



## WASH Cluster Myanmar

### Minutes of National WASH Cluster Meeting


**Date:** 2018 November 5, Monday    **Venue:** UNICEF Yangon Office

Time: 10 am – 12am    Duration: 2h

**Chair:** Sunny Guidotti, National WASH Cluster Coordinator

**Minutes:**

**Participants:** SCI, CDN, SI, RI, DRC, OXFAM, HARP, ECHO, OFDA, UNICEF (attendance sheet on annex)

Sr.	Topic	Time	Who
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. Where We are</li> <li>3. Transition</li> <li>4. Moving Forwards</li> </ol> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Donors + cluster_ Nov 5 2018 on Rakh</p> </div> <p>Presentation given:</p>		
1	Intro	10:00	All Participants
2	<p>Where we are (10min)</p> <p>This discussion focuses on Rakhine IDP camps. This meeting was arranged upon donor’s request with WASH cluster partners working Rakhine IDP camps.</p> <p>HARP: From a donor perspective, we felt uncomfortable with contracts ending quickly, local transition, challenges ahead and donors not on the picture, the plan and timing of the changes of partnerships and we want to understand gaps, funding situation and a workplan with next steps. We felt somewhat uncomfortable as donors being put on corners without ability to discuss options. So we wanted to engage in this discussion with key actors on the picture.</p>	10:05	

ECHO: we want to discuss with donors and partners to identify what are the issues on the table and way forwards. There needs to be a strategy for partners working on the ground. Donors want to follow up on a clear strategy in relation to recent changes affecting the Rakhine WASH cluster. There is an element of coordination in Rakhine and Yangon, need to strengthen coordination in Rakhine. We will continue to follow up. Would like to see a clear strategy agreed between partners and extend discussion to donor community.

OFDA: We would like to see decisions about partnerships that are strategic. Streamline and cost effective is relevant, but adequate capacity is more important for preparedness. A strategy and visibility of funding is required.

Cluster Co: presented the current situation for Rakhine IDP camps based on Q3 2018 report. Just to be clear that I'm full time WASH cluster and speak on behalf of cluster and not for UNICEF. James and Bishnu who are here can speak on behalf of UNICEF WASH.

- Current partner coverage in IDP camps 4 key partners in Sittwe and no gaps in camps currently. On October 3<sup>rd</sup> DRC informed the WASH cluster and ECHO that they would like to discontinue their WASH programme in the two DRC camps in Sittwe and that they were unable to fundraise following the handover decision of KNP camp to SI. We had a cluster meeting last week and presented the proposed: DRC to continue, if DRC cannot continue, they should stay until October 2019 for a responsible handover after the rainy season. If needed before that, at a minimum DRC needs to stay until April 30, 2019. Alternative partners will be presented.
- In August, there was a cluster meeting with DRC, SI, UNICEF and National and Rakhine WASH cluster coordinators in Yangon. At that point, DRC indicated the risk if they have to handover KNP camp to SI due to UNICEF change of partnerships. DRC indicated they wanted to stay and were going to fundraise and Cluster offered to support with fundraising and followed it up.

DRC: It's the first time we hear we didn't inform of the risk until August. We've been telling UNICEF since April, and the risk has been consistently communicated in numerous emails and meetings since then.

Cluster Co: Perhaps informed UNICEF, but this risk was first brought to the cluster in the UNICEF-SI-DRC-Cluster meeting on the first week of August when you noted you were planning to fundraise to overcome the risk of having to also leave the 2 camps in Sittwe. DRC informed the



RE



RE Notice of DRC

DRC-UNICEF-ClusterPhase out of WASH

cluster of no funds (and ECHO) in October. Emails and minutes of discussions:

Cluster Co went over the presentation (in pdf above within this document). A few highlights include:

- In terms of funding situation, up to Q3, 8.4 million out of 12.6 USD we got for Rakhine. Funding shortage and short contracts impact our work. We do quarterly monitoring of funding camp by camp due to short nature of contracts/ grants with consistent concerns over funding gaps. Only HARP is offering multi-year funding. That has an impact on partner abilities to retain that to have strategic WASH cost effective response in the ground
- Comparison of 2017 and 2019 partnership changes in WASH cluster including from HARP and UNICEF changes of partnerships. Covered WASH cluster operational, staff and technical capacity.

