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Executive Summary

The Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster (GCCCMC) held its annual meeting on 2 and 3 October 2019 in Geneva, Switzerland. The annual meeting targeted CCCM cluster coordinators, information management officers and other CCCM practitioners, including programme managers, camp managers, donors, as well as national and local authority counterparts - while humanitarian actors from across the sectorial spectrum interested in camp management issues also attended - representing 28 country operations.

The focus of the 2019 annual meeting was on presenting latest developments in the various areas relevant for the sector, while also advancing the sustainability and energy agenda. The underlying objective of the retreat was to gather suggestions for actions that contribute to localisation of the CCCM response in each of the presented areas. Based on the feedback from the previous years, the retreat's format privileged few plenary presentations and more break-out sessions with a maximum of 2-3 formal presenters, to allow time for discussions among smaller groups and maximize the interaction, before summarizing the outcomes to the plenary on each day.

The first day opened with an overview of events, developments and challenges at global and country levels having occurred since the last retreat; detailing the current CCCM coordination mechanisms for IDP responses (including active Clusters and Sector/Working Groups); with the verbal acknowledgement of practitioners attending from other displacement contexts. This plenary session, led by Global CCCM Cluster Coordinators Wan Sophonpanich (IOM) and Daniela Raiman (UNHCR), reviewed the action points for the Global CCCM Cluster from the 2018 annual meeting and what has been achieved – including the launch of a new website, delivery of a Global CCCM Training of Trainers, and the publication of four CCCM Case Studies’ Chapters detailing best practices and innovations in various CCCM response thematic areas. The session also introduced four Global CCCM Cluster Working Groups that have been formed or are in the process of forming in 2019 – Area-based Approaches; Capacity Development; Participation in Displacement; and Camp Management Standards.

Following the introduction and until lunch of the second day, a total of 16 break-out sessions were organized, with 4 sessions running in parallel in each of the four 1.5 hours’ time slots, that the participants could choose from.

The first four breakout sessions included presentations and discussions on the minimum preparedness actions for CCCM; collaboration with protection actors; perspectives on CCCM learning needs; and learning from urban planning and preparing for when camps become villages and towns. The afternoon sessions looked at the area-based approach and planning for 2020; efficient and adapted community feedback mechanisms; sustainable and connected settlements with reduced energy footprints; and how childhood development can be enhanced in a camp or camp-like setting.

The second day early break-out sessions focused on the engagement and negotiation with state and non-state armed actors, as well as, civilian character of camps; a working session for the Participation in Displacement Working Group; a working session for the Camp Management Standards Working Group; and collaboration of Camp Management Authorities with WASH and health partners to minimise the spread of infectious diseases. These were followed by the last batch including exploration of the role of camp management in return, integration and resettlement (HDN); inclusion of disability and other special needs into camp management; discussion on camp management indicators, measuring and costing for HRP; and understanding HLP issues.

Dedicated time on day 1 was reserved to a market place, designed as an opportunity for CCCM practitioners to catch up on what has been taking place in countries around the world, exchange lessons learned in an informal setting, as well to invite stakeholders to present their services and products. The last break-out time slot also had a special session trialling an innovative people-oriented design addressing a camp management challenge identified on day 1 (through mentimeter) as needing more feedback from the service users.

The final afternoon plenary interventions provided the opportunity to the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) members (NRC, DRC, Acted) to share updates on their achievements and to the facilitator and the Global Cluster Coordinators to debrief on and prioritize action points to inform the work plan of the Global CCCM Cluster in 2020.
Day 1 - 02.10.2019

08:00 - 09:00  Registration, coffee.
09:00 - 09:15  Welcome, Introduction, Agenda
09:15 - 10:30  Presentation of Breakout Sessions Day 1 and the Challenge methodology for Day 2.
10:30 - 11:30  Coffee Break
11:30 - 12:30  Ready or not... Creating safe and protected environment  Building the Capacity of CCCM Community  Planning for urban transformations and integration
Minimum Preparedness Action for CCCM at country level  Working with protection actors: examples from Somalia and Iraq  Perspectives on CCCM Learning needs: sharing results from the Global LDA, updating on the latest initiatives, and prioritizing a way forward  Learning from Urban planning and preparing for when camps become villages and towns
Facilitator: Wan Sofian (WFOC)  Facilitator: Daniela Raiman  Facilitator: Katja Holland  Facilitator: James Shell
Brune Hugloboit (IRC)  Elena Valentini (ACTED/Somalia)  Annika Geritsch (UNHCR/Iraq)  Brynne Castro (UNHCR/Brasil)  Jim Kennedy (OM  Jonathan Woodard (UNHCR/Ghana)  Emily Schmid (SDF/OM)
12:30 - 13:30  Lunch Break
MARKET PLACE
13:30 - 14:30  An opportunity for CCCM practitioners to catch up on what has been taking place in other countries around the world, highlight and showcase their key achievements, and exchange on lessons learned in an informal setting. In addition to the country desks, the cluster has also invited other relevant actors to also join in and showcase their work.
14:30 - 15:30  Coffee Break
15:00 - 16:30  Area based Approach  Complaint Feedback Mechanism (CFM)  Sustainable, Connected Settlements with reduced energy footprint  Growing Up Displaced
Overview of the broader Area Based discussion, review and analysis of the case studies for contribution towards the cluster’s paper on Area Based discussion and exploration towards the next step, including planning for 2020
Community Feedback Mechanisms: sustainable feedback systems and Government ownership
How to reduce energy footprint in collective settings, make them more sustainable/Integrated and ensure displaced persons’ access to information and connection to the world.
Facilitator: Silvano Fedorow  Facilitator: Cynthia Birklandt  Facilitator: Jone Cooper Owe  Facilitator: Wan Sofian (WFOC)
Annika Geritsch (UNHCR)  James Shell (OM)  Nima Naimi (OM)  Young Syamandino (UNHCR)  Nicolas Servais (ECO)
16:30 - 17:00  Wrap up - presentation of key points from breakout sessions
19:00  Dinner - Presentation of key points from breakout sessions
Day 2 - 03.10.2019

