



## 14<sup>th</sup> UK Shelter Forum

13th March 2014

The Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon St, London

Hosted by Save the Children and the

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

### Contents

1) Updates .....	1
<i>Joseph Ashmore (IOM), Toby Gould (RedR), Bill Flinn (CENDEP), Victoria Murtagh (Christian Aid)</i>	
2) Humanitarian Response to Urban Crises .....	2
<i>Lizzie Babister (DFID)</i>	
3) Discussion Session A: Lessons from the Philippines .....	3
<i>Chaired by Julien Muliez (Save the Children)</i>	
4) Discussion Session B: Measuring Impact .....	4
<i>Yetunde Abudul (BRE), Jelly Morning (BSHF), Oyvind Nordlie (NRC)</i>	
<i>Chaired by Charles Parrack (CENDEP)</i>	
5) 15 Years Behind WASH?: Unresolved Issues in the Shelter Sector and the 'Deep Craft' Nature of Shelter and Housing Technology .....	6
<i>Kate Crawford (UCL), Richard Luff (Independent), Victoria Maynard (UCL/HFH)</i>	

## 1) Updates

### Shelter in South Sudan

Joseph Ashmore (IOM) - [slides](#)

Shelter activities in South Sudan have included ongoing long term operations, stockpiling, and a Shelter Cluster since 2012.

Hostilities between government and non-government forces broke out in mid-December 2013, leading to displacement and interrupted markets and agriculture. As of February 2014, food security was a major concern for over 4 million people and there were over 700,000 IDPs living in multiple locations. This includes over 70,000 displaced people seeking protection in UNMISS Protection of Civilians (POC) sites. Key challenges are humanitarian access and the approaching rains.

Some sites have exceptionally high density, and advocacy has been required to identify new sites and to allocate resources to plan against risks (i.e. against flooding, fires and conflict). Both inside and outside the POC sites, Non-Food Items (NFIs) remain the primary shelter response. Emergency shelter kits are also provided (limited by transport capacity).

The shelter response is not yet in a stage of recovery or reconstruction. For displaced families, it is largely not safe to return. Despite there being significant urban issues due to many families living with host families, shelter programming in cities out of POC sites is not currently possible due to security constraints.

For more background on the response visit: [www.ShelterSouthSudan.org](http://www.ShelterSouthSudan.org).

### RedR and Urban Technical Expertise

Toby Gould (RedR) - [flyer](#)

The new RedR course tackling technical knowledge gaps in urban shelter and WASH responses was introduced. The shelter course will be a 5 day workshop which will be held in the next year and invite practitioners to focus on issues and cases that are specific to urban environments. This is part of a three year grant that RedR received to look at skills gaps in

humanitarian urban responses. RedR will also look at possible private sector engagement in urban responses.

RedR is interested in connecting with engineering consultancies and academics to support shelter agencies through technical advice and deployments. RedR would train a certain amount of people for deployment.

### Building for Safety Project

Vicky Murtagh (Christian Aid)

The majority of people who respond to disasters are disaster affected populations themselves, however they generally do not receive support (technical or otherwise) from NGOs, etc. The concern is that locals are thus repairing and building houses using poor techniques because they lack the training and materials to build back safer.

There has been discussion on the dissemination of best practice relating to safer construction skills. CARE has agreed to take the lead on a project to do this, and UCL will join (IOM are interested as well). They will have a peer review at some point and are open to any input. They are currently looking for a communications specialist. It is expected that in the next 6 months the project will be fully implemented.

### Shelter after Disaster PG Certificate

Charles Parrack and Bill Flinn (CENDEP)

The revised Shelter after Disaster post-graduate certificate and stand-alone model is part of the Masters in Disasters and Emergency Practice at CENDEP, Oxford Brookes University. The aim of this course is to link academia and practice, as well as to link people from different sectors and levels of experience. The course is 2 weeks long (residential) and is followed up with practical and theory courses that can be done in the field. The course also feeds into research, and has a connection to RedR with credits which can transfer. Pedro Clarke, one of the students currently on the CENDEP MA, commented that the practical exercises and high number of external guests make a very positive contribution to the course. The next course will start in January 2015.

