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Methodology

Survey of camp residents

Randomly selected 3056 individuals in four fields; in CIP camps, comparison camps, and in areas of larger scale construction/reconstruction. After data cleaning 2908 datasets were relevant. Of these 56.3 percent are female, and 43.7 percent are male; 24.5 percent are between 15 and 24 (Youth), 68.7 percent are between 25 and 65 and 6.8 percent are above 65; 7.1 percent are people with disabilities; 25 percent have ration cards; 92.7 percent are Palestine refugees; and 10.3 percent live in rented houses. Of the ones living in CIP camps 44 percent were aware of the CIP process.
Qualitative work

- the review of documentation available, manuals, guidelines, CIP plans, documentation of reconstruction, project documents
- focus groups with Camp Committees, Persons with Disabilities, Youth, Working Groups, CIP Focus Groups, Women, Beneficiaries of CIP, Beneficiaries of shelter rehabilitation, Poor, and Contractors (representatives of these groups were selected by CSOs and CIP staff)
- individual interviews with UNRWA staff at different levels, Host Representatives, and Donor Representatives
- visual inspection of infrastructure
- triangulation of information and testing of hypotheses
### Survey Results

#### Camp residents' satisfaction about UNRWA services related to the built environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Non CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>St. E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bank</strong></td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaza</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordan</strong></td>
<td>59.65</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lebanon</strong></td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Projects in Camps meet the needs of the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Non CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>St. E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bank</strong></td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaza</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordan</strong></td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lebanon</strong></td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The level of influence on the built environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Non CIP</th>
<th>St. E</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>St. E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bank</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>54.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaza</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jordan</strong></td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lebanon</strong></td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• it is an extraordinary achievement of ICIP and the field offices to rebuild Naher el Bared and Jenin; without this refugees might have been permanently displaced
• camp profiles are a very powerful tool to advocate for assistance on specific infrastructure in camps
• most stakeholders, except the poor with very bad condition shelters do not see the built environment at the same level of priority as education and health programming
• the current standard of shelter construction, rehabilitation, self help leads to a high impact for relatively few people of which a significant proportion seem to able to mobilize significant resources themselves indicating challenges in targeting
• the different standards and the timing of delivering shelters poses a further equity challenge (different standards for different funding sources, some people getting shelters significantly earlier than others (Gaza, Jordan, Naher el Bared)
• it is not clear who owns the CIP plans, and what the role of UNRWA should be, hosts and donors see it more in a facilitation coordination role rather than owning the plans
• a significant proportion of activities under CIP is not related to the built environment
Efficiency

• the move to modular construction has delivered efficiency gains, and often improved quality
• quality control mechanisms for construction vary across fields with some of the Gaza projects (especially Saudi II) and later packages of Naher el Bared having the best systems (WBFO seems challenged by leaking roofs and internal sewage systems)
• especially in JFO and WBFO the coordination between the CIP team and the engineering department has been challenging (long term staff vs. project staff)
• CIP approach needs significant additional time and other resources compared with previous approach
Effectiveness

- ICIP has very successfully advocated for the implementation of more integrated planning, but in the process has been very involved in field implementation while some of the core headquarters’ functions have been lagging behind such as (a) strategy and policy development, (b) setting standards, (c) giving technical guidance and advice and (d) monitoring and evaluation.
- In Naher el Bared and in Gaza rehousing there is a culture of learning with constant improvements from one package to the next.
- The professional opinion of engineers and planners is important, as just responding to the wants of individuals / communities without keeping usability in mind will not lead to best solution (houses with small odd shaped rooms).
- CIPs are of varying type some focusing on process (recounting meetings held in the community) some focus on the voting / prioritization. The data collected for the CIP were not always relevant (census in Talbiyeh). Prioritization was done without costing and alternatives. Open spaces have mixed results (Deheische and Talbiyeh the community has less access to some spaces after project implementation). There is a focus on architecture and esthetics not utility. There is a high proportion of unfinished projects, but some CIP projects excellent (opening of road, and access to school).
- The CIP manual stipulated an elaborate and somewhat costly process, but missed key elements of urban planning, building community capacity, prioritization and sustainability.
- GIZ seems to promote empowerment up to a point where challenging the DPA and "controlled conflict" is encouraged in JFO. It is not clear if UNRWA should be seen promoting this.
Opening a gate for students away from main road (Fawwar)
Playground was designed, then fenced, then permanently closed (Talbiyeh)
Playground was designed, then fenced, then permanently closed (Talbiye)

One urban pocket garden was fenced and lock up with the key kept by the house owner next to it. The keeper of the key is the contractor who built this park. The park is used by the key-keeper and his neighbors.
Impact

