

Appendix 2: Webinar transcript

Operational camp management: An introduction to the Camp Management Standards

September 23, 2019

NOTE: This transcript may contain inaccuracies. For a complete recording of the webinar, please visit <https://phap.org/23sep2019>

Angharad Laing: Hello and welcome, everyone. We can get started. My name is Angharad Laing. I'm the executive director of PHAP. That's short for the International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection. My great pleasure to be welcoming everyone to this online session - Operational Camp Management: An Introduction to the Camp Management Standards, organized by PHAP in partnership with the CCCM Cluster.

For those of you who may be less familiar with us, PHAP is a global society of humanitarian practitioners and other stakeholders on the frontlines of assistance and protection efforts worldwide. As a part of its mission, PHAP, as an association, engages this broad community. And we have a great cross-section represented online today, as well as our in-house analytical capacity to help develop and also to help revise standards in the humanitarian sector as well as contribute to other consultation efforts to bridge the gap between policy and practice.

If you'd like to have more information about this stream of work of PHAP or to inquire about a potential collaboration, please do feel free to contact us at any time at Consultations at phap.org.

Now, getting to today's business, we are holding today the first online consultation event on the draft Camp Management Standards which we hope will be the first of several interactive events on this topic. This webinar, and also the survey that preceded it, is an opportunity for practitioners to learn more about the technical area of camp management and the draft Camp Management Standards in their development and also to provide their input on this initiative, which is active and ongoing as we speak.

We will be joined today by a set of experts on camp management from UNHCR, IOM, the Danish Refugee Council and the CCCM Cluster for what I believe will be a very dynamic and interesting discussion.

It's also been very encouraging to see the level of engagement on this topic. We've had hundreds of you completing the pre-event survey which was not a short survey, I will note. There was a lot of work that had to go into responding to that. So thank you very much for the time and thought that you put into that.

We had hundreds of you completing this survey. The deadline was yesterday but we're going to be extending that just a bit. So if you haven't had a chance to complete the survey, you can still do that today. If you do it by the end of the day today, we'll be able to include your inputs in the final report.

I'm looking forward to learning something about the initial highlights. We'll hear that from my colleague Markus Forsberg later in today's events.

I'd also like to point out that the structure of our event today is a bit different from some of our other webinars and that we have a lot of people who are participating in groups together around

the world. So a warm welcome not only to everyone logged in on their individual computers but also those of you who are in groups together. I hope you'll be able to nominate someone in each of those rooms to be able to submit any questions that come up in those groups.

Now, before we get into the meat of our session, I will briefly explain a few technical aspects of the platform we're using today. First, and most importantly, how to submit questions.

If you have questions for the speakers at any time during the event today, please submit them using the Ask a Question box in the lower right-hand corner of your screen.

And please note, if you'd like to ask your question anonymously, make a note of this when you submit it and then we won't mention your name when we pose the question.

Second, you may be seeing some snap polls coming up during the session. These are to gauge your views or experience on the issue being discussed. You should see now a couple of test polls displayed as an example. Just click a response or, for the free text polls as on the right-hand side, click in the textbox, enter the response and click Submit. Note that for these polls, all of your answers are automatically anonymous.

If you do encounter any technical problems particularly with the audio on the platform, we would encourage you to jump over to our backup audio live-streaming option. This is very handy in that it uses less bandwidth, but note that it will be audio-only and it won't allow for the same degree of interactivity. So if you're able to stay on the interactive platform that is better. But we have the audio-only stream as a backup.

If you'd like to connect to that, you can click on the Listen link there and you can jump over to the audio-only if you've already run into some issues with this platform.

If you need those links again later in the event, my colleague will be happy to post those in the chat. So just make a quick note in the chat and he'll post those there as well.

Okay. So for our agenda today, we're going to be covering quite a lot of ground. First, to get us started we have brief recorded messages from the Director General of IOM Antonio Vitorino, as well as from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Filippo Grandi, on the critical importance of camp management as well as the Camp Management Standards initiative.

I'll then be asking our panellists to introduce the area of camp management to help us understand what challenges these standards are trying to address.

And then after this, we'll be hearing about how the standards came about as well as the drafting process and also a bit of how practitioners have reacted so far to this initiative in the face-to-face consultations that have been carried out to date, in particular, the consultations in Cox's Bazar and also in South Sudan.

We'll then turn to some highlights that we have already from the pre-event survey that many of you filled in and we'll discuss those results. There were also quite a few questions submitted by participants before the event related to the content of the standards, the structure, implementation, some other issues. We're going to discuss a number of these questions as well as many as we can. I'm sure that there will also be new questions arising in real time during the event.

To the extent that we have time to cover any of those questions, the panellists have kindly committed to answering questions in writing after the event as well. So even if you see we're running short on time, if you've got a great question in mind, please do submit it through the Ask

a Question box and we'll address that in writing and send that as a compilation to everyone after the event together with the event recording.

Now, before getting started with the agenda, I'd like to introduce our guest panellists. Today, we're joined by four speakers, all of whom are experienced practitioners in camp management. We're going to unmute everyone now so you can say a brief hello as I go down through the list.

First of all, Gebrehiwot Ewnetu has worked in emergency response in humanitarian operations for 15 years, first with the Ethiopian government, managing reception sites and camps and responses to protection concerns. Having worked with the Danish Refugee Council since 2012 in various roles and countries, he is currently a member of the DRC emergency team EMPACT as a global emergency specialist for the technical sectors of CCCM protection and emergency response.

Welcome, Gebrehiwot. Great to have you on the line.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Hello, Angharad, and thank you for having me.

Angharad Laing: Our pleasure. We're also pleased to welcome Jennifer Kvernmo who has been the global camp coordination and camp management CCCM Capacity Building Coordinator and Rapid Response officer for IOM since 2013. She worked previously as a practitioner and consultant in the fields of humanitarian assistance and post-conflict programming.

Her experience as a camp manager in Sierra Leone initiated the Camp Management Toolkit widely recognized as a comprehensive reference tool providing guidelines and best practice for camp managers. It's a resource which we will also be discussing today, in particular, how it relates to the new draft standards.

Welcome, Jennifer. Great to have you.

Jennifer Kvernmo: Hi, everyone. Thanks for having us.

Angharad Laing: Then, next, Kathryn Ziga is currently CCCM Cluster Coordinator in Somalia. She happens to be here in Geneva at the moment, so we've got her in the office with us as well. She's been working in CCCM since 2012 in South Sudan and Somalia operations as a camp manager and in cluster coordination having focused, in particular, on community participation and engagement, site planning and improvement and mobile approaches to CCCM.

Welcome, Kathryn.

Kathryn Ziga: Hi, everyone.

Angharad Laing: And then I'm not sure that we've managed yet to connect to Sabit. We're going to try again in a few minutes. We are hoping, we're planning to have with us on the line as well Sabit Juma who has worked with UNHCR as a CCCM Field Associate in South Sudan since 2013. He previously worked with UN-Habitat focusing on land disputes.

Again, we don't yet have Sabit back on the line. He was disconnected but we'll be trying to get him back during the event so, hopefully, he'll be able to come in soon.

So then to get us started, let's first hear the statement from Antonio Vitorino, Director General of IOM, which he recorded specifically for today's webinar.

Antonio Vitorino: Natural disasters and conflict have forced unprecedented numbers of people to seek temporary assistance and protection across the world. Millions uprooted from their homes seek safety in camps or camp-like settings.

As the CCCM Cluster co-lead with UNHCR, the International Organization for Migration works alongside 500 partners around the world to provide dignified and timely services to displaced populations in camps. I'm proud that the CCCM Cluster has drafted Camp Management Standards that draw on the wealth of experience they have consulting with affected communities, humanitarian actors and governments.

These standards will guide the future of humanitarian intervention in camps and ensure that humanitarian actors uphold the rights and dignity of displaced people. They set out best practices for establishing governance structures, coordinating services and assistance across sectors and minimizing and mitigating protection risks.

This webinar is the first step in a comprehensive consultation process with humanitarian practitioners. Camps must remain a last resort in sudden-onset and man-made emergencies. But when they are necessary, it is our responsibility to make sure communities can access life-saving services and live in safety.

We rely on your expertise and diverse experiences to enhance and improve these CCCM Standards and wish you continued success in the critical operational work you do.

Angharad Laing: Thank you. And colleagues at UNHCR have also given us permission to use these remarks from Filippo Grandi, UN High Commissioner for Refugees, which he recorded for a recent meeting on camp management.

Filippo Grandi: Good camp coordination and camp management play a critical role in ensuring the protection and well-being of people who have been uprooted from their homes and communities. Through your direct presence in displaced communities living in camps, transit sites, informal settlements and other collective locations, including in the world's most unstable and insecure areas, you have a unique understanding of the perspectives, aspirations and circumstances of people affected by disaster and conflict.

You play a key role in providing them with a safe environment and in helping them start to rebuild their lives and connect with the societies, communities and opportunities around them. You are also in a position to act as effective and informed advocates for their protection and well-being and to ensure that their voices, perspectives and priorities are actively heard and acted on, not just by aid agencies but by all those whose decisions have an impact on their lives.

