I. Background/Context

The North Kivu Displacement Context

North Kivu has seen waves of conflict related displacement since the first refugees arrived in 1994 following the Rwandan genocide. Although displacement figures and subsequent humanitarian interventions have waxed and waned over the years, the persistent presence of armed factions\(^1\) with ever shifting alliances and diverse interests has created a particularly unstable and challenging environment for the province’s population. As of November 2013, the humanitarian community estimates that more than 1,000,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) currently take refuge in host communities (approx. 62%) or ‘camp-like’ settings\(^2\) (approx. 38%).

It is difficult to predict what will happen and how displacement will be affected over the short and long term. However, the recent *cessez-le-feu* declared by the M23 rebel movement\(^3\) in November 2013 induces a positive change of the North Kivu context. The Rutshuru and Nyiragongo territories having been ‘liberated’ by the Congolese army, returns movements will probably take place within the upcoming months.

---

\(^1\) 40+ as of end of 2013.

\(^2\) For the purpose of this document, ‘camp-like settings’ will be used to describe collective settlements whether they be locally described as ‘*Camps CCCM*’, ‘*Sites Spontanés*’ or otherwise (OCHA-CMP)

\(^3\) *Mouvement du 23 Mars*
In this view, there will be a need for the CCCM sector to reinforce strategies and capacities in order to adapt to the evolving situation and tackle upcoming challenges, in terms of assistance and protection for the IDPs remaining in ‘camp-like’ settings, accompaniment of returns and access to durable solutions, throughout the timeframe of this strategy.

**Background to the CCCM Sector**

CCCM is a cross-cutting sector that traditionally aims to ensure displaced individuals in ‘camp-like’ settings have access to their fundamental human rights and a minimum humanitarian assistance. CCCM does not replace sectorial services providers and/or coordination structures (health, shelter, protection, education, water/sanitation, food-security etc.) but works with them to ensure effective delivery of humanitarian services. Traditionally, CCCM’s main goals have been to:

- Improve living conditions, assistance to and protection of IDPs.
- Advocate for and implement durable solutions.
- Ensure effective common policy frameworks (policies, guidelines and standards) guiding humanitarian actors leading to better delivery of protection and assistance services.
- Ensure consistent and common standards are applied.
- Secure humanitarian space which includes unhindered access and delivery of humanitarian services to IDPs.
- Secure camp coordination and camp management as a key sector which is resourced with adequate staff and funding.
- Organise closure and phase-out of camp.
- Mainstream cross-cutting issues including protection, environment, HIV/AIDS and age, gender and diversity.

While CCCM theoretically focuses its efforts on ‘camp-like’ settings, in practice it serves as a flexible ‘toolbox’ that can be called upon to support humanitarian operations where needs arise. This has included ‘return monitoring’ of displaced persons moving toward durable solutions, supporting the creation of ‘viable communities’ after displacement and collecting population data for IDPs located within host communities. Consequently CCCM should not be viewed as a rigid structure that no longer considers IDPs beyond a specific boundary, but rather a dynamic one that adapts with displacement trends as necessary.

The global CCCM Cluster is actively responding to these shifting dynamics and will soon release a Strategic Plan for 2014 which outlines the ways in which the CCCM Cluster can respond to the needs of displaced populations living in ‘out-of-camp’ settings, which is in line with the CCCM orientation in the North Kivu Province.

**CCCM Operational Context in North Kivu as at end of 2013**

To date, CCCM humanitarian interventions have not been formally incorporated within the DRC Cluster Approach, but have rather functioned as a ‘sector’ led by UNHCR. Since 2006, the CCCM approach has evolved significantly from regular daily ‘camp’ presence of Camp Management (CM) partners to a ‘lighter’ approach involving mobile CM teams visiting ‘camps’ and collecting data at
regular intervals. By 2012, ‘camp-like’ structures in North Kivu were labelled as either ‘Camps CCCM’ referring to IDP settlements that were essentially ‘recognized’ as being ‘long term’ and ‘viable’ by the humanitarian community and government authorities, or as ‘Sites Spontanés’ that were believed to be of less permanent nature and less ‘viable’. Note that this nomenclature appears to have been created locally within the DRC, and is not recognized by the global CCCM Cluster, nor the Camp Management Toolkit. According to these sources, communal IDP settlements can be categorized as ‘spontaneous’ or ‘planned’, or as ‘camps’ or ‘collective centres’. While these are useful descriptors, they do not necessarily imply a differentiated type of response, and all internally displaced populations in communal settings are normally considered ‘of concern’ to the CCCM sector/cluster. While the initial logic to this classification system aimed to discourage IDPs from staying long term in unviable conditions, a large majority did stay over the three month threshold period. Effectively this meant that the term ‘Camps CCCM’ became synonymous with ‘camp-like’ settings with traditional CCCM structures that received regular interventions and consideration, while ‘Sites Spontanés’, many with effectively the same characteristics as ‘Camps CCCM’, received little coordination, gap analysis, response advocacy or serious consideration. By the end of 2012, IOM (the Global CCCM lead for disaster-induced displacement) received specific funding to address these considerable gaps identified by the donor and broader humanitarian community.

Also, currently, assistance from some sectors, especially food assistance is provided based on status and not on actual food security indicators. Food distributions were provided preferentially to people in “camps CCCM”, rarely in “sites spontanés”. Little coordination and accounting of living conditions of IDPs in ‘out of camps’ situation was done.

Furthermore, DRC is characterized with important poverty and low indicators for many sectors. Current response strategy was focusing on identifying the needs of displaced populations in ‘camp like’ situation without always considering the surrounding population or the global situation of the province. In order to identify the best response for emergency needs as well as the best exit strategy based on vulnerability and not on status, a shift in this aspect is foreseen by the CCCM group.

Given this unique and challenging humanitarian and operational context, this document attempts to identify the necessary steps and way forward in order for the CCCM sector to be as efficient and effective as possible at serving the beneficiary population and wider humanitarian community for 2013-2016. As a ‘living document’ this strategy should be discussed, updated and revised frequently with involvement of relevant CCCM stakeholders as the humanitarian and specific operational contexts evolve.

