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## ACTION POINTS – summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finalise geographic areas of responsibility for shelter/NFI/CCCM partners</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draft sector strategic action plan</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partners will review and complete a basic template with information on warehouse locations, and stock status</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Draft sector guidance on standards and sourcing for specific shelter and NFI items – establish TWIG and draft ToR</td>
<td>NRC to lead TWIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community awareness raising on warehousing</td>
<td>NEMA/SEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarify reporting of NFI vis-à-vis WASH and protection</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/ISWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partners to confirm PDM activities and sharing, and to agree a minimum frequency for conducting PDM</td>
<td>Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sector to review DTM NFI and shelter indicators, and RRM NFI/ES scorecard and thresholds</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sector and shelter partners to draft common shelter assessment formats for host, for return</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Draft guidance for sector partners on minimum requirements on what to communicate to communities</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Draft new design for transitional shelter with improved technical drawing, and revise transitional shelter kit options – establish TWIG and draft ToR</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators/Shelter technical partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sector IMOs to plan and deliver training and support on 5Ws tool for partners</td>
<td>Sector IMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sector IMOs to finalise sector analysis tool and other products, such as online interactive mapping.</td>
<td>Sector IMOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Finalise CCCM capacity building action plan for 2017 in terms of approach, coverage, target audience, and topics – establish Capacity Building Group and draft ToR – and organize trainings.</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Present the DTM CCCM site tracker to ISWG</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators / IOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sector to hold a meeting with OCHA and sectors to approach the question of performance monitoring and service delivery monitoring</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Finalise the standard operating procedures for multi-sectoral site planning in camps – establish CCCM TWIG and draft ToR</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NEMA/OCHA to share the ToRs of the desk officers and proposed structure</td>
<td>NEMA/OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strengthen the capacities through CCCM CB of NEMA officials deployed under the new structure proposed by the Government.</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sector coordinators to finalize the geographical repartition of SF with partners.</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Include SGBV in all planned trainings, use of gender lens in all programming, sensitization of partners and communities on field, responding issues and reporting on GBV, training of more female police officers to work in camp and improve reporting mechanisms with protection partners working in camps (PAG, etc.).</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators / partners / Protection actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Integrate environment considerations into discussions regarding the availability and sourcing of NFI/Shelter materials.</td>
<td>NRC (NFI TWG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday 8 February

1. Overview: achievements, challenges and lessons learned 2016

*Rafaëlle Robelin (Sector Coordinator) and Pierre-Claver Nyandwi (Roving Sector Co-Coordinator)*

The key objective of the workshop was to *define the sector action plan for 2017, following and building further detail on the Humanitarian Response Plan 2017, including identifying and agreeing on areas of work to be taken forward by the sector as priority*. To orient this, an overview of the HRP 2017, achievements, challenges and selected lessons learned in 2016 was given (see Annex 5_Achievements, lessons learned and HRP 2017).

In 2016, the sector reached 146,059 families with shelter & NFI assistance (see Annex 1_ End of the year review). Towards the end of 2016, the sector scaled up significantly and began reaching out to multiple locations in Borno State where access opened up during the course of the year, and needs are overwhelming. Major lessons learned by the sector in 2016 included the use of cash, how to deliver shelter for returns, and coordination.

On CCCM, 2016 saw the development of the site facilitation approach to strengthen the CCCM framework, capacity-building, registration and extension of the DTM location based assessments to further flag the needs, in particular in host communities. The sector supported the establishment of a task force with all sectors to refine the gaps and guide the upgrading of services across sectors, through site planning and site improvements. Lessons learned from Muna Garage or Ngala interventions include the need to develop a common framework to assess and monitor progress made in term of service delivery among sectors and accountability mechanisms.

On cash, the sector saw the expansion of the use of the Red Rose platform for NFI vouchers; and the piloting of rental assistance by NRC for those displaced in Maiduguri’s host communities. Cash accounted for only 3% of sector delivery in 2016, a proportion that will grow in 2017. Cash or voucher based assistance is likely to be an important element of host community response, which the sector should expand in 2017, as response remains disproportionately concentrated in camp settings – and as communities move into the third year of strain on their resources. On return, shelter interventions remained extremely limited, but valuable lessons can be gleaned from ICRC’s Adamawa State projects. This is critical, as the scale of return shelter interventions can and must increase in 2017. Important lessons were also learned regarding coordination: the ad hoc approach to location selection among shelter partners was observed to result in piecemeal response, inconsistent communications with communities, and in the worst cases, negative outcomes for the people we serve.
On return shelter, sector delivery was very low, even though areas such as northern Adamawa remained relatively stable areas with high rates of return. This gap needs to be addressed in 2017. Some shelter delivery did occur, including shelter kits delivered by a national NGO, HARAF, and shelter projects implemented by ICRC. ICRC’s projects in Mubi and Michika LGAs provided some guidance on effective return interventions that can be taken forward by the sector as it scales up these efforts and within the cost-band of the Humanitarian Response Plan interventions. ICRC has been implementing two kinds of transitional shelters for return, which they have dovetailed with a livelihoods element, incorporating block making. Beneficiary participation has been critical, with people constructing their own walls and ICRC contributing windows and roofs. They emphasised that we cannot fill all wants; interventions are partial, to provide a beginning that people can build from. However, bearing quality in mind – the technical support must be available. Confirmation of the veracity of land claims has been secured through the community. Interventions have been targeted to the worst affected.

Lessons learned in 2016 on operational coordination include the negative impact of ad hoc and piecemeal shelter programming. It was agreed that responsible agencies be designated by geographic area for each of the activity areas: shelter, NFI and site facilitation. The agency will be the primary implementing agency for the relevant activity, also responsible for assessing and monitoring shelter/NFI/CCCM need (as applicable), in line with the sector methodology and requirements, and maintaining close communications with the sector coordinators. In case of delivery shortfall and gaps beyond the resources or capacity available to the responsible agency, the sector coordinators will advocate with donors on their behalf and/or liaise with the other sector partners to fill gaps. Responsible agencies will be fully expected to adhere to sector guidance and standards.

The designation of responsible agencies is intended to:

- Clarify divisions of labour between sector partners – increase accountability and transparency.
- Maximize logistics and cost efficiency, with single agencies funneling efforts and resources for greater and more consistent impact (rather than piece-meal approaches, with multiple agencies constructing small numbers of shelters in each site) and agencies with smaller capacities to work sideline.
- Increase predictability and consistency for our local colleagues in Government and our beneficiaries, ensuring as far as possible clear and consistent communications and faces, building stronger relationships and deeper understanding of needs in localities – enabling identification and empowerment of local actors.

Partners were asked to indicate where and in what activity they are have interest in taking responsibility by WARD for Maiduguri; by LGA for all other areas. Bilateral discussions will be held following the workshop to agree on designations.

ACTION POINT: Finalize geographic areas of responsibility for shelter/NFI/CCCM partners.

2. Shelter NFI and (DMS)-CCCM Response Plans 2017: Government of Nigeria

DMS-CCCM Sector Lead (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS))
Shelter Sector Lead (National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA))
Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe States (NEMA/SEMAs)

NEMA and NBS representatives from Abuja; NEMA, SEMA and PCNI Borno; and NEMA and SEMA Adamawa briefed on 2017 plans.