08:30 - 09:30  Registration, coffee.
09:00 - 09:30  Recap of Day 1, the day 2 agenda, etc. SAG membership.
09:30 - 11:00  Working with military, civilian-military relationships  (Women) Participation and OBV Risk mitigation  Camp Management Standards  Communicable disease control in displacement settings  Challenge 1
Engagement with state and non-state armed actors, negotiations of access to civilian character of camps
Working group update, sharing of outcomes from research on Women Participation in Coordination (IRC), I’m here (OM/IRC), Tearing Down the Walls (UNHCR)
Field tests to the OIM Standards: Results from the in-person consultation and the first on-line consultation conducted by UNHCR
How can OIM agencies work with WASH/Health partners to minimise spread of infectious diseases (e.g. EVD, Cholera/Cholera)...
Facilitator: Sanaa Alaraj  Facilitator: Yosra Rashed & Giovanna Fedorow  Facilitator: Janafer Kwanemo  Facilitator: Simon Covic  Facilitator: Rebecca Moreno Jimenez
Sandra Kranenborn (General Call)  Nevena Wielden (CCCR)  Christine Firth (OIM/IOM/IOM)  Robert Whiting (OM/South Sudan)  Anna Berndt Eghrein  Marcus Forberg (PHPA)  Anna Schmid (UNHCR)  Dr Jorge Carvalho (Smaco)  Elisabeth Baron (UNHCR/Brasil)
11:00 - 11:30  Coffee Break
11:30 - 13:00  DCM - CM roles in return, integration and resettlement  Inclusion in camp management  Monitoring and Costing camp management  Understanding housing and land; Preventing Eviction
Deep the camp life cycle need updating to reflect actual time line for CCCM engagement for integration, return and resettlement
The session will use the Sudan context to illustrate the components in how CCCM can promote and integrate inclusion into its operations.
What have we been measuring and how much should it cost? Discussions and debate on CCCM indicators and costing modality for HLP.
Facilitator: Amalica Thomas  Facilitator: Arild Aune  Facilitator: Brian McDonald & Alina Jacobsen  Facilitator: Dalia Arakji
Pierre Clerc Hyndius (STRUCT/CHC)  Remi Fambon (UNHCR/CHC)  Anna Lindhoud (UNHCR)  Robert Whiting (OM/South Sudan)  Yves Linares (UNHCR)
13:00 - 14:15  Lunch and Group Planning
14:00 - 14:30  SAG Membership Updates
14:30 - 15:30  Plenary / Group Working Session on Action Points
15:30 - 16:00  Debrief of the Innovation Challenge, Breakout Sessions debrief
16:00 - 17:00  Setting priorities for 2020: Prioritization of the recommendations and action points, as well as group discussions on operational way forward
17:00 - 17:30  Wrap Up, Retrospective Evaluation, Closing
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Key Meeting Stats

28 Country Operations represented:
- 22% Africa
- 3% Americas
- 18% Asia
- 11% MENA
- 46% Europe (Including HQ)

Participants rated 14 out of 18 breakout sessions as at least 4 out of 5 approval rating.
All of the participants providing feedback found the session topics to be relevant and useful.
Suggested improvements included type of the venue, to share session PowerPoints in advance and to increase efforts at enhancing donor participation.
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The first morning of the event saw the Global CCCM Cluster Coordinators present an overview of the current active CCCM Clusters, the Cluster Strategy, as well as the challenges and achievements of the Global CCCM Cluster related to the strategy and the action points from the 2018 meeting.

CCCM coordination mechanisms – Clusters or Sectors/ Working Groups – are activated (as of date of event) in 23 operational responses to situations of internal displacement or complex emergencies throughout the world. Although not part of the Cluster’s mandate, camp management (CM) as a technical sector is also coordinated and implemented in refugee and mixed contexts throughout the world. A number of CM practitioners from these contexts were invited to the Global CCCM Cluster Meeting due to their expertise and knowledge of best practices bringing great contributions to the technical discussions over the two days.

The following achievements relating to the strategy and 2018 action points were reported:

- The Global CCCM Cluster provided surge deployment from the global cluster team in terms of coordination, information management and capacity building to Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, DR Congo, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Sudan and Yemen; as well as scoping mission to Venezuela.

- A Global CCCM Training of Trainers was organized in Amman, Jordan to 25 participants from 8 country operations and 4 regional or HQ operations. Participants represented two Government agencies (Ethiopia and Indonesia) and 8 humanitarian agencies.

- The GCCCCMC have also been working over the past year to complete revision of the cluster’s website – www.cccmcluster.org which was re-launched in the summer of 2019.

- 4 CCCM Case Study chapters were published in the run up to the 2019 annual meeting. The case studies covered the period from 2016-2019 and presented initiatives and projects related to camp management activities, preparedness in situations of natural disasters, mobile and area-based approaches, and site management support modality of delivery, with an aim to contribute to ongoing efforts to ensure a coherent CCCM response that promotes accountability, community ownership, durable solutions and strong partnerships with partners and local authorities.

- Four Working Groups are currently active under the Global CCCM cluster:
  - Area-based Approaches
  - Capacity Development
  - Participation in Displacement
  - Camp Management Standards

The Working Groups held sessions during the two days and more information can be found in the session outlines in this report.
Breakout Session: Minimum Preparedness Action for CCCM at Country Level

Facilitator: Wan Sophonpanich (IOM)
Speakers: Bruno Haghebaert (IFRC) & Dipina Sharma (IOM Nepal)

Action points

Priority:

- Work with local and national authorities to explore their role as camp administrator in preparedness setting.
- Explore recommendations for preparedness measures in conflict context:
  - Engage stakeholders in minimum preparedness actions
  - Work more closely with protection actors for security analysis and risk monitoring.
- Link with discussions on Urban and Area-based Approach

Further action points:

- Define how CCCM can operationalize data to identify preparedness options.

This session opened with a recap of the previous year’s session action points on this topic:

- Mapping of pre-existing preparedness tools for governments where there are active CCCM Clusters/Sectors
- Create a checklist of preparedness actions that can link to the IASC Preparedness Guidelines at site, national and global levels
- Develop a community of practise through a joint platform or Global Cluster Coordinator group
- Create links between CCCM and external actors/sectors on preparedness
- Integrate preparedness into the global cluster strategy

While Preparedness was not selected as a top three priority action at the 2018 retreat, the global cluster included it as a thematic area for collected and published case studies. With dedicated chapter showing lessons learned from Nepal, the Philippines and Vanuatu on preparedness. It was noted that integration of preparedness into global cluster strategy will be taken into consideration as the cluster initiates the process of reviewing its 5-year strategy in 2020.

Conrad Navidad from the Philippines also shared updates on simulation activities to train local government and vulnerable communities in mass evacuation.

Bruno Haghebaert (IFRC) then presented on ‘climate smart’ programming; defined as looking at a wider landscape perspective of an interconnected ecosystem to analyse risks to programming. Bruno shared a minimum standards example of analysing how well organisations incorporate local climate smart disaster risk reduction into their programming. Projects considered to be ‘climate smart’ incorporate climate and weather information in assessing risk and vulnerability, enabling early warning early action, and sustainably addressing climate risks and trends.

