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The protection assessment on which this report is based was carried out by six local organisations working in camps in Kachin and Northern Shan states, and covered 33 camps in Government-controlled Areas (GCA) and Non-Government-controlled areas (NGCA), out of total 123 camps¹. The assessment had three aims: to gain a better understanding of the vulnerabilities of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) and of the threats to which they are most exposed; to analyse the extent to which camp structures and management committees help to protect IDPs, and to create a space for the displaced populations to present their own intentions, concerns and needs regarding future return or resettlement options.

After a 17-year ceasefire, the conflict between the KIA and the Burmese Army resumed on 9 June 2011. By November 2012 it had caused the displacement of between 75,000 and 97,500 people.² Villagers began to flee because of the fighting, establishing makeshift shelters in areas they considered to be safe, such as church compounds and monasteries. The displacement started in early June 2011 and the camps are still registering new arrivals.

Most of the IDPs are subsistence farming households who rely on cultivating their land. For this reason, many of them initially tried to remain close to their villages and farms. But as their situation became increasingly dangerous and unsustainable, they were forced to abandon their fields and

¹ Compiled by KBC, KMSS, Metta and Shalom as of February 2013
² The number of people registered in camps in GGA is not contested, but there are significant discrepancies in NGCA. According to OCHA, in November 2012 there were 39,000 people in camps in NGCA, while according to the IDP and Refugee Relief Committee of the KIO, in October 2012 there were 58,817 IDPs in Kachin state and 2,396 in camps in Northern Shan state.
livestock. This explains the high rate of secondary displacement, with 71% of interviewees having reached the camps after up to six months either hiding in the jungle, with relatives, or in other camps. The situation was exacerbated in August 2012 when the Chinese authorities forced Kachin refugees living in camps in Yunnan province\(^3\) to return to Burma, in violation of international obligations.

**The protection situation**

The assessment sought to understand the threats facing the displaced and the causes of their vulnerability. Overall, the IDPs found the camps reasonably safe, with only six of the 33 camps considered unsafe by over 40% of their residents. Factors contributing to their sense of security are: distance from the areas of active fighting, being hosted in the compound of a church or a monastery, or a location designated by the relevant authorities, and regular assistance. Feelings of insecurity are for two main reasons: lack of income or means to earn a living, and lack of secure uncrowded shelter, both directly caused by life in the camps. Lack of income and the means to earn was identified by 29% of the IDPs as the main cause of their insecurity. But these issues also have a number of other repercussions – from eroding the resilience of individuals and communities, which leads them to engage in dangerous activities, to the negative psychological impact on the most vulnerable.

On the other hand, the IDPs view the protection situation outside as significantly worse, with 55% in NGCA and 39% in GCA feeling insecure when they leave the camps. The difference between the attitudes of GCA and NGCA camp residents is due to distance from their villages, which is one of the main reasons for people to leave the camps. The risk increases significantly in the context of the heavy military presence in GCA or at army checkpoints. The type of threats experienced outside the camps is different from those in camps, with 67% of respondents indicating a general fear of violence. This pervasive sense of insecurity derives from people’s experiences when they fled their villages or witnessed

---

the fighting. Some had seen their houses and villages destroyed or lost close relatives and friends, and these experiences still seriously affect them and will shape their future choices. The other major threats vary between men and women, as well as between people in GCA and those in NGCA camps. In particular, arrests and detention are reported by all respondents, and represent 16% of the threats for GCA camps residents and 7% in NGCA. This tends to be the main risk people face when they travel back to their villages, and in particular at military checkpoints. Killings and exploitation are reported by 7% of respondents in NGCA. Whereas killings are due to proximity to areas of fighting, exploitation existed along the Sino-Myanmar border long before the conflict and has been exacerbated by the current situation. Finally, men often mentioned sexual violence and rape as an example of what people experienced in the villages and during the fighting, but 8% of women living in the camps still identify these as the main threat.

Another significant issue in relation to protection is people’s perception of their freedom of movement. Despite the dangers, IDPs still try to check up on their homes and farms, with 59% of the displaced population having visited their villages and farms since they first fled, often to find that everything had been destroyed. Due to the high risks of travelling, several camps have established monitoring systems to record residents’ movements. The camp committees and IDPs believe that these measures offer some protection.

Those who lack any valid proof of identity receive official documents from camp committees before they travel, and camp authorities have on occasion intervened when an IDP is arrested. Despite the monitoring system, the complete lack of protection outside the camps means that 24% of respondents in GCA and 47% in NGCA say they do not feel free to leave the camps.

One clear finding is that the IDPs view the camp committees as the main source of protection. The system of recording those who leave the camps for limited periods of time allows some measure of protection for IDPs even when they are away from the camps. More broadly, camp committees and religious authorities have generally been able to reduce anti-social behaviour by establishing camp regulations, such as the ban on the sale and consumption of alcohol inside the camps, or by directly intervening in instances of domestic violence.
Perceptions of life in the camps

The assessment also focused on the IDPs’ perceptions of life in the camps by asking residents and key informants to examine their satisfaction with the main assistance sectors and the work of the camp committees. The assessment focused on people’s own degree of satisfaction rather than on international standards in order to gain a better understanding of how displacement affects people’s lives, their levels of vulnerability and coping strategies, and how it influences future decisions.

In terms of the humanitarian assistance provided in Kachin, the restrictions imposed by the central government on international humanitarian agencies significantly limits the level and quality of assistance, especially in the camps in NGCA. The local organisations that have managed to maintain constant access to the camps have been obliged to operate with very limited resources. Conversely, international organisations that had secured significant funding struggled to gain access to the camps. The Myanmar government’s refusal to allow international humanitarian agencies access to the camps in NGCA has gravely limited the quality and quantity of relief assistance provided in the area where most of the displaced are currently residing.

As can be deduced from people’s feedback on their lack of access to any form of income, livelihood is the main area of concern for IDPs, followed by shelter, health and education. Opinions on the situation regarding food and water depend on the situation in individual camps. There is general agreement on the need to improve sanitation facilities both in terms of durability so that there are enough facilities for men and women to have separate latrines as a means to improve women’s security.

The displaced populations perceive their lack of access to livelihood opportunities and the related lack of income as their main source of vulnerability, with consequences for all aspects of their lives, from their general sense of security to being able to obtain appropriate medical services, or to support children’s education. In the absence of traditional livelihoods and sources of income, life in the camps is particularly challenging. For instance, not only are people living in isolated camps obliged to rely wholly on assistance, but it is seldom enough to cover all their needs.
Conversely, people living relatively close to towns have to buy everything they need, which pushes up their living expenses. Both situations compel people to look for solutions as day labourers, where IDPs are reported to be paid less than local villagers, or in some cases taking the risk of working illegally across the border, or in a few instances selling family members to traffickers. Cash grant projects and small-scale income-generating activities have therefore been well received by the displaced population. Such interventions are all the more important as the period of displacement becomes protracted.

Looking at other areas of assistance, although there are primary health care services in most of the camps, usually with one nurse making daily visits, people’s level of satisfaction was found to be quite low. The main issues seem to be the lack of medicines, a perceived lack of sympathy on the part of the health workers, and the need to pay for health care. A similar situation was found in the education sector, with primary schools and nurseries being accessible in most cases, but with limited infrastructure and insufficient teachers, even where there are voluntary teachers. In the case of education, there were two other main issues. First, the fact that children who were in KIO schools that are now closed, or transferred from other schools, have problems in registering in government schools because they often lack the necessary documentation, which they lost as a result of the conflict. The second problem is that schools charge tuition fees, which is difficult given people’s lack of income.

The other main sector of concern is that shelters are often overcrowded and different families are obliged to live together in one room, or the units are too small for the number of people living in them. In addition, some of the existing shelters are in urgent need of repair, and most will probably need to be rebuilt before the 2013 rainy season. In relation to protection, shelters were also often cited a leading source of insecurity in the camps.

The last element was people’s satisfaction with the work of camp committees, in particular regarding their degree of representation and their role in protecting the displaced. As previously mentioned, camp managers and committees play a crucial role in the camps and respondents offered positive feedback on their work. Camp committees are identified as the primary providers of security in camps, and receive
positive feedback in 82% of cases with regard to this task. People go to them with their complaints, and they also intervene in the resolution of disputes between IDPs and the surrounding communities. More in-depth analysis found that the extended duration of displacement is starting to affect the quality of work and the level of commitment of camp managers and committee members, who also need to attend to their own families and occupations. This issue will need to be addressed in the near future in order to find more sustainable solutions, such as involving more IDPs in camp management, which would also make them feel better represented.

**Intentions and conditions for return**

With no end to the fighting in most parts of Kachin state and people still fleeing to the camps, it is clear that the conditions for a safe and voluntary return for the displaced do not exist. Consequently, none of the statements presented in this report should be interpreted as implying that a return is imminent or that people are willing to return at present.

Given the risks entailed in travelling, only 59% of the displaced living in the camps have visited their homes, but it was impossible for them to stay. Some 87% of respondents stated that when real peace is achieved, they would like to return to their villages and homes, but this depends on certain conditions. The main factor that would influence a decision to return is security and having the resources to resume normal life. Among the anticipated needs, 47% of respondents mentioned food. Since most of the displaced have lost at least two planting seasons and will also need to rebuild their homes and recover their farms, they anticipate serious difficulties in obtaining enough food. The second main area of concern, and for which they will need assistance, is the presence of mines and UXOs (unexploded ordnance) in the areas of return. Until UXO are removed, the returning population will be seriously endangered even after the cessation of hostilities. This could affect their lives and livelihoods if mines were laid in the fields or local forests on which they depend.
For the 12% who said they would not return to their villages even with the cessation of hostilities, this is in part because they are unable to make an informed decision. While their decisions are influenced by trauma and the fear that they would feel unsafe in their homes even if peace were achieved, few knew where they would be able to stay, and more importantly how they could rebuild a new life far away from their villages.

