

**MYANMAR KACHIN & NORTHERN
SHAN STATES CAMP PROFILING
ROUNDS 1-3**

**CROSS-CAMP AND TREND
ANALYSIS REPORT**

2013 – 2015

JANUARY 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is a collaborative effort between the Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster for the Kachin and northern Shan States and the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS).

The camp profiling exercises were conducted in close collaboration with partner organizations and involve the participation of both international and national partners including: UNHCR, DRC, OCHA, UNICEF, WFP, Shalom, RANIR, KBC, and KMSS.

We are particularly grateful to the team responsible for the implementation of the data collection exercise, including team leaders, enumerators/ CCCM focal points, and data entry staff and all the respondents who generously contributed with information and time.

Special thanks for Tarik Ogbamichael, who provided statistical analysis to the project through a remote deployment as part of a collaboration between JIPS, UNHCR, Statistics Norway and NORCAP.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since June 2011, conflict between the Government of Myanmar and the Kachin Independence Organisation (KIO) left a large number of people displaced across Myanmar's Kachin and northern Shan States. Although it is likely that many people were displaced before this date, it is estimated that at least 95,000 have been displaced as of October 2015 as a result of this resurgence of conflict. Most of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) are living with host families or in camps dispersed across the area in 166 identified locations.

CONTEXT

Since June 2011, conflict between the Government of Myanmar and the Kachin Independence Organisation (KIO) left a large number of people displaced across Myanmar's Kachin and northern Shan States. Although it is likely that many people were displaced before this date, it is estimated that at least 95,000 have been displaced as of October 2015 as a result of this resurgence of conflict. Most of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) are living with host families or in camps dispersed across the area in 166 identified locations¹.

OBJECTIVES

Information on the populations living in IDP camps and camp-like settings is crucial in order to adapt the humanitarian response to the IDPs' actual needs on the ground. To respond to the gap in accurate data, the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster, established in January 2013, promoted the implementation of a collaborative camp profiling exercise. This exercise aimed to obtain an updated overview of the situation in each IDP camp and establish a common central information management tool for the coordination of camp-level activities.

The main objectives of the camp profiling are to:

- Provide a regularly updated **OVERVIEW** of the situation in camps hosting IDPs, including disaggregated population estimates
- Consolidate information for **ADVOCACY** and **FUNDRAISING** efforts on behalf of IDPs living in camps
- Indicate the need for more detailed thematic **ASSESSMENTS**
- Strengthen the **COORDINATION** of camp-level data collection, analysis and response
- Support sustainable **CAPACITY BUILDING** for camp managers

CROSS-CAMP AND TREND ANALYSIS REPORT

As part of the camp profiling exercise, three rounds of data collection were conducted between 2013 and 2015. The Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) collaborated with Statistics Norway to provide support to partners in Myanmar for conducting a cross-camp and trend analysis based on the data collected during each round in order to assess whether the situation in the camps has changed or remained stable over the last three years, as well as to identify any differences between camps. The final report is intended for use by Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster partners and donors for strategy development and planning.

¹ Shelter-NFI-CCCM Kachin Northern Shan Cluster Analysis Report 1st Oct - 2015 <http://www.sheltercluster.org/library/data-analysis-kachinshan>

METHODOLOGY

The camp profiling exercise was designed to obtain regularly updated camp profiles that contain both a general overview and sector-specific indicators in each camp to provide a comprehensive view of the situation of IDPs living in camps across the region. This in turn enables a more effective humanitarian response. The *unit of analysis* of this methodology is the IDP camp, and the geographic coverage includes all the IDP camps in the Kachin and northern Shan States.

Three main sources of data informed the findings for this cross-camp and trend analysis: a camp-level questionnaire administered to key informants in each IDP camp, CCCM's camp list to collect metadata about each camp, and lists of the organisations providing aid to inhabitants of the camps. The exercise was limited to camps and camp-level information only; it was not intended to provide a detailed needs assessment, but only to give general indicators at the camp level that can highlight the need for more comprehensive thematic assessments.

Though this methodology could only provide camp-level information, the data from this profiling exercise is critical given the lack of information available to the international community prior to implementation. Also, the profiling exercise has served as a helpful platform for collaborating on other assessments (e.g. the UNDP socio-economic survey).