---

1 Note the CM Toolkit serves as one of the primary references for CCCM type interventions.
2 Collective centres are pre-existing buildings and structures used for the collective and communal settlement of the displaced population in the event of a conflict or a natural disaster. This definition includes buildings of all types, sizes, and forms of occupancy. The key term in this definition is ‘pre-existing buildings and structures’, as the overwhelming majority of Collective centres would have been constructed prior to displacement.
3 This 3 month threshold is based on the period the RRMP (Rapid Response to Population Movements) mechanism is mandated to intervene with lifesaving NFI, WASH and Nutrition interventions.
4 Camp Management (CM), Camp Administration (CA) and Camp Coordination (CC) structures
II. Aim and objectives

The overall aim of the 2013-2016 North Kivu CCCM strategy is to better address protection and assistance needs of the internally displaced population in North Kivu living in ‘camp-like’ and ‘out-of-camp’ settlements with a clear focus on moving toward attaining durable solutions. In line with initiatives being taken by the Global CCCM Cluster to officially expand CCCM area of intervention to outside camps,\(^8\) CCCM plans to pilot a new approach in North Kivu in order to better inform and orient humanitarian actors who deliver protection and assistance services. The 2013-2016 CCCM strategy will work to address the following key objectives:

**Objective 1: Expanding the scope of CCCM activities to include all ‘camp-like’ settings as well as profiling and tracking IDPs in host communities** – The artificial designations of ‘Camps CCCM’ and ‘Sites Spontanés’ should progressively be eliminated and replaced with a more coherent and inclusive system that does not allow for any ‘camp-like’ settings to be left without consideration. In addition to this and in line with initiatives being explored by the Global CCCM Cluster, CCCM North Kivu will also expand its scope by leading profiling and tracking activities of IDPs displaced in host communities. The approach uses a more scientific methodology\(^9\) to estimate disaggregated population statistics in order to provide a more accurate picture of the complete displacement scenario in North Kivu. In addition to this origin information and return intentions will be collected to assist in moving towards and achieving durable solutions. Profiling and tracking\(^10\) will also be used to highlight specific needs and gaps to help orient future humanitarian interventions by other actors. The CCCM sector will seek for strong collaboration with existing actors such as RRMP and find complementarities with relevant tools and coordination mechanisms already in place.

**Objective 2: Reorienting CCCM activities towards durable solutions** – Given North Kivu’s persistent unstable security context of the past decade, CCCM interventions have focussed primarily on highlighting assistance and protection needs in specific ‘Camps’, looking towards durable solutions only when times of lasting peace appeared more likely. Over the next three years, this strategy proposes to explicitly highlight durable solutions analysis regardless of phases of increased insecurity and displacement to prioritize getting IDPs out of ‘camp-like’ environments whenever possible. The CCCM sector recognizes and needs to continue emphasizing that camps and ‘camp-like’ settings are temporary solutions of last resort, and that one of CCCM’s key responsibilities\(^11\) lies in orienting humanitarian action toward achieving durable solutions. This achievement of durable solutions will be done considering the living conditions of the surrounding communities. Indeed, the “sites spontanés” and “camps CCCM” are often located near villages, cities and town where the displaced sought protection and security. The IASC Strategy “meeting humanitarian challenges in urban area” states that “urban specific challenges include population density and distinguishing people of concern from those in chronic and acute poverty”. Therefore, in order not to invest in long-term activities based on

---

\(^8\) While current CCCM literature tends to limit the focus of CCCM interventions to camp and ‘camp-like’ settings, CCCM projects past and present have broadened their scope to include interventions in favor of IDPs ‘out of camp’ in order to address gaps and provide continuity of humanitarian interventions. CCCM, as a cross-cutting sector/cluster, should be viewed as a toolbox of skills and services that can be applied to humanitarian interventions to address needs and gaps.

\(^9\) Including Sampling.

\(^10\) Both agencies undertake profiling activities using their own tools, the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) for IOM and IDP Profiling for UNHCR.

\(^11\) In conjunction with the Protection Cluster.
the status but on actual needs, CCCM sector will always consider local conditions outside the displacement sites as a reference to ensure that priority needs are addressed.

**Objective 3: Enhancing the predictability and effectiveness of CCCM interventions by defining clear ways forward and defining roles and responsibilities between IOM and UNHCR** – While UNHCR has led the CCCM Sector in North Kivu since 2006, IOM arrived at the scene after receiving funding at the end of 2012 to address gaps in ‘Sites Spontanés’. This has created a unique situation in which the two Global CCCM lead agencies work in a common environment dividing, responsibilities among artificial designations of ‘camp-like’ settings. UNHCR and IOM have defined clearer coordination structures through the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG), harmonized tools and created joint Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). Several specific steps, initiatives and principles will need to be taken in addition to the recent achievements and adhered to in order to improve coordination.

**Objective 4: Building Local Capacity and Responsibility** – Humanitarian interventions have been ongoing in North Kivu since 1994 and will most likely continue throughout the scope of this strategy and beyond. Unless the humanitarian community wants to continue serving as a surrogate for the state for a further decade, efforts need to be increased to place more responsibility on state actors. While this would undoubtedly include increased local capacity building initiatives, diplomatic pressure and advocacy initiatives needs to be applied to allow state actors to be supported to assume ‘leadership’ and ownership of humanitarian responses. From a CCCM perspective, this would require enhancing the capacity of CNR, the Governmental institution in charge of IDP programmes, and Protection Civile.

**Objective 5: Enhancing Resilience** – As mentioned above, protracted and new displacements are likely to continue throughout the scope of this strategy. While resilience is a concept that currently encompasses self-sufficiency and preparedness to recurrent *natural disasters*, the recurrent nature of displacement in North Kivu, makes it an ideal testing ground for what this could mean for a complex emergency setting. Preparing high risk populations for likely displacement, including developing local contingency planning and establishing potential relocation communities/ zones with links to agricultural activities needs to be emphasized and explored over the next three years under the guidance of early recovery and development actors.

### III. Guiding principles and policies, technical guidance and standards

The following documents contain guiding principles and policies that will serve as reference for current and future CCCM interventions in North Kivu:

#### Current Documents

- Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement
- Collective Center Guidelines
- Handbook for the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons
• Framework for Durable Solutions
• IASC Reference Module on Cluster Coordination
• IASC ‘Internally Displaced Persons Outside of Camps: Achieving a more Equitable Humanitarian Response’ (Report)
• IASC Strategy “meeting humanitarian challenges in urban area”
• Global MOU between IOM and UNHCR
• Principles of Partnership
• The Sphere Handbook
• IASC Gender Guidelines—CCCM Section in particular
• The UNHCR Handbook for Emergencies
• RRMP tools and methodologies

Anticipated Documents

• Reviewed Camp Management Toolkit (Anticipated 2014)
• CCCM Guidance on serving IDPs in ‘out of camp environments’ (Anticipated 2014)
• Camp Closure Guidelines (Anticipated 2014)
• DRC National Legislation on Internally Displaced Persons (Anticipated 2014)
• National (DRC)/North Kivu MOU between IOM and UNHCR (Anticipated 2014)
• IASC Gender Guidelines (2014) –CCCM Section in particular

In addition to these key documents, the future MOU\textsuperscript{12} between UNHCR and IOM will provide a list of fundamental principles both organizations agree to adhere to throughout their CCCM collaboration and the division of responsibilities among both agencies. While the greater part of the MOU will be negotiated between the two agencies, other partners involved within CCCM should be given the opportunity to comment and propose additional elements in order to develop the most comprehensive and holistic working relationship possible. The following elements should be included within the MOU:

• **The interests of beneficiaries always take precedence** – Both agencies agree that the best interests of beneficiaries always take precedence over agency prestige, access to funding or other competitive issues.

• **Each agency agrees to support the other’s activities to the degree possible** – Both agencies agree to conduct needs assessment, planning programme design, advocacy and joint-fundraising activities together.