## 2) Humanitarian Response to Urban Crises

Lizzie Babister (DFID) - [slides](#)

Over the past 18 months, the humanitarian teams in DFID have been considering how we can improve our own response to humanitarian crises in urban areas, and how we can support our partners, and the humanitarian system more generally, to tailor responses more effectively to urban contexts. As part of this process DFID is currently running a series of stakeholder consultations on the following four topics:

1. Governments
2. Built environment
3. Complex communities
4. Markets

As part of the UK Shelter Forum breakout groups continued the discussion on the first two topics, focusing on examples of:

- ‘strong governments’ in ‘formal environments,’ where there are adequate resources, efficient organization, and disaster risk management experience.
- ‘weak governments’ in ‘informal environments.’

The major conclusions of the four groups were:

- The importance of considering how we engage with governments.
- Working with government entities whilst remaining neutral requires more thought about entry points and ways of engaging.
- The need for time to analyse the context with an assessment of existing capacity, how the city as a system works and how that affects where to intervene.
- Not looking at things on a house by house basis but on a neighbourhood, network, or regional level and what that means for programming.
- The need for additional expertise to get from response to recovery.

For a more detailed summary of these discussions, please see the Extended Note posted at [www.shelterforum.info](http://www.shelterforum.info) from the UK Shelter Forum discussions and the forthcoming meeting report from the DFID workshops ‘Humanitarian Response to Urban Crises’.

## 3) Discussion Session A: Lessons from the Philippines

*Chaired by Julien Muliez (Save the Children), with Bill Flinn (CENDEP), Mario Flores (Habitat for Humanity), Sonia Molina (British Red Cross), Gabriel Fernandez del Pino (CARE) and Brett Moore (World Vision)*

This session was held three months after typhoon Haiyan. The Philippines has a history of natural disaster – the city of Tacloban, Leyte, faced a similar situation around 35 years ago.

Coastal zones in the Philippines were the most affected. Devastation was due to the tidal surge, strong winds and floods.

While the government has defined a 40 meter-‘no-build zone’ in the coastal areas, low income communities had already started rebuilding in them. The no-build zone prevents organisations from supporting these most vulnerable people.

The affected area in Panay is more rural than Tacloban. Some communities had started to rebuild by themselves quickly, without any support from agencies. Therefore, the challenges for humanitarian agencies were: how to make the response faster; how to support communities from day one; how to support self-recovery without compromising quality and standards of construction; and how to integrate livelihoods and shelters.

The strategy of the Shelter Cluster has been divided into: emergency distribution (including supplies such as tarpaulins); self-recovery (including distributing tools, nails, coconut lumber, metal sheets, plywood), transitional shelters; and collective evacuation centres (such as schools). Most of the affected areas outside cities depend on fishing or the exportation of coconut based products, but it will take at least

6 years for affected plantations to recover. Coconut trees felled by the typhoon are available for recovery activities, but the challenge is processing the large numbers of felled trees before they begin to deteriorate through lying on the ground.

The islands of Leyte and Panay differ in terms of the availability and quality of materials, logistics, accessibility, weather, transport and politics. Distribution of materials alone is insufficient, and many families are 'building back worse'.

#### **Which message is right?**

Simplified messages might cause less misunderstanding and can be used broadly. Practitioners must ensure, however, that messages are useful for their target audiences.

It was suggested that deciding on message channels and ways to agree on common messages could be developed as part of preparedness. Discussion participants also agreed that:

- A multi-prompt approach is required, using national media, local authorities and local construction sectors.
- Messages should be adjusted locally in each country.
- Messages should be simple but need to be contextualised.

#### **How do we get funding and understanding for the softer side of shelter?**

Participants suggested the idea of "Training without hardware," where specific funding for communications facilitates efficient training for safer reconstruction programmes. Discussion points also included:

- Matching trained carpenters to the homes that need repair, providing opportunities for unemployed people.
- Promote the "soft side" by doing it well and showing the positive outputs/results.
- Advocate for "Shelter promotion" indicators in country level clusters to track awareness raising. Once training is tracked, it can

become a budget line, and therefore more present in the funding proposals.

- Build up existing knowledge of regional housing vulnerabilities to present in funding proposals.
- Human resources: Allow shelter professionals to specialise in "Shelter Promotion" by building these skills into TOR's, or make separate roles for this focus.

## **4) Discussion Session B: Measuring Impact**

*Chaired by Charles Parrack (CENDEP)*

The purpose of this session was to continue discussions on measuring the outcomes and impact of shelter programmes started at the last UK Shelter Forum. Notes from this meeting are available [here](#).

