CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT CLUSTER ANNUAL GLOBAL RETREAT

REPORT

8 - 9 October 2018 | Geneva, Switzerland

Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management Cluster Retreat Report
October 2018

Executive Summary

The Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster held its annual retreat on 8 and 9 October 2018 in Geneva, Switzerland. The retreat targeted CCCM cluster coordinators, information management officers and other CCCM practitioners, including programme managers, camp managers, donors as well as national and local authority counterparts. The focus of the 2018 retreat was on continuing to strengthen camp management practices, further exploring modalities of camp management such as mobile and remote management, exploring how the CCCM cluster works with other clusters and sectors in cross-cutting areas such as Housing Land and Property (HLP) issues and cash and on ensuring sustainability through localisation. The retreat provided the platform for over a hundred participants from 13 NGOs, 8 governmental agencies and missions and 5 UN organisations to share achievements and best practices and participate in planning the upcoming priorities of the cluster in 2019.

Day 1 of the retreat opened with an overview of the Global CCCM Cluster Strategy (2017-2021), discussed at the 2016 and endorsed at the 2017 retreat. This plenary session, led by Global CCCM Cluster Coordinators Wan Sophonpanich (IOM) and Dher Hayo (UNHCR), reviewed the cluster retreat agenda in relationship to the cluster strategy and expected outcomes. The day next moved into breakout sessions around the different ways camp management is being applied across different contexts: mobile and area-based, remote management and site management support.

The afternoon of Day 1 began with a market place, designed as an opportunity for CCCM practitioners to catch up on what has been taking place in countries around the world and exchange lessons learned in an informal setting. The next set of breakout sessions were organised around systems and innovations, with groups discussing data protection, accountability to affected populations and newly developed online platforms.

The morning and afternoon of Day 2 were set up as breakout groups to maximise the interaction time for retreat participants. The first set of breakout morning sessions focused on the use of CCCM tools, with groups discussing preparedness, site improvement and site safety assessment and capacity building. The second set of morning breakout sessions, focusing on standards and inclusion, included groups discussing camp management standards, participation and disability and inclusion. The third set of breakout sessions in the afternoon were organised around cross-sectoral themes, with groups discussing cash, Housing Land and Property (HLP) issues and durable solutions.

The closing session of the retreat was led by the Global CCCM Strategic Advisory Group (SAG), with a working session on operationalising the cluster's strategy and setting priorities for 2019. SAG members led groups to review action points generated from the cluster strategy and from the breakout groups throughout the retreat. The groups then came together to prioritise actions based around the themes of tools, external visibility and support to the field.

Organisations, Governments and Missions:

ActionAid, Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), CARE International, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Christian Aid, Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Education Cluster, Gender-Based Violence Area of Responsibility (GBV AoR), Global Logistics Cluster (World Food Program (WFP)), Global Shelter Cluster, Global WASH Cluster, Humanity & Inclusion (HI), iMMAP, IMPACT Initiatives, International Organization for Migration (IOM), UN Environment/OCHA Joint Unit (JEU), Ministry of Humanitarian Action of Central African Republic, Ministry of Social Affairs Indonesia, National Emergency Management Agency of Nigeria, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Office of the Refugee Relief and Repatriation Commissioner (RRRC) Bangladesh, REACH Initiative, Shelter Centre, German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW), Translators without Borders (TWB), United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNICEF, United States Agency for International Development/The Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA), United States Mission to the United Nations.

Representatives of country operations:

Bangladesh, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iraq, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, South Sudan, Turkey, Vanuatu, Yemen.

Acknowledgement:

Special thanks to the Global CCCM Cluster Support Team (Dher Hayo, Alistair Bremnath, Erica Karapandi, Ruxandra Bujor and Milindi Illangasinghe) and the Global CCCM Cluster Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) for the planning and organisation of this retreat, and to Manisha Thomas for overall facilitation.

Wan S. Sophonpanich   Kimberly Roberson
Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator (IOM)   Global CCCM Cluster Coordinator (UNHCR)

Welcome and Introduction

Manisha Thomas

The retreat facilitator, Manisha Thomas, opened the retreat with a welcome to the participants. She introduced the format of the retreat this year, consisting of a number of breakout groups, each recording key action points and outcomes to report back to plenary. These notes from the breakout sessions were then fed into the final session of the retreat of operationalising the Cluster's strategy in 2019.

Global Cluster Strategy – revisit

Wan Sophonpanich (IOM) and Dher Hayo (UNHCR)

The first session of the retreat took place in plenary and reviewed the Global CCCM Cluster Strategy 2017 – 2021. With the overall aim of the retreat to operationalise the strategy, the session made appropriate linkages between the strategic objectives of the cluster and the agenda of the retreat, thus helping to frame the two days. The presentation contained images sent by CCCM colleagues from the missions attending the retreat to showcase their work throughout the past year.

The vision of the strategy is that

"all people affected by or at risk of displacement have their rights respected through meaningful participation and equitable access to protection, services and assistance throughout the displacement cycle, with the view of progressively achieving durable solutions tailored to their specific displacement context."

While keeping in mind the core values and principles of CCCM, with emphasis on "Do No Harm", the vision is elaborated through four strategic objectives:

- **SO 1: People-centered 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 affected populations.

  This objective strengthens the field clusters' approaches towards designing more holistic and consultative response plans which embrace the voice of communities and affected populations, and it emphasises the cluster's focus on preventing and addressing all forms of violence, in particular Gender-Based Violence (GBV) and including women, men, girls and boys in displacement as active partners in the response.

- **SO 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.

  This objective emphasises the importance of data collection, analysis and dissemination to ensure responses are based on real needs of the displaced and affected populations. This requires establishment of efficient information management systems that will also allow for regular and impactful monitoring of the operational response and coordination effectiveness.

- **SO 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.

  This objective focuses on the pivotal role of the country clusters and the robust, predictable and efficient support the Global CCCM Cluster must provide to them to facilitate their functioning. It also emphasises the need of inter-cluster and inter-sectorial collaboration to maximise the impact of our actions.

- **SO 4: Response 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.

  The responses must take into consideration the changes in the context in which they are implemented, with not only camps and camp-like setups[1], but increasingly non-camp situations[2]. The Global CCCM Cluster has to collect good practice in the field, share it among its members and provide guidance that is flexible and can be contextualised. Engagement of and support to the national and local actors in both coordination and camp management, mobile approaches and area-based coordination, remote implementation in hard-to-reach areas and new modalities of assistance delivery (such as cash) remain the centrepiece in the developing humanitarian context. CCCM's transition and durable solution must also remain a key pillar of the country-level strategies and global support.