I encourage you to continually explore new and innovative ways of amplifying their voices and enhancing your dialogue with them so that we are genuinely accountable to them in all that we do.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you. Great to have those opening remarks to get us launched for this discussion.

Now, I'd like to turn to Kathryn, first of all, to ask a few questions about camp management as a technical sector and the role of camp managers and camp management agencies. So Kathryn, what would you say is the overall goal of camp management as a technical sector?

Kathryn Ziga: Sure the goal of camp management is to improve the living conditions and protection of displaced people and ensure that they have equal access to services provided in the camp.

So camp management agencies are responsible for the overall running of the camp. This includes providing coordination amongst stakeholders, monitoring basic service provision to ensure that minimum standards are met and that everyone can access the services, and working with camp governance structures, such as camp committees or women's committees to ensure that participation of all the population is included.

Camp management actors also ensure that living conditions in camps are dignified and safe and that the camp design and services meet the needs of the population. We also work with local authorities and displaced people to build their capacity to manage future displacement and to work towards durable solutions for the people that are displaced.

Angharad Laing: Perfect. Thanks. We've also received a number of questions from participants, for example, Saidu in Nigeria, Gilbert in DRC and others who would like to know more about the roles and responsibilities of those working in camp management as of course this relates to standards for those practices. Could you perhaps provide an overview of the different job roles that work in camp management?

Kathryn Ziga: Sure. So camp management requires an entire team. It's not just the camp manager. Camp managers oversee the running of a camp but it takes a lot of different people to do this. A camp management team is made up of different people, such as camp officers who are in the sites every single day. There are information managers who support the data management and information being collected in the camp. Sometimes there are registration clerks and database officers to keep records of the populations. There are site planners and engineers who look after the infrastructure. There are community mobilizers who work with the camp governance structures. There are outreach workers who support complaint and feedback or running sensitization campaigns.

And, usually, the majority of people working in a camp are actually residents of this camp or members of the nearby health community.

Angharad Laing: Very helpful. Thank you.

I'd like to turn now to Gebrehiwot as you're coming at this from a bit of a different angle working for an international NGO. Gebrehiwot, do you have something to add on this question about different roles in camp management? Over to you.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Thank you, Angharad. Yes. One thing I would like to say is that although the process system has some of its own requirement for the roles in a camp and you'll have many agencies who will have different requirements placed on them by their donors or by government actors, it's always important to remember that your structure should reflect the needs on the ground and the strategy that you set for yourself.

There have been operations where we've had totally different structures, job descriptions and roles in two camps of the same operation simply because it was determined that it's easier or it maximizes our resources to achieve our aims.

I think NGOs especially should be aware that setting their own strategy, setting their own operational objectives and aims is critical and they should design their functions based on that.

Angharad Laing: Excellent. Thanks a lot. Oh, sorry. Did I interrupt? Go ahead, Gebrehiwot. You had something else to add?

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: No. It's okay.

Angharad Laing: Okay. Very good. So along the same lines of outlining what is camp management, who's involved, I'll go back to you, Kathryn, to ask what are the primary agencies directly involved in camp management?

Kathryn Ziga: So camp management is primarily the role of the government. And so, depending on which country you're in, the camp management is provided by the specific government responsible for displaced people in that country. However, in cases that this role cannot be taken on by local authorities, international and national NGOs or UN agencies might step in to provide the services.

At global level, IOM and UNHCR co-lead the CCCM Cluster and then international and national NGOs are usually the ones providing camp management services. We have over 500 partners in the cluster. For example, in the country I'm working in, some of the international organizations providing camp management are ACTED, Danish Refugee Council, Norwegian Refugee Council. But the majority of the services are provided by national NGOs who are working in the different communities in Somalia.

Angharad Laing: Okay. And then the role of the CCCM Cluster itself in relation to the agencies?

Kathryn Ziga: Sure. So the CCCM Cluster provides the overall coordination of the CCCM interventions at national level in a response. This includes developing the strategy for how you're going to do camp management in a country, ensuring standards are met across partners and in different areas and sites, representing CCCM partners in the inter-cluster working group with the other clusters that are activated in the country and, at sub-national level, providing country-level data for the other clusters and advocating for funding for the partners to be able to implement these projects.

Angharad Laing: Great. And then getting to the fact that there are a variety of different contexts we're looking at here given that many displaced people are not in, so to speak, "traditional camps" but rather dispersed in urban contexts or living in informal camps or similar. What is the role of camp management in these situations? Does this lead to overlaps, perhaps, with other areas?

Kathryn Ziga: So doing camp management in an out-of-camp or dispersed camp setting, we apply the same principles as the traditional camp management atmosphere but you just have to adapt to the context. So we still provide information on services being delivered in sites and we still coordinate the response at site level. It just might be for dozens of small camps rather than one formal camp.

We still work with camp committees and we still support the participation of population but it might be using a mobile team or with information centres that serve several camps instead of just one.

It can definitely lead to overlap with partners because, in most situations, were adapting to a different context that hasn't been done before, so it's important that we establish clear roles and responsibilities at the beginning with all actors just to ensure that all the gaps are being covered and that people aren't stepping on each other's toes too much. But it's a lot of dialogue but it's not impossible by any means.

Angharad Laing: Excellent. Thank you. And turning once again to Gebrehiwot, do you have anything to add on this question of different contexts?

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Two points I would like to make. The first is that when we're talking about different contexts, there is a tendency sometimes to include urban context for cities or villages already existing or some human settlements that are already existing when there's a displacement into them for NGOs or the humanitarian world in general to consider them as part of something where we'd established camp management.

Usually, that that should be taken under very strict, much stricter rules. I don't think it's just an expansion of our existing roles because there are already existing municipal and administrative bodies there, or they should be, that should that should be able to provide the services that top managers would otherwise provide.

For example, if we're talking about the monitoring services, whether it's the service for water or health] or providing the dressing or things like this, existing municipal and government authorities should have taken that role on where they exist.

So it's not simply a matter of planning. You're replacing. It's not simply a matter of expanding your existing structure or responsibility. We would be replacing an existing authority and we will be doing it perhaps to the detriment of the overall operation at times.

So it is a much more serious decision, I think, and it shouldn't be conflated with simple top management in that sense. That's one point.

The second point is that we should always assess the impacts we will have when we do that. When we're taking on a camp that's being established anew and a new camp is being established by the authorities and we're supporting that, it's one thing to go in there and establish new systems.

In those cases where a government or administration is withdrawing from that responsibility, we should always consider whether it's worth advocating for them to take on that responsibility or even challenging humanitarian or government decisions that humanitarian actors take on that responsibility. So that is much more difficult, I think. The extension or responsibility than just going in to manage a new camp in a displacement or an emergency.

That was all that I wanted to add.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you. Let's see. We have a question that's come in. Let me just... I think I'll take a moment here actually to ask this question to you, Gebrehiwot, and then perhaps to Kathryn as I think it's pertinent to this kind of first discussion about defining camp management.

So Regina has asked how long does it normally take for a CCCM to become fully operational post emergency? Perhaps you could give us a bit of context there about how things work in your experience in terms of the timing, first, Gebrehiwot.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: In terms of the timing, I think I'll let Kathryn say more about the coordination aspect. As for a top management team, depending on the agency there, of course, it will take us anywhere from two days to a week, depending on prevailing conditions, government acceptance and our financial situation of course.

But that doesn't mean that once you establish it, it's done. Even in emergency, the first three to four months camp management will be taking on more roles or changing its structure depending

on the day-to-day needs. Every time you get an influx, every time you get a new population there will be a new dynamic, depending on the country you're in or the location, there will be various factors that will force you to change. So it is an ongoing process.

And the establishment side, of course, there are standards to what we say when we're established. We have X amount of people doing Y amount of jobs but it's an ongoing process at the beginning of an emergency, at least.

That's my response to that.

Angharad Laing: Perfect. Thanks a lot. Over to you, Kathryn, for the coordination perspective.

Kathryn Ziga: Sure. I agree with Gebrehiwot for sure that, for camp management, within the first week of displacement or when you have access to a population, camp management can become effective. For cluster coordination or camp coordination, it takes a bit longer.

For example, in Somalia, the cluster was activated in 2017 to respond to the drought, and I would say it took about a month, probably, for us to operationalize the cluster doing the information gathering on what the response should look like, meeting with the government to understand what roles the agencies would take and what the government would do. And then a lot of it is really based on training of partners.

Since camp management was new to Somalia as a sector, but people have been working in camps for years so they had the basis down, but we really had to work on training of the government and the partners to understand how CCCM would look in the country. So I would say it took at least one month but, probably, up to six for us to have an impact in the inter-cluster working groups and with all the response plans and everything and to get partners.

At this point, it has been two years and I think we are up to 15 partners, but it's been a process for sure.

Angharad Laing: Terrific. Thank you so much. Now, having heard these initial perspectives on camp management as an area of work and how its conceptualized, how it works in practice, it's time to turn to the initiative to create Camp Management Standards. For this, I'd like to turn to Jennifer.

You have been involved in this since the very beginning, so I'd like to start with the question where did the idea come from for the Camp Management Standards and why are they needed? Over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Kvernmo: Thank you. So the idea for Camp Management Standards has been in existence for a while, I would say over 10 years. When I joined the support team in 2013, there was already the idea that we could develop a sphere companion and that it would be a fairly straightforward process to kind of just write out the Camp Management Standards then we could share them and it would be widely agreed.

