GLOBAL CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT CLUSTER

RETREAT REPORT

September 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster held its annual retreat on 27-28 September 2017, bringing together representatives from 26 organizations, governments and missions. The Retreat offered an opportunity to share achievements, best practices and current projects in order to plan the way forward for the cluster in 2018, as well as discuss matters of camp management and coordination among practitioners.

The first half of Day 1 was dedicated to providing an overview of the changing CCCM context and environment, as well as showcasing projects demonstrating best practice in coordination, accountability and participation. Today's CCCM responses are becoming more and more complex and the number of thematic areas involved in camp management increasing. An ever more complex response environment means that the displacement triggers and contexts rarely fall into one category, e.g. conflict or natural disaster and therefore our approach to the CCCM sector must account for this. Localization is key to effective sustainability of camp management and requires improving engagement with civil society, volunteer organisations, local governmental structures and community-based organisations, in an effort to bring about more predictable and coordinated localized responses, particularly in high-risk and access-restricted contexts.

The afternoon of Day 1 saw an introduction of different approaches to the setting of humanitarian standards, as well as a first consultation session on the proposed CCCM Companion document to the Sphere Handbook. During the Companion review, the participants at the retreat were encouraged to sign up to the CCCM Sphere Companion reference group that will reflect upon the discussions during the consultation and guide the process moving forward.

Day 2 opened with a 1-year-after update on the Grand Bargain commitments and the latest developments in the inter-agency environment, with particular focus on how this will affect Global CCCM Cluster and practitioners in the field. The humanitarian community is facing decreasing levels of funding and will therefore have to further increase its already ongoing efforts to work towards collaborative outcomes - decreasing overlap and improving efficiency of response. These updates were followed up by discussions with representatives from the global clusters and AORs, who were invited to share best practices on collaborative, multi-sectorial projects to address gaps on the ground, and collectively explore the roles of camp managers in these settings.

The Global CCCM Strategic Advisory Group then reported back to the cluster members on their achievements, challenges and highlights; as well as endorsed ACTED and DRC for re-election to the SAG on a two-year term.

The final session of the two-day event pulled together inputs and recommendations from participants for the Global CCCM Cluster and SAG. Participants gave input on priorities for the Global Cluster for 2018 in correlation to the Global CCCM Strategy 2017-2021 four core strategic objectives.

Organisations, Governments and Missions:

Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), Calais Action, Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), European Asylum Support Office (EASO), Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), International Organization for Migration (IOM), IMPACT, Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), King Salman Humanitarian Aid and Relief Centre (KSRelief), LWF, National Authority (Nigeria & Djibouti), Norwegian Capacity (NORCAP), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), Bureau of Population Refugees and Migration (PRM), Shelter Centre, Sphere, Terre des Hommes, German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UNHABITAT), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United States Agency for International Development /The Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAid/OFDA), World Food Programme (WFP).

Country Offices:

Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Djibouti, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Indonesia, Iraq, Kosovo, Lebanon, Malta, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Switzerland, Syria, Yemen, Turkey (Cross Border Northern Syria)

Acknowledgement:

WEDNESDAY 27 SEPTEMBER

THURSDAY 28 SEPTEMBER

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Speakers – Manisha Thomas (Facilitator), Kimberly Roberson (UNHCR), Tristan Burnett (IOM)

This session saw a brief reflection on previous retreats which highlighted the fact that this year's retreat was more diverse; enabling a broader view of the CCCM not only as a cluster, but also touching on sectorial specificities. It was also noted that the sector's most important asset is its practitioners and therefore advantage should be taken of the opportunity to share experiences in order to better tackle the increasing challenges posed by the previously unseen magnitude of L3 crises. The retreat agenda covered both coordination and camp management and was linked to the four core strategic objectives of the Global CCCM Cluster Strategy 2017-21:

- People centred camp management and coordination
- Strategic and inclusive support and collaboration
- Responses fit-for-purpose
- Information and feedback-driven quality responses

The main expected outcome of the 2017 retreat was for the Global Cluster to have a better understanding of where we currently are as a sector and where we would like to go. This outcome was achieved through discussions over the two days feeding into the 'Way Forward: CCCM in 2018 and Beyond' session.

WHERE ARE WE WORKING?

Speakers – Daniela Raiman (UNHCR), Wan Sophonpanich (IOM)

Key points and outcomes:

- Vision of the Global CCCM Cluster:
  - Ensure equitable access to services and protection for displaced persons living in communal settings, improve their quality of life and dignity during displacement, and advocate for solutions while preparing them for life after displacement.
  - The Global CCCM Cluster supports field operations with tools, guidance and capacity building to coordinate and manage displaced populations effectively.
- The Cluster also operates in camp-like settings, not just camps.
- Hope to design a work-plan for the future, based on feedback from participants of CCCM Cluster Retreat "Where do you think we should be going?"

Today's CCCM responses are becoming more and more complex, and while we have made some headway at mainstreaming protection and gender into our responses, the number of thematic areas that must also be considered are increasing. This means that CCCM sector now has a wider mix of people with a wider range of responsibilities. An ever more complex trend means that displacement triggers and contexts rarely fall into one category, e.g. conflict or natural disaster, and therefore the approach of the sector must account for this.

