

---

## HUMANITARIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (HIP)

### BURMA/MYANMAR AND THAILAND

#### 1. CONTEXT

##### **Burma/Myanmar:**

Country Status in GNA (Vulnerability Index and Crisis Index) – Vulnerability Index: 2 and Crisis Index: 3. Ranking in HDI (Human Development Index): 149. Myanmar has a population of 48 million people with ethnic minorities making up 40%. There are 135 different ethnic groups divided into 8 major ethnic national races. Myanmar is one of the countries receiving least aid per capita in the world. Net Official development assistance (ODA) in 2010 was USD 358 million or USD 7.5 per capita (OECD).

The European Commission's Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (DG ECHO's) current country strategy will address the needs of the most vulnerable populations in a protracted forgotten crisis context and is focusing on: a) Rakhine state; b) Kachin state; c) Chin state; d) the area along the eastern border with China, Laos and Thailand; e) the refugee camps in Thailand.

Rakhine state - In Northern Rakhine state (NRS) the Muslim “Rohingya” population (800,000 persons) faces segregation and discrimination. Deprivation of citizenship has served to justify arbitrary treatment. The situation is politically rooted and has turned into an acute humanitarian situation. 61 % of households are classified as highly or severely food insecure<sup>1</sup>. Following the outburst of sectarian violence in June and in October 2012, more than 110,000 people remain displaced and are living in 63 temporary camps<sup>2</sup>. Inter-ethnic tension remains high and is jeopardising interventions of humanitarian actors, detrimental to the entire population.

Kachin state – The conflict between the Myanmar army and the Kachin Independence Army (KIA) has ravaged eastern Kachin since June 2011. At least 75,000 people have been displaced by fighting and IDPs are living in camps or host families in government or Kachin Independence Organisation (KIO) controlled areas. Humanitarian access to the IDPs remains severely restricted: in 16 months only ten UN convoys were able to reach 10,000 persons within the KIO controlled territory. International NGOs, working with local implementing partners, are able to deliver assistance in most areas affected by the conflict but absorption capacity is limited.

---

<sup>1</sup>WFP food security monitoring bulletin May 2012

<sup>2</sup> UNOCHA Rakhine situation report n° 7 Aug 2012

Chin state – Chin is one of the poorest and least developed states, suffering from serious food insecurity. According to WFP<sup>3</sup>, the southern townships remain of grave concerns. Results of recent country wide surveys<sup>4</sup> show that Chin state ranks first in term of food poverty incidence (25%) and poverty incidence (71%) second in terms of child under nourishment (WHO standards) after Rakhine State.

Eastern border areas –The Government has concluded ceasefires with 8 ethnic armed groups along the eastern borders and in Chin State, which could improve the situation in those areas in the medium term. If the ceasefires are translated into peace agreements it could mean the eventual voluntary return of refugees from 9 camps in Thailand. However, in northern Shan state, over 30,000 people have been displaced by fighting. The civilian population is victim of exploitation and human rights violations from both sides of the conflict. Over the years, the internal conflict on the eastern border has resulted in more than 500,000 IDPs.<sup>5</sup>

### **Thailand:**

An estimated 3 million Burmese live in Thailand as economic migrants while 140,000, mostly ethnic Karen, reside in 9 refugee camps along the Thai-Myanmar border. The Government has responded to the protracted refugee situation by pursuing a policy of ‘containment’ of the refugees in isolated camps along the border. This has significant human rights and economic implications. Prolonged insecurity and uncertainty, aid dependency and limited livelihood and education opportunities have taken the toll on the refugees.

## **2. HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

### **1) Affected people/potential beneficiaries**

In Rakhine state DG ECHO intervenes where the most acute needs are and humanitarian activities are open to all ethnic groups, the criteria being the level of needs and vulnerability. People affected by the recent sectarian violence and communities which are victims of long-term discrimination will be the main target of DG ECHO assistance. Depending on how the situation evolves in Rakhine State, DG ECHO aims to target at least 200,000 people in the townships of Maungdaw, Buthidaung, Rathedaung, Sittwe and other affected areas in Rakhine State.

In Kachin state 75,000 people displaced by the internal conflict in either government or ethnic armed group controlled areas will be targeted.

In Chin state 50,000 of the most vulnerable food insecure people living in the southern townships will be targeted.