Since the last cluster retreat in September of 2017, the cluster had been working with the IASC GBV Guidelines Reference Group and GBV AoR to develop the step-by-step pocket guide for humanitarian practitioners on 'How to support survivors of gender-based violence when a GBV actor is not available in your area'; the global cluster has also increased its information management capacity. Ongoing developments at the Global CCCM Cluster in 2017-2018 include the development of camp management standards, the mainstreaming of the global CCCM training package, the mobile camp management paper, the initiation of women's participation working group, and redesigning of the global cluster website.   All on-going initiatives are part of the various breakout sessions throughout the retreat.

---

[1] Camp-like setups include any and all locations where displaced persons live in a communal way, such as informal and spontaneous sites and settlements, as well as collective centers (including transit, evacuation and reception centers and sites).
[2] While 'out-of-camp' language has been used in the past by the CCCM cluster to describe non-communal settings, it is now recommended to use 'non-camp' for all dispersed arrangements, such as individual housing, and 'camp and camp-like' for all communal settings.

Camp Management in 2018

Breakout sessions under this theme looked to better define different ways in which Camp Management is being applied across different contexts.

- **Breakout group: Mobile and Area-based Approaches**
  The key question to answer is how CCCM mobile approaches relate to the area-based approach, for which a working group has been established under the Global CCCM cluster. The draft document on mobile approaches was also prepared for discussion.
- **Breakout group: Remote Management**
  Access to the displaced populations in need is getting more and more limited to humanitarians, and our accountability is questioned because of highly complex political situations. This session will look at how to establish sound programs and work remotely and how to access critical information remotely.
- **Breakout group: Site Management Support (SMS)**
  With increased capacity of national and local authorities to take on direct responsibility for camp management, more CCCM practitioners are finding themselves shifting from direct implementation of camp management activities to the support role. This session looks at some parameters of such support and what is needed to better define it.

Each breakout group had a lively discussion and closed with agreement on key action points to summarise the discussion and report back to plenary.

Breakout group: Mobile and Area-based Approaches

Moderator – Giovanna Federici (NRC)
Speakers – Ruxandra Bujor (UNHCR), Caroline Logan (IOM), Anna Hirsch-Holland (NRC)

This session opened with a presentation of three case studies to frame the discussion of the draft mobile approach paper.

Ruxandra Bujor presented a case study of Yemen, where a mobile approach is used in locations where there are informal settlements or non-formal settings. A challenge in Yemen is to expose governments and communities to CCCM, and there is a need for service delivery and training from the top down with government officials and the bottom up with communities. To reach settlements in Yemen, roving teams with mixed partners are working at both cluster and national level.

Caroline Logan presented a case study of Iraq, where mobile teams and Community Resource Centres (CRCs) took an area-based approach to use the Risk Assessment Site Priority (RASP) tool to capture data on informal settlements and determine priority areas for intervention. Challenges were tracking IDPs after conflict events and finding partners who were willing to work across such broad areas. However, the approach proved to be cost efficient, and teams were able to cover a lot of area.

Anna Hirsch-Holland presented a case study of Lebanon, where several agencies were implementing Collective Site Management and Coordination (CSMC) as a task force under the Protection working group. A focus in Lebanon was capacity building for the community to be the camp managers, and on creating committees to avoid dealing only through the *shawish*, who were local informal landlords. The CSMC response also included assistance with site monitoring, site visits and training on fire safety.

The presentation of the three case studies demonstrated that sensitising partners and other actors in the displacement setting about CCCM is an important ongoing activity, and also showed that it is important to define the skill set needed for each mobile or roving team based on the needs in the context.

The breakout group moved into a second activity: revising a draft document from the Global CCCM Cluster on mobile approaches to camp management. The session divided into small groups to discuss the paper based around three questions:

- What does mobile really mean?
- How can we bring forward the discussion of an area-based approach?
- How can this draft document be useful in the field?

The groups responded that there needs to be more explanation of the difference between mobile and classic CCCM teams, perhaps by the type of governance, phase of camp life or end goals. The mandate for mobile teams is more flexible, and it is a slower process to work with communities in informal settlements without the permanent presence of a camp manager. There also needs to be clear guidance on working in small informal camps and sites, as these are often not considered key areas for intervention.

Area-based approaches were defined as being geographically targeted, people-centred, multi-sectorial and inclusive (including IDPs as well as other persons of concern). Key parts of area-based approaches can be used by mobile teams. Mobile approaches are people-centred as they rest on governance capacity at scattered sites. Mobile approaches are multi-sectoral and coordinated with local authorities and other partners. The inclusive approach is also useful in defining mobile approaches, particularly as there is difficulty in identifying the boundaries between statuses of people living in the displacement contexts. The major departure is that a mobile approach does not need to be geographically defined, particularly when working in contexts where there has been very little mapping of social and physical boundaries.

To make the paper more useful for the field, the groups suggest that it be re-drafted in a TOR format that defines: when to activate this type of response, the applicability of the approach, the types of tasks under the approach and the standards for those tasks. It also would be helpful if it specified the composition of the mobile team depending on context or gave examples of team compositions. The paper could also be useful in legitimising this type of CCCM approach, particularly to gain buy-in from donors and partners.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Work on further developing the guidance (draft paper on mobile approaches)

- Work on developing guidance on links with shelter, particularly on better definitions of site typologies
- Develop a menu of responsibilities in this approach, including stakeholder roles
- Develop a TOR for this approach (including coordination structures, triggers for application, standards and indicators, stakeholder mapping and exit strategy)
- Collect tools that already exist and are used in the mobile approach to create a toolbox
- Collect case studies (beginning with Iraq, Yemen, Lebanon, Nigeria, South Sudan)
- Begin refining understanding of mobile approaches vs. area-based approaches

Breakout group: Remote Management

Moderator – Dher Hayo (UNHCR)
Speaker – Jorn-Casper Owre (NORCAP)

The goal of the breakout session was to share best practices and identify steps that could be taken at the Global CCCM Cluster level to specify the parameters of remote management as a CCCM approach. The group began by discussing the value added of CCCM in remote management, as other entities use CCCM as a reference in the humanitarian community in terms of information management in remote contexts.

Many displacement settings are considered remote, either in terms of location or access. The role of CCCM is to find a way to support the local authorities' management of displacement while supporting protection.

A remote response is different depending on context, but the overall goal is to complement the work of service providers, not to replace the role of the authority. This means balancing help to beneficiaries with support to the government, which is a challenge in places where government authorities do not hold the same view as humanitarians in terms of the approach of the response. Trust building between CCCM actors and authorities is critical in this approach.

