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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRISIS</th>
<th>South Sudan Civil War, December 2013–onwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PEOPLE AFFECTED*</td>
<td>7 million individuals, as of Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PEOPLE DISPLACED*</td>
<td>1.9 million individuals displaced (over 265,000 individuals settled in PoC sites)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT LOCATION**
Malakal Protection of Civilian (PoC) site, Upper Nile state

**PROJECT BENEFICIARIES**
1,242 households (3,856 individuals) received shelter support
Over 5,200 households (29,000 individuals) benefiting from site reconfiguration and infrastructure upgrade

**PROJECT OUTPUTS**
959 individual shelters built (238 blocks)
64 carpenters trained on shelter construction
206 heads of households trained on shelter maintenance
Site works: clearing and grading, drainage and roads improved, culverts installed

**SHELTER SIZE**
13.5m² (4.5x3m)

**SHELTER DENSITY**
3.4m² per person on average

**MATERIALS COST**
USD 201 per shelter (USD 804 per block, including labour)

**PROJECT COST**
USD 280 per household

**PROJECT SUMMARY**
As part of the wider rehabilitation of the whole site, the project targeted a sector in the Malakal Protection of Civilians site to reconfigure its layout and address issues of overcrowding, security, flood risk and poor distribution of services. One organization was in charge of the site planning and development, while another led the community mobilization, site management and shelter components. Robust emergency shelters according to Cluster-agreed designs were provided to the residents of the reconfigured sector of the site, through a highly consultative process.

* Figures as of December 2017. South Sudan HRP 2018.
** DTM, April 2018.

**STRENGTHS**
+ Procurement challenges were anticipated and delays avoided.
+ Community participation throughout the project.
+ Equitable and effective shelter allocation process.
+ Good coordination and collaboration with all stakeholders.
+ Effective collaboration with peacekeeping forces.

**WEAKNESSES**
- Community resistance and disagreements were not anticipated.
- Initial gaps in coordination between partners.
- The small transit site limited the pace and efficiency of the project.

---
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The project rehabilitated a sector of the Malakal PoC through a phased approach.

---

**TIMELINE**

Sep–Dec 2017. Planning phase: Community discussions conducted prior to start of activities.

Jan–Apr 2018. Phase 1: Community mobilization, demonstration of prototype and community consultations informing project design.


In Malakal, Upper Nile, IOM is responsible for care and maintenance and second half of the year, IOM engineering teams engaged in a range of site infrastructure construction, upkeep, and rehabilitation to ensure the continued hygienic living conditions of IDP residents and the continuation of humanitarian operations.

Once donor funding has been secured, CCCM teams stand ready to begin the first round of rehabilitation. Subsequent rounds of population influxes in 2017 and during the rainy season. The conditions in the Malakal PoC were particularly grim, especially after the new security, including gender-based violence. The environment also contributed to increasing risks to safety and security. Recurrent flooding affected the site, due to collapse of drainage and lack of tertiary drainage. The environment also contributed to increasing risks to safety and security, including gender-based violence.

The main issues in the PoC included congestion and overcrowding, encroachment of roads, lack of privacy for families sharing communal shelters, as well as the overall deterioration of shelters. Recurrent flooding affected the site, due to collapse of drainage and lack of tertiary drainage. The environment also contributed to increasing risks to safety and security, including gender-based violence.


**CONTEXT**
For more background information, see overview A.23 in Shelter Projects 2015-2016, and A.6 in this edition.

Over three years into the conflict, fighting intensified in the first half of 2017, causing further displacement across the country.

**SITUATION IN MALAKAL**
Malakal is amongst the largest towns in South Sudan and had a thriving market before the conflict. Since late 2013 when the conflict started, the town experienced heavy fighting that caused large-scale damage and displacement. Many people sought refuge in the Protection of Civilians (PoC) site within the peacekeeping base.

As it was never intended to become a long-term settlement, the site conditions soon became very dire, particularly during the rainy season. Four years after its establishment, and because of new population influxes in 2017, the site required rehabilitation due to uneven distribution of common facilities and infrastructure, as well as disorganized location and density of shelter areas.

The main issues in the PoC included congestion and overcrowding, encroachment of roads, lack of privacy for families sharing communal shelters, as well as the overall deterioration of shelters. Recurrent flooding affected the site, due to collapse of drainage and lack of tertiary drainage. The environment also contributed to increasing risks to safety and security, including gender-based violence.

**SITE REHABILITATION PROGRAMME**
Site planning and development activities in South Sudan were coordinated under the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster. In line with the CCCM and Shelter-NFI Cluster strategies, and building on the experiences of the PoCs in Bentiu and Wau, two organizations and the CCCM Cluster led the rehabilitation process of the Malakal PoC between 2017 and 2018, with the support of the peacekeeping mission.

Organization A – which was in charge of site management in the site since 2014 – led the community mobilization and shelter construction components, while Organization B was the overall lead of site planning and site development across the site. This case study focuses on the reconfiguration process of sector 4.

