**UK Shelter Forum 21**

**Notes**

****

**Session:** Promoting safer building WG

**Time:** 9.40 –9.50

**Facilitator(s):** Bill Flinn/Olivier Moles

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes / findings / photos:**

* New WG, co-lead by Care and Craterre
* Get in contact with examples and experiences of responses where technical communication has worked or not

**Summarised notes:**

*Discussion about the aims and objectives of the new WG:*

* Overlaps with others, important conjugate within cluster
* Discreet deliverables: technical info etc to categories/validate – make it easily accessible and reviewed
* Incorporate BRE
* Protocol to arrive rapidly at reliable, validated, contextualised, appropriate BBS messages in onset of major disaster – how to avoid a lag between disaster and getting messages out to communities, aim to make this process more agile and give advice more quickly
* Aim to show strengths and weaknesses and develop tools for organisations
* 20 + people on regular call list
* 3 more meetings

**Session:** Feedback from Sharing Workshop 16th Nov

**Time:** 9.50 – 10.00

**Facilitator(s):** Bill Flinn, Olivier Moles

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes / findings / photos:**

*Discussion about topics explored at pre-event:*

* What is better?
* What describes a ‘good’ house? Safety as just one ingredient
* Important to be properly aware of strengths and weaknesses of what people are already doing
* Shared interest in issues of understanding BBB/BBS and their differences
* Should we be promoting solutions to buildings or solutions that are technique focused?

*Key takeaways from pre-event:*

* **Charles Parrack:** Self-built communities and key factors that they would think are important to include safer building in their own recovery, what makes people decide to build back with resilience?
* **Joseph Ashmore:** What are long term impact on projects, not got much on longitudinal studies e.g. Pakistan 2005 ODR however last 5 years massive knowledge gap within the sector? Perspective and time. What is long term impact on training people in safer recovery?
* **Jamie Richardson:** gap between us and development sector. How to bridge? Meetings like UKSF with development actors
* **Bill Flinn**: informed choice both communities and practitioners

**Summarised notes:**

* Promoting ODI publication
* Yetunde spoke (at pre-event) about BRE/BRE building nodes, dating from 1950s, trying to reinvigorate them
* Build Change – incorporating it with BRE & retrofitting and apps
* Knowledge **exchange** – gap & weakness. Idea of trusted actors in the community
* Social housing on Brazil (Anna)
* Developmental/humanitarian divide e.g. behavior change within shelter cluster/issues of ethics/challenges for the future

Session: Gaza

Time: 10:00-11:00

Facilitator(s): Salem Al Qudwa

Notetaker: Wongani Mwanza

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* Restriction of movement of people, can be considered as the largest prison, as many people are stuck with no movement. Lots of time to travel
* Buffer zone
* Majority of ordinary buildings are not decorated / rendered concrete buildings.
* 2014 attacks made many people homeless and they took shelter in schools / other homes / communal spaces
* NGOs gave cash in the form of rent, for outside of the destructed area. Repair damaged houses
* Given the extensive constraints; what is our role?
* Family structure in relation to the physical building structure, the different generations on each of the floors, vertical extension
* How well is **community resilience** understood or factored - short and long term?
* Knowledge of building transferred from one generation to another
* Incremental housing to address affordability
* *High density, high rise, most of Israel built by people living in Gaza*
* *Restricted ability to do any building at all, and with conflict it basically made more of a massive shortage of housing. Extra demand couldn’t be met by existing access to materials / finance.*
* *Cash for repair / rent, winterise houses etc. Another mechanism in place for reconstruction*
* *Overcrowding and limitation of land, lack of fund and access to construction materials makes it quite complex. You have to apply to access cement*
* ***What’s the longer term prognosis of Gaza? How permanent is anything there?*** *What is the motivation? How does one build resilience?*
* *In 2015, when starting the winterisation project (November - January) Shejair (Shai Jair?), was the most affected area. Some people living in the buffer zone, rebuild their houses and say that they put signs up that if you destroy my house, I will rebuild it again. The people themselves are willing to rebuild again because they have* ***no other choice.***
* *There are no addresses, the name is enough to* ***locate people.*** *A sense of place. People rebuilding where they are, and that’s their home.*
* *There is an* ***amazing resilience*** *and the nature and character of the people. How do you find hope in a place where the long-term prognosis is so uncertain? But it is surprising how much there is a sense of hope. You don’t feel like you’re solving the root of the problem when you’re sorting housing, but it is part of a solution in a way.*
* *Land is registered in the family name. Social structures etc. 60% of the population of Gaza are registered as refugees, so they may not have ownership of land. Originally from other parts of Palestine. Do not have land rights. Tenants of UNRA in the area. Renting / leasing the properties to people who come in.*
* *Inter-mixed society*
* *No green areas. Playgrounds? Concrete. Concrete. Concrete. Not really a notion of urban planning or landscaping.*
* *CRS wooden house in 2014, it is a hybrid way of being able to use it. Wood and concrete used to extend the properties as well. Could expand up with timber etc.*
* *Firm and strong foundation, providing a permanent structure and investing in the housing crisis. Concrete and cement in the structure.*
* *Be aware on the perception of people and whether they will accept it or not, especially in terms of different materials.*
* *Loans are possible to relieve for mortgages etc. But the costs / risks are very high!.*
* *Majority of people in Gaza will self-recover.*
* *In 2014, a lot of work was done for recovery, tickets to materials, finance, cash etc. Reproduction process with the system coordinated by NGOs and others. Done politically and democratically.*
* *20%? Of people unable to organise that. Already overcrowded. Can’t access what’s being offered by the government. Lots of people falling outside of the system.*
* *You have to provide two sponsors in order to get a loan. Politics related to the housing sector.*
* *Unemployment is very high. But entrepreneurial spirit there is incredible. People have a sense of still wanting to achieve something even amongst everything. What is the solution, and how does that lie within politics?*
* *Situation in Gaza is an interesting example for urban planners, economists, humanitarian response, development response.*
* *Modular housing example of Brazil. Islamic Relief, modular kitchen and bathroom.*
* *People are thinking in a smart way of extending in the future.*
* *Asset given through a small house / kitchen. Allowed to sell later on.*

**Summarised notes:**

* Gaza has a restriction on the movement of people. This can be considered as the largest prison, as many people are stuck with no movement.
* Majority of ordinary buildings are not decorated / rendered concrete buildings.
* 2014 attacks made many people homeless and they took shelter in schools / other homes / communal spaces
* Family structure in relation to the physical building structure. The different generations on each of the floors of the building. **Columns of hope -** Always building with the hope for further vertical extensions
* Restricted ability to do any building at all, and with conflict it basically made more of a massive shortage of housing. Extra demand couldn’t be met by existing access to materials / finance.
* There is an **amazing resilience** and the nature and character of the people. How do you find hope in a place where the long-term prognosis is so uncertain? But it is surprising how much there is a sense of hope. You don’t feel like you’re solving the root of the problem when you’re sorting housing, but it is part of a solution in a way.
* Majority of people in Gaza will self-recover.