In situations such as northwest Syria, the remote approach differs because there is a lack of official authority and there are different groups holding some level of power. In this type of scenario, it is critical to deploy teams on the ground who can then act as the eyes and ears of the operation. An additional challenge in this context is that local organisations are often considered terrorist groups by the government or donors, and it is difficult to maintain neutrality and to keep humanitarian staff safe.

In Central African Republic (CAR), work is done through local actors who are already de facto leaders. However, it is hard to know how to assess local actors to make sure that community networks are being built. It may be necessary to have minimum standards on collecting information and on how to engage in different contexts. Iraq is another example of work through local actors, bringing up questions about accountability in remote work.

Another identified challenge in remote management is knowing how to phase out and hand over work, particularly when government might change. Data protection is linked to this, as handing over data that may be sensitive may interfere with humanitarian principles.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Define minimum suggested standards that can be used in remote management (possibly an annex to the CM standards)
- Synchronise existing training modules that cover remote management (suggestion to not develop a new training but rather review and compile what exists)
- Establish a shared folder or platform to exchange good practices and lessons learned

- Continue to work closely with state actors and build trust with them
- Define what we mean by remote management and the different contexts that are possible (inaccessible areas due to security, hard to reach areas, lack of capacity, other barriers)
- Invite more government representatives to the CCCM Cluster Retreat to add depth to discussions

Breakout group: Site Management Support
Moderator – Wan Sophonpanich (IOM)

While the CCCM framework clearly define roles and responsibilities that prioritise engagement with national and local authorities, the role of camp managers in large scale and complex crises have traditionally been that of humanitarian actors. With increased capacity of national and local authorities to take on direct responsibility for camp management, more CCCM practitioners are finding themselves shifting from direct implementation to that of a support role at the camp or site level.

This breakout group was a facilitated discussion among the participants on how SMS works in their context, the parameters in which the support structure are put into place, and how to better define and improve upon the role of humanitarian actors.

Participants from Bangladesh were the first comment and emphasise that the involvement of the State is crucial in all part of the responses, particularly as government is the provider when humanitarians leave the context. They also recalled that training and support were critical to understanding the situation, their roles, how to engage with humanitarian actors, and how to best respond to the needs. Their own understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the government vis-à-vis the NGOs was made clearer through capacity building. They expressed that it would be difficult to define SMS globally because each context is different. However, clear and relevant information about SMS should be made available to minimise misunderstandings and set up time required at the onset of emergencies.

The government representative from Indonesia continued, explaining that in the Indonesian context, the government has contextualised the cluster system and lead the coordination in country. The country has learned from the tsunami response in 2005 that the government must be the one to lead coordination in crises. National authorities have their own divisions with different roles and responsibilities, and not every context will have ministries that line up neatly with the clusters. She also pointed out that an additional risk for government staff is that, at a local level, a disaster also affects the staff and impacts their ability to contribute to the response.

Additional participants shared that SMS also meant working closely with the government to develop government capacity to respond to emergencies.   It was noted that in countries with cyclical and seasonal disasters such as the Philippines and Indonesia, the collaborations are very much ingrained into how both humanitarian and government actors work together. In Ethiopia, engagement of humanitarian actors in site management in the IDP context is new. Local authorities have taken the lead in managing most collective sites, and capacity building has been a major focus at both national and sub-national level.

Other participants stated that in some settings, engaging with local government can be challenging because there are different levels of capacity, and problems of perception around neutrality in conflict situations with internal displacement. Monitoring can also be a challenge when sites are being managed by the government. Other opportunities include engagement of civil society organisations, though many may not have familiarity with humanitarian knowledge to engage at the level required.

Overall agreement of the group was that while camp management is vital to ensure effective and responsive humanitarian actions, it is a very little understood sector. Improved awareness and continued capacity building activities should be prioritised. For the CCCM Cluster, understanding the role of the government is important, and the approach must be that the government is in charge with humanitarian support to operations, although this can be challenging when minimum standards and good practices are not being met.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Collect lessons learnt to review how SMS has been utilised in various contexts
- Based on this review, hold consultations with governments to better define when is it appropriate to move from direct implementation of camp/site management by humanitarian actors to the provision of site management support to the national authorities and agencies. and what NGOs and UN agencies should do in SMS: red lines, TORs, roles and responsibilities
- Following these consultations, develop scope of work for SMS (e.g. TORs, SOPs, structure, profiles, capacity building) through consultative processes with Governments and CCCM actors

Marketplace

Following a break for a group photo and lunch, the retreat participants regrouped for the marketplace session, in which CCCM practitioners were able to rotate to different tables showcasing CCCM activities that have been taking place in various countries and exchange on lessons learned in an informal setting. Country teams with stands at the marketplace included Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Somalia, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Iraq, Philippines, Americas (a joint stand), Turkey cross-border into Syria and South Sudan. Organisations and projects were also invited to participate in the marketplace to informally present on new systems and products. Organisations with stands included the IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), and Women's Participation project, Translators without Borders (TWB), the German Federal Agency for Technical Relief (THW), IMPACT Initiatives, REACH and IASC Gender with Age Marker (GAM).

Systems and Innovations

As we go digital, the appetite for more information, faster data and better graphics has taken over humanitarian actions. But what does it mean? How does this improved access to information impact those living in camp and camp-like settings? The afternoon breakout session was divided into three groups.

- **Breakout group: Data protection**
  This group looked at what data protection means, the key tools and case studies to understand it, and how to relate to global ongoing discussions of the humanitarian sector.
- **Breakout group: Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)**
  Establishing complaint and feedback mechanisms, two-way communication and understanding the importance of languages in minimising vulnerabilities are parts of AAP that can be discussed through a camp management lens.
- **Breakout group: Updating the online platforms**
  This group looked at online platforms for feedback from the field about tools in development as well as brainstorming about how to stimulate better engagement.

Breakout group: Data protection
Moderator – Vincent Annoni (REACH)
Speaker – Christina Vasala (IOM)

The session on data protection opened with the introduction of key definitions from a legal point of view. The group discussed the notion of sensitive data in humanitarian contexts, where information might need to be shared. An important distinction is that something classified as "secret" does not mean that it cannot be shared, but rather that it needs more safeguards than just consent of the data subject.

Data protection is important to humanitarians because we don't "own" personal data and people have the right to privacy, and because data can be badly used or put lives at risks in violation of the "do no harm" principle. Most agreements on data protection are done ad hoc and are specific to either a country or a project. There are different sources of guidance about data protection—through the internal guidelines from different NGOs, from national law, from modernized text of the Convention for Data Protection and from the EU regional legislation on data protection. If there is not guidance specific to a project, the International Data Protection standards are to:

- identify which personal data you need to collect
- be specific about the purpose of collecting (and be as detailed as possible: "humanitarian assistance" is not specific enough)
- ensure data collecting quality
- record on paper the consent of the targets. If you cannot get written consent at least have oral consent from them. How much information is needed to give consent really depends on context.

