

## WaSH/Shelter/NFI/CCCM Quarterly Meeting Minutes

Wun Tawp Motel, Myitkyina

Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2015, Wun Tawp Motel, Myitkyina

**Attendee:** ACTED-Myanmar, World Vision, Solidarites International, UNHCR (Shelter/NFI/CCCM and Protection), Shalom, KMSS-MKN, MRCS, Trocaire, HPA, Metta, UNICEF (WaSH), DRC, SHD, CESVI, IOM & OCHA

| Agenda Items                                     | Discussion points  | Action/Actor/Date  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Introduction</b>                              | <p>The meeting was co-chaired by WaSH and Shelter/NFI/CCCM clusters and translated in both English and Myanmar. The meeting started with a quick round of introductions by the individual participants. The Clusters would like to thank all the cluster members for their participation.</p> <p>The Cluster expressed that this is the Quarterly Joint Cluster Meeting of WaSH and Shelter/NFI/CCCM Clusters which is held alternatively in Myitkyina and Bhamo.</p> <p>Participants quickly went through the meeting agenda and were invited to give feedback and make comments.</p> |  |
| <b>Review of Last Agenda (Bhamo in Feb 2015)</b> | <p><b>Action point 1:</b> <i>CCCM Cluster to call a meeting at the end of March for the presentation of NRC's research findings (UDOC).</i> The Shelter/NFI/CCCM National Cluster Coordinator (NCC) will discuss this action point later in the session.</p> <p><b>Action point 2:</b> <i>WaSH cluster to organize a TWiG on drainage and RWHS.</i><br/>The design of RWHS has been finalized through a Technical Working Group with a special</p>   | <b>Finalized document of "Protection Sector position on the movement of IDP from a temporal location to another" to share with all</b> |

