

## Secondary data review matrix

Source (the sources mentioned here are examples only) and date of publication	Population of concern and identification criteria (e.g. definition of a household, definitions of vulnerabilities)	Geographic coverage	Data collection methodology	Objectives/thematic coverage	Main findings	Comments/notes
<p>1. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Rakhine State Needs Assessment, September 2015, Centre for Diversity and National Harmony (CDNH) with support of UNPF</i></p>	<p><i>Camps, target villages</i></p>	<p><i>Maungdaw and Buthidaung; Mrauk-U, Kyauktaw, and Myebon; Sittwe and Pauktaw; Kyaukphyu and Ramree; and Thandwe. Camps:: Kyauk Ta Lone, Khaung Doke, Pa Yein, Yin Thei, Taung Paw, Sin Tet Maw,</i></p>	<p><i>Sample survey (2,342); FGDs (26); KII (46); direct observation; snowball sampling within villages</i></p>	<p><i>GENERAL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Basic rights and physical security</i></li> <li>- <i>Shelter and return</i></li> <li>- <i>Food and nutrition</i></li> <li>- <i>Health and sanitation</i></li> <li>- <i>Infrastructure</i></li> <li>- <i>Education</i></li> <li>- <i>Livelihoods</i></li> <li>- <i>Access to finance</i></li> <li>- <i>Conflict prevention</i></li> <li>- <i>Reconciliation</i></li> </ul>	<p>- <b>Shelter:</b> conditions vary, worst in Muslim camps (intended to be temporary, located in flood-prone areas with poor drainage and ground water filtration). 35% Muslims said living conditions were very bad (37% in camps, 13% villages), 19% for Rakhine. Poor and very poor living conditions: 63% Muslims in Kyauktaw (9% Rakhine), 56% Sittwe (22% Rakhine), 52% Mrauk-U (16% Rakhine), 41% Kyaukphyu (15% Rakhine). 84% Muslims in camps said living conditions had deteriorated compared with three years ago.</p> <p>- <b>Livelihoods:</b> 16% reported having no income at all (22% Muslims and 12% Rakhine; 52% Muslims in camps). 87% Muslims in camps reported deterioration of incomes compared with three years ago (39% Rakhine; 72% all Muslims); 1% Muslims in camps reported improved income. Barriers to livelihoods: loss of productive assets; lack of technical knowledge on farming techniques, animal husbandry, and fish farming.</p> <p>- <b>Freedom of movement:</b> 60% Muslims not move freely (78% in camps; 96% in Kyauktaw; 92% Mrauk-U), 26% can travel to surrounding villages (23% in camps), 12% can travel to neighboring townships (0% in camps)</p> <p>- <b>Health:</b> Access to a clinic/hospital: 36% overall, Mrauk-U 14%, Myebon 21%, Muslim men 34%, Muslim women 27%, Rakhine men 37%, Rakhine women 40%, Muslims in camps 12%, Muslims in villages 41%. In Myebon and Kyauktaw, Muslims unable to use health facilities in nearby town. Can get permission to go to Sittwe but time consuming and expensive (problematic</p>	<p>Rakhine State also fares badly in numerous health and sanitation indicators. Rakhine State has low levels of antenatal coverage (67%) and only 55% of births are attended by a skilled health practitioner (with only 11.7% of births occurring in a health facility, the second lowest of all States and Regions). Across Rakhine State, only 50-58% have access to safe drinking water.</p> <p>Rakhine State also has by far the lowest levels of access to sanitation in Myanmar (48-54%) and some 41% of the population of Rakhine has no access to sanitation whatsoever.</p> <p>National average for food insecurity is 4.8%, in Rakhine State 10% of the population is</p>

