

# Profile at a glance

This is a **summary of the comprehensive profiling report 2013 – 2015** on the situation of internally displaced populations in camps in Kachin and northern Shan States in Myanmar. The profiling exercise, which is still ongoing, is a collaborative project of international and national actors, working together to provide reliable and agreed upon information to improve humanitarian response.

**JIPS has been providing support** since the initial round of the profiling process, in 2013, and throughout the two subsequent rounds in 2014 and 2015. Delivered both in-country and remotely, the support services pertain to methodology development, data collection, trainings and tools, as well as analysis and reporting.

# Myanmar

## KACHIN & NORTHERN SHAN




# Overview

In Kachin State, in northeast Myanmar, long-lasting conflict has caused large waves of displacement, including some people fleeing to the neighbouring Shan State. Since the beginning, many IDPs moved to camps and camp-like settings dispersed across government and non-government controlled areas; others are living with host families and dispersed in rural and urban areas.

**Information on the populations living in IDP camps and camp-like settings is crucial in order to adapt the humanitarian response** to the needs of the population. However, no comprehensive data on this population existed. To fill the gap, the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster promoted the implementation of collaborative and regularly conducted camp profiling exercises. The partners included both international and national actors, namely: UNHCR, DRC, OCHA, UNICEF, WFP, Shalom, RANIR, KBC, and KMSS. The exercise was furthermore supported by JIPS, Statistics Norway and NORCAP.

The profiling process was initiated in 2013 and repeated in 2014 and 2015. The exercises aimed to provide, through sequential rounds of profiling data collection, **an overview of the situation** in each IDP camp and establish a **common central information management tool** to inform the coordination of camp-level activities. The main objectives were to:

- ◆ Provide a regularly updated **overview of the situation** in camps hosting IDPs, including disaggregated population estimates;
- ◆ Consolidate information for **advocacy and fundraising** efforts on behalf of IDPs living in camps;
- ◆ Indicate the need for more detailed **thematic assessments**;
- ◆ Strengthen the **coordination of camp-level data** collection, analysis and response;
- ◆ Support **sustainable capacity building** for camp managers.



**" Profiling is now a well established and embedded process. Where before there was barely any data available due to the difficult accessibility of the remote areas, now there is reliable, consistently collected and agreed-upon data. "**


Edward Benson  
CCCM Cluster Coordinator  
Myanmar

# What methods were used?

The methodology of the camp profiling exercise was designed specifically to provide a comprehensive view and regular updates of the situation of IDPs living in camps, instead of a detailed needs assessment. The **unit of analysis** of the exercise was the IDP camp, and the **geographic coverage** included all the IDP camps in the Kachin and northern Shan States. Three main sources of data informed the findings for this cross-camp and trend analysis:

- ◆ a **camp-level questionnaire** administered to key informants in each IDP camp;
- ◆ CCCM's camp list to collect **metadata** about each camp;
- ◆ and **lists of the organizations providing aid** to inhabitants of the camps.


Based on the data collected during the three rounds of profiling (2013, 2014 and 2015), JIPS with Statistics Norway completed **a cross-camp and trend analysis**, in order to assess differences between camps and changes over time.



as well as both to each other and over time

Icons: OCHA

**Number of IDPs hosted per township in Kachin and northern Shan States**



# What was the impact?

## data

The individual camp profiling reports are referred to as the main source of information available on IDP camps in Kachin and Shan State. As a result they are widely used, for example on sectoral planning and prioritization.

## evidence base

The camp profiling provided an opportunity for both camp managers and residents to identify gaps in services. This allowed for the humanitarian community to better coordinate their work with local organizations and thus better address the most pressing needs, considering more longer-term perspectives (livelihoods).

## local capacity

Capacity building was a key aspect of the first camp profiling in order to enable local partners to conduct themselves the profiling exercise in successive rounds.

## inform response

The camp profiling exercises informed strategy and response of the Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Cluster and allowed the partners to adapt their intervention to changes in the situation on an annual basis.

# What were the findings?

The findings of the camp profiling exercise cover demographics of the camps population and thematic analysis on topics such as access to services, livelihoods, gaps and priorities in response, and camp coordination and management (e.g. type of camp management agency involved, registration system and complaint mechanism established). Consecutive exercises allow for year-on-year comparisons, however incremental improvements in methodology and investment in local capacity means that care is needed when comparing between different years.

## Coverage and general characteristics

In general, **most camps were located in Kachin State**, with a smaller proportion of camps located in northern Shan State. Almost **three-quarters of the camps could be classified as large camps** with over 100 residents. The majority of camps were located in **urban areas and areas controlled by the Government**.

**“Conducting consecutive profiling studies allowed comparative analysis and enabled us to understand deeper rooted issues.”**

Edward Benson  
CCCM Cluster Coordinator  
Myanmar

## Demographic profile

By 2015 the population in camps **had grown to approximately 83,000 across 132 camps covered**, compared to 70,000 residents in 126 camps covered in 2013.

Interestingly, despite continuing new displacements the

proportion of people in situations of potentially increased vulnerability – such as the chronically ill, separated children, single-headed households and unaccompanied elders and minors – has decreased considerably during the three-year period.

## Access to livelihoods and priority needs

The three profiling rounds show that people's livelihood strategies after displacement are **different from those they had before**, and that female and male residents do not employ the same strategies.


Also, the priority needs the communities identify for themselves did **not substantially change over time**, and large differences can be observed in the priorities of male, female and child camp residents.

## Camp coordination and management


While in 2013 the camps were managed by a variety of agencies, this has decreased over the last two data collection rounds, leaving the responsibility for camp management to only a few agencies in 2015. Overall, the findings show that **large**

**camps are better organized** because they are more likely to have camp committees or complaint mechanisms in place. In large camps, camp committees are also **better represented** by IDP members compared to small camps.

Number of IDPs in camps



Proportion of population in camps with specific vulnerabilities



\* Unaccompanied children are children who have been separated from both parents and other responsible adults. Separated children, in contrast, are separated from their parents but being cared for by another responsible adult.

# What were the profiling lessons?

## Analysis needs resources

Allocating resources for analysis is crucial in the preparation phase of an exercise. Strong engagement from sector experts during the analysis can significantly strengthen the process of contextualising the findings.

## Keep it simple!


Adapting the methodology and questionnaire design to the specific profiling context is key to produce reliable data. This is particularly important in challenging environments, such as when the timeframe for data collection is limited or when access to locations is difficult.

## Local capacity building

Investing in capacity building of local implementing partners on data collection pays off on the long run, as highlighted by the continuity of the camp profiling exercises after the first round with limited external support.

## Planning for analysis over time

Operational contexts and information needs of partners may change over time. Therefore it is recommended to plan for long-term monitoring and analysis in the design of a profiling exercise and to allow for methodological flexibility.



## Access to services

Between 2013-2015, access to services in the camps **varied from sector to sector**, with the situation improving for some sectors, while for others the situation either remained the same or deteriorated.

Availability of regular markets within the camps from 2013 to 2015 increased slightly. However, there was a small decrease in the share of camps having access to a **clinic** or a hospital. Access to

schools in camps was relatively limited throughout the period covered.

In terms of protection, a higher proportion of camps in urban areas had childcare services or defined protection responsibilities compared to camps in rural areas. As an overall trend, access to all the services mentioned above, as well as to solid or temporary shelter **tended to be better in large camps and in urban areas**.