

Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 – 12:00, Tuesday, 1 April 2015

UNOPs Office, Yangon

Attendees: SCI, KBC Lashio, Metta, NRC, Medair, UNOCHA, UNHCR PI & Donor Relations, WFP, Embassy of Sweden, ECHO, Food Security Sector, ICRC, CDN, German Embassy and WaSH Cluster Lead (UNICEF)

Apologies: New Zealand Embassy

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
1. Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed thanks to UNOPs for hosting meeting. Minutes of previous meeting, 3 March, accepted and to be posted online: http://www.sheltercluster.org/node/4632. Cluster Coordinator (CC) apologised for problems caused by the website being transferred to a new host site, which meant considerable amounts of reorganising were required and transferring 400+ documents. While the main address of www.shelternficccmmyanmar.org would remain, all other past links (as published) would be redundant. However, “rest assured” all documents on the old site would be on the new. For any specific issues/problems of not being able to locate documents, contact CC directly. 	CC ASAP
2. Actions from Previous Meeting	<p><u>Disaster Response/Contingency Planning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With rains almost here, pressing need for written clarity between UNHCR, IFRC and IOM on their areas of responsibility in the event of a natural disaster. See below. <p><u>Kachin/Shan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second round of camp profiling shared in soft/hard copy but still not uploaded, yet. Still clarity from World Vision 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. 	<p>Done</p> <p>CC ASAP</p> <p>CC ASAP</p>
3. Roles & Responsibility Between UNHCR, IOM & IFRC	18 September '14 a meeting was called by the Cluster Lead and followed the OCHA organised SIMEX. In an effort to clarify "who would be responsible for what" in the event of a large-scale natural disaster in	

	<p>Myanmar. The footnote below records the detail of what was said at this meeting. A summary paragraph immediately below.¹</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>The consensual view was that were a large natural disaster to strike either Rakhine or Kachin/Shan, at least from the initial point of impact and for the early stages of the response, UNHCR as current leader of the shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster would “more than likely be the lead”. Were the disaster to strike elsewhere, the likely lead candidate for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Emergency shelter/NFI would be IFRC; ➤ CCCM IOM. <p>However, and this was particularly stressed with regards to IFRC/IOM scaling-up the required resources, UNHCR could seek to support where it could as they got established. Equally, were the disaster to strike in Rakhine or Kachin, IFRC and IOM could look to support UNHCR.</p>	
<p>4. Kachin/Shan</p> <p>a. Re-cap of recent movements/violence</p>	<p>This agenda was led by the Kachin/Shan Cluster Coordinator, Kevin Socquet (KS), based usually in Myitkyina. While perhaps six months ago the outlook was “more positive”, now <i>far</i> less so albeit the recent national ceasefire agreement was “potentially positive”. Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Due to recent fighting there have been movements of people but as to the longevity of their displacement it has had to be taken on a case by case basis. For example, new camps have only 	

¹ **IFRC** has a global commitment in case of natural disasters; leading the Emergency Shelter Cluster (ESC). The word emergency was stressed. The request for IFRC to lead this Cluster must come from the RC/HC/HCT. Note the IFRC does not request. IFRC Myanmar would then need to contact IFRC in Kula Lumpur and Geneva (GVA). Usually it would take seven to ten days to activate. This would involve deploying a Coordinator, Information Manager, Technical Coordinator and perhaps an Early Recovery Specialist. Deployment capacity will be subject to funding, the need for an emergency appeal and in terms of "disaster relief" it usually takes 24 hours for the funds to be released. It was stressed that IFRC's Myanmar role would be to facilitate the Emergency Shelter Cluster's activation logistically but this Cluster would not report to IFRC Country Office rather directly reporting to Shelter Head in IFRC Geneva. As far as the Federation country office is concern, their support would be "just financial and logistical" as part of their global commitment. It was stressed that the moment the response moves into recovery they would look to "shut-down" and handover to the likes of UN-Habitat. In this context the examples of Pakistan and Bangladesh were mentioned. In summary, their focus is emergency and into temporary but not exhaustive of the latter. If there was a large natural disaster outside Rakhine or Kachin, the IFRC would be “willing to activate but it needs to be needs based” and RC/HC and HCT request depending, which must be very "clear cut and written in minutes". Their role as convener for emergency shelter cluster is not limited to only Rakhine and Kachin, IFRC is willing to activate but it needs to be requested by HCT and/or UNRC/HC and agreed upon.

