

Minutes of Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting

10:00 – 11:00/30, Wednesday, 21 October 2015

UNHCR Office, Yangon

Attendees: IOM, ADRA, National WaSH Cluster & Rakhine WaSH Cluster, Australian Embassy, IFRC SCT, NRC, OCHA, UNHCR Information Management & UCLA Graduate Student & ECHO

Apologies: DRC & Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of Allix James (JAMES@unhcr.org), here to support the Cluster at the national level till the end of year. Currently here on a placement as part of two year Masters programme in Sweden. Latest <i>Cluster Analysis Reports</i> for Rakhine and Kachin/Shan are now online: http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/data-analysis-rakhine; http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/data-analysis-kachinshan. Cluster Coordinator (CC) had a meeting with IOM to discuss their strategic and operational priorities for 2016. Feed-back given by CC to document being shared with key IOM donor. NRC announced CCCM training at NRC this week. She informed that IOM as well as other agencies and NGOs will be in attendance. Trócaire key sponsor of the training. 	CC to secure Trócaire attendance at next meeting
2. Clear Minutes & Previous Actions	Minutes from the last meeting were cleared and to be uploaded. All actions fulfilled.	
3. Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) & Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)	<p>Planning for next year (2016) was discussed; which breaks-down into two key elements; <i>Humanitarian Needs Overview</i> (HNO) and the <i>Humanitarian Response Plan</i> (HRP). Candid discussions had been held at the last ICCG concerning to what degree clusters/sector feels a humanitarian approach remains valid and/or where, when and how the dynamic should shift or broaden. Points CC had stressed at meeting and in writing (8th October):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Time</i> required to produce last year's literally HRP, tens of hours for this Cluster (alone); Its <i>utility</i> for operational entities that are focused and occupied on delivery of assistance; <i>Appropriateness</i>, noting its humanitarian focus; And the lack of a <i>clear position in terms of its relational relevance to the Government of Myanmar</i>, whose confines within which the international/humanitarian community operates/works. <p>Update of ideas will be presented at the HCT retreat on 22nd October. National WaSH Cluster Coordinator stressed that advocacy was important and need to push (with donors) a more development approach.</p>	

As part of this two document process, OCHA had compiled a draft HNO, which CC had feedback on. Copies of those comments to the overarching section and then specific input for shelter, NFI and CCCM, and caseload numbers were shared in hard copy. Points stressed were as follows:

Overview

- IDP caseload in Rakine, Kachin and Shan combined approximately 240,000 persons. 40 per cent in Kachin/Shan, 60 per cent Rakhine.
- Shelter the need is to provide adequate emergency shelter for new IDPs and thereafter, temporary shelter *if* displacement is to continue. Where feasible, deliver individual housing solutions as part of overall efforts to end displacement. Similarly in CCCM, prepare for life after displacement/continue to improve the lives of those within camps, accepting that their situation remains temporary. For NFIs, ensure basic household needs are met.

Affected Population

- 96,000 conflict-displaced persons in Kachin/Shan are spread over 18 different townships across 166 locations. Half this caseload there is *no* regular access for international agencies due to their location in non-Government controlled areas, major impediment to determining and meeting their needs.
- Rakhine dispersal is less; 67 locations across ten townships. Less dispersal results in heavily populated camps and more challenges. Sittwe Township contains almost 100,000 IDPs, 70 per cent of the entire Rakhine State IDP caseload. Four camps alone each contain over 10,000 individuals; combined almost 50,000 IDPs.

Humanitarian Needs

- In Kachin/Shan, need for mass blanket NFI distributions has passed. Despite pockets of conflict and some displacement, based on past trends the majority of the IDP population is stable. In the last two years number of camps remained constant. Total displaced has increased by 5,000 persons, five percent. Avoiding dependency on aid remains priority. In shelter it remains perpetual cycle of replacing temporary shelters that are sub-standard or no longer habitable or repairing or upgrading existing structures. Opportunities to support individual housing solutions continue to be exploited but are a tiny fraction of the overall caseload. For CCCM primary focus remains capacity-building of CMCs and support to CM agencies to ensure CMCs and CM agencies have the skills to manage the camps.
- Similarly, conflict IDP caseload in Rakhine remains static, increased less than 1 per cent over the last 24 months. Compared to Kachin/Shan the needs are more acute due to crowded conditions, severe restrictions on freedom of movement and access to basic services. Blanket NFI distributions in some areas still needed albeit after a six-month suspension in 2014 the situation has improved. In CCCM needs are three-fold. 1. Humanitarian assistance is well-managed, coordinated, responding to the needs and respecting international standards. 2. Participatory and community based development approaches integrated into planning and implementation of camp management activities to ensure local community solutions, priorities identified and capacities enhanced. 3. When return or relocation is possible IDPs are well-prepared to rebuild their lives permanently within a reasonable amount of time and be able to contribute towards social cohesion. In shelter, while essential care and maintenance of temporary shelters continues, structures designed for two years are over two years old. Priority

