The purpose of this paper is to set out the CCCM Cluster’s position on area-based approaches including operational considerations and opportunities they may have for CCCM actors. Based on an earlier desktop publication\(^1\), recent field experiences and their documentation\(^2\), as well as extensive debate among practitioners\(^3\), this paper highlights the relevance of CCCM activities and skill sets in applying area-based approaches in humanitarian responses in order to address some of the pertinent challenges in camp-like settings as well as dispersed contexts.

Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) was born out of the need to assign responsibility for ensuring: participation and representation of displaced populations living in camp and camp-like settings; access to assistance and protection within a safe environment; monitored and coordinated services and activities within and between sites.

However, as displacement trends intensify in complexity, becoming more urban and protracted in nature, a majority of displaced populations have access to a wider range of settlement options outside of camps/camp-like settings, alongside the understanding that the establishment of camps is a last resort. Unfortunately, this has not necessarily translated to increased access to assistance and protection. After exhausting all other options, growing numbers of displaced persons choose to or are left with no other choice than to live with limited or no access to assistance and protection alongside marginalised and vulnerable host population groups. These factors have increased the need to develop context-specific operational responses that address the needs of the displaced persons and uphold their basic rights, irrespective of the displacement settings, through improving their access to information, protection and services as well as meaningful representation.

In response, CCCM practitioners have reflected on the challenges and opportunities posed by the changing displacement realities and have explored, documented and piloted new innovative approaches\(^4\), where CCCM actors are applying their skill sets to assist displaced populations with access to information, protection and services living in dispersed displacement settings and involving communities in decision making and response planning processes. These CCCM approaches fall within the wider ‘concept of area-based approaches’. The most widely discussed and agreed upon components that characterise area-based approaches and set them apart from other humanitarian response approaches are:\(^5\)

1. Targeting of **specific geographic areas** delineated by physical and/or social and/or administrative boundaries with high levels of need – these could vary in scale from small neighbourhoods or villages, up to a whole town or city.
2. Active engagement of **multiple and diverse stakeholders** present in the target area, including local government, civil society, international humanitarian and development actors, the private sector, and the affected communities.
3. Provision of **multi-sectoral support** that addresses a range of (though not necessarily all) needs with consideration of the **whole population** of the target area (including all affected people regardless of their legal status, risk category, nationality, etc.). Thereby potentially providing a degree of assistance to the whole population (whether at individual/household levels for the most vulnerable, or at communal levels benefiting most or all individuals residing in the area).
2. The relevance of CCCM actors in area-based responses

Though CCCM has traditionally been applied to camps/camp-like settings and other types of collective sites, its resources and skill set are highly relevant to address the challenges faced by displaced persons settling outside of camps.

Camp/Site Management operations generally aim to address these key responsibilities:

1. Ensuring participation and representation through establishing and supporting mechanisms for community engagement, governance and self-management.
2. Ensuring dignified and equal access to information and feedback mechanisms for affected populations and closing the feedback loop, where data and information is protected to safeguard from potential harm.
3. Coordinating multiple stakeholders in ‘a geographical area’ – such as a camp/camp-like setting or other type of collective site – with local authorities, host community and service sectors (including information management) to facilitate the delivery of efficient, quality, and accountable assistance and protection and monitoring of humanitarian standards.
4. Advocacy and facilitation of discussion and exploration for Durable Solutions.

These responsibilities address needs of the affected population relevant across different displacement contexts and typologies, and are not only relevant to camp/camp-like settings or collective sites. They address core challenges commonly faced by displaced populations including:

- Lack of access to reliable information and feedback mechanisms,
- Exclusion from humanitarian situation assessments, response planning and decision making processes,
- Inability to locate and communicate with the most vulnerable displaced households/individuals, due to their dispersed living arrangements and the consequent lack of data on their needs,
- Lack of capacities and resources of localised community coordination mechanisms among a plethora of responders, including local governments and service providers,
- Complex and inconsistent procedures for accessing assistance and protection,
- Lack of, or incoherent, approach to community engagement – with multiple or even competing community leadership structures,
- Complex layers of problems pertaining to humanitarian, security, and development needs.