Although continuing to be seen as a last resort, camps are still very much a reality in today's responses. Nevertheless, CCCM activities go beyond the traditional idea of camps into camp-like and non-camp, yet collective settings – such as collective centres, host families, transit sites etc. and the name of the cluster reflects a limitation that is challenging to overcome when intervening in such contexts.

The above complexities raise the question of direction of the CCCM cluster and one of the objectives of the retreat is to obtain the inputs of the participants for establishing a prioritized work-plan for 2018.

WHO ARE WE WORKING WITH?

Speakers – Sophie Everest (DRC), David Preux (IOM), Genc Demiraj (UNHABITAT), Kirstin Lange (UNHCR)

This session explored different aspects of representation and participation of the affected population in camp management activities and accountability of the humanitarian community towards them through a series of field-based examples. Panellists shared experiences, challenges, tools and best practices for bringing about participation and governance in CCCM.

Presentations:

- **Myanmar Experience: Camp Governance Structure - Sophie Everest (DRC)**

Camp committees are not a guarantee of representation. Meaningful representation needs diverse leadership structures, empowered women or access to training to build capacity, targeting vulnerable groups by collecting quality data, communicating in creative ways to reach all members of the community, and promoting accountability within camp committees.

- **Women participation project – David Preux (IOM)**

Women face barriers in participation including limited livelihoods opportunities, lack of opportunity for self-development, GBV and safety concerns, gender norms perpetuating inequality, and a limited understanding of the purpose and benefits of participation. Having women on governing committees does not mean they participate in decision making. Traditional gender roles are a barrier, and CCCM actors are not there to challenge cultural norms but can try to mitigate gender roles that could lead to vulnerabilities.

- **Innovative use of Minecraft game in designing public spaces: Bloc by bloc project – Genc Demiraj (UNHABITAT)**

Public spaces are important in sustainable urban development, and engaging the community through an accessible tool like Minecraft promotes involvement and may contribute to more ownership of public spaces. It provides all different groups of population, regardless of their professional training, to participate in the development of the environment they live in.

- **How to ensure meaningful participation of people with disabilities? Kirstin Lange (UNHCR)**

Persons with disabilities have the capacity to participate in community leadership structures but often face stigma and barriers to access information. Bringing together mixed groups of disabled persons from displaced and host communities with community leaders reduces stigma and provides connections between host and displaced communities. DPOs (disabled persons organizations) are a key actor, not often engaged in humanitarian contexts.

CCCM TODAY – OVERVIEW OF THE CHANGING CCCM CONTEXT AND ENVIRONMENT

Localization is key for sustainability of camp management. This session showcased non-traditional, and at times non-institutional, actors involved (actively or by default) in camp management. The breakout group panels shared lessons at improving engagement with civil society, military and government structures, volunteer organisations, community-based organisations, in an effort to make such engagement more predictable and coordinated, particularly in high-risk and access-restricted contexts.

- Break out 1: Camp management in emergency/high risk/remote
- Break out 2: Use of CBOs for grass root-level interventions; Building the next generation of CCCM national volunteers
- Break out 3: Sustainability in a local environment, capacity of local authorities, host population considerations
- Break out 4: Area based approaches

Break out 1: Camp management in emergency/high risk/remote

Speakers – Manuel Pereira (IOM) & Veronica Costareli (UNHCR)

◆ There is a need to better define what camp management is in high risk areas; the concept of 'management' needs to be scoped out. Questions raised: Are we just managing the camp or are we looking at bigger issues? How do we access and engage with those who are not in camps? How do we engage governments? Who decides where people go? Do we support host families?

◆ Having a clearer understanding of the humanitarian space. What defines this and how can CCCM engage the government and other actors to agree on core aspects, such as impartiality? What happens when these are ignored and how should CCCM respond?

◆ When governments allocate camp locations, they do not necessarily choose the best ones in terms of safety and security, which gives the green light for potential issues; so are we legitimising a space that is not protective, and doing harm to populations indirectly by agreeing to manage such locations? Clarification: In Iraq, locations were proposed by the military but the sites were selected from these by humanitarians to be up to the standards of camp locations.

◆ It is important to establish a red line to ensure safety for humanitarians. How far do we go? Where are the red lines? (e.g. no humanitarian management of detention centres, such as in Greece where the transit camps became detention sites)

◆ It is important to know who the "dominant force" in the site is, and how we can come across as impartial.

◆ To what extent should CCCM be involved in coordinating with the military, Protection cluster, OCHA and other groups on daily operational issues? How to engage with these actors? How do we define who we should engage with?

◆ OCHA's role in advocating for humanitarian space is reducing and it should not be. OCHA needs to be leading this – CCCM is put in a vulnerable position and is in need of support in complex situations.

◆ Settlements and sites – this is more of an issue. Spontaneous settlements or creation by one of the other groups (e.g. military, armed actors etc.). Tactic used – called an informal settlement and then dialogue with militia as to how this could be administered – mostly via government. This is still a grey area. Not enough engagement to create the humanitarian space with armed groups.