> *Action points from the breakout session:*
> - Develop guidance on data protection in CCCM activities—not an entire guidance but key definitions, key tools and templates that can be adapted to context and are ready before deployment ("Dummies guide")
> - Identify CCCM data protection focal points—to provide advice but also eventually to coordinate and share awareness and provide training.
> - Begin developing training/awareness packages for partners at country level, not just implementing agencies but also local authorities. This would ideally result in a roll out package that can be deployed in different camps and settings

Breakout group: Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)
Moderator – Daniela Raiman (UNHCR)
Speaker – Aimee Ansari (Translators without Borders)

The session opened by beginning to unpack the meaning of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP). AAP gives us different facets of what it means to be accountable: there is an obligation of accountability for programming from a donor's perspective and for reporting and monitoring purposes from an organisational perspective, but AAP is also practical at the ground level. Elements of AAP include many of the major concepts in camp management: ownership, participation, information sharing, accessibility, communication, governance, empowerment and inclusion.

Aimee Ansari, Translators without Borders, presented on language as a key component of vulnerability, as we often think in terms of gender, age and ability but neglect to also account for language as critical for people to get and pass on information. She presented examples of language barriers that have impacted the ability of communities to participate: for example, in Nigeria, a study showed that nearly half of the words

used in the forms were not well understood by the enumerators doing the translating, undermining the quality of the data collected. It is also often the case across many contexts that women are more likely to only speak local languages and are less likely to be literate, therefore skewing the information that humanitarians collect. A first step to reflect language needs is to simplify language and to translate terminology in a culturally contextualised way.

The group next discussed the levels of accountability, which should exist at organisational, camp, sector/cluster and camp management agency levels—with coordination across all. Colleagues working in Bangladesh contributed that in their experience working with about 10 different sectors, it's important to reinforce accountability and ownership across all sectors as well as with government bodies. Colleagues working in Syria cross-border response added that remote operations rely on implementing partners, adding complexity to reinforcing accountability and on holding partners responsible for addressing feedback and complaints. In Greece, colleagues found that language training of staff is important, as even staff who speak local languages may inadvertently use derogatory language and terms. In Somalia, the CCCM cluster handles complaints and feedback received, then refers them to the respective agencies or organisations responsible, then monitors response as an accountability measure.

In response to the country examples, the group discussed the importance of having SOPs to respond to feedback and complaints, especially on following up. The group discussed the build-up of expertise around feedback mechanisms in the CCCM sector, and how to transition this from local to global levels, particularly for newer camp management modalities such as mobile or remote camp management. It's also critical to determine the AAP responsibilities of OCHA vis a vis the responsibilities of CCCM.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Review the CCCM-OCHA matrix that lays out the coordination responsibilities of each and explore tangible operational changes that can be put into place.
- Suggestion to also compare responsibilities of CCCM vs Protection
- Through these exercises, suggestion to better articulate what the CCCM cluster does in terms of governance structures and "stake a claim" for CCCM in CwC and AAP, as they can be inconsistent within the humanitarian coordination architectures.

Breakout group: Updating the online platforms

Moderators – Milindi Illangasinghe (UNHCR) and Brian McDonald (IOM)
Speakers – Marjolein Roelandt (IOM), Fatima Sator (GAM), Anwar Mafoudh (OCHA)

The breakout group on online platforms revolved around presentations of new or updated resources that are available. The group projected the different websites so that speakers could take the participants on a tour of the resource itself.

The Women in Displacement platform (https://womenindisplacement.org/) was introduced with a demonstration of the different segments of the website. This resource was generated as part of the Women's Participation project, which is a joint project of IOM and the Women's Refugee Commission (WRC).

The next presentation of the IASC Gender with Age Marker (GAM) demonstrated how the platform (www.iascgenderwithagemarker.com) can be utilised to support inclusive program design and planning, as well as monitoring.

Next, the Humanitarian Program Cycle (HPC) tools were introduced. The tools include the 'HPC Project Module' which is being rolled out as a successor to the current OPS system; the 'Response Planning and Monitoring Tool (RPM); and the HPC viewer (https://www.hpc.tools/) which provides key information on response and financing for each humanitarian response plan.

Finally, the updated version of the CCCM Cluster website was introduced. The old site is still live, but the Global CCCM Cluster support team is working to launch an updated, more user-friendly version. Some of the changes discussed were:

- The creation of "country pages" where information and resources specific to each CCCM response could be shared.
- The creation of a "resources" section as a means to disseminate CCCM Cluster-related guidance, templates etc.
- Integration with other humanitarian platforms: Humanitarian ID for user management; ACAPS for country-level overviews; and HPC tools for key information on needs, response and financing.

The session participants also provided the feedback that the website in its current form is not dynamic and is rarely updated, discouraging regular use of it.

> ***Action points from the breakout session:***
> - Continue development of the CCCM website with feedback
> - Include global mapping of CCCM operations and coordination platforms
> - Perform a country analysis on use of the GAM tool, examining the need for evidence vs the need for a "lite" process in the field.
> - Ensure that the products we create are tailored to the languages in which they will be implemented
> - Utilise the information from HPC tools to provide more relevant data while allowing for less duplication of work for field colleagues

Closing Day 1
Moderator – Manisha Thomas

The first day of the Global CCCM Cluster Retreat closed with each of the breakout groups reporting their action points back to the larger plenary group. The action points were recorded for further discussion at the end of Day 2 for a prioritisation exercise.

Welcome Day 2

Speaker – Manisha Thomas

Day two of the Global CCCM Cluster Retreat opened with a quick recap of Day 1 the moderators of the morning's breakout sessions giving a brief overview of their topics and objectives.

Morning session 1

- **Breakout group: Preparedness**
  This session included sharing of Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) and other projects, updates on draft IASC Emergency Response Preparedness Guidance, and consultation on contingency planning checklist.
- **Breakout group: Site Improvement and Site Safety Assessment**
  Development of a physical site safety assessment mechanism over three different phases of the camp life cycle.
- **Breakout group: Capacity Building**
  Updates from around the world, updated global training package, with discussion on how the cluster can strengthen and enhance CM capacity building.

Breakout group: Preparedness

Moderator – Florentina Debling (OCHA)
Speakers – Conrado Navidad (IOM), Werner Stern (THW), Natalia Pascual (IOM)

The session on preparedness opened with a presentation on the Mass Evacuation in Natural Disasters (MEND) Guide, a pilot document of the Global CCCM Cluster, by Conrado Navidad, IOM. IOM Philippines is using the MEND Guide as part of disaster risk reduction and resilience building in metro Manila's most vulnerable neighbourhoods. The main outputs of the project are DTM maps and reports on the neighbourhoods, mass evacuation plans, trainings and workshops on MEND, pilot field simulations and Alternative Transitional Shelter (ATS) pilots. The presentation included a video of an evacuation simulation exercise done with community members in Manila following training.