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The cross-camp and trend analysis compared IDP camps between 2013 and 2015. Within this the analysis compared relatively "smaller" camps (1 - 100 residents), referred to in this report as small camps and relatively "larger" camps (more than 100 residents), referred to in this report as large camps, and camps located in urban or rural areas, both to each other and over time.

In 2015, the data showed that most camps were located in Kachin State, with a smaller proportion of camps located in

northern Shan State. Almost three-quarters of the camps could be classified as large camps with over 100 residents. The majority of camps were located in urban areas and/or Government Controlled Areas.

By 2015 the population in camps had grown to 83,375 across 132 camps, compared to 69,941 residents in 126 camps in 2013. Despite displacement continuing, the proportion of vulnerable people living within the camps, such as the chronically ill, separated children, single-headed households and unaccompanied elders and minors, has decreased considerably throughout the three-year period².

Camp coordination and management has changed as well. While in 2013 the camps were managed by a variety of agencies, this has decreased over the last two data collection rounds, leaving the responsibility for camp management to only a few agencies in 2015. Overall, the findings show that large camps are better organized because they are more likely to have camp committees or complaint mechanisms in place. In large camps, camp committees are also better represented by IDP members compared to committees in small camps.

The findings per sector show overall that for some sectors the situation in camps has improved between 2013 and 2015, while for other sectors the situation has either remained the same or has deteriorated. The changes in the proportion of camps with solid or temporary shelter between 2013 and 2015 are quite small. Availability of regular markets within the camps from 2013 to 2015 has slightly increased. However, there was a small decrease in the share of camps having access to a clinic or a hospital. Access to schools in camps was relatively limited in the first two profiling rounds and remained so in 2015. In terms of protection, a higher proportion of camps in

² This trend is further explained in the Demographics chapter

urban areas had childcare or protection responsibilities defined in the camps compared to camps in rural areas. As an overall trend, access to solid or temporary shelter, availability of markets, health services, education and child care/protection responsibilities tended to be better organised in large camps and/ or urban areas.

The past three profiling rounds show that livelihood strategies change before and after displacement, and female and male residents do not employ the same strategies. This trend remained consistent from 2013 to 2015. Also, needs identified for the community have not substantially changed since 2013, and reveal a large difference in the priorities of male, female and child camp residents.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
CONTEXT	II
OBJECTIVES	II
CROSS-CAMP AND TREND ANALYSIS REPORT	II
METHODOLOGY	III
MAIN CONCLUSIONS	III
CONTENTS.....	1
ACRONYMS	3
INTRODUCTION	4
CONTEXT	4
OBJECTIVES	4
CROSS-CAMP AND TREND ANALYSIS REPORT	5
METHODOLOGY	6
COORDINATION	6
SCOPE	6
DATA COLLECTION METHODS	6
DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING	8
DATA COLLECTION CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS	8
DATA ANALYSIS CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS	9
MAIN FINDINGS.....	10
COVERAGE AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS	10
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	13
CAMP COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT	15
ACCESS TO SERVICES	16
SHELTER	16
FOOD SECURITY	16

HEALTH.....	17
EDUCATION.....	17
PROTECTION.....	18
ACCESS TO LIVELIHOODS.....	18
IDENTIFIED GAPS AND PRIORITIES.....	20
MAIN CONCLUSIONS.....	21
CONCLUSIONS.....	21
CONTACTS.....	22
CCCM cluster in Myiktyina.....	22
CCCM cluster in Yangon.....	22
Danish Refugee Council.....	22

ACRONYMS

CCCM: Camp Management and Camp Coordination

DRC: Danish Refugee Council

GCA: Government Controlled Area

IDP: Internally Displaced Person

JIPS: Joint IDP Profiling Service

KBC: Kayin Baptist Convention

KMSS: Karuna Myanmar Social Services

NGCA: Non-Government Controlled Area

OCHA: Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

RANIR: Relief Action Network for IDP and Refugee

UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

UNICEF: United Nations Children's Fund

WFP: World Food Programme

INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT

Since June 2011, conflict between the Government of Myanmar and the Kachin Independence Organisation (KIO) left a large number of people displaced across Myanmar's Kachin and northern Shan States. Although it is likely that many people were displaced before this date, it is estimated that at least 95,000 have been displaced as of October 2015 as a result of this resurgence of conflict. Most of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) are living with host families or in camps dispersed across the area in 166 identified locations.

