

## Shelter / NFI / CCCM Bhamo Cluster Meeting Minutes

14:00 to 16:30, March 25, 2015

UNHCR Office, Bhamo

**Attendees:** OCHA, UNHCR, IOM, CESVI, KMSS-BMO, SI & KBC

**Advanced notification not attending meeting:** UNICEF WaSH, Metta & Shalom

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	After a round of self-introduction the meeting started in Myanmar for the most part, with some translation and discussions in English after it was confirmed with the group that English was understood by all. The agenda items proposed by the Cluster Coordinator for Kachin and Northern Shan (CCK) in absence of any suggestions received ahead of the meeting were agreed.	
<b>Cluster Updates</b>  <i>IM Update</i>	<p>March 16 - 20 UNHCR Information Manager (IM) came to mission to MTY. The main objectives and outcome of the visit were:</p> <p><b>1. Revision of the Camp Master List with all stakeholders</b></p> <p>The Camp Master list is compiled, updated and released by the CCCM Cluster every 4 to 6 weeks since mid-2013, based on information collected from a range of sources and cross-checked. After almost 2 years, this Cluster invited all stakeholders for a ½ day workshop on in-depth revision of the list: status and name of places, population figures, etc. Unfortunately, in absence of a number of key stakeholders and with limited attendance the objectives were only partially achieved.</p> <p>One main agreement is the process to enter new IDP locations in the Camp List. A separate memo will come out with exact steps soon. It was agreed that the process between first mention of a new place and inclusion in the Camp Master List should be two months. Indeed, as many displacements in Kachin and NS last only for a few days or a few weeks, changing data</p>	

<p><b>Donor Briefing March 10 Yangon</b></p>	<p>in the Camp Master List immediately would likely lead to confusion. In-between, information about such new places would be circulated through emails for coordination of response.</p> <p><b>2. Camp Profiling Round 3 and Round 4 (and other possible data collection tools)</b> Data of camp profiling round 3 was finishing completion and should be released after Water Festival. Quality continues increasing with every round even though some difficulties remain. Round 4 will likely happen between September and November, giving time in-between to explore some other avenues for data collection and updating with the additional support of IOM.</p> <p><b>3. Update of the Cluster Analysis Report (CAR)</b> Several updates have been made in the presentation of the CAR, which everyone can comment on when the next one will be release within a couple of weeks after this meeting. In the shelter tracking a new entry will be made to try to better track land availability. CCK requested help from all Cluster members to update/correct regularly the CAR. Indeed, this Cluster can only access a portion of the IDPs sites and not always on a regular basis, so the CAR is as good as information that is received from all.</p> <p>The National Cluster Coordinator (CC) chaired a donor briefing in YGN on March 10<sup>th</sup> to inform all donors about needs in 2015 for shelters and CCCM in Rakhine and Kachin. Exactly a year ago one was done focusing on Kachin shelter needs, which proved quite successful. Regarding shelter needs in Kachin CC used specific assessments and/or proposals provided by some Cluster members to illustrate what need and can be done. CCK thanked agencies who went through the process end of 2014 of detailed assessment; this gave a lot more strength to the Cluster efforts in fundraising. Despite several donors requesting follow-up information, so far no clear sign of available funding have been received apart from the Emergency Response Fund (ERF).</p> <p>Question was asked if the issue to access funds was specific to Kachin or if it was also elsewhere in Myanmar. CCK explained that not only it was difficult for all areas of Myanmar, but actually Worldwide. With the highest number of IDPs since the second World war at an estimated 50 million and the highest number of large scale crisis the UN ever have had to face at the same time since its creation, at a time of global economic difficulties, raising funds for</p>	<p><u>Actions point:</u> All Cluster members to review carefully the CAR at each release (every 4 to 6 months) and provide comments/updates to maintain the quality of the document</p>
--	--	---