		<p><i>Ramree, Thae Chaung, Dar Pine, Khaung Doke Kar, Say Tha Mar Gyi, Olm Daw Gyi</i></p>		<p>especially in emergencies). Medical facilities lack qualified staff, even in populated areas. 45% respondents ill in past three months (83% Muslims in Kyauktaw, 79% Muslims in Mrauk-U). 37% suffering diarrhea; malaria, hepatitis B and C also frequent in camps = water quality problems and need mosquito nets. Access to drugs (9% Muslim IDPs; 36% Muslim villages), access to health professionals (27%; 37%).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Savings and debt:</b> 14% have cash or savings (Rakhine 17%; Muslims 7%). Extremely vulnerable to shocks. 60% have loans often from local lenders and family members (13% of loans from banks). Overwhelmingly for immediate needs: 71% food and 47% health, 28% education and 3% business</li> <li>- <b>Expenses:</b> food (74%), health (13%), education (8%), and agriculture (3%). Difficulties faced by Muslims are more acute.</li> <li>- <b>Difficulties faced:</b> Overall: health problems and food shortages, lesser extent education. Muslims in camps: health (91%), education (55%), food (50%), natural disaster (18%), security (7%), other (5%)</li> <li>- <b>Women’s rights:</b> Only 26% Muslims in Sittwe affirmed women should get better chances of education, 10% for leading business activities, 17% better chances in decision-making roles. Much less than elsewhere</li> <li>- <b>Future concerns:</b> 41% Muslim camp residents expect conditions to deteriorate in the future; 38% unsure; 8% expect improvements</li> <li>- <b>Assets and possessions:</b> 35% Muslim IDPs have enough blankets and clothing (62% Muslim villages). General lack of mosquito nets.</li> <li>- <b>Food security and nutrition:</b> 65% poor or very poor access to food (Mrauk-U 87%; Kyauktaw 79%). 54% said access to food deteriorated in last three years (35% unchanged; 90% deteriorated for Muslims in camps). Many Muslim families eating rice exclusively. Muslims poorer access than Rakhine. Source of food for Rakhine/Muslim camps/Muslim villages: 41%/5%/53% purchase; 40%/90%/21% humanitarian partners; 10%/0%/0% exchange work for food; 9%/0%/12% own production; 5%/1%/5% government; 5%/2%/6% local well wishers; 3%/1%/4% borrow/credit. IDPs receive monthly food rations consisting of rice, cooking oil, beans, and salt. Estimated 20% of food rations are sold by Muslim IDPs for more diversified products.</li> <li>- <b>WASH:</b> 54% access to safe drinking water (76% Ramree, 75% Sittwe, Kyauktaw 19%, Muslim camps 60%, Muslim villages 57%). Rainwater collected in traditional ponds is the most common. Muslim women have worst access. Water quality is better in camps but still high sanitary risks. 1:20 latrines to</li> </ul>	<p>identified as “food poor.”</p> <p>Rakhine has the highest levels of malnutrition in Myanmar (53%), a 16.3% prevalence of severe malnutrition, and more than one third of children are either moderately or severely underweight. Malnutrition is particularly severe in Buthidaung and Maungdaw Townships, where the Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate is reported to reach 21.4% and 20% respectively.</p> <p>More specifically, Rakhine has the lowest rates of early childhood education (5.4%), primary school enrolment (71-76%), and secondary school enrolment (31-32%) in Myanmar. Consequently, literacy levels—at 75% overall and 55% for women—are the lowest in Myanmar, where the overall literacy rate is around 90% according to UNDP.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>people in camps. In camps, latrines and bathing spaces were often reported as areas of concern for safety and security, largely due to damage, lack of gender separation, lack of lighting or locks, since 2013 many around Sittwe have lights. Very poor hygiene practices.</p> <p>- <b>Infrastructure:</b> poor and underdeveloped across state. Significant geographic distinctions on perceived quality of roads. 70% access markets in less than 30 minutes and 73% at least fairly good access to the products they need. 32% Rakhine reported access to electricity grid, 7% Muslims.</p> <p>- <b>Education:</b> 92% Rakhine in wards or villages access to a government school, 63% Muslims. Muslims in camps dependent on temporary learning facilities. 56% have adequate access to teachers, wide geographical variations (Rakhine 62% and Muslims 45%). Often paid low salaries including in camps. Half reported sufficient access to desks and chairs, textbooks, and writing materials (35% in camps). Muslims lack access to higher education.</p> <p>- <b>Conflict prevention:</b> 73% afraid of communal violence. 8% Muslim reported that violence was likely or very likely, 18% Rakhine. Rakhine are more fearful where the Muslim population is largely dominant. 49% reported the area where they live to be safe (37% Muslim IDPs; 40% Muslims overall 40%; Rakhine 55%). Perceived causes of insecurity: 69% community conflicts, 24% lack of law enforcement, 23% alcoholism and 7% sexual abuse. In camps, strong sense that violence occurred because of the lack of law enforcement. To protect selves if future violence: 52% Muslims and Rakhine protection from military and police (54% Muslim IDPs). Most important actors for stopping future violence: military (41%), education (15%) and economic development (8%).</p> <p>- <b>Sources of information:</b> media is a potential trigger for intensifying the prospect of violence through dehumanizing the “Other,” serving as a megaphone for communal and religious hate speech, or spreading rumours. Main source of information: Rakhine: community members (57%), radio (37%); Muslims: radio (42%), community (38%).</p> <p>- <b>Reconciliation/community relations:</b> Muslims expressed a strong desire to develop improved relations with Rakhine, Rakhine expressed the opposite. Speak to people of other religions: Muslims 73%; Rakhine 14%; differ significantly between townships. Do business with people from other religions: Muslim before 95% now 55%; Rakhine 48% before; Muslims in camps before 100% now 45%; Kyauktaw now (93%), Ramree now (95%). Celebrate festivals</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>of other religions: Muslims before 35% now 17%; Rakhine before 10% now 4%. More than 10 close friends from another religion: Muslims 63%; Rakhine 13%; Rakhine with no friends from another religion 67%. Trust people of other religions: Rakhine 15%; Muslims 30%. Comfortable living with people from other religions: Muslims 85%; Muslims in camps 82%; Rakhine 16%.</p> <p><b>Views of international organisations:</b> 57% Rakhine (56% in Sittwe) view INGOS favourably, only 14% view INGOS unfavourably. 92% of Muslims view INGOS positively (98% Muslim women)</p>	
<p>2. National census</p> <p><i>Population and Housing Census of Myanmar, 2014: Provision results, August 2014, Department of Population</i></p>	Myanmar	Myanmar	Household survey (census based), direct observation	<p><i>CENSUS</i> - Demographics - Housing situation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Total Union:</b> population 51, 419, 420 persons. 30% urban; 70 rural; average household size: 4.4 members</li> <li>- <b>Rakhine state</b> (3,188,963) 48% male, 52% female. 6.2% of national total. 17% urban; 83% rural; average household size: 4.4 members</li> <li>- <b>Sittwe population:</b> 149,348 of which 48% male; 52% female; average HH size: 5.01 members</li> <li>- Infant <b>mortality</b> rate (deaths per 1,000 live births): 62</li> <li>- Under five <b>mortality</b> rate (deaths per 1,000 live births): 72</li> <li>- Annual <b>population growth</b> rate: 0.89%</li> <li>- <b>Life expectancy</b> at birth: both 66.8; female 69.9, male 63.9</li> <li>- <b>% female headed households:</b> 23.7%</li> <li>- <b>Mean household size:</b> 4.4 members</li> <li>- <b>Age:</b> children (0-14 years) 29%; economically productive (15-64 years) 66%; elderly population (65+ years) 5.8%</li> <li>- <b>Literacy:</b> both 89.5%; female 86.9%; male 92.6%</li> <li>- <b>Disability:</b> any form 4.6%; waking 1.9%, seeing 2.5%; hearing 1.3%; intellectual/mental: 1.7%</li> <li>- <b>Identity documentation:</b> citizenship scrutiny 69.3%; associate scrutiny 0.1%; naturalized scrutiny 0.4% national registration 1.7%; religious 0.6%; temporary registration 0.5%; foreign registration &lt;0.1%; foreign passport 0.1%; none 27/3%</li> <li>- <b>Labour force participation</b> (15-64 years): both 4.0%; female 4.1%; male 3.9%</li> <li>- <b>Unemployment</b> (15-64 years): both 64.4%; female 48.4%; male 81.9%</li> <li>- <b>Material for housing.</b> Wall: bamboo 51%, wood 22%, tile/brick/concrete 16%. Roof: corrugated sheet 62%, dhani/theke/in leaf 33%</li> <li>- <b>Main source of energy for cooking:</b> firewood 69%; electricity 16%, charcoal 12%</li> <li>- <b>Main source of drinking water:</b> improved 69.5%; unimproved 30.5%</li> </ul>	The vast majority of Muslims in Rakhine State were not counted in the census	

					<p>- <b>Main type of latrine:</b> improved 74.3%, unimproved 25.7%, open defecation 14.4%</p> <p>- <b>Communications:</b> radio 35.5%; television 49.5%; mobile phone 32.9%</p>	
<p><b>3.UN/INGO Report</b></p> <p><i>Part 1: Protection Context Analysis: Rakhine State, November 2015, Protection Working Group</i></p>	Rakhine	Rakhine state	Secondary data review, risk analysis	<p><i>PROTECTION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic background</li> <li>- identity</li> <li>- displacement history</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Protection threats:</b> limited freedom of movement, physical insecurity, SGBV, lack of documentation, smuggling and human trafficking</li> <li>- <b>IDP legislation:</b> Myanmar has no national legislation or policy addressing the issue of statelessness and does not have a national IDP policy.</li> <li>- <b>Local orders:</b> Mainly in Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung. The orders restrict freedom of movement, require marriage authorizations, limit the number of children per family, provide for additional requirements for the birth registration of children, restrict construction of houses and/or religious buildings and restrict freedom of religion and the right to education for the Muslim population. (see Part 2 for more details)</li> <li><b>State of emergency:</b> declared in Rakhine State in 2012. Lifted in Sittwe and central Rakhine but still in operation in northern Rakhine state including curfew from 11pm to 4am and imposition of oppressive security measures.</li> <li>- <b>Statelessness:</b> majority of Muslim population is stateless.</li> <li>- <b>Rakhine identity:</b> Rakhine Buddhists 60% of population. One of seven largest minorities. Strong sense of nationalism and of ethnic identity. Grievances include longstanding discrimination by the state, a lack of political control over their own affairs, economic marginalization, human rights abuses and restrictions on language and cultural expression. (ICG, Report 261)</li> <li>- <b>Muslim (non-Kaman) identity:</b> not one of the 135 national recognised ethnic groups. The main objective of community leaders is to restore full citizenship and an end to discrimination.</li> <li>- <b>Kaman:</b> Muslims and by birth Myanmar citizens as they belong to the 135 ethnic national groups, 2013 violence between Rakhine and Kaman in Thandwe with several hundred Kaman displaced.</li> <li>- <b>Maramagyi:</b> Buddhist and official recognized ethnicity. In 2012 45 households in Mrauk-U and 245 households in Raw Ma Ni displaced, discrimination because of the darkness of their skin</li> <li>- <b>2012 internal displacement:</b> 140,000 individuals Muslim (Kaman and non-</li> </ul>	<p>- <b>Good historical timeline of relationship between Rakhine and Muslim communities and history of ID documentation (also see Movement Restrictions for Stateless Residents in Rakhine State, Myanmar, Information Note, April 2016, UNHCR)</b></p>