The next presentation, by Werner Stern, focused on outcome of the Mass Shelter Capacity (MaSC) project following a 4-year collaboration with different organisations, institutions, universities and individual experts. Funded by the European Union, the project produced a set of tools (the MaSC Toolbox) that identify common definitions and joint understandings among civil protection agencies and humanitarian practitioners in the field of mass shelter. Aimed at improving effective deployment of civil protection experts to prepare, set up, manage and phase out mass shelters, the toolkit marks a big step forward to increase the preparedness level of nearly all Participating States in the Civil Protection Mechanism and will be promoted to support mayors, municipal and local authorities.

Natalia Pascual next presented on preparedness activities in the Americas. Disaster and crisis scenarios in the Americas range from natural disasters to mixed migration flows to political turmoil. The Americas use three approaches to disaster preparedness, demonstrated through three examples. Preparedness in Uruguay includes updating technical guidelines based on displacement management and expanding social protection program to cover displaced people. In the Caribbean islands, where hurricane risk is high, preparedness includes updating technical assessment tools, upgrading evacuation structures, prepositioning equipment, training local government and strengthening coordination and IM systems. In Panama, which faces mixed migration flows, preparedness includes developing technical guidance and a CCCM curriculum for border police, migration officers and civil protection officers.

Florentina Debling of OCHA led the final presentation on the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness Approach. This approach is built around taking concrete actions that are focused, specific and operational. There are both minimum and advanced preparedness actions, depending on the likelihood of disaster and the seriousness of the impact. This framework is practical and flexible to improve operational readiness in the international community.

> ***Action points from the breakout session:***
> - Mapping of existing preparedness tools for governments where CCCM clusters/sectors are active
> - Explore updating or development of new tools to better assess environmental and social risks considerations in CCCM during preparedness phase
> - Create a checklist of preparedness actions that could link to the IASC Emergency Response Preparedness Guidelines —possible items for the checklist: identify government counterparts, capacity mapping, site mapping, consider differences between camps and host communities, include environmental considerations, develop agreements with private sector suppliers).
> - From this checklist, customise for preparedness at camp level
> - Develop a community of practice through a joint platform or global cluster coordinator group
> - Create links between CCCM and external actors and other sectors on preparedness
> - Integrate preparedness into the global cluster strategy

Breakout group: Site Improvement and Site Safety Assessments

Moderator – Alberto Piccioli (IOM)

Speakers – Clementine Favier (IOM), John Wain (UNHCR), Dominique Porteaud (Global WASH Cluster), Jim Kennedy (Independent)

The breakout group on site improvement consisted of presentations from different contexts and humanitarian sectors. The first presentation by Clementine Favier focused on relocations in Kutupalong-Balukhali in Cox's Bazar. Last year there was focus on risk mapping and advocating for prioritisation of the most at-risk households. Small scale site improvement work is also carrying on with the shelter sector, first in response to the monsoon season and minimising loss of life and now shifting to more comprehensive site planning.

The second presentation by John Wain focused on communal infrastructure improvements. He presented three examples: the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), where site assessments were used to identify sites that were categorised as orange (requiring heavy mitigation) and red (operations are impossible);

Malawi, where a master plan approach was used for settlement planning and long term planning solutions were integrated in the site planning and Cox's Bazar, to demonstrate how line ministries, working with humanitarian sectors, can work on long-term site planning.

Dominique Porteaud from the Global WASH Cluster next presented a critique of how CCCM and WASH are currently linked. For example, solid waste management and drainage need integrated responses with proper site planning to meet WASH standards for disposal. There is a need to look at broader perspectives, such as the sustainability of a site, rather than producing ad hoc solutions. The examples were introduced as a starting point for discussion and as sample areas that can be improved moving forward.

Jim Kennedy next presented on site planning observational audits in Nigeria and Bangladesh, and how good programming mitigates GBV risks, particularly with mitigations done at shelter, block and camp levels. An observational audit in Maiduguri led to the development of an action plan to operationalise, which was revisited after one year. In Cox's Bazar, the site planning booklet was used to add GBV risk awareness into site planning considerations. The next steps for the booklet could be to launch further trainings and audits in other sites, to broaden the tools to work in a greater variety of sites and developing a more systematic archive of lessons learned and case studies.

> *Action points from the breakout session:*
> - Adapt site safety assessment tools to the local level, and create a repository to compile existing ones online
> - Consider safety and risk at different levels (individual/household, block, site, regional), and adapt or develop tools that can move across those scales
> - Look at risks through multi-sectorial and multi-factorial lens (e.g. GBV, floods, protection, etc.), rather than in isolation
> - Integrate the work of other sectors in site improvements for a multi-sectoral approach
> - Consider developing capacity of more practitioners who can deploy as needed to support and train on site safety assessments

Breakout group: Capacity building

Moderator – Jorn-Casper Owre (NORCAP)
Speakers – Astrid Arne (UNHCR), Jennifer Kvernmo (IOM)

The capacity building session was opened by Jorn-Casper Owre, NORCAP, who emphasised that capacity building is needed to build on dialogue with local stakeholders, especially as responses are taking place in more complex settings. For example, with Syria cross-border response, capacity building is largely taking place through online courses and through trainings of local trainers. Another example of capacity building need was brought up by participants working in Bangladesh, where there are challenges due to staff turnover and balancing incoming international staff with established national staff. Other participants commented that in Colombia, capacity building is needed to respond to incoming displacement from Venezuela, however, frictions with the government have meant that capacity building with local authorities has been low.

The group moved into discussion about the limitations where trainings occur but do not have an impact in the way that camps are run when no time and follow up are included into the process. Another challenge identified by the participants in the session was that different sectors working in displacement sites use different technical language, making communication among the sectors a challenge but also increasing the challenge for national authorities or local partners to work efficiently with humanitarian actors.

Astrid Arne next presented on Site Management trainings that took place in Ethiopia in August 2018. The response to internal displacement in Ethiopia is managed by the government's Emergency Operations Centre

(EOC), and the agenda for the training was tailored for the context by the EOC. This joint UNHCR-IOM initiative to strengthen support at a local level, work with local officials who are managing the sites, with the training contextualised to the local site management support structure and displacement setting.