Overall, as in most return and resettlement programmes, the preparation of the recovery phase must be based upon proper consultation with the displaced, on meeting the necessary conditions, and ensuring that people are equipped to make an informed decision.

Based on the assessment findings, this report makes recommendations to the humanitarian community and to the conflicting parties on measures that should be taken in order to give greater protection to the displaced population in Kachin state.
1.1 To the conflicting parties

- The conflicting parties should seek a peaceful and political solution that leads to a cessation of hostilities.
- Respect for International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and human rights

While the fighting continues, the parties to the conflict must respect International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and the human rights of civilian population.

All parties must observe the principles of distinction between civilians and combatants and of precaution in the case of attacks in order to avoid civilian victims. The warring parties have ‘the duty to refrain from the use of weapons which are indiscriminate or which, by their nature, cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering.’

Respect for IHL and human rights laws requires that civilians not be exposed to any ‘violence to life and person,… cruel treatment and torture; […] nor to any] outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment.’

---

• Humanitarian access to camps in NGCA

All parties to the conflict have a duty to allow the provision of impartial humanitarian relief to the affected civilian population.6 Humanitarian workers should have unimpeded access to all IDPs, irrespective of their location.

• Voluntary, safe and dignified return or resettlement

Return and resettlement must be based on informed decisions on the part of IDPs, who have the right to voluntary, safe and dignified return or resettlement.

1.2 To the United Nations

• Humanitarian access to camps in NGCA

The United Nations should continue to advocate for unimpeded access to all Kachin IDPs, irrespective of their location, for the provision of impartial humanitarian relief based on needs.

• Support to local organisations

Recognising the challenges faced in obtaining access to IDPs, the United Nations agencies should maintain and increase their support to local organisations working in less accessible areas.

• Improved coordination among humanitarian actors

United Nations operational coordination in Myitkyina and Banmaw should be strengthened, ensuring the participation of all relevant stakeholders, in particular local organisations and community-based organisations (CBOs), as they constitute the main and at times the only providers of relief assistance to the displaced.

1.3 To all humanitarian agencies

- Improving coordination
  
  Given the limited resources and the difficulties in obtaining access to certain areas, and also in terms of good practice, humanitarian agencies should coordinate their work. There is a need for better information sharing and coordination in the planning and implementation of relief activities as well as in overall programming. The aim should be to avoid duplication, use resources efficiently and improve accountability to beneficiaries.

- Recognition and support of local efforts
  
  In line with the Humanitarian Charter, humanitarian agencies should support local efforts and measures – private donors and informal institutions as well as local groups and religious entities running the camps – recognising their achievements.

- Respect for protection principles
  
  All humanitarian agencies and workers should observe the Humanitarian Charter and Sphere Protection Principles. These principles should ‘inform all humanitarian action’, from avoiding exposing people to further harm to ensuring their access to impartial assistance and protecting them from physical and psychological harm arising from violence and coercion. Working in an environment still affected by fighting and violence underlines the importance of respecting these principles.

- Medium-term planning of relief assistance
  
  Camp facilities and infrastructure should be improved and tailored to accommodate a protracted period of displacement. Shelter structures, WASH facilities, the setting up of camp committees and support for education and livelihoods need to be reassessed and adapted to a longer displacement period.

- Improve livelihood opportunities
  
  It is important to explore and support livelihood activities, especially in camps that have lacked the space to establish kitchen gardens or opportunities to work outside the camps, as in the case of the most isolated camps.

---

7 The Sphere Project (2011), p.36.
This report is the outcome of a collaborative effort involving six local organisations and institutions working with the displaced population in the Kachin area: Karuna Myanmar Social Services (KMSS), Kachin Baptist Convention (KBC), Kachin Relief and Development Committee (KRDC), Metta Development Foundation (Metta), Shalom Foundation and Wunpawng Ninghtoi (WPN). Each of these is directly involved in managing assistance programmes in IDP camps in government-controlled and non-government controlled areas (GCA and NGCA), and therefore have direct and sustained access to the camp population. All decisions regarding assessment methodology and process were based on a participatory process that included IDP representatives.

2.1 Research objectives
The survey had three main objectives:

a. To understand which groups of displaced people are vulnerable to what kind of threats, where, and which they fear the most.

b. To identify IDPs’ intentions for return or resettlement and their basic needs and conditions for doing so.

c. To determine the extent to which camp management committees contribute to protecting IDPs.

For more details on the methodology and process, see Annex II.
3.1 The Kachin conflict

The conflict that led to the displacement crisis addressed in this report started in June 2011, putting an end to a 17-year ceasefire between the Kachin Independence Organisation (KIO) and the Government of Myanmar.

The demands of the Kachin people and of most other ethnic groups represented in the signing of the Panglong Agreement date back to the creation of the Union of Burma. The Agreement stipulated that the Union was to be created on the basis of autonomy and equality for all ethnic groups in the country. Subsequent developments and central government policies have resulted in these principles being progressively abandoned without ever having been applied.

In response, Kachin resistance began with the Pawng Yawng movement in 1949, and was continued with the creation of the Kachin Independent Army (KIA) in 1961.

After years of fighting, in 1994 the KIO and the Government of Myanmar signed a ceasefire agreement that lasted for 17 years. During this period, despite general peace, the territory became more militarised, and the national army significantly increased its presence in Kachin state.

In 2010–2011 tensions mounted between the national government and the KIO, following the refusal of the KIA to accept the government’s Border Guard
Force proposal to ethnic armed groups, and the agreement between the Myanmar and Chinese governments to construct hydro-electric dams on the Ayeyarwady river without consulting the Kachin authorities and the KIO.

Hostilities escalated into open conflict on 9 June 2011, causing the displacement of the local population.

3.2 Patterns of displacement
People fled their villages either due to direct attacks or because of fear of violence based on military operations in neighbouring areas. Initially villagers, especially men, tried to remain nearby, either in bigger towns or hiding in the jungle, in order to monitor the situation and to continue feeding their livestock and managing the fields. Once it became evident that the fighting would continue, those who had the strength or means fled to the camps.

Reportedly, people have seldom been able to stay or return to their villages or farms. In some instances elderly people remained to look after their property, fields, and livestock. Sometimes this decision was taken on the assumption that they were less likely than younger people to be threatened, but sometimes they simply felt unable to face the ardour of a long and potentially dangerous trip.

3.2.1 Arriving in the camps
Most arrivals took place between June and November 2011, some IDPs fleeing directly from the villages, others hiding in the jungle for up to six months. In GCA, camps usually began as spontaneous settlements with people gathering in places where they considered they would be protected and safe – in particular, church compounds and monasteries. In NGCA people gathered either in locations they considered safe, often along the border with China, or in camps established by the KIO. Due to their locations and the services provided, the camps are generally considered safe havens where people are far away from the fighting and receive sufficient support to meet their basic needs.

The main challenges faced by IDPs in order to reach the camps were the distance from their villages, the dangers faced during the trip, and the sudden and exponential increase of transportation prices.
In general, while arrivals peaked from the middle to the end of 2011, people continued to flow into camps throughout 2012. The later arrivals report having spent some time with relatives or in hiding until they found the situation unbearable. Of the respondents, 20% arrived in the camps after hiding in the jungle, 20% previously stayed with relatives or host families, 26% came from another camp in the country, and 5% came from camps in China. The incidence of secondary or multiple displacements has a significant impact on people’s resilience and coping strategies. In most camps it appears that people have been able to maintain pre-existing community networks, but further displacements might undermine these support structures.

There are various estimates of the total number of displaced. According to OCHA, by 5 November 2012 there were 75,000 IDPs, of which 36,000 are ‘fully accessible’ and 39,000 were in less accessible areas. The IRRC registration figures, including Kachin and Northern Shan state, placed the total number of IDPs by 13 October 2012 at 97,598. To these should be added the unknown numbers of displaced people still with host families or in hiding.

---


*Official registration data from GCA and NGCA camps.
3.2.2 The refoulement of Kachin refugees from China

Since the beginning of the displacement crisis, a number of people fled across the Chinese border. Human Rights Watch estimates that between 7,000 and 10,000 people sought refuge in China, mainly in Yunnan province.\(^{10}\)

While there have been several instances of the Chinese authorities forcibly returning small groups of Kachin refugees, in late August 2012 all the refugees in camps in Yunnan province were given an ultimatum of one week to return to Myanmar.\(^{11}\) This decision was in violation of international obligations for the protection of refugees. By forcibly returning the refugees to Myanmar, to an area of continuing armed conflict, the Chinese government violated the principle of non-refoulement.\(^{12}\)

It was reported that the ultimatum was accompanied by heightened security presence at the camps, and a ban on taking pictures or using telephones. The Chinese helped the refugees to dismantle their shelters and pack up their belongings, and an estimated 5,900 people were pushed back into Myanmar.\(^{13}\)

For refugees who opted to stay in NGCA, the KIO provided transport to a makeshift camp near Maijayang, aiming to resettle them in a number of existing camps. Refugees returning to camps in GCA generally had to make private transport arrangements. The majority of refugees relocating to NGCA settled across a total of six camps, five already existing and one created especially to host IDPs coming from China\(^{14}\). Some of the interviewees among those who had returned from China expressed concerns about being asked to move again, illustrating their sense of precariousness.