IOM noting the example of the SIMEX, which heavily impacted on the delta, in such an event IOM could “potentially be ready and willing to lead the CCCM Cluster – including at the sub-national level if needed”. As a real example the Nargis response was mentioned. Like IFRC this would require deployment of resources, surge capacity and likely use of a Rapid Response Team – surge staff are present in the country/region and at the HQ level to support both shelter and CCCM in the event of an emergency. Following the Cluster Lead’s question, what if there was a large natural disaster in Rakhine, and what role could IOM see itself playing? Similarly like IFRC, IOM said it would depend on the “scale of the disaster and the needs identified by the Cluster in-country”. In terms of providing support they did mention the possibility of co-leading of the Cluster. Tools IOM has at its disposal include the displacement tracking matrix (DTM). On shelter matters, there is the Global Shelter Cluster focal point, Maria Moita, Regional Focal Point for Asia. It was noted that co-leading would be co-leading, not cosmetic support. Note; there is a clear distinction/difference between **co-leadership** versus **co-facilitation**. If a secondary agency wants to offer support to the incumbent lead then co-leadership versus co-facilitation needs to be thought through. The former means a shared reasonability of provider or last resort, the latter does not.

	<p>been entered on the CCCM Camp List, as included in the <i>Cluster Analysis Report</i>, if they have been established at least for two months.²</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ One phenomenon that was happening was IDPs being moved from one location of displacement to another location of displacement. Aside from infrastructure issues, and finding donors willing to fund more displacement, this naturally posed a series of protection issues and concerns. In close collaboration with the Protection Sector a <i>Protection Sector Position Paper on Movement of IDPs from one Temporary Location to Another</i> had been produced. This was already having utility at the field level. ➤ Too early to say but the national ceasefire agreement “might encourage” more returns or at least “go and see” visits at places of origin. Metta noted the fear of possible “land grabs”, which could encourage or pull people back to their place of origin. The WaSH Cluster Lead was more circumspect of such a scenario. <p>In terms of key events since the start of the New Year, a recap:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Hpart Kant in January, up to 2,000 or more were displaced but now the long-term displaced stands at around 900 IDPs; ▪ In Mogoke in January, up to 2,000 reported displaced but “almost all went back”; ▪ In Kutkai/Hseni in February, up to 1,000 reported displaced, “at least” 400-500 still displaced; ▪ In east Muse in March, 1,500+ reported as displaced but the “length of displacement is not sure yet”; ▪ In Mansi area in March, a few hundred were displaced but unknown final numbers, yet. 13,000 IDPs in total across the Township of Mansi of which 6,000 are close to the fighting or possible line of fighting. ▪ In summary, estimated to be up to around 10,000 IDPs displaced in 2015 but around 2,000 look as they “will remain displaced for the longer-term”. ▪ It will be very hard to provide adequate shelter for all prior to the rainy season given access difficulties and limitations to implementation capacities. 	<p>CC to circulate protection paper with minutes</p>
<p>b. Remaining shelter gaps (increasing)</p>	<p>KS cited the issue of lack of land, which includes private land-owners wanting to reclaim their land being more and more an issue. In an effort to analyse and quantify the impact of delivering shelter, the sheet titled Shelter Coverage & Gaps gives a percentage of shelter needs that cannot be built to standard due to lack of any available land. More recent data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63% covered; • 21% gap; • 16% cannot be covered due to a lack of available/suitable land.³ <p>On standard issues, which include size, consultations with the Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) to see what</p>	

² Cluster Analysis Reports for Kachin/Shan can be located at: http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/data-analysis-kachinshan?sort=date&sort_direction=DESC.