NEMA, who have the lead for Shelter NFI at federal level and support the SEMAs at state level, has an allocated budget for ongoing emergency response in 2017, to include camp management in official sites and establishment of LGA desk officers at LGA level in Borno, as well as food, shelter and NFI provision. PCNI introduced the Buhari Plan, which targets 2.3 million IDPs with a comprehensive relief and recovery programme, including shelter – including intentions to provide prefabricated structures in return communities. The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), who have the lead for DMS-CCCM at federal level, will focus in 2017 on tracking and monitoring displacement and the key objectives developed as part of the Humanitarian response Plan 2017. They intend to increase the scope of IDP tracking, expanding state coverage to achieve a national view, not just a focus on the North East, through monthly
and quarterly surveys. NBS' own activities focus on data, no camp management per se, which will continue to be delivered by NEMA and the SEMAs. However, NBS intends to deploy key staff in the field to accompany the efforts and co-chair the sector meetings. NBS has requested for funding under the auspices of the Ministry of Budget and National Planning.

Borno SEMA and NEMA noted that IDPs have started moving back home, and the GoN have started supporting this return. The agencies are planning to mobilise support to all new liberated areas, establishing desk officers for each LGA responsible for reporting on all activities. NEMA support of partners operating in the LGAs was reiterated: the desk officers will be there to facilitate. The Ministry of Relief, Recovery and Rehabilitation emphasized ongoing support to the worst affected in Bama, Gwoza, Dikwa and other locations through the rehabilitation and reconstruction of affected buildings: he emphasized that the GoN remains on their toes, and will not relent until peace comes back to Borno State. Borno SEMA elaborated on return, emphasizing the need for an integrated response including livelihoods - farm implements, animals and training, as well as education, and food, in order to have something to rely upon when returning. The need for capacity building for the camp managers to be deployed to the liberated areas was also raised. Adamawa SEMA noted that discussion is ongoing on modalities for addressing shelter in that state. Under the ADSEMA budget there is some funding for shelter and NFIs. The State government set up return and durable solution committee headed by ESCO heading various sub committees with responsibility of working on requirements for durable and return solution.

Clarification was sought on the relationship between the Buhari Plan and NEMA plans. PCNI responded that PCNI is a collective of different Ministries and agencies, brought together to achieve a long term process, and plays a coordination role; Victims Support Fund (VSF) are the fundraisers. The Buhari Plan is the general overview – NEMA, and the State Governments, have their own plans which are also captured within the Buhari Plan. The NEMA shelter budget will be spent on the provision of construction and building materials to rebuild houses that have been totally destroyed, across the three worst affected states. Cash support is another element of the plan – NEMA is receiving ongoing training on cash to aid emergency relief.

Overall, 9 billion dollars are sought: all GoN budgets combined cannot meet this. Given the magnitude of destruction, there is space for all actors, and serious help is required, from all GoN agencies, as well as international actors. International actors need to talk and collaborate, clarifying what they are bringing to the table. PCNI is trying to bring people and resources together to achieve a synergy; having never faced an insurgency such as this one before, shared knowledge is welcome – we can avoid repeating mistakes by learning from experience.

The importance of understanding the root causes of the crisis was emphasized: sufficient attention must be given throughout the process to community security and social cohesion. Protection must also be taken into account: survivors who need safety must be acknowledged and provided for, and any movements must be voluntary and dignified, to areas that are safe – and not all are currently safe. Clear requirements must be in place for return, as well as mechanisms to bolster confidence: how will we talk about reintegration and reconciliation, as well as reconstruction?

It was assured that while the way will be open for people to move, it will not be forced. It should also be acknowledged that many people really do want to return home: many do not want to remain in camp conditions. The GoN is engaged in creating conditions that are as conducive as possible to facilitate this; support and advice are solicited and welcomed. Adamawa was raised: there, people quickly did return, even while partners planned for it. May 29, given as the date by which camps in Maiduguri should be closed, is a projection and not fixed.

The active involvement of women as change agents should take their place in the process of return: women should position themselves as people with a stake, whose interests are taken care of. Still, in camp committees and in camp management, women are underrepresented, but in Adamawa they are represented in various camps committees. Housing, land and property rights will also be central, and a clear policy on land rights is required from the GoN. This falls under the Ministry of Justice.
3. Which type of shelter NFI response, where, to whom?

Facilitator: Margo Baars

Objectives:
- Define settlement types, target groups, and appropriate shelter NFI responses.
- Define how we determine need, and how we determine vulnerability (including discussion on the Rapid Response Mechanism, and how to improve the quality and coordination of sector specific assessments).

Harmonization

Harmonisation is beneficial to make our response more predictable and comprehensive; to ensure equity and a conflict sensitive response; to inform budgeting, fundraising and procurement. However it was emphasised that harmonised intervention types provide parameters, are not straightjackets. *Response should always should be based on assessment of the specific needs, context and opportunities in each community.* Indeed, community participation and community driven response are core principles of the sector. *Sector strategy and guidance are LIVING DOCUMENTS, to be revised as necessary.*

In considering settlement types, needs, and appropriate response, the appropriate balance between speed, scale, quality and cost was sought. It was agreed that the scale of need in North-East Nigeria is overwhelming, and the situation remains fluid - therefore scale and coverage is a core consideration. The challenge of selecting the right point for investing in shelter support, thereby gaining greatest cost efficiency, was also raised. While it was agreed that money spent at the point of return, which can contribute directly to recovery, is money better spent in the long term, there was clear recognition that there is going to be a continued need to provide shelter solutions for people in displacement and at the various stages of their journey back home.

Settlement types and intervention types

Revisiting and elaborating on the Humanitarian Response Plan, the settlement types considered, in which shelter need is found in North-East Nigeria, were: displaced in host communities (including those living in the homes of others, makeshift shelter on open land, living in unfinished buildings, renters – and non-displaced, but insecure); camps in urban and rural areas; collective centres; and return areas (including squatted houses/secondary occupation, damage and destruction). Based on the analysis of needs and appropriate responses, it was agreed that the following intervention types, with the following basic parameters, will be delivered as appropriate in the North-East Nigeria response.

It was noted that different actors have been using different terms for similar interventions: agreement on what these words mean in this context will aid ongoing sector discussions, advocacy, and reporting. In particular, the transitional shelter has previously been called a ‘reinforced emergency shelter’.