<p><b><i>IOM Capacity Strengthening Programme</i></b></p>	<p>anything but core life-saving activities is a real challenge, everywhere. Quality of data to support advocacy to donors and demonstrate how essential support is, will be more central than ever in 2015 and probably 2016.</p> <p>CCK and OCHA underlined that the ERF could be a very interesting option. Training was conducted in MTY March 23, but any organization can approach OCHA anytime for more information. The ERF is so far reasonably well funded for 2015, and therefore could be a good option to respond to urgent shelter needs CCK explained that the selection process for proposal had changed from monthly selection to twice a year call for proposal. The next one should come in May for submission of proposal in June. Ahead of that interested organizations need to register in the ERF system. CCK strongly encouraged all shelter actors to consider the ERF and ensure they do not miss the May call for proposal as the next one will likely be only towards the end of the year. CCK gave the example of KBC who has submitted to ERF for shelter in Shing Jai and Putao.</p> <p>CCK introduced the IOM capacity strengthening project, reminding the group it had been discussed quite in details mid-2014, based on those discussion CCK already briefed the IOM team.</p> <p>IOM was called to support the Cluster as a technical partner. The IOM team will work closely with all CCCM agencies to develop training plans and develop adapted full capacity building package, not only training. It will also look into option to support information management. Four-day training was recently organized in MTY and BMO, focusing on roles and responsibilities. IOM and CCK underlined that the goal was to provide personalized capacity strengthening. All agencies should approach IOM if they want specific training/support. This should really be seen as a service offered to CCCM agencies, so they should be pro-active to approach with questions and raise their needs.</p> <p>IOM team will also visit CCCM agencies individually for further discussions. This is a long term project, already funded until the end of 2015, but for which IOM and the CCCM Cluster are looking for funds to continue into 2016.</p>	<p><u>Action point:</u> All Cluster members to look into the option of ERF to cover some unmet gaps, and CCK will provide necessary information on request.</p> <p><u>Action point:</u> All CCCM partners to brainstorm internally on how best they could take advantage of the IOM program and approach IOM/CCK for questions and propositions.</p> <p><u>Action point:</u> IOM to contact each CCCM partner individually to further discuss needs and how best to answer</p>
---	---	--

		them.
<p><b>Toolboxes</b></p>	<p>During February meeting, an action point for all Cluster members was to define what would/should be the steps to ensure monitoring and good use if tool boxes were to be provided. During group work on community mobilization, provision of training and tool boxes to IDPs were raised as ways to increase ownership. At that time a few possible challenges were exposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How we do when camp committee is not IDPs if the CMC is in-charge of the tool box, mostly if/when the IDP community moves?</li> <li>▪ Generally, who should be providing accountability for good use and monitoring of the project?</li> <li>▪ How do we do in very small camps? Would there be skilled people to really use the tools?</li> </ul> <p>CCK explained that there would most likely be some toolboxes available from the UNHCR following a similar project that ended up being cut in Rakhine State if the group can prove that there is a plan and a process in place to handle them and make them useful. KMSS-BMO expressed that it should be no problem to give responsibility to the CMCs, even though its head might not be an IDP, it is understood the items are for the IDP and therefore they would be given back when needed. SI was in favor of a responsibility with a specific assigned IDP who would have undergone training, which is similar to what SI does with WaSH committees when they want to hand-over small spare parts or tools.</p> <p>The possibility to have different solutions in different camps, based on discussions directly with the communities was discussed. This seemed a good approach, not the least in regards to ownership, but issue of the high number of camps. For very small camps the group would advise to be more flexible and simply distribute one or two boxes for all IDPs resting with CCCM Focal Point, without going through trainings, etc. There would always be a few men (or even women) in each case that can use them and it would still provide clear support. In any case there would be a need for basic guidelines, and whenever possible training should also be part of it (as per what CESVI has already started) but likely not possible everywhere due to number of camps.</p>	<p><u>Action point:</u> CCK to share content of tool box.</p> <p><u>Action points:</u> CCK to report to YGN level the process discussed and push for toolboxes to be</p>

	<p>The group agreed that a pilot should be started as soon as possible following some main lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sample of camps for pilot should be large enough to provide relevant picture and because needs for repair and maintenance is big so if start with too little camp it would take too long.</li> <li>▪ Sample should target medium size or large camp where there are already assessed important repair needs to maximize impact.</li> <li>▪ For larger camps, the possibility of organize Shelter (or infrastructure) committees was discussed and seen as a good option.</li> <li>▪ One risk of having the camp manager in place is that it is often a position without stipend (when for example FP is) and therefore the commitment in following-up could be less.</li> </ul> <p>CCK concluded thanking all for the ideas. As there is a clear process discussed and proposed. CCK will relay and look into possibilities of having toolboxes sent to Kachin, at least at first for the pilot project. All Cluster members will take the opportunity of the next TWiG meeting March 31 to draft a possible list of pilot camps (the same will be done by the UNHCR/Cluster engineer in MTY within a few weeks).</p>	<p>realized for Kachin based on list of pilot camps submitted by Cluster members.</p> <p>All Cluster members to draft a possible list of pilot camps at the TWiG meeting on March 31.</p> <p>UNHCR/Cluster engineer to organize a TWiG in MTY on possible new(reduced floor size) shelters and possible list of pilot camps for distributions of tool boxes</p>
<p><b>Temporary to Temporary</b></p>	<p>CCK reminded the participants the background of this agenda item, which had been discussed in previous meetings. He underlined that since it was last discussed end of February, the number of cases was quickly increasing. There is an increasing need to work on possible response because while only 3-4 cases were reported in 2014 there had already been 10+ in 2015. CCK informed that so far no comments have been received to the protection position paper on the subject and encouraged all participants to provide further comments. Some specific cases were discussed:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. Maing Khaung RC, Mansi Township</b></p> <p>KMSS-BMO as the CCCM agency briefed that IDPs from other camps in Mansi (Man Win Gyi and La Na Zup and Bum Tsit Pa areas) wanted to come back and look at their place of origin and try to re-start some of their livelihoods. Situation in the area has stabilized and people feel</p>	