					<p>Kaman), Maramagi or Buddhist Rakhine. 68 camps or villages in 10 townships. Some are new settlements, others are in or near IDP villages of origin. When displaced many moved in groups with families and neighbours so preserved family unity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Camp management committees (CMCs)</b> appointed by government, not elected by communities, rarely representative. Until 2015, no female representatives or people with specific needs on CMCs.</li> <li>- <b>Substance abuse:</b> Negative coping mechanisms such as drug and alcohol use further increase violence and insecurity.</li> <li>- <b>Most vulnerable groups:</b> persons with disabilities, elderly, children, single-headed households and IDPs suffering chronic diseases.</li> <li>- <b>Confinement and segregation of communities:</b> Government policy to control violence and reduce tensions. Bans stayed place largely because authorities could see no other ways to maintain calm. Negative impact on both sides, could lead to further extreme and desperate reactions, effect on livelihoods and market access, absence of interaction amplifies ethno-nationalist sentiments. Countrywide anti-Muslim sentiment makes it politically difficult for the Government to take steps seen as supportive of Muslim rights. This leaves Muslim communities in Rakhine State marginalized locally and nationally.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3.UN/INGO Report</b></p> <p><i>Part 2: Protection Concerns and Risks Analysis: Rakhine State, November 2015, Protection Working Group</i></p>	<p><i>Rakhine people</i></p>	<p><i>Rakhine state</i></p>	<p><i>Secondary data review, risk analysis</i></p>	<p><i>PROTECTION</i>  - Specific protection risks  - Coping mechanisms  - information gaps</p>	<p>Geographic breakdown of protection threats and areas where the threat is high or critical</p> <p><b>Limited freedom of movement:</b> local orders violate fundamental rights (e.g. education, livelihoods and health services); discrimination, marginalization and segregation of Muslims; enforcement undertaken in a harsh manner.</p> <p><b>Lack of documentation (birth, death, marriage certificates and ID documents):</b> prevents people from enjoying and exercising their legal rights, including freedom of movement, and from accessing services; can affect current/future citizenship claims; increases risk of statelessness; exposes people to extortion; promotes unsafe migration/trafficking; impedes securing of land tenure; increases physical insecurity.</p> <p><b>Sexual and gender-based violence:</b> intimate partner violence (most common form of GBV in Myanmar), sexual abuse, sexual harassment and domestic violence prevalent. Risk factors: remote locations, lack of access to water and private sanitation, living in camps where hostility between IDPs and host communities, cramped living conditions, lack of privacy in shelters, increased</p>	

				<p>tension due to protracted displacement. Underreporting due to fear of stigma/community retaliation and lack of access to remedies. Forced and early marriages and sexual exploitation/work used as negative coping mechanisms with no access to livelihoods. Purdah in some Muslim communities.</p> <p><b>Physical insecurity:</b> extortion, harassment, intimidation, impunity, lack of rule of law, exposure to danger, abuse, arbitrary arrest and detention, physical violence. Mainly boys and men.</p> <p><b>Smuggling and human trafficking:</b> sense of desperation and hopelessness leave many vulnerable to risky migration practices and trafficking. Maritime departures of stateless population (at peak 25,000 in first quarter of 2015; one third children). Trafficking linked to sexual exploitation and abuse, forced labour and slavery.</p> <p><b>Local orders in NRS:</b> limit freedom of movement; require Muslims to obtain permission to marry; limit couples to having only two children; difficult requirements for the birth registration of children; restrict the construction of houses and/or religious buildings; restrict freedom of religion and association. Violations of the local orders carry criminal penalties, including imprisonment. Muslims at times receive lengthy prison sentences after unfair trials.</p> <p><b>Lack of access to healthcare:</b> limited/denial of access, discrimination, mistreatment, arbitrary fees, inadequate treatment, irregular movements to access healthcare, risk of arbitrary detention when moving to access healthcare, extortion when moving to access healthcare, increased maternal and neonatal mortality, risk of increased morbidity and mortality, reliance on traditional medical care, limited care for chronic diseases. Muslim communities cannot access health in rural facilities in purely Rakhine villages. Morbidity and mortality likely to increase in rainy season when access is more difficult and prevalence of some diseases (e.g. diarrhea and malaria) increases.</p> <p><b>Lack of livelihood opportunities:</b> tensions have eroded livelihoods, severed traditional economic interactions and adversely affected income-generating activities for both communities. Lack/loss of livelihoods is a threat in itself, causes vulnerabilities and negative coping mechanisms (e.g. GBV, trafficking and risky migration) and lack/loss of livelihoods is also a consequence of negative coping mechanisms (e.g. migration of the breadwinner). Limited access to any livelihoods results in IDPs selling part of their food rations or pawning food ration cards for basic needs.</p> <p><b>Protracted displacement:</b> leads IDPs and host communities to develop</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>negative coping mechanisms which in turn heighten protection risks</p> <p><b>Durable solutions for IDPs:</b> March 2015, Government started implementing internal displacement plan. Phase 1: return/relocation of 5,000 households, mainly in Kyauktaw, Minbya, Mrauk-U and Pauktaw and, to a lesser extent, in Myebon, Rathedaung, Kyauk Phyu and Ramree townships. Perceived lack of prospects to return for IDPs in Kyauk Phyu, Myebon and Sittwe camps.</p> <p><b>Mapping of displacement situation and potential solutions by township.</b></p> <p><b>Sittwe camps:</b> more than 60% of IDP population in 21 camps. Most originally from Sittwe Township (both urban and rural Sittwe), others are from other townships (notably Myebon and some from Zone 1). Camps located inside or around Muslim villages which existed before the 2012 violence and were not displaced. Some IDPs in rural Sittwe still live with host families. Tense relationship between the IDPs and Muslim host communities due to competition for livelihood opportunities. Camp to camp movement inside Sittwe rural generally not restricted but there is no freedom of movement outside of rural Sittwe for Muslims (IDPs and non-displaced). Rakhine rural communities are not close to camps and generally little interaction with Muslims in Sittwe Rural.</p>	
<p><b>5. Government Assessment</b></p> <p><i>Myanmar labour force, child labour and school to work transition survey, 2015, Executive Summary Report, March 2015, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security/Central Statistical Organisation/ILO</i></p>	Myanmar	1,468 enumeration areas across the country	Household survey (23,425 households)	<p>LIVELIHOODS and DEMOGRAPHICS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Labour force</li> <li>- Employment</li> <li>- Child labour</li> <li>- School-to-work transition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Good population structure:</b> 68% aged 15-64 years</li> <li>- <b>Female headed-households:</b> total 21%; urban 26%; rural 19%</li> <li>- <b>Average household size:</b> total 4.41; urban 4.54; rural 4.35</li> <li>- <b>Population with a disability:</b> total 7.7% (urban: 9.1%; rural 7.2%; male: 6.9%; 8.4% female)</li> <li>- <b>Type of disability:</b> 5.7% seeing, 2.0% hearing, 3.4% walking or climbing steps, 1.7% remembering or concentrating, 1.3% self-care, 0.9% communicating</li> <li>- Main materials for <b>dwelling</b> walls: bamboo, wood and brick. Main materials used for roofing: tin, thatch/leaves</li> <li>- <b>Land cultivation:</b> in urban areas as well as rural areas. Average land cultivated: 6.1 acres in urban areas and 6.4 acres in rural areas</li> <li>- <b>Indebtedness</b> (outstanding loan of 10,000 Kyats or more): total: 35%; urban: 20%; rural: 41%; female-headed households: 32,5%</li> <li>- <b>Sources of income (total Myanmar):</b> agriculture 38%, non-agricultural enterprise 32%; wage/salaried employment 42%; pension 4%; rent 2%; transfer from other household 6%; remittances 5%; interest and dividends 0.7%; other 1.6%</li> <li>- <b>Main job sector:</b> agriculture/forestry/fishing 54%; wholesale/retail trade and</li> </ul>	