As it happened, maybe we were a little bit naive in how that would actually transpire because all kinds of different political agency views started coming in and saying like, "No, this is really important that we have this and it's really important that we have this," and the process stopped.

So it was really strange because everyone was agreeing that it was important for us to have standards and yet there wasn't a whole lot of vision about what those standards would actually provide once they were there and once they were drafted. So it's taken us a while to refocus that.

And I would say, from 2017, there's been a lot more agreement about why they're needed, and they're needed really because we need benchmarks. We need to be able to work a little bit faster. Gebrehiwot and Kathryn have just talked a lot about how hard it is to get a cluster up and running or to find partners to work with or to get government agreements, but if we had set benchmarks that could measure performance or that could provide a really structured way to do capacity building or to build a response during a sudden-onset emergency or to guide and harmonize practice between different camps, and to say this is the basic minimum level that we would want to see in every single location, then it would be a lot easier for us to be able to respond more quickly.

So there are a lot of reasons why they're needed but I think we're a lot closer to understanding and to getting agreement on what it can be.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you. So before we move on, I'm going to pause for another question that's just come in. I'm afraid this one is a bit of a provocative one but it seems the perfect time to raise it. So I'll throw this one over to you, Jennifer.

This is coming in from Zachary who says that at a recent sphere standards event that he attended, the question had come up about Camp Management Standards. It was said that CCCM is not included in the most recent update to the sphere standards because “the science of CCCM has not evolved.” What is your perspective on this?

Jennifer Kvernmo: I'm laughing a little bit because, yeah, it is a provocative question. I think that the management of camps has evolved a lot and I think that I would really love to talk to Zachary more in person because maybe he hasn't seen how the science of camp management has been involving as a technical sector. I think humanitarian work, in general, has changed a lot as a technical sector.

So the question was why are there no Camp Management Standards? In the very beginning when we started the Camp Management Toolkit, we had the ability to be able to say that in every particular context, we would need to rely on the local standards. And I think that that's true actually today in relationship to what we're discussing in regards to standards in general and the role of governments.

But if we are looking at the local standards and we're setting minimum benchmarks, then those minimum benchmarks should be measurable in technical standards even in camp management. And if we're talking about social standards as opposed to... which is what camp management would be doing as opposed to technical standards, then I think we could be able to say that representation would be a minimum standard that camp management would want to provide in any camp in the world.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you for that. So getting back to this process which is underway, when did you start the process and what's the overall timeline for getting to a final version?

Jennifer Kvernmo: Angharad, can you repeat the question? I couldn't hear you.

Angharad Laing: My apologies. I had a problem with my mute button. So the question was when did you start the process, the current process, and what's the overall timeline for getting to a final version?

Jennifer Kvernmo: The goal was actually to do it within this year. So the work plan was to do in-person consultations and then online consultations, and we were able to actually consult in person

with almost 200 people this year. I think that that's a phenomenal effort because it really was taken on the side of all the work that all the other clusters have done and all the other operations have done. I see a lot of people from Bangladesh have joined the call and actually one of the consultations was in Bangladesh.

So there's been this concerted effort to finish up the standards this year. However, we haven't been able to finish them because we haven't gotten dedicated funding. So as far as finishing of it, we hope to be able to be done within 2020. The objective would be to not only finish our own camp management minimum standards but then to harmonize those and translate them into other languages and put them into our capacity building materials as well.

Angharad Laing: Great. You mentioned that there have been face-to-face consultations with camp management practitioners in different locations. You mentioned some took place in Bangladesh. What were the other locations where this was carried out?

Jennifer Kvernmo: Sure. We had one in Somalia. Actually, Kathryn did one with her partners. I think there were 11 partners that she consulted with there. There was a really long consultation that took place in South Sudan and, most recently, we had one in Iraq.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you. So we will hear just very shortly about these consultations in a bit more detail, but, in general, how have these results been fed into the drafting process?

Jennifer Kvernmo: Well, they fed into the results in a couple ways. So one, they've reinforced the need for Camp Management Standards. I think that can't be underscored enough because when there is the agreement among us as practitioners and saying, yes, we do need minimum standards and we do need to be able to refer back to something, that has been largely recognized and reinforced through the in-person consultations.

The other kind of result has been around seeking more precision from other people that have been involved in the consultations.

A really practical example, so in the Iraq consultations, there seemed to be some confusion about data protection, for example. And it seems that the people that were involved in the consultation didn't really understand the role of what the camp management data protection would be, so they didn't realize, perhaps, that the camp manager would have access to the names and addresses of where people would come from. So, yes, camp management would still need to be responsible for data protection.

So the in-person consultations have showed us where we need to have more precision, for example. They've showed us where we need to specify a lot more about the roles and responsibilities of the camp management agency and how they don't overlap with other sectors.

Angharad Laing: Thank you. Am I correct in that you've also been involving affected people in the camps directly in the consultations?

Jennifer Kvernmo: Absolutely correct. And that was a decision that I'm really proud of because we have a working group. It's not just one particular agency that's working on this. We have a kind of working group task force that's been dedicated to providing guidance to each other in the Camp Management Standards revision process.

So when we decided to start doing in-person consultations, that was one of the questions that we asked the working group and it was should we be consulting directly with the affected population.

Overwhelmingly, everyone in the working group said yes. Because if we're working directly with people in one of the most traumatic points of their life that we need to make sure that we're actually consulting them about what is it that we as camp management should be representing them on.

That's really what we do in camp settings and so when we're setting our benchmarks and our standards we felt that that was an important step to take as well.

Angharad Laing: Very good. Thank you. We're going to take a brief pause here to try again to bring in Sabit on the line. Everyone will excuse us for just a moment.

Sabit, are you able to hear me?

Sabit Juma: Yes, I'm hearing you now.

Angharad Laing: Excellent. Great that you're able to join again. That's terrific to have you with us. So we introduced you at the beginning, but once again, now that you're actually here, Sabit Juma CCCM Field Associate with UNHCR.

We've just gotten to the point, Sabit, where we'd like to discuss a bit in more detail about some of the face-to-face consultations that were carried out. And as you were a part of carrying out the consultations in Juba in South Sudan, I'd like to ask you a bit about that experience and some of the key points that came out of those consultations.

First of all, who were you trying to reach with these consultations in Juba?

Sabit Juma: Thank you very much. In Juba, we were trying to reach out to IDPs in POC, Protection of Civilians in a couple of settings. We were trying to reach out to our partners, national and international NGOs. We were trying to reach out to the host community.

Angharad Laing: Are there any particular results that you would highlight from the consultations? In particular, was there anything that you found surprising that came as part of the results?

Sabit Juma: Not really surprising but the many points which came out from the different groups, partners and IDPs which was reflecting the reality on the ground especially with regard to the situation in the POC. The issue of space were some of the major issues because in the Protection of Civilians or the POC it is really congested and then it was very difficult to, let us say, to apply any kind of standard. In fact, that one came out and then shown the difficulties, the IDPs are in the POCs, and even the collective centres the same thing.

Angharad Laing: Thank you. I'd like to turn over to Gebrehiwot as I know you were also involved in the consultations. To ask the same question, regarding the highlights of the results of the consultations, was there anything on your side that you found? Over to you, Gebrehiwot. Go ahead, Gebrehiwot.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Surprising, yes. As Sabit said about the POCs because the local's response, the strong responses from the populations there, but one of the things that came out very strongly, I think, was that where we had two camps which were managed by church organizations. And because they had their own separate structure of authorities and they were not part of the humanitarian coordination, we were at first quite worried about how to present humanitarian coordination to them.

But once we got there, we were surprised this was the commonality that we shared in terms of what they felt needed to be done for top management, what basic standards we should agree on.

Of course, given that they have a different structure and their own authorities within the legal context in South Sudan and that they were very separate from the humanitarian world, they also have their own different practices.

But what surprised a lot of us was the basics that we agreed on in terms of objectives for top management and some of the basic necessities that we could agree for. Now, that's all like that.

Angharad Laing: All right. Thank you. A follow-up question, first, to you, Gebrehiwot, then also to Sabit. You mentioned that coming together of different perspectives. An interesting example of the church organizations involved in management of a couple of the camps. Were there other differences in views that you found? For example, between staff of NGOs versus those working for UN agencies or views perhaps of affected people in the camps. Did you see any other interesting differences in views of people working in different kinds of organizations or from different perspectives? First, to Gebrehiwot.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Yes, there were. NGOs, given that, as Sabit mentioned that most of the camp settings there were protection of civilians with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations taking over the administrative role. There were a few camps that were not managed that way but, for the majority, that was the case.

There were very different opinions about the overall humanitarian objectives we should meet, I would say, more between the DPKO and the rest of the humanitarian world rather than between humanitarian agencies. Of course there were differences in opinion in terms of what we should do for a particular camp or what policy we should implement between, let's say, IOM and DRC and of course that's quite normal and common. But there was a novel mismatch of objectives in terms of what we are doing there between DPKO and the rest of the humanitarian community. I think that played out quite a lot in our conversations there and it did affect, of course, how the population in these POCs responded.