|  |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
|  | <p>focus on RWHS and with the participation of both shelter and wash members. Findings will be shared during the AoB session by both clusters.</p> <p><b>Action point 3:</b> A document on “IDP Displacements Between Temporary Locations” is shared with members for eventual comments within two weeks in order for them to be finalized and considered as a position paper/ guidelines. It has been done by the Protection Sector but many participants in the meeting said they had not been updated on the paper and hadn’t received the documents. The Protector Sector will briefly present the background of the development of those documents and participants will be given the document by the Cluster with the meeting minutes.</p> <p><b>Action point 4:</b> Capacity development officers from WaSH and Shelter / CCCM Clusters to coordinate together on maintenance of infrastructure and community mobilization. The afternoon session of the workshop is the result of coordination between IOM, WaSH and Shelter/CCCM Clusters. Further synergies will be looked at camp level implementation of activities.</p> | <b>the participants</b> |
| <b>WaSH &amp; Shelter update at the national level</b> | <p><b>Updates from National WaSH Cluster Coordinator</b></p> <p>Joint meeting between WaSH and Shelter/NFI/CCCM is a very good initiative between clusters. Now it has reached the third joint cluster meeting which has resulted positive collaboration such as joint agreement on the standards, drainage, rain water catchment, common approach to address the needs of the beneficiaries, etc., which has stimulated technical cooperation between WaSH and Shelter/NFI/CCCM.</p> <p>The coordination and interest of both clusters are not just technical details but also include:</p>   |                         |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>joint monitoring and evaluation, data management, new caseloads, existing caseloads and the relocation of the camps for the CCCM aspects.</p> <p>The integrated approach between WaSH and CCCM will be expanded in 2015 for the maintenance and renovation of the infrastructures by emphasizing the linkages between the CCCM and WaSH actors.</p> <p>Joint discussions are being held in Rakhine with regards to the approach and process of effective distribution of NFIs. Therefore technical cooperation and monitoring of CCM and NFI is also included in this joined-up approach. Northern Shan State was also a part of a joint cluster effort whereby it is remote from both Yangon and Myitkyina. Thus, it was conducted in Yangon for joint cluster meetings for Northern Shan for recent Kokang and Wa development.</p> <p>Advocacy for funding for Northern and Southern Kachin in Mansi as well as in Northern Shan occurred as part of the WaSH cluster's fundraising efforts. It is noted that funding is becoming a challenge.</p> <p><b>Updates from Shelter/NFI/CCCM NCC</b></p> <p>The NCC gave updates on the national level updates and later addressed the Kachin specific need.</p> <p>The idea of conducting a joint cluster meeting was started in Bhamo, where it was said that both clusters have to address the same issues, together.</p> <p>Kachin Cluster Coordinator (KCC): Kevin, the previous KCC has left UNHCR and thus the responsibility is shared between two colleagues. The focal point for Shelter/NFI/CCCM</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>cover in Myitkyina is Maran and for Bhamo and Northern Shan it is Seng Pan. Myint Maung is the technical focal point in shelter, although currently unwell. KCC's position was advertised in February. However, due to the funding situation, the position remains unfilled. Previously KCC has worked on the sustainable working structure of the Cluster. Thus, the responsibility will be shared out as mentioned above.</p> <p>CCCM camp profiling's 4<sup>th</sup> round may be conducted this year, uncertain. However, the former Information Management (IM) colleague, Pyae Sone will leave the Cluster Lead to work for another UN Agency. This will be a significant loss to the efforts of <i>this</i> Cluster.</p> <p>Lack of cross-line missions has meant Clusters have been unable to gain the information required, especially for Shelter/NFI/CCCM. The election in late 2015 may also have an interesting impact on this operation. If there are changes due to the election, there might also be an impact on the response of the humanitarian community.</p> <p>More engagement with the authorities remains a priority.</p> <p>Coordination with faith based NGOs and local NGOs here on the ground is very positive with constructive engagement and collaboration. However, at the national level, there is more of a disconnect between local NGOs and UN agencies.</p> <p>Land scarcity and the shelter gap: is becoming a problem, with the shelters which were established 2/3 years ago now having to be replaced. 63% of the needs are covered. 37% needs remain. 16% of the caseloads were not able to solve this issue due to the land availability. Last year, there were approximately 3,500 unit shelters that were built. About 2,000 – 2,500 shelters have to be constructed to complete the gap in 2015.</p> <p>Funding: has been decreased as mentioned per WaSH, and it is the same for</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Shelter/NFI/CCCM. However, there is a strategic objective for repair and maintenance via CCCM, what is hoped, a more sustainable approach.</p> <p>NFI: will be targeted for the needs. The process and vulnerability group needs to be defined. Consultation with Bhamo actors have happened during previous meetings.</p> <p>Kokang: is a difficult area to access. However, UNCHR colleagues have been able to visit the Kokang IDPs in Wa area and conducted assessments. Based on findings, some NFI support may be provided.</p> <p>IOM and OCHA: will also be here today for the sharing exercise in the afternoon which is what this platform is for.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Small size IDPs camps (&lt; 50 HHs): Which strategy for WASH and shelter</b></p> | <p>There are 64 camps in Kachin which have small populations, from 4 HH all the way up to 50+ HH. 64 camps out of 130 are smaller camps, which is 50% of the total camps in Kachin and Northern Shan almost 50 % of the IDPs camps host only about 10% of the total IDP population. These small IDP camps are mainly located in urban GCA. Given their limited size and their comparative easier access to basic services and local market and job opportunities, it is relevant to wonder whether a specific strategy is needed for these IDPs locations. The number and geographical spread of these small size IDPs locations is indeed mobilizing the WaSH and shelter actors while the remaining humanitarian needs may be different from bigger IDPs locations. In these small locations, camp committee need to be further strengthened to ensure the proper operation and maintenance of infrastructures. Therefore, the Clusters would like to know how the individual camp management agencies are dealing with it, and whether there is a need to have specific approaches for these small sized locations.