				<p>motor vehicle repair 14%; manufacturing 11%, transportation 4%, other service activities 4%, construction 3%, other sectors &lt;3%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Literacy of working age population:</b> total 90%; male 92%; female 87%</li> <li>- <b>Education (working age highest completed):</b> not literate 12%, below primary 19%, primary 34%, middle 21%, vocational certificate 0.2%; high school 6.5%; undergraduate diploma 1.1%; bachelor degree and above: 6%</li> <li>- <b>Labour force participation rate:</b> total 65%; male 80%; female 52%</li> <li>- <b>Unemployment rate:</b> total 0.8%</li> <li>- <b>Population outside labour force:</b> total 35%; male 20%; female 48%</li> <li>- <b>Average daily wage:</b> total 4,760 kyats; male 5,320 kyats; female 3,990 kyats</li> <li>- <b>Average monthly wage:</b> total 134,490 kyats; male 147,200 kyats; female 119,040 kyats</li> <li>- <b>Reasons for not being in labour force:</b> 52% occupied with household/family responsibility (female 64%), 15% in school/training</li> <li>- <b>Size of workplace business:</b> 61% employed persons work in a business or establishment with less than five people</li> <li>- <b>% working with daily arrangements:</b> total 76%, male 75%, female 77%. Of these 58% occasional daily work, seasonal work 32%</li> <li>- <b>Migration and remittances:</b> 13.2% changed residence from one township to another, 3.3% did so between 2011 and 2014. 4.6% of Rakhine have changed their township of residence in lifetime (much below national average). 85% of members who left to live abroad send remittances. From a rural area sends on average 2.1 million kyats per annum on average. Rakhine state: average age while leaving: 26.4 years, average years abroad 4 years, 99.8% leave for employment, 84% send remittances, average remittances per year 2.5 million kyat. Rakhine state: 8% have members living abroad, Of these, there is an average of 1.4 persons living abroad.</li> <li>- <b>Child labour:</b> total 9.3%, male 10%, female 8.5%; proportion of hazardous labour: total 5.1%, male 5.6%, female 4.6%; 78% of children attending school. Rakhine state: 57% total. Main sectors for working children: agriculture/forestry/fishing (60.5%), manufacturing (12%), trades (11%), other services (6%)</li> <li>- <b>Child labour definition:</b> persons aged 5-17 years engaged in one or more of the following: 1. Worst forms of child labour; 2. Employment below the minimum age; 3. Hazardous unpaid household services</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>6. NGO Assessment</b></p> <p><i>Community Based Practices for Dispute Resolution in Rakhine State, 2015, DRC</i></p>	<p><i>Camps and nearby villages</i></p>	<p><i>2 camps (SRK, Sin Tet Maw) and 2 local surrounding host villages</i></p>	<p><i>Listening / story collection (82 stories collected)</i></p>	<p><i>DISPUTE RESOLUTION</i>  <i>- Types of disputes</i>  <i>- Causes of violence</i>  <i>- Dispute resolution mechanisms</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Local disputes:</b> Domestic abuse and small land issues most common. Many disputes linked to a lack of livelihoods and increased alcohol consumption</li> <li>- Minor disputes easily <b>escalate</b> into violent and brutal conflicts</li> <li>- <b>Conflict resolution actors:</b> limited set, led by camp/village administrators. - First handled by parties with help of families, then camp/village leader/administrator, then someone from the camp committee. If outside of the scope of the administrator, contact police (but then must involve a fee/bribe) so limited cases referred. Religious leaders sometimes involved in e.g. marriage and divorce cases. Buddhist religious less involved than Muslim religious leaders.</li> <li>- <b>Justice mechanisms:</b> Little justice expected from the formal justice system, and bribes needed to involve the police.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>7. NGO Assessment</b></p> <p><i>Voices from the Intersection: Women's Access to Justice in the Plural Legal System in Myanmar, 2014, Justice Base</i></p>	<p><i>Women in Myanmar</i></p>	<p><i>Urban and semi-rural areas in Chin State, Mon State, Kaachin State and Yangon</i></p>	<p><i>Focus group discussions, key informant interviews, participatory mapping activities (4,000 community members and KIs)</i></p>	<p><i>DISPUTE RESOLUTION</i>  <i>- Types of injustice</i>  <i>- Dispute resolution mechanisms</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Main injustices:</b> domestic violence, sexual assault and traditional inheritance practices.</li> <li>- <b>Justice mechanisms:</b> main types of injustices are least likely to go through formal or informal legal mechanisms. Many women chose to use traditional dispute resolution mechanisms. Long-held, widespread distrust of the state legal system and complaints about its high costs, corruption, gender bias, lengthy trial delays and language barriers for ethnic minorities</li> <li>- Women dissatisfied with customary adjudication practices and remedies with widespread discrimination and sexual violence/domestic abuse cases often dropped</li> </ul>	<p><i>Women in camps seem to face similar situation to women across Myanmar</i></p>
<p><b>8. IDP Assessment</b></p> <p><i>Community-Based Dispute Resolution Practices for Gender-based Violence in IDP Camps in Sittwe, Rakhine State, August 2016, IRC/DRC/UNFPA</i></p>	<p><i>GBV survivors in camps</i></p>	<p><i>5 Muslim camps in Sittwe:: Thet Kaye Pyin, Baw Du Pha, Ohn Daw Gyi, Say Tha Mar Gyi, and Pwe Yar Gone, and 2 Rakhine camps, Set Yoe Kyaw 1</i></p>	<p><i>FGDs with GBV caseworkers, women and girls, CMCs</i></p>	<p><i>DISPUTE RESOLUTION</i>  <i>- Dispute resolution needs and mechanisms for GBV survivors</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Rates of GBV perceived to be high</b></li> <li>- <b>Types of GBV:</b> intimate partner violence most commonly reported form in Muslim and Rakhine camps. Mention of sexual assault, rape, forced marriage, early marriage, and emotional violence.</li> <li>- <b>Dispute resolution:</b> Community-based dispute resolution practices for GBV limited, do not adequately or sensitively support the survivor. CMCs use mediation to solve intimate partner violence and often exhibit behaviors that do not align with survivor-centered principles. In Muslim camps, CMCs are only formal avenue for survivors</li> <li>- <b>Overcrowding:</b> 8 families per shelter, reduces privacy and increases GBV risk</li> <li>- <b>GBV root causes:</b> lack of livelihoods to depression to drinking</li> <li>- <b>Perception of safety:</b> Women and girls in Muslim camps often feel insecure</li> </ul>	

