Coordinator to liaise with <i>this</i> mission/visit to Kachin.</b></p>
<p><b>Cluster Staffing/Vacancies CCCM</b></p> <p><b>a. Rakhine x2</b></p> <p><b>b. Kachin</b></p> <p><b>Shelter</b></p> <p><b>a. Shelter (Kachin &amp; Northern Shan)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regret CC noted that CCCM Cluster Lead in Rakhine had handed in her notice due to familial reasons and would be leaving 20 June. <b>The position would be vacant and the Cluster needed a suitable replacement.</b> Persons/agencies that knew of suitable/interested candidates should contact the CC (<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>) for more details.</li> <li>Further to email/job advertisements 5 May sent across the Cluster, reiterated that IOM had placed the job advertisements for an international position to support each CCCM Cluster at field level. P3 Kachin position will initially be located in Yangon but with a view to deployment to Kachin. The P4 Rakhine position is to be located in Sittwe. The closing date had passed, 12 May.</li> <li>Cluster <b>also in need of international Shelter Expert for Kachin &amp; Northern Shan.</b> Position requires either architectural or engineering background but very field orientated position focussed on delivering standards across the Shelter Cluster. Persons/agencies that knew of suitable/interested candidates should contact the CC (<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>) for more details.</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup> The CTWG made reference to a *Knowledge Attitude and Practice Survey* by Save the Children for Kachin. It contained a section on shelter and NFIs and agreed it would be circulated across *this* Cluster with *these* minutes.

<p><b>AoB</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the following week, with the exception of next Monday, CC would be on mission to Rakhine and the following week to Kachin, Myitkyina and Bhamo. As usual, organised closely with Rakhine and Kachin shelter/NFI/CCCM field-based Cluster Lead colleagues. Any members at national level should feel free to get in contact if there were any issues they wanted the CC to raise while on these back-to-back missions.</li> <li>• Also note the CC is planning to be on mission to Northern Shan week starting 17 June.</li> <li>• 19 May there is a three-way meeting between Cluster Lead, IOM and NRC to discuss specific modalities and suitable synergy in regards to their respective support to CCCM efforts in Kachin and Northern.</li> <li>• SI asked about the progress on temporary shelters in NC, especially with the rains now here. As the minutes 10 April 10 state, "MRF have committed to constructing 78 temporary 8-unit shelters in the four IDP camps of Pauktaw (NC 34; STM 19, KNP 13 &amp; ANY 12). Construction in Sin Tet Maw is completed (19) while construction began in NC today for the first 20 of the 34 proposed shelters. All construction is expected to be completed by mid-May 2014." They also asked about progress in terms of the contractor filling in the holes in NC post the walkway improvement?</li> <li>• Asked what news/progress there was on whether there would be a census in the camps. Consensual view was unlikely.</li> <li>• SCI noted a recent mission to Meiktila with visiting US Under-Secretary of State and a WaSH person. Current and remaining IDP caseload is approximately 4,000 persons. However, around 1,750 have title deeds and will be moving into permanent houses in June. The balance of 2,250 across three Muslim and three Buddhist camps. Ambition of local government is to merge three camps into one, thus leaving one Muslim and one Buddhist camp. Long-term situation for remaining IDPs is uncertain, still reference to "building apartments". SCI requested tarpaulin support from Cluster Lead.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cluster partners to contact</b> CC (<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>) as required.</p> <p><b>CC to follow-up with MRF at national level, (Chit Ko Ko Oo) and Shelter Cluster Coordinator at RS level.</b></p> <p><b>SCI to contact CC in writing for quantities of tarpaulins needed. If feasible SCI to send photos of permanent houses to CC.</b></p>
-------------------	---	---

The next meeting would likely be scheduled for 4 June. 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:**

- *Shelter-NFI-CCCM YGN Cluster Meeting Minutes*, 26.3.'14;
- *UNHCR Map of Shan North Situation*, 5th May '14 - less place names;
- *UNHCR Map of Shan North Situation*, 5th May '14 - more place names;
- *JST Humanitarian Situation Update for the Kachin and Northern Shan States*, 7th May 2014;
- *UNHCR Brief Report on Muse Emergency Response* - 8th May 2014;
- *UNHCR Brief Report on Southern Mansi & Northern Shan* - 10th May 2014;
- *UNHCR Response in Southern Kachin State & Northern Shan State*, 12th May;
- *UNHCR Response in Southern Kachin State & Northern Shan State*, 12th May - longer version;
- *Save the Children Knowledge Attitude and Practice Survey*, Kachin 2014.
- *UNHCR Work Plan for Shelter (Rakhine)*, 12th May 2014;

- *3W Shelter & Camp Infrastructure - Rakhine State, 9th May 2014;*
- *Health Cluster, Places Visited by Mobile Clinics after March Incident 2014;*
- *UNOCHA Rakhine Humanitarian Update, 30th April 2014;*
- *UNOCHA Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine (25th April - 1st May 2014);*
- *UNOCHA Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine (2nd May - 9th May 2014);*
- *UNOCHA Monitoring of Implementation Obstacles In Rakhine (10th May - 16th May 2014).*
  
- *Cluster NFI Standards for Family of 5, 9th June 2013;*
- *Rakhine NFI Coverage & Gaps, 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014;*
- *Kachin & Northern Shan NFI Coverage & Gaps, 1<sup>st</sup> May 2014.*
  
- *ToR CCCM Cluster Coordinator (Field Level) Rakhine 15.5.'14;*
- *TOR Shelter Expert Kachin-Myanmar 2014.doc.*