- Focus on quality entails a number of initiatives such as through TWGs, update of standards and review of our 2017-2019 SOF, discussion on 3<sup>rd</sup> party monitoring, studies/evaluations, trainings, etc. For example, CDC came last year, Columbia University is coming this year, next year we have Tufts University with 4 studies.
- No gap in partnerships except for the upcoming one which DRC notified in October to us due to funding (and notified of the risk to UNICEF several months previously). We had a cluster meeting last week and we know there's been discussions with donors, including when DRC alerted the WASH Cluster and UNICEF of the risk in August. At this meeting, DRC also noted they planned to fundraise to cover this gap and if they were not able to, they would formally let the WASH Cluster know which they did in October. Cluster offered fundraising support after this meeting to DRC. As per last cluster meeting minutes, the WASH cluster recommends DRC to stay.

**Discussion: Some questions to help us get started:**

- Partners: With current funding available, do agencies feel they are able to cover all WASH needs with quality response?
- Partners: How is the current short funding cycle affecting your operations?
- Partners: Where does WASH sit in your organization's strategies?
- Donors & Partners: What are your commitment to WASH humanitarian response for the next years?

**DRC current camps.**

How is the current funding cycle?

What is your strategy?

SCI: One thing we might be missing. The discussion as Sunny pointed out focus on IDP camps but there are partners working outside camps. We are looking at longer term development funding through traditional donors. We are looking also how to complete that in line with local strategy we are working surrounding villages/host villages. How can we coordinate more amongst donors?

Cluster Co: Some villages are targeted under the HRP, but it is true that there is a WASH development sector beyond our humanitarian scope. For example we have IRC doing development in Rakhine, CDN who might be discontinuing in camps but work in villages in Kyaw Taw.

CDN: we might be discontinuing in camps, but work in 33 villages.

RI: in Myebon we are focusing on camp closure. How we manage for that and how we prepare for it. For current permanent housing, need government consulting.

DRC: ~~Until~~ the end of December, we have funding from Echo. For us we might not be a strategic WASH partner, we don't offer economies of scale. We only have two camps. We are trying to find donors to support long term. Transition will hopefully be done in a good manner. If someone is willing to give us money to run only two camps (with sufficient levels of staffing and support), or if we were to be able to expand our programme, we can stay. Otherwise, we need other WASH partners to support – we do not currently have any donor willing to make a longer-term funding commitment to DRC WASH programme. DRC has decided to phase out of WASH because we have been unable to secure adequate long-term funding, so we do not feel we offer good value for donors, or beneficiaries, and our other technical sectors are suffering due to having to subsidise our WASH programme. It is also difficult to retain staff, and to make substantial infrastructural improvements with

short-term funding. Having lost our funding for KNP camp (from UNICEF), it does not make strategic sense (for DRC, or we believe for donors or beneficiaries) for DRC to remain a WASH actor in only 2 Sittwe camps.

OXFAM: There is a gap between donors and partners and we need to keep the discussion going and use donor's leverage in areas such as camp closure, red lines, principles of engagement. How do agencies want to position and what are their responses for physical engagement in certain areas? Oxfam and SI are in consortium. Really appreciated that we are rely on long term funding. It allows us to work more with the community instead of going top down with long term strategy. As WASH cluster, we need to start looking at long term strategy and what we want to achieve. The WASH cluster timely gathered cluster position and tried to support and was very helpful. Cluster recommended against localization in these areas.

ECHO: It is very important the issue of camp closure. Partners are requesting to have clear guidelines on what donors will or not fund; where partners work with which funds? Who attended HCT camp closure workshop? In terms of leadership and providing concrete guidance, workshop didn't have actual decisions. Donor has a leadership role and would like to be involved, support and leverage to support.

**Action point 1: Cluster to re-open for a review the "WASH Cluster Camp Closure Position Paper" developed in June 2018 and include a discussion in the next national WASH cluster meeting.**

SI: SI was invited by WASH cluster to a meeting organized with DRC and UNICEF. We waited to have confirmation from DRC that they couldn't have other fund for Pauktaw camps which they confirmed in October 2018. In Sept, UNICEF sent formal letter to SI confirming DRC would handover to SI in Pauktaw camps. We really did advocacy to express our concerns aligned with cluster, for DRC to stay as we wanted that partner. Based on humanitarian principles, we said we can volunteer if there is a gap. The decision was made by UNICEF and maybe they can explain why it is disconnected. For capacity, we have full team in Pauktaw with full capacity. We have a team for consortium. We are not going to be cheaper or below the average 74 USD for example which we said. We are working at capacity and have large coverage.

