Global Shelter Cluster

ShelterCluster.org
Coordinating Humanitarian Shelter

Global Shelter Cluster Coordination Workshop

GENEVA, 5 - 6 OCTOBER

2015 REPORT

sheltercluster.org

List of Abbreviations:

AAP – Accountability to Affected Populations

ALNAP – Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action

ATM – Automated Teller Machine

DCPSF – Darfur Community Peace and Stability Fund

DFID – Department for International Development

DRM – Disaster Risk Management

DRR – Disaster Risk Reduction

DTM – Displacement Tracking Matrix

GSC – Global Shelter Cluster

HLP – Housing, Land, and Property

GFP – Global Focal Point

GIS – Geographic Information System

HCT – Humanitarian Country Team

ICRC – International Committee of the Red Cross

IFRC – International Federation of Red Cross And Red Crescent Societies

IM – Information Management

IMO – Information Management Officer

IMWG – Information Management Working Group

IOM – International Organization for Migration

JICA – Japan International Cooperation Agency

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

OCHA – Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

PDNA - Post Disaster Needs Assessment

RFP – Regional Focal Point

SAG – Strategic Advisory Group

SDC – Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

SC – Shelter Cluster

TWiG – Technical Working Group

UN – United Nations

UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

USAID – United States Agency for International Development

WB – World Bank

3W – Who What Where

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report aims to capture the outcomes of the Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) Coordination Workshop 2015. The GSC Coordination Workshop 2015 gathered 60 SC coordination team members from at least 17 out of the 25 active clusters. The purpose of the workshop was to review and revise SC Coordination practices, methodologies and tools in three areas:

- Information Management
- Coordination
- Technical Coordination.

This objective was addressed through presentations, panel discussions, and plenary sessions leading to the capturing of challenges and recommendations.

The session on information management focused on such themes as (1) who, what, where (3W) monitoring, (2) determining humanitarian caseloads, (3) addressing self-recovery, (4) assessments and monitoring, (5) technology and innovation. As a result, the participants shared challenges they are facing and recommendations on each of the themes.

The session on coordination aimed at capturing good and bad practices from country-level clusters. The SC Nepal provided examples of good practices on engaging with local NGOs, proactively including donors, and the use of cash interventions, while the SC Yemen shared an example on the use of collective warehouses to reach more areas. For bad practices, cases when appeals were manipulated and inter-cluster decisions were disregarded were brought up.

This session also included a panel discussion on coordination of cash programmes, as well as a roundtable discussion on coordination held by ALNAP.[1]

The session of technical coordination aimed to capture challenges and good practices around four themes: (1) conflict recovery strategies, (2) emergency strategies, (3) natural disaster recovery strategies and (4) a recently piloted template "Technical Guidance for Emergency [and Early Recovery] Shelter Assistance".

Finally, the agencies (UNHCR, IFRC, and IOM) conducted internal sessions as part of the GSC Coordination Workshop 2015 to discuss agency specific issues, the outcomes of which are not reflected in this report.

The GSC Coordination Workshop 2015 event page with related documents and presentations can be found here.

---

[1] The ALNAP roundtable report is available here.

Information Management

Session leads: N. Bauman, B. Hurkmans

This session aimed to gather input from coordination practitioners on the problems and potential solutions related to information management functions in country-level clusters. Five key thematic areas related to information management were identified, and break out groups formed to discuss those themes in depth. The five themes discussed were:

1. Agency activity/3W monitoring
2. Determining humanitarian caseloads
3. Addressing self-recovery
4. Assessments and monitoring
5. Technology and innovation

Initial discussions were focused on identifying problems that are prevalent within country-level coordination practices within a theme. Following a thorough discussion regarding these problems, groups brainstormed on practical solutions to these problems, with a specific directive designating those who could implement the suggested recommendations.