• **Agreement to resolve differences amongst each other** – Should differences or points of contention arise, both agencies agree to take the necessary steps to come to a solution amongst each other. If a solution cannot be found bilaterally, the problem should be presented to the CCCM SAG\textsuperscript{13} for finding a mutually acceptable solution.

\textsuperscript{12} See Section IV, Objective 3
\textsuperscript{13} Strategic Advisory Group – See section V. Management Coordination & Stakeholders
Cross Cutting Themes

The following cross cutting themes need to be considered and actively incorporated within CCCM programming:

- **AGDM** – To the degree possible, CCCM activities will strive to include periodic analyses of information from different sources disaggregated by gender, age and specific assistance requirements. This will include:
  - Collecting population data disaggregated by gender and age\(^{14}\).
  - Forming and maintaining camp/host community committees looking at the specific interests in particular groups.
  - Analyzing specific information related to durable solutions through an AGDM lens to see if different approaches are needed for individuals/groups with specific challenges.

- **HIV/AIDS** – CCCM actors will strive to support agencies to reduce the incidence/prevalence of HIV/AIDS and any associated stigma by:
  - Helping in HIV/AIDS sensitization campaigns within ‘camp-like’ settings.
  - Providing contact information of partners involved in HIV/AIDS programming when requested.
  - Reporting activities likely to increase the spread of HIV/AIDS to responsible health and or protection agencies.

- **SGBV** – CCCM partners will aim to support the prevention of SGBV in areas of intervention by:
  - Collecting Population data disaggregated by gender and age\(^{15}\).
  - Advocating for the closure/destruction of unoccupied shelters.
  - Ensuring public structures comply with SGBV guidelines.
  - Supporting the creation and maintenance of Camp surveillance patrols/committees.
  - Establishing sustainable referral mechanism to ensure SGBV survivors access to multi-sectorial assistance structures.
  - Advocate for mechanisms that promote safer access to cooking fuel.

- **Environment** – Environmental considerations are often left to the end of a displacement cycle, particular in interventions with limited funding. However in order to be most cost effective in the long run, the following minimal interventions need to be taken into consideration at the planning stages of CCCM interventions:
  - Advocate for rapid environmental assessments\(^{16}\) of new sites within 3 months of displacement.
  - Keep a guarded eye on potential erosion in camp-like setting and be sure to advocate for preventative solutions before they become unmanageable.

---

\(^{14}\) Care International has developed a Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) framework for non-specialists to evaluate the environmental situation in a camp-like setting in a given moment of time.
Advocate for tree-planting initiatives as an Income Generating Activity (IGA) to combat deforestation in and near ‘camp-like’ settings.

Advocate for the proper closure of camp-like settings once as soon as possible but by latest when 50% of the population has permanently left.

- **Empowerment of Local Capacities** – This crosscutting focus has been highlighted throughout the 2013-2016 CCCM strategy and has been selected as one of its key long term objectives. Ideally this should aim to incorporate the following elements through to 2016:
  - Encouraging leadership and building the capacity of national CCCM actors such as the CNR and the ‘Protection Civile’ for the eventual handover of CCCM related activities.
  - Create and encourage local structures to develop contingency plans for possible displacement in order to enhance longer term ‘displacement resilience.’
  - Developing longer term income generating activities that help serve communities after displacement.
  - Taking the necessary steps to allow IDPs to continue accessing their land, despite short term challenges that may arise in providing humanitarian assistance.
  - Developing committees for IDPs in host communities to give them a voice for accountability, prioritize protection and assistance concerns and develop plans toward durable solutions.

IV. Response strategy and Operational priorities

While Section II identified the aim and five objectives of the 2013-2016 North Kivu CCCM strategy, Section IV details the specific steps and considerations necessary to reach them, noting potential opportunities and constraints as well as proposing specific timeframes for action. Given the complicated operational environment, numerous variables and the unpredictable security situation, specific steps and priorities will likely need to be adjusted on a regular basis, ideally every six months. Any additions and revisions should be conducted in a consultative manner with key stakeholders, including representative members of the beneficiary community whenever possible.

**Objective 1: Expanding the scope of CCCM activities to include all ‘camp-like’ settings as well as profiling and tracking IDPs in host communities**

This objective needs to be broken down into two distinct yet interrelated components for expanding the scope of CCCM. Component 1 aims to recalibrate and return to the traditional scope of CCCM interventions by including all ‘camp-like settings’. Over the course of humanitarian interventions in North Kivu, criteria were established to determine whether new displacement sites were ‘viable’ in the long term and therefore ‘qualify’ for more in-depth examination by Camp Management partners. This distinction appears to have evolved for a practical attempt to curb the creation of more ‘camp-like’ settings as an IGA to combat deforestation in and near ‘camp-like’ settings.

---

17 Note that while traditionally CCCM has officially shied away from involvement of IDPs displaced in host communities, as of 2013, the Global CCCM Cluster has started to explore the feasibility of officially extending its targeted beneficiaries in order to provide CCCM services to fill identified needs. Many CCCM operations already incorporate CCCM programming of the displaced in host communities and DRC seems to be an ideal environment to test this in practice.

18 I.e. in North Kivu terminology this includes both ‘Camps CCCM’ and ‘Sites Spontanés’
like’ settings, yet proved unsuccessful since ‘Sites Spontanés’ continued to persist after a minimal observation period. In the end, this resulted in an artificial two-tier system which penalized specific displaced beneficiaries, while similarities between ‘Camps CCCM’ and ‘Sites Spontanés’ could be observed. While interventions in different ‘camp-like’ settings do not necessarily need to be the same, the CCCM sector nevertheless has a responsibility to develop a minimal understanding of the humanitarian circumstances in all camp-like settings, advocating for cluster interventions by relevant actors and seeking additional funding if necessary. Consequently, this strategy aims to reaffirm this responsibility over its timeframe, so that no ‘camp-like’ setting can be considered outside the scope of its consideration.

Component 2 of expanding CCCM’s scope is less traditional, but in line with directions currently being explored by the Global CCCM Cluster and involves IDP profiling and tracking. In line with Objective 2 ‘Reorienting CCCM activities toward durable solutions’, the CCCM sector plans to continue with ongoing implementation of the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) and IDP profiling and addressing host communities throughout the scope of this strategy. The idea is to view CCCM as a toolbox that can flexibly respond to gaps and serve the beneficiary and humanitarian communities. By adding further emphasis to the ‘seeking durable solutions’ aspect of CCCM, profiling and tracking aim to address a commonly identified gap and credibly provide age and gender disaggregated data, locations of origin and return intentions of the over 60% of the population displaced in host communities. These profiling and tracking activities are also anticipated to be coupled with a needs assessment component in order to highlight broad priority needs in specific areas to help orient future humanitarian interventions within the host communities.