---

<sup>3</sup> Food Security Monitoring Bulletin May 2012

<sup>4</sup> Integrated household Living Conditions Survey in Myanmar (2009-2010), MDG data report, June 2011, UNDP and Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2009-2010, October 2011, UNICEF-MoH.

<sup>5</sup> ThailandBurma Border Consortium (TBBC)

On the eastern border 200,000 people on the eastern border who have been affected by conflict will be targeted, including IDPs and local host communities.

In Thailand while in 2005 a programme started to resettle refugees to third country (80,000 refugees have already been resettled), the camp population has not decreased. This has resulted in a consistent total number of 140,000 persons, of which approximately 60,000 are unregistered. DG ECHO will target approx. 120,000 of the camp residents and other arrivals outside the camps, as well as host communities as appropriate.

## 2) Description of most acute humanitarian needs

Rakhine state - Needs include protection and/or mitigation activities against discrimination, provision of basic health care, nutrition and food security support. In Northern Rakhine State (NRS) access to health care is extremely poor with one doctor for more than 300,000 people in Buthidaung Township and one rural health centre for 38,000 persons on average<sup>6</sup>. The Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) prevalence in NRS is continuously above the 15% World Health Organization (WHO) emergency threshold. In December 2010, nutrition data showed 20% GAM rates<sup>7</sup>. The share of households classified as severely food insecure was 45%<sup>8</sup> in 2011.

This dire situation has been exacerbated by the consequences of the June and October 2012 unrest due to the temporary suspension of most of the humanitarian and development activities and further constrained access. More than 110,000 displaced people are now living in camps throughout the state and are in need of life saving assistance. Others live in hiding or with host families. Basic health care, food assistance, water, sanitation and protection are the most acute needs. The government's strategy and plan for a medium/long-term solution to the crisis will have an impact on the type of humanitarian assistance and response to be deployed.

Kachin state – Needs are most desperate in the areas outside government control where 75,000 IDPs, have set up temporary camps. After more than a year of conflict, basic assistance has reached 45,000 displaced families living in the non-government controlled area. Serious needs remain with regards to food, health care, shelter material and protection. Needs of host families sheltering displaced families also have to be taken into consideration.

Chin state – Lack of support has led to deficiencies in many sectors and growing food insecurity and vulnerability. Pockets of malnutrition among the children under 5 still need to be addressed and food security levels needs to be supported during the lean season in order to bridge the existing gaps in households' food reserves.

Eastern border - Military operations and the remoteness of the area has left the ethnic minority population vulnerable. Protection is a priority. Health, water,

---

<sup>6</sup>IOM, 2011

<sup>7</sup> ACF nutrition survey Dec. 2010

<sup>8</sup> WFP FS report Feb. 2011

sanitation, shelter and livelihoods are some of the sectors with important needs, particularly in view of return of IDPs and voluntary repatriation from Thailand.

*Refugee camps in Thailand* - Humanitarian needs in the refugee camps in Thailand relate to food security, nutrition, livelihood, water, sanitation, health, protection and working towards sustainable solutions for the camp population, such as voluntary return to Burma/Myanmar. A profiling exercise will in principle start in the camps but there is also an urgent need to re-launch the screening and registration process of refugees to ensure that only genuine refugees and the vulnerable groups are properly targeted, and also in preparation of a future voluntary return to Burma/Myanmar.

#### Other humanitarian needs

- Coordination, information and data management: In the complex operational context of Burma/Myanmar, the need for consolidated and ready-to-use data and information (mapping, data bases) is important to the humanitarian/development community for programming and coordination purposes. Efficient coordination is needed in view of the various on-going humanitarian situations in Burma/Myanmar.
- Disaster response and disaster risk reduction /preparedness: Burma/Myanmar is a highly disaster-prone country with the majority of damage caused by floods and cyclones, and to some extent earthquakes. Often local response capacity is insufficient and international assistance is needed. Wherever feasible and appropriate, disaster risk reduction activities should be mainstreamed in programmes.

### **3. HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE**

#### **1) National/local response and involvement**

In Myanmar, the capacity of the government to respond to disasters remains limited. Nevertheless, a positive step is the adoption of national disaster management plans and laws in the last year. The Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement have taken some initiatives in providing assistance to flood and earthquake affected communities in 2011. The Myanmar Red Cross has also increased its response capacity thanks to close collaboration with IFRC.