\(^{10}\)Human Rights Watch (2012a).
\(^{11}\)Ibid.
\(^{12}\)Ibid.
\(^{14}\)The existing camps are Lana Zup Ja, Bum Tsit Pa, Pa Kahtawng, Manwingyi and Loi Je, and the new one is Hka Hkye.
3.3 Freedom of movement: visiting the villages and the need for livelihoods

Most of the displaced population normally depend on subsistence farming, so they rely completely on their land and livestock. As mentioned, most of the current IDPs tried to remain in the vicinity of their farms and homes to take care of their property, fields and livestock. But as the conflict escalated, this became too risky or simply impossible. As a result people fled to safety. Nonetheless, even in camps, people tried to maintain some level of control over their farms: 59% of the respondents have visited at least once since they fled, despite the risks they face in doing so. The main reasons are to check on their homes (55%) and their land and livestock (24%), or to retrieve some of their belongings (7%).

While people are theoretically free to move within the country and in the state, access to their villages is risky because of the fighting and the level of militarisation. As several interviewees explained, they need to assess the security situation along the roads to their village before setting out, especially if they are travelling from the GCA. The main security threats are arrest and forced labour, usually as porters. Several people reported having no news about those who had been arrested.

In addition, some people had lost their identity documents when they fled, which poses an additional risk. Most of the camp managers and committees deal with this, sometimes with the support of local authorities, by issuing travel permits to leave the camps for a specified period in order for IDPs to visit their homes or villages. Although the permit is no substitute for official identity documents, it offers a degree of protection and also enables the committees to keep track of those who are away, in order to keep tabs on anyone who fails to return as scheduled.

Despite these security measures and the strength of people’s desire to visit their houses and farms, at least one third of the displaced interviewed said they had been unable to return home since they fled.
3.4 Humanitarian access and assistance

While all humanitarian agencies have had access to camps in GCA areas, it has been harder to reach the displaced in camps in KIO-controlled areas, not to mention those who had originally sought refuge in China. Consequently, the level and quality of assistance in the various camps is inconsistent and often below international standards. There has been significant support from local communities, hosting institutions, and Kachin groups in the country and abroad. This was often crucial in the initial phases of the crisis. Much of this assistance is still being offered, but as the displacement crisis becomes prolonged, it is not certain that it can be sustained for much longer and it may begin to dwindle.

At the beginning of the crisis, camps in GCA received immediate support from the local communities and from the religious institutions hosting the displaced population. The government also allowed the IDPs access to existing health centres, hospitals, schools and municipal water sources, and permitted donor visits. In the initial phase, the government’s Kachin Relief and Resettlement Department (RRD) also provided family kits, rice, cooking oil, and cash in some camps in Myitkyina, Wai Maw and Bhamo districts. The RRD is responsible for maintaining and updating registration figures for the camps in GCA. In addition to institutional assistance, a number of local and international agencies were permitted to operate in the area and continue to provide humanitarian assistance to people living in the camps, and in some cases to IDPs staying with host families.

It has been far harder to provide such assistance to people living in camps in NGCA, which is where the majority of the IDPs are residing. Through 2011 and possibly during parts of 2012, the KIO has been the main source of assistance to the displaced in areas under its control: establishing and building camps, providing food, constructing and administering school and health services. Some local NGOs and CBOs have also been active in the area since June 2011, but the lack of resources has hampered scale and quality of their work, and their largely volunteer-based teams seldom receive enough funding to meet the

15 See footnote 1 on IDPs registered in GCA and NGCA.
IDPs’ needs. Although most IDPs are in NGCA camps, the central government has restricted access to these camps for United Nations agencies and international NGOs. Following the onset of the crisis in June 2011, United Nations agencies provided some in-kind assistance in August and in December 2011, as part of a convoy that included a local civil society organisation (CSO). Between 23 March and 26 April 2012, the central government allowed another five UN convoys to visit the camps in NGCA, again to provide in-kind assistance. Since then, plans to return to provide more assistance, particularly in the areas of shelter and WASH, which require sufficient time on the ground to train IDPs and local NGOs, remain on hold, pending government authorisation.

In a 6 December 2012 press release, the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, Valerie Amos, stated: ‘The UN has not been allowed access to provide badly needed assistance to some 39,000 people in areas outside the Government’s control since July 2012. Local partners are providing food and other assistance but their stocks are depleted and with the winter months approaching getting more supplies in is critical’.18

Given their own limited access, some United Nations agencies and other international organisations have been channelling resources through local NGOs and CBOs working in the NGCA, although not enough to meet the level of need. More worryingly, the assistance going into NGCA is less per capita than in GCA where organisations have unimpeded access.

This poses a number of practical and ethical concerns regarding humanitarian principles, in particular impartiality, the right of affected populations to receive humanitarian assistance and the obligation to

---

16 Information based on a confidential document on humanitarian activities in KIO-controlled areas.
17 For details see ‘Assistance Provided by United Nations to Internally Displaced People in Kachin State in hard-to-reach areas March-April 2012’. [UNOCHA Myanmar, internal documents, May 2012]
According to international humanitarian law (IHL), the state bears the primary responsibility to protect and provide for the basic needs of affected populations. In situations where the state cannot or is unwilling to provide for such needs, it has an obligation to refrain from undue interference with or denial of access to bodies that can do so impartially.

---

20 This is based on the internationally recognised principle of sovereignty. See Schwendimann F. (2011).
21 Ibid.
The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) adopt the definition of protection as ‘all activities aimed at obtaining full respect for the rights of the individual in accordance with the letter and spirit of the relevant bodies of law (i.e., human rights law, international humanitarian law, refugee law)’.

Elaborating on this definition, the assessment sought to identify concerns related to the protection of IDPs in order to establish measures to ‘improve the safety of civilians’. According to this, ‘where there is a threat and people are vulnerable they are at risk. The more time people face the threat, the higher the risk’. The assessment therefore started by asking IDPs to describe their perception of security both inside the camps and in the wider environment, to identify the threats they face, to describe the elements that make them feel safe, those who can help to improve their protection, and finally to identify factors that make them more vulnerable.

Taken as a whole, this offers a comprehensive picture of the protection issues for IDPs living in camps in Kachin and Northern Shan states.

23 Ibid., p.33.
4.1 Perceived safety and protection in the camps
As mentioned above, most camp locations were spontaneously chosen by IDPs because they perceived them to be safe havens. The facts that camps are generally far away from the conflict areas and are often hosted in church or monastery compounds, or had been designated by the relevant authorities in the case of NGCA, serve to convey a sense of security.

When they were asked if they feel safe inside the camp, respondents replied quite positively, as shown in the Chart above. A more in-depth analysis, together with discussions with key informants and the staff of organisations working in the camps, suggests however, that concerns are being under-reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camp name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nhkaung Pa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woi Chyai</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bum Tsit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hkat Cho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lana Zup Ja</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je Yang</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This was confirmed during Focus Group Discussions when people were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 5 their perception of safety inside the camp, as opposed to giving a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer: most respondents still reported feeling safe, but to a lesser degree.

It is also important to point out that in a few cases, IDPs regard the camps as fairly unsafe, as shown in the Table above.

The main factor contributing to people’s safety concerned regular access to assistance. Other factors that helped to create a sense of protection are the presence of religious authorities or the camps being hosted in religious compounds, and the existence of fencing or gates around the camp. Under the category ‘Other’, respondents mentioned the camps being located far away from the areas of active fighting, and for camps near the border, proximity to China.24

24In this case China is considered a place of refuge, although since the forced return, some mentioned this as contributing to the sense of insecurity: ‘If we cannot go to China, where else will we escape if the fighting gets worse?’ (IDP interview).
When asked to identify factors that make them feel insecure, respondents indicated lack of income and insufficient assistance provided as their main concerns, followed by the type of shelter in which they live. As the table below illustrates, residents in GCA and NGCA camps responded differently in relation to other threats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you don’t feel safe, what are the reasons?</th>
<th>GCA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NGCA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separated from family</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assistance</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No income</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional threats to people’s safety recorded under ‘Other’ are shelter, the use of drugs and alcohol by some camp residents - often associated with episodes of violence - and the fact that some of the camps are not within church compounds. Finally, there is a general awareness that there is nothing to stop the camps being attacked by either army, and that consequences for the IDPs would be disastrous.

As stated earlier, some of the main concerns about the shelters were being obliged to share a room with unknown people, the lack of doors and shoddy or fragile constructions, and no nearby toilet facilities.
4.2 Outside the camp: an equally protective environment?

Due to the continuing conflict and the violent and often traumatic experiences sustained by a number of IDPs before fleeing their villages, during the flight, and at times when returning to visit their homes, the situation outside the camps is considered comparatively dangerous.

Overall, it appears that IDPs living in NGCA camps tend to be more critical of the security situation for civilians outside the camp, with 55% reporting that they have concerns about their safety when they leave to return to their villages, compared to 39% of those in GCA camps. This difference can be explained by the fact that IDPs living in camps in NGCA are generally further away from their villages and so face more dangers.

The camp authorities that can offer them some protection inside the camps have only limited powers outside the camp boundaries, leaving the IDPs feeling more exposed when they leave the camps. Women are far more likely than men to regard the outside environment as being unsafe, but factors such as age, ethnicity or religion did not seem to be relevant in this respect.

