Guidance note: sector strategic approach for the HPF

1st NHF Standard Allocation for 2017
Shelter & CCCM/DMS sector

**Objective:** Provide strategic priorities to guide sector partners in line of the 1st NHF allocation.

Sector related allocation priority, as developed on the NHF allocation concept note developed by the Humanitarian Pool Fund:

- Increased ability to respond to emergency needs of highly vulnerable populations where access is intermittent and where flooding, disease outbreaks, or new displacement take place.
- To enable humanitarian agencies to provide urgently required support, primarily through the provision of Health services, Shelter, Water and Sanitation, to highly vulnerable populations in priority geographic areas such as Pulka, Rann, Kaga, Mafa and Dikwa that are experiencing a significant influx of IDPs and where seasonal conditions (rain season) impact on humanitarian service delivery, as well as access.

I. **Need assessment and priorities**

a. **Key data in review:**
- Shelter gap analysis and shelter severity mapping
- Gap in terms of NFI response
- Flood prone areas
- Shelter response gaps for the rainy season
- Population movement data
- Partners presence mapping and operational presence
b. **Key sector strategic guidance and priorities: criteria and recommended approach**

- **Priority 1: Contingency response plan & rainy season**

  **Criteria:**
  - Areas prone to flood
  - Areas with shelter congestion / level of self-made shelters needing to be reinforced
  - Areas with limited accessibility – both due the rain but also due to access constraints
  - Areas affected during the past storms
  - Areas with limited shelter presence but with partners capacities to implement

  **Priority interventions:**
  - Provision of emergency shelter items / kits for the reinforcement of existing shelters and coverage of self-made shelters needing to be protected from strong rains and winds
  - Community-toolkits
  - Site improvements, including drainage
  - NFI response
  - Reinforcement kits and shelter response
  - Rapid response funds in case of shelter destructions, following recurrent rains and storms.

  Priority areas and needs are in the attached documents as well as the approach.

- **Priority 2: Continuation of the shelter response in displacement locations**

  **Criteria:**
  - Sudden and continuous movements of populations
  - Shelter needs not covered and demonstrated gaps out of camp
  - Capacity to implement shelter programme (i.e. land availability, space, etc.)

  **Priority interventions:**
  - Establishment of reception infrastructures to uphold basic reception standards
  - Communal shelters
**Shelter repairs and solution**

**II. Review of prioritised location and recommended interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGA</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population data - camps</th>
<th>Population data - HC (est)</th>
<th>Shelter / NFI need (est)</th>
<th>Current partner’s presence</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Recommended intervention</th>
<th>Shelter prioritisation</th>
<th>NFI prioritisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gwoza</strong></td>
<td>Pulka</td>
<td>28,036</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900 shelters</td>
<td>IOM/UNHCR/OX FAM/MSF</td>
<td>3 L water / day with the exiting population. Water supply is a major issue. Not encouraged as a priority given the lack of sustainable development plan. Consensual decision to avoid adding shelters in area where a WASH solution cannot be found and recommendation to relocate the population. To prioritise water emergency delivery. Should there be a possibility to find a feasible solution for the WASH situation, shelter might be considered. Relocation. Not recommended for HPF proposal if no WASH solution is found nor a sustainable development plan.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Can be covered with existing capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaga</strong></td>
<td>Benishek, Old Maiduguri</td>
<td>13,593</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>15,000 families, mostly in host community</td>
<td>1574 (and 450 for old Maiduguri)</td>
<td>CRS / IOM</td>
<td>Shelter coverage and mitigation measures, including drainage, provision of community tools, emergency shelter response.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mafa
- **Location:** Mafa
- **Population:** 15,100
- **Families:** +5,000 families
- **Response:** No shelter response besides the response provided in 2016. In 2017: NFI response but remaining gaps.
- **Country:** DRC
- **Issues:** Access to Mafa is an issue. Limited partner presence. Average arrival of population est.100/week. Congestion on site. Reception center. Upgrade makeshift shelters and NFI support & tarpaulins. Site improvement, including drainage.

## Dikwa
- **Location:** Dikwa
- **Population:** 80295
- **Families:** 10,000 est.
- **Families:** 5,000
- **Groups:** Solidarities/Mercy Cops/IO M/NRC/ICRC
- **Issues:** Over 400 people arriving on a weekly basis and expecting continuous movements of populations. Drainage is an important issue, site congestion, health outbreaks and WASH issues linked to the shelter congestion. Lack of space. Shelter reinforcement and site improvement, including drainage. Shelter coverage, small scale mitigation measures.

## Kala-Balge
- **Location:** Rann
- **Population:** 72,000
- **Families:** 3,000
- **Families:** 4,000
- **Groups:** IOM/ICRC/OFxM
- **Issues:** Access cut during the rainy season and no NFI MSU/capacities. Provision of emergency shelter items and core relief items ahead of the rain – planned. Finalisation of existing sites and drainage asap with existing capacities. Delays in decongesting site due to lack of space & land. Shelter partners to respond to needs and commitments. NFI response to emerging needs with new arrivals that are not being covered with planned prepositioned stocks (NFI stockpiled 2,000 families).

## Ngala
- **Location:** Ngala
- **Population:** 35237
- **Families:** 5700
- **Families:** 3,400
- **Families:** 7,000
- **Groups:** SIF/IOM/UNHCR/INTERSOS/Mercy Cops/DRC
- **Issues:** New arrivals est. 50.week. Existing shelter response & drainage on site awaiting the opening of the new camp. Awaiting finalisation of the site to decongest existing site. Finalisation of existing sites and drainage asap with existing capacities. Delays in decongesting site due to lack of space & land. Shelter partners to respond to needs and commitments. NFI response to emerging needs with new arrivals that are not being covered with planned prepositioned stocks (NFI stockpiled 2,000 families).

## Additional recommendations
- **Location:** Bama Banki
- **Population:** 41,238
- **Families:** 1,500 families / transit
- **Groups:** Existing response capacities for 1,000 from partners IOM/UNHCR
- **Issues:** Transit area with many IDPs transiting through Banki. Closed area, all Constructing existing shelters on site within the limit of available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>IDPs on site.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lack of available land, transit space, more land extension needed, other WASH / Health needs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Land and building reception centers. More shelter response in the future should the land be extended.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDPs on site.</td>
<td>Lack of available land, transit space, more land extension needed, other WASH / Health needs</td>
<td>Land and building reception centers. More shelter response in the future should the land be extended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

committed but space for 400 to build as of now following the site expansion.