GLOBAL CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT CLUSTER
RETREAT REPORT //OCTOBER 2015

Localising CCCM Responses:
Promoting local and national CCCM action

©UNHCR/J.Zocheman

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

www.globalcccmcluster.org

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CCCM cluster held its annual retreat on October 13th and 14th 2015, bringing together representatives from 19 field operations and 22 organizations, governments and missions. The theme was "Localizing the Response", in alignment with the Global CCCM 2013-2016 Strategic Framework and reflecting one the themes of the discussions at the World Humanitarian Summit 2015.

The Retreat offered an opportunity to share achievements and present work in progress to reflect on the ways in which we as a cluster work towards a more "localized" CCCM preparedness and response. One day was dedicated to reflecting on how CCCM is currently localizing responses, and one day was dedicated to how responses can be further localized in the future. Panels, plenaries, breakout sessions and a country operations market place were held bringing in keynote speakers, experts and cluster coordinators to engage in fruitful discussions and exchanges that led to engagements and priority activities, such as:

- Localised CCCM activities shedding light on the importance of engaging with non-traditional actors and building capacities of national authorities;

- Cross cluster synergies producing key milestones such as mainstreaming GBV into CCCM;

- Working with civil protections to develop and put into practice mass evacuation guidelines;

- Enhanced rapid response capacity of the cluster and how it has translated into well-coordinated humanitarian responses in crises producing displacement;

- The need to better organize and adapt global cluster support to match field needs;

- Sharing with the field the 'Who does what in humanitarian coordination: Inter-cluster coordination, CCCM Cluster Coordination and Camp Management Matrix' to gather input towards a broader discussion on inter-cluster and cluster coordination;

- Recognition of CCCM as an actor with one of the highest engagement with affected communities and how that role and experience could help

towards redefining humanitarian programming and transitioning;

- The need to adapt the cluster governance structures to encourage more global level engagement of partners via the creation of a strategic advisory group and technical working groups;

- Sharing of lessons learned on durable solutions to displacement highlighting the importance of community engagement at the onset together with national authorities and development actors, including through non-traditional methodologies such as cash transfer modalities;

- The discussion needed on CCCM's role in defining area based approaches and the explicit link to urban displacement and out of camps;

- Expanding CCCM methodologies and activities in accountability to affected population a displacement site level to assist displaced populations outside of camps using area based approaches;

- Adapting capacity building initiatives and integrating them fully into the cluster strategy via innovative methodologies, adapted to context specific competencies and needs, and measuring impact more closely;

- CCCM engaging further in 2016 with SPHERE on the revision and contextualization of standards;

- Awareness of CCCM's key position in the identification and fostering of durable solutions both in and out of camps is linked to the need to further engage with host communities and considering cross cutting themes such as local structures and capacities, food, livelihoods, living conditions, peaceful co-existence, as well as land and property issues.

The Global CCCM Cluster's activities in 2016 will be shaped by these discussions and priorities, paving the way for the development of the 2017-2020 Strategic Framework.

Organisations, Governments and Missions:

Agence d'Aide à la Coopération Technique et au Développement (ACTED), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Department of Social Welfare and Development of Philippines (DSWD), European Community Humanitarian Aide Office (ECHO), Global Protection Cluster, Government of the Philippines, Ground Truth Solutions, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), Impact Initiatives, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), MSB (Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency), Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), REACH Initiative, Shelter Centre, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), University of Copenhagen.

Field Operations:

Burkina Faso, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), El Salvador, Haiti, Iraq, Kenya, Lebanon, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Pakistan, Philippines, South Sudan, Syria/Turkey and Zambia.

TUESDAY 13 OCTOBER

WEDNESDAY14 OCTOBER

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Facilitators: Margo Baars, Rapid Response Officer, IOM Geneva; Kimberly Roberson, Global Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Geneva; Nuno Nunes, Global Cluster Coordinator, IOM Geneva

The retreat's theme is 'Localising the Response', in alignment with the Global CCCM 2013-2016 Strategic Framework and one of the themes of discussion at the World Humanitarian Summit. Key topics are the importance of the humanitarian coordination architecture, durable solutions, out of camp activities and cluster governance. 2016 is the final year of the existing 4 year strategic framework and the CCCM Cluster needs to prepare to develop the 2017 strategy. The session on cluster governance is an opportunity for an open discussion on wider contribution to the decision-making processes and clarification of field level issues on differences in responses in natural disasters and conflicts.

A Joint Monitoring Mission in Iraq analysed the role and support provided by the Global Cluster, which indicated that in Iraq the Global Cluster had been very useful. One aim of the retreat will be to discuss models of support and try to unpack where they are appropriate and effective in different contexts.

The retreat is the annual opportunity to interact with the diverse community of CCCM partners to better understand Cluster priorities and areas for improvement. However, most camp managers are unable to visit Geneva, which limits global level engagement with local camp management actors such as private companies, religious leaders and volunteers. The Cluster needs to engage more at the local level by systematically bringing partners into Cluster discussions and finding practical ways to support camp managers with tools and guidance.

LOCALISING CCCM RESPONSES: IMPROVING INCLUSIVE ACTION IN SITES

Panellists: Dr Mo Hamza, Professor, University of Copenhagen; Sangita Shrestha Einhaus, Dwarika Hotel, Kathmandu, Nepal; Restituto Macuto, Department of Social Welfare and Development, Government of the Philippines; Richard Warren, Sub-national CCCM/Shelter Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Myanmar

Key discussion points:

- Including local actors is highly important, noting that the degree of effectiveness is context dependent
- Links between hospitality and humanitarian sector can lead to success, as seen in Nepal
- Need for understanding and alignment on DRRM framework to avoid increasing risks
- Representation of camp populations in Camp Management Committees is crucial

Through discussion of different humanitarian responses, challenges and achievements, the session explored how humanitarian responses can be further adapted to strengthen and support the work of local and national CCCM actors in frontline responses. The findings of the World Disaster Report, camp management in Nepal and lessons learned from CCCM in the Philippines and Myanmar were presented and discussed.