In order to successfully broaden the scope of CCCM over the timeframe of this strategy, the following actions and considerations need to be taken into account:

- **Establish a logical methodology for classifying ‘Camp-like settings’**— The current distinction between ‘Camps CCCM’ and ‘Sites Spontanés’ needs to be revised and replaced with a new system based on relevant objective criteria. By granting all collective ‘camp-like’ settings the same status, they should in theory be given the same degree of consideration, though practical implementation of services may vary depending on different agreed upon variables. The key factor to keep in mind is that IDPs living in ‘camp-like’ settings should never be ignored and should their environment prove unviable, insecure or inaccessible, efforts need to be made to either promote another temporary solution or if possible provide positive orientation towards a durable solution. All collective settlements (collective centres, spontaneous sites and camps) will now be referred to as ‘Sites de déplacement’ as opposed to ‘out-of-camp’ settlements that refer to host families.

This new system will be discussed and agreed upon by a restricted group of core CCCM actors involved in the SAG. The following key elements need to be included:

---

19 Normally three months, or the timeframe through which the RRMP mechanism normally operates.
20 While the exact criteria will need to be agreed upon by the North Kivu humanitarian community, please refer to Annex 3 for some Camp Criteria and Nomenclature propositions.
21 I.e. in another more viable camp or host community.
22 ‘Sites publics’ in local terminology
- A classification system for the ‘Sites de déplacement’ including specific criteria to be considered23
- A catalogue of different possible CCCM interventions that will respond to needs identified in the ‘Sites de déplacement’ based on those different criteria
- A periodicity for validating and confirming particular ‘Sites de déplacement’ classification
  - **Timeframe:** *Site de déplacement* Criteria Exercise: From February 2014

### Establishing clear Practical Divisions between IOM and UNHCR
- While defining and agreeing upon new ‘Sites de déplacement’ criteria will likely take time, it is important to recognize that the designations of ‘Camps CCCM’ and ‘Sites Spontanés’, under the respective responsibilities of UNHCR and IOM, will remain until the end of the 2013 project cycle and the beginning of 2014. IOM and UNHCR will work together with relevant partners to identify the most accurate vulnerabilities within camp-like settings to ensure no gaps emerge during the eventual transition period.
  - **Timeframe:** From November 2013

### Coordinating with existing actors to ensure the continuity of IDP profiling and tracking in host communities
- Displaced population in host families represent more than 60% of the 1.000.000 IDPs in North Kivu. In line with the Global CCCM Cluster Strategy, the CCCM sector in North Kivu should work closely with the broader humanitarian community who targets “out-of-camp” IDPs to provide timely information to partners and ensuring profiling and tracking in a jointly owned and participatory process, developed in a concerted manner. In order to avoid duplications and ensure a wide coverage of different priorities areas, any profiling or tracking mechanisms should be discussed with key actors currently operating in host families.
  - **Timeframe:** 2014

### Developing committee structures to represent IDPs in host communities
- Over a longer timeframe, CCCM actors should support the establishment or the reinforcement of committee structures to represent the interests and needs of IDPs displaced in host communities, in coordination with humanitarian actors. This forum could provide a mechanism for collecting information to address specific gaps and challenges of IDPs living in host communities as well as provide an environment for establishing next steps needed to move towards durable solutions. Regular dialogues with IDPs in host community committees would also give a greater coordinated voice to this majority group of the displaced community, and allow for a feedback mechanism to provide a greater degree of humanitarian accountability.
  - **Timeframe:** June 2014

---
23 This should explore the possibility of measuring a ‘Site de déplacement’s’ ‘vulnerability’, with more vulnerable ‘Sites de déplacement’ generally getting more attention.
Objective 2: Reorienting CCCM activities towards durable solutions

Since 2006, CCCM activities in North Kivu have been primarily reactive, attempting to highlight gaps and coordinate humanitarian actors to respond to immediate protection and assistance needs. Interest in durable solutions tended to peak during lulls in displacement when IDPs appeared most likely to return, and fell completely from consideration as displacements increased. For the CCCM sector and the broader humanitarian community, focus and interest in addressing durable solutions followed a cyclical pattern in the past that needs to be stabilized and given equal consideration in the coming years.

There is a common misconception that CCCM’s raison d’être is to promote the creation and maintenance of camps that respect minimum standards. While CCCM interventions do strive to realize to achieve minimum standards once a camp has been created, it is important to emphasize that camps are considered temporary solutions of last resort – i.e. what one must resort to when no other options are available. The nuance that is often lost is that one of the key responsibilities of the CCCM sector is to get the displaced population out of camps by assisting them approach durable solutions. Consequently, durable solutions are not meant to be only taken into consideration when displacement causing factors cease to exist. Rather, they should be emphasized throughout the displacement cycle, especially when beneficiaries are being hosted in temporary solutions of last resort, or ‘Sites de déplacement.’

Keeping this detail in mind, the 2013-2016 North Kivu CCCM strategy aims to bring durable solutions back to the forefront of humanitarian interventions, regardless of the current phase of displacement. This implies that all interventions in ‘camp-like’ settings must be analyzed through a broader durable solutions lens and ask the question – what can be done to bring these populations/households/individuals closer to achieving a durable solution? Similarly IDPs living in host communities will be included in the identification and implementation of durable solutions mechanisms.

In order to do this, the North Kivu CCCM sector proposes the following considerations and actions for 2013-2016:

- **Profiling and tracking as Durable Solutions Tools** – Profiling and tracking activities described under Objective 1 aim to collect key data that will form the basis of helping populations displaced in ‘camp-like’ settings and those within host communities towards attaining durable solutions. This includes collecting broad information on locations of origin, serial displacements, access to original land, return intentions and ‘identify’ as being displaced. Ideally, patterns will emerge that will lead to more focused advocacy and a targeted approach to assisting populations reach durable solutions. A group of IDPs displaced in a specific location for several years, that clearly indicate they have no intention to ever returning to their land, would need to be approached differently from those displaced in same location who do want to return eventually. Profiling and tracking essentially would serve as the basis

---

24 Achieving a durable solution means that IDPs no longer have any specific assistance and protection needs that are directly linked to their displacement.
for a differentiated analysis of specific tailored approaches to achieving durable solutions for specific groups of people. As more information becomes available, increased advocacy and targeted action would be applied to focus on the specific steps needed to help specific groups, families and individuals achieve durable solutions. The idea is continue seeking and working on durable solutions throughout the displacement cycle, helping and advocating for those that can be assisted immediately in comparison with the level of poverty of the host community.

**Deadline for Commencement:** End 2013

- **Defining Specific Criteria for Durable Solutions in North Kivu** – Durable solutions need to be understood and defined on a gradual rather than absolute scale, explaining the degree to which a durable solution has been achieved. Specific criteria necessary for measuring the degree to which durable solutions are achieved need to be clarified by state actors with the support of the humanitarian community, taking into account the relevant national and international human rights frameworks. Working towards durable solutions cannot be abrupt as it is a consultative process, involving clear exchange of information, informed consent, and a robust monitoring mechanism. Durable solutions also need to be understood from an individual or household rather than group perspective, as more vulnerable members of the same community may need more specific assistance to achieve their fundamental rights.