Having said that, our primary goal during the consultation was to take up the humanitarian standards so we didn't focus too much on the DPKO's side of the opinion had to say, or we didn't reflect the DPKO's opinion too much.

Angharad Laing: Got it. Thank you. So back to you, Sabit. What do you recall in terms of different views on the standards, in particular, between staff of NGOs versus people working for UN agencies or other differences you may have encountered in the consultations? Over to you, Sabit.

Sabit Juma: Yeah. In fact, that was mentioned. For example, if you take the issue of the POC, you'll find that it is not the government who is the in charge as administrator but it is the UNMISS. Then NGOs are working there and then camp management is also one of the NGOs is working inside. So when it comes to issues of security, for example, it is the UNMISS and then... in fact, their role, their responsibility they are sometimes challenging and then some are having this different opinion that now how we can work.

But, otherwise, they are working together, the UNMISS, RRC and then the NGOs. But, yes, that was one of the differences shown there.

Again, in the collective centres, also we have seen like in one of the collective centres, as mentioned by Gebre, it is managed by the church] and then when they come together, the facility situation there it is difficult because he cannot earn any money to the facility even sometimes he tried to ask the government to support but the government cannot.

And then when you see another camp, people who came out from the POCs, IDPs were asking there that now why people are protecting the UNMISS by believing it but for them they are not protected and they are just left like that.

So I think these are the different opinions around the issues of responsibility regarding the security and also the roles in the POC and in the collective centre.

Angharad Laing: Thank you. Now, before we get back to talking a bit more about the content of the standards. I would like to go back to Jennifer as she was involved in the consultations in Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh.

Now, having heard the points that Sabit and Gebrehiwot have raised from the Juba consultations, did you see any similarities in the consultations in Bangladesh? Over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Kvernmo: I think the issues at Cox's Bazar were really different than the issues that they were facing in South Sudan. But one of the main differences that we saw was that the NGOs were much more focused on the precision of the details of the document. For example, there was quite a lot of feedback around the last section or the fifth standard around exit strategies and in-camp closure. So they were very helpful, those consultations, in refocusing what were the main camp responsibilities at operational level.

But I think when we talk to the camp communities, I was so touched by both of the consultations with the affected population about how thankful they were to the humanitarian agencies, how much trust and responsibility and objectivity that they felt through the SMS agencies' help. And I felt like that was really, really a great feedback.

They also gave us really details about the importance of consulting different people. For example, in the consultation with men, the focus group discussion there they talked a lot about, in the representation section, actually who would be the right people to be involved in the representation of their population.

So, for example, they pointed out the special and particular role that widowed women held. And, for example, they also were able to put a prioritization on services for common services. So whereas a humanitarian view would come in and say, "Oh, let's build a child-friendly space here," they prioritized their religious practice as the most important common space that should be within a facility.

I felt that that was really useful information back to the humanitarian population there. And that level of detail and that contribution from the consultations would allow us to have a lot more precision and a lot more differentiation, kind of if you think about it from the advice back to the camp management agency who would be doing that job.

Angharad Laing: Excellent. Thank you. Now, in reviewing the questions that we received just before this webinar, and indeed during the webinar now, we have a lot of questions coming from colleagues who are based in Bangladesh. You noted yourself at the beginning we have a lot of colleagues from Bangladesh on the line right now. And a lot have questions many of which are centred around this issue of the relationship between humanitarian organizations and the government.

So the theme here is looking at settings where, as Moses says, the national government has put in place restrictions that may run counter to the objectives of your agency, asking how would the standards approach this problem.

Another colleague saying that, as humanitarian workers, we're taught that we need to negotiate with government stakeholders. Do the standards provide any guidance on this? Should the standards provide any guidance on this?

Another example from Saidu, what is best practice when government actors are responsible for going against primary protection concerns? He raises examples of data protection, corruption, even assaults on beneficiaries. Are the standards going to deal with this area?

A challenging series of questions, but given the context that we're talking about, could I go back to you with that, Jennifer, and see what are your reflections on those questions. I'm sure they must have come up as well in the context of the face-to-face consultations.

Jennifer Kvernmo: There were a lot of questions. Maybe we could take one. And I think the interesting part about governments, we have many governments that are working at national level as camp managers themselves. I think that that provides a real opportunity to build understanding about what are humanitarian principles. And if government is working in the role at site level then what are the best practices and what would be the way to best uphold those standards in any particular displacement setting.

So the consultations that we've done and that I've been involved in and the standards themselves don't make reference specifically to the humanitarian standards, although our training materials do in many contexts. And I've seen actually a great number of government officials embrace them and find them useful.

Angharad Laing: Very good. Thank you. I'd like to go with the same set of questions about potential challenges in the relationship between humanitarian actors and government counterparts. Going over to Gebrehiwot, do you have some reflections on this that you could share?

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Yes. To add on to what Jennifer just said, I was in Bangladesh as well during the last two years and I have been a government worker for a long time. So just from that perspective, I would like to say to our colleagues that given that if the CCCM Cluster is already established and they have already accepted at some primary level the humanitarian standards or the international legal standards that we are trying to implement or support in the implementation, as Jennifer said, they would have already formally accepted somehow most of what we've said, so most of what we're trying to do.

So in that light, at the local level, yes, there will be a lot of challenges. But every NGO or INGO needs to strategize how to overcome those challenges. Sometimes it's by going at higher levels or through coordination. I don't know if Kathryn and others or Jennifer has something to say on that, but having a pre-established set of standards that have already agreed before we enter an operation, so governments know what we're about to do or what we're trying to do, and they give their formal acceptance of this goes a long way to helping us establish that access and establish a standard of working even with the government.

Of course day-to-day things will change and day to day there are other difficulties, especially in Bangladesh, which is a very complicated government setup. But imagine the humanitarian standards will help us at least have some form of document already pre-agreed that we can say, well, this is what we were supposed to be doing. This is what we're supposed to achieve in terms of activities. So here you go. And I'm hoping that will help us along the line instead of currently trying to negotiate everything.

Angharad Laing: Excellent. Thank you. That's very helpful. So we're going to move now to the section of the webinar where we're going to be looking briefly through some of the highlighted results from the survey that I think all of you who are online now probably responded to as well as many hundreds of others who weren't able to join the webinar today.

I'd like to turn over to my colleague Markus Forsberg who's been coordinating this process. And, Markus, you can walk us through some of the highlights that you've already managed to glean from the responses.

Markus Forsberg: Thanks, Angharad. So this survey that we just concluded at the first stage of yesterday was designed as the first opportunity for practitioners to provide their input on this drafting process. As such, the primary focus was on the overall scope and purpose of the standards in order to make sure that there is sufficient agreement on some of the fundamental questions before moving further with the drafting process and going to more detailed input.

Second, the survey also gathered more in-depth comment on the content and text of the five standards from those who were willing to engage at this level already now, and these results will also be directly feeding into the next draft of the standard.

As the initial survey deadline was yesterday, I will be providing just some highlights from the first section of the survey on the overall scope and purpose which can help inform our discussion today. Then a more comprehensive report will be presented to the CCCM Cluster and circulated to the survey participants at a somewhat later date once we're done with the analysis.

But as Angharad said before as well, for anyone who wants this last chance to submit their survey responses, they can do so before the end of today, anytime before tomorrow.

So first, a look at the respondents. I was very impressed by the engagement in this survey. A lot of practitioners really went out of their way to provide in-depth comments on the standard. So a few words about who has completed it.

So we had 398 respondents based in 68 countries. There was a quite even mix of those having an international scope of work and those working primarily at the national level. NGO respondents were particularly well represented, but with a large number also from the UN and other inter-governmental agencies. The government, Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, academia, private sector and others made up the remaining 15% of the respondents.

Then, finally, although this consultation's focus really is on the view of humanitarian practitioners, it is important to note that many working in this sector have also been affected by the same types of crises that they are now responding to. So 21% of the respondents reported that they had been displaced themselves in the past. So they also brought that perspective to their responses.

Looking at the first substantive question. This was on the purpose of the standards. So asked to rank how they would prioritize the potential purposes of the Camp Management Standards, the results were quite stark. Three purposes that I at least would consider to be in the area of providing guidance came out well ahead of the others. So preparedness and planning, operational guidance and standard operating procedures.

While, on the other hand, the purposes which are more in the area of accountability, standardization and comparability between contexts, those purposes of standards trail behind considerably.

Also, on the overall purpose, when asked about whether they saw the need for an aspirational standard that defines in an ideal state that needs to be worked towards in all contexts through just continuous improvement. So not necessarily something that can easily be reached or can be reached at all, perhaps. Or, on the other hand, whether there should be a minimum standard that defines the essentials that should be achievable in all contexts. A quite strong majority favour the minimum standard model but many also prefer the aspirational standard model.

I'll pause there and hand over to you, Angharad.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thanks a lot, Markus. So, yes, a good opportunity, I think, to throw a question over to Jennifer.