This is illustrated by a recent CCCM area-based case study compilation, where the framework of area-based approaches was adopted. In those examples, CCCM actors were able to address the needs of displaced populations outside of camps by:

- Setting up community hubs with the affected communities (displaced and non-displaced), therefore providing a point of contact for localised, area-based coordination and facilitating access to information and referrals,
- Establishing and/or supporting community governance structures and mechanisms through capacity building, facilitation, and consultation processes,
- Establishing, where needed, and supporting existing mechanisms and procedures for coordination and information management,
- Taking an open-minded, flexible, holistic, and multi-sectorial approach to the needs and priorities of the affected population,
- Establishing skilled teams (e.g. mobile outreach teams with diverse skill sets) on the ground to work closely with all communities and population groups,
- Creating diverse channels for Communication with Communities.
3. Links between CCCM framework and area-based approaches

A camp or other collective site is akin to a ‘specific geographical area’. Within a camp, CCCM is responsible for actively involving multiple stakeholders through inclusive coordination mechanisms, with the aim of thereby ensuring coordinated, multi-sectoral service delivery for the whole population of the camp. CCCM activities and tools inherently lend themselves to an area-based programming, applied through the CCCM skill set. Based on the case studies and operational experiences, the ‘specific geographical area’ for CCCM’s area-based approach can be best applied to:

- High density, urban areas with a high concentration of displaced communities – including those living in collective centres and small spontaneous sites, e.g. neighbourhoods accommodating displaced people alongside other populations;
- Dispersed rural areas with numerous smaller sites within an administrative boundary, e.g. districts where displaced populations also live close to host communities, relying on their services and infrastructures.

That said, a shift in priorities is required when adapting CCCM activities to area-based programming and area-based coordination. Particular consideration should be given to the following points:

1. While a camp or collective site for displaced people is normally assumed to be a temporary accommodation for the displaced, even if the reality is different, an area hosting displaced people is not temporary. The neighbourhood, village or town and its communities have a past, present and future and will remain there regardless of whether or not the displaced remain. As such, it is imperative that CCCM interventions consider longer term plans, needs and the resilience of the area’s communities, for example, by bringing wider urban or rural development stakeholders and plans into the coordination processes.

2. In settings outside of camps, central and local governments normally have the coordination responsibilities, and so the priority should be on building partnership with relevant authorities to provide them with support for the coordination and management of integrated multi-sectoral service delivery and protection, rather than taking full leadership over coordination at the area level, unless this is delegated by the relevant authority.

3. Since most area-based approaches target a neighbourhood or village and aim to engage multiple stakeholders therein, it is imperative to engage a diverse range of stakeholders that might not be involved in a camp-based displacement response. Foremost are the local host communities, local authorities, landlords, private businesses and service providers, as well as development and stabilisation actors.

4. Host communities must be considered alongside affected families, which means including them in activities such as community governance structures, and ensuring that they have equal access to feedback mechanisms, information, assistance and solutions according to their needs and vulnerabilities.

5. Within a camp, CCCM actors have a responsibility to set up a community governance mechanism for the camp, often entirely from scratch; however, outside of a camp or camp-like setting, it is likely that various layers and structures of formal and informal community governance already exist. This means that the focus in community participation and management must be adapted to and built around existing community governance mechanisms and support these existing structures to become representative of the whole community.

6. A certain level of service provision may already exist in an area, but it may be overwhelmed due to the influx of displaced populations and/or exclude populations from outside the area. The focus is to ensure such service provision is strengthened and inclusive.
4. Coordination ‘within’ and ‘between’ areas

In CCCM, coordination generally takes place at two levels:

1. Intra-camp: coordination within camps to ensure coordinated and appropriate service delivery within the camp.
2. Inter-camp: coordination between camps to ensure consistency in standards of service and approaches to coordination and management at camp-level.

Both levels of coordination are also necessary in area-based approaches – within the areas, and between the areas.

While CCCM generally takes on a leading role in establishing and facilitating mechanisms for coordination between and within camps/collective sites, coordination of an area-based approach would ideally fall under the leadership of local authorities with the support of CCCM actors who are able to bring significant expertise and experience to area-based coordination at a sub-national level\(^{xiv}\). This includes:

1. Conducting assessment and mapping of areas, needs and gaps,
2. Helping to identify and bring together multiple stakeholders to ensure inclusive coordination at a localised level – building on existing platforms (where they exist) or establishing new ones (if needed),
3. Helping to set up information management mechanisms to allow standardised data collection and reporting between and within areas,
4. Capacity building for authorities and other stakeholders in theory and practice of coordination, including information management,
5. Establishing structures and building the capacity\(^{xv}\) of community members for coordination, and to enable and encourage their inclusion in coordination mechanisms\(^{xvi}\).

The potential for CCCM coordination expertise at a localised level to be applied also depends on broader changes in the humanitarian coordination architecture, which allow for (a) creation and recognition of area-based multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms, and (b) assignment of coordination (or ‘support to coordination’) mandates for both inter-area and intra-area coordination.

5. The link between area-based approaches and the humanitarian-development nexus

When CCCM is adapted to displacement contexts outside of camps/camp-like settings through an area-based approach, it is intrinsically well-placed to support not only the first response to crises and displacement, but also to the recovery from crises, and ongoing or subsequent development. This is due to the unique CCCM skill set in terms of establishing and supporting inclusive, multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral platforms for localised communication and community-led coordination and collaboration.
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