The 2015 World Disaster Report, produced by the IFRC, examines the comparative advantages, complementarities and differences between local and international responses in crises. It highlights the importance of local actors and that the effectiveness of local responses is often context-dependent. The key findings of the report are that short-term goals relating to local partnerships may not lead to empowerment and representation, that there is a need to shift from technical capacity development to functional capacity development, and that there needs to be a focus on governance and the role of local actors in decision making. The report recommends a collective rethink of the financing system, as local NGOs receive only 1.6% of overall funding. It further highlights the need for a focus on remote management, the ethical considerations of transferring risk to local partners, and a focus on new technologies, including social media, for feedback from affected populations.

An example of community actors responding to crisis is the development of 'Camp Hope' in Nepal. Synergies

between hospitality work and camp management were identified, showing how this allowed local actors to respond to the April and May 2015 earthquakes that devastated Nepal and resulted in more than 50,000 IDPs across the most affected districts. 'Camp Hope' was built on a football ground in the Sindupalchok district. It houses 335 residents in 18 resident tents, with listings of each tent, the team leader for each tent and persons with specific needs. The temporary shelters have a lifespan of 5 years. Semi-permanent homes are now being built in another area, with an owner driven process where IDPs will make their own improvements to the structures. 71 Children are enrolled in local schools and over 80 people attend government recognized vocational training courses.

Camp residents largely manage the camp, which has different departments such as hospitality and security, an office tent and a medical clinic. There are also sex segregated toilets and wash rooms, a notice board, prayer and meditation tent, study tents, dining and activity tents. Community activities involving the neighborhood, such as a children's talent show, are used to mitigate anticipate tensions with the host community. 'Camp Hope' is an example of the important role of non traditional actors in camp management.

In the Philippines, two-years after Typhoon Haiyan, livelihoods, education and infrastructure have largely recovered. The challenge now is ensuring the availability of water and electricity as families move from temporary shelters to permanent structures. Local authorities have partnered with IOM to build water systems and permanent houses. By the end of October 2015, 1000 families will have moved to permanent shelters. The importance of CCCM training was highlighted for its contribution to the preparedness of local authorities to response in case of disaster induced displacement.

Lessons learned from the large-scale humanitarian response to Typhoon Haiyan are the need for strategic alignment between local initiatives and the national DRRM framework, achieving effective and coordinated humanitarian assistance, and how the inter-play between risks can increase the vulnerability of displaced persons if risks are not well managed.

In Myanmar, localisation is an essential element of the humanitarian response. In Rakhine, most actors are non-traditional CCCM actors and government departments have a key role in camp management. Statelessness and local political imperatives limit options for return and relocation and INGO presence is limited as humanitarian actors can only be present with the agreement of the government.

A key issue in Rakhine is that the Camp Management Committees (CMC) are appointed by the government, and are therefore not necessarily representative of, or accountable to, the camp populations. Crime and corruption goes unchallenged and ethnic and religious actors appointed by the government have different levels of control, for example over emergency NFI distributions. Establishing additional committees, such as women's committees, and engagement with government departments and the host community in decision-making forums are essential elements of the approach in Myanmar. A challenge will be setting a threshold at which it is appropriate for the Cluster to disengage and transitioning from humanitarian assistance to development with the existing actors.

COUNTRY OPERATIONS 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 approaches to localising responses among the varying country-specific programs.

During the Marketplace session, CCCM field colleagues and partner organizations set up information tables or "stalls" to present updates on their respective activities on localising responses, achievements, best practices, operational challenges, and priorities for 2016. Colleagues from operations in Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Kenya, Korea, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, South Sudan, Turkey/Cross-border Syria and Zambia presented on their operations and the displacement situation in their respective countries. Other partners who hosted stalls included REACH. *(You can find some country case studies on global CCCM website)*

GENDER BASED VIOLENCE AND CCCM: MITIGATING RISK IN CAMPS AND CAMP-LIKE SETTINGS

Facilitators: Monica Noriega, CCCM and GBV Specialist, IOM Geneva; Tamika Payne, GBV AoR Coordinator, UNFPA

Key discussion points:

- In 2015 process-mapping workshops were organized that identified and clarified the roles and responsibilities between GBV and CCCM actors
- The integration of GBV into CCCM programming is essential as well-designed camps can reduce the risks of GBV

Given the profile of camps and camp like settings, the CCCM cluster has made it a priority to identify and clarify how best camp management actors can be responsible and responsive to the needs of women and girls in camp settings. To do this the Cluster has been working over the last year on clarifying the roles and responsibilities between CCCM and Protection actors.

Mainstreaming and integration of GBV into CCCM in 2015 has focused on developing new tools and guidance, including an updated GBV chapter in the CM Toolkit, revised IASC GBV Guidelines, integration of GBV risks in assessments and the distribution of the CCCM Gender Newsletter. There has also been significant progress on the systematic inclusion of GBV risk indicators in CCCM information management tools.

Capacity building of CCCM staff on GBV mainstreaming has included targeted training in field missions and two trainings of trainers. CCCM also focused on strengthening collaboration and coordination with GBV actors at the global and field level, including process mapping workshops. Progress was made on the systematic inclusion of GBV risk indicators in CCCM information management tools and the integration of GBV into CCCM programming, which is essential as well-designed camps can reduce the risk of GBV.

The GVB Area of Responsibility aims to ensure accountable and collective coordination of GBV prevention and response among the 50 member organisations involved. All humanitarian actors have the responsibility to minimise risk of GBV through sectoral intervention. GBV experts are available at the operations level to provide training and guidance. The GBV guidelines are composed of 13 thematic area guides that align with the clusters. It would be desirable for a GBV person to be dedicated to CCCM cluster support, attending CCCM cluster meetings, and vice versa.

COOPERATION BETWEEN CCCM AND CIVIL PROTECTION ACTORS: OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

Facilitators: Albrecht Beck, Global CCCM Civil Protection Specialist, IOM Geneva; Martin Sjoholm, Project Manager, MSB

The Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) guide that was developed in 2013 was presented as an example of CCCM expertise gained from civil protection. In 2014 and 2015 trainings were conducted in the Philippines and Bangladesh, and a reflected exercise conducted in Nepal. The final guide and capacity building programme will be released in 2016.

The group discussed activities in the field with civil protection organisations. Challenges identified include the need for training on managing flooding and relocation, coordinating with the military, liaising with different branches of government and pre-deployment briefings.