1. Agency activity/3W monitoring

3W tools **Reflections:**	**Recommendations:**
- Tools based on Excel are not flexible enough to deal with different phases/levels/types of responses - Partners should be made more aware of the 3W reporting and its benefits - Lack of reliable internet can be problematic - Tools should be easy to use and results easy to interpret - Online platforms often do not offer bulk data entry - Support for languages other than English is usually lacking - Lack of training on 3W tools - Templates have to be revised to adapt to local contexts, so a range of tools are used at field level	- Improve the Excel template based on country-level cluster examples (add dependent dropdowns for instance) (Action: GFPs for IM) - Explore using an online/mobile data collection platform to capture real-time information (i.e. ActivityInfo) (Action: GFPs for IM) - Look into cash/distribution monitoring tool (ex. Project Matatu for UNHCR) (Action: GFPs for IM)
Data Management **Reflections:**	**Recommendations:**
- Basic data should be gathered and processed faster, more detailed data can be added later - Data on planned activities should be captured as well - Lack of data from governments, private sector and local partners (to inform	- Provide clear standard operating procedures: stress the importance of face-to-face support, phased approach in terms of data collection and sharing good products (maps, dashboards etc.) (Action: GFPs for IM) "Name and shame" or mention best three

progress on self-recovery) • How to measure quality of activities/items? • Data verification is important but does not happen often or is difficult • Lack of national level assessments: it takes a lot of time to complete needs assessments, making it difficult to use this data for gap analysis • Data is difficult to consolidate due to the range of tools used • How do we track operational presence over time and ensure contact lists are up to date? (Humanitarian ID?)	and worst three partners in terms of reporting during meetings (for country-level clusters) (Action: Country-level IMOs) • Donors should be involved in order to make sure that reporting to the cluster is a contractual requirement (Action: Donors) • Improve links with governments and other relevant actors for data sharing on needs and population before disaster strikes (Action: RFPs) • Identify information needs of partners and donors to avoid double reporting and increase the relevance of the 3W tool (Action: Country-level IMOs) • Pre-fill data as much as possible (Action: Country-level IMOs)
Other observations • Lack of skilled IMOs, need clear terms of reference: - Lack of internal IM meetings for the cluster at the global level • How do we ensure that gap analysis translates into strategic priorities?	**Recommendations:** • Improve terms of reference by standardizing and clarifying them (Action: GSC, GFPs for IM) • Cultivate career paths and engage universities (Action: GSC) • Increase surge capacity and the number of IMOs (Action: GSC)

2. Determining humanitarian caseloads

Reflections: • Onion model makes sense and the draft guidance package presents a clear overview of different methods used for estimation of caseloads. • How to avoid the temptation to always give inflated figures for the overall number of people in need? • The challenge is that we are dealing with what is in part a political process (a. tying in with government politics and b. tying in with OCHA lead fundraising). • Setting a fixed process will mean that we cannot agree with governments. This is where your final comment on process governance is critical. It is more relevant to the OCHA / UNHCT / HCT process and always leads us to the question of how many we will actually aim to target with shelter interventions – which is usually a bit of a guess – assuming xx self-recovery	**Recommendations:** • The provision of more practical and prescriptive guidance on how to estimate would be appreciated (i.e. worked examples of the methods mentioned, or a separate operational guidance section). • Greater clarity is needed on *when* it would be better to use one model for caseload estimation over another (i.e. in conflict/ natural disasters/ data rich/ data poor environments). This would promote overall consistency and comparability of estimations. Suggestion to have a decision tree as part of a practical toolkit. • Current draft guidance includes a lot of focus on natural disasters, both in the text and examples, and relatively little on conflict situations. It would be good to add guidance on conflict. • Further definition of the governance of this process, and roles and responsibilities

etc. perhaps this is where we need to focus more.	would be helpful.

3. Addressing self-recovery

Reflections:	**Recommendations:**

• Lack of data collection (preparedness)
• Not at the top of the agenda
• Lack of capacity to measure self-recovery capacity
• Lack of preparedness: housing, labour force, market tools, access to money
• Integration with other efforts (internal and external)
• Lack of capacity to assess our effectiveness post intervention
• Politically sensitive: allocation of resources. Targeting based on vulnerability is complicated
• Maybe it is best to resolve the issue of targeting before a shock criteria and pre-shock vulnerability data
• Self-Recovery capacity is related to resilience.
• Identification of criteria (prioritisation) requires study on self-recovery capacity
• Working in sectoral silos is a danger
• Lack of funding for preparedness
• Advocacy: learning is required to be efficient, thus investment is needed
• Misalignment between agency approaches and community approaches
• Partnership required: local and multi-sectors
• Upward accountability (to donors, HQ) tends to ignore community-based approaches.
	Sectoral integration
	• Early Recovery positions embedded within the team (Action: GSC)
	• Additional backstopping or remote support capacity (Action: GSC)
	• Ensure that the Early Recovery position can strengthen the linkages with other sectors (Action: GSC)
	