Jennifer Kvernmo, in response to earlier discussion, shared the background of capacity building in CCCM which was first built to address learning need for specific profiles (national authority, NGO or those representatives from the camp community). The next evolution of face-to-face training materials, which aligned with the newly established Cluster system, was designed to elaborate on what camp management is. Following an impact evaluation in 2015, it was recommended that the Cluster shift the focus of training materials from the "what" to the "how". This led to her presentation on the new Global CCCM Cluster Training Package, which has fifteen modules.

She emphasised the need for focal points among agencies for capacity building, as NORCAP is no longer supporting the Global CCCM cluster with a cluster capacity building focal point. She shared that in 2019, IOM has funding for training on these materials, and emphasised the importance of using the materials from the Cluster, when available, rather than depending on ad hoc materials.

> *Action points from the breakout session:*
> - Adapt existing modules to common contexts
> - Encourage contextualising of modules in collaboration with relevant actors, e.g. national authorities

Morning session 2

- **Breakout group: Camp Management Standards**
  A meeting for the CM Standards Working Group with interested participants to review progress and discuss the way forward.
- **Breakout group: Participation**

Presentation of the women's participation platform, case studies and operational examples and exchanges, including introduction on the use of gender and age disaggregated data.

- **Breakout group: Disability and Inclusion**
  Sharing updates and collecting feedback on the CCCM Chapter of the IASC guidelines on disability and inclusion, sharing of best practices and challenges from the field and discuss changes required to address disability inclusion issues and what it means for CCCM practitioners.

Breakout group: Camp Management Standards
Moderator – Jennifer Kvernmo (IOM)

The session opened with an update by Jennifer Kvernmo on progress on the camp management standards since the Sphere consultation session on the standards last year at the retreat. The CM Standards working group was established, and the ToR for the working group is available to be shared with anyone interested in joining for further discussions on the standards. Comments and recommendations from last year's retreat were taken into account for the drafting of the new draft being used for this discussion.

The working group had discussed that the next step for the standards would be to carry out field consultations. Colleagues engaged in operations and/or coordination in South Sudan, Nigeria and Bangladesh have already expressed interest in supporting the process. The group then moved into discussing the draft standards, divided into five groups:

Site management agencies:
The group found that the use of specific numbers could be problematic: for example, requiring a site management agency per number of displaced people. They suggest that it's better to use ranges and emphasising response based on need. They also recommend clarification of vocabulary and referencing to Sphere guidance to zoom in on just what is needed for CCCM and not already covered elsewhere.

Representation:
The group suggested that the standard include more diverse means of participation and to reword actions on governance to ensure that the community is doing more than attending meetings to tick a box. There should be more on continuous improvement of representation, ensuring at minimum a channel of communication for feedback, and to better define the role of CCCM in prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA).

Service coordination and monitoring:
The group recommended adding indicators to make sure that coordination meetings are effective, not just that they occur, and there was debate over whether a coordination standard makes sense for CCCM as other sectors also have coordination responsibilities. The group agreed that the language in the standard needs to be humanised and focused on building governance structures rather than on setting up coordination structures for INGOs.

Site environment:
The group recommended removing any indicators that are the responsibility of other sectors, such as WASH, to avoid duplicating work. The focus should be about making sure that service providers are present and that services are being offered. The standard needs to step back from details and instead offer strong definitions of concepts such as social spaces.

Strategic planning and exit:
The group argued for contextualising most indicators used in this standard and suggested a rewrite of key actions around durable solutions to focus on the feasibility of different options. Overall, the group suggested that for many people, remaining in displacement might be the best option for that moment, so transitional options should also be included.

At the end of the session, the groups came back to discuss the standards as a whole. The group recommended cross-checking to ensure alignment with CM Toolkit. It was also suggested to cross-check the indicators already used by different agencies in CCCM projects. A potential value of the standards, aside from holding CCCM actors to account, is to strongly advocate for what CCCM does to other sectors and other actors, and to explain why we work the way we do. The standards will need an introduction to give clarity on what the standards are expected to do and strong cross-referencing with the Sphere Handbook.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Ensure alignment with CM Toolkit and clearly show linkages
- Ensure the standards focus solely on camp management components
- Cross-check the standards with Sphere, CHS the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) and other existing guidance
- Validate guidance notes in pre-existing settings and through field consultations

Breakout group: Participation
Moderator – Marjolein Roelandt (IOM)
Speakers – Anna Hirsch-Holland (NRC), Connie Tangara (IOM) and Fatima Sator (GAM)

The session on participation opened with a presentation from Anna Hirsch-Holland on piloting the Women's Participation Toolkit in an urban displacement context in Eastern Afghanistan. The pilot used the Toolkit's participatory methodologies, including a community safety mapping, as well as exploring complementarities between the women's participation toolkit and UDOC tools. It started by carrying out community safety mapping. From this step, the women involved in the project decided to establish "shops" that could double as spaces for women to gather informally, bypassing the resistance and social pressure preventing women

friendly spaces from being created. A challenge of the project was working around pre-existing patriarchal power structures and empowering women to participate despite these limitations.

Connie Tangara next presented on the implementation of the Women's Participation Toolkit in Bangladesh and on mainstreaming participation of women and girls through an integrated site management and protection approach in Leda and Unchiprang refugee settlements in Cox's Bazar. Participation was a difficult and often misunderstood subject to discuss with the women and girls among the Rohingya refugee population. Women were also difficult for field teams to reach because husbands and/or male family members were often the focal point to receive and provide information. The approach, in which women were integrated in activities linked to the response in preparation of the rainy season, showed that a benefit of having women participating from the beginning of the response is pre-emptively allowing the team to resolve issues with services or facilities before they become a problem, such as the non-use of WASH facilities. Connie also noted that community engagement must be put into workplans to make sure it happens meaningfully.

Fatima Sator then shared the IASC Gender with Age Marker's (GAM's) 12 indicators on good programming, including an indicator on participation. She also noted that participation often means different things in different contexts, and it is important to start simply and aim for eventual ownership. Whenever women come together for everyday activities, there are possibilities to engage and begin to build structures for participation. The presentation included an introduction of the GAM online platform, which supports all IASC members and partners in the mandatory application of the GAM to projects and funding proposals.

Marjolein Roelandt next introduced the tools developed through the women's participation project. The project collected information on the different activities around participation, through both quantitative surveys and qualitative "stories of change" in which women relate the impact of the project through anecdotes.

In terms of participation, the group then discussed the importance of continuity, and how to ensure that participation activities and especially empowerment of women continues after humanitarians leave the context. Engaging with government on women's participation was identified as a major challenge.