So reflecting on the results that we have so far, and I know these are very fresh, what are your thoughts regarding the primary purpose of the standards? Are you surprised or not surprised to see, as Markus pointed out, the primary purpose in the eyes of the survey responders being more around preparedness planning, operational guidance and much less related to accountability? What are your thoughts? Over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Kvernmo: Well, very fresh is exactly the word because I was looking at them live as Markus was putting them up there. I've been super excited to see them and all the different contributions. So I am so inspired by the fact that people think at their minimum standards as opposed to aspirational standards because that means that we can use them in every single location and that it isn't something that we should have to compromise on to save representation or that the camp management role is to provide that representation role and to set up governance. That makes me really, really, really happy, actually, because now I'm seeing that it isn't the core camp management responsibility. So that's great.

And could you go back to the to the slide that showed the feedback? The one before that. That was really great, about using it in preparedness and planning. If only we could use it more in preparedness and planning that would mean that there were actually governments that had representatives that were ready to manage sites if there was displacement.

Let's remember, actually, that sudden-onset disasters happen three times more than conflicts. Let's remember, actually, that we don't have a way to capture and respond to all kinds of slow-onset disasters right now. And when we look at IDMC figures and what are the most likely scenarios or how long are displacements lasting, again, displacements last sometimes up to 17 years or longer for internally displaced people.

So if we're able to actually use this in planning, that means that there are going to be people who are actually well prepared and well understanding of what the job is going to be and that we're going to have less kind of emergency response and that governments are going to be more prepared and that NGOs are going to know more what to do in an emergency if it should strike. I think these are phenomenal, purposes of standards and applications of standards to be minimum in all sites. I'm very happy.

Angharad Laing: Perfect. Thanks. Quickly, I'd like to jump over to get Gebrehiwot. Sorry. Never mind. We're going to move on to the next issue. Markus, over to you. We're going to keep moving because the clock is ticking.

Markus Forsberg: So looking at the next area. When asked who should be responsible for ensuring that the standards are followed, the largest category was at 37%, actually camp

management agencies themselves. Then also, I guess somewhat related, about a quarter of respondents wanted to put that responsibility on the Global CCCM Cluster.

But also, interestingly, although they are in the minority in this set of respondents, more than a third wanted to put that responsibility of ensuring that they're implemented on bodies external, so to speak, to camp management agencies. Government authorities, donor agencies, and then close to 20% wanting an actual independent monitoring body for standards of this type.

Angharad Laing: So on this, I'm going to turn to Gebrehiwot as you do have a wide variety of experience in different roles, including working with the government as well. What are your views on this question of external accountability? Is it your impression that agencies and the CCCM Cluster can provide sufficient implementation and accountability themselves for these standards? To what degree is there a need for external accountability? What are your thoughts?

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: I think there is quite a large need for external accountability not just for CCCM but for the entire humanitarian sector and for anyone who's providing services to people under some framework of laws and rules, preferably in a professional setting or a profession.

We should also try to create our own standards of accountability which, for me, this is why the camp management standards are so important to allow us to at least hold each other to account for our professional behaviour, our decisions, our policies for implementation. And to allow others also who are not practitioners, who are not professionals, who perhaps don't have the technical skills to challenges on our day-to-day work, for them to at least challenge us on the objectives we're trying to achieve.

So having a public formal agreement on a standard would, in my view, help us to achieve that accountability, more principled humanitarian action.

Angharad Laing: Perfect. Thanks a lot, Gebrehiwot, and back to you, Markus, for the next point.

Markus Forsberg: Thank you. So when asked about the actual content of the draft standards in their current form, respondents have been asked to first read this draft. And having done so, close to three quarters of everyone agreed that the scope of the standards adequately covered the essentials of camp management, while the remaining quarter was evenly divided, quite interestingly, between those who thoughts the draft covered more than the essentials and those who thought they did not cover the essentials.

When asked to think about specific types of camps and camp-like settings, the results look somewhat different for different types. And I would highlight here in particular that respondents found that they applied less to self-settled informal settlements and only somewhat more to neighbourhood approaches or defined geographical areas.

As for those two, while there was an overall support in all the settings, those two had a little bit less support.

Angharad Laing: Okay. Kathryn, perhaps I could ask you to reflect a bit on this question of applicability to different contexts. So noting that respondents seem to believe that the standards applied well across different kinds of contexts but better in some than in others. What is it that's different about informal settlements, about neighbourhood approaches that respondents might find there to be less of a match with the standards? That the standards might be less applicable in those areas. Just a few reflections from you, Kathryn.

Kathryn Ziga: Sure. I think this came out during our consultation in Somalia since we are doing a dispersed settlement approach more than a traditional camp management. But we were able to leave our feedback into that and I think the standards are even more important in these contexts that are not as straightforward as what most camp management practitioners are used to. And we're kind of making up the strategy as we go along depending on how the context changes.

So we need the standards more in those situations to reflect back and figure out what direction we should go in and what we need to hold ourselves accountable to to ensure that we're doing good camp management even though it's in a non-traditional style.

So I think while maybe people might not see these approaches in them when they look, as long as we're applying the general standards to the context, I think that we can successfully use these in an out-of-camp or neighbourhood or evacuation centre approach.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thank you. Back to you, Markus.

Markus Forsberg: All right. Then we had a few questions on the structure of these standards as well. So asked about the structure, it was evident that many of the respondents found room for improvement but were overall positive. So in the chart in front of you there, if you see the small peak on the far right are the people that gave it a full score on clarity. But, as you can see, it was less than 20% giving that score. The rest were quite evenly spread between 50 and 100.

So a majority giving a score of 50 and above, we can at least see that few people found it catastrophic but there was still room for improvement.

We also asked about the level of detail in the standards. Here, respondents were more positive with close to 50% thinking that it was perfectly balanced between too much or too little detail. But among those who did not think it was balanced, it was clear that they overall thought that there was too much detail in the standards rather than too little. If you look at that chart _____ [1:35:10], it's quite clearly skewed to the right.

Angharad Laing: All right. Perhaps Sabit, if we still have you on the line, I could ask you to reflect on this briefly. So given what we've seen that people in general found the standards to be relatively clear but there may be some room for improvement, and, in general, well-balanced in terms of the level of detail but, if anything, perhaps could have a little bit less detail, what are your views on that, Sabit, about whether you have any thoughts or you found there were any discussions in the context of the consultations you were involved in regarding the structure and how, in practice, they could be further improved? Over to you, Sabit. Any views on this?

Sabit Juma: I think that the structure of the standards is good. What is important to me is that it captures, it was able to capture what it was aiming. Because you can see from the people how people were trying also to respond and so on. So, for me, it was very important that it captured their attention and then to respond also to the important questions which are affecting the IDPs and then also to NGOs and then the actors on the ground.

So I think it was good in general. It was good for me. And maybe during the time, because significant, of course, in different countries, situations are different and complex settings are different. Like for us here, the POCs are different but the timing maybe some challenges might come and maybe be another issue or to be added in the standards to be improved in due time. But for the moment, I think it was good to have it, to have that structure and then to have that standard also so that it can help people to... especially the camp managers to respond to their duty.

Angharad Laing: Thank you very much, Sabit. And to Markus...

Markus Forsberg: Thank you, Angharad. Then for the final set of results here, so when asked about other standards, the respondents reported using a number of other standards and guidance that they use in order to clarify roles and responsibilities related to camp management. Here, it's just worth highlighting that the Camp Management Toolkit, the Sphere Handbook, the Core Humanitarian Standard and the UNHCR Emergency Handbook stood out.

Then we asked also about whether respondents saw any overlap with the standards that they were using with the draft Camp Management Standards. All four of those top international references that I listed were found to be overlapping at least somewhat. It's a little bit of a complex picture but they are all quite overlapping according to the respondents.

There was considerably less overlap that was seen in comparison with national standards and legal framework.

But then even taking this into account, because this may or may not be seen as a problem, a strong majority 64% saw a need for Camp Management Standards with 17% percent not seeing a need for them and 19% saying 'I'm not sure'.

Angharad Laing: Great, Markus. Could we go back one slide so that we can all take another look at that other standards overlap? Perfect. Thank you.

I wanted to turn to Jennifer to see if you have any reflections, again, seeing these very fresh results regarding perceived overlap with other standards and guidance. Do you have any concerns about this regarding the draft Camp Management Standards? What are your thoughts? Over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Kvernmo: Well, I find this overlap question a little bit confusing but I would say that I would expect there to be overlap with the Camp Management Toolkit. That actually it was pointed out in the retreat last year for the CCCM where we talked about the standards themselves and we had prioritized this on our work plan.

I believe it was one of my colleagues who called this a very precious task to be able to find the ways in which the Camp Management Standards were recognized than the Camp Management Toolkit, because the Camp Management Toolkit itself doesn't even have an annex or an index to be able to find all the different references in it. So you have to really know the Camp Management Toolkit.

So if someone is saying that there's overlap, I think that's positive and that's because I know the Camp Management Toolkit quite well. That's a really good thing, in a way, that if it's already in our guidance that it's recognized as there.

I find it a little bit more confusing to see that there's some overlap, this 30% within the Sphere Handbook because sphere doesn't actually mention the tasks of the Camp Management Toolkit, but maybe that's going back to that controversial question that we were asking at the beginning.