Session: SYRIA breakout group

Time: 10.00

Facilitator(s): GIULIA FRONTINA

Notetaker: KESTER BUNYAN

**Main outcomes / findings:**

**Summarised notes:**

Case study, first hand experience. Roll of government heavily involved and lead the “clusters” in Aleppo. Each project needs to be approved by the government. (used to be each humanitarian actor)

Limited numbers of actors. Some faith based, but small scale. Do not feed into the sector system.

Organisations also need to get approval to travel. INGO need approval each time; not just once.

Church umbrella providing rental support (NGO not given this opportunity) are more flexible in what they can do. 19 christian organisations alone. Area response coordination is happening.

Cash support currently banned.

Allowed light repair, distribution of shelter kits.

9 priority neighbourhoods; where heavier rebuilding/rehabilitation can occur. These are not the poorest or most affected/needy areas. (govt choice) these have no rehabilitation, or opportunity to do so. Overcrowding is an issue. Changing the DNA of the city.

Ownership issues. Need to prove ownership : no ownership; no help.

These areas are looked at in shelter and water (not holistically).

Aleppo: western- bombed and damaged, but mostly partially damaged, so people still living there.

East: much more damage. No window, doors etc, don’t keep people or cold out.

Rubble clearance issues; government is still clearing out areas, so watertrucking and other help cannot get in.

How are people doing? Needs are varied. Emergency in east, (markets not functioning) elsewhere can be looking at long term livelihoods. Water and fuel in some areas; very varied. People are surviving through humanitarian assistance. Markets functioning in the west. Issue is lack of financial means.

Shelter problem is you may have walls and roof, but not the door etc; cost is prohibitive. (both labour and materials, though they are available). Looking for basic things to close the envelope; window, locks. Winterization and security is a problem. (winter is extremely cold, heat retention is a problem)

Structurally unsound. A number of places too damaged to live in, 9 neighbourhoods are graded, none of the other areas are.

Private firms have to abide by the same rules as INGOs.

**3 questions:**

what were/aremain obstacles to more sustainable approaches?

govt regulations. Right to tenure/rental agreements or practices. East to west migration. Less supply.

How well is community resilience understood or factored; short and long term? ./social cohesion.

“Enhance engagement between humanitarian and development actors´(Grand Bargain)- what are the implications?

People cannot go back to same building or neighbourhood, so networks disrupted. War has disrupted social practices; there is less trust and more conflict between different groups.

Previous ISIS areas are not being rehabilitated.

ICRC sees itself as transition before govt/others can go into areas; solving access to wells and work with social cohesion etc; so can transition out for other actors/government to come in. working with acceptance.

No-one is working in the Kurdish area. (access is presently being negotiated )

Positive; well thought out process, may result in more coherent response. However future problems can come because the 9 areas are not really the key areas. Create differences and all of the people, all of the areas have the same base needs.

Suggestion: people to negotiate with the government ought to be high enough level.

What is the humanitarian blindspot? Can other actors have access that we do not. Diaspora response; with so many people having moved away. However the people that moved are not the people affected, so may also not be interested in coming back.

Shelter Kits are needed (though shortterm), vouchers are used for food, might be for shelter too eventually.

Lebanon example: Heaters etc for winterization etc are often sold in the summer, then needed again (opposite for the summer with fans etc).

No access to electricity in a lot of places, same with water (eastern areas)

Water points are chemically contaminated.

Govt provides an amount of fuel/year in the west. East is not receiving fuel in the same way and do not have stoves etc. NGO have certain restrictions in that they cannot supply some of these things.

Coordination between actors: faith varies on org- not coordinating with regular sector INGO; they are avoiding notice; behaving under the radar.

Beneficiaries’ don´t know who is delivering the assistance: little communication about the assistance. People don´t wait; they self recover. Bakers important, so 2 large east bakeries are being rebuilt and approved from the govt. good projects, going ahead. Rebuilding community.

Post recovery research needed- not happened yet.

UNhabitat support in urban areas after natural disasters etc are there, but very little in post conflict situations. There is a Bagdad report, but little else.

Though not shelter: Community hubs and kitchens (Tripoli) feeds a lot of people, employ lots of people, brings people together AND placed strategically. We have the same needs; we are the same.

Collective centres; IDP using the university dorms.

Limited land creates issues.

NEW QUESTION: Are there any local actors (grassroot orgs; apart from the faith groups??)

Session: Bangladesh

Time: 10:00-11:00

Facilitator(s): Seki Hirano

Notetaker: Zac Skeates

**Main outcomes / findings:**

Think long-term at the beginning despite of government incentive. Investing in energy infrastructure.

Issues of site management with upcoming typhoons and flooding large areas of camps will be heavily affected.

Mass vs smaller camps dependent on authority and big problems with community integration.

Deforestation is affecting the resilience of these camps; slopes stability, flooding. Added to this, firewood is not a sustainable option, alternatives much reached.

Politics- sustainable options appear to enforce permanence. Think long-term at the beginning despite of government incentive. Mass number of people that need to eat, firewood is there only option at the moment. Problems with introducing stoves; user issues.

**Summarised notes:**

160,000 Aug 2016

625,000 since Aug 2017

2,000 everyday crossing over

4th Refugee cycle

Cox’s Bazar Balukhali refugee population 400,000 across 8Km2

Located in a jungle, Ukhia Upazila, previously not used because of difficulties of site.

Infrastructure and access are predominant problems. “one of the worst sites to have a camp iv’e ever seen”

Across hilly terrain, terracing hasn’t been put effectively in place.

Cholera outbreak is feared to be incoming.

Significant flooding will hit these camps in May. Many areas where camps are will be under 2-3m of flood water. Latrines are built on these site, post-flooding water will pollute the water supply.