**PLANNING PHASE**
Standard Operating Procedures were developed to guide the process, an inclusive community consultation and sensitization plan was created, and community specialized committees established to support the communication with site residents on the reconfiguration. Mass communication campaigns were conducted to ensure the population at large was informed.

Two prototype shelters were constructed for exhibition, allowing for dialogue with community members and helping to further refine the design in a participatory manner.

A transit site was established next to sector 4 and used to gradually move people and clear areas of the old site. Due to its small size, the speed of the relocation and rehabilitation process was slow.

Map showing the drainages (in dark red) and roads (in dark blue) rehabilitated as part of the site upgrade. This case study focuses on sector 4 of the site.

**CONFLICT**
**SHELTER DESIGN**

The objectives of the new shelter design were to increase the minimum covered living space, improve privacy and dignity for users and provide a more robust and durable solution, compared to the existing communal shelters. New shelters were taller than the old ones, to enable better ventilation and had roof overhangs to provide shading for outdoor activities.

Organization A initially designed a 9m² shelter in consultation with the Shelter Cluster, for an average household of three members. However, the shelter design was later revised to accommodate the increased number of people arriving in the PoC and the average household size. The shelters were arranged in blocks, with each individual unit measuring 3x4.5m. Household sizes ranged from three to eight persons, with an average of five. Shelters were designed for up to four people, so for larger families two shelters were allocated, with the option to remove the internal partition if desired. For polygamous families, shelter allocation was based on the number of wives and children.

The involvement of IDP committees was essential in the process of shelter allocation. For example, the organization initially planned to move some of the households to other sectors in the site, due to the large population in sector 4. In order not to separate families from the same groups, community representatives suggested to allocate one shelter for households of up to five members, even if this meant that they would have less living space.

**BENEFICIARY REGISTRATION**

Once Organization B completed the site plan and collected biometric data of residents in sector 4, Organization A conducted the beneficiary registration process. This was sensitive, as one of the potential risks was that residents from other sectors would claim shelters in the reconfigured sector. Households were mapped to ensure relatives and people from the same group would be resettled together, as well as to identify and prioritize vulnerable individuals and consider specific protection needs in the allocation process. Conducting the allocation in the design stage also aimed at involving beneficiaries earlier on, as they would be responsible for the construction of their shelters.

A complaints desk was established jointly by site management and protection actors, to assist people with special needs and those who had not been registered.

**REHABILITATION PROCESS**

Organization A established a transit site with 459 tents and storage spaces in an empty area adjacent to sector 4. In coordination with WASH partners, it upgraded the existing latrines and bathing facilities, and built four communal spaces and kitchens.

The rehabilitation was phased, starting with residents in the most congested blocks, who were first moved into the transit site. The site management team supported the verification and relocation of individuals from their shelters to the transit site and deployed additional personnel to manage it.

Site management staff carried out regular sensitization and awareness campaigns on the maintenance of available services at the transit site.

During the rehabilitation, the organization coordinated the monitoring, identification and demolition of unauthorized structures along the WASH corridors to create more space for facilities, and maintain road infrastructure to facilitate service delivery. A total of 83 shelters were dismantled.

In blocks were people had already moved, old shelters were dismantled and the site cleared, mainly through community mobilization. Organization B conducted the initial earthworks, including grading and levelling, decommissioned the old drainage and excavated the new channels and roads according to the site plan. Soil was sourced from a nearby quarry and transported on site for backfilling, grading and compacting of the ground for the blocks. Finally, tertiary drainage around shelter blocks was excavated.

Once the space was rehabilitated, levelled and shelters were built, IDPs were allocated to newly constructed shelters.

Close coordination with the protection team sought to ensure that persons with specific needs were prioritized in the shelter reallocation and that their position in the new layout was close to services and WASH facilities.
SHELTER CONSTRUCTION AND TRAINING

New shelters in each rehabilitated blocks were built involving site residents. Local carpenters were trained on shelter construction and maintenance, and were responsible for plot demarcation and sizing of materials to ensure speed and efficiency. Fifty-four community members were trained in demarcation, set-out, shelter construction and maintenance. These then trained their assistants on-the-job. Shelters were built through cash for work in blocks of four to six units, aiming to maximize available space for infrastructure and services.

The organization also conducted training to households within each block on shelter maintenance and site management, with a focus on avoiding construction of unauthorized structures and on fire safety.

This process ensured residents could participate in the construction and, even more importantly, in the care and maintenance phase, as well as earning an income in the process.

MATERIALS AND SUPPLY

The phased relocation approach allowed for a phased procurement of materials and easy storage, which minimized damage and loss of assets.

The shelters were made of timber and plastic sheeting for walling and roofing. Almost all materials were sourced outside Malakal, due to the unavailability in the local market and to protect the already dilapidated physical environment from further deterioration.

Initially, Organization A had considered acquiring most materials from the Shelter-NFI pipeline. However, the pipeline could only provide plastic sheeting used for the partitions, so the organization engaged certified suppliers authorized by the government to harvest poles in surrounding counties and monitor the transport to the site.

Materials were transported through the Logistics Cluster, which meant that the delivery was relatively slow, as it relied on their schedule and priorities. Most materials were stored off site, while three containers were moved to the site to pre-position items during the phased construction.