		and Set Yoe Kyaw			and unsafe at home and in camp communities; Rakhine camps: feel safe at home but concerned about going to school etc. - <b>Early marriage</b> of girls to protect daughters and to reduce expenses - <b>Work:</b> Rakhine camps 85-90% women work outside of home - <b>Support services and justice:</b> Muslims limited access, Rakhine have more	
<p><b>9. Multi-hazard risk assessment UN/Gvt</b></p> <p><i>Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment in the Rakhine State of Myanmar, November 2011, UNDP/ADPC, MES</i></p>	Rakhine	Rakhine State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secondary data review</li> <li>- Hazard mapping</li> <li>- Key informant interviews with experts</li> <li>- Field survey (?)</li> </ul>	<p>DRR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hazard prone areas</li> <li>- Exposure of people, property, infrastructure and economic activities</li> <li>- Vulnerabilities</li> <li>- DRR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Hazards (Sittwe):</b> medium short term risk of cyclones, and very high long term risk; very high risk of storm surge (short and long term), very low risk of riverine flooding and landslides; no risk of forest fires; low risk earthquakes (short term) and high risk (long term); very high risk tsunami</li> <li>- <b>Demographics and land (Sittwe):</b> 9-10% of land is settled; 20% male child; 20% female child; 28% adult male; 32% female adult; average family size 6.0 and household 6.6; total population 236, 535; 1,011 people/kmsp(GAD)</li> <li>- <b>Housing (Sittwe):</b> 1% concrete; 5.5% masonry; 10% brick noggin; 38% wood; 43% hut (constructed with local materials like straw, bamboo, wood, golpata and mud); &lt;1% others; total 25,539</li> <li>- <b>Livelihoods (Sittwe):</b> 21% agriculture; 19.5% fisheries; &lt;1% livestock; 59% others including service, business etc. (GAD)</li> <li>- <b>Livelihoods (Rakhine):</b> 50% agriculture; 13% fisheries; 10% livestock; 25% others (GAD)</li> <li>- <b>Crops (Sittwe):</b> pappy, phaseolus Mungo, sunflower, mustard, pepper (WFP)</li> <li>- <b>Healthcare:</b> 36 facilities in Sittwe, 517 in Rakhine state</li> </ul>	
<p><b>10. NGO Assessment</b></p> <p><i>A Study of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) for Disaster Risk Reduction in Northern Rakhine State, August 2015, REACH</i></p>		Rural, urban and camp communities in Maungdaw, Sittwe, Pauktaw, Minbya and Myebon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Survey of individuals (1,257 individuals); FGDs (20)</li> </ul>	<p>DRR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incidence and frequency of hazards</li> <li>- Vulnerability to hazards</li> <li>- Information sources</li> <li>- Household and community preparation</li> <li>- Disaster mitigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Risk awareness:</b> people aware of the natural hazards they are exposed to</li> <li>- <b>Experience with disasters:</b> 77% experienced two or more; 74% reported that disasters had become more required in past 30 years</li> <li>- <b>Prioritisation:</b> 79% reported that addressing impact of natural disasters was a high priority. 63% reported that top priority for resilience was better cyclone shelters followed by awareness raising and mangrove rehabilitation</li> <li>- <b>Vulnerable groups:</b> 67% reported fishermen were more vulnerable livelihood category to disasters, followed by 55% farmers and 34% wage labourers. Teenage girls particularly unaware of dangers of natural disasters</li> <li>- <b>Sources of information for disasters:</b> Radio broadcast most common (75%)</li> <li>- <b>Readiness:</b> Variable levels. 35% of people did not know where they would go in the event of a disaster. Early warning systems. Other community-level disaster management systems extremely sparse</li> </ul>	
<p><b>11. NGO Report: Education in</b></p>	IDPs and nearby villages	IDP camps	Secondary data	EDUCATION - Education issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estimated 60,000 children (3-17 years) in IDP camps are not accessing formal education, unclear how many accessing education before displacement</li> </ul>	<p><i>Secondary data sources: Rakhine state has some of the lowest education</i></p>

<p><i>Emergencies Rakhine Strategic Plan 2015, Save the Children/UNICEF</i></p>				<p>- Plan and risks for EIE</p>	<p>- <b>Issues with education:</b> shortages of textbooks, shortages of formally trained teachers, most volunteer teachers have no prior teaching experience and low levels of education, post-primary education opportunities (formal secondary, non-formal and vocational) for children 11-17 are scarce inside and outside camps for IDPs and host communities, not able to access universities in Sittwe etc due to movement restrictions, makes children vulnerable to trafficking, child labour, early marriage, unsafe migrations, drug use, smuggling, recruitment into criminal groups etc</p> <p>- Majority of education services to IDPs provided by international organisations need for increased government involvement</p> <p>- <b>Humanitarian community strategy:</b> support MoE providing education to IDPs; provide/support provision of education to IDPs and impacted host communities; ensure education services are protective, platform for lifesaving interventions inclusive, high quality, relevant, in a way that is conflict sensitive and links to early recovery</p>	<p><i>indicators in Myanmar (MOE, 2012); 71.4% primary school enrolment; 32% secondary school enrolment (87.7% and 52.2% nationally). Low rates due to range of inter-connected factors including poverty, underdevelopment, shortages of teachers, inadequate and dilapidated structures and facilities, shortages of materials, low quality of education delivered.</i></p>
<p><b>12. NGO Assessment</b></p> <p><i>Joint Education Sector Needs Assessment, North Rakhine State, Myanmar, November 2015, PLAN/REACH</i></p>	<p><i>Rakhine state (Muslims and Rakhine)</i></p>	<p><i>Maungdaw, Rathedaung, Buthidaung, Kyauktaw, Mrauk-U, Sittwe, Pauktaw, Minbya, and Myebon</i></p> <p><i>148 learning spaces in 116 villages in 9 townships of Rakhine State</i></p>	<p><i>Sample of villages and schools; FGDs</i></p>	<p><i>EDUCATION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education gaps and capacities</li> <li>- Utilization of education services</li> <li>- Effect of Cross-cutting issues on utilization (e.g. race, gender, socio-economic status etc)</li> </ul>	<p>- <b>Types of schools:</b> Most rely on government-run basic education schools, more branch schools at middle/high level. Madrassas widespread in Muslim areas and well-attended by younger children but seen as complementary rather than replacing formal education.</p> <p>- <b>Attendance:</b> Student attendance lower in Muslim vs Buddhist villages (69%:85% primary; 30%:84% middle; 25%:41% high) 60% communities in Sittwe have a basic education school</p> <p>- <b>Dropout:</b> Up to half drop-outs take place in primary school especially between grades 1-2;</p> <p>- <b>Issues:</b> 17% basic education schools run multiple shifts due to overcrowding. Primary level teacher-student ratios lowest in Sittwe (22:1) and Mrauk-U (33:1) and highest in in Maungdaw (123:1). (MoE target 30:1). 29% of teachers were absent on the day of assessment team visits; especially in Muslim communities, basic education schools are heavily dependent on (mainly male) community-paid teachers to supplement or replace missing government staff, in Maungdaw/ Buthidaung, some schools have a parallel system staffed by volunteer</p> <p>- <b>Infrastructure:</b> 55% permanent buildings made of wood, brick or concrete; 32% are of semi-permanent materials and 13% temporary structures. Multiple grade often taught in same room. Average students per classroom: 85.</p> <p>- <b>WASH:</b> 74% at least one latrine (avge 102 people per latrine); 32% gender</p>	<p>Page 20 list of education indicators in Rakhine versus rest of Union</p> <p>Primary: Grades 1-5, 5-9 years Middle: Grades 6-9, 10-14 years High: Grades 10-11, 15-17 years</p> <p><b>Basic education school:</b> Under MoE</p> <p><b>Branch school:</b> Teaching government curriculum, attached to nearest basic education school</p> <p><b>Temporary learning space (Rakhine context):</b> For disaster-affected, managed by education sector partners or township education officers, teach curriculum</p> <p><b>Madrasah:</b> Religious learning space teaching the Qur'an, run by communities independent of gvt</p>