The language below will also appear in the 5Ws – therefore, this also provides partner guidance on how to report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate cost (USD)</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Standard NFI Kit** | 90                  | - The standard kit is light, mobile and easily transported – both for humanitarians and for the people who receive the assistance.  
- The items meet the core life-saving needs most frequently noted in this context. |
| **Improved NFI Kit** | 150                 | - The improved kit includes additional items for greater dignity and protection (solar lamp, mosquito net, and mattresses), with the associated higher logistics cost. |
| Emergency Shelter Kit | 65 | The kit is designed for **distribution** to relieve immediate, life-saving shelter need for **new or secondary displacement, or people on the move** – to tide people over until a better solution can be found.  
- The kit is also used in host communities in insecure land to replace existing makeshifts or extend the shelter coverage.  
- **Light and mobile** kit that can be easily transported and delivered quickly, at scale, as well as relatively easily carried by people to their next destinations if they are on the move.  
- The kit includes 2 tarpaulins, 6 poles for basic framing and an assortment of fixings and tools  
- The kit has an intended life-span of **3 – 6 months**. |
| Emergency Shelter | 150 – 200 | The emergency shelter is designed for peri-urban and rural areas outside of Maiduguri Metropolitan Area, with more difficult and unstable access, and associated higher logistics cost – but where people are expected to remain for some time.  
- As it is relatively space efficient, it is appropriate for settlements with limited space and large flux in numbers.  
- The emergency shelter consists of a robust but basic frame with requisite fixings and tools, covered by 3 tarpaulins.  
- Construction should be overseen throughout the project, ideally **beneficiary or community driven construction**, with adequate training and monitoring. However, if time and conditions do not allow for the requisite level of community engagement and mobilisation, the shelter construction can and has been contractor driven.  
- The emergency shelter has an intended life-span of **1 year** (though plastic sheeting may need more frequent replacement depending on conditions).  
- *The Bama Model is one example of a design that falls within these parameters.* |
| Transitional Shelter | 800 – 950 | The transitional shelter is designed for use in **urban** areas, where there is **easy and stable access**, and where **people are expected to remain for some time**.  
- The shelter has a robust frame with doors and windows, requisite fixings and tools, concrete foundations and CGI roofing and tarpaulin wall covering.  
- Construction should be overseen throughout the project, ideally **beneficiary or community driven construction**, with adequate training and monitoring. However, if time and conditions do not allow for the requisite level of community engagement and mobilisation, the shelter construction can and has been contractor driven.  
- The shelter has an intended life-span of **2 - 3 years** (with maintenance and periodic replacement of walls, which are tarpaulin).  
- Key design considerations included suitability for urban environment; climate suitability for the heat and the rains; durability.  
- *The Bakasi Model is one example of a design that falls within these parameters.* |
| Transitional Shelter Kit | 400 - 600 | The transitional shelter kit is still under consideration as a solution for  
- Rebuilding homes that have sustained major damage, or  
- Extending available shelter in host community settings.  
- It should provide **sufficient materials for a substantial beginning**, which can be built upon, including also a small **cash grant** to allow some flexibility for people to supplement according to their specific requirements. |
The transitional shelter kit should be accompanied with **strong community engagement**, including technical support where required and monitoring to ensure adequate and safe shelter.

Close collaboration with the Protection Sector should ensure **Housing, Land and Property support**.

| Shelter / Housing repair & improvements | 60 - 200 | Tailored minor interventions on damaged fixed buildings with minor damage. Based on specific structural assessment to improve the housing conditions Host community / return |
| Rental support | 100 - 300 | Rental support is provided in an urban and peri-urban environment and for a period of 6 to 12 months. |
| Permanent & semi-permanent shelter | 1000 + | Outside the scope of the Humanitarian Response Plan. Shelter Sector to forge links with recovery and development actors to define linkage. |

Activities which require further technical consideration by the sector include: shelter maintenance in camps, decommissioning and rehabilitation of collective centres/camps.

**3a. Host communities**

People in host communities are found in varied sheltering situations, requiring a variety of responses. The largest numbers are found in urban settings. More than 70% of the displaced are found in host communities.

Given the complexity of host community response, and the spread of IDPs, the allocation of wards in the Maiduguri Metropolitan Area to responsible agencies should encourage more thorough understanding and coverage of the needs within bounded areas. Currently response in host communities is limited and piecemeal, and is still disproportional vis-a-vis camp response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host community situation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in the homes of others (family or friends)</td>
<td>Emergency shelter – Bama model, Communal shelter or transitional shelter – Bakasi model, within family compounds, depending on space availability and land tenure (whether land is secure or insecure) as well as anticipated length of stay of the IDPs (whether displacement is likely prolonged or movement anticipated). Shelter repair / housing improvements within family compounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift shelter on open land (usually privately owned)</td>
<td>Emergency shelter (eg Bama model), or transitional shelter (eg Bakasi model), depending on land tenure (whether land is secure or insecure) and anticipated length of stay of the IDPs (whether displacement is likely prolonged or movement anticipated). Family size must be taken into account to ensure sufficient covered living space per person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished buildings (usually privately owned)</td>
<td>Shelter repair (where land/tenure is secure, and displacement likely prolonged) Emergency shelter kits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>Cash support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3b. Camps**

Camps have distinct characteristics in urban areas (notably Maiduguri Metropolitan Area) and rural areas (such as those found in LGA capitals outside of Maiduguri). Camps in Nigeria are additionally distinguished as formal or official, and informal or unofficial. This designation is conferred by state authorities, and guides the locations in
which Government of Nigeria focuses camp management and humanitarian assistance. Camps are defined as concentrated settlements of 5 families or more, where people have constructed shelters for purpose on open land – most often makeshift, from salvaged materials (in line with DTM definition).

Urban camp characteristics include relatively easy access to existing public goods and services, and for humanitarian assistance; presence of safety/security providers; proximity to employment opportunities. However, expanding camp populations are overstretching public service and infrastructure, notably health; tensions within camps between different groups, as well as with surrounding communities exist; space and available land is often limited, giving rise to fire risk and other safety issues.

Rural or LGA capital camps include more challenging access due to road quality and security, populations in great flux, often limited space and limited movement of IDPs due to security concerns. In several camps people’s shelters are built in flood prone areas requiring urgent relocations or drainage prior to the rains.

It was agreed that first phase of response for influx in camps can include distribution of NFI and emergency shelter kits or communal shelter (depending on the scale of need and space availability). Contingency for anticipated ongoing flux in camp populations should be taken into account by site planners.

Subsequent phases vary depending on the accessibility of the camp (taking logistics cost and speed into account) and urban or rural location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban areas</td>
<td>Transitional shelter (for example the Bakasi model) with the goal of harmonising and upgrading urban camps carried over from the HRP 2016. It was proposed that this should include not only Maiduguri Metropolitan Area, but also could be considered for camps found in larger towns that are relatively easy to reach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (including LGA HQ Borno - hard to reach)</td>
<td>Emergency shelter (Bama model). Emergency shelter kit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Return Areas

Return is likely to happen in stages, with people moving first to LGA headquarters where they will temporarily shelter in camps, and subsequently to their various villages. Return home to villages of origin could be limited either by ongoing insecurity; or, where safe, by damage and destruction of homes and infrastructure – the fact that there is nothing to go home to. The sector (and the response overall) must be able to distinguish these scenarios, to clearly understand people’s intentions and desires, and respond accordingly.

Support should be provided to a range of durable solutions: which could include not only return, but also integration, or resettlement, depending on people’s opportunities, preferences, and life choices.

Assistance will follow the people. All movement must be dignified and voluntary and adhere to checklists as specified by PCNI. The sector will provide support to people at the different stages of their journey, according to need, in camps and host community settings as specified in the relevant sections.