Balancing holistic sustainability is a goal, but seemingly unachievable in the mass camps.

General approach is to retro fit the existing blocks.

Elephant migration affecting refugee camps.

8 people & 5 wild elephants’ dead.

Mapping out community spaces and infrastructure before refugees come into camps.

Refugee/Disaster recovery different paradigms.

Deforestation rate was previous 3%, now large masses are lost for firewood- issues of sustainable sources for cooking. Heavy areas completely deforested and not enough bamboo to provide for the masses. Current Market assessment evaluating bamboo supply.

Bangladesh army key to distribution of aid.

Micro-projects to provide bio-gas stoves. Problems with user issues.

Rocket stoves- 10% of firewood required.

Fundamental blockage lies with sustainability and politics. Preparation for upcoming pressure from governements.

Government favour large camps, humanitarian sector seeking smaller camps.

Government also have lack of interest in hosting communities. Communication with local populations is not allowed.

1.2 million in targeted aid group (including local population)

From the floor q’s

Are they integrating health clinics?

Health centres are NGO led, not government.

Restriction in growing the camp?

No CGI’s. No freedom of movement between

How long do they anticipate they Rohingya to stay?

1992-2008 previous. Likely to be 17-20 years according to UNHCR.

Have they explored building vertically?

CRM will experiment but unfamiliar to local population. Currently providing tarps.

Is it overwhelming government or international body?

Government slow to start but now predominant resource mobiliser via army. International aid playing a more development role in reshaping sites.

Are we integrating previously learned lessons from disasters?

Consideration of water run-off and cyclones is key in this process of recovery.

Are you working with military?

They come with a request for money. They have been working close with them to look at road planning. They have a limited skill set.

What is the existing skill set of the refugee population?

Difficulties to know payment or volunteer issues due to bureaucracy. They’ve built the camps themselves.

Is there anything you have considered for strategic recovery?

Considerations of livelihood provision, subsidence provision or synergy with local market populations.

Help people realise where the flood zones. Long-term recovery is based on increasing capacity- potentially through the smaller camps.

Using timber to create fire-bricks creates deforestation when timber could be provided as a building material (Malawi)

Session: Breakout session- Group 4- Uganda

Time: 10:00- 11:00

Facilitator(s): Jamie Richardson

Notetaker: Lamis Jamil

**Summarised notes:**

* South sudanese refugees; Camps set up after conflict with the army; **Longitudinal impact of that displacement and resettlement**
* Lessons from current situations and compare differences between the two
* **Pushing towards self reliance** because:
  + Supporting community to maintain their own independence and resilience
  + Issue of resources
* **Use local materials, local building techniques...not without challenges.** For e.g. everyone wanted to collect timber for roofs, cooking- environmental impact, land for farming, access to water and other services
* **The pressure on the environment + the Community** - a lot of people crossing the border know each other but a lot of people are coming in - a lot of stress- to alleviate
* **30-70 rule:** For every $100 of assistance, $30 must go to host community
* **Video screening:** Uganda’s diverse ecosystem; abundant food and natural resources; Bidi Bidi refuge camp; a series of camps broken up into zones- it’s not one camp; UN secretary talking about challenges for Uganda; Musa Ecweru State minister of Disaster Preparedness and Refugees)
* How does the host community cope??
* People depend on their land/greenery but food crops aren’t doing well: cassava, beans…if no crops, not selling
* Bakery course- high demand - **Job skills for refugees**
  + 50% found jobs and others in the process
  + Wanting to open business to sustain family
* **Importance of understanding refugees and host community**
* **What can we do in order to increase sustainability? “Sustainability and Resilience”**
* Conflict started with regional dispute….**resistance army was brutal and infamous for recruiting and maintaining army**
  + **Abducting children** - letting shot their own siblings and take them away knowing could not return to their communities after such horrendous crimes
  + **Traumatized and desensitized to violence**
  + **Grew up as child soldiers**
  + **Alienation from own society**
  + Tactics of army- live in bush- attack villages,....rape and murder...terrorize community and army
* Ugandan army said to get all community into one place we know they are safe - Those who refuse are the terrorists and we will kill them.
* The locations were called “camps”...Nothing there: no facilities, resources, humanitarians…they were temporary settlements
* **Women took the brunt of this work:** gather timbers, make the shelter….
* **Really densely packed settlements made of huts; Extremely violent**
  + **Army didn't like the people they were defending**
  + **Guilty of as many crimes of murder and rape as LRA’s**
  + **LRA still attacked the camp....Army allowed this to happen**
  + **People stuck between the two**
* With Peace, people were able to return
  + Wanted to decongest the camps
  + Process for returning: By this time the humanitarian organisations got involved in camps and returning process
* With no infrastructure, women were responsible for dwelling construction, went forward to transitional camps for resettling, leaving children behind with men
  + **It was a huge responsibility on men**
  + **Complete shift in gender roles**
  + **Imbalance till now- 20 years after conflict and return**
  + **Both men and women acknowledge that this is unfair**
  + **Open talk about sexual violations- brutal and normally private- an indicator of how desensitized people have become and how normalized the brutality**
* **When ppl returned**
  + **Longer term impact of shelter**
  + **Involvement of women and gender disrupted**
  + **Social structures where they used to make decisions collectively had been disintegrated**
  + **Structures had evolved, couldn’t go back to what it was before because it had changed**
* **Next, the government introduced land reform act**
  + **Now people put up boundaries**
  + **Everyone went back and tried to land grab...leading to beatings and murder**
* Ongoing refugee situation in northern Uganda attempting to maintain social cohesion, maintain livelihood, skill training, etc
  + **It destroyed one generation and it will take one generation to recover**

**Session:** Owner-driven reconstruction in Nepal

**Time:** 12.00-

**Facilitator(s):** Martina Manna

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes / findings / photos:**

* More research is needed to consider how social factors can be used in BBS
* No correlation between safety of the home and receiving technical advice
* Social factors affect physical environment
* BBS is not just technical, lot of social factors that go into this, ever-changing framework