</p> |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><u>Each table takes five minutes to discuss appropriate intervention for the smaller camps.</u></p> <p><b>Discussion outcomes of each group are as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not appropriate to combine one focal point to look after 3 or 4 smaller camps although the best case scenario would be combining the smaller camps into a bigger one. However, it is not appropriate to combine the camps in terms of CCCM. This is because of the differences between camp management agencies such as Shalom, KBC and KMSS. It would therefore be difficult to decide who would be the camp management agency.</li> <li>• One good practice is that, there was one small camp near Maina St. Joseph that was managed by KMSS. Then, the government contacted St. Joseph in order to host and combine the small households into their existing big camp. Then, St. Joseph camp accepted those small households into their camp.</li> <li>• Although it is difficult to merge the smaller camps into a big one, at one point if there is a decrease in funding in future, it should be discussed with the IDPs, government and camp management agencies in order to benefit from the possible cost effectiveness.</li> <li>• It is also needed to consider the geographical location such as NGCA or GCA as well as religious entities by consulting with them and the government since this has to be done in consultation with all stakeholders.</li> <li>• For Hygiene Education (HE) and the distribution of NFI or hygiene items, it would be good to gather at one distribution point. A voucher system could also be used for the smaller camps.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fewer than 100 populations with 20 HH could be called a “small camp”. However if it is more than 200 population with 40 HH, it does not sound right calling them “small camps”.</li> <li>• If the government can offer support by providing land, it would be possible to group and merge the smaller camp.</li> <li>• While IDPs are being displaced, they are coming to the places where they feel safe. It would need funding in order to work on infrastructure such as WaSH and shelter if combined to a new location. One possible implementable action point would be that, one camp management committee could be allocated for two smaller camps in the nearby reachable area.</li> <li>• Population: if we are combining two camps which have 200 IDPs, it would become 400 IDPs which are managed by different religious agencies. In that case, we have to include different denomination and agency for diversity into the camp management committee instead of one dominant agency.</li> <li>• In order to group or merge different camps for the different awareness sessions, if the locations are different, it would be more costly for transportation. For the distribution, it is fine with the voucher system since it doesn’t have volume for transporting back.</li> <li>• There is also a need to explore how to build the capacity of the small camp management committees.</li> </ul> <p><b>Feedback and comment by NCC:</b></p> <p><b>Clarifying on the principle:</b> The purpose of bringing this issue up is to strategize about how</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|                         |   |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | <p>to increase the activities directly related to the camp management committee (CMC). Different approaches are needed for different groups of IDPs, small or big camps. It seems that all the small location camps are in urban settings, although this needs to be explored more for those who are in rural settings. It is more about looking at who they are, where they are and how far they are from the accessible services. The question and debate here is about bringing the best approach for those smaller camps. If the IDPs are happy without the camp management committee without the support of CCCM, it is fine. If they are self-sustaining, it is also alright. However, the Cluster would like to ensure that the accountability for the smaller population is not overlooked.</p> <p>The Cluster is not talking about merging the smaller camps into the big camps by putting them in more vulnerable camps. It is not about bringing more people and creating more problems. If they are happy with four families living in the urban area by themselves, it is fine with the Cluster.</p> <p>It is not about changing the setup of the population and their existing structure. It is about changing the approach and process of the intervention, activities and monitoring and follow-up. The clusters should find the balance of changing the delivery of assistance and the systematic approach for smaller groups, though it is challenging.</p> |  |
| <b>NFI distribution</b> | <p>Both Clusters are facing funding challenges. It is the reason to look for a more targeted approach for NFI distribution.</p> <p><b>NCC update:</b> It could generally be said that the cost of NFIs is not small. One NFI kit costs US\$ 110. Since it is in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of displacement, it is quite challenging to distribute the whole new set to all of the population. Based on the distribution data, UNHCR has been</p>   |  |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>distributing regularly to the newly arrived IDPs.</p> <p>The blanket distribution has been done for all new caseloads. If the Cluster is continuing with the blanket distribution, it would not be convincing for the donor. Therefore, it would become a limited resource and be considered for the targeted distribution of the NFI. That's led the Cluster to define where camps and which target groups to distribute to again. It is about the real need of the group on the ground. The WaSH Cluster members gave up with the principle of blanket distribution of hygiene items during the WaSH cluster review at the beginning of 2015. It is not about stopping the distribution but it is about considering the strategy for the most needed group. The continuation of the blanket distribution will cause 2.5 million USD which is one third of the whole WaSH response plan for 2015. However, it is not about neglecting the vulnerability of the population. WaSH Cluster's objective is to improve the WaSH needs for the population. There are more needs beyond the hygiene kits. In terms of <b>Do No Harm</b> principles, first of all, the Cluster puts the dignity of all the IDP populations first. The dignity of the population has to be considered by improving the livelihoods and economy of the people. While decreasing the funding, it is not about cutting the WaSH needs but putting more money for livelihoods.</p> <p><b>Feedback and discussion (Q&amp;A)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is understandable to decrease WaSH items and NFI blanket's distribution. However, how do we address livelihoods?</li> <li>• When Clusters are saying 'targeting' what do you mean exactly, based on the areas or livelihood?</li> <li>• <b>UNICEF:</b> <i>Clusters are working with UNDP for multi sectorial assessments for early</i></li> </ul> |  |
|--|---|--|