So as far as the Core Humanitarian Standards, actually core would support us developing technical standards. And so I think when I went back and reread the Core Humanitarian Standards which are about the professionalism of humanitarian agencies, they were endorsing actually each technical sector developing standards for themselves and referring to those. So I think that there's a lot of really good and positive information in this overlap.

But I would want to see more where people thought that was, and I'm not surprised to see that in National Standards that there isn't very much overlap because National Standards tend to be more technical as opposed to around the practice of camp management and more which is more social.

Angharad Laing: Great. And point very well taken regarding the toolkit, that there really should be overlap there between the toolkit and the draft standards.

Since we've come back to sphere and we did have a lot of questions coming in about sphere, I wanted to throw one more of those over to you, Jennifer. It's regarding I guess the structure and the logic of the Sphere Standard and then the kind of target structure and logic of the Camp Management Standards.

There was a question from Axel about whether there would be an effort to try to harmonize... so given that the content does not overlap so much, would there be an effort to try to harmonize the structure? I guess what he might be getting at is would the Camp Management Standards potentially then become a companion to sphere in a similar structure. Has that been discussed? Over to you, Jennifer.

Jennifer Kvernmo: I think that's something that we would want to discuss at this year's retreat because I think there's a lot of confusion around the typologies that have been included in sphere and that actually a lot of... the most close counterparts that we have within camp management are probably in the shelter sector. A lot of times, when the CCCM Cluster gets activated, we get activated together with the shelter cluster.

And so I think the close work that we would want to do is around kind of helping sphere to understand our typologies and the work in which we do in groups of people living together and the work that shelter does, which is around improving a specific shelter or designing a specific shelter as opposed to working on the social aspects.

And so I think that we would want to work closely with the shelter colleagues around having them understand topologies in relationship to the CCCM framework. I know there's probably some ambiguity about neighbourhood approaches or... 'neighbourhood approaches', I guess, is the right terminology. So we would want to work closely with them on that.

But I don't see it making any kind of difference as far as the structure, the logic, because lots of different technical sectors have different structures. If you think about what the Child Protection Minimum Standards have done or the Protection ICRC Professional Standards have done, they have really different frameworks.

And so I don't think that there should be any need for us to justify our logic or our structure based on sphere. I think we are our own technical sector and we have every right to define those things for ourselves.

Angharad Laing: Thank you very much. So we have a bit of time left. I'm going to jump back in our agenda because I don't want to miss talking about how we envision these standards actually being used in practice. So I'd like to go back to you, Gebrehiwot.

So you've been a part of DRC's EMPACT team and, in that role, you've been involved in setting up CCCM programs. How would you envisage using these standards once they're finalized? How would they actually affect your work day to day? Over to you, Gebrehiwot.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Well, one of the previous challenges we faced in establishing our operations in the humanitarian context is that there's a lot of disagreement about what the objectives of any particular sector or what the day-to-day objectives should be. It's more complicated when it's something like top management which is very much not service or shelter where you provide the same set of goods or the way you provide those goods is the primary work. Are goods are much more non-tangible and providing these services, although essential, we don't have a professional team behind us to back that up.

So one of the things we're hoping, at least I'm hoping and my colleagues are hoping we will achieve with the CCCM standards or the top management standards, is that we'll have more principled humanitarian action. This will contribute to holding us to account, as I said before, and that as a sector we will have at least a basic set of objectives and targets for our activities that we can agree on before the emergency starts.

So that, at least on the ground, we won't disagree about the need for these activities nor the way it should be implemented or what we should have achieved with these activities. That's one of the major reasons we're working so hard, Jennifer and the rest of the team, to bring it to fruition.

Angharad Laing: That's really excellent. Thank you so much.

Kathryn, a similar question over to you. I understand that the standards, although they're only in draft form so far, have already been piloted in some areas where you've been working. Can you tell us about how you've been using the standards in Somalia, I believe? Is that right?

Kathryn Ziga: Yes. So we started using them last year during the HRP process, the Humanitarian Response Plan, because we had a lot of new partners on board who knew what was needed in camp management and had been trained and had been working in camps for a long time, but they had never done any kind of proposal development or setting up of camp management systems in their camps. So we rolled them out last year in order for them to help them write their HRP Project pages, which is a bit boring, but it really did help put some direction on exactly what we should be doing in each camp.

How I want to be using them more in Somalia is we're doing a lot of remote management and so we need these standards for accountability to ourselves as camp management practitioners and to the population.

We always think like camp management is hard to explain to people who don't do it and some people think it might not be tangible, but you don't know you need camp management until you finally have it and you see the big improvement that it can actually give to a camp. So without camp management, things in the camp are a mess and, when you do finally get these standards in place in a camp, you can really see the improvement not only in living conditions and efficiency of money for donors in the population, like their ability to participate.

So I hope that, once we have these standards, we can use them to make ourselves better camp managers in the country.

Angharad Laing: Great. Thanks a lot, Kathryn. So we have reached the end of our time now for today. I'd like to do a quick round the virtual room to get brief closing thoughts from all of our panellists. I'll start with you, Sabit. It's been great to have you on the line. Do you have anything you'd like to share with us now before we end? Over to you, Sabit.

Sabit Juma: Thank you very much. Just regarding the standards, as mentioned by colleagues also that it's very, very important to have it because it will help the camp managers to deliver their service with clarity and accountability. And those will unify our workers and on the ground so that all of us is represented.

And only that sometimes maybe I'm a little confused because that time I remember two or three years ago, there was an issue about the objectives indicators. For example, when you go to monitor the partners on the ground and they said, "Okay, for us we have our own indicators. We have our own objectives regarding this program."

And then CCCM said, "Okay, but for us also we have these indicators we are looking at," and so on. So there was a bit kind of... I don't know how these standards may be able also to solve these issues with CCCM and then their partners on the ground.

Angharad Laing: Okay. Thank you and thanks again for being part of the discussion and the larger process. Now, to you, Kathryn. Do you have any brief closing remarks you'd like to leave us with?

Kathryn Ziga: I'm happy that there's been such an interest in the Camp Management Standards. I think we had 130 people on this webinar. And to go back to the controversial question of CCCM not having developed in the last few years, I think we proved that wrong on this webinar.

And I look forward to working with all of the people here to formalize the standards and start using them everywhere.

Angharad Laing: Absolutely. Thanks so much for being a part of the discussion today. And now to Gebrehiwot. Over to you for brief closing remarks.

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu: Well, I'd like to thank everyone who participated [inaudible 1:52:46]

Angharad Laing: Unfortunately, I think we just lost audio from Gebrehiwot. I'm so sorry about that, but at least we had you for most of the event. Thank you so much for all of your contributions, for your hard work on this initiative, and we look forward to working with you more in the future.

Then last but not least, over to you, Jennifer, for your closing thoughts.

Jennifer Kvernmo: I'd like to thank all the participants and, particularly, PHAP for your partnership. But I just want to remind each of us that any of us could be displaced at any time and need to live in a temporary site. And what would we want to have our rights be? How would we want to be represented? How would we want the camp management agency to treat us? How would we want our own government to treat us should we become displaced?

And these Camp Management Standards are one way that we can articulate that by working together to really define what is our vision for them.

So thanks to everyone who came into the call and thanks to PHAP for getting us started in our first online consultations with people outside of our sector. It's really been a great and very useful process.

Angharad Laing: Our pleasure, and thank you. So now we'll bring this to an end. Thanks, once again, to everyone.

The recording of the event both in video and in audio-only podcast format will be available on the event page in the coming days. We'll also be posting the survey results once those are completed. And, once again, if you did not have the chance to complete the survey before the webinar today, you do have a final chance. We're going to open it back up and leave it open for the rest of the day. So if you can complete it before tomorrow, we will be able to include your input in the final report.

So with that, I'd like to thank everyone once again both panellists and participants for a very interesting discussion. There's clearly so much engagement on the issue and so much more to say. We very much hope that we will be able to continue the consultation in the online sphere in this manner to further support this important standards process.

Thanks so much to my colleagues and the PHAP team preparing the event as well as everyone at IOM, UNHCR, ACTED, NRC, DRC and others who have all been contributing behind the scenes to the preparations.

This is Angharad Laing signing off from Geneva. Thank you very much.

Appendix 3: Webinar follow-up responses

On **23 September**, PHAP and the Global CCCM Cluster organized a webinar on the critical work of Camp Managers and the draft Camp Management Standards. This included experienced Camp Managers who have been involved in the standards development process and was an opportunity for practitioners worldwide to provide their input on the draft standards.

While many of the questions from participants were answered during the event (listen to these in the event recording), there were more questions than there was time for, and the guest experts have answered follow-up questions in writing. The responses are listed in this appendix (an online version is also available at <https://phap.org/23sep2019-followup>)

Community engagement

“ What are the pros, as well as the cons of engaging refugee people in camp management? ”

- *Mahtabul, Bangladesh*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

There are no cons in the engagement of the camp population in displacement settings. People who are affected by your work and actions should be engaged. There may be difficulties caused by the nature of the camp management activity and the way in which this engagement occurs. In Bangladesh, there have been many challenging issues. However, it is valid for an NGO or other camp-based staff to engage with the affected population, and solving those difficulties is just one aspect of the job.