	<p>they can go back to use their fields, but there are checkpoints and military patrols that would not allow people to overnight in the villages in this area.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>There is no official system in place to access such places, people show their IDs and whatever documents proving they come from this area to local military in-charge. KMSS-BMO specified that it can be seen as a positive sign that IDPs want to return to a more normal life rather than staying in camps. CCK explained that in such case, the fact that IDPs themselves request the movement is a very important point, and there could be possibilities to support such transition. IOM added that in other places transitional shelter (made of easy to dismantle material that can later on be transported and re-used in place of origin) is the solution chosen.</p> <p>After long discussions, it appeared like in such cases transitional solutions could be considered, but major hurdles remain, such as land tenure and general instability. Indeed, there is a need to make sure IDP can remain in the transition place until full return/permanent solution can be achieved, otherwise they might end up in a situation where they have nowhere to go or stay. Another difficulty is that this is difficult to support such transition solution based on relief assistance alone, and therefore other assistance needs to be sought, which can take time. It is important from CCCM agencies and Camp management Committees to be very transparent to IDPs that <i>if</i> they make the decision to move from on temporary camp to another there is right now no guarantee that they will receive assistance in terms of shelter and WaSH.</p> <p><b>2. Loi Je KBC</b></p> <p>In this camp the Church that had provided land to shelter IDPs had since the beginning requested KBC to help move the IDPs to a new land to free the Church space for the 100 anniversary of the community, before October 2015. Land has been identified, provided also by a Dean from the Church, where currently sugar cane is grown.</p> <p>CCK underlined that in such case, beyond the issue of requesting IDPs to move again, which is</p>	
--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> *Note added after the meeting, within the days before and after the meeting the area mentioned has seen some intense fighting, including use of aircrafts and helicopter within less than 20 miles of where IDPs were hoping (step by step) to return back closer to the place of origin. At time of writing building up of troops is continuing in that area even though fighting has halted.*

	<p>never good for people, the land tenure is again central. Indeed, if all previous efforts to move IDPs and failed, there would be a need to at least move them somewhere that can offer sustainability. In this instance there has been verbal guarantee that the land can be used as needed, but it would likely be too little to approach and convince donors to invest again for similar shelters for the same IDPs, with no clear longer-term added value. CCK inquired if local authorities have been approached to see if they could provide land with longer land tenure?</p> <p>The group was concerned that if that would be done IDPs would be strongly encouraged to be included in larger organized relocation plans rather than proposed land where they feel comfortable to stay. Example of the movement to Sein Lone in 2014, a return to place of origin that did not work well, is in people's mind. CCK and IOM proposed, if it can support the claim, to approach local authorities with KBC. OCHA said that it seems difficult (not to say impossible) to reach more sustainable solutions without including more the local authorities. It has not been attempted much so far, so OCHA encouraged to try and not let previous unsuccessful experiences mean that there is no tentative to go further.</p> <p>CCK mentioned that alternatively, if really no solution can be found with either the existing location, or through discussions with local authorities, could the Church give a written guarantee for IDPs to be able to stay as long as needed on the new land? CCK also insisted on the importance to include IDPs in all these efforts/communications that they can be included in decisions concerning them, and maybe in solutions</p> <p>During previous displacements in Kachin in the 80's or 90's this was much less of a problem. With smaller population and land value very low, IDPs deciding to re-start their life in a new place would just use an empty land or purchase it cheaply and re-build after a period with next of kin. In current situation where land has acquired a huge value, same copying mechanism is not really feasible.</p>	
<p><b>AoB</b></p>	<p>TWiG meeting on March 31 to discuss smaller shelter when land is not available &amp; pilot for tool box distributions.</p> <p>Concern that <i>if</i> things flare up again in Mansi it could reach LNZ-BTP (on the line of the pipeline/transport projects).</p>	

	With the Water Festival there will be no meeting in April and the next quarterly joined WaSH/shelter/NFI/CCCM meeting to be held in MTY (in keeping with rotation of places between BMO and MTY) and tentatively agreed for May 13 and 14.	
--	--	--

**Documents shared in hard copy:**

- CESVI shelter construction and repair project
- Minutes from previous meetings
- NRC Camp management training document