	Research, Criteria, Understanding
	• Develop institutional capacity to understand what actions contribute effectively towards early recovery
	  - Dedicated research (Action: GSC)
	  - Invest in extended REACH (Action: GSC, REACH Initiative, Donors)
	  - Build capacity of local stakeholders, practitioners and community members through development programmes to support this (Action: GSC, RFPs, Country-level SCs)
	• Develop minimum standards:
	  - It is acknowledged that there is a need for specificity. Context matters, nevertheless a balance between general and specific can be achieved through research and analysis (Action: GSC)
	  - Build the capacity of local government to understand REACH (Action: REACH Initiative)
	
	Funding and preparedness
	• Better understanding of existing capacities – to be done before crises (Action: GSC)
	• Mainstream preparedness into response programming (Action: GSC)
	• Dedicated funding during 'peace times' for preparedness and mainstreaming (Action: Donors)
	• Target more funding sources – private sector, governments (Action: GSC)
	• Find the balance between operational capacity and research (Action: GSC)

	Work Plan
	1. Data collection/preparedness - Analysis of data collection built-in contingency planning (Action: RFPs, IM) 2. Advocacy with external actors including donors to fund and implement preparedness activities to better understand recovery and self-recovery practices (Action: GSC) 3. Creation of a community of practice to produce a knowledge node for practitioners and to exchange information related to recovery and self-recovery (Action: GSC)

4. Assessments and Monitoring

Reflections:
Assessments
- Lack of information sharing, often due to competition between organisations.
- Assessments conducted by different agencies are rarely comparable, meaning that the information within them can be difficult (if not impossible) to compile.
- Cluster coordination team often lacks time and capacity to fully engage during the design of a REACH assessment, leading to results that are less useful than they would otherwise have been.
- We often struggle to collect the right information, frequently getting lost in the detail (due to a few strong voices) but easily losing the bigger picture. There needs to be a balance between technical and coordination voices.
- Accuracy of the collected information needs to be proportional to the emergency phase and the information needs, but we often forget that we also need a certain amount of comparability with monitoring exercises.
- We do not place sufficient emphasis on secondary data: sharing other available data, including pre-crisis, other agency reports, studies from development actors etc. and as a result, we often re-invent the wheel.
- We need to improve the way we use assessment tools to measure the same indicators.
- We need to develop and standardise thresholds for composite indices (e.g. NFI score cards).
- A lack of humanitarian access can be very challenging when trying to conduct shelter assessments, particularly in conflict contexts.

Monitoring:
- Would it be possible to put a monetary value to the effectiveness of interventions?
- We often struggle to link outputs to outcomes - how can we improve the way we systemically link these indicators?

- Need to better time the monitoring assessments so that we can feed back into the response better (e.g. Vanuatu was too late).
- Monitoring support to self-recovery is particularly problematic and we do not appear to have adequate indicators to capture this so far.

Recommendations:

What?	Who?
Build capacity of cluster coordination teams on assessments in general and particularly at the point where their input is needed to engage in the process in order to get the best results. ➔ Training for cluster coordinators and partners	REACH/ GSC
Develop a global toolbox of indicators, tools and analysis guidance, including training material so that data can be collected and shared by all cluster partners in a more coordinated fashion. Improve understanding of methodologies and tools for use in situations with **limited humanitarian access** and make these publicly available. ➔ Ensure all indicators, tools, methodologies, datasets are available online	REACH/ Cluster IMWG
Create a **culture of sharing** among country-level clusters and among agencies, perhaps through a community of practice on assessments. This would also help us to build up institutional knowledge on assessment and monitoring. ➔ Create and moderate a community of practice on assessments	GSC / REACH
Share case studies of good IM and assessment practice (i.e. the SC Somalia M&E strategy, crowdsourced photo analysis in Malawi). Consider using articles on the SC website, newsletter, and case studies in Shelter Projects. ➔ Record case studies, promote their use and discussion around them	Country clusters with support from IMWG / Global Support Team
Investigate new technology, tools and methodologies for accessing secondary data, user generated data and estimating caseloads. E.g. crowdsourcing, satellite imagery, ATM records, phone companies etc. Where possible, pilot these alongside more traditional methodologies to evaluate usefulness for future responses. ➔ Pilot new approaches	Country cluster IMOs / REACH supported by IMWG