In addition, the engagement of the camp population could be indirect through the participation of the communities in camp committees and responding to needs assessments conducted by camp managers. This helps to identify the needs and type of response of the camp management team and ensure the involvement of the camp community in decision making.

“ How do you deal with huge turnover as it prevents you from forming community council and having people around that know the rules and teach newcomers how to respect them? ”

- *Amira, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

In those situations where there is a rapid turnover of those using the facility (for example, a transit center or a way station where it would require a substantial administrative and management duties), the population would likely also not be a unified population or have community structures intact. If the displaced population is from the same location and a part of the same operation, our strategy as the DRC would be to recruit people from the community to work as part of our staff to stay with us for the duration of the transit centre or way station activity and help us with both communication and daily management tasks. However, they would be our workers and not a community structure. Posting rules and providing an orientation to newcomers on how to respect them should be done by the staff in these circumstances.

Content of the Standards

“ What are best practices on shelter numbering/addressing systems across different contexts? ”

- *Cyril, Nigeria*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Shelter numbers are a part of the addressing system but not the critical portion. Addressing systems in the heat of the emergency is critical for the sectors of nutrition, health, and food but are in the control of site planning, demarcation shelter, WASH, and CM. Usually what we try to do is at the planning stage; during site planning activities, we try to agree on what the addressing system shall be (taking into consideration what requirements health, food and nutrition partners need to have) and establish an addressing system that responds to these needs.

For example, in Nigeria, the larger problems identified were that site planning came after displacement and that many partners, including those working in food, were not successful in determining or organizing their plans for distribution. This resulted in frustration from the other sectors to harmonize the existing addressing system and no one being able to take the leadership in fixing it. The best experience I have had was where the camp management, site planning, and demarcation of the site was conducted by the same organization and where the sectors most affected by the addressing system (WASH, Food, Nutrition, and Health) already knew what their requirements would be, and we could anticipate challenges. Unfortunately, it is rare to be able to anticipate challenges. What Camp Management should aim for is to be responsive and flexible in ensuring there is a satisfactory addressing system for the duration of the emergency. After this time, the long-term needs are satisfied by addressing (planning, management, and safety/security) the challenges, even if it would entail changing to a new addressing system at additional cost at a later date.

“ How do the standards deal with ensuring the wellbeing of children and new-born, and access to play? ”

- *Javier, Colombia*

Jennifer Kvernmo

It's a good question, Javier. Commitment 4: of the CM Standards relates to the Site Environment, which should be safe as well as physically, socially, and culturally appropriate for inhabitants. This means that the physical space and layout need to be conducive to all inhabitants noting that children and babies have very different needs than adults. The key actions here are really to make sure that in the planning, layout, and maintenance of the facility, each of the particular needs of the population can make full use of the spatial spaces and that these are culturally appropriate. One excellent practice I have seen in the Philippines for new-born infants is the designated “nursing mothers' rooms” at the request of the population, for example.

“ If the crisis occurred within a location where we have multiple displaced people from different tribes that have an ongoing conflict among them which would be the best approach? Given we have limited supplies, and assuming general spaces like bathrooms that might be shared, for example, how would we display the camp in order not only to

avoid conflict but also to avoid that one group feels underprivileged in comparison with the other? Within the camp setting, how does one manage in terms of security? I've attended seminars before and have yet to learn of methods to be applied so that people feel safe. In addition, if a crime occurs, from whom should the people seek help? Are there professionals placed just to help victims or are they the same that provide the overall security for the camp? ”

- *Patricia, Portugal*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

This question requires extensive discussion rather than one response. Providing for the wellbeing and the safety and security in an emergency to a displaced population is a function of community institutions, government/duty bearer efficiency, and policy. The good functioning of formal social institutions and the establishment of a multi-sectoral set of emergency response teams (from case managers to community outreach) is not something that could be solved with one standard or one set of standards. On managing inter-ethnic and nationalist or identity conflicts that lead to displacement and how we would manage them in practice is a vast topic, and the response will most likely not be possible to cover completely as different contexts have different responses to this form of conflict. The policies in an operation must be designed with the specific conflict in mind and with a full assessment of risk and threats to support policymaking. In some operations, there have been separate camps for separate groups of populations. At times policies were developed that help manage conflict and mitigate violence while keeping the populations in conflict in one camp, and at times, it was possible to have a stable and safe camp without any of these measures. Keeping in mind the humanitarian principles of adhering to neutrality and impartiality of a CCCM Response, I would be happy to discuss some of the policy decisions. I have experience of working with a government and also working with a protection-focused NGO separate to this answer.

“ What if food delivered to camps are being diverted to finance armed group activities? What would be the best solution to ensure camps continue to receive food supplies and at the same time ensure that food does not fall in the hands of the wrong people? ”

- *Melvina, Mali*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

It really depends on who is diverting the food, when it is diverted and how (for example, the forces controlling the camp are diverting it from humanitarian storage or are they collecting shares of it from the population?) it is being diverted. Context matters, and as long as the response decisions are informed by a full and accurate understanding of the risks involved in the decisions made, that is all that can be expected. Decisions range from withdrawing from the operation, to repeatedly changing means of delivery and distribution of food. It is essential to remember to be context-specific in response to the challenges (no grand solutions that solve the challenges in every context), adhere to the humanitarian principles we uphold and work towards achieving the humanitarian imperative with the ultimate goal of protecting the sanctity of life and human dignity.

“ How do the standards address prepare long term strategy, including plans for camp closure, solutions, and exit/handover? ”

- *Ali, Somalia*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Camps are an option of last resort. They do not provide a permanent sustainable solution but offer temporary provision of protection and assistance, in order to meet the basic human rights of displaced populations. This is taken into account in commitment 5 of the Standards, which is entitled *Site closure, Planning, and exit from the location*. The standard is focused on actions related to the site level strategy, including planning for exit and prioritizes the safety and dignity of the displaced population. For any location to close, it really needs to be done with the full informed, voluntary, and lasting solutions in place for the population. This means that each person is able to make an informed and voluntary choice on what the best solution is for them to pursue.

“ How are the standards relevant for those of us in Information Management? What is the role of information management in the standards? ”

- *Mohammad, Bangladesh*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Due to the inter-sectorial nature of CCCM, Information Management (IM) is an important component for proper decision making. As IM encompasses data collection through assessments and analysis of the data captured, the standards will set up directions on how to measure how well the camp/site reaches the standards.

“ Do the standards cover how could we minimize Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in IDP or Refugee camps? ”

- *Aschalew, Ethiopia*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Yes, protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) is linked in each of the five Standards, but the key actions are different. For example, in the first standard Key Action 1.3 relates to staff capacity and training and states that each staff should have undergone training, understanding the significance of reporting, and has signed a code of conduct. While in the Second Standard related to representation, PSEA responsibilities are also passed to the camp representatives so that they can also be aware of how to report.

“ Are there standards on agreed floor spacing (capacity) for one person? Is there agreed spacing between tents or other shelter means? ”

- *Sophia, Jamaica*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Of all the numeric indicators commonly used as guidelines in humanitarian shelter response, it is the indicator for covered shelter space that is perhaps the most often quoted – three and a half square meters per person. However, a lack of awareness of where this and other indicators came from has played a part in limiting the discussion on the appropriate use of this indicator across

all forms of shelter and reconstruction response. Jim Kennedy and Charles Parrack have done [excellent research on where this indicator came](#) from and I would encourage you to read their article as the history about where this indicator came from illustrates how technical standards need to relate more to the context or culturally specific needs of the emergency response, than on a specific floor spacing for any settings. Also remember that all discussion of standards needs to relate first and foremost to the beliefs, principles, duties, and broader rights declared in the Humanitarian Charter. These include the right to live with dignity, the right to protection and security, and the right to receive humanitarian assistance on the basis of need.

“ Do the standards address how advances in digital technology and the spread of social media and internet can be used to effectively impact and ease Camp Management? ”

- *Zelkifli, Switzerland*

Jennifer Kvernmo

The CM Standards do not really address this area, no. It is an interesting area that we could consider including in Commitment 2 related to key actions related to representation.

“ Have you conducted any assessment and consultations in different contexts while drafting this standard? ”

- *Yusuf, Tanzania*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Yes, extensive in-person consultations have been done as part of the validation process. So far, they have taken place in South Sudan, Somalia, Bangladesh, and Iraq with over 200 people contributing through workshops, one on one interviews, and focus group discussions.

“ Have the standards been piloted, and if so, how was the pilot planned? ”

- *Luisa, United States*

Jennifer Kvernmo

To some extent, the Standards have been piloted in Somalia where Kathryn is the Cluster Coordinator and was setting up a new Cluster operation. More extensive piloting is planned in phase 2 of our project; we are seeking funding for that now.

“ What is the difference between camp management and camp coordination? ”

- *Fatima, Yemen*

Jennifer Kvernmo

The difference between management and coordination is confusing because its “business” language being applied to humanitarian settings. However, what it means functionally is what happens at which level. Management usually means what happens in ONE site, while

coordination is what happens BETWEEN sites. You may want to read more about this in the [CM Toolkit Chapter 1](#). See the section on stakeholders.