Despite the resumption of peace talks in February 2013 between the Government and the KIO, there have been continuous incidents of conflict across Kachin State, resulting in increased levels of displacement. The number of registered IDPs has fluctuated in some locations due to temporary returns to check on property or access livelihood sources, but information suggests these are not permanent returns since concerns about insecurity persist.

Displaced communities are dispersed across Government and Non-Government Controlled Areas (GCA and NGCA), whilst others also crossed into China to flee the insecurity. Most of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) have sought shelter in camps and camp-like settings across the area. In GCAs, these are mainly located in buildings or compounds of faith-based organizations. Other IDPs have found shelter in host communities, mainly in urban areas, though it is likely that their number is higher than reported as many of them are not included in registration lists. In NGCAs, available information is scarcer and access is limited.

OBJECTIVES

Humanitarian actors and local organisations have been supporting the needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) since the resurgence of

conflict, needs which have evolved over time due to the protracted nature of the situation. Nevertheless, difficulties in access, especially in NGCAs, the fluctuation of displacement levels, the variation in the type of assistance provided, and the diversity of camp size and structures have made it difficult to clearly assess those needs. In the past, there have been varied sources of information regarding the situation and magnitude of IDPs' living conditions in camps, though the information was difficult to use effectively as they were collected using different methodologies, cover only limited periods of time, and information sharing was limited between humanitarian partners.

Given that the vast majority of assistance is being provided through camp structures, humanitarian actors in Kachin State have been working together to strengthen the coordination of assistance to IDPs living in camps, as well as to coordinate advocacy efforts on their behalf. Information on the populations living in IDP camps and camp-like settings is crucial in order to adapt the humanitarian response to the IDPs' actual needs on the ground. To respond to the gap in accurate data, the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster established in January 2013 promoted the implementation of a collaborative camp profiling exercise. This process aimed to obtain an updated overview of the situation in each IDP camp and establish a common central information management tool for the coordination of camp-level activities.

The main objectives of the camp profiling are to:

- Provide a regularly updated **OVERVIEW** of the situation in camps hosting IDPs, including disaggregated population estimates
- Consolidate information for **ADVOCACY** and **FUNDRAISING** efforts on behalf of IDPs living in camps

- Indicate the need for more detailed thematic **ASSESSMENTS**
- Strengthen the **COORDINATION** of camp-level data collection, analysis and response
- Support sustainable **CAPACITY BUILDING** for camp managers

It was decided to implement the camp profiling exercise as a monitoring tool so that the data could be updated regularly to assess changes in the situation over time. As part of the ongoing camp profiling exercise, three rounds of data collection took place between 2013 and 2015, the first from June to July 2013, the second from May to June 2014, and the third from April to May 2015. A fourth round of data collection was carried out from September to December 2015, but as the fourth round is still in process, this report only discusses findings from the first three rounds.

CROSS-CAMP AND TREND ANALYSIS REPORT

The findings of the three rounds of the camp profiling exercise in the Kachin and northern Shan States were disseminated through different channels and in different formats, specifically through individual profile reports containing an overview of the situation in each IDP camp and an open database of information on each camp. After the first round of data collection in 2013, a cross-camp profiling report was produced that compared the situation in different IDP camps³. Taking this analysis one step further, the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS) collaborated with Statistics Norway to provide support to partners in Myanmar for the analysis of the data beyond the individual camp profiles given the rich amount of data from three rounds of data collection. This

collaboration produced a cross-camp and trend analysis in order to assess whether the situation in the camps changed or remained stable over the last three years, as well as to identify any differences between camps. The final report is intended for use by Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster partners and donors for strategy development and planning.

The following section provides a summary of the main methodological steps and elements of the camp profiling process, as well as the overall limitations of the exercise. The main findings are subsequently presented by thematic sector. The last section contains the main conclusions and recommendations.

³ Documents are available on the following website:
<https://www.sheltercluster.org/hub/kachinshan>

METHODOLOGY

The camp profiling exercise was designed to obtain regularly updated camp profiles. These contain both a general overview and sector-specific indicators in each camp to provide a comprehensive view of the situation of IDPs living in camps across the region. This ongoing process in turn enables a more effective humanitarian response.