5. Technology and Innovation

Reflections:	Recommendations:
• The SC needs adaptable technologies, usable by the most number of people vs. a need for using newer, more innovative technologies that could perform IM work better • IMOs lack prior training	• Better trained IMO who can serve as a strong link between global and country-cluster levels (Action: GSC) • Develop a common data collection platform (Action: GSC) • Develop a set of IM tool kits / case studies for

• Lack of capacity of partners and ourselves to provide reports (typically 3W)	various contexts (Action: GFPs for IM)
• Lack of knowledge in terms of what technology and software is available, rapid change of available platforms, software	• Define the scope of IM services/support to be provided at the country level to manage expectations from the beginning (Action: GSC, Country-level SCs)
• Unwillingness to share data among humanitarian actors – no incentives to share unilateral assessment results with other agencies and cluster partners	a) Services are network and collaborative focused
	b) Advocacy – donors
• Issues around access to and sharing of information in the context of conflict sometimes forces the use of basic IM tools	c) Tracking data sharing activities and promoting agencies that are good information and data sharers.
• Knowing when NOT to innovate – with some types of tools it is difficult to ensure continuity, as they are not accessible for all	• Create a web-page on good and bad practices and innovation via a community of practice (Action: GSC)
• Customer focus/service delivery - who is our customer?	• Obtain licenses for software (Dropbox, Tableau, Adobe Illustrator, ArcGIS) and integrate within the IM Toolkit (Action: GSC)
• Lack of capacity/resources at the Global level	• Clearly define the minimum competencies required of IMOs (Action: GSC).
• Due to a variety of tools and practices that are needed for differing responses at country-level, it is difficult for global resources (as currently structured) to adequately backstop and systematize.	

Coordination

Session leads – J. Ashmore, G. McDonald

The purpose of this session was to share good and bad practices on country-level cluster coordination. To achieve this goal participants shared practices from their experience in plenary, summarized as follows:

- **Nepal:** Appointing a local NGO as a Central Hub focal point agency for coordination allowed involving local actors in coordination efforts and decision-making as well as holding meetings in the local language.

- **Nepal:** Proactively including donors (USAID, JICA and DFID) in pre-SAG meetings (as opposed to in response to a problem) allowed donor involvement in forming the strategy and consecutively supporting it. As a result it helped to avoid donors funding outside of the strategy, and they sought advice from the SC team with respect to their funding decisions. It also facilitated the promotion of SC values among them.

- **Nepal:** In situations where relief items do not reach higher grounds due to logistical issues, cash based support has proven to be a good practice. However, when shelter specific cash turns into a multi-purpose grant, it brings up issues around cash misuse, inconsistency in implementation of grants, availability of local markets and difficulty to monitor shelter interventions.

- **Yemen:** In the context of inadequate access – decentralized warehousing rented by UNHCR and shared for stocking/distribution by all partners allowed to reach more areas.

- **Philippines:** The 8 key messages posters, providing guidelines from the SC, were circulated across agencies and used extensively.

- Establishing free of charge phone lines in camps for beneficiaries to present their shelter/NFI suggestions and complaints was brought up as an example of accountability of a coordination team to affected populations. All calls were registered in a case-handling database, which also directed requests to agencies in charge. Software kept the case open until a call was returned to the caller providing an update/feedback on the process.

Examples of *bad coordination practices* from Philippines, Pakistan and Ukraine were also raised during the course of this session:

- Appeals can be/have been manipulated.
- Inter-cluster decisions were disregarded.
- Disconnect between different levels of coordination (national, regional, district).

Issues and Recommendations:
The issues of (1) limited engagement of the SC with governments and local actors, (2) limited understanding of governments and local actors of what SC is and (3) limited understanding of the SC on how governments and local actors operate were raised by several participants. The following points were suggested in response to these issues:

- If a standing SC exists prior to the disaster/emergency in a country, ensure they continue to work in their roles during a disaster/emergency.
- Be clear about SC roles and responsibilities, and produce an information leaflet for partners who may be unfamiliar with the SC. Provide inductions for partners and use it as an opportunity to exchange knowledge.