³ Cluster Analysis Reports for Kachin/Shan can be located at: http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/data-analysis-kachinshan?sort=date&sort_direction=DESC.

	<p>flexibility there may be. GSC advice, which includes factoring-in storage space and outside/covered space. On land issues WaSH also noted the impact lack of land was having on the building of latrines.</p> <p>Noting the increased number of IDPs as outlined in the previous agenda point suggests another 400 to 500 units will be needed to add to the current gap of 2,000 units for which there is sufficient space to build. At least the same number would be needed to reach standard, which cannot be built due to land issues.</p>	
c. Access	<p>Access remains a significant challenge and generally decreasing; only one third of the caseload can be regularly accessed by national and international staff from UN/INGOs. For those located in urban areas, other than protection, needs limited. Of the 75,000 not in urban areas, regular access is feasible for about 25,000, a “worrying trend”. March and April there were cross-line restarting but these rounds will reach 15,000 in NGCA of a total caseload of 50,000. Thus at best, 25,000 accessible out of an estimated 75,000 (and increasing) outside the four main urban areas. This does not include the specific Kokang situation (see below).</p>	
d. NFIs	<p>The central issue is needs will remain this year for winter items. More assessment is on-going.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimate that for IDPs in “priority areas 1 and 2” would need replenishment of winter clothes, 9,000 to 10,000 HH. Priority area 1 needs about 3,000 HH kits, priority area 2 6,000 HH kits. • Of these two, the highest priority number is number 1 where even now, 1 April, they are <i>still</i> in winter conditions. • Thinking ahead, perhaps there was then the need to preposition stocks before the winter season starts, October. This could include contingency for 1,000 to 2,000 HH. • With these most recent cross-line missions all NFI winter items collated in 2014 will have been distributed, which is positive. 	
e. Kokang	<p>While the Kokang situation has grabbed the headlines, for those based in Kachin State, despite its relative proximity, linkages to Kachin/Shan modest. Kachin-based Coordinator KS has not much more information than YGN offices, noting the updates provided by OCHA and circulated by the national Cluster Coordinator. In brief summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand there has been displacement within Kokang and movement into China. ▪ WaSH confirmed “no access” for them albeit WFP has done some assessments. ▪ Save the Children’s update suggests some would rather stay in new place. ▪ OCHA travelled to Lashio/met with Deputy Minister of Social Welfare and confirmed that access is not possible and Government will ask for assistance. The figure being “banded-about” is 65,000 IDPs. ▪ More widely OCHA mentioned the Emergency Response Fund (ERF) mechanism, where to respond to small/temporary-scale displacement: food/shelter and WaSH, funds of US\$200,000 to US\$250,000 could be released, steered by the AHCT. 	
f. CCCM		

<p>i. Needs</p> <p>ii. UDOC</p>	<p>On financial matters the situation remains very worrying; <u>currently there is a gap of US\$500,000 of a total envelope/need of US\$900,000. The bottom-line consequences are clear, if the money does not materialise the amount of assistance will have to be scaled back in the matter half of 2015.</u> The CC had emphasised this point at the brief he had given to donors in YGN March 10. For more detail see below.</p> <p>Overview Warm welcome give to Rafael Abis (RA) (rafael.abis@gmail.com), who on behalf of NRC's support to the Cluster had been conducting research on urban and out of camp displacement (UDOC). This was something that had been outlined in the 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan.⁴ RA's presentation stressed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Visited Bhamo and Myitkyina, could not visit Northern Shan due to "unstable situation". ▪ More serious profiling of outside of camp population is needed. In Myitkyina records are very poor. ▪ Some are living just outside the property/land of a church compound. ▪ Nobody would/could say they could rent and pressures of more people living in host families evident. ▪ The pressure and tensions on resources evident and drug pushing is palpable. He asked where was the intervention from the international community despite tensions being reported as on the increase. ▪ Could shelter actors build lofts in host houses or supply materials to house families with extended houses? <p>Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Map out the affected population, not just those in the camps; ▪ Yes while coordination structures in camps, what about at the host family level and the need to define who might be the beneficiaries of such targeted assistance; ▪ Equity is an issue/concern. "I wish I was an IDP child so I could receive a bag"; ▪ Stressed the need to engage in terms of donors, link between relief and development; ▪ Advocate for access to services and how the mechanism for those in camps could be available for those not living in the camps. <p>Durable Solutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% said of those asked said that they are "not ready" to return to their village of origin, various reasons given; 	
---	---	--