COORDINATION

The camp profiling exercise was led by the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster. The CCCM cluster carried out the process in a participative and consultative way at all stages, including during the development of the methodology, implementation of the data collection, the analysis and the reporting phases. The process involved the participation of both international and national partners, including: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Danish Refugee Council (DRC), Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), World Food Programme (WFP), Shalom Foundation, Relief Action Network for IDP and Refugee (RANIR), Kayin Baptist Convention (KBC) and Karuna Myanmar Social Services (KMSS). Technical support - especially for methodology, tool development, analysis and reporting - was provided by the Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS: more information available at www.jips.org).

SCOPE

The *unit of analysis* of this methodology is the IDP camp, and the geographic coverage includes all the IDP camps in the Kachin and northern Shan States. For the purpose of the exercise, the term 'camp' covers the following types of settlements: 'Planned Camp or Settlement', 'Spontaneous/Self-Settled Camp', and 'Collective Centre'. The camp profiling exercise does not cover IDPs living in individual dwellings, either privately or hosted by non-IDPs, nor does it cover IDPs living in boarding schools.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS


Given the objectives pursued by the exercise and the intended thematic coverage, the methodology developed combined different information sources: a camp-level questionnaire administered to key informants in each IDP camp, CCCM's camp list to collect metadata about each camp, and lists of the organisations providing aid to inhabitants of the camps.

The *primary key informant* for the camp-level interview was defined as the camp manager or responsible person. The 'gaps identification' module asked camp managers as well as camp residents (one female IDP representative per camp) about the most important needs for the community. The questionnaire was developed during the first round in a collaborative and consultative manner in order to address the varied information needs of partners both in Kachin and in Yangon. For the second and third round, further consultations were done to identify a few specific changes to the tool based on the experience and lessons learnt from the previous round. The questionnaire collects general information about the camp, basic disaggregated demographic data about the population registered in the camp, camp coordination and management structures, camp infrastructure and services, access to livelihoods, and, finally, needs or gaps identified by camp managers and camp residents. The questionnaire was drafted in English and later translated into Myanmar and Kachin languages. A systematised approach to data collection and data management was discussed and agreed upon by all partners to ensure that all activities and responsibilities were clearly identified and specified.

The below diagram visualizes the data management process. For the majority of camps, data was collected by sponsored CCCM focal points who work in each camp. For the rest, a team of enumerators from the camp's responsible organization collected the information. The primary responsibility for the supervision and monitoring of the data collection was with the camp responsible organizations with the overall quality assurance and technical assistance taken care by CCCM cluster.

Before the implementation of the data collection, team leaders, enumerators/CCCM focal points, and data entry staff received training on the methodology, the operational plan, and the various tools used for data collection. After the training, data collection took place (as mentioned, round 1 in June-July 2013, round 2 in April-May 2014, and round 3 in December 2014-February 2015), followed by data processing (capture, cleaning and tabulation) in the months that followed each round.

Figure 1: IDP data management process



DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

A cross-camp and trend analysis based on the last three rounds of data collection was conducted by Statistics Norway with support from JIPS. This analysis involved the following:

- Consolidation and review of the camp profiling datasets collected in 2013, 2014 and the first half of 2015⁴.
- Discussion with partners on the tabulation and reporting plans to conduct cross-camp and trend analysis.
- Conducting statistical analysis of the data following the agreed-upon tabulation plan, and identifying relevant trends, patterns and key findings. All analysis was done using the statistical software SAS. Data was disaggregated by small camps (1-100 residents) and large camps (> 100 residents), as well as by urban and rural camps. The disaggregation by camp size was done to account for large differences in number of residents living in the camps. This allowed those groups to be analyzed separately. Distinguishing between the urban and rural camps similarly allowed for the identification of any systematic differences based on geographical location.
- Drafting of the technical report according to the agreed-upon reporting plan.

DATA COLLECTION CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

The methodology proposed for the camp profiling exercise led to certain limitations. Although most of them were minimized during the different stages of the design process, some remaining concerns are discussed below.