#### **QSAND Project - [slides](#)**

*Yetunde Abudul (BRE)*

The QSAND Project is a shelter and settlement sustainability assessment tool developed by the IFRC to quantify sustainability after disaster. It was developed to benchmark the success of projects and offer improved delivery for beneficiaries through a holistic integration of environmental, social and financial principles. The tool was subjected to a peer review process including RedR and EWB.

Target users include individuals in the field at district/province/field levels, desk based staff at the national/regional level, and monitors at the international/donor level.

The process begins with a Pre Assessment Tool (PAT) for early decision making processes. This is followed by the Core Assessment Tool (CAT) to track the long-term progression of reconstruction programmes. A score determined using the assessment tool. All information is recorded for future M&E.

The CAT quantifies performance through four steps:

1. Determine the most relevant issues.

2. Establish how many points are achievable for each issue.
3. Calculate an overall performance score.
4. Determine a scoring band.

The next steps for the tool include the release of the SAT in April 2014 and the release of an e-learning tutorial in April.

### Looking Back at Post-Disaster Housing Reconstruction: Lessons and Reflections from Coventry Conference

Jelly Moring (BSHF)- [slides](#)

Twelve case studies were presented. These were from Asia and Latin America and highlighted the core themes:

- *User Satisfaction*: This is based on an overall sense of security, ease of maintenance, security of tenure, adaptability and layout design and is measured over 3 to 40 years. The key factors that influence user satisfaction are links with government and communities, government/donor restrictions, quality of assessment and integration of services.
- *Beneficiary Targeting*: People in rural areas are more likely to stay in allocated homes. Beneficiaries often adjust even to poorly designed houses. Key issues include deciding whether or not to prioritise certain beneficiaries and determining which stakeholders to engage from the outset.
- *Replication*: Replication (hardware or software) can achieve affordability but relies on occupants knowing which improvements to make. Security of tenure and long-term agency presence can act as incentives for safer building.
- *Technical Performance*: The lack of disaster proofing for home extensions can have significant impacts on performance. Training for maintenance, good project staff, quality control and an emphasis on disaster mitigation are important in this.
- *Impact on Livelihoods*: Relocation weakens livelihoods.

Overall, building communities and resilience is not just about houses. A holistic approach that incorporates livelihoods is needed. Working with the private sector can help to increase the scale and reach of programmes. Other areas to be considered include exploring the positives and negatives of priority cases, and whether construction can overcome trauma in post-disaster areas.

### Shelter and Settlement Impact Evaluation Tool

Øyvind Nordlie (NRC)

Øyvind [presented](#) a project led by UN Habitat on behalf of the Accountability Working Group of the Shelter Cluster. The project was to develop a tool to measure the long-term impacts of recovery.

There are essentially two approaches for conducting an impact evaluation: real-time or after the fact. The Impact Evaluation Tool aspires to be active at all stages, from Sector Learning (pre-disaster) to Recovery Target (post-disaster). It includes Emergency, Transitional, and Permanent Reconstruction phases. It can be used to set targets during disasters and for longer-term learning.

This tool is still in development and there is a need to gather context and baseline data on physical, financial, human, social, and natural capital in order to consider all sectors that are impacted. There are already needs assessment tools collecting much of this data and further consideration of these tools is necessary.

A pilot project conducted with REACH in Mindanao, Philippines reviewed indicators. This process highlighted many of the challenges in building this tool, in particular, who will collect the data and interpret it. It also highlighted the proliferation of tools that exist, and the difficulties of linking impact evaluations to learning.

### Discussion

Firstly, participants discussed four basic questions that must be considered in developing

tools to measure the impact of shelter programmes:

1. Is it possible to measure the impacts of shelter provision?
2. Can indicators developed for one shelter project/context be transferred to other projects/ contexts?
3. How can we as a sector manage this learning so it's utilised and shared by all who need it?
4. What purpose does impact evaluation have?