Interviewees were asked to identify the threats they face and how they form their perceptions of the security situation in the wider environment in which they live. The main concern for all respondents is the fear of violence, having experienced violence at the initial stages of the conflict and for some during the entire time they remained in the conflict areas. The displaced have often lost their homes, farms and personal belongings due to the fighting, and in a number of cases also family members. This experience has left a pervasive sense of insecurity.

| Do you have concerns about safety outside the camp? |
|------------------|-----|
| GCA Yes          | 39% |
| No               | 61% |
| NGCA Yes         | 55% |
| No               | 45% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have concerns about your safety outside the camp?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protection in the camps
First, arrests and detention are more of a concern for people in camps in GCA (16%) than in NGCA (7%). This may be explained by a well-known case of an IDP from one of the camps in Myitkyina who was arrested by government forces inside the camp and remains in detention. Since then, especially in the Myitkyina area, IDPs fear arrest whether or not they are inside the camps. The risk of being picked up, mainly by government forces according to the interviewees, is also very high for people travelling to their villages and moving around in the conflict areas. People can be detained indefinitely, and there have been reported instances of torture and forced labour in such circumstances. Since IDPs who are living in camps in GCA have to travel longer distances to reach their villages, they feel more vulnerable because they have to go through more government military posts, which they identify as a threat.
On the other hand, the threat of being killed is of higher concern for people living in NGCA (7%) than in GCA (2%), an issue that might be explained by the camps’ proximity to conflict areas. Another threat specific to the camps in NGCA is exploitation (7%). This is not unusual in the border areas in Kachin and Northern Shan states where, even during periods of peace, there has long been widespread illegal cross-border labour migration and related risks of trafficking.26

Finally, there is a notable gender difference in the perception of threats, with men attributing greater importance to arrests and domestic violence, while it is only women who report sexual violence inside and outside the camps (8%) and the fear of killings (6%). Lack of privacy and frustration may have led to male violence, which has been acknowledged by elders. In relation to the threats identified by women, in Focus Group Discussions men often mentioned they are less worried about being killed than of their wives and other female family members being raped. Women often mentioned their fear of being alone or losing their husbands in the conflict. This shows once again the impact of threats of indiscriminate killing, as well as the use of torture and rape, which respondents frequently reported and was confirmed by other sources.27

4.3 Discrimination and relations with host communities
Discrimination in the camps does not seem to be a major concern for 83% of respondents. For the remaining 17%, the main sources of discrimination were religion, economic conditions and gender (reported only by women). Discrimination on the basis of religion is a concern for 4% of the non-Christian minority and for 35% of Christian respondents.
Discrimination and tense relations with host communities seem to be more of a concern. While 77% of respondents stated in individual interviews that there is no tension with the host community, most of the participants in Focus Group Discussions revealed subtle yet widespread examples of discrimination against IDPs. In addition, a few camps seem to have serious problems with the host communities, as shown in the chart above.

According to the IDPs, the main reasons for tensions with the host communities are feeling unwelcome (34%) along with resource-based conflict (13%) and tensions with certain community members (11%). In relation to feeling unwelcome, respondents gave examples such as teachers treating IDP pupils differently, or referring to them as ‘IDP children’ rather than simply children, and of being teased by children from the host community. Other significant issues are that IDP labourers are paid less for the same work. There have also been instances of offensive behaviour and even physical abuse, as in the case of a few reported episodes of stones being thrown at the camps.

**4.4 Freedom of movement in and out of the camps**

The camp authorities regulate movement in and out of the camps with curfews and systems to record people travelling for specific periods of time. Inevitably, this restricts complete freedom of movement, but the number of IDPs who stated this explicitly gives cause for concern,
particularly in NGCA, and especially for certain camps. The assessment found that in GCA 76% of respondents felt free to move in and out of the camps despite also reporting a high level of risk in doing so, compared to 47% in NGCA. As the chart below shows, in two camps 100% of respondents said that they had no freedom of movement.

![Chart showing freedom of movement in various camps](chart.png)

4.5 Coping mechanisms
Generally, camp managers or committees were found to impose very strict rules. This was partially to ensure good management, but more in-depth discussions showed that some of these measures are motivated by protection concerns. For instance, most camps have regulations for IDPs who want to travel to their villages or leave for short periods of time. First, people must request permission from the camp committees, telling them where they are going and for how long. In some camps
there are time limits after which people are deleted from the registration lists. Camp management committees established these rules following incidents of arrest, torture and rape on people’s way to their villages. It was explained that these regulations alerted camp managers and committees to cases when travellers may have been endangered, for example by being arrested on their way home. In some cases, camp managers- especially religious leaders- have intervened to obtain their release.

Among other ways to address protection threats, respondents suggested that camp managers or committee members should resume the practice of sleeping in the camps as they did in the early stage of the crisis. In some cases, respondents said that they wanted gates or fences in order to control entries. A number of camps have prohibited the sale and consumption of alcohol on the premises. Interviewees claim that these provisions have reduced episodes of violence, although at times people drink outside the camp and return drunk, posing the same problem.
During individual interviews and in Focus Group Discussions, respondents were asked about their level of satisfaction with the different sectors of assistance they receive and with the work of the camp management teams. Despite the fact that satisfaction is a highly individual judgement and therefore not measurable in terms of humanitarian standards, such perceptions give an insight into how different types of assistance affect people’s lives, their levels of vulnerability, their means of coping and their decisions about the future.

5.1 IDPs’ perspectives on humanitarian assistance
Respondents were asked to express their level of satisfaction with the main sectors of assistance provided in camps, namely: shelter, health, food, WASH water, sanitation, hygiene and education. During Focus Group Discussions they were requested to identify priorities and gaps. While some situations are specific to individual camps, several concerns are common across the whole population.

5.1.1 Health
While most camps have primary health care services, including a nurse usually assigned by the local hospital, the assessment found a generally low level of satisfaction. The main reasons given were the lack of medicines,
which means that nurses are often unable to treat patients, and a perception that nurses are unsympathetic.

The lack of medicines was confirmed in interviews with some of the health workers in the camps, and further corroborated by the fact that there is a greater level of satisfaction with health services when outside organisations provide extra medicines.

The other main problem is obtaining medical assistance at night or for serious health problems that cannot be treated in the camps. In these instances IDPs are expected to seek medical assistance outside the camps, which is difficult when these are in remote locations. Furthermore, fees are often charged for health care in hospitals and other structures, which poses a major challenge for the IDPs because of their lack of reliable income and savings.

5.1.2 Livelihoods
Lack of livelihood opportunities and income was a major concern for all interviewees. Having no income clearly makes people feel more vulnerable, as shown by the fact that 29% of interviewees cited this as the main reason for them to feel unprotected.

As mentioned earlier, the great majority of IDPs are subsistence farmers, and their traditional household economy is based on cultivation, livestock breeding and collection of forest products. Being in the camps, especially for those in towns, IDPs can no longer rely on such sources of income.

In addition, urban life is costlier than in the villages because almost everything has to be bought. On the other hand, the more remote camps often offer no chance to earn money nor do they provide sufficient space for cultivation. In some areas, the high concentration of people has led the KIO

if we don’t work outside we won’t have enough to feed our children. Those children attending school need lunch box daily and without work we would not be able to afford it.

Displaced woman

29 Forest products were used either to complement the family diet, or to boost the household economy in order to meet particular demands, such as school fees or unplanned medical costs.
to ban the collection of bamboo shoots for sale, restricting it to household consumption. Similar issues are being raised about firewood. As a result, it is extremely difficult for IDPs to earn any income while living in the camps, and this has economic consequences as well as undermining their self-reliance and psychological health, especially among the elderly people.30

The chart below illustrates how interviewees said they earned money, if at all. Cash grant projects have been appreciated, although these are often used for education rather than for food – the main purpose of the grants. Some organisations have started small-scale income-generating activities in the camps such as distributing piglets, facilitating kitchen gardens or supporting women’s groups producing food to sell outside the camp. Nonetheless, these initiatives remain quite limited and do not meet the needs of the whole population.

The other main source of income for IDPs is casual labour. The availability of this type of work varies significantly according to where the camps are located, with camps in towns or near the border offering better opportunities than those in more isolated areas. While casual labour is the most viable option for most of the displaced, it was often reported that IDPs are paid less than the local population. A group of women explained that for harvesting activities, an IDP would earn 2,000

30 Interview with a camp manager in an IDP camp in Bhamo and with a camp committee member in Myitkyina.
Shelter conditions vary significantly among different camps, and between camps in GCA and NGCA. As can be seen from the Chart above, in NGCA there are more concerns about the durability of shelter and its exposure to the elements. This could be explained by the length of time these shelters have been in place, as the older ones are beginning to deteriorate. In a number of GCA camps, some organisations, mainly with the support of UNHCR, have recently been building extra shelters.

While shelter conditions have gradually improved since the beginning to 2,500 Kyat compared to the standard local rate of 3,000 Kyat. As some said, ‘People know that we are IDPs. We don’t have a choice, and we have to take the job’. Cross-border intermediaries behave in a similar fashion, sometimes skimming off up to half of the workers’ earnings. Again, this seems to relate only to IDPs, who are more vulnerable as illegal migrant workers.

5.1.3 Shelter
Shelter conditions vary significantly among different camps, and between camps in GCA and NGCA. As can be seen from the Chart above, in NGCA there are more concerns about the durability of shelter and its exposure to the elements. This could be explained by the length of time these shelters have been in place, as the older ones are beginning to deteriorate. In a number of GCA camps, some organisations, mainly with the support of UNHCR, have recently been building extra shelters.

The chief concerns about shelter is captured in the Chart below.

---

31 Displaced women participants in a Focus Group Discussion in Ziun camp, Myitkyina.
32 Reported by NGO staff working in the IDP camps in Northern Shan, near the border with China.
of the displacement, overcrowding remains a major problem. In some of the camps, different families still have to share one-room shelters, while in others they live in communal spaces, which have to be vacated during the day to make way for other activities.