Cluster Co: WASH Cluster invited and offered to have meetings with partners including with other sectors and UNICEF on this issue. The approach decided was bilateral discussions. WASH Cluster offered to facilitate these bilateral discussions and DRC requested cluster to get involved in early August. WASH cluster offered support for fundraising to DRC because we recognize the importance of keeping an additional partner for cluster operational capacity. There were bilateral discussion between DRC and UNICEF. WASH Cluster organized a meeting with DRC, UNICEF and invited SI to discuss the issue of Pauktaw camps at Yangon level. The conclusion was that a joint field visit needed to be conducted to establish the situation in the camp. The position was that the WASH cluster saw DRC leaving and this handover as a loss with one less partner in Pauktaw camps and with the risk, also because DRC led on protection, MHM, hygiene kits. DRC confirmed they wanted to continue and would fundraise to complement their WASH expatriate post which would be cut with the UNICEF transition in Pauktaw.

UNICEF: Bishnu: It is important to differentiate the strategy from the work plan. The WASH cluster already have a strategy. We need a workplan per camp for 2019. For Kyuak Phyu (KP), I visited to the camp in Kyaukphyu and had a meeting with district commissioners and other few people. Government plan is very confidential and not shared. They have planned to relocate the people. When we discussed with the government for Kyaukphyu, they don't want to disclose the plan. It is very difficult for us to influence government plan unless we know their plan. Donor commented we would like to be involved in government plans, we need to work together towards this. In response to SCI's

comment, in term of UNICEF, we are looking to support a development sector to capture the work outside of camps that are beyond WASH cluster. We shouldn't mix humanitarian and development. We are working with the government to set up a coordination mechanism for development works that we started last year but it is not really moving. So we are discussing in Nay Pyi Taw to have a functional sector WASH working group for development issues. This is the plan for 2019, working with government for Township WASH plans.

Action point 2: Donor and cluster meetings more often. Donors to join in and have more discussions with the cluster beyond the current technical or national officers attending the cluster meetings.

sa

Action point 3: WASH cluster to request donor's support with leveraging issues and advocacy when needed. Invitations for workshop and meeting continue to circulate.

Action point 4: As per WASH CC presentation, the WASH cluster request donors for longer term funding as short-term funding limits our ability to do more strategic and meaningful work with better long-term results and community involvement. It is also difficult to retain staff and other issues associated with short term funding.

UNICEF, James: For the camp transition, we met bilaterally with partners, with donors and with cluster. UNICEF recognized that there are definite risk in camp transitioning, it was driven by cost. From a cost efficiency point of view, it should be more Cost efficient after six years. From a strategic point of view, long term makes sense. Some of the funding is coming but we can't commit. We are chronically underfunded. With fewer partnerships maybe we can do longer term agreement partnership.

UNICEF, Bishnu: why local NGO in kyaukpyu? We are looking at diversity of the partners in Rakhine. We really need to maintain diversity of the UN agencies, INGOs, LNGOs, CSOs. If we work together, we can do something. Can we think about to jointly build the capacity of the National NGOs? UNICEF is putting more effort on providing close supervision and support to the National NGOs. We are taking the risk.

ECHO, Julien: It feels like a rushed agenda in response to cost efficiency rather than a step by step process. How can the handover to LNGO be done adequately? What are the milestone you need to do? Sit together to discuss with everyone. Avoid bilaterals. Visited Myebon and develop a timeline for handover with the elements necessary for handover.

UNICEF, Bishnu: We should have done a wider discussion before we moved forward. This is a lesson learnt for all of us. We want to avoid gaps and challenges with the workplan. There are principles of engagement and visits. Let's work together to see how can we solve this issue. The basic principle is to have a clear workplan for 2019 agreed by all and that we can follow. Before deciding with LNGO (CDA), we did a joint visit with OXFAM in the field. We looked at the CDA as they are our long-term partner. They are working a lot of development in other parts of Myanmar.

ECHO: on localization, need to avoid exposing partners. Basically a strategy is needed to identify risks. Where are we standing, who is well positioned, what are we doing, which environment we are working in. What we would like to see with the coming partners. UNICEF, partners, cluster in the middle that would help in the process. For donor community to be involved, evaluate the needs, to avoid gaps.