Break out 2: Use of community-based organizations (CBOs) for grass root-level interventions; Building the next generation of CCCM national volunteers

Speakers – Conrad Navidad, group facilitator (IOM); Tess Berry-Hart (Calais Action) & Dher Hayo (UNHCR)

◆ Grassroots organizations can be fast and effective and often respond to gaps in the services provided by the state/large organizations.

◆ Grassroots organizations need investment, not dismissal. They have a lot of capacity, though there are varying levels of order and skills. Large organisations should engage them to utilize that capacity, learn from and build on their on-the-ground systems, provide them with training, and engage them for cost-efficient implementation.

◆ Local organizations often know the culture and context better than international organizations. Many grassroots organizations such as those in Calais represent public opinion.

◆ Volunteers don't need to manage camps or take on complex projects, but that doesn't mean that they can't have space to work.

◆ However, it's important that community groups are held to standards and proper due diligence is needed. The most effective way of ensuring standards and code of conduct is to offer support such as funding, training, or resources in kind.

◆ Engagement with community organizations should not just be a tick of the box that says "we do community engagement".

Break out 3: Sustainability in a local environment, capacity of local authorities, host population considerations

Speakers – Liv Grete Framgard (UNRWA) & Erica Bower (UNHCR)

◆ Pilot project: Dier El Balah Camp in Gaza Strip:
  - There is an increasing need to find sustainable settlement solutions for camp settings.
  - The project ran with the premise that 'there is no such thing as waste' – meaning that everything can be reused even in a humanitarian setting. This not only reduces cost but it is an environmentally sustainable solution.
  - Social sustainability is the ultimate end goal and is not to be considered as a separate entity from economic sustainability.
  - Sustainable strategies include water, organics, energy, and inorganics.

◆ Climate Change and Disaster Displacement: Protection in Camp Management:
  - 25.4 million are displaced each year by sudden-onset natural hazards
  - Disaster is a multiplying force, even fuelling conflict.
  - Climate change is increasing the frequency and intensity of sudden onset hazards (storms, floods) and slow onset hazards (droughts, melting permafrost, rising sea levels)
  - Durable solutions for IDPs and refugees need to take into consideration climate change.
  - Protracted disaster displacement causes of loss of livelihoods too.
  - Protection risks in camps after disasters follow a similar pattern to that of conflict situations.

Break out 4: Area based approaches

Speakers – Olivier Cecchi (IMPACT), Giovanna Federici (NRC)

◆ How to identify an area as a basis for planning, to promote recovery / stabilization of crisis affected communities through a localized approach:
  - Pilot of IMPACT and ACTED's joint initiative, AGORA has been so far piloted in Niger and Jordan.
  - It involved testing and developing an approach and toolbox to understand the new context of area based approaches and to have reliable information available for all humanitarian actors. The first step consisted of defining the community area (territorial understanding) and delineating/understanding settlements through a settlement-based approach. The second step used the Social Network Analysis Theory, identifying the best sources of information, or "key informants", within each settlement (specifically refugees / displaced persons and host communities).
  - Mapping Focus Group Discussions combined with Social Network Analysis.
  - Technical workshops with UNHCR, World Bank, and other international organizations to finalise approaches and toolbox.
  - Training on toolbox for cluster members and coordinators, UNHCR staff and any other interested partners.

◆ UDOC: Urban Displacement Outside of Camps and how can the CCCM skillset be applied and adapted to address the needs of displaced populations living in non-camp settings.

- The UDOC represents three pillars – an area based approach, local stakeholders, and integrated programming.

- It has three main goals:

    1. Two ways communication - to ensure that the affected community know how to access services and claim their rights.

    2. Community engagement - to ensure community ownership of and contribution to the management of the displacement situation.

    3. Support to area level coordination - to support local structure to ensure appropriate and efficient provision of assistance and protection.

- Several lessons have been learned so far from the implementation of the UDOC approach, including the following:

    - An area based approach requires a narrow geographical focus.

    - Neighbourhood selection depends on the local understanding and experience.

    - Consensus should form the foundation of the activity and building it requires engaging with formal and informal leadership

    - Service mapping should be a priority throughout the project.

    - Develop a comprehensive communication strategy which involves a variety of methods to communicate with different segments of the population.

    - Essential to coordinate with other actors with a similar approach.

    - Coordinate and gain consensus on how to work with community structures/focal points.

    - Accountable community structures require time.

HOW ARE WE DOING CCCM?

Speakers – James Kennedy, Aninia Nadig (Sphere), Morena Termini (EASO), Werner Stern (THW)

This session examined different approaches to setting standards in the management of camps, collective settings and other facilities for displaced persons. It also provided updates on the latest revision of the Sphere Handbook.

Introduction to humanitarian standards by James Kennedy:

The presentation provided a contextual introduction to humanitarian standards with a look at the history and evolution of standards. The first ever written guidance on a camp layout was in 1959 by the League of Red Cross Societies and involved following military guidelines of camps with tents along military straight lines – this still has a legacy today. Despite this legacy, Fred Cuny (a disaster relief specialist) later introduced the idea of camps being formed in communal groupings that better reflected community characteristics. However, communal groupings pose a difficulty in striking a balance between local cultural norms and ensuring the preservation of life and rights. This balance is still a challenge today as standards seek to be both local and global in their approach.