The quality of the shelters also raises a number of concerns and minor complaints, particularly regarding the original constructions, which are now starting to deteriorate, and those built with young bamboo and tarpaulins. During an assessment in March and April 2012, a UN team that visited NGCA camps found that few of the shelters were sufficiently robust to withstand the rainy season and winter, and recommended that they be rebuilt before the rains. While UNHCR has supported some organisations to build new shelters in certain camps, there is a need to upgrade the existing shelters, especially in NGCA areas. Some organisations estimate that all of the shelters will need to be rebuilt before March 2013.

To conclude, in the questionnaire session on shelter, interviewees raised a number of concerns regarding security. Clearly, protection and physical security are closely linked to shelter. Poor shelter is often cited as a reason for feeling unsafe and the quality of shelter affects people’s wellbeing.
5.1.4 Education

Most camps have nurseries and primary schools either inside or in the vicinity. Hence 97% of the camp population reported that children had access to education.

While this seems positive, a number of factors associated with education can be viewed as being among the priority concerns, especially for women. The main difficulty is the need to pay for tuition fees and other costs related to education. Once again, a lack of income affects many aspects of the IDPs’ life, and education is seen as the most affected after food.

The other main concern is the impact of this phase on the children’s long-term education. The change of school, in some cases the inferior teaching being provided, and parents’ difficulties in paying for their education could all have a negative impact on IDP children. Many interviewees and teachers reported a lack of appropriate and sufficient classrooms, and in some cases even teachers. Some of the camp schools are run by volunteers, or teachers paid by camp committees or NGOs, as there are not enough government-appointed teachers. In terms of physical infrastructure, the existing schools in nearby villages are often unable to host additional pupils and have to establish double shifts. In some cases disused school buildings have been made available for IDP students and their teachers, but often there are too few tables and chairs.

A further challenge often cited in relation to the educational continuity is that the GCA schools require documentation in order for children to transfer from another school. Due to the conflict, most schools in NGCA either no longer exist or are unable to issue these certificates. So far, the children in camp schools have had no problem, but for children not residing in camps it has been impossible to enrol. Furthermore, during the ceasefire period, NGCA 10th standard (matriculation) students could sit for final exams in government schools, making those who passed eligible to attend government universities. This mechanism no longer exists, which makes it very hard for students to proceed to university.
5.1.5 Food

Although there was no attempt to conduct a full assessment on food security, this study asked three basic questions on how people perceived their ability to obtain food.\textsuperscript{33}

The feedback was generally quite positive, with 90\% of respondents saying that they receive sufficient food aid. A more detailed analysis, and more in-depth discussions with key informants suggested that this overwhelmingly positive response is among other things a way of showing gratitude, in particular for the rice. In their villages most IDPs could not eat rice as often as they would have liked, so they very much appreciated having regular supplies. Many of the women mentioned their concern about the lack of anything with which to accompany the rice (‘curry’) since this is what constitutes a meal.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Adults: number of meals per day} & \textbf{Children: number of meals per day} \\
\hline
Three meals a day 71\% & Three meals a day 92\% \\
Two meals a day 29\% & Two meals a day 8\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

The above Charts show the number of meals a day for adults and children.

\textsuperscript{33} The questionnaire is reproduced in Annex 2.
5.1.6 Water

Access to water varies significantly across different camps. As shown in the Chart below, in some camps most residents believe they have enough water for their daily needs, while in others there is clearly a problem of access to water or the quantity available.

Although water did not seem to be a major problem in most of the camps, there were quite widespread concerns about sanitation facilities, specifically latrines. The respondents highlighted two main issues. First, most latrines need repairs and septic tanks are starting to fill up as they had been planned for a shorter period of time. Second, most camps have too few latrines, and the fact that male and female latrines are not segregated poses a risk for women. Thus, many interviewees mentioned serious security issues for women, especially when they need to use the latrines in the evening and at night.34

5.2 The camp management committees

As part of the assessment, interviewees were asked a series of questions on the functioning of camp committees, the quality of their work, and their contribution to providing security. Questions sought to find out whether people were aware of the existence of the committees, and whether they knew what their roles and responsibilities were.

---

34 See also ‘Assistance Provided by United Nations to Internally Displaced People in Kachin State in hard-to-reach areas March-April 2012’. [UNOCHA Myanmar, internal documents, May 2012]
Collecting these data was possibly among the most difficult in terms of the reliability of the answers. Despite formulating questions in a way that would not be perceived as judgemental, it was assumed that interviewees would not feel completely at ease about criticising the work of camp committees. This is explained in part by gratitude towards the work of the committees but also a fear that any criticism might influence the level of assistance. The numerical findings reported here should be interpreted in this light, and Focus Group Discussions and interviews with key informants were used to gain a more in-depth insight into the true opinions about the camp committees.

5.2.1 Are camp committees working properly?
Overall 95% of IDP respondents agreed that camp managers and camp committees were doing good work. There was no difference among respondents on the basis of ethnic group or religion, although there was a slight difference between men (97%) and women (93%). Interestingly, when members of camp management committees were interviewed, more women (86%) than men (75%) had a positive view of their work, despite the fact that most committee members are men.

As confirmed by further prompting in some individual interviews and during Focus Group Discussions, while people are generally satisfied, certain elements could in the longer term affect IDPs’ acceptance of the camp committees and their ability to work. The overwhelming majority of committees set up at the beginning of the crisis were appointed by religious or community leaders and comprised mainly of volunteers from church or social committees. As the displacement situation has become so protracted, it is difficult for committees to keep up the same rhythm of work because they also need to dedicate time to their families and other activities. This is creating some friction with the camp populations, who report not always being treated sympathetically, and feel poorly represented or understood. While some camps have sub-committees that include IDPs, they occupy a lower rung in the management hierarchy.

35 Some organisations are paying the salaries of one or two committee members. Although this seems to help these people to provide the right level of support it is not uniform across camps, and does not provide for the whole committee.
Another potential source of friction is the fact that committees are quite strict about enforcing camp regulations and some families were not comfortable with committees using corporal punishment to discipline children.

5.2.2 Are camp committees and sub-committees providing sufficient security?

It is clear that camp management committees and managers play a key role in the functioning of the camps and the protection of IDPs. This is often the case in camp settings, especially when camps are established spontaneously. People who are fleeing from danger often attribute a special role and capacity to the institution hosting them.

As discussed in Chapter 4, camp committees are viewed as playing a fundamental role in providing security, resolving disputes among IDPs or between IDPs and communities, and as the entity to which people address their complaints. It is therefore encouraging that 82% of respondents reported being satisfied with the degree of security they provide.

In response to questions about what measures could make them feel more secure, it emerged that several IDPs were concerned that fewer committee members were sleeping in the camps. The absence of committee members during the night is often perceived as a security risk, particularly in GCA camps.
## Life in the camps

### Does the camp management committee provide sufficient security?
- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

### Who provides security for the camp?
- Camp management committee: 76%
- Village leader: 6%
- Armed group: 6%
- Civil authorities: 6%
- Others: 5%

### Who solves disputes or conflict?
- Camp manager: 25%
- Other community leader: 13%
- NGOs: 10%
- Civil authorities: 2%
- Between community members: 2%
- Camp Management Committee: 2%
- Other: 13%

### Where do you go if you have a complaint?
- Village or community leader: 7%
- Civil authorities: 15%
- NGOs: 7%
- Camp management committee: 1%
- Church or religious leaders: 2%
- Other: 1%
To understand the IDPs’ intentions regarding a possible return to their homes after the end of the fighting it is clear that continued conflict by definition precludes the basic conditions for a voluntary and safe return. This is further illustrated by the fact that there are still new arrivals at the camps. None of the statements presented in this chapter should be taken to suggest that a return is imminent or under active consideration. Rather, they offer some insight into people’s feelings and intentions about return should there be a cessation of hostilities, and their main conditions for return – all of which should inform eventual return programmes.

6.1 The right to voluntary and dignified return
The Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (GPID) are based on international humanitarian, human rights, and refugee law, in order to guide governments, conflicting parties and international organisations in providing assistance to, and ensuring the protection of internally displaced persons. These principles have specific provisions regarding durable solutions for internally displaced persons. Principle 28 states that:
1. Competent authorities have the primary duty and responsibility to establish conditions, as well as provide the means, which allow internally displaced persons to return voluntarily, in safety and with dignity, to their homes or places of habitual residence, or to resettle voluntarily in another part of the country. Such authorities shall endeavour to facilitate the reintegration of returned or resettled internally displaced persons.

2. Special efforts should be made to ensure the full participation of internally displaced persons in the planning and management of their return or resettlement and reintegration. 36

The Government of Myanmar, which holds principal responsibility for the protection of its citizens, as well as the KIO, are thereby urged to respect the right of the internally displaced to an informed, safe and dignified choice to return to their original homes or to resettle elsewhere. Humanitarian agencies should also respect these principles.

The Guiding Principles also include guidance regarding the responsibility of governments after people have returned or resettled. Principle 29, paragraph 2 states:

Competent authorities have the duty and responsibility to assist returned and/or resettled internally displaced persons to recover, to the extent possible, their property and possessions, which they left behind or were dispossessed of upon their displacement. When recovery of such property and possessions is not possible, competent authorities shall provide or assist these persons in obtaining appropriate compensation or another form of just reparation.

Finally, Principle 30 exhorts governments to guarantee unimpeded access to humanitarian organisations and other relevant agencies supporting the displaced population in order for them ‘to assist [the IDPs] in their return or resettlement and reintegration’.

6.2 Intentions and conditions for a safe, dignified and voluntary return

As stated earlier, 59% of the IDPs have been able to visit their homes since they fled, of whom 79% went in order to check the status of their homes and farms, fields and livestock. The second main reason was to retrieve some of their belongings (the first reason for 9% of respondents, and the second priority for 16%).

