**Agenda Technical Working Group – Latrines rehabilitation – 30th of September 2015.**

**Agenda**

[1 – Identification of the leader of the TWG, review the objectives mentioned here below, discussed the number of session necessary.](#_Toc431474923)

[2 – Finance: Feedback form the different agencies with their respective donors regarding the fact that the temporary aspect vs. the cost to redo it every 2 years.](#_Toc431474924)

[3- Review of the different design of latrines into the camps (normally, they should be barely identical, but maybe for the most recent latrines, some major difference could be noted).](#_Toc431474925)

[4- Review of the identification of the different weaknesses of the current design.](#_Toc431474926)

[5- Propositions of modifications on the current latrines:](#_Toc431474927)

[6 - Propositions of a new design to face this kind of event, and knowing the fact they should be apparently in the same way (semi-permanent, TBC from the Cluster).](#_Toc431474928)

**Agencies attending**

CDN, DRC, IRC, Oxfam, SCi, SI, Unicef

*MoM done by SCi, on the 1st of October 2015.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 – Identification of the leader of the TWG, review the objectives mentioned here below, discussed the number of session necessary. | **SCI** |
| For the leadership (*cf.* next meeting).  The objectives of the Technical Working Group have been discussed. From a first proposition to simply do a technical working group to review the design of the superstructure of the latrines, different inputs have been given and lead to review the global sanitation approach in the camp in Rakhine.  The Pandora box has been open, and weaknesses or points to improve for every element of the sludge/sanitation chain have been identified.  Finally, it has been agreed by all the present actors to review fully the sanitation approach.  For this first meeting, even if the storm effect have fueled the discussion, it has been shared more broadly the different problems we meet regarding the sanitation since months.  Finally, after identifying the different issues, it has been decided to give a specific session per link of the chain.  The different topics to be treated are :   * Superstructure * Alternative design * Pit, receptor tank (on site treatment) * Treatment (off site treatment) * Desludging (technical aspect, logistic, running cost …)   Session are planned every 2 weeks, and plan to last around 2 hours. |  |
| Action Point 1: |  |
| 2 – Finance: Feedback form the different agencies with their respective donors regarding the fact that the temporary aspect vs. the cost to redo it every 2 years. | **All Agencies** |
| Consortium shared the concern of his donor who is well aware of the protracted aspect that this crisis is taking. However, the (semi-) temporary aspect of the infrastructure remain the strategy.  No other comments. |  |
| Action Point 2: |  |
| 3- Review of the different designs of latrines into the camps (normally, they should be barely identical, but maybe for the most recent latrines, some major differences could be noted). | **All Agencies** |
| Every Agency have follow the guidance of the WASH cluster. Single structure, or a pair of latrines, or a block of 4 latrines linked to a double ring pit have been designed.  Variation exist due to rehabilitation. Some have concrete stair (vs wooden), concrete floor (vs bamboo/wood), zinc sheet (vs/bamboo mat). |  |
| Action Point 3: |  |
| 4- Review of the identification of the different weaknesses of the current design. | **All Agencies** |
| Superstructure:  All agency mentioned the problem of the misuse of the superstructure component: wood and bamboo are used firewood and/or maintenance of the shelter.  To improve the durability of the wooden structure, a best quality of wood is required. But to get a significant improvement in term of durability, the cost of the wood component will be multiply by 2 or 3.  The access of the super structure should integrated gender aspect (women, girl, and child under <5). Integration should be considered as well for people with impairment (Even if there is no wheel chair in the camp, a slope ease the accessibility, and social caring need to be pair up).  In a more general way, population need to be consulted at the really beginning of the potential new phase of this sanitation approach.   * *Reminder*:   It should be a design with the less maintenance possible, and with a use of material which cannot be destroyed or misuse (bamboo, …). Many agency have already shift (or are considering) to replace the bamboo mat of the wall by zinc sheet.  In the same way, concrete on the floor improve the functionality and durability.  It has been remained that the concrete footing are necessary to protect the wood of an accelerated degradation by moisture.  Privacy : =>zinc between latrines, it has been mentioned, except for SCi, that no complain have been notified regarding the zinc sheet (it can contribute to increase the heat into the latrines).  SI (Pauktaw): material stolen for rehabilitation the shelter which is slower that the rehabilitation of shelter. => raise this problem  Out of the design for new latrines, the design for rehabilitation of the current latrines need to be as well considered, in a DRR approach (reinforce zinc sheet fixing on the roofing, stability of some latrines …).  Pit:  -Problem with the pit cover. Should not go more than 3 feet diameter even with rebar.  -Problem with Waterproofness of the pit, pit cover solidity or concrete ring solidity.  -In general manner for the concrete, it is very difficult to obtain a good quality concrete as the raw material are of bad quality (salty sand, gravel, quality of cement, quality of reinforced bar)  -Latrine pits are filling more quickly with buildup of solids/reduced working volumes.  -In Pauktaw, (SI) camp, plastic tank are considered.  -DEWATS for school latrines with prefabricated modules is shown.  -The fact to link the pit between them could be a way to ease the a more balance filling of the pit.  -The treatment need to be as much as possible on site, as the treatment of site implies difficulties, not only in term of treatment but as well logistic (especially transport on bumpy track. The fact to cross village are as well a huge constraint.  Desludging  TWG should go for the sludge cycle. SI survey on going regarding the full desludging process in Sittwe.  Treatment:  The STS has reached its limit in term of quantity of sludge, as well in term of treatment quality.  More treatment site are needed, with different technologies.  Other problem faced  It is remind that it is very difficult to find land.  Some land owner complain and prevent the progress on construction. Even the rehabilitation is sometime used to make blackmail, to put pressure and obtain compensation.  Regular flooding of some place, and high water table are the main constraints.  Transport of the sludge is a problem especially to go through villages with the tractors. Quality of road are not good (*cf.* § Pit)  Drainage problem on the camp, create a huge erosion problem (**drainage component need a dedicated TWG**). But the outlet of the drainage should be thought regarding the latrine positions.  General consideration  Environmental constraint(High water table/ Heavy monsoon),  Oxfam propose to use a plastic tank and then the latrine on the top of it.   * *Reminder:*   Each design should be consider, and the prone and cons have to be noted.  Even if the financial aspect should be considered, at this step, it should not limit the discussion, in order to ease the brainstorming.  Design vs. beneficiaries, and design need to be contextualize (vs shelter, vs symbolism, *e.g.* the fact to have latrines with higher standard than shelter)  “Permanent”, “Temporary” concepts is quite variable and bias. The land owner could have a perception regarding the “permanence” which may differ to the ones form INGO, or Institutions. |  |
| Action Point 4: |  |
| 5- Propositions of modifications on the current latrines: | **All Agencies** |
| Criteria for our design:   * Protecting the footing * Wood is treated * Maintain privacy * integrate menstrual hygiene into the design * integrated people with impairment * **To reinforce them** * **To protect population** |  |
| Action Point 5: |  |
| 6 - Propositions of a new design to face this kind of event, and knowing the fact they should be apparently in the same way (semi-permanent, TBC from the Cluster). *Recommendations* :   * Use of material who cannot be destroyed or misuse (bamboo, …), * Gender consideration (gender separated or family separated), * DRR approach (flooding, erosion …), * Storage/treatment of the sludge : Innovative solution for the (DEWATS, Wetland Work…), or any other proposition. | Next time |
| To be detailed in the next sessions. |  |
| Action Point 6: |  |
| **AOB** | **All agencies** |
|  |  |
| **Next meeting** |  |
| Next meeting in two weeks about the design of the superstructure, lead and prepared by SI. |  |