- Recruit local information management organizations.
- If possible try to embed SC liaison or IM staff within the government.
- SC products should be available in local languages. Language barriers can be resolved through the recruitment of translators early on, or the use of translation services.
- Work with central governments to facilitate local level introductions and relationship building.
- Train government staff in IM and coordination, and use the training offer to help create relationships.

Supporting cluster partners to better include Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) in assessments came up in the context of the SC often having to rely on government assessments at early stages of a response, with potential for political bias. What could be done?
- If possible embed IMOs into relevant government department to help understand the nature of assessments and push for better assessments.
- Conduct SC Rapid Assessments early.
- Separate qualitative (e.g. how markets will recover) from quantitative (level of damage) assessments and advocate for more qualitative assessments. It can be done through, for example, focus group discussions to better understand barriers and enablers of recovery according to key informants and affected people.
- Ask affected people to tell their story and follow this story with specific families over several months of response.
- Open a 2-way channel of communication as early as possible, this could take the form of regular appearances of SC agencies at phone-in radio shows for example.
- Learn to live with and understand fuzzy data and information. Do not be too reliant on REACH led SC assessments.
- Try to get agencies to understand markets and share findings early, to help support self-recovery strategies.

ALNAP: Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters

Session Leads: P. K. Clarke and L. Campbell

P. K. Clarke and L. Campbell presented the main findings of their research entitled "Exploring Coordination in Humanitarian Clusters", asking two questions:

- What is the optimum level of coordination in the humanitarian clusters?
- What are the conditions required to achieve successful cluster coordination during a humanitarian response?

Full report is available here.

Following the presentation, the participants discussed coordination challenges identified as a result of the study: (1) sub-national coordination, (2) the role of national actors, (3) trust, (4) IM, (5) decision making, roles and responsibilities, in five break out groups. The session was finalized with presentations from each of the groups. A separate report on this session is available here.

How to coordinate cash? Based on case studies (Ukraine)

The session was conducted as a panel discussion facilitated by J. Zarins (Associate Director Disaster Risk Reduction Response and Field Operations – Habitat for Humanity) and the following panel members:

Andre Durr – Cash and Voucher Programme Officer, SDC
Juliet Lang – Cash Advisor at United Nations, United Nations
Waheed Lor Mediabidi – Chief of Cash Based Interventions Section, UNHCR
Igor Chantefort – Cluster Coordinator Ukraine, UNHCR

The presentation on "How to Coordinate Cash? Case Study of Ukraine" can be found here.

Technical Coordination

Session lead: J. Ashmore

During this session the participants were divided into four groups with an aim to identify/share good and bad practices, as well as challenges on specific topics of technical coordination, as follows:

1. Conflict recovery strategies
2. Emergency strategies
3. Natural disaster recovery strategies
4. Feedback on the template – "Technical Guidance for Emergency [and Early Recovery] Shelter Assistance"

1. Conflict recovery strategies

Challenges:	Good Practices
- Unpredictability and fluidity of the situation - Ongoing movement and displacement - Unreliable government partners - Funding: life-saving vs. recovery (mentality needed); due to lack of funds humanitarians should prioritize - Psychological issues: ready for recovery? - Politically sensitive nature of regions - Priorities of government and degradation of development structures - Breakdown of civil society - Understanding the importance of peace-building in shelter - Engagement with affected populations - Presence of organized crime/gangs - Beneficiary selection and targeting - Exit strategy	- DTM better tracking (moving away from location-based) - Linking assistance to governments (deliver one message) e.g. Ukraine, Iraq, Zimbabwe. Embedding staff → capacity building - Linking shelter to livelihoods (e.g. Sudan) - Engagement with development: co-location of partners including community based organizations. Discuss humanitarian limits - Engagement with private sector and industry associations - Rehabilitation of collective centres (e.g. Yemen) - HLP guidance/link with protection generally - Integrate DRR/DRM - Building peace and community (e.g. DCPSF Darfur) - Community based approach, planning for each socio-economic group, including the marginalized ("training for transformation") - Conflict sensitive analysis.