Even when they managed to visit their homes, none of the interviewees could stay there and had to return to the camps. Their reasons were the lack of security in the village in 62% of the cases, and the fear of further attacks for 22% of the respondents. These answers confirm the absence of conditions for a safe or voluntary return.

When asked if they wished to return to their village once the situation becomes peaceful, the vast majority of IDPs said they would.

The main factors that have impeded return are presented in the Chart below. Among the answers for ‘other’, the presence of UXO and land mines in particular was a major concern. These issues will have to be addressed before the IDPs can consider returning to their villages.
Even when their preconditions are met, several other elements will influence people’s decisions, most of which are shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCING FACTORS</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets in the village</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions in areas of return</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family unification</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to return / miss the village</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about the farm and livestock back home / fear of losing it</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I cannot get a plot of land here</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of livelihood opportunities here, while at the village we can work</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the situation gets worse here</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living conditions in place of displacement</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of services in current place of displacement</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic considerations</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from others (trusted sources) who encourage a return</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weather in place of displacement is too cold</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of freedom and control of our own life</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 The decision not to return
For the 12% of IDPs in the surveyed camps who are considering not going back to their villages, the main reason is that they have witnessed the fighting; this means that they do not believe they could ever feel safe there again. A second compelling reason is the knowledge that they have lost everything – their home, farms and orchards – and they would have to start again from scratch.

Further questioning also showed that such a decision would not be taken lightly, and that they were unclear about what they would do if they were to stay or resettle. When asked what they would do if they stayed, 44% said that they did not know, while 30% said they would stay in the camp. This suggests that the option of not returning, in any case a difficult choice, is made harder because the IDPs lack the necessary elements to make an informed choice. Aware of this, most IDPs have suggested some of the conditions that would help in pursuing the option to stay: the government would need to allocate land for them, which should be suitable for agricultural or other livelihood activities. Based on these considerations, 38% of respondents mentioned that their main concern if they did decide to stay would be how to manage without assistance. In both cases – returning to their villages or settling elsewhere – people will need help in resuming their previous livelihoods or embarking on new ones. It can be assumed, therefore, that there will be a need for support in the start-up phase.

6.4 Need for humanitarian assistance upon return
Irrespective of whether they aim to return home or to resettle, respondents identified the areas of support shown in the Chart below as the first priority.

As is the case for most programmes to assist returnees, it can be anticipated that people will need support both before leaving the camps and when they reach their respective destinations. Most IDPs are aware of the extent of damage or destruction to their farms and property, and to what extent they will need to start their lives all over again. Many of the issues that returnees face will not be solved in the short term, in particular the presence of landmines and the impact that this will have not only on people’s physical security but also on their livelihoods and mobility.
In order to obtain a more in-depth understanding of people’s perceptions and intentions, interviewees were also asked to identify the main issues they expect to experience when they return, and the immediate support they would need. The answers are shown in the Chart below.
Even if they return in the foreseeable future, IDPs will have missed at least two planting seasons, which means they lack seeds for new planting. Their awareness of this situation is reflected in the fact that food is listed as the primary need, at least until they can resume their farming and other activities. In most cases they will also need to renovate or rebuild their homes, and the same will probably apply to their farms and other small infrastructure they had. Furthermore, they will be returning to villages that were severely affected by the fighting, where community infrastructure such as schools or clinics are likely to have been damaged or destroyed.

The existence of UXO in the areas of return is the second main area requiring the intervention of specialised organisations and institutions. The presence of landmines, planted by both of the warring parties, constitutes a serious threat to people’s safety, and will hamper reconstruction of the villages and impede the return to normal livelihood activities such as planting or collection of forest products.

6.5 Current information and sources of information

Finally, since fewer than two-thirds of the IDPs living in the 33 assessed camps have been able to visit their homes, it can be anticipated that when the time for return comes, people will need the necessary information to make informed and voluntary decisions. The assessment included a small section of the questionnaire to find out the IDPs’ main sources of information. In due course this may help to identify the best media through which to channel information for the displaced.

At present, IDPs are receiving most of the information regarding the situation in their villages from village chiefs (19%), government officials (29%), relatives who have visited (19%) and the media (10%).

After having identified the conditions for return and the factors that will influence their decision, the interviewees were asked what they would need to know in order to make an informed decision. As can be seen from the Table below, respondents indicated overwhelmingly that information about the security situation was their main concern. A second issue is the presence of mines and other UXO; followed by information on the condition of basic services.
The hope and the conditions for return
7.1 Fears and concerns about protracted displacement
It became very clear from interviews and discussions with IDPs and especially with key informants that it was never expected that the displacement would last for more than a year. The fact that it has been so protracted, and with no immediate end in sight, has affected people’s psychological wellbeing and also explains why the initial relief efforts were set up in the way they were.

At first, when people were offered the possibility of asking the interviewers questions or to present their main concerns at the end of the interview, the majority of IDPs asked when there would be peace and when they could go home. Discussions with camp managers as well as with pastors and priests, and also with organisations specialising in trauma healing, reveal that an indefinite number of IDPs are still experiencing trauma and are struggling to deal with life in camps. Being obliged to live in an enclosed space, combined with the fact that the majority of IDPs cannot pursue any meaningful economic activities, is making people feel – and become – completely dependent on relief aid and other sources. Indeed, over half of the participants in Focus Group Discussions raised questions about
what would happen if the crisis continued and donors stopped providing support. This strong fear adds to their already uncertain future and is stretching their resilience to its limits.

7.2 The need for medium-term interventions
The second impact of having planned for short-term relief affected the type of assistance provided and the camp infrastructure. As was acknowledged in the interviews, the quality of shelter illustrates the fact that it was initially difficult to estimate how many IDPs to expect or the likely duration of their stay. The lack of livelihood opportunities and the limited – albeit reportedly successful – income-generation activities also point to an early focus on immediate relief assistance. Lastly, some of the camp infrastructure, such as latrines, water facilities, and makeshift schools are also showing their limitations as the period of displacement has gone on for so long. Further challenges may be posed by the fact that most of the in-kind and financial assistance in the initial phase was provided by communities, religious institutions and private donors in Myanmar and by the Kachin diaspora. Although this solidarity is still continuing, it is unlikely that such levels of support can be sustained over the long term.

It remains impossible to predict how much longer people will have to stay in the camps, but the fact that fighting is continuing, that the peace talks held at the end of 2012 did not achieve results, and the presence of UXO in the areas where most IDPs come from, suggest that the displacement is likely to last for at least another year, probably longer. This means that the camps will need to be significantly upgraded:

- Shelters need regular maintenance and in some cases may need to be replaced before the next rainy season.
- WASH facilities should be upgraded and redesigned, using technical solutions to make them more durable. It will be of paramount importance to build enough latrines for the camp population, and to have separate facilities for women and men in order to improve women’s security.

---

37 A camp hosting over 2,000 people had four water tanks, built by three international organisations, none of which was in use. The tanks relied on water pumps, but the committee no longer had enough money to purchase the fuel.
The education sector has received limited external support so far, relying mainly on private donations and the goodwill of teachers who have been working as volunteers or for lower salaries. This situation is not sustainable and jeopardises children’s education. There is a need for appropriate measures in terms of both infrastructure and regulations in order to provide consistent solutions to the issues raised by IDPs, for example official recognition of the schooling provided in camp and KIO schools.

7.3 The protection situation and the need for safe programming

Outside the camps, IDPs face serious risks. The situation inside the camps is generally better, but could still be improved.

The IDPs are obviously aware of the dangers outside the camps, with 39% of men and 51% of women saying they feel insecure when they leave the camps. The main threats reported are arrests, often leading to disappearance or long-term detention, torture and rape. This creates a very unsafe environment for those remaining in the conflict-affected areas, and new people continue to arrive at the camps. This situation impedes any possibility of return.

Most IDPs consider the camps safe havens and camp committees have taken measures to reduce the impact of external threats – for example through the ‘in and out’ recording system - and internal ones, as in the case of banning alcohol.

To further improve people’s feeling of protection while they are in the camps, organisations and camp committees should adhere to the first Sphere protection principle to ‘avoid causing harm’ by taking all possible steps ‘to avoid or minimise any adverse effects of their intervention, in particular the risk of exposing people to increased danger or abuse of their rights’, whether as a result of the humanitarian assistance provided or the means used to deliver it. All humanitarian programmes should strive to ensure that their WASH, shelter, livelihood or any other types of project improve the safety of civilians: this is referred to as ‘safe programming.’ Two examples in this context would be to build

---

39 Ibid., p. 33.
separate latrines and bathing facilities for men and women, or to ensure that shelters have doors and are designed in a way that makes people feel safe.

Safe programming can also go a step further, in line with Protection Principles 3 ‘Protect people from physical and psychological harm arising from violence and coercion’ and 4 ‘Assist people to claim their rights, access available remedies and recover from the effects of abuse’ of the Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards. Observing these principles does not require a specific protection mandate, or technical protection-related knowledge, but can be pursued through small-scale activities often suggested by the intended beneficiaries. The principles can be respected in various ways, from encouraging and supporting steps that the affected population has already taken – such as suggesting camp committees assign someone to be responsible for security during the night – to suggesting changes in the existing arrangements in order to include more women in camp committees to act as reference point for women facing difficulties or abuse, and to work with the relevant authorities to minimise some of the main security threats. Organisations working in the camps should also consider how to manage the information they receive regarding human rights violations and abuses. While they might be compelled to refer such information to the relevant authorities or agencies, organisations working in camps must also be perceived as neutral, not least because the appearance of bias could have negative repercussions for the camp population.

All those involved in working in the camps should jointly reflect on how to adapt programmes to further contribute to people’s safety.