- The most important limitation is that the exercise's scope is limited to camps and camp-level information only. As such, the data collected does not give detailed information on individual IDPs or IDP households living in these camps. It similarly does not provide an analysis on the situation of IDPs living outside of camps, either in host families or elsewhere. Generally the camp profiling exercise was not intended to provide a detailed needs assessment, but only to give general indicators at the camp level that can highlight the need for more comprehensive thematic assessments, which usually require household-level information. Those types of assessments are intended mainly for relatively stable situations, where population movements are minimal.
- Second, the quality and reliability of the demographic data collected during the camp profiling exercise varies according to the capacity level and structures in place in each camp to maintain and updates lists or registration systems of the IDPs living in the camps. The lack of systematically available information on individuals, such as date of birth and sex, makes compiling the data a challenge not only for the camp profiling exercise but also for other processes like the official registration system.
- Third, the exercise did not collect sensitive data related to the situation of IDPs in the camps, taking into account the context of

⁴ Questionnaires and other tools available here: <http://www.jips.org/en/field-support/country-operations/myanmar/Kachin>

the situation and the need to ensure that no harm would result from the exercise. This meant, however, that certain more sensitive issues cannot be incorporated into the analysis.

- Fourth, in addition to these methodological limitations, the process faced some operational challenges, mainly associated with the difficult access to certain locations and the remote management and monitoring of data collection. Other challenges included the limited timeframe in which the rounds of data collection took place and the different level of understanding of the questions among the enumerators. The latter challenge was avoided in round 3 primarily because of number of trainings conducted by CCCM cluster.

Because of these limitations, the data collected needs to be considered with a certain degree of caution. This camp profiling exercise is therefore better suited to the identification of general trends and patterns of sector-specific indicators than to the precise and accurate estimates of the magnitude of the needs of IDPs.

DATA ANALYSIS CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

- In the analysis, measured changes were based upon disaggregated data and often reflect changes only in a small number of camps. Minor changes may result in relative differences that are not as significant in reality as they appear numerically. The data collection tools and certain indicators varied slightly from year to year, making cross-year comparison challenging for specific indicators, for example those relating to water, sanitation, shelter and education. Those performing the analysis lacked a variable code list, which made it difficult to verify data codes for matching the variable to the relevant indicator (especially for the first round dataset).
- Datasets for the second and third data collection rounds consisted of 11 and 10 separate datasets respectively. The observation units (row observations) differed between camps, with some camps broken down by sex, demography, gap, vulnerability and livelihood characteristics, which made it difficult to merge the datasets.
- Lastly, several revisions and cleaning of the data were needed in order to import the data into SAS for statistical analysis.

MAIN FINDINGS

The findings of the camp profiling exercise are based on three data collection rounds carried out in 126 camps in 2013, 127 camps in 2014 and 132 camps in 2015. The findings cover general statistics and thematic areas important to the profiling exercise, including demographics, camp coordination and management, access to services, livelihoods and identified gaps and priorities.


COVERAGE AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The data shows that the general location and size of the camps have stayed the same from 2013 to 2015, with the only exception being a small increase in the number of camps located in Government Controlled Areas.


Between 2013 and 2015 the distribution of camps across the townships did not change substantially, as depicted by graph 1. In 2013, most camps were located in Kachin State, while

a smaller share of camps was located in northern Shan State. Similarly in 2015, 85% of camps were located in Kachin and 15% in northern Shan. The highest proportion of camps was observed in Kachin in the townships of Myitkyina (19%), Waingmaw (16%), Hpakant (15%), Momauk (11%), Bhamo (8%) and Mansi (8%) and in northern Shan State in the township of Kutkai (6%). In terms of IDP population per township, Waingmaw, Hpakant and Mansi townships host the largest number of IDPs, with over 1,500 in each (graph 2).

Graph 1: Distribution of camps in Kachin & Northern Shan, by township




Graph 2. Displaced population by township in 2015 (map produced by UNHCR)



The proportion of camps by location type and typology has not changed substantially over the last 3 rounds.


In 2015, almost three-quarters of the camps could be classified as large camps of over 100 individuals (graph 3), and 2013 and 2014 show a similar trend.

Graph 3: Distribution of camps by size and year (large/small)




More specifically in 2015, a majority (60%) of camps contained between 101 and 1,000 residents, while 12% of camps contained between 1,001 and 5,000 individuals and 20% contained between 5,001 and 10,000 individuals. The distribution of camps by size has not changed considerably compared to the two previous years (graph 4).

Graph 4: Distribution of camps by size and year




The urban-rural division of the camps also shows a similar distribution in 2015 compared to the previous years. In 2015 more than half (52%) of camps were located in urban areas, and 37% in rural areas. For the remaining camps the location type was mixed or unknown (graph 5).

Graph 5: Distribution of camps by type of location



In 2015 85% of the camps were located in Government Controlled Areas. This represented a slight increase from 82% in 2014 and 75% in 2013 (graph 6).