The North Kivu context is specific in that internationally agreed durable solutions criteria may not easily be met. ‘Establishing long-term safety and security’ will be very difficult to predict, especially if looking at the historical waves of violence over the past two decades. Similarly, ‘achieving an adequate standard of living’ also provides challenges in that a significant proportion of the ‘non-displaced’ community already do not achieve this. While not ideal, state and humanitarian stakeholders involved in the durable solutions process will need to define ‘local durable solutions criteria’ to establish what is acceptable progress within the North Kivu context. This should be considered a ‘practical’ rather than ‘acceptable’ necessity and would need to be complimented with strong and sustained advocacy efforts pushing for minimum standards for the entire North Kivu population.

In order to achieve this, a Durable Solutions Task Force or Working Group, chaired by the authorities, should be established with active participation from relevant state actors, the Protection Cluster, CCCM, OCHA and other interested actors, including actors working in the resilience/early recovery sector to develop criteria for a North Kivu durable solutions scale. Though challenging, this tool could be used to objectively measure the degree to which, individuals, households and communities have achieved durable solutions. Eventually, this Task Force or Working Group could evolve into a longer term working group, pushing durable solutions interventions where opportunities arise.

---

25 These include long term safety, security and freedom of movement; adequate standard of living; access to livelihoods and access to effective mechanisms that restore housing, land and property or provide with compensation.
26 Note an ‘adequate standard of living’ encompasses minimum access to food, water, healthcare, housing and education.
27 As measured by Sphere Standards, which are the agreed upon minimum standards required to enjoy the right ‘to life with dignity’.
28 i.e. equating ‘adequate standard of living’ with what the non-displaced community typically has access to, rather than Sphere Standards.
29 Note this analysis will also need to include an evaluation of which persistent assistance and protection needs are specific to displacement as opposed to chronic challenges faced by the general population of North Kivu.
• Advocate that DRC IDP Legislation conforms with international durable solutions guidance – Considering DRC IDP legislation is expected to be approved during the timeframe of this strategy, CCCM, Protection and other humanitarian actors should advocate that it includes the following elements:
  o Cessation of ‘IDP status’ should be based on the degree to which durable solutions have been achieved, not simply the amount of time a person has been displaced.
  o Achieving durable solutions is a process and not a single event.
  o The state, in consultation with the displaced populations, holds ultimate responsibility for identifying and achieving durable solutions.

  ▪ Deadline for Commencement: August 2013

• Promotions of Income Generating Activities by humanitarian and development agencies – In the short term, IGAs allow beneficiaries the possibility of learning relevant skills or use the skills they already have and becoming more self-sufficient during displacement, as well as providing potential sources of future income that can help them achieve durable solutions. IGAs should also target IDPs living in host communities as well as host communities for a better integration. Camp Managers and Camp Coordinators should advocate for the promotion or implementation of IGAs.

  ▪ Timeframe: Since 2013

• Setting up Durable Solutions Committees – Authorities, with the support of Camp Managers and Camp Coordinators should set up a durable solutions committees in ‘camp-like’ settings to periodically develop a clear understanding and evaluate progress made toward durable solutions. The concept of durable solutions, the theoretical options and the criteria toward achieving them need to be explained clearly and concisely and at regular intervals in order that it is clearly understood that the ‘Sites de déplacement’ are temporary in nature. Ideally parallel meetings could be conducted with IDPs originating from common geographical locations to create a forum for deciding future options. An AGDM approach could also be established for IDPs of different ages, genders and specific needs to express durable solutions based concerns affecting specific groups of people. Similar types of committee structures should be established for IDPs displaced within host communities.

  ▪ Timeframe: 2014

• Durable Solutions specific to Urban Contexts (i.e. Goma) – Durable solutions for those displaced in ‘camp-like’ settings in urban contexts should be examined from a unique perspective given their specific situation. While camps/sites spontanés like Mugunga 3 and Lac Vert were originally isolated units outside the periphery of Goma town, they can now increasingly be considered part of urban continuity and will very shortly be sectors within the urban sprawl. Given that a proportion of this population comes from considerably longer distances, do not have access to cultivatable land, and appear likely to integrate within the Goma community, the question needs to be asked whether this population could come under municipal authority rather than a humanitarian one. Should the majority of this population...

30 For the purpose of this strategy we are referring to Mugunga 3 camp and the surrounding Goma ‘Sites spontanés’.
indicate plans to stay in ‘greater Goma’ with no plans to return, the time would appear reasonable to look for a local integration option, with an emphasis on turning former camps into ‘viable communities’ by improving access to municipal services from a more developmental perspective. Though potentially a longer term initiative, this option should start to be explored as soon as possible under the umbrella of the Durable Solutions Task Force or Working Group suggested above.

- **Timeframe:**

- **Mapping opportunities for durable solutions in areas of origin, displacement or possible relocation:** Opportunities for durable solutions for IDPs may be created as a result of the deployment of the MONUSCO Force Intervention Brigade (FIB), peace talks, and the deployment of state authority. Furthermore, the response to needs of IDPs in protracted displacement should evolve from an emergency to a transitional mode, to support local integration or relocation, at least pending the restoration of conditions conducive to return in areas of origin. Information Management Tools as well as the protection monitoring system will help to identify opportunities for durable solutions in areas of origin, displacement, or elsewhere (relocation) by mapping areas where IDPs could voluntarily return or integrate locally (pending return), conditions of security, access to essential services and other relevant criteria in these areas. This will also help humanitarian actors advocate for durable solutions with the state actors to both the broader humanitarian and donor community.

- **Potential Anthropological study** – Including an anthropological analysis of the displaced populations would provide a unique lens for understanding the social-cultural dynamics involved in displacement and how these are likely to affect approaches to and achieving durable solutions. Combined with an analysis of cultural factors linked to enhancing ‘displacement resilience’ of the ‘potentially displaced,’ a solid academic analysis could provide an excellent basis for future preventive and solutions oriented programming.  

- **Timeframe:**

**Objective 3: Enhancing the predictability and effectiveness of CCCM interventions by defining clear ways forward and defining roles and responsibilities between IOM and UNHCR and humanitarian community**

The unique circumstances involving two lead agencies intervening within the same sector at the same time and location need to be addressed within the first year of this strategy timeframe. In order to do so effectively the following steps need to be undertaken:

**Establish Clear Written Roles and Responsibilities** – Clear written roles and responsibilities defined between UNHCR and IOM should be captured in a document. This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) document needs to be completed, doing away with the ‘artificial’ North Kivu camp distinctions. It would highlight the fundamental underlying principles that serve as the basis for the

---

31 Note UNHCR’s Innovation Section is looking into piloting an anthropological analysis in Dollo Ado, Ethiopia in 2013, which may serve as a model for this approach.

32 i.e. ToR or responsibility table
working relationship between UNHCR and IOM in North Kivu/Eastern DRC. The logic of this document is to have a common reference point to emphasize common fundamental principles in order to best serve the beneficiary population.