⁴ Page 15 of **Humanitarian Response Plan: Increased support for approximately half of the around 5,000 IDPs not living in the camps, whether they are registered in camps or not. In 2014 the Cluster has been in consultation with the urban displacement and out of camp (UDOC) research conducted by the Global CCCM Cluster. A scoping mission is planned during the first quarter of 2015 to define how this initiative can support the Kachin/Shan CCCM Cluster. Difficulty to access information and support for IDPs in host communities has regularly been raised as an issue. Activities could include developing information centres for IDPs located outside camps.**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More mapping is needed and as part of this, the “IOM displacement tracking matrix” was mentioned; ▪ Involve more partners/community support projects; ▪ Camp management training/national authorities; ▪ Durable solutions – roving team, know what they are agreeing to for their return <i>if</i> they return; ▪ What is the status of the Government and what is the view of the donors, particularly if the money is not there. Not only just about CCCM but this also concerns early recovery and protection; ▪ Government still resistant to increase numbers. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreed that CC would circulate RA PowerPoint presentation off the back of this meeting. ▪ Confirmed that RA would generate a final report, which would be cleared by Chris Blears (CB), Country Director of NRC. CC should liaise with CB for copy of report. 	<p>CC to share RA PowerPoint CC to liaise with CB for copy of report</p>
<p>5. Rakhine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WaSH 	<p>Update was given by national WaSH Cluster Coordinator, Olivier Le Guillou (oleguillou@unicef.org). CC started by stressing that it was very positive that the latest incarnation of the <i>Shelter Options</i> paper as circulated now had a WaSH component. For the sake of transparency CC explained that he had been approached by WaSH Cluster Lead for inclusion of relevant text, which was swiftly done and along with the entire document made available in English and Myanmar, which included WaSH technical annexes.⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WaSH operational presence this year was for maintenance of the main camps; maintain in terms of “sphere standards”. ▪ WaSH Cluster in Rakhine has the same line ministry as shelter; continued collaboration was imperative. Also stressed the need for the <i>centrality of protection</i> and “red lines”. ▪ Stressed the need for a “habitat” perspective/vision, particularly on WaSH matters. ▪ Mention made of water boating activities to one camp in Pauktaw, Ah Nauk Ywe. On this issue there was a technical paper available. ▪ On recent returns as reported in townships north of Sittwe, view from WaSH was that these were locations that were “most easy” to have returns and in reality people may have moved no more than 50 meters. This needed to be at the forefront of people’s minds if any new assistance was deemed necessary. In real terms, other than taking down their shelters and settling in their place of origin, little had changed. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shelter Options/Latest Developments 	<p>CC noted significant developments in the last month:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 3 March was previous national Cluster meeting at which Cluster Lead put forward <i>Shelter Options</i> 	

⁵ See *Shelter Options for Rakhine State 2015 – 2016*, 17 March 2015. This includes a section entitled WATER & SANITATION and Annex VI & VII *Latrine Options*.

