

## PRIORITISATION MEETING NOTES

### SHELTER/ NFI CLUSTER MEETING (FEDERAL)

Tuesday, 8<sup>th</sup> May 2018, 10:00 am, IOM Office, Addis Ababa

**Present:** IOM, CRS, NRC, COOPI, IRC, OCHA, Save the Children, Concern, HelpAge

#### 1. Meeting Objectives

The SNFI Cluster presented that the last Cluster's prioritisation exercise took place in February 2018 and there was a need to review the Cluster prioritisation according to the new displacements identified in DTM10 as well as due to flooding and conflict in Guji Gedeo. It was also important to review the criteria used for prioritisation to reach a consensus by Cluster members

In addition, the SNFI Cluster expressed the need to expand our range of activities, including more durable shelter solutions, along the lines of the HDRP and include this in the prioritisation exercise.

#### 2. February Prioritisation

The SNFI Cluster presented the criteria and background from the last Prioritisation exercise. As part of its bi-monthly Cluster prioritization, the shelter/NFI Cluster updated its prioritization in mid-February and agreed on 3 key areas to guide prioritization: 1) type of emergency, 2) duration of displacement, and 3) percentage of vulnerable people in IDP sites. The criteria for prioritisation was as follows: -

- Drivers (conflict-induced IDPs are prioritized over climate-induced IDPs but not only those linked to the Somali Oromia conflict but through-out the country)
- Conflict IDPs categorized based on the length of their displacement (from September 2017) months)
- Drought IDPs categorized in terms of time of displacement and increased vulnerabilities at the sites
- Sites prioritized that have individuals with specific vulnerabilities, including women and children IDPs as well as the elderly and those with disabilities linked to the conflict
- IDPs hosted in rural areas are no longer prioritized over those hosted in urban areas.
- Coordination with other clusters also taken into account as per HRD

A further breakdown of conflict displaced households that have more than 10% of HH were then identified and categorized for immediate support.

#### 3. Review of Prioritisation Criteria

A presentation and discussion of the DTM analysis round 10 was carried out and the different criteria the SNFI Cluster was looking at from DTM were discussed :

- Sites prioritized that have **>10% individuals with specific vulnerabilities**, including women and children IDPs as well as the elderly and those with disabilities linked to the conflict
- Sites with **more than 50 % living in substandard shelters**
- Sites with **individuals living in the open air, collective centers**

- Sites with **at least 3 safety concerns with current shelters including weather** (lack of security/weather/privacy/no light)
- **Sites with greater prevalence to health issues particularly pneumonia**
- **Sites opened in 2018 or have new displacement in 2018**
- Remove from priority sites those that have >50% HH have an income or other livelihood activity or a great number of assets

Prioritisation of sites linked to recovery activities under Pillar 3 were discussed as well as vulnerable HH that get affected by flooding under Pillar 1 requiring immediate mitigation support.

The following points were raised by partners: -

- Health indicators were not believed to be directly relevant to the cluster prioritisation and partners agreed we shouldn't focus on them, especially when there is a lack of resources. The issue of inter-sector prioritisation was proposed to be considered not only for health indicators but also WASH as a sector directly linked to shelter.
- The partners agreed that the safety/health and income criteria were interesting, however, they should be used as second-tier criteria. They should be used while targeting specific population within a site, if possible.
- Targeting HH using the GSC Score Card should be applied to support HH most in need at each site.
- The key criteria of displacement driver and time frame was proposed to be maintained and should be analysed to identify the priority sites.
- Partners were not particularly interested in the shelter type criteria for example. However, after much discussion, partners agreed to prioritize open air and sub-standard shelters in the analysis.
- There was a disagreement on collective centres, as some partners argued that tarpaulins and rope were not priorities there and others argued exactly the contrary as tarpaulins can provide privacy and enclosures for greater protection and allow HH to build their own shelters outside if desired.

In addition: -

Criteria such as displacement driver and time frame were considered fundamental, but insufficient. Partners discussed taking into account the specific context in the regions, the direct impact on the livelihoods on the IDPs, their intention in terms of relocation/return or integration and the state of their previous shelter - ie destroyed/damaged houses, etc.

Drought affected HH in Somali Region are differ from those in Afar, and there exist various coping mechanisms for flood affected HH. The consequences of the conflict in Oromia/Somali are also different from those in Tigray. This is information that DTM analysis cannot really support with. For flood affected HH it was discussed - Why not studying the impact of floods in the past to prioritize the needs this year?

There was also the discussion on whether there is a need to harmonize prioritisation criteria for all the regions. This was an important issue last February, as the regional office prioritized some drought affected IDP's, which were Priority 2 at Federal level.

Partners raised the issue of how to incorporate some of the local authorities' priorities and how to better coordinate with them. There is challenge when partners arrive at sites that are prioritised by the SNFI

Cluster but the Zonal bureaus direct partners to support elsewhere. This was highlighted by partners especially in Deder and Chinaksen.

Partners raised that all DPPB offices wanted to want to focus on flood affected HH as a priority.

The final discussion was on prioritising ES/NFIs or recovery activities. Some partners believe that immediate focus on NFI distributions are key in the flood affected areas (those ones affected now and those which will be affected in the coming weeks). Mitigation should have prioritized before but these activities are too late for this flood season but it should be prioritized after the rainy season.

Partners also emphasized the need for rehabilitation/return support and the SNFI cluster to investigate assistance options that were shared at the Shelter and Settlements Assistance Workshop held in April. Partners are to investigate all the possible sheltering options and identify the needs in their areas of operation and assess what specific solutions agencies could specialize on.

#### **4. Summary of Criteria for further Cluster Analysis**

The following criteria were agreed upon for further analysis by the SNFI Cluster:

**Priority 1:** Flood in 2018 / Conflict after September 2017 + substandard shelter types

**Priority 2:** Drought affected IDP's after April 2017.

**Priority 3:** Remaining unassisted displaced HH

The Cluster will include the vulnerability criteria (>10% at sites) into this SNFI analysis as this is an important factor to be maintained.

The Cluster will share the final analysis and Prioritisation Table of each woreda at the next SNFI Cluster meeting