

Minutes of Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting

14.00-15.30, Thursday, 6 August 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: ACTED, ADB, ADRA Myanmar, CDN-ZOA, CHRO, DRC, ECHO, Embassies [Australia, Finland, Germany, Thailand, Sweden], ICRC, IOM, MedAir, Malteser International, , IFRC, KMSS, Metta, NRC, Protection Sector Lead, UNOCHA, UNOPS, UNHCR Programme and External Relations, UNOCHA.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
Overview	<p>An overview of developments was provided by Chair. Information available to date demonstrates a situation in which the scale of damage varies from place to place. According to RRD, an accumulative number of over 39,000 households have been temporarily displaced. The Government has been active in responding, and there has been a large outpouring of public and private support, with community based organisations playing the role of first responders. Cash is being collected from community level, and queues of in-kind support are pending delivery to affected areas. Assessments are emanating from Rakhine State, but assessments from other areas are only slowly emerging and some (MRCS) are just starting.</p> <p>UNHCR and partners in Rakhine have conducted assessments of IDP camps and areas in Minbya, Kyauktaw and Mrauk-Oo. Some 21,000 displaced are affected from 24 camps.</p> <p>Joint assessments found that 7,330 houses have been damaged and 3,385 houses have been destroyed in northern Rakhine. Houses in other townships in Rakhine State have also sustained damage due to flood waters and winds. Township Authorities and agencies are still assessing the impact to determine needs. Sixteen of 130 evacuation centres remain open. Agencies have distributed NFIs, including blankets, mats and buckets, to 1,000 households in northern Rakhine</p>	<p>Action: Assessment data from northern Rakhine State available at request.</p>

	<p>State.</p> <p>In Hakha, Chin State, over 6,600 people have been displaced in 13 locations. Evacuation sites include schools, monasteries and community facilities.</p> <p>Access to affected areas remains a significant challenge due to impassable roads, large debris in rivers. Displacement figures are changing daily as some people return to their homes and places of origin. Others are newly evacuated as flood waters move southward to other parts of the country Bago and Ayeryawaddy.</p> <p>Agencies at the meeting offered updates on some areas, noting that along the Ayeryawaddy there are likely to be significant areas inundated/affected, and that rural areas are the hardest so far to map needs. Save the Children is active in Magway and helping with coordination. Many of the community-based actors lack coordination structures. Reports from the groups on the ground and the RDD often vary in information. Reports of 37,000 affected in Magway, 46 villages submerged.</p> <p>The MRCS, according to IFRC, has been developing some good information on Magway and Sagaing. No figures available on shelter needs, but has displacement figures. Emergency response teams have been dispatched, NFIs, but awaiting more information. In process of prioritizing where it is putting assistance in these areas.</p>	
<p>Update on HCT+ meeting</p>	<p>UNHCR briefed on the HCT+ meeting, in particular a discussion around what structures would be necessary for the response. It was noted at the meeting by participants that the response in progress involves both life-saving and recovery aspects simultaneously not least in view of the damage to agricultural land and livestock also considering that planting season will be over in a few weeks. LIFT and 3 MGD informed about possible flexibility in existing programmes. There were questions also around how the authorities were planning to the manage response.</p>	

<p>Update on MoSWRR NPT meeting</p>	<p>A meeting in NPT on 5 August by the Deputy Minister/MoSWRR at which several INGOs/UN/donors were present, which discussed the activation of an Emergency Operations Centre. The Deputy Minister informed that the Emergency Operation Center on the national level is active and thanked agencies that would second staff to support them (OCHA, UNDP, MIMU and MRCS). Support is targeting information management and sharing as well as other coordination. He noted that the EOC role is to ensure that collaboration between the region/state governments and the international community would take place smoothly. The EOC has requested assistance from OCHA with assessments (there was mention of assessment teams and action plans for rehabilitation to be worked out based on the assessments but no further details).</p> <p>The Deputy Minister emphasized that that there is a need for cash assistance in the response. He explained that taking lessons from Nargis cash was primarily needed for recovery and in kind assistance for the initial emergency response. He emphasized that an equal share of cash and in kind is necessary as of now. If only in kind assistance is provided, cash circulation will drop as will employment which was an issue encountered during Cyclone Nargis.</p> <p>This body will also deal with community fundraising efforts and receive cash. Respondents at the meeting highlighted the different modalities for handling cash, such as cash for food, as a way of seeking clarification on the modality that the EOC would plan to use and distribution; including pointing to valuable expertise among agencies that might assist. However, each situation would need to be assessed for appropriateness of the cash intervention and risks. Further information relayed on a letter received from MoFA on request to join a cash donation ceremony, but noted that many donors and agencies at the table would likely not have the ability to participate.</p>	
<p>Discussion on current situation</p>	<p>Questions were raised in discussion around ways to deal with the fluidity in the current situation with floods receding and people returning to their homes or places of origin. It was noted that it was important that the Cluster remain flexible in its response even if evacuation centres close. It was noted that many isolated rural areas are out of reach. Chair noted that it was important not to get stuck in idea of camps and displacement, it is premature to talk about IDPs. The question</p>	