	<p>for Rakhine State 2015 – 2016 for feedback and discussion, thereafter finalised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 10 March, with some key partners present, CC presented <i>Shelter Options for Rakhine State 2015 – 2016</i>. Event was called <i>Embassies/States Shelter/NFI/CCCM Partners Briefing</i>.⁶ ✓ 12 March were reports of IDPs in Mrauk U Township being given permission by the Rakhine State Government to take-down their temporary shelters and return to their places of origin (see photos below). ✓ Within the coming weeks reports of similar events in Rathedaung and Kyauk Taw (see photos below). ✓ Evidence suggested the authorities were targeting the easier caseloads to address, the “low hanging fruit”. Strategically this was consistent with the <i>Shelter Options for Rakhine State 2015 – 2016</i> although <i>most</i> encouragingly in terms of timing they were being more ambitious than the <i>Options</i> paper outlined. ✓ Noting the words of the RC/HC, the key driver(s) in terms of <i>why</i> these caseloads were two-fold. First, they were the “low-hanging fruit” but also the deteriorating condition of the temporary shelters. Strategically this was very positive in terms of the temporary approach to shelter and decisions taken over two-years ago by members of this Cluster. The symbolism of taking down the temporary shelter and settling in the place of origin was <u>very</u> encouraging after over eighteen months of inertia, greeted with “cautious optimism”. ✓ Piecing together the precise Rakhine State Government (RSG) plan remains a challenge but the basic steer states that approximately 2,000 households (HH) across various townships, not Sittwe, would be supported with return through the provision of cash assistance of US\$1,000. Note this was consistent with the amount given to those affected by violence in southern Rakhine State in late 2013. Based on latest discussions with the RSG the Cluster was advocating for a materials package of US\$1,500 for such a caseload. However, noting the early stages of this process and its obvious sensitivities (and like his WaSH counterpart) the CC was keen to stress that and in reality people may have moved no more than 50 meters. This needed to be at the forefront of people’s minds if any new assistance was deemed necessary. Furthermore, now there were returns, as or more emphasis should be focused on consultation with the surrounding Rakhine communities and their needs as the returnee needs. The lens should be broader than the displaced or just humanitarian focused. ✓ If there was to be any monitoring of these returns the CC was keen to stress that it should be led by the Protection Sector.⁷ 	
<p>6. AOB</p>	<p>➤ IOM would be giving a donor brief on their working supporting the CCCM Cluster in Rakhine and Kachin/Shan. All welcome to attend. A copy of their presentation would be circulated with this set</p>	<p>CC to circulate copy of IOM donor brief</p>

⁶ Participants included TIKA, Swedish Embassy, World Bank, USAID/OTI, Swiss Embassy (including SDC), German Embassy, ECHO, DFID, Royal Thai Embassy and Australian Embassy.

⁷ See documents entitled *Protection Sector, End of displacement* April 2015 & *Protection Sector Update on IDPs movements in Rakhine*, 10 April 2015 in zip file.

	<p>of minutes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ This week CC would be attending “Early Recovery Network” w/shop in YGN. Documentation as shared could be requested from the CC thereafter. ➤ ECHO asked about progress on the household (HH) survey. By all accounts “going well” thus far albeit respecting the decision of Save the Children, the camps where they are engaged in CCCM it is <i>not</i> proceeding. However, in all others it is or is planned to proceed, done by UNHCR, LWF and DRC. Note, since likely NFI distributions would occur post the HH survey/utilising this latest data, this could be a concern for Save the Children managed camps. Lack of HH surveys could mean no reliable basis for which the Cluster Lead to provide NFIs. Again, it was important to stress that the individual position of Save the Children in Rakhine <i>must</i> be respected. However, the consequences of this decision would also be for them to manage with their caseload. ➤ The Global Shelter Cluster was offering online training, for any interested in more details they should contact the CC directly. ➤ ICRC confirmed fuel-stick distribution for all households in the Myebon camp(s) and Ah Nauk Ywe in Pautkatw Township. ➤ OCHA was advertising for a Humanitarian Affairs Officer P-4 based in YGN. The closing date was end of April. ➤ Finally, CC was very glad that Richard Tracey (RT) was present at this meeting. The end of March saw the departure of RT from UNHCR Sittwe, having reached the end of his current contract. In the current financial climate for UNHCR, maintaining two internationals at a P3 grade for shelter responsibilities was no longer viable. RT has led the Shelter Cluster for UNHCR at the Sittwe level for over two years. He brought significant expertise in terms of his years of experience living and working in Myanmar and built an effective relationship with the RSG. His contribution has been significant and the CC thanked him for all his work. As of 1 April Wilfredo Jr. Tiangco (tiangco@unhcr.org) (otherwise known as “Boyet”) was <i>the</i> Rakhine State Shelter Cluster Coordinator. 	
--	--	--

