

Recommendations on Tri-Cluster Approach	shelter cluster comments and reflections towards new relocation	ACTION POINTS AND CONSTRAINTS	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS BY PARTNERS
<b>Geographical focus</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To communicate with the beneficiaries/IDPs about the land use situation in Zona K</li> </ul>	Communication and ensuring that the beneficiaries have a voice in the whole process will be crucial to ensure that they are involved and feel ownership to move. As done in return projects, go-and-see visits could be organised to the relocation sites priority given to the first settlements that would move. Communication with the beneficiaries should be done throughout the relocation process and starting with the design: discussion on minimum land-area sizes and private space, how to position plots (separate access to roads or clusters of houses around communal space, more front space or back space?), locations of latrines (female/male), locations of community centres, discussions on typologies (square versus rectangular shelters)... It will give guidelines for the site planning WG to filter in the wishes of the IDPs.	Who will take the lead to ensure IDPs integration during the site planning stage?	This should also be addressed at the information/communication WG. Part of their mandate is to ensure the participation of the IDPs. It should be taken into consideration that additional capacity will be required and that there is need for a commitment from the donor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New IDP camp(s) should include a land use agreement (formal or not)</li> </ul>	The minister of interior and national security (with consultations of the Inter-ministerial task force on IDP relocation) decided that the IDPs will be staying between 2 to 3 years, starting from first of Mar 2013. This should be further formalised, including a land-agreement on the roles/responsibilities specifically in regards security and the protection of the rights of IDPs (for example, principles of minimum standards should be incorporated in this document like plotsize...).	Principles of minimum standards to be generated and approved by Mol to guide the SPWG.	Securing the agreement on the land tenure is important. A letter of commitment by the Mol has been provided but there should integrate a stronger level of details. UNOCHA could propose a draft what details should be integrated in this land-use agreement (to further protect the rights of the IDPs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New camp(s) should have land allowing beneficiaries' livelihood activities.</li> </ul>	Livelihood activities are crucial for the sustainability of people settling and there are possibilities to incorporate them from the initial start-up of the settlement. The livelihood aspects can be tackled on two levels; one direct livelihood activities for individuals for shops/small market... and secondly through integrating the IDPs in the implementation of the activities which would strengthen again the ownership of the projects by the benefitting population. NGOs/implementing partners should try to make the project process as community driven as possible in order for the communities to benefit from the different stages. Cash for work/Food for work programmes linked to site-clearance, shelter/latrine construction, community mobilization and planning..	Owner driven approaches take more time to implement. Is it feasible piloting owner driven approaches for such big numbers?	It would be possible, but requires additional time and capacity. Commitment from the donors will be crucial. DRC has already included training to beneficiaries in order for them to be involved in the construction process themselves.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SBIA approach should be implemented on any new identified sites.</li> </ul>	Yes, the site based approach should be used everywhere. By including the committees in the process together with the DMA and implementing organisation, will ensure that more decisions will be made on site.	Do all stakeholders have enough human resources to have a strong presence in the field? Secondly, will there be sufficient security in the relocation site to have a very strong presence?	As most INGOs are working through local partners, there will be a strong presence in the field (depending on security in the field).
<b>Integrated approach</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At planning stage, all clusters (including livelihood) should be part of the process in order to ensure better integration (joint programming)</li> </ul>	In the case of the relocation process, which is lead by the government, the clusters could provide technical support and know-how to strengthen the existing system of the relocation task force. The clusters could help to strengthen the capacity of their respective partners/members. It will be important to think about the implementation methodologies during the planning process to ensure that as much livelihoods activities are incorporated in the design stage (owner driven versus contractor driven approaches). All clusters/sectors should come up with a capacity mapping of the partners involved.	Owner driven approaches take more time to implement. Is it feasible piloting owner driven approaches for such big numbers? Will all clusters be involved in the process?	Partners are already looking at the resource mapping. Changing from contractor driven approaches to more owner driven will be a challenge. Extra trainings will have to be incorporated to engage the IDPs in the construction. Most partners see the benefit of owner driven approaches but this needs to be further evaluated if this would be a feasible solution for 'temporary' relocation ('CAMPS'). In return programmes this should be done.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At implementation stage, incremental approach should be applied with the most needed clusters to allow smooth implementation</li> </ul>	As the relocation site is very far out of town, it will be important to have most of the clusters/sectors on board. We will have to ensure that the minimal needs are covered in the first months, otherwise the settlement will not be sustainable. It will be important to have a strong pull-factor through an integrated approach if this relocation would be successful. Nevertheless, we have to be cautious to not attract too much attention as people could be attracted to the site.	Providing too much support (blanket distributions) will attract many people. A fine balance needs to be found to ensure that the minimum standards are met. Which clusters/sectors will be involved?	Resource mapping is being done for WASH/shelter but hasn't started for other sectors. The support of the donors will be crucial as some projects are on hold until the site planning/design are in place. Who can provide DONOR support (UNOCHA?)