					<p>segregated. 35% handwashing facilities; 31% year-round access to clean water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Reasons for not attending:</b> costs associated with school (fees, materials, transport, uniforms), need to support household, distance to school; Muslim FGD reported girls stop going to school when hit puberty to avoid mixing with men and to help families at home.</li> <li>- <b>Humanitarian Education sector</b> provides short and medium-term EiE interventions e.g. TLSs and education supplies to IDPs and host communities</li> </ul>	
<p>13. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Education in Rakhine: Next Steps for the Sector, September 2013, Save the Children</i></p>	<p><i>Rakhine and Muslim communities displaced and host</i></p>	<p><i>Sittwe and Pauk Taw</i></p>	<p><i>Guided conversations with key informants; stakeholder mapping informant groups;</i></p>	<p><b>EDUCATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Role education in inter-communal conflict</i></li> <li>- <i>Key education stakeholders</i></li> <li>- <i>Visions for future</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Root causes of conflict:</b> political, social and economic marginalization with ethnic discrimination; deprivation of Rakhine population vs rest of union; Muslims increasingly economically successful; ethno-politics used by the central government to control minority groups</li> <li>- <b>Conflict drivers:</b> misuse of land, stealing, secondary settlement as a result of IDP movements; community disruption and change in power brokers; national politics; increased focus on religion and patterns of segregation; lack of education = young people susceptible to ‘ethnic mobilisers’; education a forum for discrimination; lack of citizenships underpins all</li> <li>- <b>Humanitarian aid:</b> Common perspective amongst the Rakhine that aid used to sustain and increase Muslim population.</li> <li>- <b>Economics effects of displacement:</b> Segregation and restrictions of movement = massively curtailed business between communities = loss of livelihoods and increase cost of labour/good. Many Rakhine do not want to renew business relations with Muslims, not enough trust between communities, however still business between two communities with areas between becoming market supply hubs</li> <li>- <b>Future intentions:</b> majority Muslims want to go home to former lives/businesses, reported willingness to resume peaceful relations. Few think this will happen in short-term. Most Rakhine did not express an interest in life returning to how it was before - they envisage a life without Muslims (but recognize conflict and segregation made the situation worse economically).</li> <li>- <b>Females:</b> After displacement Muslim female youth less able to leave the house, wearing more conservative clothing, may be due to increased security risks. Increased security risk from sudden joining of several communities from</li> </ul>	<p>Extensive history to conflict and background to education in Myanmar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MoE 1980-81 regulations require university applicants to be “Burmese Nationals”</li> </ul>

					<p>different areas and with different cultural practices. Absence of women's groups in Muslim camps, voices not being heard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Movement restrictions:</b> since 2000, Form 4 needed to travel (USD 35 for 45 days). Now Muslims in camps cannot leave. Arbitrary detention by police.</li> <li>- <b>Education segregation:</b> Muslim children used to learn Rakhine but now concerned that not learning/using Rakhine, Muslims now prefer Myanmar</li> <li>- <b>Tensions between Muslim camps and host communities:</b> violent clashes, problem of land compensation and movement restrictions negatively affecting livelihoods of host, increased competition over fishing, uneven distribution of aid (mainly for IDPs). Some host village leaders established themselves as gatekeepers to manage the resource distributions =&gt; growing resentment from IDPs. Some host communities not feeling safe living near the IDPs anymore; theft and fighting more common. Poor camp administration and infrastructure is fueling this resentment as environmental issues such as rubbish/sewage contaminating farmland and health risk for host.</li> <li>- <b>Education in host communities:</b> poor before displacement, now lack of trained teachers (many were Rakhine and now unable or unwilling to continue teaching), shortage of materials and cessation of supervision and support from the Government. Additional demands from large numbers of IDPs</li> </ul>	
<p>14. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Education Rapid Needs Assessment and Response Recommendations: Part 1 Report, December 2012, Save the Children/UNICEF</i></p>	<p><i>Camp population (Muslim and Rakhine)</i></p>	<p><i>3 Muslim camps in rural areas: Baw Du Pha, Ohn Taw and Thet Kel Pyin; 3 Rakhine camps in urban locations: Ywar Gyi Myauk, Mingan and Set Yone Su</i></p>	<p><i>Key informant interviews, direct observations, FGDs and child participation sessions</i></p>	<p><i>EDUCATION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Assess and learning environment</i></li> <li>- <i>Teaching and learning situation</i></li> <li>- <i>Teachers and other education personnel</i></li> <li>- <i>Education policy</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Availability of education:</b> Rural Muslim areas: no access to government schools; movement restrictions outside camps. Some access to non-formal education and religious education, but do not teach basic learning skills and not recognized by government. Urban Rakhine areas: enrolment 79% before the conflict to 21% post conflict (rural: 59% before 21% now). Enrolment in camps: 26%. Most not attending school are staying at home/HH tasks</li> <li>- <b>Barriers to access:</b> Urban Rakhine areas: distance to school, insufficient school and learning materials (and funds to purchase them). Muslim rural: lack of education spaces, infrastructure and teachers, registration</li> <li>- <b>Issues:</b> Poor WASH facilities, lack of teaching and learning materials in all camps, lack of play and recreation areas. Urban Rakhine areas safety in and travelling to and from school major concern for children, parents and teachers.</li> </ul>	
<p>15. NGO Report</p> <p><i>Socio-anthropological</i></p>	<p><i>IDPs and host communities</i></p>	<p><i>8 locations: 4 Muslim camp/vill</i></p>	<p><i>Key informant interviews, non-</i></p>	<p><i>GENERAL</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Knowledge, perceptions and practices</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Economic relations:</b> Pre-2012 economy based on patron-client bonds between Buddhist and Muslims. Muslims most casual labour in agriculture, key actors in the fishing, vegetable, and poultry markets in Sittwe Township. Trade</li> </ul>	

