**Minutes of IM Network Meeting: 3rd May, 2017**

Chair Person: Shon Campbell, MIMU Manager.

Participants’ Organizations: MIMU, UNOCHA, UNHCR, IRI (INGO Rakhine Initiative), PACT, Phandeeyar

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Issues discussed** | **Next steps** |
|  | **HRP monitoring:**  OCHA presented progress and issues in data management and monitoring of the Humanitarian Response Plan / HRP as an ongoing process involving all the humanitarian clusters and sectors.  The HRP monitoring includes 7 clusters/sectors, and covers 23 indicators reported against the baselines and targets recorded in the 2017 HRP. Data is gathered from sectors/clusters quarterly (gathered from field-based partners and compiled at national and possibly sub-regional levels). OCHA collects and compiles this information in the form of the HRP Quarterly monitoring reports which are presented at the quarterly HCT meetings and to donors. The monitoring reports include a short update of the situation, progress against indicators, funding level (by sector and by donor), gaps/challenges, and recommendations.  It was noted that the ICCG / Inter Cluster Coordination Group is the owner of the quarterly monitoring and OCHA provided the service of bringing the information together in a form for wider dissemination.  A number of key issues/challenges were presented:   * Lack of dedicated IM capacities at national and subnational levels – a number of sectors do not have this capacity and this has noticeably limited their ability to reconcile information from partners’ databases and to provide timely, required information/data for the quarterly monitoring processes. This results in less meaningful and reliable information once compiled, and limits the capacity to bring information together across sectors/clusters and to undertake trend analysis. * Lack of partners’ buy-in, especially at sub-national level – partners don’t necessarily join the meetings or provide data when required resulting in potential under-reporting. * Weak data collection mechanism – each cluster/sector uses its own methodology and some introduced changes in monitoring approaches, posing some challenges in compiling data and undertaking trend analysis over time; * Quality of indicators - despite significant improvements of the HRP monitoring framework since 2013, further efforts need to be pursued in future planning to further improve the quality of the indicators to meaningfully inform HCT decision making. . Depending on the HCT’s decision on planning approaches (single-year or multi-year planning) given the extended period of humanitarian support to relatively stable IDP populations, the sectors’ monitoring framework could be further improved including on monitoring and reporting of response outcomes. Such outcome indicators would be monitored periodically and not as frequently as the (quarterly) output indicators. So far only the Food sector has outcome level indicators. * Differing methodologies and data management systems - synchronising the data collection and methodologies has been challenging with the changing and differing capacities in the clusters/sectors. OCHA also noted that there is not any one-size-fits-all approach that would work across all clusters/sectors so the focus is to support each cluster/sector to have an effective way to gather/analyse and report the information.   OCHA is working with cluster coordinators through the ICCG to establish more effective data collection systems through partners and will debrief cluster coordinators in the ICCG meeting on 12 May. OCHA will offer data management improvement support in 2017.  The key discussion points following OCHA’s presentation include the following.   * Difficulty reconciling population figures for targeting – a great deal of progress has been made in clarifying the population figures which are mainly based in the CCCM data which has been agreed by all clusters/sectors. Categorisation is largely based on the Humanitarian Data Collection Standards defined through the IM Network. Each sector puts forward number of persons in need and targeted (402,000 in Rakhine, 123,000 from Kachin and northern Shan). The process of HRP development has included consultations with government and more will be done in 2017 to seek a consensual view on figures used by different government entities and the humanitarian community in Myanmar. * Confusion over what is included in the category of “crisis-affected population” – the HRP monitoring does not fully follow the Humanitarian Data Collection Standards in some categories which has caused some confusion. UNHCR noted that it had been straightforward to report against the categories of displaced persons but not against the category of “crisis-affected population” as it is not clear who is included in this group as presented. OCHA explained that it includes various groups such as returnees, former IDPs, persons moved to particular model villages, and relocated IDPs as described in the footnote of the population table in the HRP. ***It was suggested that more attention be taken to disaggregating the “crisis-affected persons” category to the various categories used in the Humanitarian Data Collection Standards,*** particularly as support to the returnee categories will be more relevant to quantify in the coming period. * Getting the number of indicators down to a manageable number – OCHA has provided specific support to refining the indicators used for the quarterly monitoring, and it currently includes just 23 indicators compared to over 100 in 2013. * Frequency of monitoring – at the HCT’s agreement, data is currently compiled and reported quarterly. UNHCR indicated that the current monitoring/reporting is too frequent given the relative stability of the situation in terms of implementation for the displaced populations. Reducing the frequency may allow more focus on review of beneficiary needs as well as outcomes of assistance provided now that the support has been ongoing for some time. From a field perspective, partners’ capacity is limited to report on the current indicators through the 4Ws – need consistent agreed data collection methodologies ***It was suggested that issues/concerns related to frequency of monitoring/reporting should be raised at the ICCG/HCT for further discussion and guidance with consideration of 6 monthly reporting.*** * Available support – OCHA is providing dedicated support to clusters/sectors in this area, and the MIMU Data Management and Visualisation Specialist also noted his availability to support tools development if needed. |  |