Sphere Handbook and minimum standards by Aninia Nadig(Sphere):

The presentation introduced the latest Sphere revision process, an update on the current draft and next steps, as well as a providing an introduction to Sphere Companions.

The Sphere revision process started in early 2017 with draft 1 released for review between April and June 2017 – draft 2 will be shared in October 2017. A workshop was held in September 2017, with experts from fourteen thematic areas in attendance, to discuss draft 1. Discussions focused on the standards and the structure, including how to get agreement on the minimum for standards (codifying and setting a level) And how to reconcile the striving for global standards which are globally usable but with indicators that are locally applicable.

Standards are an expression of rights which are universally applicable, whilst indicators need to be adapted. The specifics/indicators of the standard depend on the context. The indicators themselves do not have actual numbers in the new draft and one has to dig deeper into the context to discover the indicator values.

This revision has integrated 'Core Humanitarian Standards'; which will replace the 'Sphere Core Standards'. Public consultations are an opportunity for CCCM actors to input on the revision process and all the retreat participants were encouraged to comment on draft 2 which can be accessed through the Sphere website.

European Reception Condition Standards by Morena Termini (EASO):

The European Asylum Support Office (EASO), soon to become a European Agency, are working towards operational standards and indicators. EASO has produced a legal framework known as the Reception Conditions Directive which prescribes that asylum seekers have to be provided with certain defined services. The framework was drafted by EASO in consultation with a working group of experts from 8 EU member states - as well as reference groups including international humanitarian agencies and consultations with the EASO Consultative Forum and the EASO Reception Network - and was published in September 2016. Emergency situations do not fall under the scope of this guidance; EASO are currently working on a guidance for contingency planning in the field of reception.

Enhancing preparedness in mass shelter capabilities by Werner Stern (THW):

This presentation introduced the Mass Shelter Capability Project II (MaSC II) which was developed by the German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW) in collaboration with the IOM, UK Government (formerly), and Irish National Directorate for Fire and Emergency Management, with support from the Italian Civil Protection Department. The project timeframe is from January 2017 through to December 2018 with workshops in September and December 2017. The project is designed to enhance preparedness across participating states regarding deployment and hosting of mass shelter capabilities, by identifying detailed requirements for the deployment of the defined mass shelter capability; producing recommendations and guidelines ("Tool Box"); and developing detailed supporting material for the deployment of flexible, scalable and interoperable UCPM mass shelter capabilities.

SPHERE COMPANION CONSULTATION

Break-out Groups

There are currently five handbooks that have joined Sphere as companions. Companions are complimentary to the Sphere Handbook which covers life-saving standards. Applications to become a Companion should come from those producing the handbook and should meet the criteria of relevance, style (written in a Sphere-like manner), values; and need (demand driven).

The Sphere Companionship model involves bi-lateral agreements between Sphere and Companions as well as between the Companions. The proposed CCCM Companion, if accepted, would join the Humanitarian Standards Partnership.

This session was the first consultation for the proposed CCCM Sphere Companion. Global CCCM Cluster members were encouraged to take on an active role in the new Sphere Companion expert reference group that will reflect upon the discussions during this consultation and guide the process moving forward. Full session notes can be found in Annex 1.

◆ **General Considerations from participant feedback:**

- It needs to be decided who the audience is: is it camp managers, coordinators or both? The decision should be made before giving universal standards and must be a priority for the expert working group.
- May require input of all other clusters as we need to be aware of their standards
- Standards should take an inclusive approach; they should also be universal and human rights based.

◆ **Next steps for Sphere Companion:**

- The Global CCCM Cluster support team to circulate a TOR for an expert reference group. The next draft will be circulated to all participants at the retreat and all edits are welcome.
- Participants were given the opportunity to sign up for the expert reference group.
- The expert reference group must include camp managers and camp coordinators; if either are missing from the discussion then the Companion will not fulfil its purpose.

WHAT IS NEW?

Speaker – Ignacio Leon (UNOCHA)

This session provided the 1-year-after updates on Grand Bargain commitments, as well as the latest developments in the inter-agency environment - with particular focus on how this will affect the Global CCCM Cluster and CCCM practitioners in the field.

The world has changed significantly in the past decade as new technology is introduced at a rapid pace, mass migration increases, support for globalisation and multilateralism, including funding of international endeavours decreases and increasingly complex humanitarian crises continue to occur. Therefore, as humanitarians, we need to tackle three main issues:

1. The decrease in funding will have a direct effect on the way we work.

2. Ford revolution: society will not have the capacity to absorb all of the new technology that is coming. The 'revolution' that has occurred in the last decade is relatively greater than the revolution that has occurred in the previous hundred years. We need to think about how we can incorporate and absorb the new technology into camp management.

3. We are not doing enough to touch the agenda of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. There are a couple of SDGs which are important for the humanitarian sector in terms of issues pertaining to water and environment.

The new Secretary General has put forward new UN reforms. His new vision includes 38 proposals out of which 7 can have a direct impact on the humanitarian sector. The first one is the reporting line; which states that we should have a humanitarian coordinator, HCT, and for everything to be merged to form one body.

