

## Shelter / NFI / CCCM Myitkyina Cluster Meeting Minutes

10:00 to 12:00, Tuesday, November 26, 2013

UNHCR office, Myitkyina

Attendees: DRC, Shalom, MRCS, UN-Habitat, WaSH Cluster, UNHCR, OCHA, KMSS-MTY

Received advanced notice but did not attend: Metta, KBC, Trocaire & ACTED

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Cluster Coordinator Kachin State (CCK) welcomed the participants, presented the agenda and introduced the visitors from joint ECHO-UNHCR-NRC monitoring mission, then all participants introduce themselves. CCK informed that the main goal of this specific meeting would be for the Cluster partners to share with the JMM their point of view on this Kachin/Northern Shan State Cluster and propose changes, as/if needed for the 2014 in terms of the Cluster's way of operating.</p> <p>However, the meeting would start with three updates from the Cluster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-TWiG;</li> <li>-Mansi crisis response;</li> <li>-Summary of 2014 Kachin humanitarian strategy workshop in YGN, organised by OCHA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Cluster updates:</b>  <b>TWiG</b>	<p>CCK mentioned that the <b>Technical Working Group (TWiG)</b> that had been carried out between July and October had stopped since the Cluster Shelter Expert had changed and the new person has spent most of his induction time travelling to get to know the areas of responsibility. No request has been received by CCK from members to continue this TWiG, but CCK asked participants if it should be re-started at next opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shalom said their impression was decisions made at the TWiG took too long to be implemented and that designs were often not well-adapted to the ground reality;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KMSS-MTY mentioned that none of the person present had attended any of the TWiG meeting but that they heard from their colleague that the designs needed to be more adapted to the land available. In summary for both agencies the main point is the size of 5 units barrack shelter.</li> </ul> <p>Responding the National Cluster Coordinator (CC) said that while the Cluster is aware of the challenges of the land, standards remain important. CC underlined that the number of units can be flexible but that donors wants to be sure that shelters respect basic standards such as size/person ratio and that shelter are sufficiently safe. CCK mentioned that these remarks proved the utility of the TWiG as some points clearly still need discussion.</p> <p>ECHO inquired if participants had the impression that designs were imposed? Shalom answered “yes”. The CC explained that Cluster standards should be seen as a steer to make sure that overall quality of shelters is adequate, but there were not set in stone and there was space for flexibility. DRC added that from a protection point of view the issue of privacy needed to be addressed. The shelters needed to be adapted to the different profile of families, as well as taking into serious consideration the gender issues.</p> <p>The UNHCR person from the JMM mission, who represents the Shelter Cluster at the Global (GSC) level clarified the role of Geneva in regards to designs.<sup>1</sup> The approved designs for Kachin had actually been discussed locally and then approved by Geneva, not the other way around. The Global Shelter Cluster provided comments and advice to ensure consistency with international standards but propositions remain for the field to submit as/when changes are needed. ECHO underlined that as a general rule implementing agencies should feel the freedom to adapt standards and guidelines. The Cluster provides guidelines based on experience, which serve as a starting point for discussion. CC confirmed that the Cluster’s International Shelter Expert, deployed to Myanmar for three months, had made the need for flexibility one of the main points of his final report.</p> <p>CCK commented that the TWiG would re-start. Also, noting DRC’s comments persons from the protection sector would be invited to participate (as/when relevant). However, both the</p>	
--	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Miguel Urquia, UNHCR’s Emergency Shelter Coordinator