The following group discussions commented on the complexity and challenges in preparedness consideration in conflict settings. Some colleagues shared experiences of initiating preparedness discussions and action through engaging stakeholders around risks/scenario related to natural disasters. This would ensure that Minimum Preparedness Actions are in place. Some advanced preparedness actions would also likely overlap between conflict & natural disasters responses (e.g. Protection would be different but procurement could be the same).

Conflict-sensitive preparedness actions requires strong partnership and communication with Protection to ensure that information is available to make early decisions. Where cluster is activated and there is early warning working groups within the IASC then risk reduction should be there and communicated to all parties.
The session opened with a presentation from Elena Valentini (ACTED Somalia) on the GBV Safety Audit in IDP sites in Somalia. The Safety Audit assessments are conducted using the Safety Audit Checklist tool developed with support of the GBV integration guidelines – the checklist is multi-sectoral and data is collected on an excel database for partners to verify. The checklist is filled through a mix of observations, site walks and key informant interviews with female community members. Separate checklists are filled for every site and respective results are entered in a data analysis matrix. Data disaggregated by sites are then analysed to identify GBV risks, vulnerabilities and produce specific recommendations to reduce GBV threats/risks in the sites.

Safety audits are conducted every 6-7 months and the findings assist advocacy for the camps. A training module has been produced for inclusion within CCCM trainings. The data is used to produce narrative reports and factsheets, conduct workshops, and to setup action plans with humanitarian partners. Activities that have been brought about by this initiative include the installation of street solar lamps; implementation of site maintenance activities; female representation in site maintenance.

Annika Gerlach (UNHCR Iraq) then presented on the Iraq Protection Cluster/CCCM Cluster’s Incident Matrix. The Incident Matrix is a joint CCCM and Protection Clusters’ initiative based initially on the efforts of Jeddah-based humanitarian partners. The objective of the Matrix is to better track the incidents, gauge trends and use them for a higher-level advocacy through the cluster mechanism in order to uphold the civilian and humanitarian character of camps. They are additional to existing reporting mechanisms through the Ninewa Protection Working Group. The Matrix was piloted in Jeddah camps, Airstrip and Hajj Ali camp and as of June this year across Iraq. The Matrix initially focused around actions of armed actors, later expanded to rights violations related to people with perceived affiliations.

The data was used for advocacy purposes with the government on the breach of the civilian character of the camps. The survey is not intended to be used as a case management tool and solely used as a quantitative data collection to inform the clusters. Trainings are conducted to familiarise partners with data collection using the KoBo tool and reports are issued on a quarterly basis. Data collection is anonymous and the data is cleaned manually by the Protection Cluster.

For the Global CCCM Cluster, there is a need to specify the difference between specific safety audit and normal site monitoring with tagging of GBV issues. Previous review processes have concluded that camp management agency might be the best place to conduct safety audits in sites. The Somalia Safety Audit shows what is possible when all sectors have a buy in.

This overlap with Protection on safety audits highlights the need to perhaps define what things CCCM can do to contribute to the work of other sectors – e.g. for Protection it can be safety audits and incident tracking reports.

### Action points

- Define how to work with IDPs and/ or local partners on safety audits (including complementarity of referral pathways) – national legal framework provides specific mandate for government partners
- Conduct advocacy and guidance on working with other actors/ clusters, including developing guidance on integrated projects (in particular with protection, WASH, GBV).
- Operationalise data that is collected in order to inform response.
Breakout Session: Building the Capacity of the CCCM Community

Facilitator: Kate Holland (NRC)
Speakers: Bryant Castro (UNHCR Bangladesh) & Megan Lind (NORCAP)

Action points

- Conduct a Cluster capacity assessment.
- Ensure that training tools and calendars are shared – roll out of new training material to new and current trainers.
- Conduct advocacy for funding.

The main objective of this breakout session was to reflect on the recent capacity building initiatives in the Cluster in order to share best practices, lessons learned as well as to identify the priorities to move forward on. The breakout session included two presentations by Bryant Castro (UNHCR Bangladesh) and Megan Lind (NORCAP) and an overview of the recently conducted learning needs assessment.

The GCCCMC conducted a Global Training of Trainers for 25 participants from Government, NGOs and UNHCR/IOM. The Global Cluster has also established a Capacity Building Working Group to support global learning needs, map learning trends, lessons learned, guidance, operational support, amongst others. More information can be found on https://cccmcluster.org/capacity-building#wg

Bryant Castro (UNHCR Bangladesh) presented on the capacity building initiative in Cox’s Bazar; the joint Capacity Sharing Initiative (CSI) – a Multi – Sector Platform for Camp in Charge (Government Camp Managers) Support Staff. This project was in response to the Bangladesh Government’s decision to nationalise camp management. Led by the Site Management Sector (SMS) this capacity building project is setup to assist the government in taking over camp management activities. The CSI project is a long term program which aims to capture good practices of camp management from practitioners and SMS and translate this into a training platform.

There are 4 components of this project:

1. Providing training to the CiCs every week on specialized sectors.
2. Mentoring and Shadowing of CiC staff on camp management and field activities.
3. Converting the training modules into a narrative such as the CM Toolkit but adapted into the Rohingya Response. This narrative would consolidate all tools used and standardize them with the aim that it could be used as a government guide book.
4. By 2021/2022 to create a team of trainers from the government who can conduct ToTs to ensure sustainability of this project.

Megan Lind presented on the Comprehensive Coordination Support to Child and Adolescent Survivors of Sexual Abuse in Emergencies Initiative. The objective of this initiative is to improve the quality of and access to services for child survivors. The initiative was piloted in Niger, South Sudan, Iraq and Myanmar with the Child Protection and GBV AoR’s providing remote support. The initial findings show that there are still gaps in services due to the lack of collaboration between sectors. Megan ended her presentation with a list of key questions that could be asked to improve services for child survivors.

Kate Holland presented the recently conducted Learning Needs Assessment by the Capacity Building Working Group in September 2019. 175 responses were collected from INGOs, UN agencies, National NGOs, Government and local authorities, and CBOs. The data collected helps frame the priorities for capacity building in the sector and guides the Working Group on the way forward.
The session opened with presentations on urban planning – the history, the current context, tools and challenges followed by posing the below questions:

- What other realistic tools could be added, to better frame and support a possible process towards urbanisation?
- What is the role of camp management, in activating, adapting, coordinating, monitoring any of those extra tools?

The session broke into groups for discussions. Key points raised in discussions:

**Tools:**
- **Tools don’t just mean drawings or numbers:** Tools can include processes and the knowledge we learn from the local communities; such as how they have used the land.
- **What is already out there:** Need to ensure that we are aware of existing tools and be mindful within urban contexts that settlements are not fixed / are sprawling, and not defined by a line on a piece of paper.
- **Environmental impact:** Often sites are not intentionally ‘chosen’, but are used as there are no other options. What tools exist to help understand and minimize the environmental impact in these less-than-ideal sites?