Moving forward, the Cluster needs to include local actors in mass evacuation preparedness training, integrate early warning systems, include local government as well as policy actors, and utilise informal community groups.

It is noted that MEND is a good basic guideline, but it needs further revision and additional support. Potential areas for improvement include providing civil protection guidance to governments, MEND training for CCCM staff and integration of a settlement approach and rural based planning.

Another example of support to national governments is the International Humanitarian Partnership (IHP), an informal network with 8 countries that support staff working in natural disasters with base camps. The IHP provides services such as staff, equipment, training and guidance. Support has been provided to camps in Iraq and South Sudan. At the Global level Memoranda of Understanding are being developed to enhance secondments and services delivery of civil protection.

THE STATUS OF CCCM'S GLOBAL RESPONSE CAPACITY

Facilitators: Jorn Casper Øwre, NORCAP, NRC; David Preux, Rapid Response Officer, IOM Geneva; Ruxandra Bujor, Rapid Response Officer, UNHCR Geneva

The ECHO funded Global CCCM Cluster capacity building project includes a Rapid Response Team (RRT), emergency and technical deployments, as well as Urban Displacement & Outside of Camps (UDOC). The project has allowed the Global CCCM Cluster to enhance global responses, develop new tools and reach affected populations.

Rapid response deployments can be initiated within 24 hours and are normally for three months, covering coordination roles and operational support. The deployments are gap filling and time-limited, either responding to immediate emergencies or gaps in staffing. However, if a deployment needs to be extended, it should be funded by country missions. Increasing the visibility of the CCCM sector to donors and partners is a key part of the RRT deployments, which is essential to ensure funding for operations. The biggest challenge is maintaining momentum after the deployment ends. A database where individuals can manage their own profile is being developed for all those on the roster.

Accountability to affected populations needs to be prioritised in the humanitarian response. The coordination landscape needs to change in certain situations by localising operations and coordinating with local actors. The RRT cannot do this alone, but are charged with ensuring coordination.

Key challenges identified during discussion were securing funding, incentivising commitment to CCCM, the need to increase support to camp managers and agency affiliations of deployees. Expansion of fundraising activities was highlighted as a need in order to ensure the sustainability of the Roster.

GLOBAL SUPPORT TO COUNTRY OPERATIONS: CCCM TOOLS AND CLUSTER MAPPING-WHAT NEXT?

Facilitators: Jean-Philippe Antolin, Rapid Response Officer, IOM Geneva; Andrew Cusack, Senior Policy Officer, UNHCR Geneva

The purpose of the session was for participants to discuss where CCCM is in the world right now in relation to other clusters and within Humanitarian Appeals, discuss the tools they are using, and to share the latest tools from the global level.

In 2014, humanitarian response plans were conducted in 29 countries and there were 30 appeals. The total funding request was for $18 billion, and $10.7 billion was received. Most of the funding received was not from the appeals as some bilateral funding was received. In 2015, 33 countries were covered by 34 humanitarian appeals. To date 8.4 billion USD of the required 19.5 billion USD has been received.

The CCCM cluster is formally activated in 11 countries and sectorally activated in another 6 countries. CCCM activities and formal response plans appealed for $355 million in total (though the results of the appeals are unclear as the CCCM sector is not systematically tracked by the Financial Tracking Service). It was identified that there is a need to think more deeply about defining CCCM caseloads before deciding which clusters need to be activated, taking into account that globally 70% of IDPs are in out of camp settings.

A CCCM Active Operations mapping was conducted in 2015, however was limited in identifying CCCM activities due to politically sensitivities in some countries and because maintaining the required level of communication and accurate information is a challenge. Within the humanitarian coordination framework, OCHA tracks cluster activities through the RMP, which is a 4 part online system consisting of financial tracking, humanitarian response plan, indicators and project planning module. A proposed solution is the Cluster Coordination Description Mapping Matrix, which is a factsheet that will be rolled out by OCHA in January 2016, based on the first part of the Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring tool (CCPM).

It was discussed that, in addition to the Camp Management Toolkit Database, further work needs to be done at the global level to facilitate peer review and access to templates, tools and guidance to CCCM actors. Key challenges include supporting staff in non-formal camp setting or Clusters that are not formally activated and balancing the political aspects of cluster activation with the needs of the affection populations.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH OCHA, INTER-CLUSTER COORDINATORS, CAMP COORDINATORS AND CAMP MANAGERS

Facilitators: Kimberly Roberson, Global Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Geneva; Loretta Hieber Girardet, Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor, UNOCHA Geneva

The draft 'Who does what in humanitarian coordination: Inter-cluster coordination, CCCM Cluster Coordination and Camp Management Matrix' document was presented and ideas on how the matrix could be communicated to the field were discussed. This included including creating an executive summary, introductory text on objectives, transforming it into a checklist and removing the sub-signs.

The matrix might be the beginning of a discussion between Global CCCM Cluster and Global Cluster Coordinators Group on inter-cluster coordination and cluster coordination, and addressing the differences between Camp Management agencies and cluster coordination.

It could also lead to trainings. However, a challenge will be to create a universal matrix that is not context specific. Discussions suggested that a summary of the matrix should be drafted and shared with country operations, and clarity on coordination in outside of camp setting should be sought.

It was noted that heavy reporting requirements to inter-cluster coordinating mechanisms leave little space to discuss methodology and advocacy in inter-cluster coordination meetings and that clarification on the role of OCHA as a provider of last resort is needed.

HUMANITARIAN COORDINATION ARCHITECTURE: WHERE ARE WE?

Moderator: Nuno Nunes, Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, IOM Geneva
Facilitators: Gwyn Lewis, Inter Cluster Chief, UNICEF; Stuart Kefford, Operational Peer Review and Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team Geneva; Loretta Hieber Girrardet, Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor, UNOCHA Geneva

Key discussion points:

- Greater flexibility in denominating emergencies may better reflect complexities

- Can we transform OPRs to be more constructive and advisory?

- Timeline for HPC could be better communicated with partners and should be more field oriented

- Areas for improvement of the CCCM Cluster include accountability to affected populations and monitoring interventions

- Deactivation of L3 emergencies in conflict situations can be complex.