> *Action points from the breakout session:*
> - Collect lessons learned and see if guidance can be standardised for CCCM globally
> - Look at existing tools for participation and assess their adequacy and relevance
> - Develop indicators for participation to improve programming

Breakout group: Disability and Inclusion
Moderators – Astrid Arne (UNHCR) and Agnes Tillinac (IOM)
Speakers – Sien Andries (Humanity & Inclusion) and Priscila Scalco (IOM)

The session on disability and inclusion opened with a presentation about the development of the IASC Guidelines on the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action. In 2016, a task team was formed to work on the IASC Guidelines, which are aimed at assisting humanitarian actors in creating a standardised understanding of disability, to acknowledge the responsibility of practitioners in considering the rights of persons with disabilities, and to help humanitarian actors understand how to respond to the needs of persons with disabilities (PWDs) through practical guidance. The guidelines are being developed through a participatory process of task team members, and it is currently under revision ahead of an upcoming global consultation forum.

Sien Andries presented Iraq as an example, where staff at reception centres were not trained to be inclusive of PWDs. When PWDs came to the centres, they were generally assumed to be in need of medical services rather than getting screenings for other needs such as livelihoods. The child-friendly spaces were also not organised to be inclusive, with children with disabilities generally just watching other children play rather than being able to participate.

Priscila Scalco presented on South Sudan, where camp staff in Bentiu are piloting an inclusive initiative in collaboration with technical experts. This was a pilot site for the women's participation project, and as part of the project evaluation, the team began working on developing infrastructure to improve accessibility and inclusive camp management. A challenge in working with PWDs here is identifying the scope of needs. Humanity and Inclusion helped to train IOM enumerators to build capacity around working with PWDs.

The group then discussed additional challenges in integrating PWDs in camp-level programming. For example, in Bangladesh it was possible to construct some latrines with wider doors, but there is a lack of understanding as to how to address other needs of PWDs. Funding was also identified as a major constraint in being able to implement projects to rehabilitate infrastructure to better serve PWDs and improve accessibility. Prejudices already exist, in displaced communities as well as in the humanitarian community, about certain types of disabilities and about how PWDs can be integrated.

Astrid Arne next led the group in revising a checklist of recommended actions to integrate PWDs from a CCCM perspective to close the session.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Share the checklist of recommended actions to integrate PWDs (from CCCM perspective)
- Provide feedback to the IASC guidance that is in development
- Develop further action points based on the CCCM checklist

Morning report back to plenary

The morning closed with brief presentations from each of the morning's breakout groups on their action points for use in the closing session to create an action plan for the Global CCCM Cluster for 2019.

Afternoon session

- **Breakout group: Cash**
  The session explored the relevance of cash discussions for the CCCM cluster and agreed on priorities for the cluster moving forward to better support field operations involving cash.
- **Breakout group: Housing, Land and Property (HLP)**
  This session explored ways in which HLP-related challenges can be overcome and prevented through specific CCCM activities. The session looked at best practices, identifying gaps, and the way forward for the global cluster.
- **Breakout group: Durable solutions**
  How often are we there? This session explored ways in which CCCM can better prepare all stakeholders for durable solutions.

Breakout group: Cash

Moderators – Ivan Karlsson (IOM)
Speakers – Jake Zarins (Habitat for Humanity), Tim McInerny (NRC), and Carla Lacerda (IOM)

Ivan Karlsson opened the breakout session by presenting the definition of cash transfer programming (CTP), which is the provision of cash or vouchers to households or communities via any modality. He followed by introducing some definitions around cash before moving into the presentations. He emphasised that using cash gives decision-making power to the beneficiaries if done the "right way".

Jake Zarins and Tim McInerny next dialed in to share their perspectives on the use of cash with CCCM and noted that to meet a specific objective, such as addressing GBV, it is necessary to identify the right tools based on analysis of the context. A challenge of multi-purpose cash programming is that monitoring is limited to tracking expenditures and there is a limited scope for measuring outcomes. Another challenge is that injecting cash into markets, which should increase quality of goods and decrease prices, sometimes does not work this way for the poorest and most vulnerable people and will impact power dynamics within markets.

Carla Lacerda next presented on the use of cash within IOM's CCCM programs, illustrating the variety of assistance transfer modalities (in-kind, cash/vouchers, technical expertise, capacity building). She elaborated on the potential roles for camp managers in cash-based interventions (CBI): understanding the context and dynamics on site, engaging with cash actors and working groups, enabling the use of cash and cash delivery. Currently in cash programming there is a gap in understanding if objectives are met, but there is space for CCCM to have a role here, possibly in acting as information focal points to assist CBIs.

> *Action points from the breakout session:*
> - There is a need to create space for cash discussions within CCCM
> - Need to practically review how cash works in CCCM and better define when cash can or should be used

- Develop guidance and mechanism for camp managers to ensure that all actors using cash in the camp remain accountable

Breakout group: Housing, Land and Property (HLP)

Moderators – Yasmine Colijn (NRC) and Dalia Aranki (HLP AoR)

Dalia Aranki opened the breakout session with a presentation on HLP and CCCM. CCCM actors face HLP issues on a daily basis through their work, and security of tenure from a CCCM standpoint means having a home, free from the fear of forced eviction, that offers shelter, safety and the ability to access a secure livelihood. An integrated program approach from the beginning of CCCM program design is recommended, along with close monitoring of HLP throughout displacement and advocacy for security of tenure.

Yasmine Colijn, NRC, next presented on HLP issues that specifically affect camps. It was noted that context is critical when dealing with HLP, as in many places, proving land ownership is complicated and culturally-based. As CCCM actors work directly with displaced and host communities, verification of land ownership can be done from bottom up and top down. When setting up interventions in CCCM, it's necessary to have a clear understanding of the land and people's relationship to it right at the start. It's important to have "red flags" so that CCCM actors aren't perceived as complicit in land conflicts or don't aggravate the vulnerability of the population in need. For example, NRC will not engage in camp management in camps that are situated on land without consent from the landowner.

The breakout session then moved into small group discussions to identify potential CCCM activities with communities for (a) due diligence; (b) monitoring of HLP risks; and (c) protection from forced eviction.

The group discussing due diligence discussed the importance of understanding tenure situation in a context. Best practice is triangulating information on ownership through participatory methods while also engaging the authorities to understand legal legislation. An example of Haiti was brought up, where communities had their own system of land tenure, which was not fully understood by the humanitarian community; another from South Sudan, where the POC sites are within areas controlled by the UNMISS but the host community has claimed land rights and demanded payment.

The group discussing monitoring HLP risks identified open communication with the host communities as critically important, along with clearly mapping the services that are available. It was also deemed a good practice to have a help desk available in areas of displacement, and coordination among the actors working on issues involving HLP. There is also a need to develop clear procedures on dismantling shelters during camp closure or handover, along with agreements over who owns materials and whether or not they can rent or sell their temporary shelters.