**Summarised notes:**

*Martina describing her research in Nepal and her findings:*

* Undertook research within 7 months, with first half spent building a school
* Gov programme in Nepal, supporting people by funding towards BBB
* People know how to build on site but not ensuring safety in homes
* Conducted 100 interviews, found 72% of interviewees still living in unsafe temporary buildings
* Safety paradoxes between short term and long term
* Delaying construction was due to finance and perceptions e.g. aftershocks
* Interpretation/use of existing space e.g. “concrete is so strong nothing will break it”
* Social factors: perception/prioritization (spending 1st tranche on worshiping)/ behavior of ‘safety’
* Built environment: loss of faith in traditional material/time & investment & safety

**Session:** CTP and the environment

**Time:**

**Facilitator(s):** Jake Zarins

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes / findings / photos:**

* Link between humanitarian and development, crucially need to be linked with environmental actors as well. HA & Dev stuck in silos and missing the big picture
* Can’t look at these issues in isolation, shelter has huge implications on the environment
* Cash and shelter in interlinked with health/livelihoods/gender
* Elements of sustainability could have broader impacts
* Questions what our responsibility as humanitarians is? Can’t just focus on life saving and social aspects and livelihoods. Need to look at sustainability, environment is equally or more important.

**Summarised notes:**

*Report details:*

* Report: looking through an environmental lens
* Implications of people having more choice
* 3 pg shelter sector specific briefing note
* Recommendations: report is new and scary, by students without experience in humanitarian sector. Gives an interesting perspective, consultancy client-driven view, balances risks and choice

*General overview of Shelter/Cash/Environment:*

* Shelter is a resource intensive sector and sustainable sourcing of materials only works in regulations, (people find black markets etc.). But questions arise about how HA know if markets are sustainable or not.
* Cash = choice, can be a process of recovery
* If people have choice, don’t know where they are spending it vs cash for work – structured
* Conditionality and restrictions can guide people to make informed decisions
* Questions if HA should do volume or quality? Questions over what is quality? Quality should include environment, more than just building materials
* Within coordination systems
* ‘New’ ways of doing things, choice/dignity element is driving cash forward e.g. no restrictions/choice
* Malawi, mango trees are being cut down, erosion due to no trees is reducing fields, cutting down trees to fire bricks for housing, shelter cluster was contributing to breakdown. Not looking holistically.

Q: **Giulia Frontini**   
Does the report look at the implication of environmental issues but also by context? E.g. urban or rural? Teasing out differences at a later stage would be interesting?

A: **Jake Zarins**  
Report breaks it down into markets, protection (e.g. siting/gathering put at risk) and (?) risk and opportunity comes under these banners. Urban more access to resources...   
Example: getting FFS sourced timber in Kenya. Guidance needs to be reversed, how do we responsibly source materials, do we have enough money to mitigate?

Session: QSAND

Time: 11:50-12:30

Facilitator(s): Yetunde Abdul

Notetaker: Wongani Mwanza

\*International Day for Disaster Reduction - Friday 13th October 2017\*

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* Sustainability and resilience, QSAND
* Shelter and Settlement Sustainability resilience tool
* There was a gap for the humanitarian sector, there wasn’t really anything that scored humanitarian projects in a comprehensive way. It’s exactly what BREEAM does in the construction industry.
* Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters, started in 2014
* A lot of development organisations were in the process of developing the concept and idea of QSAND
* BRE - It is owned by a charity. The BRE group is gifted into the BRE trust to fund research and experiments. To build a better environment and world for everyone. Promoting and developing a sustainable environment for all. Not driven by commercial markets
* Not overkill, creating something to promote and facilitate sustainable approaches to relief, recovery and reconstruction in shelter.
* Overseas building notes, they have been developing over the past 30-40 years.
* A sustainable comprehensive approach to reconstruction to guide and inform and create a framework
* Pre-assessment tool (Provides early information that can be taken and considered when thinking about sustainability even before a disaster hits. Making decisions beforehand, making simpler choices) and Core assessment tool.
* They are working with CRS, in Nepal and in the Philippines.

**Summarised notes:**

* Quantifying Sustainability in the Aftermath of Natural Disasters, started in 2014
* There was a gap for the humanitarian sector, there wasn’t really anything that scored humanitarian projects in a comprehensive way. QSAND is exactly what BREEAM does in the construction industry but within the humanitarian sector.
* A lot of development organisations were in the process of developing the concept and idea of QSAND, and now a few organisations are using QSAND.

Session: Shelter Projects

Time: 11:50-12:30

Facilitator(s): Joseph Ashmore

Notetaker: Wongani Mwanza

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* The Shelter Projects book has over 200 case studies of different shelter programmes
* There are explicit examples of learning from each of them
* Diversity of what has been done in shelter, including discussions, picture sand case studies with some recurring similarities
* How do you identify beneficiaries to receive assistance?
* Every context is entirely different
* **Where do we go from this? Do we keep collecting case studies? Why do we do it?**
* To learn from past experience
* Learning about how you can do it
* Used academically
* Finding the right people is difficult for compiling the document
* **Next:** Comparative compliations
* Urban-related compilation
* Sherlterprojects.org website
* What case studies do you have and can contribute in the future?
* We need more, collecting case studies etc.
* Contact us on ideas on how to progress it and take it forward and on specific case studies for collection for the next idea.

**Summarised notes:**

* The Shelter projects book is available for all to access, either online or physically. It contains over 200 case studies of different shelter programs. The latest edition is 2015-2016.
* There is a question as to whether the Shelter Projects should keep on collecting case studies, and if so, what should it do with the case studies? Where do we go from here?
* There is a possibility of considering the use of comparative compilations of the projects, so that lessons can be learnt from past responses and applied differently
* Organisations should get in touch to find out more, especially as they are collecting more case studies and need contributions for the future.

Session: Breakout: sustainable materials

Time: 13:40-14:40

Facilitator(s): Vera Kreuwels

Notetaker: Kester Bunyan

**Main outcomes / findings:**

Introduction to timber resource library.

Discussion of sustainability; is it appropriate.

If technology or products/materials are introduced wrongly it will take 10-15 years before you can reintroduce them; perception of a new material as for the poor will mean that other strata of society do not adopt it, no matter how good the product is.

**Summarised notes:**

Xylarium (wood library).

80yrs ago- what is the value of the wood itself. 10% of worlds trees 80000types BRE: wood properties. Kew however has fruit bark etc; systems and biology.

Sustainable? (These timbers came from virgin forests).

Now timber comes from plantations; teak often only 15 yrs old-so may be different structurally. Timber library is used for ID purposes-looks at slide collection (anatomically underpins and can find out whether timber is from a sustainable source when it arrives on the docks) Chain of custody element, not depleting resource.