The session aimed to provide a snapshot of the implementation of the Transformative Agenda, ten years after the establishment of the cluster system. Whilst building greater awareness of global level processes and current details, including the Humanitarian Project Cycle (HPC), World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), and L3 status, the discussion focused on where the CCCM Cluster is now and where it needs to be going.

The Level 3 (L3) activation was created during crises in Haiti and Pakistan, where the countries were overwhelmed with the extent of the crisis. The criteria for L3 activation are the scale, urgency, capacity, complexity and reputational risks. When an L3 is activated, rapid response mechanisms are activated by lead agencies and senior staff are deployed. This was implemented in the Philippines and in Nepal, with system wide responses. However, there are more complex scenarios such as South Sudan and the Central African Republic, where the thresholds for activation and deactivation are unclear.

A number of factors prevent the deactivation of an L3, including use of benchmarks that are linked to the capacity to respond criteria, which mean that most L3 activations remain valid according to the criteria, particularly in conflict situations. Consequently, a proposal has been to change the benchmark criteria. Another proposal is to determine additional denominations (Level 2 /Leve 1) to achieve more flexibility and better reflect the complexities. During the plenary a suggestion was made for wider dissemination of details on the process and discussions held within the Emergency Director's Group regarding activation levels.

OCHA has dedicated a permanent team to manage the protocols of the transformative agenda, increasing awareness within OCHA field teams, Humanitarian Country Teams members and humanitarian practitioners. Operational Peer Reviews (OPR) are a holistic assessment of the leadership, coordination and implementation of humanitarian assistance that are conducted 2 to 3 months after an L3 is activated. Six OPRs have been implemented in Syria, Philippines, CAR, South Sudan and Yemen will be implemented shortly. Conducting OPRs in conflict situations often have more complex security and humanitarian access issued, compared to natural disasters.

Common issues identified by the OPRs are security, access, leadership and capacities of Cluster lead agencies, and protection. They also found that accountability to affected populations actors often have their own frameworks and programming, which are seldom made in a coordinated and collective manner. The team is now looking at how to integrate OPR findings at the highest level. The aim is to move to a collective approach where the OPR would share best practice with field actors and become more constructive and advisory.

The plenary discussed the need for the OPR to be better publicised so that humanitarian actors can advocate for the Humanitarian Coordinator to address the gaps underlined and strengthen ownership. The OPR is often perceived as a very resource-consuming process and actors are at times frustrated with the short mission that contrasts with the complexity of the context actors are dealing with.

The Humanitarian Project Cycle (HPC) aims to improve capacity by fostering a strong needs-based approach based on joint analysis rather than on a compilation of projects. Both the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) are increasingly used as a tool for coordination, but implementation at field level is challenging. Some processes are considered too burdensome by field actors and there are mixed perceptions of the outcomes. The key is to communicate with partners on timelines and that it is a collective approach, as well as allocate more time to data analysis rather than data collection.

In order to promote continuous improvement a handbook to guide OCHA staff engaged in inter-cluster coordination could be developed. Also, lessons can be learned from the CCCM Cluster, an actor with one of the highest levels of engagement with affected communities. The ICC is trying to achieve the same results at strategic level as the CCCM Cluster does at field level.

Regarding the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS), there have been 8 regional consultations to date and the Global Cluster Coordinators Group (GCCG) has been involved in consultation and entered a written submission from the CCCM, Health, Protection and Shelter Clusters. Following a 3-day consultation in Geneva on 14 October 2015, the next step will be the summit in Ankara.

Five major areas for action were highlighted in the GCCG submission:

1. Dignity: Ensuring that humanitarian action has a people centred approach.

2. Safety: putting protection at the centre of our response and linking to accountability.

3. Resilience: Finding solutions to prolonged crises and addressing the humanitarian dimensions of refugee and migrant crises.

4. Partnership: Governments should be in the lead whenever possible, with more responsibility given to local actors. Involving local communities will improve the quality and credibility of needs assessments.

5. Predictable financing: Inclusion of local partners and NGOs.

Areas of discussion include longer timeframes for humanitarian programming and durable solutions, which CCCM should work towards. The cluster system is effective in transitioning coordination mechanisms to, and enhancing responsibility of, national actors. However, there are areas for improvement, which include AAP, mainstreaming protection and monitoring interventions.

GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER GOVERNANCE

Moderator: Andrew Cusack, Senior Policy Officer, UNHCR Geneva; Jorn Casper Øwre, NORCAP, NRC; Bryant Castro, CCCM Coordinator, DRC; Zeenat Garewal, Country Director, ACTED

Key discussion points:

- Wider involvement of NGOs in governance structures at the global level
- NGO involvement would strengthen advocacy, fundraising and innovative approaches
- NGO and civil society participation in mid-year meeting encouraged

From the conception of the CCCM Cluster in 2005, the lead agencies have been IOM and UNHCR, with the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) as the main partner at the Global level. NRC, the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and the Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED) would like to discuss the current governance structure and encourage more involvement of NGOs at the global level.

In September 2015 the NRC, DRC and ACTED wrote a letter to the CCCM Cluster asking to discuss the creation of a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG). The structure and type of decision making body needs to be defined and a Terms of Reference should be drafted for this decision making body.

From the conception of the Cluster there was strong acknowledgement that CCCM is an area of technical expertise and should be developed with strong engagement of NGOs. Until 2009 there were pooled funds to develop the Cluster's capacity with a broad base of constituents, including NRC. In 2013 ECHO support through funding to the Cluster renewed discussions of the need for commitment to CCCM from a broad range of partners. The Global Cluster welcomes the suggestions on leadership, engagement and challenges.

ACTED advised that the aim of the letter was to start a process to encourage more global level involvement of NGOs and civil society, who are at the forefront of CCCM responses. In particular, NGOs can contribute to approaches to displaced populations outside of camps. ACTED calls for more proactive and meaningful involvement of NGOS and the institutionalisation of their involvement possibly through involvement in the formal governance structure. This will give NGOs and civil society actors shared responsibility to review global strategies and work plans and identify gaps.

For DRC activities in Iraq, the rationale is to improve operational outputs of the CCCM cluster. For example, tools developed in the field could have a centralised place for vetting and sharing. NGO involvement would strengthen advocacy efforts and fundraising, as a wider range of actors could represent the CCCM Cluster.