*recovery on livelihood and access to markets. It hopes to have some ideas for targeted distribution. Today marks the 4<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Kachin conflict whereby supporting the same assistance from the beginning is becoming challenging. Therefore, it would be good to hear from the participants about selection criteria and process of the targeted groups.*

- **MRCS:** *It has to consider whether what has been provided from the beginning is enough? Now it is noted that some IDPs are able to find the livelihoods. This could become one criteria? It is also noted that there are some families who have livelihoods opportunity by NGOs. In that case, they could not be included in the distribution. However, they are also vulnerable families whom have children and elderly, those have to be included for redistribution. I would like to suggest and comment to address those in the assessment. Hygiene is also not just about the item distribution but also behavior change within the community. Although they are receiving the hygiene items, if their behavior is not changing, reinforcing the awareness sessions together with the assistance items should be a priority.*
- **WaSH CLUSTER:** *Suggestion to distribute some of the main needed WaSH NFI (ex: soap) to some participants of Hygiene promotion and awareness sessions rather than blanket distribution.*
- **UNHCR:** *does not have all the kits for another blanket distribution for all IDPs. Therefore, the available items are limited. Thus, it is not able to go for the blanket distribution again. It is a frustrating moment for all of the humanitarian community. WFP will also be conducting targeted distribution. It indicates that more sector/clusters will be on the same trend in order to support the early recovery. Socio economic survey will be*