2. Emergency Strategies

Challenges	Good Practices
- Logistics/pipelines/access/security - Quality of information available - Coordination with organizations outside the cluster - Tents vs. tarpaulins - Challenge of continuity in a disruptive phase - Cost efficiency - Roles and responsibilities - How to deal with government and donors to achieve a win-win situation - Prioritization - how you define needs - Needs vs. target vs. capacity - Understanding context/volatile situation - Meet priorities of agencies and clusters - Understanding capacities of partners - Understanding coordination - Pressure on the process (how to give information and rely on it) - Initial emergency strategy might become the strategy for reconstruction too - Understanding of coping mechanisms/ markets, pre-existing systems	- Co-location of coordination (Vanuatu): Government/UN/ICRC/NGOs - Including local communities in the assessment process (Pakistan) - When coordination leads to collaboration (sharing resources and capacities) - When clusters are part of government structures: leadership, preparedness, baseline information, map/GIS, human intelligence - Timely strategy with a big picture/ overarching goal: emergency, recovery and reconstruction - Joined assessment - Definition of household - REACH - Quick "SAG"/be reactive - Linking strategy with DRR - Apply learning from past disasters - Mainstream IM in the strategy process - Including private sector, linking/mapping of pre-existing capacities - Processes that lead to engagement (e.g. Nepal) - Timing of strategy (e.g. winter, adapting to customs…) - Do not harm: not "just do", but be ready to take the less worse, not the best action, and sometimes do nothing

3. Natural disasters recovery strategies

Challenges

- UNDP is in charge of a recovery cluster, but because it is not a humanitarian agency it does not have people on the ground. This is an issue in many cases. In general, if development agencies are in charge of disaster recovery, various issues emerge. Organisational culture and engagement with development actors is a challenge.
- The role of SC in recovery is not always clear. The term recovery needs to be defined in a participative manner.
- In Nepal the discussion on recovery started immediately after the emergency, there was no transitional plan and the government plan itself was not endorsed yet.
- Knowing when SC has to transition.
- Understanding the role of self-recovery and the existing capacities for it.
- Link SC strategy to the WB/PDNA.
- Timely capacity of governments to create recovery strategies.
- Separating effects of last event, prior events and poverty.

- Dealing with no build zones.
- Recovery takes time and donors often focus on a shorter timeframe. Need more flexible donors.
- Urban contexts are very challenging. Urban complexities include: housing, land and property (HLP) issues, services/infrastructure, informal settlements, case load definitions, modality of assistance, land access, high rise, multi-use and multi-occupancy buildings.
- Government counterpart for interim (transitional) private shelter is often not there, moving directly to permanent public housing plans.
- Government assistance does not prioritize housing.
- Scale of training and capacity building can be very large.
- Designing out risks, such as roof construction.
- Resolving compensation issues such as compensating landowners for providing safe land for displaced people.

Good Practices
- Recruiting a recovery advisor (or backstopping if there are no resources) who has experience in a given country.
- Recovery has to be in the SC plan since the beginning and it has to be taken seriously. Getting agencies to think about it at an early stage (which is normally a challenge).
- Dedicate resources to think about the exit strategy.
- Informed strategy, not to compromise recovery with humanitarian interactions.
- Participatory approach to define strategies. Linking strategies and actors.
- Balancing short and long term priorities, to fit everything into a strategy.
- Use local knowledge, participation. Promote community coping strategies, enhance them whenever possible.
- Mapping the pre-existing capacities and building experience.
- Use private sector to support reconstruction authority.
- Integrating development actors (e.g. WB) in second phase assessments, to align the kind of data collected, and therefore the strategies (especially for data collection).
- Link shelter to livelihood activities.
- Try to link things back into pre-disaster government structures.
- Multi hazard mapping. Being prepared for different kinds of hazards and also recurring events that might exacerbate the situation for already affected groups.
- Being aware of day-to-day issues such as unsafe domestic practices, dangerous conditions and etc.
- Multi sector strategies and approach: to health, crime/security/protection, WASH, agriculture/food security, livelihoods.
- Emphasizing value of vernacular architecture.
- Understand HLP issues early and recruit an HLP support at the start.
- Taking a settlement approach.
- Defining the scope of the SC.
- Understand how long the recovery may actually take and involve advisors according to the different phases (emergency, early recovery and recovery).
- Consider climate change effects on land availability, vulnerability, livelihoods, and consider them while designing a house.