NRC advised that revising the governance structure and creating a SAG would be a symbol of the revitalisation of NRC and CCCM working together. Last year, 15 of 22 missions were responding to urban displacement settings and the UDOC tools need to be further developed. The sector is at the cross roads of urban response and it is important to include other partners as new displacement patterns force us to reconsider responses.

At the retreat in 2010 only IOM, UNHCR and NRC were in attendance as that was the global constituency of the cluster at the time. Now we're at a welcome point where more organisations want to be part of the governance structure. Different groups within the Cluster can help develop important operational themes. A particular consideration is support to governments. In relation to capacity building and governance, NRC has a strong leadership within capacity building and management of the Roster.

The Cluster coordinators committed to responding to the letter and suggestions within three weeks. A tentative date of 7 Dec was set to discuss ways forward and partners were actively encouraged to participate. NGO participation in the mid-year meeting was also encouraged.

CAMP CLOSURE AND DURABLE SOLUTIONS

Moderator: Kimberly Roberson, Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Geneva
Panellists: Charles Setchell, Senior Shelter, Settlements and Hazard Mitigation Advisor, USAID/
OFDA; Patrice Dossou Ahouansou, Field Officer, UNHCR Democratic Republic of Congo; Ben Oduwa,
CCCM Coordinator, IOM Democratic Republic of Congo, Conrad Navidad, Head of Sub-Office, IOM
Philippines, David Preux, Rapid Response Officer, IOM Geneva

Key discussion points:

- Engagement of authorities and humanitarian/ development actors is necessary for planning and implementation of durable solutions, as seen in Democratic Republic of Congo

- Best practices and lessons learnt from cash rental subsidy methodology in Haiti

- How does CCCM implement durable solutions in conflict situations and/or urban displacement?

Shelter can have profound and positive economic and development benefits by re-engaging affected populations in the process of housing development, promoting livelihoods and disaster risk reduction (DRR), if materials and labour are featured in programming. Greater emphasis on viewing shelter and settlements in relation to existing land and housing markets is needed.

Settlements planning should be shelter-led, multi-sectoral, and engage with other Clusters and actors. Benefits of an inter-sectoral approach include shelter and site planning to reduce GBV and expanding child-friendly spaces to family-friendly settlements (examples included Afghanistan, Haiti and Pakistan). Urban shelter will be the future with mass rural-to-urban migration and growth of slum areas. Therefore, we need to engage with development agencies as they have limited expertise in urban planning, housing and reconstruction. Another lesson re-learned is that we need to separate NFI from shelter and settlements.

In the Philippines 50,000 IDPs, mostly from minority Muslim groups in the south, were displaced during armed conflict between a secessionist group and government forces. As part of a phased process from the emergency to permanent phase, IDPs were housed in the sports complex that served as an evacuation centre. However, the conditions were not favourable for long term housing, and the local government was very active in bringing together a variety of agencies and clusters in planning for long-term solutions for IDPs, including re-settlement and the allocation of permanent housing. The key factor in the resettlement preferences and decisions for the affected population was access to livelihoods, although people still wished to return home if possible.

The complex was closed in July 2015. Shelters were constructed according to the cultural needs of the IDPs, including buildings on water stilts to facilitate access to the water for 'water gypsies'. It was highlighted that durable solutions are very much tied to land access and tenure rights.

Durable solutions can never be achieved in isolation; we have to work with other humanitarian and development actors. In the Democratic Republic of Congo, IDPs have been in a cycle of displacement for the last two decades. There are currently 60 camps in North Kivu, and a strategy is being revised to consolidate some camps and close others. Ensuring that the process of camp closure adheres to protection principles is a key challenge. The humanitarian community is engaged with the national authorities to help them understand their responsibilities as camp administrators and encourage engagement with the IDPs and adherence to protection principles.

A platform to discuss durable solutions was set up through a forum for durable solutions (FOSOD) under the coordination of the Provincial Minister of Planning. Seven camps have been closed between December 2014 and September 2015 using a 10 step camp closure process; five in an orderly manner and two spontaneously by the government on IDPs. Challenges include the lack of security and ongoing conflict, lack of physical access to the field, lack on services providers and land availability in areas of return.

Identified ways forward are to share lessons learned, advocate for reintegration activities, and examine the opportunities for durable solutions analysis through profiling. We should not assume that development actors will simply take over humanitarian operations. Sometimes they do not have the capacity but on have an appropriate coordination mechanism in place. We need to somehow adapt the cluster to the context.

A cash grant rental subsidy approach was used in Haiti since 2011, which aimed to support families returning to their neighborhoods by providing affected households with a cash stipend to cover on year's rent, plus additional grants for livelihoods and other types of assistance. Prior to the crisis, more than 95% of the camp population had been renting accommodation and there was also a high urban density and land tenure issues. Challenges included landslides and flooding, insecurity and forced evictions as well as a lack of a perceived 'legitimate' national authority.

The cash rental subsidy methodology allowed the Cluster to close some of the most problematic camps in Haiti. Rent was paid directly to the landlord and IDPs were allowed to keep the difference, creating an incentive to negotiate the best rental price. The cost-benefit ratio of this implementation modality was judged to be negative due to issues such as increased likelihood of beneficiary claims, difficulty to ascertain family size without resorting to individual registration as opposed to head of household registration, foreseeable issues with community mobilization, and heavy time and human resources requirements. Additional assistance was provided through synergies created with local and international NGOs. An evaluation was conducted one year later, which concluded that project beneficiaries were able to obtain and maintain safe and secure accommodation after the period of rental subsidy. As such, the housing after the grant was better than prior to the earthquake. The next step is a 'Site and Service Approach' to develop private investment in housing construction.

It is important to note that durable solutions are not always possible to pursue. In conflict scenarios there may be no immediately clear solutions in sight, and this can cause issues with donors who insist on settlement/shelter being part of a durable solution. When developing a process of recovery, a dialogue and identification of a series of options and mobilisation is extremely important, including in the process of camp closure.