Low env impact. 75% imported things in construction, so need to ensure resp in supply chain. 1920-30 Tree in Burma felled, finished in Uk. Now resources are adding value in country; more money to local economy. (so tree felled in burma, turned into furniture in Burma)

What is available, what are the skills needed. Social value (grown in Britain; takes into acc apprentiships, jobs etc, like buy local).

Red list; most rare/threatened. Can suggest alternatives.

Materials faster grown are often weaker, and lower durability; understanding the material is the key.

Chemicals; some tropical woods have 30% extractable chemicals; always the tropicals have more. Trees can be renewed. So key is management.

BRE involved in connected to local forestry commissions and interest in climate change-will the wood still be used or relevant with changes to climate. Grass etc used for roofs, also have similar issues.



Sustainable?

Does this fit the community, would it do harm, will they understand? Can they still build as they always have?

How can we introduce methods and materials that don´t cause harm?

Haiti-

Structures were concrete and poorly built, but most vernacular buildings survived.

Traditional to build your house over time. Belief systems are imortant; 2 front doors, 1 back: voodoo spirit thinking.

Cordaid developed a small prototype house: Strong foundation , wrapped with tarp, then became a Tshelter and eventually a permanent shelter. Prototyped with 13 different wall techniques.

Techniques were scored by sustainability and vulneralbility criteria.

Cement with chainlink won (17/20 17/18 in the 2criteria above)

How sustainable was it really? No one used it in their own self recovery. Self recovery was mainly concrete block. So new ideas and materials were not adopted.

Social component: what/who makes a particular decision on a product: is it the technique or is it the people.

Effects;

What would a new form of concrete do to the market?

Talk to the people, will they like it?

How can we get the new product to work in a place like St Maarten.

Discussion

Even if material is good; if you don´t have enough time to introduce it properly, it is not good to introduce it. (if you are only staying a year but need 5-10) know what you can achieve.

Be the market.

If you introduce it wrongly, it will be 10-15 years until you can introduce it again and for it to be accepted.

Household level is core, but are there other levels to engage in the processes? (is the most vulnerable helpful; new products are often not for the target group). If the material is good, but gains an image of being for poor people, it will not be accepted in other strata of society.

Pride and trends: use of brick in more urban areas; trend and repetition, who can showcase your material?

Are we using “sustainability” in the right context? Not the 3 pillars. We have been talking about making a product more sustainable.

Market creates artificial demands. Embodied energy/ lifecycles.

Reality is short term and in an emergency situation. Are we actually equipped to make these material or product decisions quickly? Are architects? Are engineers??

There are many tools to use to find out what to use. But sometimes background interests change the outcome. Govt. influence, etc.

Bangladesh; lack of timber, needed an alternative. So used RC rebar system that was cheaper. This is a success. Will people lose their livelihoods or roles within a chain?

Need to mix up engineers, social skills, pull everyone together to ask what are we trying to achieve?

is it housing? Is it looking at things longer term?

Repairabilty, perhaps 3 year cycle of repair is OK if the knowledge is there in the community to repair.

How do we measure success?

Humanitarian minimum standards, but we have to go further.

Session: What is strong enough? (Structures Lab) PSB

Time: 13:40-14:40

Facilitator(s): BRE + Bill Flinn

Notetaker: Zac Skeates

**Main outcomes / findings:**

Potential for BRE to test the simpler vernacular designs found in disaster affected populations.

Communicating safer is not completely safe, and reliance on this safer message should be with caution.

Risk perception is individualistic and therefore the individuals assessing whether their homes are subjective and based on the reliance on their house as a need.

Other aspects of the home, space and usage, are more important than the safety of the house.

**Summarised notes:**

***Tour of BRE strength laboratory.***

*Bending, loading, how do materials behave under pressure?*

*The industry hasn’t engineered curve projections.*

*Modern Laboratory to test the integrity of materials. Testing contributed to the British building standards.*

*What can be done locally?*

*If BRE and humanitarian aid agencies can work together, existing methods in other countries can be examined and data can be fed back to local populations.*

*Creating guidance that is interpretable for the local populations that don’t have access to codes.*

*3-D printers are challenged when producing larger scale projects.*

*Construction has traditionally been a wasteful process.*

* *Can we reuse the resources that have been wasted?*
* *Can we change the process to reduce wastage?*

**Bill Flinn**

Optimising resilience and sustainability.

How ethical is it to promote unsafe process?

Marginalised communities are built inadequate to standard, with no code, and have to face disasters; typhoon blow them away, earthquakes cause them to fall over.

Quality or quantity?

What is strong enough?

Context is key- typhoon won’t do as much damage with timber as an earthquake with heavy rooves.

Communicating safer is not completely safe, and reliance on this safer message should be with caution.

Risk perception is individualistic and therefore the individuals assessing whether their homes are subjective and based on the reliance on their house as a need.

Other aspects of the home, space and usage, are more important than the safety of the house.

Need is greater than resource. How do we then deal with helping people make their housing safer?

Suggesting an economic benefit to preparation and safety messages.

Session: CAT 5 Resilient (Wind tunnel)

Time: 13:40-14:40

Facilitator(s): BRE and Tim White

Notetaker: Wongani Mwanza

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* It is important to find out the direction of the prevailing wind for a project.
* With a tent, having the eave end facing the prevailing wind is better than having it on the gable end as a higher wind speed would be needed to create great damage
* 100mph is up to category 3
* Window breakage / openings within buildings is a factor to consider as the pressure coming in through window breakage then causes roofs to fall off etc.
* It is very difficult to say that you can have a Category 5 resistant building
* Wind is complex
* Not only the strength of the house, but it is also the whole environment
* Trees around it can be an issue as well
* Securing the roof after and before the hurricane
* To what level should we be able to build?
* Not about the category but the maximum wind speed
* Pressure
* Question of if we should find an evacuation shelter, or buildings that can have spaces for people to hide away? As preventing damage from happening is very difficult. What are you trying to do? Prevent loss or save lives?
* Saving lives through preventing further damage to the house
* Measures for a safe room? Safe toilet? Safe space?
* Coastal issues with water surge
* Fisher communities mainly worry about their boats and a safe place to hide. Not necessarily about the buildings
* Acceptance of risk, what do they accept to lose and what do they not want to?
* Higher value on livelihoods when they know that they can just rebuild their house
* Philippines, permanent housing still empty outside the settlement areas, non-build areas