The group discussing protection from forced eviction compared eviction and relocation, with Haiti as an example, where it took months to find a location that was secure from the risks of forced eviction. In South Sudan, women are unable to inherit property and female-headed households are often evicted. In Somalia, all sites are on private land, so CCCM partners must have land tenure agreement timelines on hand to make sure they have enough time to plan for dignified transitions. In Gaza, many displaced people reside in schools during breaks, but have to be evicted when the school year starts again.

Action points from the breakout session:
- Ongoing monitoring of HLP issues, advocate for ongoing due diligence from CCCM actors
- Define activities that CCCM should focus and engage on with communities

> - Work with HLP AoR to develop guidance on HLP processes as part of CCCM interventions at country level, including collection of case studies.
> - Further explore CCCM's role in prevention and mitigation of forced eviction
> - Identify possible tool/guidance for other stakeholders/partners who are not familiar with HLP issues in camp and camp-like settings

Breakout group: Durable solutions

Moderator – Hannah Curwen (IOM)

The session on durable solutions was structured as a group discussion about the role of CCCM, and participants were asked to share solutions strategies in place in their countries.

A challenge specific to durable solutions is that solutions rely on several factors, such as an improved security situation or having required resources to repair damaged homes, to be in place. Development programming may not consider IDPs in programming or have a good awareness of their needs. Plans and budgets for local governments are based on population figures that often don't include IDPs. IDPs have vulnerabilities, even if they have financial resources.

South Sudan colleagues identified the future of POC sites as a major challenge, especially around the timelines for operations. In Chad and DRC, communities need livelihoods opportunities, and need to rebuild social cohesion. In Somalia, IDP camps became urban settlements, so long term solutions have to pass through government authorities as part of urban planning. In Yemen, humanitarians advocate with the government to use host community integration instead of camps, with the incentive of humanitarian investment in local services. In Afghanistan, humanitarians work with development counterparts to support returns. Participants noted that planning and strategy for durable solution can be overlooked when displacement context is primarily focused around ad hoc spontaneous sites.

> **Action points from the breakout session:**
> - Current challenges in achieving durable solutions that need support/guidance/suggested solutions:
>   - Contexts with a lack of political will or a government that is willing to work with you
>   - Short-term donors
>   - Working with development actors without replicating efforts

Afternoon report back to plenary

The afternoon breakout session closed with brief presentations from each of the breakout groups on their action points.

Operationalising the Cluster's strategy – setting priorities for 2019

The final session of the 2018 CCCM Cluster Retreat was led by the Strategic Advisory Group members Chris Gad (DRC), Giovanna Federici (NRC) and Andre Krummacher (ACTED). They gave a brief introduction of the role of the SAG, then positioned the action points presented by the various breakout groups into three main areas of suggestions for 2019:

- Tools, guidance, case studies
- External visibility
- Field support

The group divided around these areas to discuss and prioritise action points for the cluster in 2019.

Priorities for tools, guidance and case studies

1. **Camp Management Standards.** Revise the draft version of the camp management standards and share back the new version to the working group. Identify initial sample countries for field level consultation. Develop a concept note and funding requirement. Engage other participants for the working group, such as academics and government.
2. **AAP**. Explore how to present the responsibilities and added value of CCCM in AAP to external stakeholders.
3. **Camp Management Modalities**. Develop a concept note, definition, framework and roles and responsibilities, including consultation with government counterparts on what SMS is for current contexts and possible future ones, as well as ensuring mutual understanding and expectations. This also include finalising definition of mobile and area-based approaches. A collection of case studies for the various modalities should be collected and disseminate.

Outside of the top three, the group also identified additional priorities that should be taken into consideration:

- Capacity building (adapt existing materials to fit different contexts, field support)
- Remote management
- Collecting existing tools

Priorities for external visibility

1. **Global mapping of CCCM operations.** This helps to demonstrate the wider context in which we operate. Colleagues in country need to feed into this process, as advocacy needs to be based on facts. Priority information to map includes: # of people, # of sites (typology) and actors
2. **Funding strategy.** This is an essential enabling factor for many of the initiatives we are interested in carrying out in the next year. Develop a concept note, plan of action, work plan for 2019-2020, identify donors and engage more with organisations that could contribute to the work plan.
3. **CCCM website relaunch**. The SAG and support team need to give their attention to this relaunch, and it needs to be part of a larger communications strategy.

The group also identified preparedness as a close fourth priority.

Priorities for field support

1. **Communication between global and national clusters**. Formalise more regular communication to have better information from the countries on their priorities and where they need support. This needs to happen with the cluster, not just within the agency. This is linked to resources: there needs to be funding for staff to support this, perhaps a list of resource persons who can be quickly called upon or deployed.

2. **Country cluster performance monitoring**. The global cluster should reach out to clusters with the new tool developed as part of the GCCG workstream this year. Set a call with all cluster coordinators and IMs in early 2019 to collectively plans for clusters that would like to do the evaluation. Identify support required to put this into action from the global cluster.
3. **Compile a repository of tools, lessons learned, best practices**. Compile or re-share available tools and templates. Have an online library, not just a "junk pile" of hundreds of documents but a vetted list. Discuss how to organise this.

Closing Remarks

Kim Roberson provided a closing remark following the 2-day cluster retreat:

- These meetings are important to catch up and meet new people and put faces to names. It's also an opportunity to showcase the great work being done in the field. But it's important to feed back to us to make these two days useful for you when you take the time from your schedules.
- At the global level, we see an evolution in the topics that are considered important, and active participation shows that these sessions have value. HLP, AAP and durable solutions were new topics this year, showing increased emphasis on the importance of these issues for CCCM, which is ensuring grassroots protection.
- The field of CCCM is clearly evolving. The term 'site management' was used very widely during the retreat this year, and is used to cover the diversity of the sector

Kim concluded by saying that this year's retreat has generated the most concrete requests yet to the global cluster as to collective priorities that are important to those working in the variety of contexts. The knowledge and experience shared at the retreat have provided the global cluster with vital guidance and contribution, so congratulations to the participants.

Wan Sophonpanich then thanked the global support team from both IOM and UNHCR for organising and coordinating the event, with special thanks to the presenters and moderators of the breakout sessions. Many thanks also to the SAG for their engagement and support throughout the planning process, to Dher for stepping in to cover for Daniela just in time to organise the retreat, and to Manisha for accompanying us through another year of the Global CCCM Cluster retreat.

The retreat has reaffirmed some of the key priorities for the cluster and highlighted more action points that must be addressed. It is hoped that participants will continue to provide inputs and engage with the global cluster as we work towards these goals.

Thank you very much and we look forward to seeing you again in 2019!