

Minutes of Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting

10:00 – 1200, Wednesday, 24 June 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: DRC, Trocaire, German Embassy, Australian Embassy, HD Centre, LWF, UNHCR, IOM, Food Security Sector & ECHO

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	Introductions were done. Thanks were given to DRC and LWF who had just had been involved with an audit of UNHCR Myanmar, which included looking at the agency's coordination responsibilities. Minutes of 5 June "Extraordinary" meeting were accepted and will be posted online at the usual location: http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4632 .	
2. Actions from Previous Meeting	CC went through the other actions and gave a summary update on them and their status. One issue that remains outstanding is clarity from World Vision (WV) needed on whether they could address quality issues in Shan, name of location being "KBC Cultural Compound". Cluster Lead in YGN had been chasing them for feedback but still no response. Said they would reply to CC 23 March.	
3. Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Displacement	<p>UNHCR Protection Officer took to the floor to give a detailed/insightful talk on preventing sexual exploitation. This is obviously an important issue for the UN(HCR). Talk included discussion of complaints mechanisms in camps. UN/partners have a responsibility not only to reduce abuse but capture those cases, report and follow up where they arise. Partners mentioned some existing mechanisms. However, the Protection Officer reiterated that there are mechanisms but they don't meet our obligations currently. A film detailing the definition for sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and whom it applies to was shown: http://www.pseataforce.org/en/tools/search/to%20serve%20with%20pride-----</p> <p>Protection Officer detailed/shared Secretary General UN bulletin in 2013 about the mandatory obligation to report on gender based violence, whether perpetrated by UN or affiliated partners. Key themes of slides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who it applies to...everyone including partners and uniformed personnel; • When...during work hours and outside; • Definition; • Analysis of risks in Myanmar. Participants were asked to identify risks in this area. Responses included "food distribution", not just in camps but also remote places. Where the camps are smaller and in remote places, DRC mentioned CMCs and kick-backs, displacement due to emergency and where there is a high concentration of women and children in specific areas. 	

	<p>Discussion on SEA in IDP camp contexts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cluster partner noted there have been complaints in Rakhine. However, needs to be better mechanisms that target SEA, specifically. • Training has been done in Rakhine regarding SEA. Bit of a gap regarding Kachin and Northern Shan States (NSS) reporting mechanism for SEA, more needs to be done in these areas; education was mentioned. • LWF noted referral pathways in Sittwe and their monthly report notes complaints. <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review to see if existing mechanisms are effective. UNHCR will be working with the camps/as appropriate. • UNHCR nominated focal points in each of their offices, which includes training for these focal points. • Information campaign is/will be performed for communities, using pamphlets with graphics. A SEA specific phone line was also discussed. • Timeline is to get something up and running by the end of the year. • UNHCR Protection Officer happy to hold meetings with interested partners to establish joined approach. • DRC reiterate they are happy to engage with UNHCR on this matter and discussion with other partners will be occurring. 	
<p>4. Release of Round 3 Camp Profiling Data for Kachin/Shan & IOM Kachin IM Impressions</p>	<p>Now three rounds of camp profiling have been completed 2013-2015. The first two are available: http://www.sheltercluster.org/hub/kachinshan, while the latest was now being distributed in the flash drives at this meeting. One omission is the analysis on place of origin, albeit two maps that offer some insight were shared. Overall agreement that this was a good process that was done collectively across partners and local NGOs. More analysis of the data can be done and JIPs is currently offering support.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 141 sites, and 2 sites in host communities, 2013-2015 trend says numbers have gone up. • Registration has happened in camps and complaint mechanism coverage increased. • Number of new arrivals for this year is modest compared to subsequent years. • Drilling down into the trends per sectors: shelter is fairly consistent, health in rural areas declined in terms of access, large market access is fairly consistent, access to schools in urban areas and tertiary education access has gone down. <p>Discussion ensued on ‘places of origin’ issue and feasibility to return and if this issue needs to be answered here or at another level. Clear consensus was that this was <i>not</i> the forum to decide. Cluster Coordinator (CC) stated that the key priorities for this cluster in terms of CCCM are improving the lives of people in camps. Beyond that Cluster can contribute to that debate but the debate is bigger than <i>this</i> Cluster.</p> <p>Trocaire noted there hasn’t been much movement in terms of LNGOs. Their strategy appears to remain prioritising obtaining more funds. Cluster Lead agreed. Consensus was there seems to be strong resistance to discuss ways forward despite funds</p>	