- Compensating people with food security related items, so they can focus on reconstruction activities (self-help or participatory). More generally, understanding other priorities of affected groups that present a barrier to recovery.
- Land use exchange programs (DRR) or mixed used buildings, e.g. allowing profit-making activities on the ground floor with the condition of providing housing in the upper floors.
- Finishing unfinished houses to increase housing stock.
- Mitigate risks through typology.

4. Feedback to the template – "Technical Guidance for Emergency [and Early Recovery] Shelter Assistance"

The template – "Technical Guidance for Emergency [and Early Recovery] Shelter Assistance" can be found here.

Positives:
- A good means of knowledge management
- A good way of engaging with partners and donors early on
- Encourages engagement with other clusters
- Saves time reinventing the wheel
- Encourages a standard approach in presentation of technical documentation.

Challenges:
- Overall questions were raised about what the purpose of this document was, and the need for guidance on its use. Also, another main criticism was that it was too construction focused.
- It was seen that in its current state it was 'too leading' and perhaps instead what it should do is ask a number of questions to then guide discussions/TWGs etc.
- This document can then be a means of record keeping - as under each question/topic the outcome, reason for decision can be listed. So it provides an easy way of tracking the justification for a decision and when it was made. Thought also needs to be given to how materials are counted, how it ties in with IM and this could also be another question included in the template.
- The second part of the technical guidelines template should link to a technical resource database which would include a list of all technical documents created by cluster teams – perhaps listed against 'Frequently TWG'd Questions' or something similar, for instance on winterisation.
- Additionally, considerations around cultural and social contexts should be pre-loaded on the technical resource/website, so that one could have country specific observations, as well as thematic ones.
- There needs to be more emphasis on knowledge management, one suggestion is that 'the last technical coordinator standing' is responsible for clearing up the Dropbox and ensuring that all final documents are accessible on a public platform, so two weeks additional time is built in to their contract for when they have left the country.
- Finally, consideration around translation of template/questions asked and how to communicate better that this document exists. Also, a feedback mechanism so as to improve/modify questions asked.