**Strategy:**
- **Evolution of camps:** As camps are increasingly evolving into the fabric of the city/town - when this is looking likely, additional priority should be invested towards a strategy/plan for how the camp can be assimilated into the urban centre. Urban planning expertise, including local government and development actors is key to ensure this occurs effectively.
- **Stakeholder mapping:** Strategy development is essential, but must be informed by engaging with all stakeholders operationally. There is a need to start with a clear stakeholder mapping & analysis.

This must include a mapping / understanding of local power brokers i.e. who wields the influence.

International development actors and donors should be explicitly engaged in this process / phase, acknowledging it will likely evolve into a developmental issue/priority.

**Operational:**
- **Retain the helicopter/balcony view:** Take a step back & remember to prioritise activities based on strategic priorities.
The marketplace session provided an opportunity for CCCM practitioners to catch up on what has been taking place in other countries around the world, highlight and showcase key achievements, and to exchange on lessons learned in an informal setting. In addition to the country desks, the Cluster also invited other relevant actors to also join in and showcase their work. Desks included materials and presentations from JIPS, REACH / IMPACT Initiatives, Global Alliance for Urban Crisis, ALNAP, Sphere, Translators W/O Borders, ACAPS, IDMC, Shelter Centre, CHS Alliance, Afghanistan SM (UDOC Activities, ABA), Bangladesh SMS (Capacity Building and other presentations), Nepal – CCCM Simulation Guidelines & Web Portal, South Sudan (ACTED, IOM, UNHCR), Somalia (CCCM Strategy), Nigeria (CCCM Tools and Products), Greece (SMS Interventions), Women's Participation Project, CCCM Case Study Publications, IASC Secretariat, ABA/mobile WG.
The session opened with an introductory presentation summarizing the Area-Based Approach (ABA) within the context of the CCCM Cluster. In 2011, the CM practitioners strongly requested guidance to work outside of camps. In response to this, since 2012, there have been evolving discussions starting with responding ‘outside of camps’, then the introduction of the UDOC, and more recently the ‘mobile’ and ‘area-based’ approaches.

With these evolving discussions, together with other Clusters working on similar approaches, it has been difficult to create a common language on terminologies. For example, the ‘mobile approach’ can be used within the ABA as a modality to deliver CM but can also be used as a CCCM approach in itself. The Shelter Cluster has termed ABA as the Settlement Approach. These challenges and ongoing evolving discussions have brought about the creation of the CCCM ABA Working Group, three case studies on mobile approaches and the ‘mobile approach’ guidance paper.

James Shell (IMPACT) was then invited to present on the Shelter Cluster Working Group – Urban Settlements. James defined the Urban Settlements approach with four key principles:

- A localized geography with a local authority counterpart.
- Multi-sectoral.
- Response considers the whole population and not just the displaced.
- Multi-stakeholder – Government, Humanitarian actors, Development actors etc.

The Shelter Cluster Working Group sees ABA as contributing to social cohesion due to the inclusion of the host population and urban poor. It offers the opportunity for collaborative programming as well as engaging explicitly with local authorities and offers possibility for sustainability as international support decreases.

The working group has collected 30 case studies and is working with other stakeholders to develop guidance to apply this approach.

Annika Grafweg (IOM) presented the recently published GCCCMC ABA themed case studies. A review of these case studies looked to identify common challenges as well as common learnings that could help shape the CCCM ABA Working Group’s planning.

Participants were then divided into three groups to discuss either:

Discussion 1
- Key points of CCCM ABA positioning paper
- What do we need to say as CCCM Cluster on ABA?

Discussion 2:
- What are the key issues regarding ABA that we need to explore/better understand?
- What kind of support can the WG offer to the field? Ideas for webinar, activities and tools, etc.

The groups proposed a number of activities for the working group, which have all been recorded, and the four main action points above were formed from these.
Facilitator: Cynthia Birikundavyi (UNHCR)

Action points

- Promote local ownership of CFMs.
- Associate CFMs with camp life cycle.
- Link with CCCM Cluster Participation WG and CCCM training materials.
- Produce a checklist and tip sheets:
  - Do’s and Don’ts
  - Technology
  - Sustainability
  - Responding to complaints and feedback
- Engagement with donors and other actors in camps on the importance of CFMs.

The objectives of this session were:

- Identify key aspects to take into consideration during design planning to ensure sustainability and local ownership of feedback mechanisms.
- CFM ‘life-cycle’: CFM structures and how they mature along with the response.
- List challenges that we could discuss further at global level.

A feedback mechanism is a formal system established and used to allow recipients of humanitarian assistance (and in some cases other crisis-affected populations) to provide information on their experience of a humanitarian agency or of the wider humanitarian system. Such information is then used for different purposes, in expectation of a variety of benefits, including taking corrective action to improve some element of the response. (ALNAP)

The participants were shown two introductory example videos of CFM from LWF and IFRC - The LWF Complaints Response Mechanism & Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) - and posed the following questions:

1. What considerations were taken in terms of sustainability and population "buy-in" when developing the Complaints and Feedback structures?

2. Where any system built on already existing government structures or community dynamics? How has this contributed / challenged information flows?

3. Innovation, technology, cost and CFMs: some structures are innovative and quite complex, perhaps challenging their sustainability/longevity or a potential handover to local structures, is this something you faced/are facing, what kind of discussions ideas have your team and/or operations come up with?

4. Feedback, complain and reforms: what does your feedback loops look like? What provisions are taken in order to ensure that change occurs?

The group’s discussions prompted by these questions fed into the formulation of the above highlighted action points.
Breakout Session: Sustainable, Connected Settlements with Reduced Energy Footprint

Facilitator: Jorn-Casper Owre (NORCAP)
Speakers: Aimee Jenks (UNITAR) & Hovig Etyemezian (UNHCR)

Action points

- Jump on the ship!!! There is space for everyone.
- Connectivity = Human Rights. CCCM to progress connectivity innovation in sites.
- Sustainable + Green Camps – collect case studies. Cluster should provide guidance, expertise, and materials on different sustainable and green energy options so that camp managers/proposal writers can pull from these when creating an initial proposal or response. Some options include:
  - Booklet: Sustainable settlements: Maximizing the social, environmental and economic gains in humanitarian displacement settings.
  - Reach out to UNITAR because it is their role to provide expertise.
- Develop ToRs for a CCCM Cluster Working Group and submit to the GCCCMC Strategic Advisory Group for approval.

