

Technical Working Group. Shelter Reinforcement. 6 April 2011

Present: CCCM, Shelter Cluster, IFRC, BRC, CARE, World Vision, CORDAID, SASH.

Agenda:

- TOR for Shelter reinforcement group as agreed by Shelter Cluster SAG:
 1. *Determine the indicators to classify the degradation of shelters and identify priority locations accordingly.*
 2. *Make an inventory of best practices in recurring camps and possible technical solutions.*
 3. *Draft a work plan for the implementation of activities (training, distribution etc) and determine the indicative costs of the programme.*
 4. *Mobilise partners with capacity for implementation (technical, financial) and advocate for additional funding if required.*

Review of recent programmes and discussion on lessons learned:

Presentations by CARE and IFRC / BRC:

Both CARE and BRC programmes involved upgrading of spontaneous self-made shelters.

CARE: document attached.

CARE carried out a programme of distribution of 20,000 shelter reinforcement kits in Carrefour and Leogane, including sites where they had not previously been involved in support activities. CARE provided technical advice and technical support including print materials, community mobilisation, demonstration, and practical assistance by carpenters. While the kit was uniform the timing and degree of assistance varied between locations with different lessons learned accordingly. Lessons learned and recommendations from CARE are in the attached document.

BRC:

BRC implemented a programme of upgrading of self-made shelters in camps where they providing a range of integrated support including camp management support. The case discussed is JMV camp in Delmas. BRC distributed plastic sheeting fixings and limited quantities of wood to all households, and provided technical support through teams of carpenters hired from within the camp to help optimise the use of the materials and performance of the shelter.

Field Visit notes to both programmes attached.

Lessons learned:

- Technical assistance is needed before, during and after distribution.
- Practical technical assistance by carpenters in both cases was important to ensure the materials were used well, including for example improving roof drainage and waterproofing.
- Technical assistance was necessary for very vulnerable households who could not carry out the work themselves.
- In some cases it was more feasible to dismantle poor quality shelters and reconstruct them to a better standard. This may be considered replacement rather than reinforcement.
- One plastic sheet is only enough for the roof and will not cover walls as well. If walls and roof need upgrading two plastic sheets are required.
- Improvement of shelter conditions in some locations requires interventions or activities such as decongestion, site drainage, watsan provision.
- Shelter material distribution, shelter improvements or site improvements have several risks including increasing pull factor, precipitating evictions.
- Without preparation, coordination, monitoring and technical assistance materials ended up quickly on the market.

Discussion

Participants noted the following:

- It is most important to have an accurate registration of beneficiaries and confirmation of occupancy of existing tents or shelters to inform programme planning and in advance of distributions or technical support.
- Activities need to be planned and implemented in close coordination with all agencies operating in the same area and with the same beneficiaries.
- The objective needs to be clarified, for example the objective in the CARE programme was **‘The shelter conditions of families living in spontaneous camps and villages improved and the vulnerability to natural disasters improved’**.
If this is the case then there may be a need to develop common or agreed criteria to assess ‘shelter conditions’ or to decide what standards if any we are trying to achieve through improvement measures or what shelter performance criteria should guide the intervention. The discussion included whether the primary concern was ensuring shelters are ‘reinforced’ to withstand the impact of the next hurricane season, which would mean strengthening, anchoring and weather-proofing as priority, or whether other concerns should also be considered as shelter condition indicators, and therefore considered in the programme response including, for example, issues of space and congestion, access to sanitation or other concerns expressed by families currently in emergency shelter.
The activity should be referred to as shelter improvement rather than shelter reinforcement.
- There are lessons learned, good practices to be shared and recommendations to be compiled on:
 1. The technical specification of the materials provided.
 2. The technical assistance including the use of the materials provided.
 3. The methodology of an improvement programme (process)
- For camps and non camp populations in emergency shelters it would be best to confirm the numbers and locations of people in emergency shelter and to ascertain those in relatively better or relatively worse conditions by sharing and analysing information at field level, suggested commune or sub hub level.
- There is a need to ensure people in emergency shelter outside the camps are also targeted for assistance if they are in need. This will require a process of identification and mapping. It is proposed to start from the existing CCCM map and add any further emergency shelter sites and numbers of emergency shelters / families at commune level. Additional survey activities will also be needed.
- CCCM has already compiled information for camps on risks including landslides, flooding, and eviction. The provision of services is also reported, (confirm if there is also qualitative *watsan* data). The data on space per household is also useful to indicate overcrowding. It should be possible to add criteria on shelter performance (standards and conditions) to help establish degrees of need.
- The profile of camp populations is useful to understand the likely duration, including for example whether they are close to their neighbourhood of origin before the earthquake, earthquake affecters or not, property owners or renters, the damage status of their previous homes, and vulnerability indicators.
- There were issues in previous distributions that some beneficiaries received shelter kits shortly before moving to new T-shelters. It was discussed that the pipeline plans for various groups should be considered in the prioritisation and targeting.
- The plans, capacities and resources of agencies already planning or interested in supporting shelter improvement activities needs to be collected, if possible commune wise.
- We would also like to collect any more project documents, lessons learned, needs assessments or other field information, which can contribute to better planning.

Actions:

1. Meeting of CCCM and Shelter Cluster to agree plan for joint cluster working group on shelter improvement.

2. CCCM and Shelter Cluster to review the current information available to CCCM including
 - Site assessment criteria, (risk, services etc)
 - Emergency Shelter performance criteria (if existing).
 - Beneficiary information (property status, origin, vulnerability)Common assessment criteria to be confirmed for each to determine needs and prioritisation.
3. Send request to all partners in shelter cluster and CCCM cluster to collect their plans or interest in emergency shelter improvement activities. The clusters should also request any project documents, needs assessments or lessons learned which can be shared or contribute to planning.
4. Compile and review information from field experience and prepare recommendations on:
 - Technical specifications;
 - Technical advice;
 - Methodology to implement shelter improvement;Relevant TWG members required to take part in each of these topics.
5. Devise rapid commune level planning process to progress identification and reporting of needs and prioritisation.
6. Compile overall needs, proposed prioritisation and recommended solutions for advocacy with donors.