There is still reluctance from the government to invest in Kachin and Rakhine states for political reasons. Since late 2011, there has been an opening in the south east with the start of a multi stakeholder peace initiative, which has gathered momentum in 2012 with solid government leadership and involvement. This represents a good opportunity for cooperation between the government and the international community to prepare a comprehensive plan for the return and reintegration of IDPs and refugees from Thailand. Some of these plans might be duplicated in other areas of the country where ceasefires with ethnic armed groups are effective.

In Thailand, the Government is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention. It maintains ultimate authority over the refugee camps in Thailand. The Ministry of Interior controls the day-to-day running of the camps in collaboration with refugee and camp committees. Refugees are not allowed to move freely outside of the camps. Advocacy has resulted in the lifting of some restrictions by the Thai

authorities and non-formal and vocational education, livelihood activities and capacity building have become possible at local level.

## 2) International Humanitarian Response

There is no Country Assistance Program (CAP) in Myanmar. Instead the UN has in 2012 launched response plans for Kachin State (USD 35.8 million) and Rakhine State (USD 67.6 million). ICRC's operation in Myanmar has been limited to prison visits and orthopaedic centres for landmine victims. However, recently there have been positive developments and their presence has increased (e.g. in Rakhine state). In Myanmar a large number of DG ECHO partners (63 including UN, INGOs, ICRC, IOM) are present. Only a limited number have government permission to work in Rakhine and Kachin states. In Thailand both the UN and INGOs are able to work in the refugee camps. The level of funding going to the refugee operation along the Thailand-Myanmar border is about EUR 47 million per year or EUR 336/refugee (TBBC 2011 Annual Report).

## 3) Constraints and DG ECHO response capacity

Limitation on access is a characteristic for many aid programmes in Burma/Myanmar, with lengthy administrative procedures to obtain visas, travel authorisations and Memorandum of understanding (MoUs). Security concerns and anti-UN/NGO sentiment (i.e. in Rakhine state) are also hindering effective implementation of humanitarian aid. However, most programmes can still be monitored by DG ECHO. Although commitments have been made by the Government to improve access, and some positive developments have taken place (i.e. new partners have been allowed to work in the south east), access in Rakhine, Kachin and Shan states remain erratic and limited for international humanitarian staff. In Thailand, challenges relate to upholding humanitarian principles.

## 4) Envisaged DG ECHO response and expected results of humanitarian aid interventions.

In 2013 DG ECHO assistance to actions in Burma/Myanmar will be EUR 14,5 million and in Thailand EUR 4,5 million for the refugees along the Thai-Myanmar border. In Myanmar, DG ECHO will focus on areas occupied by ethnic minorities. Information management/ coordination may be supported on a countrywide level.

In Thailand, further assistance to the camps should be coupled with increased efforts for improved beneficiary targeting, and advocacy for durable solutions for the refugees, such as voluntary repatriation to Burma/Myanmar. In 2013 DG ECHO will continue to reduce its humanitarian aid to the refugee camps, while closely coordinating with other EU funding such as Aid to Uprooted People (AUP).

### Northern Rakhine state

- Protection activities against discrimination of the Muslim community
- Food assistance and nutrition activities, notably food aid during the lean season
- Livelihood support for the rest of the year, and therapeutic and supplementary feeding programmes targeting children and pregnant women
- Provision of basic health services
- Inter-ethnic tension mitigation and prevention

- Mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and preparedness activities

*Rakhine state areas affected by sectarian violence*

- Food assistance and nutrition activities
- Temporary basic health care
- WASH
- Non Food Items
- Protection and inter-ethnic tension mitigation and prevention

*Kachin and Shan state conflict areas*

- Shelter - climate adapted shelter materials, camp/settlement management
- Non-food items, climate adapted kits
- WASH in camps and settlements
- Food aid
- Basic health services to the displaced and host communities
- Protection and mine awareness in camps with a high number of women, children and elderly.

*Chin state*

- Food assistance during the lean season

*Eastern border areas*

- Protection and mine awareness activities on the eastern borders with Thailand.
- In case of return to places of origin for IDPs and refugees, temporary shelters and basic health services, water, sanitation.

*Refugee camps in Thailand*

The main sectors of support will be food assistance, primary health care, protection and working towards durable solutions, such as voluntary repatriation.

#### **4. LRRD, COORDINATION AND TRANSITION**

1) *Other DG ECHO interventions*

In Rakhine state DG ECHO closely coordinates with other Commission services in order to increase the possibility to transfer some activities to long term funding.