The session opened with an overview of sustainable solutions and the fact that resistance to sustainable operations has decreased. The session was then framed around energy and sustainability based on this new understanding of the environmental imperative and the idea that energy and connectivity is more and more becoming a human right.

Hovig Etyemezian, Head of Innovation at UNHCR, presented on connectivity and digital inclusion. Hovig defined connectivity as part of the digital inclusion agenda as being available, affordable, and useable. Connectivity brings the following benefits to displaced communities:

- Digital inclusion supports self-reliance.
- A gateway to accessing information.
- A lifeline to connect people with friends and family.
- Supporting humanitarian services such as cash-based interventions, financial inclusions, education and livelihoods.
- Supporting access to services from private sector through financial services.
- Supporting host community.

Considerations for CCCM included making connectivity part of the agenda from the outset and not have it be a secondary ticket item that is thought about 2-3 months later. A number of case studies from Tanzania, Uganda, Nigeria and Za'atari were then presented and sparked group discussions surrounding complexity of connectivity in conflict contexts, as well as donor interest.

Aimee Jenks (UNITAR) then presented on the Global Plan of Action (GPA) which is focused on energy access and implementing a new model for sustainable energy solutions.

The humanitarian field is having to transition to sustainable options with the challenges of there being high forced migration rates without sustainable energy access with high costs for response. In order to make this transition, humanitarian agencies need to move outside of their silos to incorporate sustainability into response. Key challenges to this include:

- Energy planning is not systematic.
- Displaced people are not included in national or international energy access agendas.
- Energy needs are rarely integrated into project finances.
- Varied expertise and capacity to plan and implement sustainable energy solutions, and no standard of what expertise should be there.
- Data on energy needs and technical solutions are limited and are not effectively shared.

The (GPA) provides recommendations on how to transition to sustainable energy solutions and outlines a global framework accelerate the SDG7 for displaced people, host communities and humanitarian operations. The group then went in to discussion on how the GPA can support the CCCM Cluster on Energy.
Breakout Session: Growing Up Displaced

Facilitator: Wan Sophonpanich (IOM)
Speakers: Nicolas Servas (Education Cluster) & Pallob Mamun Md. Parvez (Bangladesh)

**Action points**

- Develop and share tools to better assess the needs and gaps of youth and the elderly in sites.
- Engage with the wider humanitarian group – Child Protection, Education and Protection.
- Produce case studies on using education / youth engagement in CCCM.
- Develop and share the profile of “working-with-youth” as part of Camp Management teams.

The aim of this breakout session was to serve more as an exploratory session – to have interaction and engagement from the field level to evaluate how a ‘focus’ on children in CCCM can be better explored and supported at the global level.

Nicholas Servas (Global Education Cluster), presented on adolescents and youth in relation to education, engagement and representation in displaced communities.

Around 42% of displaced populations globally are under the age of 25 and in fact are the majority in displaced populations in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia. Research has found that displaced youth, in general, consider primary and secondary education as top priorities, as well as vocational training. Further research shows that those graduating from vocational training are more likely to be self-reliant.

Engaging young people creates a sense of empowerment and brings about a positive impact for displaced communities. However, young people’s inclusion in consultative processes are generally prioritised less than consultations with adults. Therefore, CCCM actors should look to utilize youth representation bodies, as well as contribute to the prioritisation of access to existing education.

The session then moved on to a presentation by Pallob Mamum Md Parvez (Bangladesh). The large influx of Rohingya children and youth to Cox’s Bazar has brought about questions on which education curriculum/system should be delivered. The Bangladesh education system cannot be utilised due to differences in context and language. Classes have limited the progress of children and youth who have been attending classes together despite varying levels and needs. In order to address this, an initiative from Library Without Borders has provided access to books and ebooks to ensure that children growing up have access to appropriate education for their age.

The group then moved into discussions of linking CCCM with other sectors such as Education and Protection to improve response for adolescents and children. There were inputs from participants with experience from the Philippines, South Sudan, Bangladesh, and Greece. The main points raised included:

- There needs to be involvement and collaboration between a wide range of actors including Education, Child Protection, Gender and Health. It is important that the conversation is opened up to these actors/sectors as there is existing knowledge and guidance.
- Male adolescent groups tend to fall under the untargeted aspect of humanitarian programming. Therefore it is essential to look at this age group and to better understand the gaps.
- Need to compile and consolidate experience and lessons learnt on how to integrate youth and adolescents into the core of CCCM activities.
- There is a need to bring the community engagement element of CCCM and replicate into a Youth Participation Project. The Women’s Participation Project has developed tools and methodologies to engage children, adolescents and the youth.

The group collated these key points into the above highlighted prioritized action points.
Facilitator: Daniela Raiman (UNHCR)  
Speakers: Sandra Krahenmann (Geneva Call) & Naima Weibel (CCHN)

Action points

- Establish a taskforce/working group under the Global CCCM Cluster to define the issues.
- Produce a CCCM Case Study thematic publication on this topic, distinguishing between natural disaster/evacuations and conflict situations.
- Conduct a compilation of best practices in negotiation from Camp Management perspective (incl. what level of engagement is appropriate for camp managers) and share, organize a thematic training
- Link with the Protection Cluster and define relationship with peacekeeping, PoC,
- Produce Guidelines on ‘red lines’ for Camp Management Agencies.
- Reception management by military

Naima Weibel from the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation (CCHN) presented on enhancing professional exchanges and peer learning among frontline humanitarian negotiators. CCHN as a strategic partnership between MSF, UNHCR, ICRC, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, and WFP aims to facilitate and capture, analysis and sharing of humanitarian negotiation experiences and practices; to provide a space for both multi- and single-agency dialogue and to foster a community of practice among humanitarian negotiators. It captures and analyses the practice, develops tools, shares negotiation experiences and provides advisory support to humanitarian frontline negotiators.

Identification of and engagement with the military chain of command were the themes that the participants evoked. The issue of camp managers being approached with inquiries concerning national security and how to deal with situations when such questions are asked by the military, as compared to the government camp administrators generated lively exchange, as well as existence of camps where the military acts as camp manager.

Sandra Krahenmann from the Geneva Call focused on the negotiations with non-state armed actors and presented the approach of the organization towards the joint drafting and negotiating of workable operational norms, which are then signed as an agreement between all parties.

She also brought up an interesting conundrum for the armed groups when they have effective control of a territory and behave as a de facto authority, namely their relationship with the internally displaced populations.

Often, the armed groups do not realize the difference in needs of displaced populations from the civilians living in the same territory, including possible absence of traditional governance structures, and are unable to adapt their interactions to the situation. An additional challenge is the freedom of movement – while civilian population, having their rights respected, would likely opt to remain in their homes, even under the authority of the armed group, the displaced persons might not have such an attachment and would prefer to leave, thus “weakening” the perceived authority of the armed group. While contrary to humanitarian principles, the armed groups can also consider taking part of the assistance provided in sites as a form of “tax” which comes with control of territory.

