



Minutes - ACCOUNTABILITY

Shelter Technical Working Group Meeting, Kathmandu

21 May 2015

Attendance: International Alert, IFRC/NRCS, GOAL, Save the Children, Handicap International, RedR India, UNDP, OXFAM, Plan International

For correspondence:

Eve Leonard: tech1.nepal@sheltercluster.org

Siobhan Kennedy tech2.nepal@sheltercluster.org

Discussion on Strategies for targeting beneficiaries in a context with immense needs and limited resources

- Beneficiary selection criteria at a HouseHold level - is it possible to create standards and/or a common approach that also address issues of equity and protection?
 - In some cases perhaps process includes beneficiaries in the development of their own selection criteria (especially for long-term recovery planning) – using a whole of community approach
 - Selection criteria and processes developed by others prior to the earthquake that could be explored
 - Some communities are requiring a blanket geographical approach be applied – especially in areas where more than 90% of homes have been severely damaged/destroyed
 - Perhaps a difference in approach/strategy is necessary 1) districts where the majority of households have been destroyed 2) districts where their remained capacity to help each other to recover at the community level
 - The poverty elevation fund has mapping that may support development of beneficiary selection criteria
 - Apply learnings from previous disaster – for example NRCS working with the Local Authority and DLSAs and some political parties following the floods last year to identify beneficiaries and implement shelter programming – **Sanjeev Hada will provide any data on selection criteria used in Floods recovery planning from last year.**
- Importance of contextualizing processes and adapting them to local realities
 - Encouraging agencies to work at a local level with local community groups such as local women's groups (Gender taskforce is currently compiling a list for all 14 priority districts)
 - At the village level – many have pre-established Recovery Committees established
 - Coordination at the village level using local structures using an open forum for accountability could be successful
 - For example, structures in LGCDP – led by UNDP has a ward system and the 9th ward of every village has a citizen's awareness centre which may be a good link
- How the shelter beneficiary selection and accountability criteria intersect with other sectors does (is it possible to develop a multi-sector approach)?
 - UNDP is responsible for restoration of public building. Given the time pressure due to upcoming monsoon season and winter, perhaps some communities will look toward an interim model of community assets being used to 'house' larger grouping of families.
- Land Ownership and Property Rights



- Households that were living together as one household prior to the earthquake may now divide themselves up in order to receive more aid
- Challenges of family ownership of land that no longer exists, natural markers to delineate land ownership moving and/or being demolished,
- NGO – FWLD is a legal aid NGO working in this area prior to the earthquake and most likely can support sorting out some of these challenges

OUTPUTS

- Elizabeth Drew (International Alert) will be commissioned by the Shelter Cluster to draft an Options Matrix for determining entry points at different community levels and communications to consider and develop the Scoring Matrix that agencies can use for targeting and selection
- Robert Dodds/ Jessica Letch will provide the IFRC scored card as starting point for Eve to adapt into a standardize score card which agencies can use for beneficiary selections and/or reporting

Next meeting – recommendation to host at an earlier time of day and for agencies to invite Nepali counterparts where possible.