The humanitarian community is acting through very clear principles: neutrality, impartiality, humanity and independence. However, looking at the development side, there is a significant challenge as the leadership and ownership of development projects is with government and therefore the development agenda is at risk of influence from domestic plans.

The new way of working aims for collective outcomes between humanitarian and development actors. This is also in line with what was agreed upon during the World Humanitarian Summit. The Grand Bargain in the beginning was only an idea on how to optimize humanitarian resources (funding). The ten important points in regards to the Grand Bargain are as follows:

1. Greater Transparency: Can we have a reporting standard relevant for everybody?

2. More support and funding tools for local and national responders: at least 20-25% of funding to be directed towards local and national responders. However, the questions regarding their impartiality and capacity remains unsolved.

3. Increase the use of coordination and cash based programming.

4. Reduce duplication and management costs with periodic functional reviews.

5. Improve joint and impartial needs assessments.

6. A participation revolution: include people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives.

7. Increase collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding.

8. Reduce the earmarking of donor contributions.

9. Harmonise and simplify reporting requirements.

10. Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors.

To date, multi-year planning has significantly increased; 8 countries have already moved towards multi-year planning and 3 more are coming into the picture. Protracted crises are also seeing a move towards multi-year planning.

CCCM, by nature, already has a multi-sectoral outlook integrated into its approach. Prioritization is of ever more importance as donors cannot fund everything. Need analysis must match planning and be timely – publishing a needs assessment three months after a response is not acceptable. Response planning and decisions should be tailored to best assist the people in need and not involve the specific agendas of the organisations the CCCM actors are representing.

ONE YEAR WITH THE GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER STRATEGIC ADVISORY GROUP

Speakers – Christian Gad (DRC), Giovanna Federici (NRC), Andre Krummacher (ACTED), Roland Schlott (LWF)

The Global CCCM Cluster Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) reported back to the cluster members on their achievements, challenges and highlights during the first year since inception. This session also saw the nomination and endorsement for agencies elected to the SAG for the next two years.

The SAG is made up of representatives from four NGO's (ACTED, DRC, LWF & NRC); IOM and UNHCR as cluster lead agencies, and two cluster representatives from the country/regional level. At the Global CCCM Cluster Retreat in 2016, the four NGO representatives were endorsed as there were no other nominations from other agencies. At this year's Retreat, ACTED and DRC were nominated for re-election as per the SAG terms of reference (to initiate a staggered yearly election for two year terms for two SAG member agencies), with both agencies endorsed.

In its first year, the SAG has:

◆ Endorsed a cluster strategy

◆ Worked together on a proposal for ECHO which was not successful in the end, though it still helped the SAG to think about concrete initiatives to be taken at the cluster level.

◆ Made a work plan and identify key priorities.

Four key priorities for 2018:

1. Put a focus on camp management. There is a need to go back to the core functions of the cluster. NGO involvement at the global level is limited but at the field level there are many actors. Therefore there needs to be a comprehensive mapping to understand: Where are the camps and who are the camp managers around the world?

2. More updates and overviews on field operations. Challenges and problems encountered at field level. Develop some sort of community of practice forum?

3. The SAG needs to be more engaged and more involved in advising the cluster coordinators and support team on key issues, strategies, approaches, etc. The 'advisory role' should mean exactly that.

4. The SAG should closely follow the implementation of the work plan and ensure there is understanding on how to implement.

Feedback from Participants:

- Focus more on camp management.
- Updates and overviews on field operations.
- Updates on thematic areas.
- Monitoring implementation of work-plan.
- Increase communication between SAG and field operations.

GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER CAPACITY BUILDING

Speaker – Jennifer Kvernmo (IOM)

This session provided an update on the capacity building achievements of the cluster over the past year, introduced the new global learning package, and suggested priorities for learning materials going into 2018.

A CCCM online learning course is now up and running - currently available in English, but soon to be available in French and Arabic.

The Global CCCM package for Training of Trainers, aiming at building the capacity of CCCM practitioners to contribute to an effective camp response and raise standards in the sector was updated with funding from the PRM "Safe from the start". Among the key deliverables was the mainstreaming of GBV considerations throughout the package. . Modules are broken down to follow the core responsibilities of camp managers and show how GBV considerations can be mainstreamed into each one of these activities. All references to specific displaced population groups (refugees, IDPs)have been taken out as it is broader and can be adapted at the contextual level.

To pilot the training package, 2 Regional TOTs have taken place, in Casablanca and in Dakar. Participants attended as part of country teams from Somalia, Chad, CAR, Nigeria, South Sudan, Yemen, Iraq and Burundi - bringing together cluster lead agencies, NGOs, and governments. The training was solidified with pre-learning webinars and tasks and the post course action-plans.

MARKETPLACE

The objectives of the Marketplace session was to provide an opportunity for participants to network, learn from each other's operations, and explore different projects among the varying country-specific programs and CCCM related actors. During the Marketplace session, CCCM field colleagues and partner organizations set up information tables or "stalls" to present updates on their respective activities. This session involved stall presentations from country operations including Chad, Central African Republic, Iraq, Myanmar, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen; as well as stall presentations from partner agencies, tools and inter-agency projects including CCCM Capacity Building, Anti-Trafficking Task Team, JIPS, Sphere, Women's Participation Toolkit, Displacement Tracking Matrix, Inter-Agency Site Monitoring Systems (examples from Iraq, Somalia, Syria, Myanmar & CAR), IMPACT, CaLP, GBV Reference Group, and IDMC.