**Summarised notes:**

* Wind is a complicated environmental factor to consider
* It is difficult to make a building Category 5 resilient as other factors such as window breakage from debris need to be factored in.
* Window breakage from debris can lead to uplifted roofs due to the build-up in pressure
* It is important to find out the direction of the prevailing wind for reconstruction purposes
* Having the eave end of a tent facing the prevailing wind is better than having it on the gable end as a higher wind speed would be needed to create great damage

Session: Breakout Session- Group 5- Measuring Resilience (Shelter Exhibit)

Time: 13:40 - 14:40

Facilitator(s): Yetunde Abdul + Livia Mikulec

Notetaker: Lamis Jamil

**Summarised notes:**

* **What is resilience? What does it mean in the long term?**
* “BREEAM New Construction” book
* **How to measure resilience across different sectors?**
  + Habitat for Humanity
    - New indicators for risk reduction + resilience (for households)
    - Satisfaction-type indicators
    - BREEAM post-occupancy evaluation, aka “aftercare”
  + Building resilience back
    - Long-term resilience eg. in the case of an annual hurricane season
  + ARUP International Development
    - Community-scale resilience - not indicators but framework to understand impacts
  + Rockefeller - urban resilience - a lot of indicators
* One term “resilience” : different definitions + applied differently….complex….so how to measure it?
* DRR and Resilience Indicator Bank- for different sectors: agriculture, livelihoods, etc. -- has different outcomes. Therefore, **is it useful to measure resilience - for every situation? Is it flexible?**
* **Beyond SPHERE? Can we look only at shelter & settlements? Or should we look at different sectors & bring them together? …** not different to ARUP’s approach
* **Setting up a resilience center at BRE.** - can’t be physical resilience alone (e.g. floods etc) ...social is also needed + technical
* **Measuring resilience: if you buy into it, you’ll be using it like it’s meant to be used. (**For BREEAM, it doesn’t matter which manual you open)
* BREEAM, QSAND Indicator Bank: not just hard but soft stuff: durability, material resilience, adaptation to climate change, energy
* **Settlements vs. shelter in resilience:** BREEAM spatial planning/master planning (in Dutch) - impacts on community cohesion. Privacy & safety issues can reinforce crime and feelings of being unsafe
* BREEAM- scoring mechanism across projects; **performance comparability is important for BREEAM** as it is essential for success. Free tool.
* **How to benchmark** **resilience with its different aspects, make it comparable and aim for something?**
* **People’s perception of own self-efficacy- affects measurement of what they can do or implement**
* **Resilience is complicated**-systems-engineering approach or **whatever you are going to use to measure it- should be able to take that complexity**
* **Measuring indicators separately may not give the required result when they interact together**
* **How far outside the shelter sector do we need to look for measuring resilience?**
* **Resilience is the ability to recover from stresses in every facet of life**...but it is difficult to capture the data from everything
* **RedCrescent: resilience is not just the ownership of livelihood assets but the qualities associated with them (the strength, durability)**
* Shall we use **qualitative or quantitative indicators? Vulnerability is subjective….too many opinions- it depends on what you are trying to do with it.**
* Resilience- can it be captured through sophisticated risk assessment?
* **What do we want to measure resilience for?** Is it for impact measurement purpose? Is it for DRR to assess how their project strengthens their ability to coordinate with partners/technical advisors?
* **Resilience is not going back to the same thing because you don’t want it to happen again- how can you change?**
* Resilience as a risk assessment for urban contexts too
* **Measuring recovery vs. resilience** (is it just institutional?)
* **Knowledge transfer gap:** After Typhoon Haiyan, people know the build back better principles (Habitat) but are they implementing it? …. **Lack of follow-up and lack of technical knowledge support**
* **How to measure resilience success in the long-term?** When people are not translating it to everyday life?...
* BREEAM- environment and innovation
* Brazil: behaviour change and how people interact with the environment
* **What are you resilient *to*? Concept of “acceptable risk”**

Definition of resilience in QSAND manual**Session:** Living with floods

**Time:** 13.50-

**Facilitator(s):** BRE & Tim White (not present) /Steven Garnen/ ARUP

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes / findings / photos:**

* Flood resistant housing in the UK should include modern technology which has the capacity to be mainstreamed
* Importance of educational programmes and training was discussed
* Crucial to plan for type of flooding, understand how the water will reach the building
* In Pakistan, it was important to challenge perceptions of common building myths and making small adjustments to houses with new technologies

**Summarised notes:**

*Discussion about flood resistant house built at BRE site*

* In response to UK floods & EU learning, not on the radar for construction or insurance investing in resilience
* Different scenarios: rising ground water, rain water events, river overflow.
* Houses can be made resilient against rising ground water: hole for sumps and pumps, membrane fitted on walls, self-sealing, sub floor drain channel around edge, drains connected to sump, sub-floor cavity drain; established technology.
* Modern refurbishment e.g. types of insulation, rendering is natural cement, electrics hang from above not on ground level, flood resistant doors, non-return valves on toilet, 24hr battery alert system.
* UK has no public safety insurance, mainly private sector. No checklist for flood risk, mainly through modelling and mapping.
* Property flood resistant database - certified surveyor takes flood measures and insurers will see database.

Q: Are you going to change building regulations as this is expensive to implement?   
A: Government grants allowed some properties to be retrofitted. 90% has been in resistance products e.g. external door guards, however this shows that companies are less into internal resilience.   
Contacted by DEFRA and formed industry round table focused on increased ownership and created action plan and task groups. Concluded that there is not much in terms of standards or certification of products, not enough focus on training e.g. installers.   
Importantly groups are looking at behavioral changes in communities.

Q: How do small time builders etc. learn these techniques?

A: Educational courses, training companies, Cumbria showcase – (installing resilient measures in 3 areas), IT channels, awareness

Q: How sensitive are these techniques to quality of workmanship installing it?   
A: Lots of examples of products fitting things incorrectly based on lack of skills. Crucial to bring in trained surveyors, auditing, certifications

*Discussion about flood resistant houses in Pakistan:*

* Pakistan: 18million people affected 2010-2013; Shelter Cluster helped build 180,000 inc: IOM – 70,000 houses. Lime stabilizer in mud bricks. Small adjustment to vernacular houses introducing new technologies. Broad variety of types of shelter response.