The question of identification of the right interlocutor was touched upon, in particular in the context of fragmented armed groups fighting each other, but also to engage with decision makers with operational control of the territory, rather than the “public relations” attachés posted in the capitals.

The participants then discussed the dilemma of CCCM actors when conducting advocacy as a cluster, versus ensuring that the services continue to be provided in the camps/sites no matter what and agreed that an organization has to be fully supportive of the negotiator. At the same time, there are red lines that often block NGOs in negotiations and the participants agreed that a systematic approach to negotiations with a unified front (access focal points, SOPs, awareness of the negotiation strategies of different NGOs) is the only way to achieve common goals.
Facilitator: Marjolein Roelandt (IOM) & Giovanna Federici (NRC)
Speakers: Christine Friis Laustsen (UNHCR), Robert Mominee (IOM South Sudan) & Anna Hirsch-Holland (NRC)

Action points

- Document best practices on participation with actionable recommendations.
- Identify ways to actively reach out to and support local women’s organisations. Support through institution building.
- Examine & map existing HR policies & collect best practice on inclusive staffing.
- Create specific guidance on how to establish, structure & support inclusive governance mechanisms.

The aim of this session was to present recently delivered projects, to share the findings and best practices, and help frame discussions to identify key action points for the Participation Working Group.

Christine Friis Lausten (UNHCR) presented on Tearing Down The Walls: Confronting the Barriers to Internally Displaced Women’ & Girls’ participation in Humanitarian Settings report. This report, based on a desk review and focus group discussions conducted in Niger and South Sudan, outlines what it means to have meaningful participation and how to address barriers to raising women’s participation and the challenge of normalization of harmful practices. The report highlights key barriers in the burden of survival; loss of livelihood that comes with displacement; participation varies in different spaces; SGBV, particularly domestic violence and intimate partner violence; militarization of the humanitarian space can create risk for women and girls, especially when there is a blurred line between civil and military space.

Structural Gender Inequality is the main barrier to participation and this needs to be confronted. Women and girls are breaking down the walls to engage in participation and durable solutions. There also needs to be strategic consultation on how to engage men and boys to encourage women’s participation. On top of this, it is unrealistic to aim for substantive women’s participation if humanitarian agencies do not display gender equality in terms of resources, staffing and others. Finally, participation happens in many different spaces and it is important to meet women where they are and to see how these spaces can be linked.

Robert Mominee (IOM) presented the I’m Here project; a systematic needs and gap analysis in adolescent engagement with humanitarian services. A benchmark questionnaire and adolescent mapping was conducted to determine the perception of services. QR cards were then disseminated to youth to monitor access to services. The main finding identified was that adolescent girls were not participating or accessing services. Follow-up consultations were then conducted with groups of girls to discover the barriers to access. The main barriers discovered were that many girls were dropping out of accessing services due to early marriage and pregnancy.

Anna Hirsch-Holland (NRC) delivered the third presentation on research conducted by NRC and IOM on the role of elderly women in community coordination and leadership. Qualitative research was conducted in Afghanistan, Iraq, Tanzania and Kenya with the aim of understanding the role older women play and how humanitarians can support and harness this role. Clear trends were seen where older women held authority and respect from the community and are very much involved in passing down traditions and emotional support to the community. Older women were found to have wide social networks, social intelligence and historical knowledge of different families. Service providers saw older women as a potential barrier to protection through harmful traditional practices. Older women also have influence on decisions made with regards to marriage and education of girls. The final report will work as a guidance on taking specific steps to work with older women.

The group then moved into discussing priorities for the Working Group that would be practically beneficial to the field.
Facilitator: Jennifer Kvernmo (IOM)
Speakers: Marcus Forsberg (PHAP) & Aninia Nadig (Sphere)

Action points

- Vision:
  - Digital / environmental
  - Cross linkage to other Humanitarian Standards Partnership Toolkits
- Structure:
  - Rephrasing as positive commitments
  - Address typologies through key actions which will require reformulation
  - Annexes SOPs, Tools
- Localisation:
  - Guidance notes
  - Contextual guide F&D process (Field)
- Consultations

Jennifer Kvernmo (IOM) opened the session with an introduction to the history of the Cluster’s work towards producing standards for camp management (CM). Initial efforts to produce standards received constructive feedback and a new methodology was proposed. The 2018 Global CCCM Meeting provided a broad consultation and set goals to refocus and ensure alignment with the CM Toolkit with harmonization at the site level.

Four country level in person consultations were conducted in IDP and refugee contexts in South Sudan, Bangladesh, Iraq and Somalia utilizing workshops, 1-1 interviews, and focus group discussions with affected populations. 42% of those consulted were representing the Government.

On top of these in person consultations, an online consultation with Professional Association of Humanitarian Workers (PHAP) was also conducted. Marcus Forsberg (PHAP) presented on the PHAP consultation. PHAP has previously worked on other standards consultation processes such as Sphere, Child Protection, ICRC Protection etc. For CCCM, PHAP conducted a combination of a survey and a consultation webinar focused on scope and purpose of the standards, as well as comments on the current draft. 443 respondents based in 71 countries took part in the consultation; 67% of represented NGOs and 20% had been displaced themselves. The analysis of the data collected will help frame the focus of the Working Group and the standards document produced.

Aninia Nadig (Sphere) presented on the Humanitarian Standards Partnership (HSP). The HSP used to be named Sphere Companions documents, and include the Humanitarian Charter, Protection Principles, Core Humanitarian Standards, which are deemed to share values and principles with Sphere. HSPs cover diverse topics and have similar and recognizable structures for standards, actions, indicators and guidance notes. A CCCM Camp Management document would need to meet this criteria in order to be considered to be included as an HSP.

The session then moved into breakout groups to discuss the following questions:

- Vision: What do we want our work to be like as a result of these standards? What are we trying to achieve in 5-10 years with the standards?
- Localization: How shall the views of the affected population be reflected in our standards?
- Structure: How shall the structure of the sub-standards be organized. Do the sub-standards need to be harmonized with the structure of the new Sphere? (Standard, Key Action, Performance Indicators, Guidance notes) Is it the recommendation of the group to become part of the HSP?

CCCM practitioners and stakeholders are invited to join the CM Working Group – please visit https://cccmcluster.org/global/Camp-Management-Standards-Working-Group
The main focus of this session was to look at how camp management agencies can work with WaSH and Health partners to minimize the spread of infectious diseases.