Return support will be provided only at the point of actual return – once people are all the way home, in their village of origin, on or accessing their own land. The situation of people returning to villages of origin who were previously renting was raised and appropriate response must be considered by the sector for action planning.

Transitional shelter kits, designed for return, can include shelter materials and, where relevant and feasible, cash grants. Kits could be tailored to align with specific types of structural damage: for example a roof kit, and a wall kit. The type of material and labour sourcing must be informed by local availability and appropriateness: response should be community driven as far as possible. Housing, land and property issues are being dealt with under the Protection Sector.
In Borno State, consideration must be given to fireproofing in any shelter intervention, as the thatch roofed huts in the scattered hamlets of Borno State have seasonally suffered destruction by fire, requiring repeated response from Borno State authorities in previous years. Borno State consists of hundreds of hamlets of up to 300 people scattered across vast areas: associated operational challenges should also be taken into consideration.

Transitional shelter support at the point of return will target those with destroyed or severely damaged homes, and the most vulnerable, and will provide the basis upon which people can improve, working towards recovery and permanent shelter solutions.

Permanent shelter interventions for return are being developed under the auspices of PCNI and the Buhari Plan. PCNI is looking at developing a cost analysis of shelter types and highlighted the cost benefit for areas with minimal damages where housing can be renovated for the same cost of the transitional shelter, in accordance with HLP laws, as a viable option. The sector will seek clear linkages to early recovery and development actors to ensure this phase of response is coordinated and delivered with appropriate timing and design. The path to durable solutions is the collective goal. Permanent shelter solutions are beyond the scope of the Humanitarian Response Plan 2017 and the sector, and should be integrated into other coordination and financing structures (such as, for the United Nations, the UNDAF).

Shelter must be delivered in coordination with other critical services and infrastructure, notably water and sanitation, which should be in place prior to shelter construction. Further inter-sector coordination on returns will be sought.

3d. Collective Centres

Collective centres are existing, fixed structures that are provided for or become inhabited by more than 5 families of IDPs (in line with DTM definition): often schools, government buildings, religious institutions, or unfinished construction projects. In some cases these buildings are part of the shelter landscape inside larger camps; in many others they are found scattered among communities. As buildings are relatively weatherproof collective centres are frequently severely overcrowded. Most frequently, communal living is gender separated to align with religious and moral preferences. Over the long term, high density communal living conditions, and separation of families, are not healthy or acceptable, and family shelters should be sought as an alternative wherever possible.

Response in collective centres may include targeted upgrading of facilities (including WASH), partitioning of interiors to enhance privacy, decongestion through provision of alternative shelter.

The sector needs to consider a systematic approach regarding the use of schools as collective centres, in coordination with the Education Sector. The Government of Borno announced 33bn NGN for school rehabilitation in 2017. Ensuring that Borno’s children can resume and continue school is paramount. This may include prioritizing schools for relocation and rehabilitation, with provision of acceptable alternatives for the people currently housed in them.

3e. Defining need: sector assessments

The sector targets assistance to displaced people and returnees based on need: people without capacity for self-repair, in poor makeshift or no shelter; or in damaged or unfinished buildings. Vulnerability criteria as a sub-set of need to target further.

On how the sector determines and prioritises need, existing assessments were discussed, with their purposes and limitations clarified, and gaps identified.

| Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) | Crude tool for flagging sector need and geographic prioritization. Periodic, wide area coverage; multi-sectoral, includes site and location based assessments. Community level only; based on key informants and observations. |
Assessments in IDP sites and location based assessment serving as a baseline and prioritization tool to guide the response.

**IOM DTM CCCM site tracker**
Continuous monitoring and flagging need to household level in camps with coverage and gaps in service delivery, on a weekly basis. Limited to established sites that are covered by site facilitators (currently 37 sites) and to be extended. Used as a baseline for the CCCM monitoring and gap analysis assessments.

**Rapid Needs Assessment (Rapid Response Mechanism)**
Through the Rapid Response Mechanism (including NRC and DRC for shelter/NFI rapid assessment and response, in case of large scale influx or other specific alert requiring life-saving emergency response), DRC, NRC and ACF have developed an NFI scorecard based on sampling of households. Part of rapid multi-sector assessment conducted for specific, new mass movements, in specific locations, informing frontline response and beneficiary selection. Input is sought from the wider sector on determining thresholds for response. The scorecard could be used as a basis for all NFI response.

**Sector specific needs assessment**
Based on the baseline shelter need information, detailed household level needs assessments to determine shelter and NFI need, to the level of detail required to inform shelter response and beneficiary selection. Currently, there are no sector agreed formats for sector specific in-depth assessments. The sector considered which assessments are required, following the existing multisectorial assessments and severity need mapping. A harmonized return assessment will be needed, to ensure definitions of damage and destruction are applied evenly, and therefore that assistance levels are equitable. A host community shelter assessment would help to define and improve understanding of these settings.

How to coordinate assessments was also discussed. Communities are exhausted with multiple assessments, and NEMA is urging coordination, the usage of existing tools and to avoid the conduction of multiple assessments. In terms of rapid multi-sectoral assessment, the RRM and the DTM location based assessment should fill this gap where needed for the sector. With regard to detailed, sector specific assessment, responsible implementing agencies in their designated areas should be primarily responsible for conducting assessments and monitoring need.

**ACTION POINT:** Draft sample shelter assessments for host communities and for return for partners to use it in their response areas.

### 4. Cross-cutting issues

**Facilitator:** Pierre-Clover Nyandwi  
**Presenters:** Gorretty Akinyi Omala (Protection Sector Coordinator); Yodit Mulugeta (NRC)

Objective: Discuss how protection is and should be mainstreamed in Shelter NFI and DMS-CCM response, including gender.

