

Technical Working Group (TWIG) on cash for shelter and NFIs

18 June 2015

14:00-15:30

UNHCR Office (16, Lavrska St.)

Agenda of the meeting

1. Introduction, presentation of participants; 5 min – Igor
2. Draft TWIG ToR presentation, 5 min – Igor
3. Update on previous meeting: matrix of types of cash, its further development, 10 min – Igor and Dana
4. Cash for rent: (brainstorming 15 min per topics)
 - 4.1. Aims: CC decommissioning, over occupancy, absence of minimal facilities
 - 4.2. Outreach to beneficiaries: CC visits, MoSP relaying information, spontaneous contact with agencies
 - 4.3. Critical modalities of operation: Cumulating or non-cumulating with other types of assistance; visits of premises (accompanying vulnerable beneficiaries), checking standards and living conditions. Idea of potential caseload handled by an experienced team (# HH / months)
 - 4.4. Calibration of the amount: fix % according to the average, modular % (category and vulnerability), % of rent according to real rent
5. Mapping of actors: planned and funded activities / planned – Andrii & Stanislav – 5 min
6. In-kind & vouchers & cash: feasibility in different areas and conditions. Recommendations -5 min
7. AOB

AGENDA ITEM 1 - Introduction, presentation of participants

Shelter/NFI Cluster Coordinator has welcomed all the participants that come to the meeting. After a short presentation of participants, Agenda has been reviewed, no changes made. Minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed.

AGENDA ITEM 2 - Draft TWIG ToR presentation

AGENDA ITEM 3 - Update on previous meeting: matrix of types of cash, its further development

The previous draft matrix of cash has been briefly presented again.

AGENDA ITEM 4 - Cash for rent

The participants have reviewed again Cash for rent in the matrix: high implementation cost, it has not been decided as to the recommended % of the rent cost that should be covered by the humanitarian assistance, solid market survey is needed as rent amounts vary from region to region.

Cash Coordinator: When considering cash for rent vs. multipurpose cash it is necessary that:

- a) To make sure no duplication of beneficiaries occur;

- b) If both activities are implemented in the same geographical area, then amount of multipurpose cash grant should be adjusted accordingly not to include rent component.

Cluster coordinator has briefly presented preliminary REACH assessment findings that relate to the cash for rent modality, which are the following:

- 1) Family size breakdown per type of accommodation: 2.84 for Collective Centers, 2.68 for hosted, 1.96 for hotels, 2.75 for owned accommodation and 3.16 for rented.
- 2) Type of accommodation before displacement and after: the majority of families that owned accommodation before are now renting or hosted.
- 3) Rent amount: The majority are within 1,000-2,000 UAH per month.
- 4) If people share their accommodation with others: 50 % yes in Collective Centers, over 80% in hosted arrangements, round 15% for owned and over 20% for rented.
- 5) Risk of eviction: higher risk of eviction in Collective Centers and rented/hotel, lower for rented and owned.
- 6) Likelihood of over crowdedness (measured by number of persons per room): critical for 15% caseload in Collective Centers, high risk for 25% in Collective Centers, less than 5% critical situation for rented, owned and hotels.
- 7) Electricity, toilet and running water are over 95% situation satisfactory.

Also, round 10% have written rent contract. REACH Assessment does not at the moment present breakdown per location/ rural&urban areas.

IOM: Date of assessment matters: for example through PDM it was possible to find that utility bills have increased significantly as well as rent. For rent there was round 10% renting cost increase for studio type apartment, 6% increase for 1 bed room apartment, and 3% increase for two-bedroom apartment (for the period October 2014 – March 2015).

PCPM: For example, Romashka Collective Center should have more free bed-capacity as cash for rent is aimed at decommissioning partly the Collective Center and making it more as a transit center.

IOM: If existing Collective Centers could be used for short stay and as emergency referral receiving points, that would be great.

PCPM has also considered integration of children at the moment.

Cluster Coordinator: There is a very useful and informative report of 2013 shared before with Cluster partners where housing and accommodation are considered in detail. According to the report pre-conflict situation in Ukraine already had over crowdedness elements. Officially there is 21 sq m standard for living space in Ukraine. At the same time the Ministry of regional development acknowledges that number of persons per room is the best indicator. So 7 sq m per person is the minimum in Ukraine, while this would be 2-3 persons per room.

PCPM: there is practice that host families charge IDPs for gas and electricity; often it is not taken into account.

IOM: integration of the displaced population into localities where they stay and extend their stay is important; rent should be linked to the sustainability of persons of concern.

UNHCR: there are some families for which even with rent support it will not be able to sustain themselves. Thus there are two caseloads: extremely vulnerable not able to sustain themselves and those that with cash for rent support can achieve this.

IOM: livelihoods is extremely important component. In rural areas there are isolated CCs.

UNHCR: On the contrary, some IDPs staying in the city center (Kyiv) might not be interested as the location suits their needs and people would like to continue their stay.

UNHCR: breakdown aims of cash for rent by types of accommodation of possible beneficiaries.

UNHCR: link conditional cash to IDP profiling, when during decommissioning of CCs it would make sense to provide such type of assistance if sustainability can be achieved.

Cash coordinator: it would make sense to define when multipurpose cash cannot satisfy shelter needs and that would be a place to apply

UNHCR: More precise targeting with cash for rent is possible.

PCPM: In Iziom beneficiaries were identified through home visits through some 30 community mobilizers (for 560 beneficiaries).

IOM: error when conducting verification, sometimes 50%.

UNHCR: as a vulnerability family size could be considered; one of the conditions for enrolment into cash for rent program could be application for government assistance.

Summary table of discussions:

1. Trigger(breakdown by type of accommodation): protection based approach (vulnerable groups with shelter needs); CC decommissioning; integration and access to livelihoods (given profiling differences); over occupancy; (if eviction is related to money); absence of minimal facilities
2. Outreach to beneficiaries: CC visits, MoSP/SES/hotline relaying information, spontaneous contact with agencies, through protection monitoring/individual protection assistance, network of local NGO;
3. Critical modalities of operation: harmonizing with other types of assistance; visits of premises (accompanying vulnerable beneficiaries), checking standards and living conditions. Idea of potential caseload handled by an experienced team (# HH / months)
4. Calibration of the amount: fix % according to the average, modular % (category and vulnerability), % of rent according to real rent