The group discussion on these four questions highlighted the following points:

- Are there any universal indicators? Which indicators are the most important?
- How can we systematize impact evaluations?
- How can we ensure adequate control groups against whom we can measure interventions? How can we be sure that impacts are attributable to an intervention?
- How can we measure outcomes and predict impacts?
- How is quality ensured throughout the process?
- How can we measure the impact of shelter on health, education, etc?
- What are the incentives to gather good data?
- How do we deal with the institutional bias to report only positive outcomes?
- What time in the response cycle is the best to gather data?
- Measuring impact is not just about donor auditing, it's also good for communications and brings in more donor funding (i.e. "value for money")
- Resources on impact evaluation:
  - ["Contribution to Change"](#) - An approach to evaluating the role of intervention in disaster recovery". It provides tools to measure impact.
  - [The Humanitarian Genome Project](#) (version 3) is developing a search engine for evaluation and lessons learned

The next question the group discussed was: What is the one thing you would do next to improve impact evaluation?

- Identify who is not here (at discussions like the UK Shelter Forum)
- Coordinate measurement with other sectors to minimise measurement fatigue
- Involve beneficiaries to determine indicators and learning, implement participatory practice in gathering information
- Map outcomes
- Challenge bias to publish only positive outcomes
- Model evaluations off of those conducted in the medical field, as they face similar problems
- Collect existing information including data held by governments
- Make the results useful for practitioners, including real time learning and evaluation
- Use passive as well as active indicators
- Create the time so practitioners can talk and write
- Identify how the results are communicated, including social media
- How does measuring impact feed back into the shelter process
- Identify methods to collect baseline data pre-disaster
- Gather existing best practice from impact experts
- Understand which impact measurements can be compared and contrasted (i.e. similar events, regional contexts, etc.)
- Identify what can and cannot be measured
- Conduct more operational research. Donors should take more risks in funding shelter projects so there is more learning in shelter and planning and more innovation
- Identify who the results will be useful for
- Investigate different funding models for how they impact on impact measurement.
- Identify specific achievable questions (i.e. How much construction do you need in order to achieve change?)

## 5) 15 years behind WASH?: Unresolved issues in the shelter sector and the 'deep craft' nature of shelter and housing technology

Kate Crawford (UCL) and Richard Luff  
(Independent), Victoria Maynard (UCL) [slides](#)

The WASH sector has gradually accepted that improving sanitation, and all associated health outcomes, rests on social transformation.

[Community-Led Total Sanitation](#) examples show that social transformations happen not simply because of investment in infrastructure or in good quality/more ubiquitous/interactive ways of sharing information. It occurs as part of a process of transforming views about what is acceptable and what is not.

Change depends on building this kind of deep understanding of our own action. Using the idea of '[deep craft](#)', it was proposed that mapping what we do and don't know about change in the shelter sector depends on bringing together the people with a wide breadth of experience and understanding, ranging from the details, cultures and systems of building to post-disaster response and funding mechanisms.

Participants were split into three groups to discuss what we thought they knew about building back safer after disasters and areas for further enquiry. Each discussion was based on a hypothesis:

1. Shelter actors provide cash, material, IEC and training inputs in the belief that families/ communities can build back safer but most families – the “non-intervened” people - still build back worse.
  - Should we let communities identify their own constraints to building back safer and design programmes to address these (building on the [IFRC PASSA tool](#))?
  - Should we address the fact that a longer time frame is required to enable building back safer to occur and that

this might need local partner organisational capacity building?

2. Shelter actors do not have standards that guide design and construction of houses to a resilience specification.
  - Should we try to develop a standard method of reviewing existing building codes and standards in each country to help us identify gaps?
  - Should we work towards greater clarity on the definition and allocation of risks and responsibilities between governments, shelter actors and people building back?
  - Should we think about defining 'better' in terms of performance levels such as 'life safety' - during recovery - and 'building safety' for permanent reconstruction?
3. Since shelter and settlement actors don't have resilience standards, it is difficult to understand the consequence of trade-offs and develop a menu of equivalent shelter/housing options.
  - Should we try to have a better understanding of the difference that scale and context (as well as our ways of analysing the context) actually make to the trade-offs between cost, speed and community engagement?
  - Should we try to analyse data and multiple risks to better explain trade-offs between coverage, quality at a strategic level (and how these might change over time) and between the different options for materials/equipment at the individual shelter level? Maybe by thinking in terms of a "performance specification" – an end objective – with many design/choice combinations that might achieve the same objective?

## Other shelter fora

Presentations were also made on:

- [Australia Shelter Forum](#): Brett Moore, WorldVision
- [India Shelter Forum](#): Anshu Sharma, SaferworldCommunications
- [InterAction](#): Mario Flores, Habitat for Humanity International

Further notes from these presentations are available for download from [shelterforum.info](http://shelterforum.info)