**How to mainstream protection in shelter, NFI and DMS-CCM response:**

In all CCCM, the concerns of women, children, elderly persons and persons with special needs must be borne in mind. The intervention must include specific highlighting and targeting of these special groups. The same applies in the provision of shelter where women and children are the majority of the displaced. Survivors of sexual and gender based violence because of their vulnerabilities, are persons whose interests must be specifically targeted for assistance, including access to material, medical, legal assistance. In the planning and setting up of camps as well as coordination, a gender sensitive approach must be applied; for example the location of WASH facilities, the
separation of toilets for male and female and wheelchair accessibility for persons living with disabilities. Adopting a rights based approach in CCCM/Shelter/NFI as human rights is cross-cutting, for example the right adequate shelter is tied to WASH and security of the persons of concern. Community participation and engagement in camp activities and to involve women in decision making committees. Provide training and capacity building for government authorities running the camps on protection mainstreaming. Carefully examine risks of violence, especially gender-based violence (GBV), to boys, girls, men and women in their daily activities (e.g. fetching water, going to the market or to school, collecting firewood or getting fuel), and work with them and protection actors to identify preventive measures and responses. Ensure that effective security measures are in place, especially at night, such as police and/or community patrols where possible, adequate lighting or other security measures. Monitor high-risk security zones regularly and at different times of day (e.g. around showers, latrines, child-friendly spaces, schools and routes to schools, health facilities, water collection points, etc.). Be aware of existing tensions between different ethnic, religious or other groups and consider cultural practices within the affected community. Regularly monitor and discuss with beneficiaries if they feel pressured, directly or indirectly, to return to their place of origin or relocate, or if they feel prevented from leaving the camp. Set-up referral systems in partnership with protection actors to provide an appropriate response and specialised assistance to persons with specific needs. Apply standards on data management and implement measures to secure referral data i.e. to ensure that personal data and lists of beneficiaries of specialist protection interventions are kept confidential and stored in a secured manner to avoid unintended uses. Set-up feedback and complaints mechanism to receive and investigate requests and grievances regarding CCCM interventions, facilities and services at the displacement sites, as well a allegations of intimidation, coercion, violence and sexual exploitation and abuse experienced by women, girls, boys and men in receiving assistance. Respond to all complaints, regardless of whether corrective measures can/need to be put in place. Ensure that camp/site managers and coordinators have signed a code of conduct stating their commitment to respect and foster humanitarian standards and the rights of beneficiaries. Train managers and coordinators on the code of conduct and effectively monitor their adherence to the code. Compliance with the requirement to have a code of conduct is a non-derogatory criterion for the selection of all service providers. In partnership with protection actors, identify dedicated focal points and raise awareness about Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) by UN staff members, related personnel and partners. Provide clear information on the fact that beneficiaries do not have to provide services or favors in exchange for receiving services or accessing Provide efficient lighting throughout site/settlement, with special attention to public and communal areas such as sanitation facilities. Respect minimum space standard in shelters to minimise risks of exploitation and abuse. Plan separate bathrooms and toilets for men and women, avoid dark and isolated areas. Include partitions and door locks (when culturally relevant) to better protect women and girls, particularly single women and female-headed households. Take into account local material, existing capacities and the environment. Whenever possible, locally acceptable and available materials and labor should be used to benefit the local economy, while not depleting local resources.

ACTION POINTS: Include SGBV in all planned trainings, use of gender lens in all programming, sensitization of partners and communities on field, responding issues and reporting on GBV, training of more female police officers to work in camp and improve reporting mechanisms with protection partners working in camps (PAG, etc.).

- Discuss environmental issues arising from shelter NFI programming and how we might mitigate these.

The presentation highlighted global efforts and goals on which emergency responders should give credence to sensitivity of the environment’s response to impact of Humanitarian emergency operations and commit to environmental sustainability. Concerns were raised on peculiar issues to Nigeria’s environment, for instance; deforestation (where about 1562 trees is estimated to have been felled from construction of 6720 Bakassi model transitional shelters by actors in Northeast Nigeria), solid waste management (related to tarpaulin use in the region), Ecotoxicological risks (from increased use of pesticides) etc. Partners were encouraged to mainstream environmental protection and sustainability all through project cycle to reduce environmental footprints of humanitarian operations in the region.
ACTION POINT: Integrate environment considerations into discussions regarding the availability and sourcing of NFI/Shelter materials.

- Raise housing, land and property issues and the HLP Working Group.

The presentation highlighted global efforts and goals on which emergency responders should give credence to sensitivity of the environment’s response to impact of Humanitarian emergency operations and commit to environmental sustainability. Concerns were raised on peculiar issues to Nigeria’s environment, for instance; deforestation (where about 1562 trees is estimated to have been felled from construction of 6720 Bakassi model transitional shelters by actors in Northeast Nigeria), solid waste management (related to tarpaulin use in the region), Eco toxicological risks (from increased use of pesticides) etc. Partners were encouraged to mainstream environmental protection and sustainability all through project cycle to reduce environmental footprints of humanitarian operations in the region.

5. Technical Shelter

Facilitator: Tommy Sandlokk

Objectives:
- Identify gaps or areas for further technical development in shelter response.
- Review balance of in-kind versus cash support for shelter.
- Agree and prioritise development of specific technical solutions or guidance, which can be tasked to Technical Working Groups.

Emergency shelter: a technical working group reviewed and improved the Bama design in October 2016 with more ventilation and extended the height on the sidewalls from 1,2m to 1,5m. The floor space is 3,6m X 4,5m = 16,2 sqm. The group considered Bama model sufficient and what is achievable within the budget of an emergency shelter. Beneficiaries often construct additional spaces for kitchen, semiprivate outdoor areas etc. around the shelter. This needs to be considered when doing site planning. Sufficient spacing between each emergency shelter is very important and highly recommended. Spacing between shelters should be minimum 4 metres.

Transitional shelter: building off the Bakasi model, privacy, outdoor shade, ventilation and sustainable solutions for shelter upgrade were discussed with adjustments recommended:
- To achieve more privacy, move the sleeping section to the ends of the shelter, and use the mid-part as entrance and living space. Existing placement of doors and windows changed accordingly.
- Suggested shading solution is to extend roof construction by one meter. To save cost this will only apply on entrance side on the revised floor plan.
- Ventilation and sustainability. Tarpaulin has poor ventilation qualities, and environmental issues. As an option and repair solution, straw mats discussed but not agreed on as a solution. Main challenges with straw mats was identifies as fire hazard and danger of damaging the existing marked for beneficiaries, in terms of increased prices and availability. Benefits with straw mats is ventilation qualities of the material, possibilities to be used as reinforcement if beneficiaries wants to upgrade façade with mud, and opportunity to facilitate livelihood activities with production and sale.
- Update technical drawings with more details to become easier to read for contractors.
- The shelter team should take into consideration large and polygamous shelters.

Transitional Shelter Kit
- Recommend not to go below timber size 2” X 3” to ensure to support the dead load and wind.
- Previews CGI Sheets used was 0.15 mm so no tool for cutting has been necessary. Transitional shelter kit provides 0.35mm CGI sheets. Because of the thickness, cutting tool should be provided.

Shelter construction options
• Option 1 - Engage beneficiaries unpaid to construct their own shelters managed by implementer

Some of the group participators have experience from the region with use of IDPs for construction work and find this solution very challenging to manage. One of the main issues identified was significantly increased implementation period.

• Option 2 - Pay beneficiaries to construct shelters managed by implementer and contractor. NRC have been successful with this approach, we should therefore further discuss way forward.

• Option 3 - Contractor to construct shelters with agreement of using beneficiaries and local labour.

• Option 4 - Contractor - Use of contractors is the most common way of implementing among agencies; this solution is sufficient and more manageable. This is not seen as ideal solution, therefore strategies should be developed to use beneficiaries and local labourer to a larger extend.

Sector members should register the names of their shelter technical expert to further discuss the drawings and technical shelter specifications. The need for more specific shelter assessment reports was also agreed.

Emphasis was made on the fact that the sector can focus on shelter response options within the cost-range of the Humanitarian response plan 2017 and agreed specifications-band for reporting purposes (i.e. emergency shelter / transitional shelter / housing & shelter repair). There is however a need to increase support for more durable shelter options and a specific linkage should be made with early recovery & development partners as well as development coordination mechanisms for durable and permanent structures.