- **Deadline for completion:** 2014

**Harmonization of Tools, Information and Outputs** – In order for CCCM outputs to be as predictable, consistent and practical as possible for humanitarian actors, they should provide as consistent information as possible. Regular revisions of tools and outputs should take place between CCCM actors and technical counterparts in order to ensure consistency and interchangeability, and any new initiatives should be discussed and analyzed co-jointly.

Information needs to be shared with partners consistently using an agreed schedule, and should be branded as products of the CCCM Sector rather than solely agency specific. Eventually and if possible the possibility of having a co-joint centralized CCCM information management hub should be explored.

- **Deadline for Commencement:** September 2013
- **Periodicity:** Every two months/as needed

**Harmonization of Advocacy Messages** – A clear mechanism for identifying, agreeing upon and transferring key CCCM advocacy messages should be incorporated into the CCCM coordination structure, in particular through the SAG. These advocacy points should be presented as originating from the CCCM sector rather than a specific agency. This will give any arguments presented more consistent and credible weight and limit the possibility of mixed messaging.

- **Deadline for Commencement:** End of 2013
- **Periodicity:** Monthly/as needed

**Create a Clear and efficient overarching CCCM** - Since the beginning of 2013, UNHCR and IOM have discussed possible arrangements on how to establish a CCCM coordination mechanism. Whereas the two working groups will continue to operate until a clear division of responsibilities between both agencies is agreed, the new working group, the GT ‘Sites de déplacement’ will gather all stakeholders involved in ‘camp-like’ settings in North Kivu to discuss on a regular basis. The objective of this is to ensure relevant stakeholders have a good global understanding and to minimize meetings, ensure that all IDPs’ needs are similarly and equally addressed, develop clear and consistent understandings and avoid information duplications.

Furthermore, coordination should be increased within the CCCM sector through the establishment of a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) composed of all CCCM sector actors including UNHCR, IOM, CNR, Protection Civile, and displacement sites management agencies (ie PU AMI, DRC). The CCCM SAG will aim at discussing strategic approaches, harmonization of tools and advocacy messages and developing a common approach. It will meet on a monthly basis or on an extraordinary basis when the circumstances require it and invite specific organizations depending on the topic.

- **Timeframe** GT ‘Sites de déplacement’ Novembre 2013

33 Including 3W, camp profiles, population movement reports, statistical documents, gap analysis and others.
34 A CCCM (rather than agency-specific) information management officer could be seconded from NRC or another standby partner experienced with both agencies could harmonize and distribute co-joint CCCM products and ensure consistency.
While IOM and UNHCR join efforts to progressively harmonize their approaches and tools, the first meeting merging the two working groups ‘Sites spontanés’ and ‘Camps CCCM’ took place in November 2013 in order to increase synergy among both agencies. Similar meetings will take place on a monthly basis.

- **Provide mutual support to registration and profiling and tracking activities** – In January 2014, IOM will initiate and pilot a new biometric individual registration programme in the ‘sites spontanés’ of Goma and Masisi and in selected camps, such as Mugunga 3. Similarly IOM started using the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) in June 2013. UNHCR also tested profiling and general needs assessment methodology on IDPs. Both agencies agree to be mutually supportive of these initiatives, providing human and material resources where possible, and doing what is necessary to enhance the success of the other agency’s initiatives.
  - **Deadline for Commencement:** Mid-2013

- **Encourage additional initiatives to strengthen CCCM Collaboration between IOM and UNHCR** – Initiatives requiring UNHCR and IOM to collaborate should continue to be explored and encouraged to enhance predictability and efficiency of CCCM outputs. These include:
  - **Co-joint CCCM Training initiatives** – In April 2013, a capacity building initiative was launched co-jointly with IOM and UNHCR training partners in core CCCM theory and principles. While the project is currently funded until December 2013, both agencies should continue to use trained trainers to build the capacity of relevant stakeholders after the closure of the project.
    - **Timeframe:** Ongoing
  - **Explore the possibility of ‘pooling’ common resources** – Both UNHCR and IOM could potentially avoid duplication, make better use of resources and more efficiently serve the humanitarian community and beneficiaries if they formally evaluate and compare the resources available to each agency. Does each agency need its own GIS specialist, demographer or map plotter if these resources could be shared and produce similar results? A formal evaluation of IOM and UNHCR available and anticipated human and material resources and possibilities of pooling should be explored by the end of 2013.
    - **Timeframe:** From January 2014
  - **Search for common funding opportunities/Common CCCM data hub** – Both agencies should seek sources of joint funding for specific projects that would serve CCCM activities conducted by both agencies. For example, a project that would allow for creation of a joint CCCM Data Hub could serve to collect, analyse and standardize inputs supplied by both agencies, and standardize and harmonize the circulation of outputs. A secondee from a standby partner, with experience from both agencies could be included as a project leader.
Conduct an annual co-joint CCCM Lessons Learnt Workshop - CCCM coordination and activities have been conducted in North Kivu since 2006, yet documentation of lessons learnt appears to have been done inconsistently and on an ad hoc basis. An annual workshop hosted by UNHCR and IOM and key CCCM partners would provide the opportunity to explore, express and document specific lessons learnt/best practices to provide an informed basis for future interventions.

- **Timeframe:** June 2014
- **Periodicity:** Annual/Following large crisis

Evaluation of the possibility to create a Co-joint Contingency NFI Reserve – Creating a joint NFI reserve that could be accessed by CCCM agencies in emergency operations would allow respective Camp Management partners the opportunity to respond to high priority needs in displacement sites without resorting to lengthy advocacy procedures.

- **Timeframe:** January 2014

**Additional considerations for CCCM Coordination Structures**

- **National CCCM Coordination Structures** - Note as of end of 2013, CCCM Sector architecture is currently active only in North Kivu. Should financing and human resources allow, it would be ideal to create a CCCM structure at the national level, complete with dedicated CCCM Coordinator tasked with developing and harmonizing future CCCM strategies and interventions in other provinces in DRC.

- **Necessity for creating Coordination Structures and SOPs for emergency urban displacements** – Inclusive coordination mechanisms with related SOPs need to be established in order to create clear and predictable responses to future urban displacement emergencies that are both efficient, effective and inclusive of all relevant humanitarian actors. Ideally this should be under the leadership of national authorities with the support of humanitarian actors.

  **Timeframe:** May 2013

- **Coordination with inter-cluster and clusters:** The CCCM Sector will pursue the coordination with the clusters and inter-cluster.