	<p>Cluster co: WAHS Cluster shared the position for localization. WASH cluster aligns with world humanitarian summit goals but it needs to be contextualized. The WASH cluster did not recommend localization in Myebon and Kyauk Phyu on the basis that they are remote and very sensitive locations, therefore localization should be in nearer areas to Sittwe for appropriate monitoring, supervision, mentoring and AAP. For Kyauk Phyu specifically, the WASH cluster saw the GAD collaboration with Oxfam as a good opportunity with GAD responding during the floods this year for example. If that model worked, we could've replicated in other areas for more government responsibility for service delivery in camps. CDA specifically had never worked in conflict areas and there was a concern with their capacity and impartiality. More details on powerpoint. The WASH cluster developed positions and shared consistently as per timeline in powerpoint, WASH cluster has the strategic framework, camp closure document, transition toolkit, etc. Also the HRP plans go into detail with breakdown of support and operational cost per partner per township with averages.</p> <p>HARP: on localization, there is an opportunity in villages. More opportunities to localize in these locations instead of camps.  UNICEF, Bishnu: visited to Myebon. We are not thinking cost efficiency and effectiveness. As a cluster, Sunny raised issues strongly although she is sitting @ UNICEF, she brought cluster position to us and to management. In Kyauk pyu: UNICEF talked with District administrator. Situation is relative in various places. GAD is only doing security. They have to follow humanitarian principles.</p> <p>DRC: <u>Yangon-level</u> cluster did a lot to represent partners' concerns and support and facilitate. <u>We have been working with Sunny to find solutions to our funding issue, and to work out the best strategy to resolve the issue of how to cover WASH services in the 2 DRC Sittwe WASH camps.</u></p> <p>RI: the positions from the cluster detailed on the strategy/plan drafted by the cluster and shared before this meeting reflect that already.</p> <p>ECHO: we have to use government's accountabilities. Please think of donor's role, we must hold government accountable. We shouldn't be supporting. Reference to the Fact Finding Mission, we can't keep going on the same manner. More accountability and buy in from the international community. We need to handover responsibility to government because of government policy and encampment and policies they put in place.</p> <p>OFDA: we request UNICEF for more transparency on how decisions are made, there are cost trade-offs but overall capacity is more important. Recent decision of RI staying in Myebon is great, we need to keep an open discussion.</p>		
3	<p><b>Transition: Change of partnerships &amp; 2 DRC camps</b></p> <p>Cluster Co: presented with timeline of events and change of partnerships. WASH cluster presented the decision from the cluster meeting where DRC is the recommended partner by all cluster partners. If DRC decides not to stay, SCI and CDN confirmed to the WASH cluster last week their commitment for WASH services in IDP camps and can take over the 2 DRC camps. The WASH cluster proposes these two partners as plan B based on a number of criteria mentioned related to WASH team presence in Rakhine, knowledge of Sittwe IDP camps WASH services, etc. The WASH cluster partners and DRC agreed that DRC should stay until October 2019 at a minimum for an appropriate handover. If DRC needs to leave earlier, at a minimum it should be by end of April 2019. WASH cluster comes up with positions, strategies, but has no decision power, that lies with partners and donors here, so we try to influence.</p>		

DRC: we have two donors (UNICEF, ECHO). We do need continued funding. We want to stay in the 2 camps and in WASH. We are happy to work with cluster and donors. How we can get the long term funding required? MHF limitations on staffing. We had an open discussion with UNICEF in May and Cluster in early August.

DRC (Rakhine): we are happy to stay in camps. DRC had lowest costs in comparison from other partners, because we have been underfunded in WASH for some time, but we cannot continue to operate like this. Now we are not more cost effective than others, as DRC does not have other WASH programs and now with the UNICEF cut in Pauktaw have less capacity, and will be proportionally more expensive, due to the need to maintain adequate staffing (including an international WASH specialist) for 2 rather than 3 camps. DRC can handover responsibility if no longer term funding is available. UNICEF ~~and ECHO~~ provided short term funding every few months over the past ear, which limits DRC's ability to operate. ECHO were also only able to offer 8 months of funding in DRC's initial ECHO grant for 2018 (now extended until Feb 2019), and DRC was unable to make cuts from Protection or CCCM in Rakhine (also funded by the same ECHO grant), plus the same ECHO grant also funds DRC activities in Kachin and Oxfam activities in Kachin. We need at least one year of sustainable funding to stay in WASH. Quality of services is important for DRC. ~~ECHO funds other activities~~.