• the creation of ICIP and CIP has enabled UNRWA to reach a new strata of audiences and been a very effective advocacy tool
• individualization of designs for shelters has led to a greater feeling of inequity as some families were able to get more than others
• procedures on shelters have not been clear to beneficiaries and other stakeholders, leading to a perception of nepotism and corruption (how the size was calculated, how to complain about construction quality)
• Refugees have always shaped the built environment themselves, and enforcement of rules has always been difficult in camps
• existing power structures in the camps seem to have been strengthened by the CIP approach
• expectations were disappointed in the reconstruction and CIP approach (drawings do not match construction, prioritization does not lead to projects)
Sustainability

- ownership of shelters is generally good with a significant proportion of people improving shelters using additional funding (however indicating challenges in targeting)
- ownership of CIP infrastructure interventions is mixed; good for some individually used initiatives, not so good for many others
- working groups created under CIP are not yet enabled to be independent, have not raised funding outside attached German funding, have disintegrated (Husn), taken over by Camp Committee (Talbiyeh)
Preliminary Key Recommendations

1. Decide on the nature of community development. UNRWA would like to engage in how much empowerment and for whom; existing power structure or most vulnerable?

2. Participation should be more focused on results. Consider the use of consultative approaches instead, keeping in mind the role of the technical specialists, the overall limitations of implementation, and use townhall meetings more frequently.

3. If a continuous higher level involvement in the built environment is sought, then graduate from a neighborhood upgrading approach to an urban planning approach, including more technical expertise on projecting demographics and its implications for housing, schooling, health services, water, sewage networks, and transport systems (open roads).

4. Reconsider shelter standards, balancing the need for donors to present attractive shelters to their constituents with the growing numbers of vulnerable refugees that require basic shelter. A self-targeting approach would reach the largest number of vulnerable refugees but might not be feasible for donors.

5. Self help approaches should be further studied. However, this cannot be combined with self targeting.

6. Continue and strengthen the camp profile project, including crowdedness of the poorest quintile to assess the access to affordable housing better. Use the camp profiles to prioritize interventions across UNRWA fields of operation.

7. Now that basic capacity in fields exist, headquarters should focus on the typical headquarters role of updating policies and standards, and to provide practical guidelines checklists for fields, engineers, and beneficiaries.

8. Addressing preparing for the situation in terms of the medium. How much does UNRWA want to be involved? What should the conditions be for involvement?

9. UNRWA should be concerned over priorities of refugees and other local stakeholders for education and health services, as well as in the challenging structure of the General Fund, as well as the operational risk associated with infrastructure implementation.
Decide on the nature of community development UNRWA would like to engage in. How much empowerment and for whom; existing power structure or most vulnerable?
Participation should be more focused on results. Consider the use of consultative approaches instead, keeping in mind the role of the technical specialists, the overall limitations of implementation, and use townhall meetings more frequently.
If a continuous higher level involvement in the built environment is sought, then graduate from a neighborhood upgrading approach to an urban planning approach, including more technical expertise on projecting demographics and its implications for housing, schooling, health services, water, sewage networks, and transport systems (open roads).
Reconsider shelter standards, balancing the need for donors to present attractive shelters to their constituents with the growing numbers of vulnerable refugees that require basic shelter. A self-targeting approach would reach the largest number of vulnerable refugees but might not be feasible for donors.
Self help approaches should be further studied. However, this cannot be combined with self targeting.
Continue and strengthen the camp profile project, including crowdedness of the poorest quintile to assess the access to affordable housing better. Use the camp profiles to prioritize interventions across UNRWA fields of operation.
Now that basic capacity in fields exist, headquarters should focus on the typical headquarters role of updating policies and standards, and to provide practical guidelines checklists for fields, engineers, and beneficiaries.
Already start preparing for the situation in Syria after the conflict. How much does UNRWA want to be involved? What should the conditions be for reconstruction?
UNRWA should be conscious of priorities of refugees and other local stakeholders for education and health services, as well as the challenging situation of the General Fund, as well as the reputational risk associated with infrastructure implementation.
Engagement in Camps - Way Forward

High Scenario
Engage with organizations that have long experience in community development, with the goal to establish reasonably representative and responsible community organizations that will be strong partners in attracting funding and implementing projects in the camps.

OR
Allow external actors to plan with support of UNRWA (a) DPA, DORA, LPDC, (b) iNGOs, (c) camp committees get the partnership unit in ERCD involved.
Headquarters then can focus on guiding fields, and expand towards higher level urban planning

Low Scenario - Mainstream
Strengthened role of CSO who is and has been representative of UNRWA in camps, in coordination with Social Worker for targeting and Engineer for infrastructure work will create medium term high level priorities in coordination with existing organizations in camp.
ICIP in fields would focus on supporting construction and monitoring and evaluation, ICIP in headquarters on policy and standard setting