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p><i>conducted soon by the initiative of ECHO as well as early recovery survey in the camp by UNDP. It is hoped that there will be an outcome for targeted distribution. Camp profiling is also somewhat contributing to the above survey which is only possible with the contribution of the local NGOs.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of changing the strategy of the UN agencies regarding the targeted distribution, are the government in both GCA and NGCA aware of it. What is the feedback from them?</li> <li>• <i>During the strategy discussion of WaSH, it is discussed that the whole strategy for the WaSH intervention will change. However, it is also noted that there are some cases which are still needed for blanket distribution such as remote and hard to reach areas, as an exception.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>CESVI:</b> What about the hygiene conditions in the schools? It is observed during the monitoring activity in Momauk area in Bhamo that there are very poor hygiene systems in the schools and what is the WaSH intervention for it.</p> <p><i>WaSH cluster agrees on the comment. Schools are a part of the strategy to conduct the activity as a first entry point towards the community. It was part of a WaSH activity last year.</i></p> <p><b>Good practices</b></p> <p><b>UNICEF:</b> In 2004 in Northern Shan, Metta provided soap making vocational training to IDPs in order to produce the products which they procured for hygiene activities, therefore promoting sustainability and reducing dependency.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
|   | <p><b>UNHCR:</b> It would be great to share these good practices with the UNDP for early recovery activities instead of just giving out the in-kind contribution but also extending for the livelihood opportunity.</p> <p><b>All participants:</b> Meeting minute translation in Myanmar is very good along with the English version.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Update of WaSH &amp; shelter gaps and new temporary locations in Kachin and NSS</b></p> | <p><b>Shelter and related WaSH gaps are illustrated in three categories;(1) gaps in new camps due to armed clashes and small scale emergencies, (2) move from Temporary location to another temporary locations and (3) insufficient shelters needs existing camps</b></p> <p><u>Cat (1) Gaps in New Camps</u></p> <p>The presentation portrayed the gaps in three camps such as Kude Maw KBC Camp in Hpakant, Nam Zalot Camp in Hsenni and Pang Ku Camp in Kutkai. The total shelter gap is 238 shelter units. There is no identification of camp management in these camps yet.</p> <p><b>UNICEF:</b> When there is a new camp, how could the CCCM cluster define the temporary setting? In Northern Shan, the population fluctuates and there is very short term displacement. In that case, how many months should the Cluster wait as a buffer period? There are some camps in NS not registered on a CCCM list.</p> <p><b>UNHCR:</b> has been conducting the assessment in Kude Maw KBC Camp during the last two weeks. It seems that the new caseloads are still arriving although the displacement started in February. As per IDPs, they may be going back to their village of origin depending on the security condition for a day or two. However, IDPs shared that they will likely remain staying in the camp due to the security condition in their areas.</p> | <p><b>CCCM cluster to work with PWG on criteria setting guidelines to verify the status of new displacement to determine temporal displacement and prolong displacement including registration into CCCM list</b></p> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>WaSH CLUSTER:</b> In terms of WaSH, it is noted that Metta Lashio has also been responding with the WaSH needs in Nam Zalot and Pang Ku as a WaSH focal point.</p> <p><b>UNHCR:</b> In Northern Shan, it is noted that the population has fluctuates very quickly. By doing the systematic assessment, it would offer substantial information to plan for the infrastructure development.</p> <p><u>Cat (2) Move from Temporary Location to Another Ones</u></p> <p>Joint Clusters shared the list of camps which has potential for relocation. The clusters would like to have the verification performed by the PWG/CCCM for those camps which have potential for relocation.</p> <p><b>Protection Perspectives for the Relocation of the IDP Camps</b></p> <p>PWG coordinator introduced PWG's working paper on the relocation of the IDPs camp from the existing camp towards a new location.</p> <p>PWG is hearing more and more of the relocating of the IDPs from one camp to another without the consultation of the IDPs. PWG is concerned since it brings instability to the IDPs which could create vulnerability. It is noted that there are different reasons for the cause due to the land owner taking back the land for different reasons. Sometimes, it is due to the tension between host communities and IDPs. However, the problem is not solved by relocating and putting the same problem in another location. Sometimes, it is also noted that the new proposed site are not big enough which creates worse living conditions compared to the existing camps. Therefore, PWG would like to propose not to relocate, unless there are better conditions in relocating sites in comparison to the existing camp. PWG would also like to remind the clusters to take the protection as a central point.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>Therefore, after discussing with the WaSH/Shelter/CCCM, PWG would like to ask all the clusters to alert PWG immediately, if there is any mention of camp relocation. PWG is looking for a high level of consultation towards the IDPs and the push factors of the relocations. PWG would also like to know if there are any protection concerns by staying in the existing camp as well as protection concerns as a result of the movement. In addition, PWG is also concerned for the status of the camps, such as how long can they stay, and the situation of the current land, etc.</p> <p>It is also hearing that there is limited funding availability for both Clusters. At the same time, there are new caseloads in Kachin and Northern Shan. Some existing camps are not equipped with proper shelter and WaSH infrastructure. Therefore, in this context, it is believed that the existing camps should not be relocating towards a new place but rather covering the needs of the existing gap. To conclude, PWG would like to request to know if there is any information on the possible relocation of sites.</p> <p><b>Information Sharing on Potential Relocation Camps</b></p> <p><b>World Vision:</b> Waing Maw Myoma Camp in Waing Maw is relocating towards a new location. WV is constructing six unit shelters as well as WaSH components which will be completed by the end of June 2015.</p> <p><b>SI:</b> In Loiye area, there are four different Lisu camps. It is noted that one of the camp has to be relocated to another area. The camp manager is planning to merge that camp into the existing Lisu Camp.</p> <p><b>Information Platform</b></p> <p><b>WASH CLUSTER:</b> <i>The best way is to inform the concerned cluster. Once received, the Cluster</i></p> |  |
|--|--|--|