The next meeting will be scheduled after the water festival, late April or more likely early May. Nearer the time the CC would send an email confirmation and as usual, an agenda.

April 2015: IDPs Ah Nauk Pyin (ANP), Rathedaung Township & Kyein Ni Pyin (KNP), Pautktaw Township Building Individual Shelters⁸



March 2015: IDP Returnees in Mrauk-U Township Taking Down Temporary Shelters and Self-Built Shelters in Place of Origin



⁸ In ANP construction is in place of origin and KNP, location of displacement

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, 3.3.'15;*

HCT-OCHA

- *Census Update, 20th March 2015 to UNCT;*
- *OCHA ICC Meeting, 23 March '15;*
- *Myanmar Humanitarian Briefing- IASC, AP Regional Directors Meeting, 1st April 2015;*
- *Myanmar 2014 Strategic Response Plan Periodic Monitoring Report January - December 2014.*

Kachin, Northern Shan & Kokang

- *Protection Sector Position Paper on Movement of IDPs from a Temporary Location to Another-final draft, March '15;*
- *UDOC Key Findings in Kachin (PowerPoint), 1st April 2015;*
- *OCHA AHCT Kachin-Shan State Meeting, 13 March '15;*
- *OCHA ICC Kachin-Shan State Meeting, 24 March '15;*
- *OCHA Myitkyina General Coordination Meeting, 25 March '15;*
- *Meeting between the Government and UN-INGOs, Lashio, 10th March '15;*
- *Lashio Meeting with the Deputy Minister of Social Welfare (31 March 2015);*
- *Lashio Coordination Meeting, 21st April 2015;*
- *CCCM Capacity Building - Donor Brief - IOM Myanmar 2014-16.*

Rakhine

- *Shelter Options (paper) for Rakhine State (including water & sanitation);*
- **Annex IV Individual Shelter Options 3 (revised), (Materials Package),** including image of product;
- **Annex VI & VII Latrine Options;**
- *Rakhine Transfer Modality Scoping Mission Report, (March 2015) WFP;*
- *Rakhine State Level Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) Meeting, 10th February 2015;*
- *Rakhine State Level Emergency Coordination Centre (ECC) Meeting, 1st April 2015;*
- *Protection Sector, End of displacement April 2015;*
- *Protection Sector Update on IDPs movements in Rakhine, 10 April 2015;*
- *OCHA ICC Rakhine State Meeting, 24 March '14;*
- *OCHA ICC Rakhine State Meeting, 7 April '14;*
- *CCCM Capacity Building - Donor Brief - IOM Myanmar 2014-16.*

Disaster Response/Contingency Planning/Emergency Preparedness

- *REPORT ON HCT SCENARIO PLANNING WORKHOP, 20 March 2015;*

- *HCT SCENARIO PLANNING PowerPoint, 20 March 2015 ERP (Annex 2);*
- *HCT SCENARIO PLANNING PowerPoint, 20 March 2015 Kachin-Shan (Annex 3);*
- *HCT SCENARIO PLANNING PowerPoint, 20 March 2015 South-East (Annex 4);*
- *HCT SCENARIO PLANNING Matrix, 20 March 2015 South-East (Annex 5);*
- *IOM, Improved Disaster Management & Resilience Against Natural Disaster in Rakhine State;*
- *OCHA ERP Working Group Meeting Summary, 3 April 2015 - DRAFT.*