	<p>available likely to reduce. As an example, the Cluster Lead UNHCR spends a million on camp management, camp focal points and camp running costs/year; to assume this will continue indefinitely is wrong. Some feel that resources aren't being used as efficiently as they could and not targeted towards the vulnerable. General consensus was to address this issue. CC has been pushing for meetings with these LNGOs since January, nothing has materialised.</p> <p>Food Security Sector (FSS) asked if this profiling available for other areas of return outside the camps? Cluster Lead noted that it had done three rounds of camp profiling but would not and does not have the capacity to extend to outside camps. That being said, with the support of NRC there was mission to explore the displaced living outside camps and in urban areas, "UDOC". A presentation was given 1 April and had been circulated but the final report was still outstanding from NRC. Also noted that UNDP is aiming to undertake a socio economic survey for Kachin/Shan. Here and in the field there had been input given.</p> <p>IOM has now recruited an IM Officer in YGN; his remit includes supporting the Cluster. He had just returned from a scouting mission to Kachin/Shan and shared initial thoughts.</p>	<p>Trocaire and UNHCR to discuss and make arrangements for a meeting between relevant partners/LNGOs</p> <p>CC link FSS with UNHCR Information Manager</p> <p>Cluster Lead still to obtain final NRC UDOC report</p>
<p>5. Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (& CERF)</p>	<p>Unsure if Myanmar will be selected for CERF, but "reasonable probability". OCHA approach this year is to have conversations with the Cluster leads about proposal, geographic, sectors and identify ideas about how we should/would use this money. Conversations have started. Preliminary indications were that overall needs were most acute for shelter in Kachin/Shan but further discussions/consultations needed. Had been some initial discussions with WaSH Cluster to repeat what was done last year, joint submission. CC stressed that current funding levels for this Cluster are not reflected in OCHA's public information. Funding this year is reasonable, with the exception of shelter for Kachin/Shan, where there is a gap.¹</p>	
<p>6. Contingency Planning Capacity</p>	<p>Combining basic NFI stocks from all partners, including the Cluster Lead, shows a contingency stock for 10,000 households. This equates to approximately 50,000 people. While this could be viewed as reasonable, the OCHA contingency scenario requires planning for 500,000. An additional process is underway to see what additional stocks, including within the region, are available.²</p>	<p>Cluster Lead to continue to chase up other agencies regarding contingency stocks</p>

¹ Though not mentioned in the meeting, on the matter of the **ERF Myanmar** the Advisory Board of the Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (ERF) met 20 May 2015 to review and discuss the 2015 ERF resource mobilization strategy, endorse the new global guidelines "Operational Handbook for Country-based Pooled Funds" and determine schedule for next ERF allocation. The Board agreed to set the goal at \$7 million. Current donors agreed to advocate with other prospective donors including Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Finland, Switzerland and OCHA for Turkey in order to broaden the donor base. The board supported the combined effort of aligning ERF next Call-for-Proposals with the possible Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) under-funded allocation, set for July.

² Following the meeting OCHA circulated the updated HCT Emergency Response Preparedness Plan (ERPP) which has just been revised and updated. The plan was based on IASC guidance for Inter-Agency Emergency Response Preparedness as an action-oriented approach to enhance readiness for humanitarian response. The ERP approach has three components: i) Risk Assessment and Monitoring, ii) Minimum Preparedness Actions, and iii) Advanced Preparedness Actions and Contingency Plan. The Emergency Response Plan Working Group (ERP WG), composed of HCT members, local NGOs, Myanmar Red Cross Society and other interested organizations, agreed to develop, in addition to Rakhine Contingency Plan, scenario planning for a cyclone in Ayevarwaddy and an earthquake in Mandalay. This revision also incorporates recommendations from simulation exercises conducted, which identified key preparedness and response concerns to be explored as well as best practices, lessons learned and solutions proposed. The ERPP is intended to be a live document and regular monitoring and updates will take place during the year. As a next step, the ERPP will be presented to the Relief and Resettlement Department in Nay Pyi Taw and a workshop will be conducted to present the Rakhine Cyclone Contingency Plan to the Rakhine State