Implementation of the Standards

“ What is the best way that the standards can be enforced with limited resources? ”

- *Gideo, Nigeria*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

The idea is that those who are involved in camp management and coordination agree to hold each other to account, and the standards would function as a tool to be used to ensure more principled and accountable humanitarian action. This would not require any additional resources once the standards are agreed upon and instituted, although the process of drafting and consultation has taken significant time and resources.

“ What are the main accountability mechanisms for camp management and how are they expected to relate to the Camp Management Standards? ”

- *Shashanka, Bangladesh*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Currently, there is very little accountability for decisions made in camp management. For example, the decision in Bangladesh to delay establishing community structures and camp management structures was a decision that was controversial at the time it was made - regardless of what the conflicting opinions were – no one would be held accountable for the effect of that decision. Hopefully, in the future, there will be an additional tool for these standards themselves to support one position over the other and to hold people to account professionally if they fail to uphold the standards.

“ What can you do really, to ensure the respect of standards, when every day you receive new arrivals fleeing attacks, making camps congested? ”

- *Lassana, Nigeria*

Jennifer Kvernmo

The reality is, Lassana, that decongesting a camp while making sure that people have a safe place to arrive will take time. I am aware that there have been very specific decongestion strategies developed in Nigeria (which I would be happy to share with you if you write to ccmsupport@iom.int). One of the strongest points for this strategy, is the way that it gives a clear framework for prioritization and triage for activities, and the way that it puts a clear emphasis upon doing what is *_possible_*, and supporting the coping mechanisms of all those involved, rather than being paralyzed in action when being faced with extremely challenging situations. What is clear that camp set-up has to take into consideration a wide range of stakeholders and the spatial and facilities needs of a number of key humanitarian sectors and gives a clear checklist and timeline for doing so.

“ Are the standards relevant for all contexts? How can the same standards be used for a long-term displacement camp and for managing a transit camp in Greek island where people typically stay for 1 or 2 nights? ”

- *Aliya, Greece*

Jennifer Kvernmo

SPHERE standards are relevant for all contexts as they describe an ideal principle based on how the displaced people should have dignity while displaced. They are written in a general way and are qualitative in nature. They are equivalents to the commitments in the Core Humanitarian Standards. The key actions, however, outline practical steps to attain the Minimum Standards and are suggestions and may not be applicable in all contexts, or as you say durations of displacement – protracted vs. transit sites. In your setting, you will need to see how to select the most relevant for the situation. The indicators and guidance notes will be helpful to you in this way.

“ What are the strategies for ensuring that the standards can be implemented in different settings, especially in terms of being appropriate for the affected people we are serving? ”

- *Arnold, Tanzania*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Implement and contextualize. Professionals like yourself are the ones to say if something was appropriate or was not. If it turns out that there are significant problems, these concerns should be flagged so that a resolution can be sought for with other professionals in the humanitarian community dealing with camp management.

“ How will you ensure that the Standard will be used? How will you transfer the content to the users? What kind of training are you using? How will you ensure that the Information/Standard is accessible for all? ”

- *Axel, Germany*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Yes, we are planning on making the CM Standards part of both our face to face and online training programs. The vision is that the CM Standards will be digitally cross-referenced to other technical guidance, which is also related to our sector (Sphere technical standards, the UNHCR Handbook, etc.) as well as other CCCM reference materials like the Camp Management Toolkit.

Relationship to other standards

“ How are you harmonizing the upcoming Standard with the structure and logic of Sphere (Minimum Standard, Key Action, Key Action, Guidance Notes)? Will you be

using also Sphere Focal Points (54 countries) to distribute the Information? ”

- *Axel, Germany*

Jennifer Kvernmo

As part of the consultation we are currently undertaking, we are looking at precisely this question and what structure this will best facilitate a logic that is coherent to our sector as well as coordinates well with other Humanitarian Standards Partners. We would welcome collaboration, of course, with Sphere Focal Points to distribute our CM Standards.

“ Are there Sphere standards that help in CM? How do they relate to the CM Standards? ”

- *Ali, Egypt*

Jennifer Kvernmo

The CM Standards, once finalized, has the ambition to cross-reference to the other Humanitarian Standards Partners like Sphere. The cross-referencing will help other practitioners know both what to expect from a Camp Management Agency as a service provider or how to plan and prioritize their work as one.

“ What is the role of Camp Managers to meet the Sphere standards in camp settings during emergencies? ”

- *Ghulam, Pakistan*

Jennifer Kvernmo

Unless a Camp Management Agency is also providing services (Shelter, NFI, WASH, etc.) in emergency response, the specific role of Camp Managers would not be to implement the Sphere Standards but simply to know about them and how different gaps in services are impacting the population living in the site.

“ From an operational point of view, what is the role of Sphere Standards in your work? ”

- *Leo, Germany*

Jennifer Kvernmo

A Camp Management Agency has a continuous responsibility to collect, analyze, and disseminate information both to the camp population and to the service providing partners. This information is the basis for effective coordination within the camp, and also externally as a part of inter-camp coordination and monitoring by the Cluster/Sector Lead Agency, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and national authorities. Knowledge of SPHERE Standards helps a camp manager to know what the other sectors are working towards in their service provision (work plans) but also analyses these standards together with cross-sectoral analysis. Operationally, the camp manager’s role is to systematize standards and facilitate their application to all people in the site.

“ What are the most common tools already used for CCCM that the standards are meant to complement? ”

- *Augustin, Mauritania*

Jennifer Kvernmo

The most common reference guide for CCCM is the Camp Management Toolkit. Other global references include the CCCM Case Studies, Camp Closure Guidelines, MEND Guide. You can find them on the [CCCM Cluster Website](#). National standards are also very relevant in our work.

CCCM's relationship to other actors/stakeholders

“ Based on my past experience, CCCM is considered to be one of the best sectors when it comes to response, but how do we apply CCCM and the CM Standards in emergency contexts where CCCM works alongside other clusters and actors that are operating in camps and want to have a say? ”

- *Janet, Kenya*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

That would relate more to how the cluster system was established and the various inter-cluster or operational level decisions being made. The standards being presented here are specifically for camp management practitioners and should not bear any relation to the conflicts between various clusters and agencies over issues of mandate and authority within the cluster system. If they do, it would be the decision of each manager on how to ensure the maintenance of the agreed-upon standards.

“ Is there a strategical guideline on information flow from the partners to the Cluster and vice-versa? ”

- *Farouk, Nigeria*

Alisa Ananbeh

According to [IASC guidelines](#), humanitarian actors who participate in the Cluster/Sector are expected to be proactive partners in exchanging information relevant to situational understanding and the response. Cluster/Sector partners are to adhere to commonly agreed definitions and indicators for "sector" needs and activities, as well as the use of common baseline or reference data. Humanitarian actors should be encouraged to share information with the wider humanitarian community.

“ How do you work with peace operations with a PoC mandate? ”

- *Ai, Japan*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

For myself - peacekeeping operations as government agents regardless of whether it is UN peacekeepers or non-UN peacekeepers usually pose the same difficulties for access and humanitarian principles as any government would. One should always remember that humanitarian actors and practitioners are brought together by a common set of objectives and principles - peacekeepers are formed from government institution and do not adhere in the same way we do to those common objectives and principles.

“ How do Camp Managers work with protection partners in camps, considering most data from protection partners, especially GBV partners, are undisclosed? ”

- *Samson, Nigeria*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Both GBV and health partners should provide anonymized statistical data for the purposes of improving the safe management of the camp. Where emergency operations are working well and within the limits of professional accountability – they do so according to agreed Information Sharing protocols and procedures.

In some operations, it is camp management agencies that refuse to share some necessary data, also quite an unprofessional practice. In both cases, operational management has a responsibility to ensure that there is a resolution to these conflicts. If the operational management represented by the office of the humanitarian coordinator, the inter-cluster coordination group or other operational management structures does not resolve these problems - what we usually do is seek higher sources of authority or advocate with the donors to have the dysfunction remedied.

Prioritized actions

“ What are the first three public health prevention/protection strategies you employ in setting up a camp? ”

- *Rhae, United States*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

It depends on what the top three threats to public health are, the likely morbidities in a population group, and so on.

Usually, it is the health sector that leads the process of identifying the major public health risks - even where camp management or other sectors have the responsibility to implement the response. And once they have identified them and we have agreed on the appropriate responses through the operational management or coordination structures - the responsibility to assess the impact and define changes to the responses still lies with the health sector professionals

“ What is important to first of all pay attention to when setting up a camp to ensure a properly managed camp? ”

- *Jean, DRC*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Everything. There is no such thing as a perfect camp – and there are no easy solutions. By definition, emergencies do not allow us the luxury, the challenges we shall face, or the context that shall greet us – only of being as prepared as possible and where possible for us to anticipate challenges based on past experience. But I am afraid no checklist of things that would ensure properly managed camps.

“ In case of militia presence and control of a camp, what would be the minimum or main standards to prioritize? ”

- *Maha, Yemen*

Gebrehiwot Ewnetu

Remember that all your policy or strategy decisions should reflect humanitarian principles and should be working towards achieving the humanitarian imperative of saving lives and contributing to the safety of the populations with which we work. Where that may be compromised – it is up to your agency to decide where they would draw the line.