Testing principles to disprove common myths (plinths/different types of mixing for bricks and rendering etc.) Session: Plenary- Knowledge Exchange

Time: 16:00 - 17:00

Facilitator(s): Eefje Hendriks

Notetaker: Lamis Jamil

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* How to get the message of self-recovery across? How to communicate it?
* Examining completely independent recovery: lessons from the Philippines
* Knowledge-based intervention: the relationship between needs-assessment, identifying and using the existing knowledge network, and the importance of getting the message across in building back safer

**Summarised notes:**

* 85% recover completely by themselves without humanitarian or governmental assistance
* 5 students from Netherlands doing field research - looking for location and suggestions on methodology and co-authors/researchers
* Do a **needs-assessment** before going to the situation to see what is the best way of presenting the knowledge to communities
* The message doesn’t always come across with training...so we need a “longitudinal view” … How to have control of the situation, be able to hit the right spot and make an impact
* **Examining Narrow perspective of self-recovery- Completely independent recovery.** Money was provided but no technical assistance- How do people do it themselves?
* **Philippines:**
* Mapping the knowledge needs in the situation: what priorities do they have, what knowledge is already available to them, what do they understand of it, what knowledge exchange habits do they already have, how do they communicate, what is the existing knowledge network?
* After natural disaster, the motivation to apply knowledge increases yet it also goes down. **Need to find the right moment where access to money and material is going up and find the moment when people are in design phase of the structure and people are more likely to adopt this knowledge.**
* Transfer is not the way to go but **EXCHANGE way of communication is the way to go**
* Big gap between knowledge and policy/practice: **How do our guidelines get adopted in practice and policy?**
* Trying to understand how do people communicate and what do they exchange? Which trusted person do they go to for answers? What information do they find? Try to strengthen their existing knowledge network to lead to an intervention that leads to safer housing
* Different outcomes:

-Methodology: how to do an assessment of knowledge of a situation before coming with intervention?

-insight into knowledge needs?

-fail and success factors that might affect adoption

* **It’s very important to develop methodology that tests effectivity of the interventions being done:** How to test in long term, What are the effects…. (collaboration with Jamie and Charles to see how to test more than one intervention to compare which has the biggest influence on adoption + insight to effectivity of at least one intervention)
* Philippines (to be done in Nepal after)...surveys, focus groups, observations to find out existing knowledge network; apply the same methodology and same set of questions to Nepal and also do an intervention
* A lot of differences between all these houses in the Philippines...every community has own struggles
* What's in common: a lot of households don’t have the opportunity to improve their own situation because of livelihood issues…..yet no clean water or food…..so recovering their house is time consuming….3.5 years after Haiyan people haven’t started with their house yet
* No experts (people who have knowledge on how to build back a hurricane-- resistant house) were involved in their process…..this was not present in local building school or anything local involved with house reconstruction…...the knowledge about hurricane resistant houses was just not present
* Lack of awareness that it is possible to reconstruct something that is hurricane-resistant ...lack of this makes it hard to start searching for information because you do not think it is possible
* Misconception that the guidelines would be too expensive for them to apply….sometimes it is the case that there is lack of nails, materials…..the guidelines are actually far away from their situation
* If u have money, would you invest it in ur house? Housing is not always the 1st priority in their lives
* **Test the intervention with a step of assessments over a longer time to decide when to do a knowledge-based intervention**
* People who are illiterate and/or don’t communicate on paper find it hard to find the interventions effective
* **Call for collaboration with this research projects.** Suggestions for what focus groups would be interested, what survey questions to add, what assessments may be of use, what intervention designs suggested to test

Session: Thermal Comfort

Time: 15:00-15:30

Facilitator(s): Dr. Dima Aldabra

Notetaker: Zac Skeates

**Main outcomes / findings:**

Thermal comfort is not a luxury and is considered to be the no.1 concern whilst living in shelter.

We need to think about how climate affects people within their recovery process.

**Summarised notes:**

University of Bath

Thermal comfort is not a luxury.

Zaatari, Jordan (2012).

People appropriated their space with how they live, with awareness to their neighbours and heat.

Azraq Camp

Grid layout meant less flexibility. Self-made windows to relieve heat turned into sand entry points.

People resulted to showering with clothes in to stay damp and cold. Other methods included spraying floor with water.

Of all concerns, heat and cold within the shelter led to the most unsatisfied response.

Neutral temperature: 22.8C

Women within hot climates will were the equivalent thermal insulation (clothes) as the British population do in the United Kingdom

Session: Pakistan Shelter Flood Resilience

Time: 15:00-15:30

Facilitator(s): Tim White IOM

Notetaker: Zac Skeates

**Main outcomes / findings:**

Lime stabilised earth can create water resilient, affordable, low carbon construction but training is essential.

Half measures do not work.

Concrete stabilisation is more expensive and harsher on the environment but easier to get right.

**Summarised notes:**

Pakistan

3 years of extreme flooding

18 million affected

Many different organisations contributed to the recovery process.

2 key outputs:

1. Research Report
2. Methodology
3. Key Finidngs
4. Shelter Guide

Defining what is an effective shelter?

* Safe and resilient
* Acceptable to occupant
* Sustainable

800 surveys, using 2 surveyors for quantitative and qualitative data.

12 different panels tested in heavy rain conditions.

Lime stabilised soil is highly effective.

Solid foundation is highest priority.

Concrete stabilisation is more expensive and harsher on the environment but easier to get right.

Testing in front of others showcased the use of soil stabilised housing and convincing the local populations of methodology.