<p><i>study of displaced and non-displaced communities of Sittwe Township, 2014, ACF</i></p>	<p><i>Buddhist and Muslims</i></p>	<p><i>age: Onh Daw Gyi, Dar Paing, Thea Chaung, Takke Pyin (Market); Takke Pyin Ywar Ma (Kaman village), Zaw By Gya (Buddhist village), Set Yoe Kya (Buddhist village and camp) and Set Yone Su 1 (Mara Ma Gyi camp)</i></p>	<p><i>participatory ethnography</i></p>	<p><i>related to care, health, nutrition, WASH, FSL - Social and cultural background and patterns of the population - Mutual aid mechanisms and positive coping mechanisms - Differences between communities</i></p>	<p>over the Bangladesh-Rakhine border by a network of Buddhist and Muslim traders. Current: Trade between Muslim and Buddhist areas resumed since 2012 at grassroots level and willing to work together. Most goods available in Muslim area. More intermediaries = higher prices. Some resumption of trade and livelihood interactions (discreet and diffuse). Buddhist activist groups and youth groups closely monitor large-scale or systematic links between communities. Informal networks to access cash e.g. remittances through Rakhine and Hindu traders in Sittwe town. Muslim camps: limited access to cash in the Muslim area is major constraint. Poor households sell rations to diversify food and purchase firewood. Most Muslim urban dwellers are not skilled for the available works in rural area (agriculture, fisheries). Buddhist camps: most have access micro-loans from Ministry of Cooperatives. More diverse livelihood opportunities as access to Sittwe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Coping strategies:</b> most Muslims not able to save pre-displacement capital, only traders with good connections with Buddhists were able to retrieve part of their capital after displacement. Remittances make a big difference for IDPs (even though small 20,000-40,000 kyats on irregular basis). Impossibility to honor zakat seen as humiliation. Main social asset to access cash is relationship with CMCs, power of Muslim CMCs is greater if not absolute. GAD designated self-proclaimed leaders as CMCs. CMCs hinder access to cash, food and NFI distributions. Coping mechanisms for poorest are selling part of rations and other assets or migrating, collecting firewood and irregular employment opportunities in local markets.</li> <li>- <b>Camp/Host relationships:</b> Worsening tensions in both Buddhist and Muslim locations. Cause: expropriation of land for camps, bad governance of CMC; IDPs and host share same resources (firewood supply is critical).</li> <li>- <b>Social tensions:</b> Urban Muslims more liberal, rural Muslims more conservative = social tensions between Muslims. Especially in relation to women and movement (e.g. purdah). Few sources of livelihoods = increased domestic violence (high rates) and alcoholism. Women's mental health in camps suffers from being separated from previous social networks</li> <li>- Relationships between urban girls and rural boys = source of tension</li> <li>- <b>Nutrition:</b> Pre-2012 fish was main source of protein and more varied diet, in camps IDPs need to sell part of ration to purchase fish. Diet mainly of rice with chilies. Buddhists more diverse diet, few children with GAM.</li> <li>- <b>Breastfeeding:</b> Muslim boys breastfed till 2 years, girls to 2.5 years. After 6</li> </ul>	
--	------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--

				<p>months boys fed with additional food, not clear for girls. During crisis, boys likely to receive more additional food after 6 months, girls only breastfed. Breastfeeding of Muslim newborns delayed till prayers from Mullah and washing, can take a few days. Mothers mostly eat rice and chillies maybe fish for 40 days after birth; vegetables, beans etc are prohibited during this period. Many fruit and vegetables not allowed until 6 months after birth. Buddhist, Hindu and Mara Ma Gyi communities restrict diet after birth especially vegetables. Greater number of children and high stress = vectors of malnutrition in Muslim communities. Muslim: boys fed before girls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>WASH</b> Muslim: prefer tube wells and deep tube wells with hand-pumps preferred to other drinking water sources. Buddhist, Hindus and Mara Ma Gyi prefer 'heavy' water from ponds and rainwater. Water filtering generally not practiced. Muslim latrines and defecation must be in north-south orientation = high rates of open defecation. Children under 5 open-defecation around the house. Lack of privacy for women (even when going to latrine) is source of discomfort for women. Buddhist IDP households generally have private latrines. Water rarely found in the Muslim camps' latrines so individuals have to bring their own bucket of water. Anal cleansing is sometimes done with mud available besides the latrines. Buddhist/Muslim: soap generally not used after defecation. Diarrhea attributed to food or bad spirits rather than water quality.</li> <li>- <b>Reasons for displacement:</b> houses were burnt to the ground (in Sittwe, Pauktaw, Myebon and Kyauk Pyu principally), allegedly forced to leave their house by the authorities (e.g. Nar Zi ward) and tensions due to living in proximity with the Rakhine and the constraints put on their mobility rendered their livelihoods too difficult to pursue (e.g. Than Taw Li and Bu May).</li> <li>- <b>Self-settled camps:</b> Most IDPs remained in self-settled camps, e.g. Thea Chaung and Dar Paing for three reasons: arrived late such as Muslims from Than Taw Li; Kaman from Thea Chaung don't want to mix with the Muslims in the IDPs camps with 'uncivilized' conditions in camps; self-settled in important economic places such as Takke Pyin Market, Dar Paing and Thea Chaung for economic opportunities</li> <li>- <b>Land compensation for camps:</b> promised by government but not received.</li> <li>- <b>Kaman living in camps:</b> may be assimilated with Muslims as many unable to retrieve their identity papers, and seeking an papers besides local leaders attesting of their Kaman origin can cost as high as 500,000MMK.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--