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><i>could forward the information to PWG for verification and inclusion.</i></p> <p><b>WaSH CLUSTER:</b> Both clusters are well noted. As a systematic platform, it is encouraged to request to share this kind of information towards the concerned cluster to move the information forwards to PWG and CCCM. The organization could also share the information directly with PWG and CCCM.</p>  |  |
| <b>Accountability to affected people</b>                       | OCHA gave a presentation for 1 hour, which included two rounds of group work.   |  |
| <b>Presentation on community participation in camps by IOM</b> | <p>IOM presented on the community participation in the camps. IOM will be conducting this with the CCCM agencies in Kachin for coaching and mentoring which is also a part of IOM's activities in Kachin. IOM will cooperate together across the clusters and sectors for the capacity building of the camp management committee for various topics.</p> <p>Participation means that everyone has a voice to represent themselves. It is not only about voicing opinions but also about making sure that IDPs community participate in the decision making process. If the IDPs depend more upon the assistance, it makes them more vulnerable.</p> <p><b>WaSH CLUSTER:</b> WaSH cluster is stressing on the necessity to increase the community participation. The efforts of WaSH clusters members enabled to reach high level of WaSH infrastructure coverage. It is now crucial to focus further on operation and maintenance activities through empowerment of camp committees and IDPs communities with WASH issues. There is a progressive shift from hardware and technical issues toward more social and community activities. The inclusion of WaSH operation and maintenance into camp committees activities are crucial and should be further developed to ensure the</p> |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>sustainability and appropriate use of existing facilities.</p> <p><b>Trocaire:</b> Is there any assessment for CCCM?</p> <p><b>IOM:</b> There are assessments for the CCCMs. The step of each camp is different. Some are already in the “functional” stage. They have to be moving forwards to the next steps such as ownership. There were also camps that are not yet on that level yet. Some are still at the beginning of the steps, “passive”.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Presentation on Capacity development of focal agency and camp management committee (WaSH) by UNICEF, Dhruva Majagaiyan</b></p> | <p>Besides increasing the technical capacity of WaSH actors, the objectives of the WaSH capacity development activities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To empower communities to take responsibilities for operation, management and maintenance of WaSH facilities and reduce the dependency;</li> <li>• To enhance community capacity to take part on the decision making process;</li> <li>• To support the monitoring of the WaSH situation;</li> <li>• To be accountable to affected population.</li> </ul> <p><b>WaSH CLUSTER</b> has been putting a great effort on/in the capacity development of the WaSH committee as well as of WaSH focal agencies. In 2015, WaSH CLUSTER will be further cooperating with CCCM and Shelter Cluster to upgrade the capacity of camp management committee for ensuring, sustaining and securing access to WaSH facilities.</p> |  |



|                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| <p><b>AOB</b></p> | <p><b>New shelter design and gutter system:</b></p> <p>UNHCR and Shelter Cluster members present the new shelter design as an option for land scarcity area. Shelter and WaSH clusters agreed for new gutter system for rain water catchment system and introduction of PVC pipe to replace metal gutter which offer both cost efficiency and improve water quality. In the new design the down pipe is fixed into the shelter (post) in 45 degree from the rafter. Also a suggestion to put the bar at the lower part of the down pipe to flush out first rainwater with dust.</p> <p>As soon as it is available, the CCCM Cluster Lead will include the Urban Displacement Outside the Camp (UDOC) report to inform the Cluster members of the findings. If there is any organization which is interested in working on this population, it would be good to know.</p> <p><b>Briefing on Urban Displacement Outside the camp (UDOC) findings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The assessment team traveled to Myitkyina and Bhamo but could not travel to Northern Shan State due to unstable condition.</li> <li>2. According to the assessment finding, out of the total recorded IDP caseload 91,000, 13,000 are living outside the camp with host community. Majority of them are from Bhamo area. There is no proper record of Myitkyina area displacement outside the camp.</li> <li>3. In Bhamo area, out of recorded 8404 IDP outside the camp, 1475 is registered. In particular Mansi in Bhamo area hold 2372 caseload.</li> <li>4. Assessment found out that 100% respondents request shelter and WaSH facilities</li> </ol> |  |
|-------------------|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>such as extra room, toilet and bigger septic tanks where they are hosting. Other findings demonstrate that 68% are in need of educational support, 61% has irregular jobs and 55% in need/assistance on civil documents. Above all this, the government is still resistant to increase numbers of registration of IDP outside camps.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many areas in Kachin State don't have proper recording of displacement community outside of the camp especially in Myitkyina. Profiling of affected population should extend beyond the camps and there should be coordination mechanisms for UDOC.</li> <li>• Consideration of possible mechanisms in order that services in the camp are also available for displaced individuals outside the camp.</li> <li>• 100% of the respondent said that they are "not ready" to return to their village of origin, various reasons given and after four years of re-escalating up of the conflict, UDOC intervention should address/advocate to Government and donors.</li> <li>• What is the status of the Government and what is the view of the donors, particularly if the money is not there. Not only just about CCCM but this also concerns early recovery and protection as well as involvement of more partners and community to support UDOC project.</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|