

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, 22 January, 2014

UNHCR Office, YGN

Attendees: ACTED, Relief International (RI), IOM, LWF, DRC, IFRC, UN-Habitat, UNOPs, UNHCR, NRC, Malteser, Metta, Plan International, UNOPs, Save the Children & Education in Emergencies Sector (Save the Children), OCHA & Gender Capacity Advisor (GenCap)

Unable to attend the meeting: World Concern, TIKA, Solidarites International & WaSH (UNICEF)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Introductions	Cluster Coordinator (CC) welcomed all, first meeting of 2014. Before going on <u>he stressed his genuine appreciation for all the support and collaboration in 2013.</u> CC hoped and expected that with the network and experience built-up over the last eleven months, this would serve the Cluster and response very well in 2014. Introductions included the new Gender Capacity Advisor, Matt Byrne, who will be hosted by OCHA (byrne1@un.org).	
Actions/Updates from Previous Meeting	<p>Looking at the length of the 18 December minutes the CC's 2014 resolution was to draft shorter minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CC had yet to draft the minutes from the penultimate meeting of 2013. Since 18 December there had been few updates on the Mansi situation, suggesting relative calm over the last month. <p>However, OCHA who had just returned from a cross-line mission, with many organisations, stressed the following points. <u>Attention/concern was drawn to the issue of boarding house(s); 300 IDP students, the need for NFIs (blankets & clothing) due to cold temperatures, shelter that currently just stood at (UNHCR provided) tents and lack of WaSH facilities.</u> A report was due next week.¹ The total IDP figure estimated to be approximately 5,000 IDPs, consistent with data reported at the previous national Cluster meeting, 18 December.²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The shelter gap, 20,000 – 25,000 IDPs in Kachin remains a key priority. Additional flash drives with all camp profiling data and analysis for Kachin & Northern Shan 	<p>CC to complete and circulate 22 November minutes.</p> <p>Partners who did not attend this meeting to contact CC for a flash drive.</p>

¹ As circulated with soft copies of these minutes, see *OCHA Inter-Agency Mission to La Na Zup & Bum Tsit Pa Report, Kachin State, 12th - 17th January '14.*

² For minutes of this meeting, see: https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting_Minutes.aspx.

	<p>were available for people to collect at the end of this (22 January) meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC had met LNGOs in YGN, at KMSS office, 16 January.³ Key points to emerge: “generally LNGOs feel less comfortable in large meetings” and do not “feel trained to be in such meetings”; still felt some actors at YGN level did “not understand the context”; by their own admission they are “more comfortable with other LNGOs and coordinating via informal structures”; language remains a challenge; LNGOs get frustrated with high turnover of international persons and they approach the humanitarian response holistically <i>not</i> by sector. However, they “do want to engage and actively participate”. Agreed between CC and LNGOs that in coming weeks a Kachin orientated Cluster meeting should be hosted at/by KMSS. • See below for CC’s permanent shelter findings during mission to Thandwe. • Since the last meeting and the persistent problems in Myebon, CC shared again the Protection Sector advocacy note plus the <i>Myebon Joint Mission Statement</i> by the Embassy of Switzerland, Embassy of the Republic of Turkey, Embassy of the United States of America & Delegation of the European Union, 30 December 2013. In early January there has been another mission to Myebon, which included the Minister for Border Affairs. Relief International (RI) was happy to report that since then access and the situation was “much improved” in terms of providing humanitarian assistance, publically there was a “much more helpful feeling”. This was positive to hear after months of seemingly little progress. Noting this RI requested UNHCR to proceed with provision of new walkways, as was being done elsewhere, now it seemed more likely the IDPs would remain. During the aforementioned mission the Minister for Border Affairs had stressed to the IDPs that relocation was not feasible. 	<p>CC to liaise with KMSS when to host Cluster meeting.</p> <p>UNHCR to proceed with provision of new walkways in Myebon, Taung Paw.</p>
Cluster Staffing/Capacity 2014	<p>During November’s joint monitoring mission Cluster had been praised for its capacity. All existing national/international staff capacities established by December 2013 would be the same for 2014. Only differences were two new international CCCM Cluster coordinators in Rakhine. One delayed through NRC (for the Cluster) and due to arrive within a week. Second to arrive in February, provided by Australian Civilian Corps Specialists (through AusAID). Also, one additional CCCM national staff added to CCCM Cluster team in Rakhine. Three of four Shelter Cluster persons back in Rakhine, fourth expected to be back in-post next month.</p>	
Updates on Fires & Response in Rakhine	<p>Since the last meeting there had been another fire. The first in Nget Chaung IDP Camp in Pauktaw Township, 12 December, where temporary shelters for 1,300 IDPs (265 HH) were destroyed, which included one 15 day-old child dying. The second fire also in Pauktaw Township occurred in Sin Tet Maw 16 January, destroying shelters for 552 IDPs (112 HH), 31 8-unit rooms & 6 communal kitchens and 2 temporary learning spaces, no deaths or injuries reported.⁴ Predictably the response was NFIs and</p>	

³ LNGO participants at this meeting were Metta, KMSS and MDCG, Shalom unable to participate.