|  | **IM Working group in Rakhine**  OCHA is leading on development of an IM WG in Rakhine and has so far established a common mailing list and dropbox to share information. Members of the IMN had no information on the plans, aims, activities of the group but it is assumed it will focus on development as well as humanitarian initiatives in Rakhine state (the whole of Rakhine approach). It was suggested that information exchange links be made with the IM Network at a minimum to ensure adequate coordination. |  |
|  | **Cluster/Sector/agency updates**  **UNHCR** – shortly releasing the CCCM site monitoring infographics (one-pager per camp produced monthly) developed for Rakhine based on data gathered through the Kobo-based site monitoring tool. HRP Protection indicators being finalised – the process of collating the data takes a week for each process. The new IMO had already started in Maungdaw for a 3 month period and will focus on specific products such as NFI tracking for all agencies (including maps, infographics), overseeing the project implementation mapping etc.  **Phandeeyar** – planning aData Diving event Saturday 6th bringing together volunteers to clean and organise available data on the extractive industry to support EITI monitoring. There is also a plan to work with the tech community and civil society groups interested in strengthening the free-license Open Street Mapping – this will be done over some months and include activities promoting OSM, a one day event, and possibly dedicated days/periods for each township or community when people can come together to update the OSM maps.  **INGO Rakhine Initiative** - new initiative being implemented by a number of Rakhine-based INGOs. This joint project aims to create a more robust evidence-base for the whole of Rakhine for implementation and advocacy purposes. It will include a more in-depth understanding of the context and trends in Rakhine, related particularly to health, education and livelihoods. The IRI has an IMO based in Sittwe and will ensure linkages with the recently-established Rakhine Coordination Group and other ongoing initiatives. It is currently pulling together a context analysis, preparing a Resource Library of relevant documents. It remains key to link collected assessments to the MIMU Assessment Tracking to avoid duplication and gaps in reporting to the Countrywide Assessment tracking tool.  **PACT** – mobile-data collection platform for survey for Maternal Child Health survey using Commcare (similar to Kobo but purchased system) – gathering information from 76 villages in Mandalay, Kayah, Sagaing and Magway.  **UNOCHA** – released the IDP maps for Rakhine (feb 2017) and for Kachin state (Jan17) and the Humanitarian snapshot for April 2017. Currently preparing the MHF reports.  **MIMU** – finalising MIMU 3W products based on inputs of 213 agencies in the March 3W round. Undertaking an internal data management review as a key step toward bringing all MIMU datasets into a central database to enable better public access to this data. Specific areas which will be followed up include establishing metadata standards for the MIMU-maintained Baseline Data, thereby complementing the metadata maintained for the spatial data sets. The MIMU team had checked on current use of metadata standards by others and there is no cross-sectoral use of metadata standards so a simple set could be very useful also for CSO and other users.  MIMU capacity building support has been guided by the priorities suggested in the earlier IMN discussions in 2015 (Excel, IM, GIS skills). Hence we have developed a 3 day IM workshop, a 10-day QGIS training using free software for mapping, and a 5-day Excel training which is also delivered as a longer, certified distance training course. Key principles in MIMU capacity building include   * Justified selection (i.e. whether and how the training will be used by the applicant in their regular post) – to this end trainees included in the 10-day QGIS trainings and their managers were asked to provide feedback on how the training is being used. Those that did not provide feedback will be a low priority for future MIMU courses as it is unclear how they are using the training provided. * Bringing together mixed groups – from across agencies, ministries, and from different locations across the country to promote better understanding and exchange. * Competence-based certification – the distance intermediate Excel course includes a series of assignments and an examination to determine skill level at the end of the course. Certificates will only be available to those who pass these steps so as to know how is eligible for more advanced trainings.   The next MIMU IM workshop will be offered in May.  Michael Gehling, the MIMU Data Management and Visualisation Specialist deployed from AVID, is available to provide support in data and database management and advising on ways in which databases can be linked to visual platforms. |  |
| **4.** | **Next Meeting**  The next meeting will be on June 7th at 3pm – suggested areas of focus include northern Rakhine, emergency preparedness for the cyclone/flood season and an update from MIMU on the approach taken for the internal data management review. | Share ideas for speakers |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Participants** | **Designation** | **Agency/ Organization** | **E-mail Address** |
| 1 | David Knaute | Project Lead – INGO Rakhine Initiative | SCI | david.knaute@savethechildren.org; |
| 2 | May Myat Aung |  | Pact | mmyataung@pactworld.org; |
| 3 | Parveen Mann | Information Management Officer | UNHCR | mannp@unhcr.org; |
| 4 | Pyae Sone Kyaw Win | GIS Officer | UNOCHA | kyawwin@un.org; |
| 5 | Myo Thiha Kyaw | Humanitarian Affairs Specialist | UNOCHA | kyaw1@un.org; |
| 6 | Thet Aung | Open Data Manager | Phandeeyar | [thetaung@phandeeyar.org](mailto:thetaung@phandeeyar.org); |
| 7 | Michael GEHLING | Data Specialist | MIMU | michael.gehling@undp.org; |
| 8 | Shon Campbell | Manager | MIMU | [manager.mimu@undp.org](mailto:manager.mimu@undp.org); |
| 9 | Mi Mi Kyaw Myint | Resource Centre Associate | MIMU | [mi.mi.kyaw.myint@undp.org](mailto:mi.mi.kyaw.myint@undp.org) |