7.3.1 The protective value of livelihoods
One of the key findings of the assessment is the importance to those displaced from their homes of having opportunities to earn an income. Their lack of a livelihood makes the IDPs more vulnerable, as indicated by an average 29% of respondents indicating the lack of income as one of the factors contributing to their feelings of insecurity, even inside the camps. The lack of (sufficient) income can erode people’s resilience, and
can – as has happened in some cases40 – lead people to run major risks in order to earn a living. The assessment also shows that the lack of income is affecting the quality of education families can offer their children, and their ability to obtain appropriate health care. If this situation continues it will have very damaging effects on the displaced families.

The interviews showed that cash transfers and livelihood projects, such as kitchen gardens and small-scale food production for sale, were appreciated. This suggests a strong case for boosting these initiatives and exploring other options, especially in the most isolated camps.

7.3.2 The gap in psycho-social support
There is a need to dedicate attention to the widespread need for psycho-social support among the camp population. As mentioned under Protection Principle 4, it is important that organisations seek to help communities to recover from the effects of abuse. At present there is neither the capacity nor the resources to provide much-needed specialised psychological support for the camp population. There are, however, indirect forms of assistance that could enhance the wellbeing of IDPs. In relation to the provision of psycho-social support, the Humanitarian Charter mentions that ‘aid should be delivered in a compassionate manner that promotes dignity, enables self-efficacy through meaningful participation, respects the importance of religious and cultural practices and strengthens the ability of affected people to support holistic well-being’.41 Some of the organisations involved in this assessment have experience with community-based approaches to provide a degree of psycho-social support to those affected by disasters. Some of the camps have elderly people with masonry skills, and activities could be organised for them in a way that would contribute to the healing process. Another example comes from the experience of Metta during the Cyclone Nargis, where the construction

---

40 Examples of high-risk activities range from women going into areas affected by military operations to collect forest products, to a report of parents selling four young girls to a Chinese businessman in February 2012. The latter was reported by one of the organisations working in the camps and has not been independently verified.

of communal kitchens provided a means for women to spend time together and to offer and receive mutual support.\textsuperscript{42}

7.4 Camp management committees: sustainability and representation

The assessment has shown the central role of camp management teams, both in the functioning of the camps and in the protection and perceived sense of security of the displaced population. It is vital that the committees continue this work for the duration of the displacement. At the same time, a growing level of dissatisfaction with the committees derives mainly from the fact that so few of the camp managers and committee members are IDPs.

This set-up poses a challenge both to the committee members and to the IDPs. For some of the former, leaving their normal occupations to work in the camps is becoming a burden for themselves and their families. The IDPs, however, feel that committees often do not understand them or their difficulties, and resent their absence from the camps.

As part of a medium-term approach, the management structures should be reconfigured in order to increase the level of IDP representation. While some organisations are already providing some financial support to camp committees and to a few camp managers or committee members, these structures may not be sustainable in the longer term. It would be useful to consider including more IDPs in the committees, even as camp managers, as this would both increase their representation and provide an occupation – not only or not necessarily in terms of income, but also as a way of feeling useful for the community – especially for camp residents who feel their skills are not being used. While a resident IDP may face various challenges in serving as a committee member, this could also help to boost people’s confidence, letting them to contribute to their own community, with the added advantage that IDPs could probably dedicate themselves to the task on a full-time basis.

\textsuperscript{42} Metta Development Foundation : Accomplishment Report on Community Kitchen Projects, 30 August 2012.
7.5 Preparing durable solutions

While the majority of people residing in the camps have indicated their wish to return to their homes once the conflict is over, it is clear that the conditions do not permit a safe and voluntary return or resettlement. With new arrivals, and a continuous need for relief assistance, it is difficult to think of durable solutions.

It is crucial, however, from the very early stages to engage the displaced population in designing a durable solution so that a return and resettlement process can be successful. It is often argued that the design of a recovery – and return – strategy should start as early as possible to ensure LRRD, or the continuum from relief to development. Any return programme must include a significant component of reconstruction and support to enable people to resume their traditional livelihoods, and also an element of reconciliation. These preliminary insights into people’s understanding of the situation, and their conditions and fears concerning an eventual return, represent a precious body of information to be used in the future.
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Annex I  List of Acronyms and abbreviations
FGD  Focus Group Discussion
GPIID  Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement
IDP  Internally Displaced Person
IRRC  IDP and Refugee Relief Committee (KIO)
KBC  Kachin Baptist Convention
KIA  Kachin Independence Army
KIO  Kachin Independence Organization
KMSS  Karuna Myanmar Social Services
KRDC  Kachin Relief and Development Committee (KIO)
LRRD  Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development
Metta  Metta Development Foundation
OCHA  Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
RRD  Relief and Resettlement Department (Government)
Shalom  Shalom Foundation
UN  United Nations
UNHCR  United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UXO  Unexploded Ordnance
WASH  Water Sanitation and Hygiene
WPN  Wunpawng Ninghtoi

Annex II Methodology
The assessment methodology and process was agreed following a participatory process that included a group of IDP representatives from some of the camps. The entire process – from defining objectives to formulating the methodology and questionnaires – was discussed in the course of a four-day workshop as a means to come to a consensus.

Representatives of the six organisations involved in the assessment participated. In addition, representatives from some of the chosen IDP camps attended two of the workshops. They shared insights on issues likely to emerge from the exercise, and participated in shaping an assessment that would be most appropriate and acceptable to the IDPs.
The assessment was carried out in 33 camps, of which 20 are in GCA and 13 in NGCA or areas under contested control. The camps were selected on the basis of organisational coverage, security, physical access, and the ethnic composition of the camp populations.

By 13 October 2012 the total population registered as living in the 33 selected camps was 38,256, while the total population living in camps and with host families in both GCA and NGCA was 97,598. The camps selected aimed to reflect the proportion of people in GCA and NGCA areas. The Table below shows the relevant populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Camp population</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Population in selected camps</th>
<th>No of target camp</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>38 781</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12 501</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>58 817</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25 755</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97 598</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 256</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more details, see Annex III.

By using mixed methods, the research aimed to provide a representative sample of the displaced population and offer a comprehensive overview of the situation in the selected camps. Random sampling was used for individual interviews with 392 people. This sample size gives a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of 5%.

In addition, individual interviews were conducted with 132 individuals from four pre-selected categories in each camp, or a total of 525 interviewees. Finally, 24 Focus Group Discussions were held in 19 camps with a total of 152 participants selected through purposive sampling, based on a set of four criteria. These were usually conducted after individual interviews as a way to validate information collected in

---

43 The so-called ‘grey areas’ are either under contested control or are controlled by other militia groups.
44 For example, the Western Division in the NGCA had to be excluded due to fighting.
45 The figures refer to data by RRD from 28 September 2012 for camps in GCA and data provided by IRRC on 13 October 2012 for NGCA in Kachin and Northern Shan.
The use of mixed methods combined with the geographical spread of the camps contributed to triangulating the information, further strengthening the methodology.

**a. Individual interviews with IDPs**

Individual interviews were conducted with a randomly selected sample of 392 IDPs. The number of interviews conducted in each camp was proportional to the size of the respective camp population against the total population in all camps (see Annex 1).

Interviews were conducted using a standard questionnaire comprising both open and closed questions. The questionnaire, while drawing on questionnaires used in similar contexts, was designed in-country in two phases. In the first phase, a group of IDP representatives identified and formulated the questions based on the research objectives. In the second phase, IDP representatives and members of the participating organisations worked together to compare the initial draft questionnaire with existing protection and return assessment questionnaires to produce a comprehensive version that was then approved by the forum. The questionnaire was pre-tested in Yangon.

Individual interviews were based on random sampling. Each team of interviewers identified the central point of each camp (usually a church, school, or camp management committee office) and after twirling a pen, selected the direction to follow for the household surveys. The interval was calculated based on the number of shelters and number of interviews planned for the camp, making each camp unique. Interviewers were members of the organisations participating in the assessment or IDP members of the camp management committee. Interviews were usually held in Kachin or Burmese, depending on the language spoken by the IDP, and took place in the room of the interviewee.

**b. Key Informant Interviews**

Individual interviews were conducted with three to five people in each camp, depending on availability, and a total of 132 people were interviewed from the following categories.
Workshop participants, who had an overall or general knowledge of the IDP situation, decided on the categories. Key informants were asked the same set of questions as IDPs, making the findings and opinions to some extent comparable.

c. Focus Group Discussions
Focus Group Discussions were held in 19 of the 33 camps. The selection of participants was based on purposive sampling, a sampling matrix produced during the planning workshop. The four criteria used for forming the groups were gender, age (three age groups: 14-17, 18-35 and over 36 years), ethnicity and area of origin (GCA or NGCA). The workshop participants identified these criteria as the main elements influencing different opinions among IDPs.

In the camp selection process, there was an attempt to strike a balance between camps in GCA and NGCA, as well as camps in Christian and Buddhist compounds, although practical considerations also played a part.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of key informant</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp management committee members</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providers (e.g. teachers)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop participants, who had an overall or general knowledge of the IDP situation, decided on the categories. Key informants were asked the same set of questions as IDPs, making the findings and opinions to some extent comparable.

Focus Group Discussions were held in 19 of the 33 camps. The selection of participants was based on purposive sampling, a sampling matrix produced during the planning workshop. The four criteria used for forming the groups were gender, age (three age groups: 14-17, 18-35 and over 36 years), ethnicity and area of origin (GCA or NGCA). The workshop participants identified these criteria as the main elements influencing different opinions among IDPs.

In the camp selection process, there was an attempt to strike a balance between camps in GCA and NGCA, as well as camps in Christian and Buddhist compounds, although practical considerations also played a part.