Cluster Co: Following the cut from UNICEF and impact on your support costs, the MHF can absorb that for example. How much is that? MHF funds is not ideal, is a gap filler but this would be prioritized by the WASH cluster given the imminent nature. If donors can't support for longer term, will you stay?

ECHO: mentioned they hadn't heard this issue of short term funding. Conclusion: We want to see DRC stay at least until Oct 2019 as cluster suggested and have a smooth transition. Possible partners are identified with joint field visits and inventory done with the partners. ECHO mentioned they would like to join field visits. ECHO funds yearly through the HIP and funding levels expected to stay. ECHO is interested to looking at other ideas for contribution such as what the WASH cluster presented on 3<sup>rd</sup> party monitoring or preparedness.

Cluster Co: reminded of UNICEF-HARP-ECHO meeting where donors were planning on the field visit but then it went for the WASH cluster to organize in Rakhine with anyone invited.

UNICEF: Transition should be started in the monsoon period, if DRC decide to discontinue and handover in Oct, to have proper transition.

OXFAM: We will look at the status of infrastructure to allow new partner to budget and plan based on their operations and costs.

SCI: Need to look at the infrastructure and the modality of delivery through contractors or not based on the experience of handover under HARP.

Cluster Co: Joint cluster field visit is planned for tomorrow with every partner invited. Up to now CDN, SI, Oxfam, DRC had confirmed. This joint visit is to look at needs and costs in relation to WASH cluster standards in these camps. I cancelled my trip to Rakhine to join this trip as I needed to be here but we hope to receive the report within a week. DRC already estimated costs for these camps and shared with the cluster partners.

Action point 5: Rakhine WASH cluster joint field visit report with needs and costs to be shared with partners and donors within the next week.

#### 2 DRC camps

SI: Would DRC be able to stay if they had an expat?

Cluster Co: What is DRC's strategy and how does it incorporate WASH? Do you want to stay in WASH in the coming 2 years if funding wasn't an issue?

DRC: DRC will phase out but want to handover responsibly as agreed by October 2018. DRC would want to stay but is not a cost effective partner because this would be our only WASH programming in Myanmar, we do not have a lot of WASH in other parts of Asia region, and now we are left with only 2 WASH camps. This means that it no longer makes strategic sense for DRC to remain in WASH in Rakhine (unless a donor is able to provide us with 12 months of sufficient funding, in which case, we could reconsider)

HARP: you can't compare apples with oranges on cost effectiveness. There are other factors to be considered.

ECHO: cost/beneficiary provided by the WASH cluster is not representative and in some areas it is more expensive. This comes as a result of UNICEF's shake up and needs more regular communication.

Cluster Co: WASH cluster has a detailed HRP planning and costing with breakdown per partner including operation and support costs and also per township. This average cost/beneficiary is just a ballpark to give some idea for discussion but it varies and we have already shared with the WASH cluster the detailed costing for 2019. Same was done for 2018. What is donor's commitment to cover these camps? Is ECHO committed to funding WASH in these camps in 2019?

Action point 6: WASH cluster to circulate again the detailed costing per township and beneficiary typology. More details available upon request with breakdown of operational and support costs.

ECHO: We don't have sector specific funding but has a commitment to continuity of services. The call for proposals is coming out soon. We want more regular joint visits in Rakhine.

Action point 7: Rakhine WASH Cluster to carry out regular joint visits to camps.

Cluster Co: based on the presentation, the cluster partners who are best positioned to take over would be CDN and SCI. They also confirmed interest in the last WASH cluster meeting.

CDN: CDN has the capacity and is doing WASH in Rakhine. It is difficult to get 3 months of funding at a time which is similar to what DRC was mentioning and a partners' issue.