⁴ See photo below for damage in Sin Tet Maw Camp.

	<p>tents, supported by DRC, Save the Children ICRC, UNHCR (& MSF). Wider discussion was what mitigation measures could be put in place. In response to a request from the Cluster Lead, LWF said they would consider broadening the scope of their fire mitigation and response measures to the four camps in Pauktaw. The CC stressed that the persistent lack of a camp management agency for Nget Chaung will only make such efforts all the harder.</p> <p>CC also stressed that having been in consultation with colleagues in Rakhine, as mentioned at the last meeting, rather than simply reconstruct temporary shelters, the Cluster was keen to explore scope for IDPs to return to their place of origin.</p>	<p>LWF to consider including 4 Pauktaw Camps within its fire mitigation and response efforts.</p>
Report on Cooking Energy Situation in IDP Camps in Rakhine	<p>The consultant's report had been received and was being shared at the Rakhine CCCM Cluster. The CC had yet to read the report. Partners should contact the CC for a soft copy.</p>	<p>CC to share soft copies of the report, as requested by partners.</p>
Donor Visibility Among Cluster Partners	<p>A 20 minute presentation was given by UNHCR's Associate Donor Relations Officer, Meret Weyermann (weyerman@unhcr.org). The key points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growing concern of donors to have their flag/logo displayed on activities funded by them; • Due to lack of common practice in doing visibility at camp levels, some donors do get more visibility while others (sometimes the much bigger contributors) do not get or hardly get visibility. • However, respect of the beneficiaries' dignity needs to be kept in mind when doing visibility. • UNHCR wanted to find out if coordinated visibility among all actors in a camp setting is something the Cluster Members are interested and if so, which would be a possible way forward? • During the discussion limited interest was given by Cluster Members. While DRC raised the issue that it will be difficult to have donor logos on one single sign, as not all actors are funded through the same donors; LWF raised the issue that some donors also wish to have visibility in the donor countries for the activities implemented in Myanmar. • NRC suggested visibility signs at the entrance of camps with all activities implemented and funded by the relevant donors (similar to construction site signs). • CC noted that on various Cluster documents would not be difficult to include relevant donors, for example shelter cluster factsheets. • No concrete decision taken in terms of action(s)/next steps. 	
Humanitarian Strategy 2014	<p>The CC shared the latest versions of this Cluster's submissions as part of the 2014 <i>Myanmar Strategic Response Plan</i>, three documents. A shelter/NFI submission for Rakhine and Kachin and Northern Shan</p>	

	<p>(K&NS) and a CCCM submission for Rakhine. The CCCM submission for K&NS would be submitted to OCHA this week.⁵ All of these documents were manifestations of the four strategies drafted in 2013 and revised at the end of 2013. Noted that revisions and feedback from OCHA were extensive to ensure greater brevity. Similar experience shared by Education Sector. Feedback, comments and criticism to the Cluster Lead were all welcome. In response to a question, CC confirmed that budget for NFIs in Rakhine does not include all the additional 64,000 caseload, notably people in isolated villages (Muslim & Rakhine).</p>	<p>Cluster partners to feedback comments/criticism to CC on Response Plan documents shared at meeting.</p>
<p>a. Rakhine Priorities</p> <p>Shelter Options/Pathways</p> <p>IOM CCCM Capacity Building Support</p>	<p>For Rakhine, the CC emphasized that at the start of the year, as the situation currently stood, the three key priorities are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CCCM consolidation and reinforcement to cover all outstanding gaps; 2. Care & maintenance of temporary shelters, include. for this rainy season; 3. Exploration/pilots of shelter options/pathways, beyond temporary. <p>On point 3, in late December the CC with a Rakhine colleague had gone to observe progress with permanent shelter reconstruction in Thandwe. Photos were shown of houses not destroyed, as an approximate comparator, houses built by Department for Rural Development (DRD) and houses built by the IDPs themselves.⁶ Based on this preliminary visit the self-built results appeared better in terms of quality and time, and had naturally offered more space for individual flexibility, as the photos showed. Reputedly the DRD house cost approximately US\$1,000 while the self-build seemed to involve IDPs contributing an additional US\$500 on top of the US\$1,000 received from DRD. NRC commented that with DRD houses lack of concrete footings or protection of upright posts into the soil was problematic. Discussion recognized it was simplistic to extrapolate too much from this context and assume it could be replicated in central Rakhine. However, there were still lessons to be learnt and members of the Shelter Cluster team in Rakhine were planning another visit to spend more time consulting with beneficiaries and Government. ACTED responded positively to the “self-help approach” and noted that in Meiktila he was also hearing reports of a similar approach.</p> <p>IOM updated on meetings with the CC in December, 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 visiting, which will include visit from USAID’s OFDA office. Aim is to explore ways for IOM to support camp management actors in Rakhine, “on the job” support. Save the Children have expressed an interest but offer is open to others who are comparably involved in camp management in Rakhine. Terms of reference for such a relationship as to how IOM could support the CCCM Cluster being drawn up by Cluster Lead.</p>	<p>Shelter Cluster in Rakhine to conduct mission to Thandwe and report/share findings.</p>

⁵ CC noted that for the Cluster’s own strategies, as initiated last year, NFIs were included as part of CCCM. This is due to how in practice things were being coordinated at field level. However for this template NFIs tended to be joined with shelter. CC hoped this would not confuse Cluster partners.