Dr. Jorge Castilla Echenique (WHO) presented on communicable disease control in displacement settings. Dr Echenique’s main message was that epidemiology should direct interventions – with daily epidemiology, targeted multi-sectoral interventions, and addressing risk factors such as malnutrition and overcrowding.

Public health response in displacement settings should look to analyse local/site public health risks with periodic updates. It is important to identify and address risk factors across sectors related to living conditions; Shelter – camp density, Protection – security, WaSH, Food distribution and nutrition, health services and health promotion, mental health and psychosocial status of displaced people. A key action for CCCM can be the inclusion of public health expertise in displacement site management committees; as well as collaborative distribution of responsibilities between CCCM and health sectors/clusters.

Dr Echenique shared a number of key links to help inform CCCM practitioners:

- Link to the WHO training platform https://openwho.org/courses/

Eliceli Bonan (UNHCR Brazil) presented on the Venezuela Situation response in Boa Vista, Brazil. The response involved key activities on communicable diseases in displacement sites in collaboration the Government of Brazil.

In April, 2018, the Brazilian Government created the Operação Acolhida, a federal response to the Venezuelan migration and humanitarian emergency, and designated its Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Social Development to lead the operation. UNHCR in Brazil works in cooperation with Federal Government to implement its mandate.

All migrants and refugees have access to the public health system and medical screening and evaluation is conducted when they cross the border. For the sites, Camp Management coordinated with health actors and the Ministry of health to adapt SOPs for communicable diseases. Each camp management team contains a health focal point – social workers or health professionals. Other aspects included trainings on contagious diseases such as epidemiological surveillance and TB sample collection.

The key lessons learned were that it’s important to aspire to maintain standards and protocols but it’s also necessary to adapt to the reality of the emergency. Close collaboration with health actors is key to disease control in crowded sites. It’s also important to formalize procedures so that all stakeholders are working together. Non-communicable diseases such as cancer and malnutrition posed a challenge and requires close collaboration with health actors to identify.
Facilitator: Manisha Thomas  
Speakers: Pierre-Claver Nyandwi (UNHCR Chad) & Annika Sandlund (UNHCR)

**Action points**

- Advocate for & actively engage in platform for coordination & sharing / operationalising of data on HDN  
  - (Better information sharing + esp. with government & development)
- Linkage to ABA, coordination at the operational level.
- Frame how CCCM wants to engage with development actors – guideline  
  - Awareness raising on CCCM for dev actors.
  - Communicate how CCCM feeds into in-country WGs etc.
  - Transition, role and responsibilities guidelines.

The session opened with an introduction of all participants and what questions they have in this area – common themes were around durable solutions, linking with development actors, and returns.

Annika Sandlund (UNHCR) presented an overview of the Humanitarian-Development-Peacebuilding Nexus. Stakeholders at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) 2016 identified the need to strengthen the humanitarian-development nexus and to overcome long-standing attitudinal, institutional, and funding obstacles (New Ways of Working). The UN Secretary-General's reform agenda includes four big themes – prevention, field-focus, sustainable results and integrated responses.

In practice, where does CCCM fit in? What is the context? What are the humanitarian principles and what comes first? These questions will help frame CCCM’s adaptation to the HDN. Annika went on to state that the Area-based approach works well to link with government and development actors, as well as linking to linking to durable solutions. In terms of integration, it can be beneficial to link to gradual solutions without saying integration; this can work better than establishing a policy framework for integration as it can be scary terminology for States.

Following this overview, Pierre-Claver Nyandwi (UNHCR Chad) presented the ongoing work for CCCM in Chad regarding the HDN. The causes of humanitarian emergencies in Chad are structural (lack of basic infrastructure and social services), societal (gender issues), cyclical due to climate change, economic difficulties (crisis since 2015) and insecurity in neighbouring countries, as well as dependence and systematic use of humanitarian aid for certain chronic crises. On top of this, actors and donors for both humanitarian and development aid are working in the same areas but without financial or programmatic coherence e.g. targeting of populations.

On this basis, it was recognized that it is needed to encourage the implementation of complementary and coherent projects and interventions between the humanitarian and development sphere in order to break the cycle of humanitarian assistance and reduce vulnerabilities and risks.

In light of this, the joint CCCM/Shelter Cluster has conducted a review of the cluster strategy to operationalise and align humanitarian and development standards by improving the type of shelters provided to displaced and returnee populations. The Cluster also engaged with the Development and Security Plan for Lake Chad Province in collaboration with UNDP. Discussions were also held with the Government on Chad regarding HLP for Chadian returnees from Central African Republic. However, the Cluster is facing a major challenge of lack of funding in order to implement the HDN effectively.

The session then moved into a group discussion on the HDN's implications for CCCM, the way forward and what CCCM has to offer. It was noted that CCCM has a lot of data that can be analysed to look at durable solutions; development actors should utilize this data. It was also noted that HDN per country is very context specific but guidelines are need on how CCCM can engage with other actors.
Facilitator: Astrid Arne (UNHCR)  
Speakers: Kirsten Lange (UNHCR), Remo Fambri (UNHCR Myanmar) & Robert Mominee (IOM South Sudan)

Action/Key points

- Treat the user as a customer! (involve – communicate – work with local Disabled People’s Organisations).
- Don’t be constrained by data – if you think there are no disabled people in your camp….you are wrong.
- Collect case studies and good practices – operational guidance for inclusion in CCCM.

The session opened with a presentation from Kirsten Lange (UNHCR) on the inter-agency initiative for disability inclusion in Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Response Plans, as well as a study of how this is being applied in the field. This initiative was part of the DFID investment programme with core funding to seven agencies and a shared results framework – with one focusing on disability inclusion.

The study found that 20% of HNOs included data on disability and of these, disability was addressed through the vulnerability lens. Analysis is missing on why disabled populations are at heightened risk; there is currently not enough data on what hinders programming for inclusion.

Key recommendations:
- Avoid listing persons with disabilities (PWD) in the list of vulnerable groups without an analysis of what and why they should be part of this group.
- Identify specific barriers to accessing assistance as a contributing factor to heightened risk.
- There should be increased attention on intersectionality as a part of strengthening vulnerability and risk analysis – recognising all groups as not homogenous and outlining their differences.

Studies on HRPs found that only 10% included disability inclusion.

Key recommendations:
- Define how the response will address the factors that will reduce vulnerability.
- Integrate a twin track approach to inclusion which includes doing both mainstreaming and targeting.
- Strengthening participatory approaches.
- Create a separate sub-section for disability related needs.

Remo Fambri (UNHCR Myanmar) presented ‘inclusion in a complex environment’ in Myanmar. CCCM programming in Myanmar is utilising a number of activities that promote inclusion.