- ACTION POINT: Revise design for transitional shelter (Bakasi) with improved technical drawing
- ACTION POINT: Revise transitional shelter kit options
- ACTION POINT: Sector and shelter partners to draft common shelter assessment reports (host, return)

6. Logistics and procurement; Technical NFI
Facilitator: Margo Baars with Armand Adon (Logistics Sector)

Objectives:
• Review Logistics Cluster common storage plans.
• Review sector stockpiling and flexibility for rapid response and identify gaps.
• Review quality and availability of shelter and NFI items locally and regionally, and the impact of the sector response on markets and environment.
• Consider whether there is a need for sector guidance on standards and sourcing which could be tasked to Technical Working Groups.
• Review sector post-distribution monitoring form, and agree frequency and modalities for conducting PDM.
• Review kit contents and harmonization.
• Review balance of in-kind versus cash support for NFI.
• Clarify coordination and reporting of NFI versus WASH and protection items.

Logistics Sector briefed on Mobile Storage Unit (MSU) provision. Currently, 10x32m MSUs are in place in Gwoza and Ngala; locations planned subsequently are Monguno, and expansion in Ngala; eventually, Biu, Gubio, Dikwa and Marte. Additionally, MSUs are on loan to partners including MSF, DRC, Christian Aid, Social Welfare Network Initiative, and Mercy Corps in Maiduguri, Bama, Mafa, Dikwa, and Pulka. Space in the common stores is allocated based on request and for a period of up to 3 months. Partners can request a loan of an MSU for a period of up to 6 months. Nine MSU remain, following plans currently in place. The shelter NFI sector should be aware that from the point of view of stockpiling, use of common stores can be problematic, due to time limitation to the MSU. The sector needs to consolidate current and projected pipeline information to help inform and anticipate storage needs. As each partner is currently conducting their own procurement and logistics, this requires input from all partners.

It was agreed that partners will review and complete a basic template with information on warehouse locations, and stock status. It needs to be determined whether the form will list kits (against the sector standard kits) or loose
items. The latter is more useful from an operational response perspective, also noting the problematic tendency of partners to procure pre-packed kits results in a lack of flexibility to respond precisely to assessed needs, resulting in wasted resources: if people need only blankets, they should not receive an entire kit, and this practice is not encouraged. However reporting on loose items is more demanding.

In terms of projections, it was noted further that the 5Ws has a dynamic section which asks partners to indicate planned (funded) activities as well as completed and ongoing – this should enable projections. Estimate for the year can be based on targets in the HRP. The balance of in-kind versus cash support needs to be estimated to enable this. It is clear that there is scope to expand the cash modality for shelter and NFI need where markets are active and functioning. The question of the appropriate balance to aim for will be taken up with the sector cash working group.

On warehousing and security, a serious incident in the Maiduguri area was noted where an attempt to take items out from the warehouse was blocked by the surrounding community, who believed the items should be meant for them. This dynamic requires awareness raising with communities on the purpose of warehousing and stockpiling, the scope of need, and targeting approach of the relevant sectors, to ensure that people understand what is happening. NEMA agreed to support on this.

A second point was made on an incident in which a trailer was overloaded and damaged power lines, resulting in resentment from the community towards the agency responsible. Proper and careful loading of trucks, and awareness of power lines was encouraged.

It was agreed that sector guidance on standards for specific items would be helpful to the sector, and NRC agreed to play a lead role in compiling this. Sourcing wood is the biggest challenge for the sector, given the scale of planned shelter activity. In late 2016, there was a severe supply limitation and competition for available supply, resulting in delays in project implementation, as both Government and international partners increased activity levels. High quality wood is grown in South West Nigeria; it is likely that there are sustainability issues with forestry practice that should be looked at in further detail. Deforestation has been noted as an ongoing process in Gambu and Taraba States. Some suppliers have delivered consignments of poor quality wood, likely harvested haphazardly from nearby forests, that have had to be replaced in their entirety, as the poor quality timber bends and cannot be used for construction. Items that partners are tending to procure outside of Nigeria for quality reasons include: plastic sheeting; reusable sanitary pads; aquatabs. Mosquito nets also require further investigation to confirm whether nets to standard are available in-country: in 2016, international suppliers were intending to work with Nigerian manufacturers to bring locally produced products to standard. The status of this needs to be updated.

Localized procurement, as close as possible to the response itself, is pursued wherever possible by some partners to provide support to regenerating markets. Regards the impact of humanitarian response on local markets, CRS are investigating in further detail and will share findings. More general inflation in the North-East was noted, with items such as razors seeing price doubling or even tripling. The drivers of inflation require further investigation, though it is worth noting that, whether accurate or not, some community members perceive the humanitarian response as an element.

It was noted that ongoing lack of clarity on reporting of NFI vis-a-vis WASH and protection (which has a very significant NFI pipeline) needs to be sorted out to ensure proper gap analysis and avoid duplication. This issue should be taken up by the Inter-sector Working-group (ISWG).

It was agreed that the sector will give input to the Rapid Response Mechanism NFI scorecard, in particular on defining thresholds for response.
Partners agreed to enquire internally about frequency and sharing of PDMs. On kit content, the need for larger size jerry cans for those returning was raised for consideration (currently the improved kit has 10 and 20l jerry cans; rather, replacing with a larger size would better meet needs).

**ACTION POINT:** Partners will review and complete a basic template with information on warehouse locations, and stock status (sector coordinators)

**ACTION POINT:** Draft sector guidance on standards for specific items (NRC to lead TWIG)

**ACTION POINT:** Community awareness raising on warehousing (NEMA)

**ACTION POINT:** Clarify reporting of NFI vis-à-vis WASH and protection (sector coordinators/ISWG).

**ACTION POINT:** Partners to confirm PDM activities and sharing, and to agree a minimum frequency for conducting PDM (partners)

**ACTION POINT:** Sector to review and input on RRM NFI scorecard and thresholds (sector coordinators/partners)

### 7. Return and durable solutions

**Facilitator:** Pierre-Claver Nyandwi

**Objectives:**

- Review stakeholders, roles and responsibilities for durable solutions in shelter and DMS-CCC in North-East Nigeria, and define the challenges.
- Propose an action plan for the way ahead.

Durable solutions must be considered in a broad sense: the context and pathways need to be defined for the range of potential durable solutions – not only return, but also integration or resettlement. Where return is the option chosen, return must be safe, voluntary, and dignified. To be durable, return requires in the first instance, peace and security in the areas of return, and secondly, a means of survival: livelihoods (such as farming or fishery), economic opportunity, social and economic recovery. Response should be multi-sectoral and integrated.

Return assistance, such as transitional shelter kits or improved NFI kits, would be provided *at the point of return* when people are back on or accessing their own land. Other options, pathways to other possible durable solutions, should be developed and offered to people at the same time, to support meaningful decision making.

Camp closure, where it occurs, must be orderly and phased with protection of lives and properties paramount and a range of options offered to people. Considerations include movement tracking and seeking clearance from security operatives; assessment of destinations – including assuring adequate shelter and other services on arrival; provision of transport and logistics; information sharing meetings with those leaving the camp and implementing partners. Following this, cleaning and sanitation of environment; reuse or recycling of materials left on-site (the possibility and cost effectiveness of people transporting their shelter items to their next destinations should be considered); handover of permanent structures; consolidation of residual caseloads to be considered.