<p>Updates on Flooding in Myanmar³</p>	<p>OCHA Update: Seasonal Flooding in Rakhine State (27 June 2015) Heavy rains reported across Rakhine State for the past five days and have led to localised flooding in various parts of the state, with Buthidaung and Thandwe Townships the most affected. International organizations have offered their assistance to the Rakhine State Government, should it be required. Roads and bridges across the state have also been affected by landslides and flooding. The local authorities, MRCS and local civil society provided assistance to those evacuated, including food and water. OCHA and partners have offered their support and assistance. The Rakhine State Government will hold its disaster management meeting on Sunday, 28 June, morning, and deploy assessment teams and inform international organization if required. OCHA and other organizations have accepted an invitation to accompany some of these trips to the most-affected areas.</p> <p>OCHA Update: Seasonal Flooding in Rakhine State (6 July 2015) 2 July the Government activated its newly established Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) in Nay Pyi Taw specifically in response to the flooding. In Rakhine State, the OCHA office in Sittwe is liaising closely with the authorities and has coordinated joint assessments with UNICEF, UNHCR and UNDP in conjunction with the Rakhine State authorities. While the EOC numbers for partially damaged houses in Rakhine State appear high (1,815), the joint assessment team and Rakhine State authorities report that only 352 houses have been seriously damaged and only 281 households forced to temporarily relocate to evacuation/rescue centres and host families. So there are big discrepancies and we will continue to liaise with the EOC, RRD and State authorities to clarify/reconcile figures. All of the temporarily relocated households in Buthidaung and Kyauktaw have now returned. In the most seriously affected township of Ann, 114 households remains displaced and are still staying with relatives and host families. Reconstruction of 114 houses will probably be necessary. In all locations teams report that the authorities have been able to adequately manage the response within their capacity and have provided assistance when and where required to the different households. OCHA is closely monitoring the situation. Additional updates are also posted on the OCHA Myanmar Facebook www.facebook.com/ochamyanmar.</p>	
<p>Update: Information on Kokang provided by the Government⁴</p>	<p>12 June, OCHA met with the Deputy Minister of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement in his capacity as Secretary of the Rehabilitation and Administrative Support Committee for the Kokang Self-Administered Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Government figures, Kokang had a pre-conflict population of 126,000. Of these, it is estimated that about 70,000 remain displaced. Of the 70,000 people who remain displaced, an estimated 56,000 are in China. • Main humanitarian needs of returnees identified were food and shelter. The Government identified the following reception centres for returnees: Tar Shwe Htan; Par Sin Kyaw; and Laukkaing. <p>17 June, OCHA and WFP in Lashio met with the Director of the Relief and Resettlement Department (RRD) for Shan State, who had just returned from a visit to Laukkaing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director suggested that authorisation would need to be provided by the President for international organisations to star relief assistance. 	

Government. As circulated with these minutes ANNEX 1 - Rakhine Contingency Plan, ANNEX 2 - Rakhine Contingency Plan Sector Standard Operating Procedures, ANNEX 3A - Ayeyarwaddy Cyclone Scenario Planning Summary, ANNEX 3B - Mandalay Earthquake Scenario Planning Summary.

³ Although this topic was not raised in the meeting, by way of these minutes an update on the recent flooding in Myanmar is included.

⁴ Although this topic was not raised in the meeting, by way of these minutes an update on the Kokang situation is included.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security situation seems stable, except for Maw Htike area in the North. The government is providing some assistance to the returnees (including food and NFIs), together with the Kokang Youth Organisation (who is also providing cash). • No intention to establish IDP camps. • Since 12 June, people have been returning at the rate of approximately 100-200 people per day. Many people are not returning yet because there are still a significant number of troops in the villages. Although no assessment has been made, the government estimates that there is some level of damage in most villages. Once granted access, coordination can occur in Laukkaing, between the Government of Myanmar, military and international organisations. <p>24 June, the RC/HC and OCHA met Minister U Hla Tun (Chair of the Rehabilitation and Administrative Support Committee for the Kokang Self-Administered Zone):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government will provide both humanitarian and recovery/reconstruction assistance to the returnees. • Assistance will be managed by the Committee which the Minister chairs. The Committee will welcome support to implement its Plan of Action, of which only some elements were shared. The government is currently compiling more detailed reports of needs for temporary shelters, food and other assistance, and will share this data once available. • Minister mentioned that given that the region is still an area of active conflict; any travel would need to be cleared by the Tatmadaw. 	
<p>7. Rakhine</p> <p>I. Shelter</p>	<p>i. Update on funding & meeting the Chief Minister</p> <p>It looks likely that UNHCR will support RSG process to tune of US\$1 million, following strong donor support and clear support across the Cluster.⁵ Additionally another donor will directly support with a further US\$3 million. UNHCR working with LWF will opt for cash-based assistance. <i>If</i> all these channels of assistance materialise and are able to be delivered as planned, this should offer enough resources to ensure the initial RSG target of 5,000 IDP HH receives individual housing assistance. Emphasis was made to highlight that UNHCR is providing assistance to a Government of Myanmar process, a point that was stated more than once by the UNHCR Representative who recently met the Chief Minister for Rakhine with the CC, in Sittwe.</p> <p>ii. Handing-over of permanent houses</p> <p>As part of the aforementioned mission, there was also an opportunity for UNHCR funded houses for displaced Myramagyi from 2012 to be officially handed over to the displaced. The ceremony had gone well. Following formalities, the next day it was reported that following a lottery temporary shelters were vacated and the new houses occupied.⁶</p> <p>iii. Rakhine Area Humanitarian Country Team note, 15th June '15</p> <p>The CC highlighted a recent document that emerged from the OCHA hosted/chaired Rakhine Area Humanitarian Country Team, 15 June, Sittwe.</p> <p><i>The following points were agreed by the Rakhine AHCT members at the joint AHCT /ICCG and it was agreed to submit them</i></p>	