	<p>is to continue to support the construction of individual housing solutions, as initiated in 2015.</p> <p>Following on, WaSH Cluster stressed need for more integration between CCCM and WaSH, less dependency, more self-reliance. ECHO noted a recent visit to Northern Shan where they stated that NGOs were doing well but noted there is always room for improvement. Specifically in terms of shelter they had some concerns if Metta shelters were the same size in all locations and concerns about the serrated metal edges. Responding, CC was looking into the size issue. On the matter of serrated edges, was it the responsibility of the Shelter Cluster to activate action on this matter? Overall the quality of the Metta shelters was high and where was the “agency” of the people and their responsibility. If there were sharp edges, was it unreasonable to expect the displaced communities to ensure they were filed down, as needed?</p>	CC to revert on size of Metta shelters
<p>4. NRC Presentation - Urban Displacement and Outside Camps (UDOC) with CCCM Partner – KBC, Kachin State</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kelly Flynn presented on behalf of Raphael Abis. UDOC approach is to encourage something of a paradigm shift in CCCM. Findings were presented in relation to urban displacement that some IDPs were choosing not to go into camps. Instead there were IDPs dispersed in urban/rural areas mixing with migrants and the local communities, sometimes impoverished, who would host them. Some of these rural areas were often very remote and hard to access. Tension within the communities evident. Pressure upon resources which can lead to a disruption of peace and order; a right to education; shelter versus right to worship. In response to the question: “What is the situation of IDPs living outside camps and within host community in Kachin State?” the numbers observed in Kachin were as follows: 2,509HH/13,803 individuals estimated to be living within host community, many with relatives. Issues of cramped shelter conditions and inadequate toilet facilities. Noted that these IDPs living outside camps are not officially registered therefore no entitlements. There is no mechanism where the government registers these people outside of the camp. On durable solutions and early recovery, 100% of IDPs were not ready to return to their place of origin, main reason being: insecurity in areas of return; presence of land mines; damaged infrastructure; basic services and livelihood and continuing human rights violations. A potential return “might” take place in 2016. Using Bhamo and Myitkyina as case studies for the next steps in Kachin, it is important to identify/count IDPs outside the camps. This needs to be done through coordination at a community level; designing an out-of-camp response; looking for durable solutions to end displacement; a whetting of donor interest in looking at the potential for piloting a response. There needs to be advocacy and donor engagement to encourage meaningful CCCM activities in Kachin. A recommendation from the NRC was to advocate for recognition of IDPs outside the camps; mainstream the UDOC to a wider coordination body; to promote access to basic services and protection, as well as campaigning for durable solutions and returnee monitoring. A question put forward by UNICEF was “how can we have a more consolidating process when it comes to registering people outside of the camps?” 	<p>While report would be shared as part of the distribution following this meeting, CC should be contacted directly for those who wanted copy of Power Point: Urban Displacement & Outside Camps (UDOC), NRC-KBC Kachin State</p>
<p>5. Rakhine State Update</p> <p>a. Overview</p> <p>b. TIKA</p>	<p>Though TIKA was not present for today’s meeting CC, remaining in close contact, gave an overall update on shelter and TIKA programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of HH displaced, 25,241. To-date, 1,768 HH by Rakhine State Government (RSG) given individual housing solutions, across five townships. 1,489 HH returns (84%) and 279 HH relocation (16%). 	

- Modality has primarily been cashed based assistance, and overall viewed to have worked well, owner driven construction, approximately 1 Kyats million/HH or US\$830/HH.
- Turkey/TIKA committed with RSG to support another **3,750HH**, US\$4 million available, provisional plan between Turkey & Rakhine State Government for six phases, blend of place of origin and relocation;
- Phase I, approximately 500 HH is Kyauk Taw T/ship, across five sites;
 - UNHCR as Cluster Lead is monitoring very closely, feeding back to Turkey/TIKA, almost weekly. In two sites there were serious concerns about quality and voluntariness and construction quality, the latter due to contractor modality. TIKA subsequently suspended one site and intervened in another to cease building for part of the caseload and demanded upgrades for another;
 - House construction by the community is progressing well in three other return sites in Kyauk T/ship.
 - While originally UNHCR funds were to be used for MraukU and Minbya, TIKA funds will cover both of these T/ships.
- UNHCR pencilled in **1,000 HH** for purely return cases but RSG assigned the Pauktaw and Kyauk Phyu relocation caseload, vast majority in Ah Nauk Ywe, and not willing to proceed due relocation dynamic.
 - RSG proposing another **1,950 HH** as part of this second phase.
 - “Were” those three to happen, plus what has been done, **8,468 HH**, more than one third of entire caseload, 33%, 42,300 individuals would have received an individual housing solution. However, many challenges ahead.

Key Points

- RSG should be commended, especially where it has worked, led from bottom up and top down, modality is impressive;
- Significant donor interest, Turkey has US\$4 million, UNHCR has US\$1 million and USAID confirmed US\$5 million into returnee areas;
- However, concerns regarding recent developments in Kyauktaw – quality of materials and lack of consultation and coercion. IDPs must be consulted;
- Fact is international community is very supportive of returns, ideally *whole* camps – Nget Chaung and Kyein Ni Pyin, not piecemeal.