COLLECTIVE OUTCOMES

Session facilitator - Ignacio Leon (UNOCHA);

Speakers - Brett Moore, Global Shelter Cluster (UNHCR); Eva Garcia Bouzas, Global Protection Cluster (UNHCR); Patricia Kormoss, Global Health Cluster (WHO); Monica Sanchez Bermudez, HLP AoR (NRC); Sonia Rastogi (UNICEF)

In resource-scarce environment, working collaboratively across clusters/sectors is not only the preferred, but often the only viable option. This session followed up from last year's discussion that looked at exploring linkages across sectors for more efficient delivery of assistance and protection. The global clusters and AORs were invited to share best practices on collaborative projects to address gaps on the ground, and collectively explore the roles of camp managers in these settings. Each of the Panellists were asked to consider multi-sectorial actions and prioritisation:

Global Shelter Cluster:

- We find ourselves siloed by 'cluster' but recognize that the global cluster coordinators are discussing how to better work across sectors.

- It's important to respond rapidly, which means having the right tools, including the best of urban planning and design tools. This will be especially important in urban responses.

- The physical environment and social environment are interlinked and we therefore need to look at the links between technical interventions. Using a spatial approach gives room to integrate different sectors.

- We need to understand how a space is used in order to form our response.

GBV AoR (GPC):

- The IASC GBV Guidelines were written in consultation with a number of actors. They contain indicators making it possible for all sectors to include GBV specific indicators in HRP processes. These guidelines are not meant to be used only by GBV specialists, but it's possible for sectors to take on the role, especially CCCM as they have much more field capacity than GBV specialists.

- Upcoming from GBV AoR: now trying to create guidelines on what to do in cases of sexual violence when there is not a GBV specialist onsite. There are also checklists and action plans in development for GBV.

Global Protection Cluster:

- Aims of Protection mainstreaming:

- Prioritize safety and dignity, and do no harm.

- Ensure meaningful access

- Accountability

- Participation and empowerment

- The protection cluster can share good practices with anyone who is interested.

HLP AoR (GPC)

- HLP covers different sectors by definition (it must include livelihoods, shelter, etc)

- Why the connection with CCCM? CCCM interventions have potential to:

- Exacerbate existing conflicts.

- Contribute to land grabs or forced eviction.

- Maintain or entrench gender inequalities.

- Do no harm and CCCM: HLP issues need to be thought through the lifetime of the camp/settlement. Best practice: Shelter has integrated HLP issues and a due diligence standard.

Key Discussion Points:

- CCCM actors do have information about other sectors, but are perhaps not sufficiently explaining the role of CCCM to other actors. Good camp management means protection. Also, HLP is always negotiated by camp managers. So what do other sectors/AoRs need from CCCM to understand what CCCM is?

- Multiplication of assessments is partly due to the fact that CCCM actors see where the gaps are but aren't capacitated/equipped to get the other clusters to actually coordinate their services within the camps/sites.

- To get collective outcomes, it is important to understand each sector's mandate. In South Sudan, GBV and CCCM actors from the field work together on how to mitigate GBV in camps at a national level. It's important to have this understanding of other sectors at a global level, but it's also critical at the field level—for actors from each sector to understand each other's mandate and how the sectors intersect.

- Protection mainstreaming has been ongoing for the past 10 years, and it is the responsibility of each cluster. Protection should not be something for specialists. The Global Protection Cluster produced a guidance document on how to integrate protection in CCCM, but most participants have not read it. So how can Protection do a better job of appealing to CCCM?

- The idea of the panel is to discuss collective outcomes, but the examples given were largely cluster specific. We need to start to think differently. Providing access is protection: access to education, to health, etc. There are hundreds of guidance on everything. Should there be a guidance on how we can work together?

- We're siloed at both the global and field levels and part of the problem is that donors fund certain sectors which then filters through implementation. We need to emphasise information sharing to ensure that best collaborative practices are filtered through to implementation.

- The way we communicate might be the problem. Articulation of what CCCM does in terms of protection and what is expected from protection might contribute to mutual understanding that protection is already integrated into CCCM dialy operations and understood by its actors. In the end it's a shifting of mentality and looking ahead to the new generation that is coming. We could not and should not have everything collective as we must be strategic.

- Communication and language: we need to change our communication. The impact on people who are affected by crises should be priority, rather than standing and authority of humanitarian actors.

THE WAY FORWARD 2018

Speakers – Kim Roberson (UNHCR), Nuno Nunes (IOM)

This session followed the strategic objectives of the Global CCCM Cluster Strategic Framework 2017-21.

Strategic Objective 1 - People Centred Camp Management and Coordination

The needs of displaced women, men, girls and boys in camps, camp – like and communal settings are addressed promptly from the onset and throughout their displacement in a comprehensive manner, with active participation of and feedback from the affected populations.