	<p>SCI: SCI is also interested to expand the presence of WASH in camps in Rakhine and works in different sectors in these specific DRC camps. SCI also has development funds for WASH and raised this issue of donors discussion with development donors in this context.</p> <p>Action point 8: donors to discuss with development donors on humanitarian-development nexus for Rakhine and in the protracted crisis in Myanmar.</p> <p>Action point 9: With costs from DRC and from the joint visit, we need to follow up on discussions with DRC and SCI and/or CDN for a consortium set up <a href="#">if appropriate</a> or <a href="#">coordinated planning a way</a> to ensure smooth transition and funding.</p> <p>Action point 10: discussion amongst donors needed to define who can fund what. Based on that, MHF can be prioritized or not for DRC camps. Noting MHF deadline for proposals is November 25<sup>th</sup>.</p>		
	<p><b>Moving forwards and Transition/DRC camps discussion</b></p> <p><u>Contractors</u></p> <p>Oxfam: A paramount discussion to be held is on the contractors issue and the consequences of endorsing a system that penalizes IDPs while supporting corruption. Paradigm in how we work in camps and the red lines on principles of engagement. We need to formalize a cluster position.</p> <p>ECHO: this is important and the solution does not have to be exclusive, but red lines to be drafted.</p> <p>UNICEF: infrastructure cost is high, important to find out the costs in all camps and segregating the cost to check on cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Cluster Co: discussions took place on the issue of contractors in Rakhine and an analysis was done at national level to support the Rakhine WASH cluster which showed that after cyclone Mora, most damaged infrastructure happened in areas where partners used contractors. Also a HARP inventory showed infrastructure delivered through contractors yielded less. There are different views so a consensus is required so we can put that. Do you want in Rakhine or national level led?</p> <p>Partners/donors: this should be done in Rakhine as more operational and contextual.</p> <p>Action point 11: Rakhine WASH Cluster to write a position paper advising on the use or not of contractors for WASH construction and rehabilitation in the camps.</p> <p>Action point 12: National WASH Cluster will build on the already shared analysis of contractors versus direct implementation and propose a discussion on the national WASH cluster meeting to look at what other factors need to be considered in the Rakhine WASH cluster position paper.</p>		

Action point 13: Rakhine WASH Cluster to raise to ICCG at Rakhine level the WASH cluster position on contractors especially with infrastructure clusters (i.e. shelter, education) as their work through contractors can impact on the WASH cluster decision/consensus to be reflected on the position paper.

Closure of camps

ECHO: following the 'HCT camp closure workshop' the impression is that partners need guidance and the WASH cluster should discuss on this issue.

Action point 1 already covers this.

We will continue this discussion this coming Thursday at the national WASH cluster – everyone is welcomed. Thanks for requesting this meeting and for everyone's input.

Meeting Title : WASH Cluster Meeting

Venue : UNICEF Office, Yangon

Time : 10:00- 12:00

Date : 05-11-2018 (Monday)



No	Name	Title	Organization	Email	Contact Ph	Signature
	Deborah Murphy	OFDA rep	USAID	dmurphy@ofda.gov		<i>[Signature]</i>
	BEN	WASH Advisor CDN-ZOA	ZOA	a.benhamouche@zoa.ngo		<i>[Signature]</i>
	Julien Baha Collett	TECHNICAL EXPERT	ECHO	Julien.Baha-collette@echofield.org	09 403 233 238	<i>[Signature]</i>
	PETER MCGEACHIE	HARP-P DTZ	HARP-P	peter.mceachie@ecdf.org	09 786933438	<i>[Signature]</i>
	PE DONATI	WASH CONSORTIUM MANAGER	OXFAM			<i>[Signature]</i>
	DAVID GIMAZWANI	HEAD OF PROGRAMS	DLC	DAVID.GIMAZWANI@DLC.MG		<i>[Signature]</i>
	Katie Tuller	Business Development	RI	katie.tuller@ri.org	09420053746	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Valentin Bidoue	WASH Coordinator	SI ygn.	wash.coord@si.org	09 8989 04 996	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Joke Thuriere	CD	SI	joke.thuriere@si.org	09 425 007 411	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Gareth Hughes	CD	CDN	g.hughes@zoa.ngo	09 486 785 68	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Vincent Ponzani	HOP	SCI	vincent.ponzani@scitech.org	09 261 831 760	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Cleavina Cantai	HOO	ECHO	cleavina.cantai@echofield.eu	09 254 461 117	<i>[Signature]</i>
	Beshna Pochum	WASH chief UNICEF	UNICEF	bpoichrum@unicef.org	09 451 15550	<i>[Signature]</i>

unicef.org