Community Engagement: all three Camp Management Agencies (CMA) have standardized their approaches. Women and Youth groups have been created but face a challenge of the leadership being chosen by the Government. Complaint Response Mechanism: standardized to be able to analyze and refer important issues to different partners at the different levels. Training: is conducted on how to do programming and distribution to ensure that it is inclusive – including procedures for NFI distribution for Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Specific Needs (PSN). Transition/camp closure: merged with Shelter as it is easier to take the information to translate it into programming for shelter and WASH. Solar street light project: bridging between camps and villages, to give access to services at night.

Robert Mominee (IOM South Sudan) presented on inclusion programming in South Sudan. A situation analysis was conducted to review access to humanitarian services for persons with disabilities. Community groups communicated a priority for improving mobility and thus prompting a review of infrastructure plans. A ‘war wounded disabled’ community group was formed, as well as a systematic assessment of disability including a survey to discover disaggregated data and physical access to structures. It is important to work with the community and to go through a prioritization process. A discussion with the community on the limitations and realms of possibility was followed up with a consultation then prototype stage where the engineers and construction workers sat together and designed accessible services. In every stage, the community tested them to ensure that it works.
Facilitator: Alisa Ananbeh (UNHCR) & Brian McDonald (IOM)
Speakers: Nick Imboden (UNOCHA)

Action points

- Develop a standardised methodology for activity based costing and project based costing.
- Create a library of examples from each CCCM Cluster that goes through a unit-based costing process - share documents not just case studies.
- Further explore challenges.

This session took place following recent engagement by OCHA with the global clusters to discuss the implications of the various costing methodologies in light of a number of humanitarian responses shifting from a project-based costing methodology to unit-based costing. The aim of the session was to give an overview of these approaches and trends, to understand its implications for CCCM and going forward, to plan how best to support clusters in responses that adopt unit-based costing methodologies.

The session opened with a presentation from Nick Imboden (UNOCHA) who gave an overview of the three main costing approaches (project-based, unit-based, hybrid approaches), showing the advantages and challenges with each. He then detailed the steps involved with unit-based costing: 1) defining the main cost drivers; 2) defining the units of measurement; 3) providing a cost range; 4) indicating average unit costs; and 5) calculating overall costs per activity.

Unit-based costing methodologies involves a shifting of the task of costing, from individual project submitting agencies to the cluster. Choosing a unit-based costing approach without any form of project registration has a negative impact on response monitoring and financial tracking.

Alisa Ananbeh (UNHCR), presented on what unit based costing looks like for CCCM like and what the implications are. Alisa took the group through the HRP Cascade Costing Model (see below). There are currently 8 countries using unit-based costing in 2019 – Afghanistan, Burundi, Burkina Faso, CAR, DRC, Ethiopia, Myanmar, and Yemen.

The participants then broke into groups to discuss cost drivers (activities, services or outcomes) and units of measurements; context weighting and risk inclusion; challenges in the Activity Based Costing. These discussions fed into the above highlighted action points.

[Diagram: HRP Cascade Costing Model]
Facilitator: Dalia Aranki (Global Coordinator HLP AOR)

Action points

- Understanding HLP/Land issues throughout intervention (not just at start) – including preparedness.
- Share HLP guidelines for countries that have developed them. Develop new ones for other contexts.
- Reach out to work together to find solutions. HLP AOR, Shelter HLP and other countries.
- Regularly/consistently include all community mentors/organisation to understand land + people’s relationship to it.
- Global HLP AOR – support vulnerability criteria for relocations.
- Link to HLP on cluster website.

The session opened with a scenario group exercise in which participants were given various stakeholder roles and a conflict displacement context. The following questions were posed:

1. What information does the humanitarian agency need to find out before putting down gravel or building more latrines in the settlement?

2. What are some of the challenges that may arise from the different perspectives?

3. What suggestions do you have to:
   - Prevent an increase in rent for Maryam and her family?
   - Prevent eviction of all families from the land?
   - Support Yusuf and his family reclaim their land?

An example from North-West Syria was then presented which highlighted the challenges for CCCM and Shelter Actors because of a lack of due diligence. For Shelter, due diligence is conditional to funding for some donors - detailed guidance has been developed. Potential consequences of not doing due diligence include disputes with landlords and threats/actual eviction; increased rent, tensions with landlords, host community; landlords reluctant to allow interventions (that may be ‘permanent’ or change land) or written agreements; longer term effects on land use and natural resource management.

The presentation moved on to discuss the summary of challenges/solutions of the Shelter Cluster;

- due diligence process followed by effective measures including close coordination between shelter and legal protection actors in shelter repair and rehabilitation programs to check authenticity of existing documentation and to engage in community verification;
- engagement and participation of community leaders and immediate neighbours during ownership verification – talking to de facto authorities is never enough;
- if possible, working on/with public land over private land;
- if owner(s) is absent but has been identified: obtain copy of ID and then arrange video call to confirm identity of owner and obtain authorization for the planned intervention - if owner consents, call should be recorded;
- no engagement at all if owner cannot be found/contacted and has not authorized a third party to act on his/her behalf;
- template checklists and tools, such as Land Use Agreements to guide implementation of Due Diligence and standardise approaches.

CCCM experiences of HLP from Mozambique, Nigeria and Iraq were then discussed by the group before moving on to formulating the highlighted action points above for the Global CCCM Cluster to take forward.
Two breakout sessions featured an ‘innovation challenge’ providing an introduction to UNHCR Innovation Service’s user journey mapping tool. During the first morning a ‘Mentimeter’ live survey was conducted to determine the top two camp management challenges that require more feedback from the service users in order to design a solution. Governance, participation, Site Planning, Safety; and Complaints and Feedback Mechanisms were the five areas that came up during online voting of over 70 participants as most important and Governance was then addressed through the user-journey mapping tool.

User-journey mapping is a tool that the UNHCR Innovation Service uses to design or improve services and/or processes. It is part of the toolkit of innovation methodologies and its main goal is to guide the design of services or processes with a human-centered approach. The exercise consists of walking the participants through the design process and the different steps of their service/process through the experience of the potential users.

Dimensions of innovation:

- **Product innovation:** Changes in the things (products/services) which an organization offers (e.g. portable water filter).
- **Process innovation:** Changes in the way in which they are created and delivered (e.g. Ford’s production line);
- **Position/Policy innovation:** Changes in the context in which the products/services are introduced (e.g. jeans);
- **Paradigm innovation:** Changes in the underlying mental models which frame what the organisation does (e.g. low-cost airlines).

Key points for CCCM actors:

1. Develop empathy.
2. Question your assumptions and bias.
3. Prior to design – ask your clients for their input.