<b>Coordination, communication and dialogue</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening dialogue/coordination of all active partners involved in the site through the weekly operational meeting.</li> </ul>	Further strengthening of the shelter cluster partners will be important to ensure that they have a voice in the meetings of the site planning WG. The shelter cluster will provide trainings to the different actors to ensure that basics of site-planning are understood by all stakeholders (GPS/google earth/SPHERE standards/principles of site planning).	Training will be done in week of 8th of April.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formalize the communication and dialogue (coordination) between OCHA, OIC and Turkish Aid.</li> </ul>	Shelter Cluster will improve communication with other OIC shelter partners to better understand their capacity to respond in the relocation. UN OCHA would be in the best position to take a lead role together with Mol/DMA to get them on board.	The relocation is looked upon as an exit strategy, it will be important that all current stakeholders contribute to this process to the best of their ability.	It will be important to have the commitment from the other clusters. If too shelter driven, same problems could occur.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appoint a site manager to establish and maintain communication flow between stakeholders on site (site based approach). This appointment can be done from one of the lead partner on the site (need to define selection criteria of the lead partner and Terms of Reference (ToR) of site manager).</li> </ul>	It will be important to ensure that there is a proper coordination mechanism on the ground. Integrating the IDP committees from the start-up in this process, will ensure that they have more ownership. As the relocation plan is very large (180.000-350.000 people), the master plan should give guidance on how the large area will be split up and which agencies would have a lead-role in the management of daily tasks in the field (especially in regards to the site planning), in cooperation with the committees/DMA/DC. Nevertheless, it should give flexibility to incorporate changes/wishes from the people working in the field. This again could be a cash-for-work approach where people from the community are trained and paid to take on board this task.	Master plan should be made very quickly as some stakeholders are under pressure due to contractual deadlines (donors). Will a flexible master-plan be practical in the field?	Clarity needs to be found on the Site Managers role and the SBIA. Who hosts the site manager? Who does he report to? Authorities have the lead role in the relocation programme. What is missing in the representation of the IDPs (role of DC?). It will be important to further look at how coordination in the field will take place, who takes the lead at field level, how do they report?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SBIA should ensure proper communication plan including information packages in English and Somali (flyers, meeting, etc.).</li> </ul>	This will be done through the communication working group. Nevertheless, the site planning working group will also have an important role to play in communicating the site based approach to the communities through the communication working group..		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The District Commissioner (DC) needs to be involved from planning stage for the design of the site to the implementation stage.</li> </ul>	<p>The DC/DMA will be very important in the initial decisions on the basic principles of the site planning (surface area per HH, fire-break design,...). Furthermore, it will be crucial that they have increased capacity (human resources) to be able to fulfill their activities/responsibilities at site level (site based approach), working side by side with the committees and the implementing partners.</p>	<p>Do the different stakeholders (DC/DMA/INGO/...) have capacity to be actively involved in site base approach?</p>	<p>see comments above</p>
<b>Phase mapping/planning/implementation sequence and timing</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A "site manager" should lead the process from planning stage to implementation/delivery stage.</li> </ul>	<p>A well-agreed work-plan on roles/responsibilities should be drafted by all stakeholders involved. As this relocation is a government led programme, it will be important to see how the management in the field would look like. For example: the master-plan could split up the area in workable zones (field units) where an implementing organisation has a lead-coordinating function. They would work in cooperation with the government (field-officers), UNHABITAT (through their IP) and the committees to ensure that the principles of site-planning are transposed to the reality in the field as a group. Each field-unit would have a site-manager from both the respective 'lead-agency' which works very closely with the government counterpart.</p>	<p>Do the different stakeholders (DC/DMA/INGO/...) have capacity to be actively involved in site base approach? Who takes the lead in the field? Who reports to who?</p>	<p>A coordination structure in the field needs to be established. A TOR for being a lead organisation and for the site manager needs to be drafted in order for the agencies to see if they can provide support in taking up this role.