Adequate and durable shelter options would be the most ideal solutions in areas of return to contribute to the durable solutions and meet the shelter needs of returnees, taking into consideration locally available materials and technology and also using local labour, paired with livelihood opportunities. Shelter repair kit were also discussed as a longer-lasting solution to meet the shelter needs of IDPs already out of the emergency state and returning in their area of return.
8. Information Management
Facilitators: Noah Sempiiia and Niroj Shrestha

Objectives:
- Review sector information management for Shelter NFI and DMS-CCCM, including 5Ws and DMS-CCCM tools.
- Identify information gaps and propose additional products or analyses that would assist sector operations.

The sector information management strategy is in place as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible to complete</th>
<th>Purpose/products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector 5Ws</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>Sector partners</td>
<td>Monitoring shelter/NFI/CCCM sector delivery – completed, ongoing, planned (including monitoring implementation of HRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Monthly sector report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ 3W mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ NFI needs mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Shelter response and severity mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sector Infographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ CCCM capacity building mapping and response infographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM CCCM gap analysis based on the site tracker &amp; DTM site assessments (Not sector tool but an IOM/DTM tool used as a second source)</td>
<td>Weekly / monthly</td>
<td>Site facilitators / IOM DTM / Camp managers</td>
<td>Monitoring multi-sector needs in specific sites (limited to 37 for the time being due to the limited numbers of IOM site facilitators), in order to identify and refer gaps to relevant sectors/actors for timely follow up. Data is used by the sector to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ CCCM gap analysis for sites covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Interactive maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The sector also uses the DTM and its interactive mapping to develop the severity mapping, prioritization of shelter / CCCM needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector analysis tool (in development)</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>Sector IMOs</td>
<td>Analysis tool that generates automated reports from multiple sources including 5Ws, DTM, and HRP data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online interactive mapping under consideration</td>
<td>Recommended to be updated on a monthly basis</td>
<td>Sector IMOs</td>
<td>The sector recommended to develop an online mapping tool to place the latest updated maps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges with information management and data collection include a lack of harmonization and coordination between sectors, resulting in multiple demands on partners and sometimes duplicate reporting; lack of standardization of tools among sectors; lack of proper analysis of all available data; duplicate counting at hh level (NFI/Shelter), the usage of indicators for reporting activities. It was also recommended that the different IM sectors sit together at the ISWG level to maximize the usage of available resources & data across sectors and provide an effective response.

The 5Ws have been revised for 2017 (with the inclusion of new HRP indicators) and disseminated to partners. Partners suggested the addition of a ‘community’ field in the 5W matrix so that they can enter the exact locations of their activities (especially in Host Communities). Others proposed the sharing of a weekly dashboard, including weekly mapping of interventions so that Partners are better informed of each other’s activities to avert duplication of assistance.
Sector IM will focus on delivery and improvement of the tools and products listed above, including provision of training and close support on completion of the 5Ws to enhance the completeness and accuracy of reporting from each agency (and therefore the quality of sector monitoring, gap analysis and products); and on enhancing the utility of interactive mapping and analysis tools. Closer involvement of NEMA counterparts on IM will be sought. Sector IMOs need to share available information sources and products that partners may not be aware of.

ACTION POINT: Sector IMOs to develop and deliver training and support on 5Ws tool to partners.
ACTION POINT: Sector IMOs to finalise sector analysis tool.

**Friday 10 February**

**Which type of CCCM response, where, to whom?**

*Facilitator: Rafaëlle Robelin*

9. Site facilitation and management support

*Facilitators: Gebrehewot Ewnetu (DRC) and Mika Mugugo (IOM)*

Objectives:

- Review the site facilitation model developed with the CCCM toolkit (including on-the-job training for self-governance in areas where partners are not permanently present).
- Prioritise areas for deployment of site facilitators.
- Agree geographical coverage for site facilitation.

The Site Facilitator’s (SF) role is to support the GoN in ensuring that camp management agencies are mentored and guided to accomplish their roles and responsibilities as well as to monitor the humanitarian situation in sites. As of early February 2017, 37 sites were supported by SF, in Maiduguri and Adamawa. The extension of the network is planned for 2017 to hard to reach areas outside of Maiduguri in Borno State and partners have confirmed the capacity and intention to extend the model in some selected sites to support the Government. SF work together with camp managers from NEMA and SEMAs and IDP leaders in official camps (managed by the government); also with Churches, Civil society and in unofficial camps (all camps are not managed by the government). SF additionally reach IDPs and IDP leaders in out-of-camp settings (host communities) to support their organization, voice their concerns, share with the humanitarian community the gaps and challenges they face and support the identification of locations where IDPs are residing. SF collect weekly information through the DTM CCCM Multi sector tracker to assess needs and gaps, including service delivery on a weekly basis, and liaise with psychosocial teams to refer vulnerable cases to partners for specialized care and partners on the ground to refer needs.

The CCCM toolkit for camp managers was developed following consultations with the NEMA/SEMA camp managers in October / November 2016. As a result, a toolkit was developed to gather key tools to be used by camp managers for improved intra-camp coordination. During these consultations, it was also agreed to extend the site facilitation coverage for improved monitoring, on the job-training and support to the NEMA/SEMA camp managers.

Discussion centred on the implications of establishing LGA level Emergency Management Committees in Borno, which is currently under discussion between OCHA, NEMA, and SEMA Borno. NEMA plans to deploy desk officers to each LGA, who will operate at that level rather than site or camp level: they have insufficient capacity to provide camp managers in every camp. The desk officers deployed at LGA level will ensure the liaison with the Federal and State level and take the responsibility of the first response at LGA and ward levels, with their own fiscal plan and overseeing the community response. The planning shall remain at sector level to identify the priorities and further support. The need for clarity on the ToRs of the Emergency Management Committees, their relationships with state and federal levels, as well as the ToRs of specific agency personnel within them (such as LGA Desk Officers) will be important to clearly understand, so that the site facilitators to be deployed to these locations can work effectively
at site level. The correct entry points for the site facilitators need to be clearly identified: at a lower level than LGA, these might include district heads, with whom the Desk Officers may liaise.

**ACTION:** NEMA/OCHA to share the ToRs of the desk officers and proposed structure.

**ACTION POINT:** To strengthen the capacities through CCCM CB of officials deployed under the new structure proposed by the Government.

**ACTION POINT:** Sector coordinators to finalize the geographical repartition of SF with partners.

### 10. Multisectoral assistance / CCCM & Site planning

**Facilitator:** Rafaelle Robelin and Tommy Sandlokk

**Objective:**
- Based on the lessons learned from the previous CCCM coordinated multisectoral initiatives led by the sector for camp improvements (i.e. Muna Garage, Ngala starting), define and agree the framework for an SOP on the delivery of assistance to raise standards in sites: including a) coordinated/joint assessment and gap analysis, b) coordinated site planning, c) sector performance/monitoring criteria.

The group took into consideration the lessons learned from two scenarios:
1. Muna Garage informal settlement, in urban setting
2. Ngala IDP camp in a recently liberated areas where services are to be scaled up from scratch.