Session: Local Building Practices

Time: 16:20-16:40

Facilitator(s): Olivier Moles

Notetaker: Wongani Mwanza

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* Centuries of local experiences worth enhancing
* Local solutions and strategies: Post-disaster in the Philippines, people knew very well how to build an emergency shelter. From this they re-used salvaged materials in order to have a form of early recovery leading to a **full reconstruction** of their dwelling.
* To improve on the existing, we first need to **understand** it
* To identify what is good and the weaknesses within the existing, to **improve** on it
* In 2007, doing a deliberation of what happened in Kuakata in South East Bangladesh.
* Maintain local building culture, and discussing options on how to rebuild with existing methods.
* Sirajdikhan, long-term flooding issues. People live expecting to know that there will be further floods. Building higher, people having a place within the house to take care of the surrounding.
* After 2009, they were committed to do something about the flooding. Working in all the areas of Bangladesh. Understanding the local culture of each place, and see if there can be a product that can be better adapted to the local population of the people.
* In each area, what is the typical feature of the house? Strengths and weaknesses?
* Identify who are the people that you need to commit to help to build enough local resources for the project not to just end with one person. But to be able to change the **standards** in the place. Changing policy decisions. Making an impact for people to change the way that they are working in the area.
* From the existing in case of a disaster, they would need to consider whether they need to repair the houses or build an emergency shelter response?
* Repair the existing, or promote housing improvements?
* The **end goal** is to improve the local living condition. Self re-construction. How does the project really impact the local building culture?
* How can we help to make this project to use local materials, local resources, local people to implement the project. Majority of the money in the project to feed the local economy? How do we do this?
* And to feed housing improvements as well?
* How to design the building within the project. **Co-designing** the building. Understanding the strengths and the weaknesses of the local building culture then leads to the preliminary design.
* Validation to the local community to see if it is true about the project. It can last one or two days. If you are sure and understand the strengths of the existing, then it is important to develop a solution to impact the local houses. This revised edition should then be validated with the community.
* Is this construction okay? Is it cost effect? Construct model houses. Feedback to the community. Prototype of house, construction of prototype. Feedback.
* Validate the local building improvements through scientific recognition and validation.
* Solutions at local level. Solutions to dismantle and move the house in less than one hour.
* In the same village, one community is used to living on a lifted house, one is used to living on the land. With the same project, two proposals need to be given. Options for the people. Two approaches.

**Summarised notes:**

* It is important to link tradition and modernity. In order to help those recovering to move on to the future whilst still maintaining a sense of tradition
* Learning from the existing building culture and valuing existing communities’ best practices is important, and it is useful to consider identifying the local craftsmen.
* Think about where the money of the project goes. If you can use local people, then let them do it! Support poverty alleviation.
* Solutions can be solved at the local level. The **end goal** is to improve the local living condition. Self re-construction.
* **Co-designing** the building. Understanding the strengths and the weaknesses of the local building culture then leads to the preliminary design.
* Link action, research and education.

Session: Humanitarian interventions supporting shelter self recovery

Time: 16.40

Facilitator(s): Elizabeth Parker (and Theo)

Notetaker: Kester Bunyan

**Short plenary session covered;**

Findings from a systematic review over 2 years.

Financial, technical or other assistance to construct a shelter.

Since the study is peer reviewed and thorough, what you look at cannot be changed.

Part of a broader program. (7 other reviews)

The so what/what we found out is the bit of use to Shelter practitioners: Theory of change.

Hunt for the best sources; feel they are always out of reach. Finding most covering adequate detail came from the base of the triangle (Data sources). Little or no academic detailed sources for individual situations, they cover bigger areas.

Research conclusions not strong, but there was unfortunately insufficient outcomes on livelihoods etc. but some positive for self reliance etc. (see slide)

Valuable knowledge; ability of households/people to contribute skills; as this plugs gaps (access to materials or labour) if there is corruption etc., so when any factors change, the household itself is not having to manage these risks.

Session: PLENARY

Time: 16.45

Facilitator(s): VICTORIA MAYNARD

Notetaker: KESTER BUNYAN

**Short plenary session covered:**

Lessons from typhoon Haiyan.

Shelter self recovery was a big thing during this emergency, lots of different actors looking at self recovery.

Similar context; different to the 11 programs in the evidence synthesis.

Engaged with a lot of people, narrowed to 6 programs.

What were the unique combinations provided. How do you balance speed/cost/needs of interventions.

Comparing between organisations, what happened over time and what priorities??

Urban planning:

Traditionally; house/community/people but what about areas, or markets; this is a change.

How to link area approaches to regional plans?

Session: Plenary - Building Safety in Shelter Self-Recovery

Time: 16:00 - 17:00

Facilitator(s): Charles Parrack

Notetaker: Lamis Jamil

**Main outcomes / findings:**

* The need for continued collaboration between operational agencies and research organisations to demonstrate a secure methodology and analysis of evidence-based data from the field
* Operational agencies do need to provide their gathered information in more detail and more comprehensively so better judgements and assessments about what happened can be made
* So far, four main findings as to what factors make shelter safer: technical support, adapting local construction techniques, model houses, posters and manuals
* There are some things that come through from an assisted program(?) to an unassisted one(?)

**Summarised notes:**

* The work of Beth and Victoria, Bill Flinn, Eefje has reflected self-recovery from different angles, and has provided evidence for safety within self-recovery
* Stressing collaborations between operational agencies & research organisations with regards to providing really good research and evidence gathering. **Need the reach and in-depth work of operational agencies + skills of research organisations for demonstrating a secure methodology and analysis to be able to rely on results**
* Demonstration of the quality and reliability of the evidence can then be used as a solid base to advocate for donors, the national government, and evidence-based policy
* Operational agencies: gather great data, but struggling to analyze it. **Researchers: need to make sure they are asking the right questions**
* Description of self-recovery: Different from Eefje’s - doing it with people who not only do it by themselves, but with people who do it with some sort of assistance as well. **Self-recovery is about how much control people have about the decisions made for their own self-recovery.**  Sometimes it is assisted, sometimes unassisted.
* **What factors promote greater safety in self recovery? Where is it written? How can we prove it?** There is little evidence about it because the methodology isn’t written up in enough details. **Operational agencies need to describe in MORE DETAIL/more comprehensively so we we can make judgements about what happened) and do better assessments of what happens as a result of it**
* **Findings & Conclusions: What makes shelter safer?**

1-Technical support, training, monitoring (e.g. Olivier’s work) does have an effect but it takes time…so you can only do it if you have time to do it.

2-Adapting local construction technologies: likely to be successful but time consuming to figure out what the local technologies are and then adapt them

3-Model house: effective, but only if people are actually working on the house

4-Poster and manuals-- need better info...evidence is that they work, yet questionable

**Session:** Wrap up

**Time:** 17.50-18.00

**Facilitator(s):** Jamie/Yetunde

**Notetaker:** Emma Weinstein Sheffield

**Main outcomes:**

* Offers for next UKSF: University of Bath would be happy to host
* Care in collaboration with Habitat for Humanity will be happy to organise