<p><b>Mansi</b></p> <p><b>2014 Kachin humanitarian strategy workshop</b></p>	<p>CC and CCK requested that participants “participate actively” in the TWiG to avoid having the impression that decisions are imposed but rather reflect what the field suggests. MRCS also explained that they were conducting a kind of tehcnical meeting similar to the TWiG and that from now on they will send their shelter program person to the TWiG to participate. MRCS also confirmed that IDPs complained about the privacy issue.</p> <p>CCK presented the structure the Cluster has put in place to coordinate the response to the recent <b>Mansi</b> displacement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -Two persons in Northern Shan State, one for general coordination and one for shelter;</li> <li>• -Usual set-up in BMO;</li> <li>• -Both working in close relation with CCK and UNHCR office in MTY to centralise information and follow-up;</li> <li>• -Contacts of the different persons involved were put at the bottom of the agenda, so CCK encouraged participants to make sure they had/kept this document. Currently, all agncies are focusing on providing new IDPs emergency/life-saving relief assistance. During the next Cluster meeting, as the situation should have stabilised, the more mid-term response will be discussed.</li> </ul> <p>CC gave the outline of the <b>2014 Kachin humanitarian strategy workshop</b> on Wednesday November 20th, held by OCHA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-CC expressed reservation that it was conducted in YGN. However, it is indeed difficult to find a central place for MTY, BMO and Northern Shan;</li> <li>-Good attendance and balance between LNGOs, INGOs and UNs;</li> <li>-Several such Workshops has been organised: one day for Kachin, one day for Rakhine and one day for the national strategy;</li> <li>-Regarding <i>this</i> Cluster we now have strategies for all three sectors, namely a consensus for our directions in 2014. During the next four to siz weeks there will be further revision of the two strategies. Note, it is important to present the situation precisely to donors to advocate and fundraise;</li> <li>-CC recalled the four main obejctives for the Shelter Cluster in 2014 and underlined that one important challenge was to estimate exactly the needs:</li> </ul> <p>1<sup>st</sup> objective: provide shelter to the estimated 20,000 IDPs who do not yet have any/adequate</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>shelter; 2<sup>nd</sup> objective: upgrade shelters to meet standards (security, size, privacy, etc); 3<sup>rd</sup> objective: camp infrastructure; 4<sup>th</sup> objective: durable solutions in case people can return back home or resettle elsewhere. -CCK specified that this shelter strategy would be discussed in more detail at a following meeting.<sup>2</sup></p>	
<b>Global Shelter Cluster</b>	<p>The GSC gave a presentation on the Global Shelter Cluster, its goals, roles and responsibilities, insisting that it is a mechanism created to support implementing agencies, a “service provider”. He also shared a Cluster leaflet.</p> <p>The WaSH Cluster asked if the WaSH-Shelter Clusters coordination was part of the overall strategy, and further if there was anything in place to “impose” this coordination? GSC answered that it was more guidance and recommendations, without a system in place to force implementing agencies to follow strict coordination. ECHO specified that when shelter projects are presented to them they ensure that WaSH and gender were taken into consideration. The GSC also requested participants to share what they think has been functioning well amongst/with the Cluster, what support they received and more importantly where they would like to see improvement? ECHO reinforced this point, what was most important for them to understand was where Cluster members think they should receive more/better support.</p> <p>Shalom said it was difficult for them to attend coordination meetings due to their high numbers. As well, it is difficult to provide data. For example for the 3W WaSH table, not all agencies provide. They suggested that one whole-day meeting/month would be easier for them to attend. ECHO asked more specifically, beyond meeting organisation issue, what cluster members feel they receive or not from the cluster? Shalom confirmed that the cluster meetings were useful but that attending was the real issue for them as they were busy with implementation. ECHO suggested that some meetings can be prioritised. For example, at the beginning of a crisis, when decisions have to be taken, it is particularly important to have everyone involved present. ECHO also underlined that it was important for the Cluster to</p>	

<sup>2</sup> See *Shelter Cluster Strategic Operational Framework Kachin and Northern Shan States v1.4 27th September 2013* under **Key Documents** at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/default.aspx>

	<p>share agenda ahead of meetings for members to be able to decide on the importance of their participation. More widely CC said that in order to develop a “coherent response” there was a need for coordination, and that some decisions needed to be made together. Two hours of meeting every four to six weeks seem a reasonable commitment to achieve this goal. “Two hours over five weeks, taking an average of a forty hour week, was just one per cent of one person’s from each partner time.” This idea was reinforced by the WaSH Cluster Coordinator.</p> <p>CCK asked to all participants if one day/month was easier to manage than twice two hours/month for WaSH and <i>this</i> Cluster. Overall, participants confirmed that this would be easier for them, and CCK said that it could probably be feasible. The WaSH Cluster confirmed that it can be tried.</p> <p>MRCS mentioned that meetings cannot always give answers, and suggested that workshops and training can be useful instead of meetings to build the capacity of local partners and design solutions. For example from these workshops we could work out how to adapt shelter designs. KMSS-MTY said that they understand that some process should be followed and therefore answers can take time.</p> <p>Again ECHO requested participants to give specific areas where they would wish to receive more support from the cluster. Shalom answered that the main point is funding and land space availability. In regards to funding, ECHO mentioned that when funding is never really enough, some adaptation/improvement can often been done with little budget. The CC fully recognised that raising funds for Kachin is a real challenge, much more so than for Rakhine he stressed that it is also easier to raise funds if good standards are being implemented.</p> <p>ECHO thanked the participants for the comments and ideas, but regretted that some Cluster partners did not participate in the open discussion. OCHA mentioned that after discussions with LNGOs, inter-sector wise, the reluctance to meet for coordination purposes had been raised, but at the same time the request to be informed and trained on standards was stated. OCHA suggested workshops with inputs from both sides on what are international standards. MRCS supported this idea. The GSC thanked the participants and stated that from this meeting he could see good coordination between various level organisations. He underlined that from experience the GSC knows that it is a hard road to agree on everything but it is also</p>	
--	--	--

	worth it in the long run and will provide the best results. CCK mentioned that another representative from ECHO, part of the JMM, was due to attend this meeting but could not due to health and plane issues. However, he would reach MTY this evening and therefore all Cluster members were invited to participate in a dinner with this person to expose their views.	
<b>Partner Updates</b>	<p>Time was pressing, allowing for a very brief period for partner updates that were pressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MRCS shared data regarding gaps in relief assistance in Northern Kachin in Putao and Machambaw T/S where they plan to do an assessment in November 2013. There is an urgent need for shelter, for some HH that are there already since over 2 years without proper shelter;</li> <li>• MRCS-ICRC will distribute NFIs beginning of December. Some IDPs in this are received land, so maybe permanent housing should be considered.</li> </ul>	