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At planning stage, all the clusters and all the partners involved at site level should be part of the process:</li> </ul>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that all considerations are in the site plan;</li> </ul>	<p>All main stakeholders should be involved in the planning stage. Initially it will be important that all sectors/clusters provide details on what the needs would be in regards to relocation in order for the site planning WG to incorporate these thoughts. Secondly, discussions should also be held on <b>what kind of</b> assistance each cluster/sector could provide for all different stages in the relocation and thinking 'outside the box'. For example cash for work through site clearance,...</p>	<p>Is it feasible integrating the wishes of the IDPs in this process? Is it feasible implementing owner driven approaches for such big numbers?</p>	<p>Commitment/support from WASH/SHELTER cluster will be needed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that coordination is taking place from the initial phase of the project and onward.</li> </ul>	<p>See above</p>	<p>see above.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site plan should include all works (including demolition) and should be approved by all site stakeholders (CHF and non-CHF funded actors) prior to implementation.</li> </ul>	<p>As the site is transitional and the government has provided a tenure agreement for 2-3years, it will be important to remain pragmatic. For example, as this relocation is dealing with around 300.000 people, it will be important that guiding principles for the site-planning are agreed upon from the beginning. It will be more beneficial to strengthen the capacity of the partners to be able to implement the site-planning in the field and this in constant dialogue through consultations with the committees and the DC/DMA/UNHABITAT. For example, the site plan could incorporate a master-plan that would split up the area in workable zones (field units), incorporating the bigger infrastructure works (primary roads and demarcation of public areas).</p>	<p>Do the different stakeholders (DC/DMA/INGO/...) have capacity to be actively involved in site base approach? Who takes the lead in the field? Who reports to who?</p>	<p>A coordination structure in the field needs to be established. A TOR for being a lead organisation and for the site manager needs to be drafted in order for the agencies to see if they can provide support in taking up this role.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timely funding approval to partners – related to the project's design based on the site plan.</li> </ul>	<p>It will be important to map out what the partners can already provide within on-going funding. This will provide time to further fund-raise. As it will be difficult to predict the funding level of this project, priority should be given to essential services (site-planning/water/sanitation/livelihoods) to ensure that the whole process remains sustainable. In regards to shelter, it will be impossible to provide transitional shelter to all households. For example: it would be more beneficial spreading the shelters over the whole site instead of clustering them together in smaller pockets (hoping that each household would have access to a lockable shelter through sharing of the shelter in-between households). Advocacy to other donors will be necessary, not only CHF.</p>	<p>Relocation site should have minimum services (water, main roads and demarcation) before IDPs can move.</p>	<p>Some organisations have funds to start the activities. As soon as the site is ready, services could start with the ongoing funds. It will complicate beneficiary participation through the suggested cash or food for work approaches if the beneficiaries are not on site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site planning should include a narrative part detailing the sequences.</li> </ul>	<p>Before the site-plan is finalized in a clear document, basic principles need to be discussed and agreed upon at Task Force level (minimum standards, fire-breaks, % of communal space, nr of toilets, % of market space, % of roads...). For example, the master plan could split up the area into workable units and the guidance note would provide support to the field units to implement the site-planning through a community based approach at site level.</p>	<p>Master plan should be made very quickly as some stakeholders are under pressure due to contractual deadlines. Will a flexible master-plan be practical in the field?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should be in accordance to the cluster overall strategy (to avoid discrepancy as experienced in the Health cluster)</li> </ul>	<p>As the cluster systems are parallel to the new coordination structure (task force and working groups), the clusters could provide technical feed-back on the process. The clusters can also further strengthen and build the capacity of their partners/members. Shelter Cluster has already organised a site-planning training for shelter members/DMA in partnership with the site planning WG.</p>	<p>ICWG to see how the clusters can better complement the achievements of the task force. ToR specific for this relocation for the clusters?</p>	<p>Cluster should complement the efforts of the task force.</p>
<b>Who leads/ Who follow/ Monitoring</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The leadership should be done at site level and clear ToR must be agreed by all stakeholders</li> </ul>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Who takes the lead in the field? Who reports to who?</p>	<p>SEE ABOVE</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better linkages between the monthly coordination mechanism (lead by DC and OCHA) and the field site, in order to provide necessary support to the implementing partners at site level</li> </ul>	<p>See above</p>	<p>Who takes the lead in the field? Who reports to who?</p>	<p>SEE ABOVE</p>