Annex A: Global Coordination Workshop 2015 Participants

No.	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	E-mail address
1	Baria	Alkafre	UNHCR – Syria Shelter Sector Coordinator	alkafre@unhcr.org
2	Silva	Alkebeh	UNHCR – SC Pakistan KPK/FATA Coordinator	alkebeh@unhcr.org
3	Monir	Al-Sobari	UNHCR – Yemen Shelter/CCCM Cluster IMO	alsobari@unhcr.org
4	Joel	Andersson	UNHCR – Syria NFI Sector Coordinator	anderssj@unhcr.org
5	Rashid	Arshad	IOM – Working Group Coordinator	rarashid@iom.int
6	Thomas	Bamforth	IFRC – SC GFP for Coordination	Tom.bamforth@sheltercluster.org
7	Alejandro	Barcena	IFRC – SC Nepal	alexbarcena@gmail.com
8	Neil	Bauman	IFRC – SC GFP for IM	Neil.bauman@sheltercluster.org
9	Edward	Benson	UNHCR – Myanmar Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator	benson@unhcr.org
10	Zeynep	Beyazay	UNHCR – SC Turkey IMO	beyazay@unhcr.org
11	Zineb	Bhaby	IFRC – SC Nepal	Im1.nepal@sheltercluster.org
12	Deepika	Bhardwaj	IFRC – SC Nepal IMO	Im3.nepal@sheltercluster.org
13	Igor	Chantefort	UNHCR – SC Ukraine Coordinator	chantefo@unhcr.org
14	Kenneth	Chulley	UNHCR –Shelter/CCCM Cluster CAR Coordinator	chulley@unhcr.org
15	David	Daldago	IFRC – SC Nepal	
16	Arnaud	de Coupigny	IFRC – SC Myanmar Coordinator	Coord1.myanmar@sheltercluster.org
17	Brice	Degla	UNHCR – DRC Shelter WG Coordinator	degla@unhcr.org
18	Katia	Di Peri	ACTED – SC Country Co–lead	katia.diperi@acted.org
19	Phil	Duloy	Shelter Box – In roster for cluster coordination deployments	philduloy@shelterbox.org
20	Wardell	Eastwood	IFRC – Asia Pacific	Wardell.eastwood@ifrc.org
21	Xavier	Genot	IFRC – SC Vanuatu Coordinator	Coord.vanuatu@sheltercluster.org
22	Martijn	Goddeeris	NRC/UNHCR – SC Somalia Coordinator	goddeeri@unhcr.org
23	Sanjeev	Hada	IFRC – SC Nepal Deputy Coordinator	Coord7.nepal@sheltercluster.org
24	Dave	Hodgkin	IOM – Sub–national coordination and technical advice	dhodgkin@iom.int
25	Kate	Holland	People in Need – Sub–national Coordinator	kate.holland@peopleinneed.cz
26	Bo	Hurkmans	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	hurkmans@unhcr.org
27	Laura	Jones	IOM – SC South Sudan Coordinator	ljones@iom.int
28	Antanas	Jurksaitis	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	jurksait@unhcr.org
29	Fiona	Kelling	NRC – SC Palestine Coordinator	coord1.palestine@sheltercluster.org
30	Eve	Leonard	British Red Cross – SC Nepal	eleonard@redcross.org.uk
31	Mitch	Levine	IFRC - SC Nepal	Mitchell.f.levine@gmail.com
32	Francesca	Lubrano	UNHCR – SC Turkey Coordinator	lubrano@unhcr.org
33	Santiago	Luengo	IFRC - SC Americas	Santiago.luengo@ifrc.org
34	Andrii	Mazurenko	UNHCR – SC Ukraine IMO	mazurenk@unhcr.org
35	Gregg	McDonald	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	mcdonalg@unhcr.org
36	Pablo	Medina	IFRC - Senior Officer SC Coordination	Pablo.medina@ifrc.org
37	Steven	Michel	UNICEF – SC DRC Coordinator	smichel@unicef.org
38	Maria	Moita	IOM – ex Roving Focal Point	mmoita@iom.int
39	Mohamad	Mukalled	UNHCR – SC Iraq Coordinator	mukalled@unhcr.org
40	Maja	Munk	DRC – Shelter/NFI Coordinator for the whole of Syria	maja.munk@drc-mena.org
41	Shirin	Narymbaeva	IFRC - SC Support team	Shirin.narymbaeva@ifrc.org
42	Davide	Nicolini	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	nicolini@unhcr.org
43	Klaus	Palkovits	Austrian RC	Klaus.palkovits@roteskreuz.at
44	Andrew	Peacock	SC Vanuatu	apeacock@camphere.com.au
45	Anna	Pont	IFRC - Americas	Anna.point@ifrc.org
46	Subesh	Prasad	IFRC - SC Fiji	Subesh.parsad@ifrc.org
47	Bruno	Raimbault	IFRC – SC Myanmar	Raimbault.bruno@gmail.com
48	David	Ray	Shelter Box –SC Malawi Deputy Coordinator	daveray@shelterbox.org

49	Jean	Ruberintwari	UNHCR – SC Mali Coordinator	ruberinj@unhcr.org
50	Nevins	Saeed	UNOPS/UNHCR – SC Sudan Coordinator	saeedn@unhcr.org
51	Oscar	Safar	IOM – Cluster Co–lead	osafari@iom.int
52	Shaun	Scales	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	scales@unhcr.org
53	Fadi	Shamisti	NRC –SC Palestine Deputy Coordinator	fadi.shamisti@nrc.no
54	Ryan	Smith	IFRC – SC Vanuatu	Smith.ryan547@gmail.com
55	Victoria	Stodart	IFRC – HLP	Victoria.stodart@ifrc.org
56	Ernesto	Tobar	Habitat for Humanity – Construction Manager – Cluster coordinator	etobar@habitatelsalvador.org.sv
57	Richard	Tracey	IFRC – SC Nepal	Coord2.nepal@sheltercluster.org
58	Miguel	Urquia	UNHCR – Shelter and Settlement Section	urquia@unhcr.org
59	Cornelius	Weira	IOM – Subnational Coordinator	coweira@iom.int
60	Sithole	Wonesai	IOM – WG Coordinator: SC/NFI/CCCM	wsithole@iom.int