**Objective 4: Building Local Capacity and Responsibility**

Humanitarian interventions in North Kivu have been ongoing for just under two decades, and while the state holds primary responsibility to address these issues, humanitarian agencies have tended to be at the forefront of the response. Effectively an entire generation has passed without major changes to the substance of response, with humanitarian actors reacting to crises as they arise. While state actors will likely need logistical and material support to undertake their responsibilities, there is no reason that they cannot take on a larger leadership role that is supported by the humanitarian community. Unless steps are taken to build national capacity, the humanitarian community risks taking the lead for another decade, ‘reacting’ rather than building a minimal platform for handing over responsibilities. While this issue needs to be examined in depth from a broader humanitarian perspective, the immediate opportunity to start the process is through the upcoming annual workshop. Community participation is a key component of successful humanitarian work and, while this is not a new concept, it is often neglected in practice. The CCCM lessons learnt workshop provides a unique opportunity to explore and document lessons from the past, thereby providing a foundation for future interventions.
perspective, the following specific orientations for the CCCM sector should be explored, taken into account and implemented in the coming three years:

- **Developing the Capacity of the authorities through training initiatives** – Government institutions, including CNR and Protection Civile particularly, should be encouraged to fulfill their responsibility to the fullest. As of mid-2013, joint IOM/UNHCR CCCM trainings are targeting members of the government institutions to increase knowledge of fundamental principles, standards and technical capacities of CCCM interventions. These efforts should continue over the course of this strategy and be broadened to include more in depth practical sessions on the following: Strategy Development, Contingency Planning, Budgeting, Coordination, Humanitarian Architecture and Humanitarian Financing and Data & Information Management.
  - **Timeframe CCCM Training:** Ongoing

- **Consider encouraging leadership through mentoring programs and co-leadership arrangements.** Alternatively, key CM/CC staff could be seconded to CNR or relevant state institutions to build capacity and work together from within. During emergency operations, these humanitarian secondees would act as sounding boards and provide strategic and practical recommendations to authorities.
  - **Timeframe:** From 2014

- **Advocate for clearly defined government IDP structures and responsibilities in upcoming DRC IDP legislation** – The national IDP legislation should be an opportunity to enshrine in law a clear coordination mechanism, identify responsible institutions and define their terms of reference regarding the protection of IDPs and CCCM issues. It is imperative that CCCM and humanitarian agencies continue to advocate for this precision until the DRC IDP legislation has passed.
  - **Timeframe:** July 2013

- **Inclusion of disaster preparedness capacity building** – Given IOM’s significant CCCM experience in natural disaster preventive capacity building and the North Kivu population’s additional vulnerability to volcanos, poisonous gas and earthquakes, it seems natural to expand capacity building activities to include natural disaster preparedness. Both conflict and natural disaster displacements have unique subtle elements and being able to address both by profiting from specific agency expertise would provide excellent added value.
  - **Timeframe**

- **Design CCCM programming with cessation/handover in mind** – Current and future CCCM programming needs to be designed keeping in mind that funding may be significantly reduced from year to year and government bodies may be suddenly required to shoulder a greater degree of the responsibility. The more national capacity is developed through training, mentoring, experience, legislation or otherwise, the better prepared state actors will be to

---

35 Advocacy for this issue should continue until legislation has passed.
36 IOM is the global CCCM lead agency for natural disasters.
best assist displaced communities. As a consequence, capacity building needs to be prioritized in all CCCM programming over the timeframe of this strategy.

- **Timeframe:** 2014+

**Objective 5: Enhancing Resilience**

Given the likely scenario where the security and humanitarian situation in North Kivu will remain fragile throughout the scope of this strategy (and beyond), state actors and the humanitarian community need to develop methods and implement activities that increase at risk populations’ ability to best react, survive and endure potential displacements in the most dignified manner possible. While resilience is traditionally a term used to describe the degree to which a population’s preparedness will allow them to survive and endure natural disasters, the concept can be applied to complex emergencies as well. This is particularly the case in North Kivu which, to date, has seen almost 20 years of ‘reactive’ humanitarian response activities to displacement. Rather than continue to ‘reactively’ respond to displacement for the next decade, the humanitarian community needs to ask what can be done to improve a given community’s ability to endure conflict related ‘displacement shocks’? More specifically, and for the purpose of this strategy, what specific CCCM tools and activities should be explored and applied in order to increase the ‘at risk’ North Kivu population’s ‘resilience’ to displacement?

The following specific considerations should be taken into account during the planning cycle for CCCM interventions in North Kivu:

- **Importance of maintaining ties with agricultural land** \(^{38}\) – Given that a large proportion of the ‘potentially displaced’ in North Kivu survive from small scale agricultural production, maintaining ties to agricultural land of origin during displacement is of the utmost importance. Being able to visit and regularly farm one’s land provides a degree of self-sufficiency that allows an individual or family to remain more independent and lead a more dignified existence. In the short term this means that the displaced will be less reliant on humanitarian assistance while during longer term, regular visits and farming will discourage land appropriation by others and avoids challenging problems related to HLP \(^{39}\) rights which could negatively impact achieving durable solutions. As a consequence, any kind of decisions by CCCM or other humanitarian actors that influences the displaced to move far enough away from their land to lose effective ties with it, could negatively impact those families ability to resist future shocks.

- **Camp Consolidation or ‘Regroupement’ – Resilience Considerations** – Tied in with the importance of IDPs maintaining access to their land, is a caution regarding ‘consolidating’ or ‘regrouping’ camps. Humanitarian actors, thinking in practical terms of providing assistance, often try to group together displaced populations in order to centralize services. While this may seem to be a good idea in theory, in practice a careful analysis in consultation with

---

\(^{37}\) Given IOM’s CCCM experience in disaster preparedness and capacity building, it appears particularly well placed to take the lead on this issue with the support of UNHCR and other partners.

\(^{38}\) Note Principle 9 of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement – ‘States are under a particular obligation to protect against the displacement of indigenous peoples, minorities, peasants, pastoralists and other groups with a special dependency on and attachment to their lands’

\(^{39}\) Housing, Land & Property;
beneficiaries must be undertaken, to ensure that any consolidation will not reduce beneficiaries’ access to their land, and reduce their long term self-sufficiency and overall resilience. Consequently any kind of consolidation or ‘regroupement’ exercise undertaken by the CCCM Sector needs to include a Cost Benefit Analysis taking into account the long term self-sufficiency needs and dignity of beneficiary population.

- **Timeframe:** From 2014

- **Preventative Resilience Building Interventions** – Building up a populations’ resilience to displacement will require a long term multi-faceted and multi-sectorial approach in order to be effective. From a CCCM perspective, these should include the following interventions that could be gradually incorporated throughout the timeframe of the strategy:

  o **Profiling and tracking populations at risk of future displacement** – As profiling and tracking exercises of IDPs in host communities increase throughout 2013 and 2014, it would be a good opportunity to conduct a pilot profiling and tracking project looking at a population at ‘high risk’ of being displaced in the near future. Understanding intentions of how a given population would react, where they would go and how they would plan to survive could provide an excellent basis for preliminary preparatory actions\(^{40}\) by state actors and humanitarian actors.

    - **Timeframe:** June 2014

  o **Supporting capacity of local Contingency Planning Committees** – Developing and supporting local contingency planning structures should also be encouraged to enhance ‘displacement resilience’. This could provide a forum for local community leaders to explore different displacement type scenarios and organize the specific steps they would anticipate taking collectively in order to respond to these scenarios. Ideally these would be initiated and set up by state actors, with contingency training follow-up and periodic support conducted by humanitarian partners.\(^{41}\) The eventual goal would be to facilitate dialogues between ‘potential’ host communities with the at risk ‘potentially displaced.’