AREA-BASED APPROACHES AND URBAN DISPLACEMENT OUT OF CAMPS

Facilitators: Giovanna Federici, CCCM Cluster Consultant, Urban Displacement & Outside Camps, NRC; Vincent Annoni, CCCM Coordinator, REACH Initiative

The Urban Displacement and Outside of Camp (UDOC) approach and model is based on an area-based approach. There needs to be further reflection and development on the links between UDOC and area-based approaches. The area based approach increasingly appears in agendas and strategic approaches and CCCM has a specific contribution through the work on UDOC and inside camps. These tools and skills will expand CCCM beyond being narrowly defined by the boundaries of camps.

There are 4 key approaches to area-based response in the humanitarian sectors:

1. Administrative unit: regions/district/ municipality

2. Community boundaries

3. Areas covered by service providers

4. Consolidation of data at the household level

The questions this raises for CCCM are whether CCCM should be a catalyst in defining area based approaches, or apply and use specific guidelines or encourage context specific understandings, and is it possible for CCCM to work with these approaches?

It was recommended to have standby or permanent urban planning capacity from the outset of an emergency and CCCM training for urban planners. Also needed is a clear humanitarian architecture in urban responses, where grassroots-based coordination by CCCM could strengthen a multi-sector response and local and private actors should be involved from the beginning of an emergency.

It was noted that defining the boundaries of a neighborhood can be an extremely political intervention. However, taking an area based approach could strengthen accountability to the affected population, who will have one face of the international community in the intervention. In protracted/chronic situations the unit of analysis needs to go beyond the area to include social networks. An area based approach has been successfully used in disaster risk reduction by creating platforms to engage national government and private sector.

The question of whether CCCM has the capacity to work outside of camps is informed by donor interest levels, which can decrease after the initial emergency, and because outside of camp situations are often not prioritised or included in programming.

Inclusiveness means that we move from a status-oriented response to a vulnerability-based response. The CCCM cluster seeks to investigate how UDOC can be presented as an activity to prepare the ground for durable solutions. In fact, area-based approaches should be discussed within the HCT as a concept for looking at displacement in general. There can't be a safe protection environment in a camp unless we involve the community. The focus should be on how we define camps and the shift/adaptation of tools and approaches in different settlements.

ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED POPULATIONS: PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION WITHIN CAMPS

Facilitators: Nick Van Praag, Director, Ground Truth Solutions; Michele Ndhlovu, Accountability Officer, UNHCR Geneva; Veronica Costarelli, National Emergency Coordinator, Danish Refugee Council Myanmar

The CCCM toolkit contains all the necessary information regarding accountability best practices in CCCM implementation, however it becomes more complicated when putting it into practice. Camps offer a hospitable environment in which to be more accountable, and the most persuasive method is talking/interacting with beneficiaries.

Discussions of accountability to affected people (AAP) was triggered by the Rwanda crisis in 1994. This was followed by many accountability initiatives, such as the Sphere project, but the presets of accountability were however not met by large agencies. The Ground Truth Program was formed to offer perspective on channels for AAP, such as methods of interacting with beneficiaries, effective tools and approaches. Ground Truth utilizes participatory development by placing the individual in the center and using customer satisfaction industry tools. Simple, pointed questions are necessary and need to look at relations, agency, outcomes and services.

In Haiti, Oxfam GB, JPHRO, and Concern are looking at how AAP is working. The metric used to provide the affected population's perspectives on a relocation process was the question 'do you feel safe where you live?' which was then allocated a score. Community solidarity and livelihoods programming are other examples of areas where people's perceptions influenced implementation. Za'atari Refugee Camp in Jordan used a similar process to show perceptions of safety in the camp, using heat map visualization.

Various methodologies can be used. For example in Sierra Leone, perception surveys used epidemiology data as a baseline. To ensure accountability, data collection needs to be accompanied by recommendations and follow up action.

From a UNHCR policy perspective, defragmentation is key, as is mainstreaming beneficiary involvements with intention. The production of guidance defining concepts, methodology and recommendations on AAP is ongoing with finalization expected shortly.

The reality in camps is more complicated than setting up the physical structures. The soft approach of system building, trust building and community engagement, referral pathways, and service provider accountability, is important. The issue is that response and expectations management is difficult, thus monitoring and evaluation, focus group discussions, and outreach to the vulnerable, are key. While Global cluster tools exist, these are to be adapted in the field. A challenge is obtaining and maintaining donor support.

It was noted that focus group discussions may be limiting, but they can be improved by making them more interactive and focused on people's particular problems. The Cluster needs to consider how beneficiary input can have strategic impact. Remote assessment can be a useful method of survey, especially when several methodologies of data collection are employed.

Camp managers can be a key element of accountability, especially on tracking and tracing contextual community understanding, but the question remains as to how data access can be provided to the affected population, the particular methodologies for information sharing and how can we ensure AAP outside of camps or to populations in transit.

CCCM COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

Facilitators: Natalia Pascual, CCCM Capacity Building Focal Point, NRC; Jennifer Kvernmo, Capacity Building Specialist, IOM Geneva; Tya Maskun, CCCM Capacity Building Advisor, IOM Myanmar

The objectives of the session were to reflect on the capacity development needs of different CCCM profiles, analyse how these were addressed in the CCCM capacity building strategy and provide recommendations to the strategy for further building capacity. The session started by getting participants to define what capacity development means for them. The discussion focused on CCCM functions, profiles, learning needs and existing tools from a systemic standpoint (looking at individuals, organisations and operational environments). Participants were then grouped according to their profile and asked to provide their recommendations to enhance the capacity building strategy for those profiles.

Discussions highlighted that the traditional CCCM model of capacity building does not address needs in the current context and some competencies will be context specific. The Cluster needs to develop a new capacity building plan and strengthen the camp management components, including an online platform with practical tools, interactive functionalities to foster field exchange, regional CM support, CM in natural disaster scenarios and CM training schemes. It is important to identify context specific competencies and develop a capacity building plan based on learner profiles and the involvement of local actors.

CCCM SUPPORT TO NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND LINKS TO THE SPHERE PROJECT

Facilitators: Nuno Nunes, Global Cluster Coordinator, IOM Geneva; Christine Knudsen, Sphere Project Director, Sphere Project

There is a possibility of creating a set of standards for CCCM building on the SPHERE standards to look at how CCCM can work better and more effectively with other standards. Discussions raised the question of whether more standards should be created or whether the structures could be simplified and incorporate more partners. Sphere no longer delivers training, but instead focuses on developing tools, training of trainers and keeping a database of trainers. Advocacy with national authorities resulted in a number of countries adopting the Sphere standards. Potentially, Sphere could be the starting point for improving standards and developing minimum standards at national level.