- Capacity Building
  - Technical and functional capacity for CCCM actors. To ensure we have equipped and motivated partners and personnel.
  - Cluster coordinators training to include soft skills such as emotional intelligence, diplomacy and negotiation skills.
  - Platform for collection of CB information – such as training reports, database of trainers etc.
  - Build trainer roster within countries.
- Participation
  - 'Meaningful' part of participation to be reflected in Sphere companion indicators.
  - Develop a Global CCCM tool for measuring women and minority groups participation in governance structures.
  - Training to come with empowerment to community governance structures – to enable the population to monitor and coordinate whilst camp managers provide support.
- Working Together
  - Define the role of or approach to working with non-traditional camp management agencies (i.e. military).
  - Work on bringing localisation to the global level in order to make the Global CCCM Cluster more representative.

Strategic Objective 2 - Information and Feedback Driven Quality Responses

The activities and interventions of the CCCM cluster(s) are driven by efficient information management systems, based on sound analysis of the population needs, respect of minimum standards, and taking into consideration the findings of continuous monitoring and quality control measures.

- Create a database, managed at the global level, for camps in each country (need to define camp for the purpose of this database). The Database should track population size, camp management agency, and coordination agency.
- Develop a comprehensive and integrated feedback mechanism.
- Develop an agreed global and editable (adaptable at local level) CCCM cluster IM tool for site level monitoring.
- Harmonize IM tools at the national level – to be coordinated by national CCCM coordinators.
- Advocacy at global level to ensure IM capacity at country level.

Strategic Objective 3 - Strategic and Inclusive Support and Collaboration

The Global CCCM Cluster and its members actively search for synergies and collaboration with other clusters, members of the humanitarian community, governments, civil societies and private sector at the global and country levels and support country clusters in the discharge of their role.

- Advocacy and Communication
  - Global CCCM Cluster to advocate to other clusters to improve understanding of CCCM.
  - Update governments on CCCM strategies at global level.
- Open line to Global Cluster Coordinators
  - Establish an open line to the Global CCCM Cluster coordinators (with an in-built response obligation) by which CCCM colleagues at the field level can discuss in country situations in which IOM/UNHCR interactions are negatively affecting core deliveries - to be established in next 3 months.
- Performance Monitoring
  - Global Cluster to conduct country Cluster performance monitoring and provide support.
- Capacity Building
  - Global Cluster and NORCAP to develop capacity of in-country trainers to conduct ToT's.
    - The Global Cluster can advocate to donors at the global level – this can sit with the SAG.
  - Continue to build the capacity of NGOs and governments in order to localize CCCM. Adjust CCCM to include capacity building and strategy at the assessment stage.
  - Government colleagues to take part in implementation of global training. A resource to support the global cluster.
- Do No Harm
  - Define red lines of when not to engage in camp-management. What is non-humanitarian in terms of camp management? When do you decide whether to do it or to engage with governments?
    - Drawing a red line with governments is a bit of a dangerous thing to do at the global level. In all countries we are working at the invitation of governments. If it is a sensitive case the country operations can contact the Global Cluster for support.

Strategic Objective 4 - Responses Fit for Purpose

The responses to current and evolving situations are efficient, drawing from good practice and lessons learnt, conceived and executed in an innovative manner.

- Develop method to prioritise sites.
- SOPs for both global and country levels – develop templates.
- Global CCCM support and advocacy for funding
- Working Groups
  - ABA working group
    - Working group to meet and define aim and scope before linking with other similar working groups such as Shelter Cluster ABA working group.
    - One aim would be to clarify roles and responsibility between CCCM and UNOCHA in out of camp settings.
    - Methodology needs to be harmonized.
  - Remote and mobile management working group.

Annex 1 – SPHERE Consultation Breakout groups:

Break-out Group 1:

The group opened with a discussion to answer the question "how much do we do in CCCM that can translate to our own standards, separate from those of other clusters/sectors and keeping in mind that standards express universal rights?" and then moved on to discuss their reactions to the draft CCCM Companion.

Key Points from the dsicussions:

◆ There are still overall issues about the audience, role, and use of the Sphere Companion that need to be discussed.

◆ There are going to be issues with the word "camp", but changing to "displacement management" might be too general.

◆ CCCM is social, so can it be quantified in a meaningful way?

◆ The draft needs more reference to concrete actions as much as possible: words like "accountability" can mean anything and need to be backed up.

◆ Standards right now are very focused on camp management

◆ General agreement that thresholds are a good idea to set minimum requirements

◆ Missing concepts

  • Access to information and communication.

  • Care and maintenance of camp infrastructure.

  • Address systems and site mapping.

  • Reception/transit site management.

Break-out Group 2:

The group focused on Standard 5 - Monitoring and Coordination. The group preferred the first phrasing of the standard, as it seems to capture more, but would like to see evidence-based response and community participation included.

Key Points:

◆ The Key Actions were well received by the group with one suggested minor adjustment for Key Action 8 to change 'camp response plan' to 'service monitoring framework'. Many felt that this would avoid confusion as to what is meant by 'camp response plan'.

◆ There is a need to add an indicator for camp coordination in order to measure standards across camps, instead of just at site level. They also suggested to make sure indicators are somewhat related to Camp Coordination as well as Camp Management.