Graph 6: Distribution of camps by type of area



DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Population data was collected through the camp registration system according to the normal processes. Graph 7 shows the population in the camps in 2015 disaggregated by age groups and sex.

Graph 7: Population in the camps in 2015 by age and sex groups



In small camps the proportion of residents that arrived and departed in the previous four months decreased slightly from 2013 and 2015, with 24% in 2013 to 6% in 2015 for arrivals, and from 25% in 2013 to 16% in 2015 for departures (graph 8).

Graph 8: Movement of population by small camps and year




In large camps the proportion of arrivals and departures has reduced more substantially, decreasing from 100% of recent arrivals in 2013 to 26% in 2014, and 40% of recent departures in 2013 to 31% in 2015 (graph 9).

Graph 9: Movement of population by large camps and year




According to the data collected, the population in camps has grown from 69,941 in 2013 to 83,375 in 2015 (graph 10). The increase in camp population is primarily attributed to higher levels of displacement as well as increased access to more camps, expanding the geographic coverage of the profiling exercise. The registration process for IDPs in the camps had also considerably improved since 2013 because of fully functional systems (CMCs and CMAs).

Graph 10: Evolution of camps and population in camps by year



In all three profiling rounds there were fewer male residents than female residents registered in the camps. To demonstrate this, in 2015 the ratio was 47% male to 53% female (graph 11).

Graph 11.: Evolution of population in camps by year and gender



Despite ongoing displacement, the proportion of vulnerable people living within the camps, such as the chronically ill, separated children, single-headed households and unaccompanied elders and minors, decreased considerably over the three-year period. The proportion of separated children decreased from 2013 to 2014 and then increased in 2015, but this proportion is still much lower than in 2013 (graph 12).


One possible explanation for the trend of a decreasing proportion of separated children living in camps is that, during initial displacement, parents preferred to send their children to camps with relatives to continue their education. Parents would remain out of the camps to look for jobs and/or remain closer to their places of origin for livelihood purposes. The parents faced difficulties finding jobs as well as multiple protection risks near their places of origin, and therefore eventually joined their children in the camps (or parents had their children join them in camps they chose to settle in).

The proportion of single-headed households also decreased considerably (graph 12). A possible explanation for this trend is that especially in the initial stages of the conflict, it was mainly women who arrived and registered in camps while husbands wanted to remain mobile for livelihood purposes. While the women were initially registered as single-headed households, their husbands would periodically visit or stay in the camps. The proportion of single-headed households would then decrease when the husbands moved into and registered in the

camps, for example because they found it more difficult to find a job, as well as through new marriages in camps.

It is worth noting that data collection on vulnerabilities during camp profiling is not intended/ designed to give a comprehensive picture of individual cases of persons with specific needs in the camps. Rather, data were gathered by CCCM data collectors through key informant interviews and is intended only to give a snapshot at the camp level (see also data collection challenges and limitations section). Also, since the start of the camp profiling in 2013, CCCM agency/data collectors' understanding of protection concepts and/ or definitions have been gradually improving (as well as the quality of questionnaires and trainings). Therefore, an improved understanding of definitions would also have had a role in the trend of a decreased proportion of vulnerable people living in the camps.

Graph 12.: Proportion of vulnerable people as of all camp residents⁵



⁵ In 2015, the "unaccompanied elderly" category has been revised to "elderly at risk".

CAMP COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT


Nearly half of the camps were established in 2011, while the other half were established in 2012 and 2013. Only a small share of camps had been established either before (in 2010) or after this period (in 2014 or 2015) (graph 13).

Graph 13: Distribution of camps profiled by year of establishment



While in 2013 the camps were managed by a variety of agencies, this trend changed over the last two rounds of data collection. In 2015, almost three quarters of the camps were managed by KBC (47%) and Shalom (27%). Other agencies responsible for camp management in 2015 were KMSS-BMO (9%), KMSS-MYT (8%), IRRIC (5%), KMSS-LSO (3%) and Religious Organisation (1%) (graph 14).


Graph 14: Distribution of camps by management/responsible agency




While in 2013 all camps had a registration mechanism in place, this tendency decreased over the last data collection rounds, particularly for small camps where in 2015 only 91% had a registration mechanism in place. In nearly all large camps, camp management committees

were established, although this was featured only in 36% of the small camps in 2014. Overall, the proportion of both small and large camps with a complaint mechanism in place in 2015 more than doubled compared to 2013, although in 2015 this was more prevalent among large camps (81%) than the small camps (51%) (graph 15 and 16).