CCCM will take part in a revision of the Sphere standards, which will begin in May or June 2016, following the WHS. The review will focus on what has changed in the last 5 years, for example, the rise of urban displacement contexts. One of the key challenges is the contextualisation of the standards, as it raises the question of whether they perceived as a western imposition.

The two key areas of work with Natural Disaster Management Agencies are countries requesting assistance in training in preparedness and building manuals on camp management and site development, and the CCCM Cluster network of focal points

Camp Managers are using Sphere standards to improve aspects of camp management. The Standards appear to have gaps and there seems to be a lack of clarity as to which standards have to be taken into account. There is a need for local actors to understand the norm on the ground and to adapt the standards to these norms and then to be able to justify any deviation. National authorities want to have a set of international standards to use as a guideline to understand what the norm is. This provides an opportunity to start using Sphere to advocate for better standards.

Advocacy with donors to raise awareness that these standards must be contextualised is needed. Figures need to be shared with donors to justify funding, and this may be problematic for donors who may see standards as a minimum requirement to provide funding. A key issue is that the 'number' is often an indicator rather than a standard. Identified ways forwards were further discussion on the possibility of a chapter on the contextualisation of standards and how camp managers and camp committees fit into the standards.

STRENGTHENING CAPACITY IN CCCM: MAKING A REAL IMPACT

Moderator: Jennifer Kvernmo, Capacity Building Specialist, IOM Geneva
Panellists: Natalia Pascual, CCCM Capacity Building Focal Point, NRC; Bryant Castro, CCCM Coordinator, Danish Refugee Council for the Iraq Consortium; Tim Foster, CCCM Capacity Building Impact Evaluation

Key discussion points:

- Shift from training to capacity development
- How can CCCM capacity building respond to new challenges and trends?
- Lessons learnt and best practises from NGO consortium in Dohuk, Iraq
- Update and recommendations from Capacity Building Impact Evaluation

This session reviewed what has been done in capacity building activities over the last year and discussed how to assess its impact. Participants were asked which direction the cluster should take to enhance its capacity building efforts through the discussion and presentations made by the panellist who provided a summary of the different CB programs, training packages (options) and present the preliminary results of the impact evaluation. The presentation from the Iraq Capacity Building Consortium project and its mentoring approach looked in depth of training as a lifesaving component in the complexity of the emergency in Iraq, followed by a presentation from the independent consultant conducting a capacity building impact evaluation. A question and answer session recommended shifting the capacity building approach and validated the findings of the impact evaluations.

There has been an evolution of CCCM capacity building from development of training materials for the newly formed Cluster in 2010, to more recent initiatives including a training of trainers curriculum, CCCM training roster, deployment of expert trainers and roll out of training. The overall trend in the last year has been decreasing training deployments and more long term capacity building requests. Moving forward we need to focus on the why (principles, approaches, roles and responsibilities, camp life cycle) and what (implementation and skills) of CCCM, going beyond training to support more robust learning on all levels.

Examples of capacity building initiatives from Iraq, South Africa, Philippines, Burundi and Bangladesh were then presented. There are emerging displacement trends such as the European crisis and UDOC has been recently piloted for the last years to address the massive out of camp affected populations. Overall trends in CCCM capacity building include preparedness, responding to emerging needs and shaping response and a focus on national capacity building. The Global Cluster is engaging on several initiatives from a CCCM roster, development of the recruitment process, new modalities such as e-learning to coaching support to trainers. We are now building a community of practice to actively support those conducting capacity building projects. The Master Trainer Workshop in Torino brought CCCM trainers together to revise approaches, methodologies and specific documents. Of the 60 recommendations that were identified during the workshop, the strongest request was to create a capacity building working group as an information-sharing forum.

In Dohuk, Iraq, an NGO consortium of DRC, NRC and ACTED was created to support the government through a CCCM mentoring scheme. Teams of 1 international staff, 1 mentoring focal point in each camp and a mobile team of 3 persons would support the government's teams of 1 senior Camp Manager and 6 national staff. The consortium was facing challenges such as government restructuring, lack of national counterparts, no camp management staff and new actors not agreeing to past MoUs. Over the course of the project, the consortium realized that capacity building involved more than camp management and included GBV prevention and the development of Terms of References. The main hurdle is that there was no understanding of what CCCM entails at higher levels of the government response and CCCM capacity building is not considered part of the first line humanitarian response in Iraq. In the Iraqi context it is never clear who the government appointed camp managers report to. A consortium also has its downsides, such as lack of clarity on who steers it.

The consortium model is 3 tiered: a) static model of Camp Management b) mentoring with policy level advice, and c) mobile approach. The mobile aspect is currently engaging at the life-saving level but this needs more awareness raising. Underpinning issues are low funding, the need to continually show CCCM'S relevance and to show complementarity with other clusters. Government officers are now seconded to work in the consortium to gain first-hand experience.

The Capacity Building Impact Evaluation conducted in 2015 looked at 200 courses in over 50 countries in the last 10 years. The evaluation aims to recap the current capacity building approaches, provide a historic overview and identify ways forward for the cluster in

its capacity building strategy and approach. The methodology of the evaluation was a combination of key informant interviews (44 in total) plus an online survey, document reviews and two field visits to the Philippines and South Sudan. Key conclusions from the evaluation are that training events have been the main capacity building methodology of the Cluster and that alternative learning methodologies can also be explored to better meet learning needs. Also, the Cluster has historically measured output (how many people were happy at the end) rather than impact. A key lesson learned is that participant selection is key and that the current trainings focus on the 'what' which needs to shift to the 'how' of CCCM.

Key recommendations are that capacity building should be integrated into the overall CCCM strategy, action plan and team competencies, keeping in mind the levels of individual, organizations and environment. CCCM should also concentrate on impact indicators, emphasize preparedness, and follow up on trainings. CCCM should further delve into the different categories of trainees, trainers, professionals, experts, and coordinators. CCCM needs to strength its engagement with local resources, national authorities, and the displaced community.

GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: WHAT SHOULD THE FOCUS AND PRIORITIES OF THE GLOBAL CCCM CLUSTER BE?

Facilitators: Kimberly Roberson, Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Geneva; Nuno Nunes Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, IOM Geneva

Key discussion points:

- Key strategic areas to be prioritised, changed or included in the Global CCCM Strategy
- Creation of a Strategic Advisory Group and/or Thematic Working Groups
- Increased NGO involvement and membership of the Cluster.

A discussion was held on the prioritization of key strategic areas in 2016 and areas to be changed or included in Global CCCM Strategy. It was debated whether it would be most appropriate to create a SAG or a thematic working group as well as what the function of a SAG would be, besides funding and strategic planning. It was recommended that the structure should remain light so as not to introduce additional layers of decision making. The focus is on increased NGO involvement, which will increase the membership of the Cluster.

There should be different streams of work managed by thematic working groups. There could be a two-track approach, with wider participation at the policy level and specific areas of/projects of interest. CCCM should invest in knowledge management and define reporting lines for the decision making body, which should have a role in endorsement of documents and approaches.

The overall outcome of the discussion on governance was an agreement on the need for more open governance with increased membership; hence the governance

structure should evolve in recognition of increased interest from partners. Other clusters have SAG and technical working groups, so it would be good for CCCM, as it shows the evolution of the cluster.

Participants were then asked to form breakout groups to discuss and feedback on the Global CCCM 2013-2016 Strategic Framework. The break out groups were asked to identify the parts of the strategy that should be prioritised in 2016 and issues to include or change.

The priorities were identified as:

- Development of the relationships with WASH, Shelter and Protection Clusters
- Communication and visibility of the Cluster
- Dissemination of training materials and guidance products
- Collection and management of IDP population data
- Reinforcement of rosters and RRT
- Accountability to Affected Populations
- Division of roles between CCCM and OCHA
- Expanding cluster membership
- Capacity building
- Real time evaluation of country level clusters
- Tailored support to country operations
- Information Management tools
- Institutionalisation of MEND and UDOC

Issues to include and/or changes include:

- Evaluation of capacity building

- Include data on displacement trends
- Include 'alternative camps' to explore new approaches in collective settlements
- Change the name of the cluster
- Include adaptation of cluster governance
- Add Communication with Communities (CwC) to Accountability to Affected Populations
- Guidance on context/country adaptation of tools

The Global Cluster Coordinators committed to set a

formal meeting on the 7 December 2015 including ACTED, DRC and NRC and other interested partners to advance the discussion on the requirements and expectations of involvement in the Cluster decision making body.

ADDRESS BY THE KEYNOTE SPEAKER

Chaloka Beyani, Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of IDPs

Key discussion points:

- Any CCCM strategy should always consider durable solutions and host communities
- Local actors should be enabled to increase capacity
- Assistance and durable solutions need to be provided outside camps as well as within camps
- Adequate protection from forced settlement closure needs to be ensured

The retreat is an opportunity for localizing the response and developing messages for the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS). We have to highlight the primary role of local, national and regional actors in terms of preparedness and response.

We should aim at enabling the local actors in improving local capacities with a focus on coordination, community

engagement and two-way communication. CCCM is well positioned to pilot outside of camp response as well as address the challenges of identifying displaced persons outside of camps with specific protection needs. The CCCM Cluster and partners support humanitarian engagements, in particular for long-term solutions.

Durable solutions cannot be achieved by ad-hoc and un-coordinated approaches but require long-term interventions with a strategy to agree on a framework and activities for the promotion of durable solutions. A CCCM strategy should not be implemented without having elements on integration within the host community or durable solutions.

Several cross-cutting themes need to be considered: investing in local structures and capacities, expanding common resources and services at local level (access to

food and livelihoods) upgrading living conditions, promoting peaceful coexistence at local level and land-tenure security.

It was noted in the discussion that House, Land and Property (HLP) does currently not adequately deal with rental housing. Gaps in responses to climate change induced displacements are recognized and there are ongoing reflections by the Special Rapporteur.

The name of the cluster works well in camp situations but creates the perception that protection can only be provided in camps, while the majority of IDPs live outside camps and protection. Therefore, assistance and durable solutions need to be provided outside camps too. It is necessary to monitor IDPs outside of camps, as these populations are often not visible or not perceived as IDPs for national governments.

In Haiti, a rental subsidy solution was not especially effective as livelihoods were not considered and the earthquake brought middle-income families into poverty that did not fulfil the vulnerability criteria for assistance and were therefore invisible to the response.

The question was raised as to how CCCM can operate in contexts, such as the northern triangle of Central America, where there is a failed state and no humanitarian response or framework? IDPs in that region need humanitarian support and to be brought in the scope of protection and assistance.

Settlements have always been a way to provide protection. However, experiences in Darfur, Kenya, Haiti and Philippines, show that if durable solutions are not applied within 3 to 5 years after displacement, it becomes very difficult to move toward durable solutions. It is necessary to profile the settlement population on their specific needs, return intentions, safety and security, and then promote voluntary return if the situation allows. Promoting voluntary return if possible is the best measure. A strategy needs to be in place securing adequate viable long-term solutions. We have to make sure that IDPs have adequate protection against forced removal from settlements and forced settlement closure, as well as addresses issues of land acquisition in areas of origin as it can raise concerns on the sustainability of returns.

CLOSING REMARKS

Presenters: Kimberly Roberson, Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR Geneva; Nuno Nunes, Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator, IOM Geneva

The Global Cluster Coordinators will follow up by the end of October 2015 regarding the discussions and recommendations on the Cluster Strategy for 2016 and beyond. A meeting will also be set in December 2015 to further discus cluster governance. The Cluster's future adaptations to new displacement trends will be of interest. USAID/OFDA noted their thanks to the organisers and

interest in further engagement with the cluster. A camp manager (DRC) highlighted that it was a good experience and provided an overview of activities in Geneva, and suggested inviting more camp managers to exchange on tools and practices. Thanks to the organisers, notetakers, and the Graduate Institute.

CCCM CLUSTER
SUPPORTING DISPLACED COMMUNITIES

www.globalcccmcluster.com