⁵ See minutes from previous national Cluster meeting, 5 June: <http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4632>.

⁶ For *FACTSHEET (for) INDIVIDUAL HOUSES IN SET YONE SU-1 IDP CAMP, June 2015* and site plan in Rakhine zip file as circulated with minutes contact Cluster Coordinator (benson@unhcr.org).

<p>II. UNDP Livelihood Survey & Funding</p>	<p><i>as the way forward to acknowledge the end of displacement and shifting in humanitarian assistance with particular focus in Zone 1 as follow:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The majority of formerly displaced people in Zone 1 have returned to their plots of origin and have:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Received funds and built individual houses;</i> <i>Used their own money to build;</i> <i>Received a private loan/advance against a government promise and have built or are ready to build;</i> <i>Used existing materials and made makeshift housing.</i> <p><i>While problems remain, displacement is ending in Zone 1, which requires a shift from humanitarian planning and implementation to a more inclusive, development-based approach and modus operandi.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>On a case-by-case basis, humanitarian organizations should reduce assistance to formerly displaced people in Zone 1 with a view to phase out residual humanitarian assistance (GFD and NFI) within 6 months or as assessed.</i> <i>Reducing humanitarian assistance will be based on needs. Needs will be assessed by the sector/clusters and they will revise their approach and programs accordingly, with a view to reducing the overall caseload within 6 months or as assessed. Government planning will need to be taken into account and strong advocacy made to also include villages where displacement has recently ended.</i> <i>There is a need for the international community's advocacy and support to the government to step up their inclusive development interventions in Zone 1.</i> <p>It was noted that UNDP was proceeding with a livelihood survey in the camps and to that end, Simonetta Rossi, based in Sittwe (simonetta.rossi@undp.org) should be contacted for those interested in more details. Also, the Early Recovery (ER) team circulated a request for proposals (RFP) to support the returns in Rakhine. The ER team in Sittwe is organizing a joint meeting in Sittwe, led by RSG (Planning Minister) with UN and INGOs to explain the plan and modalities of engagement.</p>	
<p>8. AOB Quarterly Humanitarian Response Plan reporting</p> <p>Cluster Funding Levels</p> <p>Joint WaSH/shelter/NFI and CCCM meeting, July</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second quarter <i>Humanitarian Response Plan</i> deadline is 8 July. Cluster Lead will do the needful and as ever, share version(s) for comment and discussion. First quarter report is available at: http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4631. Likely that some of the shelter targets for Kachin/Shan will need to be revised down. CC stressed that current funding levels for this Cluster are not reflected in OCHA's public information. Funding this year is reasonable, with the exception of shelter for Kachin/Shan where there is a need/gap.⁷ Next national Cluster meeting will be joined with WaSH, with emphasis on supporting returns. UNICEF will host. 	<p>2nd quarter HRP document to be prepared by Cluster Lead</p>

⁷ Though not mentioned in the meeting, on the matter of the **ERF Myanmar** the Advisory Board of the Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (ERF) met 20 May 2015 to review and discuss the 2015 ERF resource mobilization strategy, endorse the new global guidelines "Operational Handbook for Country-based Pooled Funds" and determine schedule for next ERF allocation. The Board agreed to set the goal at \$7 million. Current donors agreed to advocate with other prospective donors including Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Finland, Switzerland and OCHA for Turkey in order to broaden the donor base. The board supported the combined effort of aligning ERF next Call-for-Proposals with the possible Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) under-funded allocation, set for July.