Graph 15: Distribution of mechanisms available by small camps and year




Graph 16: Distribution of mechanisms available by large camps and year




On average, in large camps, camp committees were better represented by IDP members than in small camps. Small camps more commonly had non-IDP members be part of the camp management committee. In large camps a greater proportion of committee members attended the CCCM training (graph 17 and 18).

Graph 17: Average number of camp committee members in small camps by gender and year



Graph 18: Average number of camp committee members in small camps by gender and year




ACCESS TO SERVICES

SHELTER


For small camps, the number of camps with solid or temporary shelters from 2013 to 2015 remained stable for rural and urban camps. The main improvement is found within urban camps between 2014 and 2015, which increased with 28% its share of solid or temporary shelters. However, the proportion of rural camps with solid shelters decreased by 22% in the same period (graph 19).

Graph 19: Distribution of small camps having solid or temporary shelters



For large camps the proportion of camps with solid or temporary shelters from 2013 to 2015 has slightly decreased in both urban as well as rural areas (graph 20).


Graph 20: Distribution of large camps having solid or temporary shelters




FOOD SECURITY

The overall change in regular market availability from 2013 to 2015 is positive; availability to regular markets for camp populations increased from 14% to 18%. However there was a 15% decrease from 2014 to 2015. When looking at urban and rural camps, an increase in regular market availability from 2013 to 2015 are found for urban small camps and rural large camps, which goes up by 4% and 10% respectively. Large and small camps both in urban and rural areas have reduced market availability from 2014 to 2015 (graph 21 and 22).

Graph 21: Distribution of small camps having regular market availability




Graph 22: Distribution of large camps having regular market availability




HEALTH

The overall trend from 2013 to 2015 shows a small decrease in the share of camps that have access to a clinic or a hospital (from 86% to 73%). However it should be noted that the share of camps with access to a clinic or a hospital is high for all three years and all urban small camps have access to a clinic or a hospital in 2013. A higher proportion of the camps in urban areas have access to a clinic or a hospital compared to the camps in rural areas (graph 23 and 24).

Graph 23: Distribution of small camps having access to a clinic or hospital




Graph 24: Distribution of large camps having access to a clinic or hospital



EDUCATION


Overall, between 2013 and 2015 access to school in camps was relatively limited and remained stable. The availability of primary school increased from 27% in 2013 to 28% in 2015, the availability of secondary school reduced from 15% in 2013 to 14% in 2015, and the availability of high school decreased from 8% in 2013 to 5% in 2015. However, a higher proportion of large camps have access to school as compared to small camps. Access to primary schools in the large camps is notably higher than access to secondary or high schools (graph 25).

Graph 25: School availability in small camps by school type and year



While in large camps school availability has been relatively stable over the years, in small camps the proportion of camps with schools peaked in 2014, but reduced again in 2015 (graph 26).


Graph 26: School availability in large camps by school type and year



PROTECTION


Overall, between 2013 and 2015 a higher proportion of camps in urban areas reported having childcare or protection responsibilities defined in the camps compared to camps in rural areas. In small camps, the proportion of camps with child care or protection responsibilities defined increased from 23% in 2013 to 62% in 2015 in urban areas, but decreased in rural areas from 50% to 22% (graph 27).

Graph 27: Distribution of small camps with child care/ protection responsibility defined



In large camps in urban areas, the proportion of camps with childcare or protection responsibilities defined has remained stable (48% in 2013 to 49% in 2015), but slightly improved in rural areas (from 31% in 2013 to 44% in 2015) (graph 28).


Graph 28: Distribution of small camps with child care/ protection responsibility defined




ACCESS TO LIVELIHOODS

Between 2013 and 2014, and between 2013 and 2015 as a whole, the number of camps where both female and male IDPs stated that they have no first priority livelihood activity has reduced significantly. For both female and male residents in the camps, farming was defined as the main livelihood activity prior to displacement. After displacement residents diversified their livelihood strategies and engaged more in other activities, including livestock amongst others. Particularly in 2013, male camp residents mentioned mining as a main livelihood strategy (graph 29 and 30).