National and Rakhine sub-national **WaSH** persons responded with the following points:

- Rakhine sub-national WaSH coordinator was keen to stress her support for TIKA programme and that they were clearly taking their commitment to support returns and deliver standards extremely seriously;
- Equally happy with the standard of toilet that TIKA was funding/providing;
- National WaSH Coordinator was keen to encourage joint monitoring missions between UNHCR and UNICEF persons to these sites. Point was noted and would be shared by CC with Sittwe-based colleagues.
- Noting that Kyauk Phyu, Kyauk Ta Lone, was in Phase III, national WaSH Cluster Coordinator noted the position of likelihood of return was not clear and stressed the issue of vulnerability. CC concurred and noted his detailed knowledge of the site was limited. Would defer to Sittwe colleagues.

<p>6. Impressions from Kachin & Northern Shan Mission, September 2015 (time permitting)</p>	<p>Inadequate time to cover this item, deferred for another meeting.</p>	
<p>7. AOB</p> <p>Update on the humanitarian situation in central Shan State</p>	<p><i>On 06 October 2015, fighting broke out between the Myanmar Military and Shan State Army North (SSA-N) forces at the Ta Sam Boo outpost in Mongshu Township, central Shan State. Fighting has continued since then, with eleven villages reportedly affected and/or destroyed. Ta Sam Boo is the main jetty for people from northern Shan State to access the southern and eastern parts of Shan State. Monghsu Township is four hours travel from Lashio and is in a mining area under SSA-N control.</i></p> <p><i>According to local and international organisations in the area, some 2,550 people have so far been displaced from 11 villages to three nearby villages (Hai Pa, Wan Saw and Phak Kee) in Mongnawng Town in Kyethi Township. Those displaced are staying in monasteries and one IDP camp. Some media reports have indicated over 3,500 IDPs in the area (this figure is not confirmed) and that several village tracts in Laikha Township (neighbouring Kyethi) are now also affected by the fighting. Local organizations report that more IDPs could be arriving in the coming days, exceeding local capacity to respond.</i></p> <p><i>IDPs have received food from the Shan National League for Democracy, SSA-N and local donors but the assistance is reportedly insufficient if the IDPs stay longer. According to SCI and local CSOs, no other assistance has so far been provided and IDPs have been staying in makeshift shelters/in monasteries for several weeks without basic household or hygiene items. Shelter, Food, NFIs, Health and WASH are expected to be initial needs. The nearest health facilities for families staying at the camps in Mongnawng are Mongshu Township Hospital which is 20-25 miles away. SCI and Kaw Dai Organisation, a local CSO, have deployed an assessment team to the IDP sites with stocks of basic household items and hygiene kits for initial distributions. The team will reach the area today, 23 October. Relief International is also undertaking a rapid assessment with local CBOs including Shan Youth Network and Shan Women's Action Network who are planning to provide hygiene kits. Other organisations, including those with offices in Lashio, continue to monitor the situation closely and are assessing whether they can provide assistance.</i></p> <p>Going forward, agreed actions (by OCHA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCHA make a map showing displacement in the area. • UN DSS to provide map/analysis on areas where armed conflict is anticipated. • If ICRC succeed in mission to the area, they will share findings. • Protection sector will draft a short advocacy paper for use by the HCT and others. • ECHO and RI will consult on reprogramming existing funds to response in this area. • OCHA will fast track the INGO Consortium WaSH/Shelter rapid response project for Kachin and Shan. • OCHA will connect with the Kachin AHCT and organizations operating out of Lashio to update. 	

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, 9.9.'15;

OCHA

Cluster input on *Myanmar: 2016 Humanitarian Needs Overview*

Cluster input on number of "People in need of [shelter, NFI and CCCM] assistance"

Flood Response

9.11.'15 Myanmar Flood Response National Situation Report

Flood Shelter Cluster Strategy draft, v.1.2-Draft Final

Flood Response Plan - Final 2015

Flood Response Plan Monitoring - Final 2015

MYAMAR 2015 FLOODS RESPONSE AFTER-ACTION REVIEW – ICCG, 24 September '15

RAKHINE FLOODS RESPONSE-OCHA Lessons Learnt & Recommendations, 12-19 October '15

Rakhine

Protection Sector - Concerns & Risks RAKHINE November 2015

Protection Sector - Context Analysis RAKHINE November 2015

Kachin-Shan

19.10.'15 Protection Sector-Civilian Character of Camps-English

19.10.'15 Protection Sector-Civilian Character of Camps-Myanmar

Conflict & Displacement in Central Shan State, Protection Sector Advocacy, 2 November 2015

Early Recovery Assessment Discussion Paper, Discussion Paper, October 2015

Myanmar Central Shan State Displacement, OCHA note, 3 November '15

Protection Analysis - Concerns & Risks KACHIN & SHAN October 2015

Protection Sector - Context Analysis KACHIN & SHAN October 2015

Shelter Tool Kit Distribution Guidelines

Urban Displacement & Outside Camps (UDOC) Assessment Report, NRC Myanmar, March-April 2015

Urban Displacement & Outside Camps (UDOC) PowerPoint Presentation, NRC-KBC Kachin State, October '15