	<p>was also raised as to what defines ‘affected’. There is a large number affected by the floods. The real task was to find those in need of assistance among the larger group. Current data does not provide this picture. This data is key and should come from government and agencies. Metta also briefed that it is asking its teams to make assessments as well as providing response, including in northern Rakhine State.</p>	
<p>Operational access for agencies to affected areas</p>	<p>One agency raised a concern regarding permission from the authorities to engage in the response, noting that there remained some obstacles even for very well established NGOs. For example, NRC is ready to fly in emergency response team, but temporary blanket permission is not forthcoming in an easy manner to enable this. OCHA noted that there should now be a fast track mechanism.</p>	<p>Action: the matter to be taken up by OCHA with the Emergency Operational Centre and other appropriate authority.</p>
<p>Data collection/assessments</p>	<p>On data collection it was noted that MIRA may not be the best template to capture data required for current response due to the parallel humanitarian/recovery nature of it. MIRA is useful for identification of immediate humanitarian needs. Shelter may also require a separate more technical assessment approach than what a multi-sectoral assessment tool can cater for particularly since the recovery phase is kicking in fast. A meeting at OCHA to discuss an assessment being prepared was taking place simultaneously. A recommendation from UNHCR for the meeting had been the need to take account already of assessments that had been done considering the magnitude of present local and international actors and identify gaps for further assessments and to adjust those to the particular context which will vary from township to township. Collaboration on this with local government is essential. There is an unnecessary risk of raising expectations also. Local NGOs and community organisations also have a lot of data that can be tapped. There is a need to understand what is being collected, where and by which groups/agencies. A key challenge will be figuring out what is happening in rural areas.</p>	
<p>Lessons learned</p>	<p>DRC raised the need to examine lessons from Nargis, potentially through OCHA where this could be discussed and lessons shared with current actors, and how this might help design the type of</p>	<p>Action: Follow-up discussion on how this might be</p>

	data that is collected. This recommendation was supported.	developed.
CERF	Chair briefed on HCT intention to put forward needs under CERF Rapid Response window. The implementation period will be 4 months, and potentially USD 3m or over. UNHCR briefed on an application it has put forward for 0.5m USD for shelter repair in IDP sites, return IDP areas, and others affected in Rakhine to support needs, albeit on a limited scale, across communities. The intention is to work with the authorities and other shelter actors to address needs. IOM briefed on an application under CERF RR for shelter toolkits for 10,000 households, and CCCM activities that would focus on Chin, Magway and Sagaing, as well as supporting efforts in Rakhine.	
IFRC appeal	IFRC briefed on the joint Red Cross society emergency appeal and activities that will be supported by DREF. The lack of data at present has made this a harder process. Working with MRCS which is able to respond well in all areas due to strong on the ground presence through volunteers and established networks. Will be providing households kits and shelter toolkits. This intention to assist has been advised to CERF as part of building a picture of which actors will be operational on shelter.	
Protection/advocacy	<p>The Protection Sector advised on advocacy it had proposed to the HCT+, that the current situation take account of the need for continued consideration of the need for displaced persons to be allowed to safely return to places of origin, over being forced to remain in areas that are unsafe due to floods. This is a continuation of the advocacy around the need for durable solutions for IDPs that predate the cyclone effects.</p> <p>It was further noted that in areas where IDP return has been recently promoted, there is a need to be cautious in how this is approached, in particular as people in both communities now require shelter assistance. Assisting IDPs alone is not an option as it would only create divisions and conflict risks. The response needs to be resourceful enough to ensure a response adequate for all communities. There is equally a need to ensure no discrimination in assistance, and need to lift</p>	<p>Action: The four advocacy messages promoted to the HCT will be shared with Shelter Cluster so that all actors can incorporate these in discussions with interlocutors.</p>

	restrictions on freedom of movement (e.g. for life-saving access to hospitals).	
3Ws	OCHA is asking clusters/sectors to update 3Ws for the flood response. E-mail will have been sent to agencies and responses encouraged.	
OCHA reporting	Clusters/sectors are being asked to twice weekly supply an update for OCHA's consolidation. Rate will be twice a week for the next two weeks and then reviewed. Cluster partners encouraged to share information, in particular with Shelter lead.	
ERF	OCHA briefed on the fact that ERF will now be available, though the exact amount available is not yet decided/announced. Donors were encouraged to support ERF which will be open for application to NGOs. The idea is for CERF/ERF to complement one another in the prioritization of funding. The funds will target shelter, WASH, food, health, protection, among other priorities.	
Response Plan	OCHA also briefed on the idea that a response plan may be developed for the flood situation, but a discussion on this will be had further at the HCT before it goes ahead. Inputs into the strategy will also be welcomed by donors.	
Cluster roles	The Chair briefed on discussions that have been held, including at HCT+, on the shape of the cluster response. The HCT has decided not to create new cluster/sector leads at present time. Shelter and NFI coordination does not hinge on UNHCR being in Sagaing or Magway, or other affected areas. There will be a review if necessary of the response shift in coming weeks to something larger or more complicated. UNHCR, IOM and IFRC have discussed this also given the natural disaster dimension of the response and their specific roles. IFRC says it is possible to muster shelter cluster coordination resources, but doesn't make sense to have parallel cluster leads. Under present cluster can offer some support in non-Rakhine areas. If Shelter Cluster endorses HCT approach, this is fine with IFRC. If after any review down the road, IFRC is willing to adopt Cluster lead role if agreed. IOM also willing to review further into the response if changes required regarding its role for CCCM although this is not foreseen as likely for the floods	Action: Review further as the response develops, as necessary.



	situation.	
Cash based assistance	A brief discussion was held on cash based assistance and the idea of having a selected meeting to offer best examples of how this can be carried out in Myanmar, potentially enjoying CALP.	Action: DRC to explore CALP and report back. OCHA to support with this activity since it is a cross sectoral theme.