<p>15, 2015</p> <p>ALNAP – Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a last tangential point, CC noted a recent study to emerge on coordination, ALNAP, “Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters”. A discussion paper was circulated, which highlighted nine key points that can contribute to successful coordination.⁸ The CC was keen to share/garner people’s honest/forthright views in terms of whether members felt this Cluster was succeeding in these areas or not. Criticism, as long as it was constructive, was <i>always</i> welcome. <p>Although the below topics were not raised in the meeting, by way of these minutes the information is shared:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Protection Sector has finalised the <i>Protection Analysis on Kachin and Northern Shan</i>. The analysis was initiated by the Protection Sector in the second half of 2014 and is the result of a qualitative threat analysis conducted jointly by protection actors in the field, complemented by an extensive desk review finalised in the first half of 2015. The report is for internal use only and its circulation is restricted. Therefore, if you should require a copy of the analysis please contact Amber Larsen on (LARSENA@unhcr.org). There is a two-day <i>Gender Equality Programming in Emergencies</i> training for all Yangon-based Cluster/Sector Gender Focal Points, kindly hosted by UNICEF from Tuesday July 14th to Wednesday July 15th, starting at 08:30 every day, and ending by 17:00. Those who wish to attend should contact Sabai David david6@un.org. 	<p>Members to provide any feedback, if applicable</p>
--	--	--

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, 13.5.'15;*
- Shelter-NFI-CCCM YGN Cluster Meeting Minutes, 5.6.'15.*

HCT-OCHA

- WHO vacancy, Temporary NPO - EHA Unit (2015-9);*
- OCHA ICC Meeting, 22 June '15;*
- Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (ERF) Advisory Board Meeting Summary, 20 May '15;*
- IOM Expanded work on CT & GBV in conflict areas in Myanmar [May, 2015];*
- ICCG CERF Underfunded Consultations, June '15;*

⁸ The following factors were highlighted as important to achieving successful coordination.

- A focus on activities that have direct operational relevance to members (rather than on collecting information for other actors);
- Clear, mutually agreed and respected procedures for information management and decision making;
- Sharing common goals for the purpose of response;
- Trusting relationships and the ability to recognize and resolve conflicts;
- An independent, knowledgeable, respected cluster coordinator;
- Clear divisions between cluster activities/needs and those of cluster lead agencies;
- Clear and agreed roles and responsibilities for cluster members and cluster coordinators;
- Devolvement of sub-national as well as national level clusters with good linkages between these different levels.

- *HCT (draft)*, 19 June 2015;
- *Expanded HCT (draft)*, 19 June 2015;
- *ALNAP, Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters, Discussion Starter*;
- *2015 Humanitarian Response Plan Funding Levels, per Sector*, June 2015.

Kachin-Shan

- *Secretary-General's Bulletin on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse*, 2003;
- *Prevention of Sexual Exploitation & Abuse*, PowerPoint 24.6.'15;
- *Peace Update*, June-July 2015;
- *OCHA Summary of the Findings from DFID Laiza Mission*, June '15;
- *Evaluation on the Performance of Camp Management Committees 2014*;
- *Accountability to Affected Population (AAP) review in Kachin and Rakhine*, OCHA, July '15.

Kachin-Shan Camp Profiling, Round 3

- *Displaced Population Place of Origin (PoO) per Township (Round 3)*, map 1;
- *Displaced Population Place of Origin (PoO) per Township (Round 3)*, map 2;
- *Camp Profiling Comparative Analysis, 2013-2015*.

Rakhine

- *Secretary-General's Bulletin on Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse*, 2003;
- *RFP for ER and Livelihoods Supports to the Returnees and Conflict Affected People in Rakhine State-1*;
- *Rakhine State Inter-Cluster Sector Coordination Meeting*, 16th June '15;
- *Rakhine State Floods Update*, 3 July '15;
- *Rakhine Area Humanitarian Country Team*, 15.6.'15;
- *Protection Sector Update on IDPs movements in Rakhine*, 22 June 2015;
- *Prevention of Sexual Exploitation & Abuse*, PowerPoint 24.6.'15;
- *INGO Rakhine Consultations Report*, April 2015;
- *INGO Briefing Note - Segregation & Assistance to Camps*;
- *INGO Briefing Note – Development*;
- *INGO Briefing Note – Citizenship*;
- *Accountability to Affected Population (AAP) review in Kachin and Rakhine*, OCHA, July '15.