    - **Timeframe:** January 2015

  o **Documenting and Sharing Lessons Learnt from the current displaced community** – CCCM partners and others working with the recently displaced communities, should hold use a Participatory Evaluation Methodology (AGDM)\(^{42}\) style methodology to gain a clearer understanding of displacement experiences and what coping mechanisms best served specific groups of the displaced population as they fled. Documenting and sharing these experiences with at-risk populations could provide useful preparatory coping mechanisms for future displacements. This exercise could be particularly useful for understanding specific coping mechanisms proved useful for the most vulnerable members of the ‘potentially displaced.’

    - **Timeframe:** June 2014

---

\(^{40}\) This could include: Negotiating access to land, setting up contingency stocks, and community governance structures, preparatory warning systems etc.

\(^{41}\) These exercises could ideally be combined with a high risk population profiling exercise, collecting initial displacement intentions and data while at the same time setting up and supporting structures for follow-up.

\(^{42}\) Age, Gender, Diversity, Mainstreaming.
Potential Anthropological study – As mentioned in durable solution section, including an anthropological analysis of at the ‘at risk’ populations could provide a unique lens for understanding the social-cultural dynamics involved in displacement. Combined with an analysis of cultural factors linked to achieving durable solutions for the currently displaced, a solid academic analysis could provide an excellent basis for future preventive and solutions oriented programming.

V. Advocacy and communication

As specified under Objective 3, CCCM advocacy needs to be agreed upon and harmonized between UNHCR and IOM and issued co-jointly as sector/cluster and not as agency specific. This will not only help maintain credibility and avoid mixed messaging, but also give more solid weight with two agencies backing common approaches.

Everyday CCCM advocacy mechanisms

Given that a large proportion of CCCM activities involve identifying gaps and advocating for them to be filled by other clusters, advocacy plays a very regular and central role in CCCM operations. In order to best achieve this, highlighted gaps need to be prioritized by the Camp Coordination agencies, submitted to cluster leads and other actors with a reactive capacity, and followed up with regular advocacy until issues are resolved. In order to be both efficient and effective at this, advocacy for gap filling should follow a pre-defined mechanism, using multiple methods to highlight and address priority needs.43

Longer term advocacy considerations

The CCCM sector, along with the Protection cluster should support the following advocacy points in order to better reach objectives related to durable solutions and capacity building:

- Advocate to achieving Sphere Standards for the entire North Kivu population – While this issue is much broader than the scope of CCCM and effectively implies action by development actors, it is nonetheless a key issue that needs to be regularly highlighted in high level decision making fora. Given that one of the key responsibilities of CCCM is monitoring standards and highlighting gaps, the CCCM sector is uniquely placed to push for this initiative from the ground up.

The challenge is this: Humanitarian actors with limited resources and wishing to avoid potential sources of conflicts with other vulnerable communities, have established a series of ‘local minimum standards’ to strive towards instead of Sphere Standards. Given that Sphere Standards are an internationally agreed upon measure to quantify ‘the minimum required to

43 Email, Cluster meetings, bilateral meetings, etc.
enjoy the right to life with dignity,’ simply achieving this lower ‘local’ standard means that beneficiaries’ ‘Right to Life with Dignity’ is effectively not being respected. While practical and resource considerations may not allow for a higher standard, simply accepting and achieving ‘local’ standards as the ‘norm’ for North Kivu is not acceptable, especially considering humanitarian interventions have been ongoing for a generation. Rather, it must be accompanied with persistent advocacy messaging stating that while local targets/standards are being reached, beneficiaries are still not enjoying their right to life with dignity, and consequently living in conditions where their fundamental human rights are not respected.

VII. Monitoring and Evaluation of the strategy

As described previously, this strategy is designed to be a living document, discussed, debated and updated on a regular basis. Ideally a formal revaluation with CCCM sector partners should be conducted every six months in order to adapt to changes in the security environment and displacement situation. Each year, intervention strategies should be recalibrated and, if necessary, redefined in order to adjust to operational priorities, with an additional ‘planning’ year added to give focus to sector’s long term vision.
Annexe 1 : Carte
Annex 2. Propositions for a New ‘Sites de déplacement’ Classification system

Criteria and Classification - All ‘Sites de déplacement’ need to be evaluated and classified along a scale that will indicate the type of CCCM intervention that will be recommended. Examples of important criteria to consider include:

- **Vulnerability of site population?**
  - Is the population taxed by armed factions?
  - How likely is the site to stay secure?
  - Does the population have access to their own or other agricultural land?
  - How amicable are relations with the neighboring or host community?
  - Does the population have access to livelihood activities?
  - What proportion of the site population is vulnerable or have specific needs?

  **The more ‘vulnerable’ a site is considered, the greater degree of CCCM consideration it should receive.**

- **Viability of the site**
  - Does the site have access to sufficient potable water?
  - Do residents have sufficient space to maintain minimum standards?
  - Are the displaced sheltered on public or private land?

  **The less viable a site the greater degree of CCCM consideration it should receive in order to specifically promote durable or alternative temporary solutions.**

- **Size of the site Population** – Larger camps will need more attention to ensure minimum standards are adhered to, to the best degree possible. Possible thresholds include 500, 1,000, 5,000, 10,000 and 20,000 IDPs each requiring a more involved CCCM consideration. Any site over 5,000 should have a daily presence of camp management actors.

  **The larger the site, the greater degree of consideration it should receive.**

- **Accessibility of the site**
  - Is the site accessible to humanitarian actors?\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{44}\) Note that just because a camp is not accessible, does not mean it should not be taken into consideration by CCCM. In such cases CCCM actors need to find proxies to provide regular updates of population, gaps and other challenges through telephone or other means.
Is the inaccessibility due to security or other reasons?

The less accessible a site, the greater degree of CCCM consideration through proxies and alternative creative means

- **Security in and around the site**
  - Are law enforcement (FARDC, PNC, MONUSCO, etc) agents present in the vicinity of the site?
  - Are armed groups active around the site?
  - What is the influence of parallel administration in the vicinity of the site?

- **Durable Solutions and long term intentions**
  - Does the population have an intention to return in the short or long term?
  - Does the population have access to land and livelihoods?
  - How long has the population been living in the site?

The closer a population is to achieving durable solutions the greater degree of CCCM intervention to achieve them.

**CCCM Intervention Options based on Criteria**

- **Regularity of CM partner presence** – Larger, more vulnerable sites and less viable sites should profit from a greater degree of presence from CM partners. This could range from daily full time presence to bi-weekly visits.

- **Remote Monitoring** – Inaccessible camps should profit from remote monitoring using proxy partners, camp committees, regular telephone meetings or other similar means.

- **Committee based management** – Committees in smaller and isolated sites should be trained on standards and key risks and supported in order for them to as effectively and efficiently mitigate and self-manage potential challenges. They should also have access to contacts to help deal with challenges beyond their capacity.

- **Durable Solutions Support** – Older sites or those with significant proportions of IDPs not wishing to return should be given specific additional support towards achieving acceptable durable solutions.