Based on the existing practices and lessons learned, steps taken into consideration for the Standard Operating Procedures for the CCCM task force, for camp improvements and camp response, are:
1. **Security assessment** (in the case of areas being liberated UNDSS / UNDHAS) – led by OCHA
2. **Baseline assessment / information agreed upon:**
   - Inter-Sector Working Group MSA / DTM Flash profile tool used for areas newly accessed with the ISWG, RRM MSA in case of new and large sudden displacement of populations. Reporting is made at OCHA/ISWG level.
   - Sector CCCM gap analysis (snapshot) / DTM CCCM IOM Site tracker (monitoring of living conditions & gap analysis) for existing camps and to inform the need to scale up humanitarian services. Reporting made at CCCM sector level and across sectors by OCHA.
3. **Revision of the gap analysis across sectors – with the accountability sitting in each sector to refine the gap analysis - and additional sector specific assessments based on the needs identified.**
   - In IDP sites, site safety assessment, site planning assessment, including drainage, topography assessment.
   - Specific sector in-depth assessments for WASH, Health, etc.
4. **Definition of sectors and partners capacities to respond and coverage, supported by OCHA in particular for host communities and recently liberated areas.**
5. **Site planning – CCCM task force**
   - Close collaboration with sectors to build the necessary structures or upgrade services based on the planned interventions.
   - Partners involved: Sectors, GoN, CM, partners, Security and communities, etc.
6. **Response and implementation plan (with time-frame and responsibilities to other sectors)**
   - Definition of a time-frame for implementation
7. **Performance assessments / accountability mechanisms.**
   - Monitoring could be done through the site facilitators & camp managers when on site, to check if the services are provided. Accountability to rely on each sectors and OCHA/ISWG to support in this regard.

**ACTION POINT:** DTM/CCCM IOM team to hold a meeting at ISWG level to present the CCCM site tracker.
ACTION POINT: Sectors to hold a meeting with OCHA and to approach the question of performance monitoring and service delivery monitoring.

ACTION POINT: Sector to develop the ToRs for the CCCM TWG to lead the development / finalization of the MSA SOP.

11. Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP)

Facilitators: Margo Baars and Elizabeth Mpimbaza (OCHA)

Objective:

- Review AAP (including feedback and complaints mechanisms) and communication with communities within the Shelter NFI and DMS-CCCM sectors; identify gaps and areas of work which could be taken forward.

From the field, examples of failures to communicate adequately are common, including those conducting assessments saying they will come back, but never returning. The question is, what can we do to reach back with updated information? In another case, PEP kits were present, but no one on the ground was aware of where: the question here is how to reconcile available services and materials with those who can use/deliver them. Overall these cases boil down to a lack of due diligence to community by humanitarian partners.

In many areas there are no phone numbers, no email or network, and agencies not returning: for these cases, NEMA or NOA could help and should be enlisted to send massages back through local leaders. Designating responsible agencies by geographic area may ease this issue, as people can be directed to an agency, and agencies can develop stronger relationships locally.

It was suggested that there are some minimal requirements on what to communicate to communities that could be usefully reiterated for sector partners, as a short guidance. This would include:

- **Communities should receive feedback on assessment results.** Eg, if a borehole is found to be ok, and decision is not to intervene, then feed that back. A matter of transparency – should communicate not only on what we do, but also what we don’t do.

- **What people are receiving, why people are receiving what they are receiving**, and how it compares with other areas. Is it the same, or is it different, and why.

- Expectations management is key – partners need to ensure their communications are clear and not raising expectations.

CCCM has established complaints and feedback mechanisms in camp settings where camp managers are present. CCCM is instrumental because someone needs to follow up and reach back with news, but while this may work in camp settings where the complaints systems are in place and managed by camp managers and site facilitators who are there on a day to day basis, similar systems in remote settings and out of camp / host community settings are more problematic. The protection sector has established complaints desks in some host communities with the Bulamas, which could be replicated. The credibility of complaints info and the need for verification of complaints was raised. Any complaints system needs to be accompanied by verification and expectations management, as well as clear communication on what type of complaint can be received and dealt with through the mechanism. Verification in host community settings could be through local leaders/Bulamas - appointees/committee representing every tribe, women, youth.

In South Sudan, child protection caseworkers passed out an ‘accountability card’, with a name of the person committed. This idea of the identification of a clear, accountable focal point could apply in other sectors. The media can help with communication of what we’re doing and with fundraising, however, children are routinely being shown in papers. To what extent does the community understand what we’re doing with the info we provide? We should improve collectively on how this interface is managed. Government does not want exaggeration in media. Regards participation, community engagement in design and product is a central sector principle – participation in shelter construction.
More broadly, discussion has been initiated by OCHA on how to centralize and consolidate a system for referring and following up on complaints and feedback across the response as a whole. Concern was raised about the timeliness of a system that could introduce layers of complexity; if to be functional this would have to be carefully avoided. There has been an attempt in Adamawa to run a central hotline, whose lessons and success need to be followed up on; there was interest in a hotline approach for Borno as well.

**ACTION POINT:** Draft guidance for sector partners on minimum requirements on what to communicate to communities.

**ACTION POINT:** Continue to engage in discussions on response-wide feedback and complaints systems & CwC.

### 12. Capacity building

*Facilitator: Pierre-Claver Nyandwi*

**Objective:**
- Identify priority training topics, and priority locations for CCCM training.
- Agree an action plan including partner coverage and timing.

In 2015/2016, capacity building has been delivered in CCCM, protection information management, psychological first aid, mass casualty handling, HLP, humanitarian principles, access and security, durable solutions, emergency shelter, Sphere, coordination.

Priorities were articulated as: durable solutions/livelihoods (including ToT with a view to devolving capacity), CCCM, IM and protection IM, WASH/shelter, community participation, environmental protection, GIS mapping, humanitarian principles, organized movements (appropriate procedure and considerations), protection mainstreaming including disability, and GBV and sensitization of partners and communities in the field on reporting and responding to GBV.

A capacity building group was agreed to, which will include relevant stakeholders (IOM, UNHCR, NEMA), to build and harmonise the action plan for 2017 in terms of approach, coverage, target audience, and topics. The following timetable was suggested, to be taken into consideration by the capacity building group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Timing (Quarter)</th>
<th>Partners involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durable solutions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gov/affected community/partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Gov/affected community/partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH/shelter</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Shelter/CCCM/WASH partners. Protection Officers and AC/Gov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Gov/affected community/partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCM</td>
<td>1st–4th</td>
<td>Trained camp officials/LGA officials/AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td>1st–4th</td>
<td>Gov, partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection (disability)</td>
<td>1st–3rd</td>
<td>Shelter, protection and WASH sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental protection</td>
<td>1st–4th</td>
<td>Government and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS mapping</td>
<td>2nd and 4th</td>
<td>IM officers, site facilitators, Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian principles (for new desk officers)</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Government and camp managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION POINT:** Capacity building group to build and harmonise the action plan for 2017 in terms of approach, coverage, target audience, and topics. Group to include SGBV in all planned trainings for sensitization of partners and communities in the field. Sector to liaise with the protection for the training of female police officers in camps.