◆ The group did not see a need for a "monitoring framework".

◆ Indicators should somehow measure the progress of meetings instead of simply tracking that they have occurred. One suggestion was to add a percentage indicator of action points followed up on after meetings.

◆ There is a need to explore the possibility of including participation or involving population in coordination mechanisms.

Break-out Group 3:

The group focused on Standard 6 - Information management.

Key Points:

◆ The group questioned whether the Companion should be used as a resource or for governance – to be discussed further.

◆ Standard 6 actions should be ordered sequentially e.g.

- What information do you collect – KA 1, 2, 9

- How do you collect it – KA 6, 8

- How to use it – KA 3, 4

◆ Civilian nature of camps should be made clear. A standard was suggested around armed actors in camps.

◆ Community participation – moving away from checkbox towards social cohesion mapping and ensuring all parties are represented. The indicator should look something like '% of camp population feel that they are included in decision making processes'.

◆ The language of these standards should focus on outcomes not actions.

◆ The value of CCCM, in collecting feedback from each sector, finding gaps and seeing coordination between sectors, should be highlighted.

Break-out Group 4:

The group agreed that CCCM standards were needed, especially to monitor accountability. The group identified three typical roles in CCCM – Camp Administrator, Camp Manager, and Camp Coordinator – and felt that these roles needed clarification within the standards document. Generally reviewing the draft Companion, participants concluded that the standards and actions were well formulated but some indicators need more work. The group went on to discuss the following:

Advantages of the Companion:

◆ Having standards in CCCM helps monitoring activities implemented with different partners; enables feedback; promotes accountability and can be complementary to the CM toolkit.

Disadvantages of the Companion:

◆ Can create some confusion / problems with other sectors who may think that CCCM is "stepping on their toes" - some areas of responsibilities seem to be overlapping which may end up in gaps.

◆ Too camp oriented and not taking into consideration the reality of other settings.

◆ Questions raised: How do the standards differ from the toolkit? How do they complement each other? How can these standards be imbedded into the existing toolkit?

◆ Some of the standards are related to provision of services as opposed to management and/or coordination; participants pointed out that some of the suggested actions seem to mix implementation with coordination. There is a common opinion that standards should be related to coordination and not programming.

Comments on the Standards

◆ Standard 1: ACCOUNTABILITY Indicator: % of complaints/requests/feedback that receive a response – 'complaint/feedback' could be replaced by 'suggestion' or 'recommendation'.

◆ Standard 3: CAMP GOVERNANCE Indicator: X number of women representatives in leadership structure OR Y number of women-led committee that link to leadership committee - it is difficult to have women in governance structures - roles of CCCM officers should be evaluated in accordance to their capacity to coordinate and manage as opposed to implement activities.

◆ Standard 8: SAFETY & SECURITY Indicators: #number of security patrols/checkpoint (regularity/number) per hh/ risk factor (not possible/necessary in all contexts); #of community-level security patrols trained, monitored % of population that report to feel safe in camps – some participants shared the opinion that having security patrols in camps could lead to a sense of unsafety among the population. Suggestion: replace security patrols by safety groups.

Break-out Group 5:

This group held discussions in two parts; where the first part pertained to answer the following three questions in review of the whole document:

◆ What is good?

- The group felt that a companion document was important as CCCM actors would be able to easily consult on all CCCM standards and indicators.

◆ What is missing?

- Local capacity building is missing in the introduction and this is something which can also be included in the exit strategy or in the durable solutions.

- Participation of host communities

- CCCM Standard 4: Ensuring that camp managers are present.

- Very little framework present regarding site planning (Emergency handbooks and guidelines are present, however the link to connect all the relevant areas is not present).

- No mention of Housing. Land & Property.

- Is there any legal framework or is this document intended to help CCCM actors advocate?

◆ Are there suggestions for improvement?

- Physical environmental standards needs to be provided. For example, we should have very clear indicators for how long tents will be provided in a camp.

- Standard 12 (Durable Solutions): Where should we go in terms of durable solutions and how far should we go?

- A lot of organizations do not have an exit strategy. Exit strategy (local capacity building) can be a part of durable solutions.

- IDPs should be engaged from the beginning - for example, in repairing shelters.

- Standard 5 (Monitoring) should be linked with information management or should be listed as a separate category / standard.

In the second part, Standard 6 (Information Management) was the focus of the discussion:

◆ CCCM Standard 6 states in the opening statement: "....while also allowing communities the opportunity to provide critical feedback on its impact". However, no key indicator then talks about accountability.

◆ Critical feedback to be removed from here and can be included in the core CCCM Standard 1 Accountability.

◆ Critical feedback from the communities to be used to modify programmes accordingly.

◆ Key action 8 of CCCM Standard talks about "Data", however no indicator is present which talks about Data Protection Policy.

◆ Action 6 and Action 7 of CCCM Standard 6 can be combined together.

◆ Possible outcome indicators present are difficult to measure. A survey is required to assess such indicators and sometimes there is no time available to do so.

◆ Government to be included in the outcome indicator.

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER ANNUAL RETREAT-2017

www.globalcccmcluster.org