Graph 29: Number of camps with main livelihood activities defined before and after displacement by male residents in 2013



Graph 32: Number of camps with main livelihood activities defined before and after displacement by female residents in 2015




Graph 30: Number of camps with main livelihood activities defined before and after displacement by male residents in 2015



The number of camps where females mentioned trade (buying and selling) as a main livelihood activity dropped sharply from 2014 to 2015 (graph 31 and 32).


Graph 31: Number of camps with main livelihood activities defined before and after displacement by female residents in 2013



IDENTIFIED GAPS AND PRIORITIES


Most important needs for the community identified by the camp managers have remained relatively unchanged between 2013 to 2015. However, the main need identified over the years has been basic food, which need has increased substantially compared in 2015 and 2014 compared to 2013. The overall trend shows that camp managers have identified a smaller variety of needs compared to 2013 and 2014. This potentially shows that needs are shifting and that managers are now considering more longer-term perspectives (livelihoods) (graph 33).

Graph 33: Priority 1 according to camp manager by year



Priorities of camp residents have also not substantially changed over the years, but differ mainly between male and female camp residents. Female camp residents rate cash/money assistance as the most important need in the camps while males state that basic food is the highest need. Children are more concerned about access to school materials/ supplies (graph 34).

Graph 34: Priority 1 according to camp residents in 2015



MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The main goal of the camp profiling exercise was to obtain an updated overview of the situation in each IDP camp in Kachin and Shan States and to establish a common central information management tool for the coordination of camp-level activities. Given the rich amount of data from three rounds of data collection (between 2013 and mid-2015), partners produced a cross-camp and trend analysis in order to assess whether the situation in the camps changed or remained stable over the last three years, as well as to identify any differences between camps. This report is intended for use by Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster partners and donors for strategy development and planning.

CONCLUSIONS

The cross-camp and trend analysis compared IDP camps between 2013 and 2015. Within this the analysis compared small camps (1 - 100 residents) and large camps (more than 100 residents), and camps located in urban or rural areas, both to each other and over time. In general, most camps were located in Kachin State, with a smaller proportion of camps located in northern Shan State. Almost three-quarters of the camps could be classified as "larger" camps with over 100 residents. The majority of camps were located in urban areas and/or Government Controlled Areas.

By 2015 the population in camps had grown to 83,375 across 132 camps, compared to 69,941 residents in 126 camps in 2013. Despite displacement continuing, the proportion of vulnerable people living within the camps, such as the chronically ill, separated children, single-headed households and unaccompanied elders and minors, has decreased considerably throughout the three-year period⁶.

Camp coordination and management has changed as well. While in 2013 the camps were managed by a variety of agencies, this has decreased over the last two data collection rounds, leaving the responsibility for camp management to only a few agencies in 2015. Overall, the findings show that large camps are better organized because they are more likely to have camp committees or complaint

mechanisms in place. In large camps, camp committees are also better represented by IDP members compared to committees in small camps.

The findings per sector show overall that for some sectors the situation in camps has improved between 2013 and 2015, while for other sectors the situation has either remained the same or has deteriorated.

Availability of regular markets within the camps from 2013 to 2015 has slightly increased. However, there was a small decrease in the share of camps having access to a clinic or a hospital. Access to schools in camps was relatively limited in the first two profiling rounds and remained so in 2015.

In terms of protection, a higher proportion of camps in urban areas had childcare or protection responsibilities defined in the camps compared to camps in rural areas. As an overall trend, access to solid or temporary shelter, availability of markets, health services, education and child care/protection responsibilities tended to be better was more often reported in large camps and/ or urban areas.

The past three profiling rounds show that livelihood strategies change before and after displacement, and female and male residents do not employ the same strategies. This trend remained consistent from 2013 to 2015. Also, identified needs for the community have not substantially changed since 2013, and reveal a large difference in the priorities of male, female and child camp residents.

⁶ This trend is further explained in the Demographics chapter

CONTACTS

For further information or to access the database you can contact,

CCCM CLUSTER IN MYIKTYINA

- Maran Tan Nau, Cluster Coordinator, maran@unhcr.org
- Soe Paing, Data Management Associate, paing@unhcr.org

CCCM CLUSTER IN YANGON

- Edward Benson, Cluster Coordinator, benson@unhcr.org
- Parveen Mann, Information Management Officer, mannp@unhcr.org

DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL

- Anders Tharsgaard, DRC Coordinator, anders.bech.tharsgaard@drcdk