The camps in which FGDs were conducted are: Loi Je, AD 2000, Jan Mai Kawng (KBC), Jan Mai Kawng (KMSS), Man Wing Gyi, Ziun, Hkat Cho village, Lhaovo Baptist, Momauk KBC and RC, Yoe Gyi, Maina, Bum Tsit, Lana Zup Ja, Pa Kahtawng, N Hkawng Pa, Nay Wunn Ni, Ni Thaw Ka, Maina AG (Lisu) and Je Yang.

As for individual interviews, practical considerations included access, organisational presence in the camps, as well as the availability of staff members with training and experience in conducting FGDs, in order to ensure research quality.


d. Additional information gathering
In addition to the processes described above, the researcher gathered further information through a literature review and discussions with other humanitarian organisations and entities working in the camps. The information gleaned from these discussions helped to provide more contextual analysis, but does not influence the data or their interpretation.

e. Scope and limitations
The design and conduct of the assessment complied with standard principles of social research, while also taking into account the humanitarian context in which it was carried out. This sometimes imposed limitations in terms of access, and also required a degree of flexibility. Due to the sensitive nature of the assessment, given its focus on protection and return intentions, principles of prior informed consent, accountability and confidentiality were at the centre of the assessment process and its implementation. All interviewees were provided with an agreed explanation of the assessment process and its purpose, and were requested to give their consent to participate in the survey. This ensured that all such participation was completely voluntary. In addition, all relevant authorities as well as camp management committees and organisations were informed about the assessment.

While only a small percentage of the camp population was interviewed, this is justified by the use of a statistically calculated sample of randomly selected participants that ensures an adequate degree of representativeness even in predominantly qualitative research. The use of purposive sampling further contributes to ensuring representativeness of the interviewees, selected across different groups.

It must be recognised that the assessment and the data collected through it represent the perception of the participants at a specific time, based on personal experiences. Thus perceptions would differ from one person to another, depending on individual life experiences. Nonetheless, the methodology ensures that they can be considered representative of the opinions of the IDPs in the surveyed camps.

f. Basic statistics
Some of the key features of the respondents to the interviews and FGDs in the 33 camps are shown in the Table below. As previously mentioned, interview participants were selected randomly, hence the higher representation of certain groups rather than others is related to the characteristics of the population residing in the camps, but also to some social norms. For instance, the fact that a low number of children and under-17s were interviewed, despite their high representation among camp populations, is partly explained by social norms whereby consultations (or, in this case, interviews) are traditionally conducted with senior family members. The limited representation of children and youth was partially addressed through dedicated Focus Group Discussions with people from this age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Village/area of origin of IDP respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>220 GCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>303 NGCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ethnicity | Age groups | |
|-----------|------------|
| Kachin    | 14-17      |
|           | 9          |
| Shan      | 18-25      |
|           | 59         |
| Myanmar   | 26-45      |
|           | 265        |
| Others    | 46-65      |
|           | 161        |
|           | 66+        |
|           | 29         |
### Annex III Matrix of camps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Total in surveyed camps</th>
<th>% of selected camps</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Key informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GCA (Data 28 September 2012)</strong></td>
<td>38,781</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12,501</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHERN SHAN</strong></td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Thomas camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay Wunn Ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Myitkyina</strong></td>
<td>12,930</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MYITKYINA</strong></td>
<td>5,392</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziu</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Mai Kawng</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Mai Kawng-KMSS</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hkat Cho Village</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAING MAW</strong></td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhaovo Baptist</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maina AG (Lisu)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maina – KMSS</strong></td>
<td>985</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maina – KBC</strong></td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhamo</strong></td>
<td>15,797</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHAMO</strong></td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shwegu</strong></td>
<td>432</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yoe Gyi</strong></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert</strong></td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD 2000</strong></td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Man Wingyi (KMSS)</strong></td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ni Thaw Ka Monastery</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOMAUK</strong></td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5782</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RC camp</strong></td>
<td>951</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KBC camp</strong></td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hka Hkye</strong></td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Inside</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Under</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadung Gingwang</td>
<td>6,196</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Post 6</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIZA Muklum</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woi Chyai</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Sat 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA GA YANG - Laiza Ginwang</td>
<td>11,752</td>
<td>11,570</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Ga Yang</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbung</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je Yang</td>
<td>6,909</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hpun Lum Yang</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern division</td>
<td>18,049</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI JA YANG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaiwang/district</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa Kahtawng</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN MAW Ginwang/district</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lana Zup Ja</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bum Tsit</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Hkawng Pa</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loi Je</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Lang Pa Ginwang/district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern division</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern division</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western division</td>
<td>11,691</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camps inside China</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97,598</td>
<td>38,256</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex IV Assessment tools

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

A.1 Interview location
A.2 Place of origin
A.3 Ethnic Group
A.4 Religion
A.5 Gender
A.5 Age group
A.6 Size of the household, incl. respondent
  A.6.1 How many children are in the households (under 18)? How many under five?
A.7 When did you leave your village/place of origin?
A.8 Why did you leave your village/place of origin?
A.9 When did you arrive in this site/camp?
  A.9.1 If you did not come directly from your village or from place of origin, where did you move from?

B. Conditions in camp/site, host families

B.1 How many times did the adults in this household eat per day?
  B.1.1 How many times did the children in this household eat per day?
B.2 In your current location, have you received any food aid sufficiently since your arrival?
B.3 Main concerns about shelter?
B.4 Do you have access to medical care here?
  B.4.1 If not, where else do you go?
B.5 Is there a school?
B.6 Do you get sufficient educational opportunities? If No, what are the additional requirements?
B.7 Do you get sufficient water for your daily drinking, hygiene, and cooking needs?
  B.7.1 If No, where do you get the extra water?
B.8 What do you or your family does to earn income while displaced?
B.9 Before the crisis, did you own land?
  B.9.1 Which type of land?
  B.9.2 If Yes, are you aware of the situation of your land now?
C. Camp management committee
C.1. Is there a camp manager?
C.2. Is there a camp management committee?
   C.2.1 If yes, do you know the camp management committee members?
C.3. Are there sub-committees?
   C.3.1 If yes, do you know the members?
C.4. Does camp management committee and sub-committee provide sufficient security?
   C.4.1 Can you explain why?
C.5. Is the camp management committee working efficiently (properly)?
   C.5.1 Can you explain why?
C.6. Is there any organisations or agencies providing humanitarian aid?
   C.6.1 Which organisations are they?
   C.6.2 Are they working properly?

D. Safety and security
D.1. Do you feel secure in this camp or location?
   D.1.1 If ‘yes’ (feel safe), why?
   D.1.2 If ‘not’ (don’t feel safe) or ‘somewhat’, why not?
D.2. What would make you feel more secure in this camp/location?
D.3. Do you have concerns about your security more in general or outside the camp?
   D.3.1 If yes, what sort of threats do you face?
D.4. Are there cases of discrimination within the camp? Due to what?
D.5. Are there tensions with the host community?
   D.5.1 If yes, why?
D.6. Do you feel free to move in and out of the camp?
   D.6.1 If NO, why?________________________________________
D.7. Who provides security services?
D.8. Who manages conflicts-tensions between groups in the camp/host families?
D.9. Where do you go to complain about abuses/violation?

E. Opinions about return
E.1. Have you or any member of your family gone back to your home since you were displaced?
   E.1.1 If yes, Why did you return to your village (2 answers):
E.1.2 Why didn’t you stay in the village?
E.2 Do you want to return to your village/land?
If the answer is NO (do not want to return),
E.3 Why not?
   E.3.1 If the answer is NO (do not want to return), what are your plans?
   E.3.2 What problems do you or your family anticipate encountering if you remain where you are living?
   If the answer is YES (do want to return)
E.4 What will influence your decision to return/leave the camp?
   E.4.1 What reasons have prevented or are preventing you and your family from returning to date?
E.5 What do you need in order to be able to return home? (indicate the most important by indicating a rank of 1-3)
E.6 What do you or your family anticipate will be your immediate concerns/needs upon return to your or your family’s place of origin?
E.7 What information would be useful to assist you in making a decision on return and timing?
E.8 Where do you receive information about conditions in your home village?

Questions or concerns posed by IDPs about return.

QUESTION GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

1. When and why did you leave your village/place of origin?
   1.1 And when did you arrive here?
2. Do you feel secure in this camp? (Give a score from 1 to 5) and what are the reasons for your answer?
   2.1 What are the threats people face in this community? How are people threatened?
   2.2 Are there specific groups in the camp that are being threatened more than others and who are they?
   2.3 What do people do to protect themselves from these threats? Can you give us some examples?
   2.4 What would make you feel more secure here? Or what would you like to see changed?
   2.5 Who could contribute to improving the security or to make these changes happen? Who can contribute to protecting the population?
3. What do you think of the living conditions in the camp? What are the 3 main things that need improvement? (Ask people to rank in order of importance 1-3)
   3.1 What could contribute to improve them? And how?
   3.2 What do you think of the work of the camp manager? And of the camp committee?
   3.3 Do they contribute to your security?
   3.4 And what do you think about the organisations supporting the camp? Which organisation is it?

4. What will determine your decision to return/leave the camp or to decide to settle?
   4.1 Are there other factors that you consider important for your decision?
   4.2 Do you know what the situation is like in your place of origin? How did you get the information?
   4.3 If someone was to decide not to return and to rather settle in this town/village, do you know if this would be possible or if there would any obstacles? Like what?
   4.4 What do you or your family anticipate will be your immediate concerns /needs upon return or if you decide to settle here?

5. Do you have any questions for us or other concerns that you would like to tell us about?