⁶ See foot of minutes for selection of photos shown at meeting.

b. Kachin Priorities	For Kachin & Northern Shan, the CC emphasized that at the start of the year, as situation currently stood, the two key priorities are: 1. Addressing the significant temporary shelter gap, estimated to be 20,000 – 25,000 IDPs; 2. CCCM capacity-building/enhancing.	
NRC CCCM Capacity Building Support	Chris Blears (CB) (NRC Country Director) shared a one-page document outlining some potential areas for NRC to get involved in Kachin & Northern Shan. Since the last national Cluster meeting, CC, CB and the (sub)Cluster Coordinator for Kachin had met and discussed some areas where NRC's engagement and support could be hugely valued. For more details partners were encouraged to digest one and half pager <i>Mobile Camp Management Training & Coaching Project</i> circulated by CB.	CC to circulate soft copy of NRC Mobile Camp Management Training & Coaching Project document.
CERF Funding	CC shared <i>WaSH Cluster & Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Funding Priority Paper</i> , a joint submission between WaSH & this Cluster to focus on critical shelter and associated WaSH needs. Target was 15,000 IDPs, US\$2.1 million for shelter and US\$1.35 for WaSH. NRC asked if some of the funds could be directed to their aforementioned plans. CC stressed the critical priority was the shelter gap in Kachin and even if this amount of funding requested was approved, which was highly unlikely, would still leave 10,000 IDPs without temporary shelter. However, if NRC is committed to these CCCM capacity building efforts then role of Cluster Lead was to support them in their efforts to find funds.	
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACTED stressed their frustration at some of the data/IM gaps in Kachin. The CC agreed to follow-up. More widely ACTED ambitions will focus on “longer-term solutions in NGCA areas”, including “community infrastructure and social cohesion projects” to be funded by UNDP and the Government of Japan. This led into wider discussion as to whether the humanitarian community felt ready if/were there to be largescale IDP return? The consensus in the room was “no”. DRC requested NFIs to be on the agenda for the next meeting. Following question from CC, general consensus was to have this meeting once every three weeks, unless developments required greater frequency. CC to attend Laiza mission, 26-29 January. Would be first time CC had visited NGCA plus symptomatic of the wish to spend equitable amounts of time in Rakhine and Kachin in 2014, versus last year where Rakhine demanded more visits. 	<p>CC to follow-up with ACTED in regards to data/IM gaps for Kachin & Northern Shan.</p> <p>NFIs to be on agenda for next Cluster meeting.</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:

- *OCHA Inter-Agency Mission to La Na Zup & Bum Tsit Pa Report, Kachin State, 12th - 17th January '14;*
- *Nget Chaung IDP Camp Pauktaw - Burnt Shelters, December 2013;*

- Ariel photo of destroyed shelters in Sin Tet Maw IDP Camp, Pauktaw Township;
- Designs of LWF Fire Points & examples of Certificates of Training;
- *Myebon Muslim IDPs' relocation request*, Protection Sector Advocacy Note, 19 December 2013;
- *Myebon Joint Mission Statement*, Embassy of Switzerland, Embassy of the Republic of Turkey, Embassy of the United States of America & Delegation of the European Union, 30 December 2013
- Shelter and NFI submissions for *2014 Myanmar Strategic Response Plan*, Rakhine and Kachin and Northern Shan and CCCM for Rakhine;
- *NRC Mobile Camp Management Training & Coaching Project*, 22.1.'14;
- *WasH Cluster & Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Funding Priority Paper*, 2014 CERF Underfunded First Round;
- OCHA-led Myanmar Cluster-Sector Coordination Review Workshop, 7.11.'13 - covering Email;
- OCHA-led Myanmar Cluster-Sector Coordination Review Workshop, 7.11.'13 – Actions;
- Inter Sector Meeting Minutes, 11.12.'13.



Ariel photo of destroyed shelters in Sin Tet Maw IDP Camp, Pauktaw Township, January 2014



Examples of permanent houses in Thandwe not destroyed by fire/violence, December 2013



Examples of permanent houses in Thandwe that were not destroyed by fire/violence, December 2013



Department of Rural Development Constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013



Department of Rural Development Constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013



Department of Rural Development Constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013



IDP/Self-constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013

IDP/Self-constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013

IDP/Self-constructed Houses in Thandwe, December 2013