Organization A procured two timber cutting machines and constructed a workshop on site. Shelter staff trained five carpenters in the PoC on general operation of the saw machines, as well as on how to size the timbers at different angles, and trained casual workers on how to protect timber against termites. Timbers were cut in the required lengths as per the design and bundled as kits for each block.

Organization B took care of the mobilization of site clearing equipment and the procurement of culverts.

COORDINATION

The site management team, with the support of the CCCM Cluster, acted as a bridge between service providers and site residents to ensure gaps could be reported and service delivery was efficient. In this capacity, Organization A maintained essential communal infrastructure such as footbridges, communication centres, community halls and recreational areas.

It also supported the dissemination of information products from partners, to create awareness on services available to mitigate and address protection risks within the PoC. This campaign was then expanded to the host community through outreach teams and the delivery of leaflets on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) and referral pathways.

The organization established and circulated a quarterly community meeting calendar amongst all partners, to ensure that meetings with various groups were properly coordinated, and to promote participation. Moreover, to respond to community engagement challenges in the early phases, the organization facilitated bi-weekly meetings between agencies and camp leadership structures to share updates, coordinate aid delivery and ensure that assistance reached the most vulnerable.

MAIN CHALLENGES

ACCESS AND LOGISTICS. Shipping of materials was delayed due to insecurity around Malakal, and heavy rains affected the site development works. One machine broke down, but was fixed using the standby mechanics who were employed for regular repairs.

UNDERSTANDING OF TECHNICAL STANDARDS. Initially, community leaders struggled to understand the standards used for site layout, width of roads, drainage and distance from shelters to latrines. Using prototypes and demonstrations on the ground helped explain these concepts to the community and solve any disagreement.

COMMUNITY RESISTANCE. Several hurdles with community youth occurred during the rehabilitation process. These included disagreements over the occupancy rate and number of shelters per block, which led to the stopping of demarcation works, and over a pay rise due to currency inflation, which caused workers to go on strike. Prolonged negotiations and a re-calculation of the pay rate solved these issues. In one instance, violence against project staff required the mediation of peacekeepers and the redesign of the proposed block layout.

PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

As part of a separate PSEA initiative, Organization A – together with another agency – conducted awareness sessions for men and women separately, trained community committees and set up a Community-Based Complaint Mechanism across the site.

Community-led protection structures were supported with incentives and involved in decision-making on key initiatives. Beneficiaries were consulted on the reconfiguration plan through focus group discussions with youth, elderly and women’s group, as well as by involving community leaders.

The organization also promoted participation of 50 per cent men and women in camp leadership structures, and ensured age, gender and area of origin were equally represented in community committees.
STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES AND LESSONS LEARNED

STRONGTHS

+ Procurement delays were anticipated and alternative materials stocked as contingency (e.g. bamboos to replace timbers). To overcome transport delays from the logistics base to the site, additional storage space and vehicles were secured to pre-position items on site.

+ Participation and engagement of the community at all stages of the project.

+ Equitable and effective shelter allocation process. This was possible thanks to the collaboration of site management, protection and registration teams from the two organizations.

+ Good coordination and collaboration with all stakeholders, both at inter-cluster level and between the two implementing organizations.

+ Effective collaboration with peacekeeping forces proved instrumental in overcoming issues with the community and providing logistical support when needed, also thanks to the joint monitoring visits conducted with the two implementing organizations.

WEAKNESSES

- The extent of initial resistance and demands from community members were not sufficiently anticipated, despite the strong community engagement component.

- Initial gaps in coordination between partners meant that communities were often unilaterally engaged and schedules not aligned. To help coordinated resources and activities, a common plan, a calendar for community mobilization activities and regular operational meetings were set up.

- The small size of the transit site limited the number of households that could be relocated and impacted on the intervention capacity. The transit site could only accommodate one block of households at a time, thus relocation, site development and shelter construction were limited to the size of the vacated block.

MATERIALS LIST FOR A STANDARD BLOCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Unit cost (USD)</th>
<th>Total cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x4&quot; Hardwood timbers</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>284.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x2&quot; Hardwood timbers, 4m long</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>111.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4x5m plastic sheet</td>
<td>pcs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>175.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamboo</td>
<td>bundles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding wire</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails 4&quot;, 3&quot; and 2&quot;</td>
<td>kg</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber washer</td>
<td>packet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylon ropes (30 m/roll)</td>
<td>roll</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour for construction</td>
<td>crew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, loading and offloading</td>
<td>lump sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total per block 804.50
Average cost per individual shelter 201.13

LESSONS LEARNED

• Managing community expectations. Shelter prototypes should display the same size of blocks and exact types of materials as will be used for the actual construction, as any deviation will be a cause for disagreement and contention.

• Continuous engagement of the IDP committees was vital to the reconfiguration process. Some of the suggestions made by community representatives – including around the shelter allocation by household size – contributed to the project’s success.

• Holding meetings outside the targeted sector of the site provided a more conducive environment to address issues, especially after the incident that involved violence against staff.