The 2012 DIPECHO Action Plan for South East Asia will include Burma/Myanmar and will allow a second round of DRR actions with an extended geographical coverage. DRR is a clear priority for the Government considering that the country is so exposed to cyclones, floods, tsunamis and earthquakes. The DREF, the Small Scale Disaster Response HIP and/or the Epidemics HIP may complement this HIP for small scale humanitarian actions.

2) *Other services/donors availability*

In 2012 humanitarian funding to Burma/Myanmar amounted to approximately USD 64 million<sup>9</sup> with main donors being the European Commission, Switzerland,

---

<sup>9</sup> OCHA Financial Tracking Service for Myanmar emergencies – 04.09.2012  
ECHO/-XA/BUD/2013/91000

Norway, Japan, UK, AUSAID, USAID, Turkey, Sweden and Denmark. Following recent events in Rakhine State, Saudi Arabia and Turkey have provided assistance. The main donors to the camps in Thailand are the Commission (DG ECHO, AUP), Sweden, Netherlands, UK and USA.

### 3) *Other related EU interventions*

Other Commission initiatives include DEVCO's Non-State Actors and Aid to Uprooted People (AUP) programmes and the Instrument for Stability (IfS), which support programmes countrywide. The Commission is also supporting multi-donor initiatives such as LIFT (Livelihood Trust Fund) and a new health fund. In NRS, DG ECHO and DG DEVCO are coordinating their approaches with a view to creating synergies. In Thailand, both DG ECHO and AUP is supporting the refugee camps. Following positive political developments in Burma/Myanmar, UNHCR has put "voluntary return of the refugees to Myanmar" on the international agenda. Even though this return will only take place once the environment is conducive for it (security, livelihood opportunities, etc), the Commission supports UNHCR as it is the durable solution preferred by many refugees.

### 4) *Exit scenarios*

Although ceasefire agreements with ethnic groups have been signed and peace and post conflict initiatives are shaping up, the need for political solutions to address ethnic minority issues is challenging the country's transition process. Durable settlements with ethnic groups should in principle pave the way for sustainable development programmes and the possibility for a future voluntary return of refugees from Thailand. DG ECHO continues to reduce its funding to the camps in Thailand over time, focusing only on those in genuine need of assistance.

## 5. OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL DETAILS

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2013/01000 and the general conditions of the Partnership Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

### 5.1 **Contacts**<sup>10</sup>

Operational Unit in charge: ECHO/B/5

Contact person at HQ:

Jenny CORREIA NUNES [jenny.correia-nunes@ec.europa.eu](mailto:jenny.correia-nunes@ec.europa.eu)

in the field:

Christophe RELTIEN (Myanmar) [christophe.reltien@echofield.eu](mailto:christophe.reltien@echofield.eu)

David VERBOOM (Thailand) [david.verboom@echofield.eu](mailto:david.verboom@echofield.eu)

---

<sup>10</sup> Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL (e-Single Form)

## 5.2 Financial info

Indicative Allocation: EUR 19,000,000

Man-made crises

Humanitarian Aid: EUR 12,000,000

Food Assistance: EUR 7,000,000

For Burma/Myanmar: EUR 14,5 million for Kachin, Rakhine, Chin, Eastern border, and some national programmes.

For Thailand: EUR 4,5 million to support the refugees from Burma/Myanmar and host communities as appropriate.

## 5.3 Proposal Assessment

### Assessment Round 1

- a) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described under section 3.4 of this HIP.
- b) Indicative amount to be allocated in this round of proposals: EUR 12,000,000 from the Humanitarian Aid budget-line and EUR 7,000,000 from the Food Aid budget-line.
- c) Costs will be eligible from: 01/01/2013.<sup>11</sup> Actions may start from 01/01/2013.
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months.
- e) Potential partners: All DG ECHO Partners.
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form.
- g) Date for receipt of the above requested information: For Thailand by 20/12/2012, for Myanmar by 01/02/2013.<sup>12</sup>
- h) Commonly used principles will be applied for the assessment of proposals, such as quality of needs assessment, relevance of intervention sectors and knowledge of the country/region. In Burma/Myanmar, presence on the ground will be a requirement considering the lengthy procedures to obtain MoUs.

---

<sup>11</sup> The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, whatever occurs latest.

<sup>12</sup> The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially if certain needs/ priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.