<p>16. NGO Report</p> <p><i>Conflict Assessment in Rakhine State, February/March 2013, DRC</i></p>	<p><i>Camps and nearby villages</i></p>	<p><i>Sittwe, Sittwe camps and Myebon Township</i></p>	<p><i>Systems thinking approach and 36 key informant interviews with decision-makers</i></p>	<p><i>GENERAL - Understanding conflict dynamics</i></p>	<p>- <b>Root causes of conflict:</b> center-periphery imbalances and divide and rule strategies from the government; ethno-political and socio-economic not religious but as religion mobilizes people in Myanmar and internationally it becomes an important element in sustaining the conflict. Ethno-politics implemented from the center as a means of control. Rakhine population socially and economically deprived compared to the centre</p> <p><b>Conflict drivers:</b> Muslims (non-Kaman) not included on list of the 135 ethnic groups. Divide and Rule Strategy by the centre. 1982 Citizenship law stripped many Muslims of both citizenship and basic rights to services. Many Rakhine have one-sided view of Islam: violent, seeking to dominate, low status of women, large families = theory of Muslims trying to turn Rakhine into separate Muslim state. Few traditional conflict dispute mechanisms. Chinese gas pipeline 2010 led to economic opportunism and concern over lack of structures for resource and revenue sharing. Anti-UN/NGO campaign based on perceived bias towards Muslim community for 20 years. Humanitarian organisations have weak relationships with and understanding of the local community.</p> <p><b>Key triggers in 2012:</b> Political rivalry and ethno nationalism made possible by political reform process (relaxed freedoms and increased political space). Political, religious and economic opportunism. Increasingly uncensored media. Rape case by Muslim man. Potential core of mainly ethnic Rakhine militants, composed of political, religious and business extremists, nationalists and opportunists that have a vested interest in furthering the conflict.</p>	
<p>17. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Rakhine Early Recovery Activity: Baseline Assessment. June 2016, IRC/DRC/Andaman/RI</i></p>	<p><i>Returned IDPs in northern Rakhine State</i></p>	<p><i>Rathedaung, Minbya, and Mrauk-U</i></p>	<p><i>Household survey (620), FGDs (56)</i></p>		<p><b>Source of livelihoods:</b> mainly agriculture also trade and fishing. One-third depend on casual labour (more for Muslims than Rakhine). Low ability to diversify income sources. Substantial variation in food security across townships and ethnicity (insecurity higher Minbya, Rathedaung, and Muslims; lower in Mrauk-U)</p> <p><b>Self-identified needs:</b> more jobs, better education and health services. External assistance: mainly Muslims, largely in form of food assistance. Point of contention for Rakhine who accuse NGOs of bias. Anti-international sentiment softening after Cyclone Komen in 2015. Communities stressed the importance of providing equitable assistance (between and within communities).</p> <p><b>Participatory Governance:</b> village governance mechanisms highly centralized (male village administrators, elders, religious leaders). Village leaders and advisors tend to dominate decision-making and oversee dispute resolution.</p>	

				<p>Half to two-thirds reported engagement with village governance (e.g. selecting leaders, engagement with decision making). Village politics is male-dominated; poor and youth also marginalised. Muslim communities demonstrated lower levels of participation and awareness of village governance. Three-quarters reported perceived their village leaders listened to their priorities and concerns; smaller majority felt their leaders were effective in addressing them. Most felt community leadership improved in past year, linked to appointment of a new village tract administrators after the 2015 general election. Two-thirds of survey respondents wanted more involvement in village governance.</p> <p><b>Trust and Engagement:</b> slow increase in interaction between members of different ethnic groups in past year mainly resumption of pre-conflict economic relationships. Continued hostility and mistrust. Around 60% reported interacting with members of another ethnicity in past month (higher Mrauk-U, lowest Rathedaung). Interactions more frequent; Muslims reported gradual easing of movement restrictions through reduced requirements for permission documents or reduced rates of informal payments to police. About 25% Muslim, 33% Rakhine, 50% Maramargyi engaging in informal social relations other ethnic groups. Around 50% Muslims feel positive about interacting with other ethnic groups (33% Rakhine), over 90% hope this will increase (20% Rakhine). Rakhine women skeptical grounded in perceived threat of sexual violence permeated popular narratives since 2012. Majorities of all ethnic groups expressed a willingness to work with members of other ethnicities on projects that benefit village.</p> <p><b>Protection:</b> dispute-resolution remains dominated by a small group of village elites, formal justice mechanisms only as last resort (significant concern for GBV cases where rights and needs of survivors are unlikely to be respected, and the primacy given to mediation and stability likely to put them in harm's way once again). Muslims dependent on village tract administrators and policy for more serious disputes but nearly always Rakhine so potential power imbalance. Access to documentation (birth certificates and updated family lists). Poor coverage (about 75% Muslims no birth certificates children born in last year, 33% Rakhine; almost no Muslims updated family list in past five years; nearly half Rakhine).</p> <p><b>Access to services:</b> Chronic service provision gaps faced for all. Reported access to health (under half Muslims; 90% Rakhine). Higher barriers to access: Muslims, Minbya, Rathedaung, lower in Mrauk-U. Referral process to Sittwe</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>hospital challenges for Muslims. Education more easily accessible for all communities. Slightly more Rakhine in primary school, geography is key difference.</p> <p><b>Freedom of movement:</b> almost all Muslims subject to some degree of movement restriction. Very rare movement restrictions for Rakhine</p> <p>Under half Muslims reported moving freely in village tracts (tight restrictions Minbya, less in Mrauk-U). Only one-sixth reported being able to move beyond village tract (mainly Mrauk-U). Burdensome informal payments to police or other authorities.</p> <p><b>Ending displacement through return to area of origin/local integration:</b> 43 respondents IDPs. Vast majority of formerly displaced people expressed satisfaction with the process. Some reports of misappropriation of funds allocated for returnees by village leaders, poor communication with local populations.</p>		
<p>18. NGO Report</p> <p>Morbidities by location by season, April-October 2016. IRC</p>		<p>Camps where IRC active in health</p>	<p>PHC Consultations</p>	<p>HEALTH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Morbidity/disease prevalence by location by season</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Most common diseases:</b> Rhinitis, bronchitis, acute gastritis (mainly in wet season); scabies; hypertension, skin ulcers (mainly wet season); acute GE; worm infestation (mainly Thar Yar Kone and Ohn Yay Phaw);</li> <li>- Hypertension as high as 22% in Thien Tan and Pyar Le Chaung; Rhinitis as high as 31% in Phwe Yar Kone in wet season</li> </ul>	
<p>19. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Knowledge Attitudes and Practices Survey of Hygiene Behaviors in Sittwe Township, Rakhine State, May 2015, Oxfam/ACF/SC/SI</p>	<p>Direct beneficiaries of WASH Consortium Project; IDPs in camps and villages. HH definition based on HH distribution lists</p>	<p>11 IDP camps; 8 villages near IDP camps and 7 villages in remote areas</p>	<p>HH survey (425)</p>	<p>WASH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demographics</li> <li>- Diarrhea</li> <li>- Water access and behavior</li> <li>- Ceramic filter use</li> <li>- Handwashing</li> <li>- Good hygiene</li> <li>- Defecation</li> <li>- Waste disposal</li> <li>- Bathing areas</li> <li>- Menstrual hygiene</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Water source:</b> 95% boreholes; 30% open wells in villages and 29% change water source during the year (due to change in taste/quality)</li> <li>- <b>Water-borne diseases:</b> 45% could name one water related illness (mainly diarrhoea), 44% could name 2 or more; 83% had clear understanding diarrhoea caused by water, much less for skin and eye infections. More respondents associated dirty food with diarrhoea (55%) than unsafe water (46%); 70% treating severe diarrhoea with ORS; 21% with homemade ORS; 39% believed diarrhoea was inevitable; 60% associated diarrhoea with hot season; 26% believed their children would suffer from severe diarrhoea in the next month (21% in camps; 32% in villages).</li> <li>- <b>Water use behaviour:</b> 95% do something at home to keep drinking water safe. In camps: 74% filter water (ceramic or cloth); 14% keep container covered; 12% keep container clean; 3% use water pot with handle; 1% use boiling, none add chemicals</li> <li>- <b>Hand washing behaviour:</b> reason for no soap available: 60% could not afford or not prioritised (20%). Most important times for washing hands: 60% after defecation; 43% when dirty; 42% before eating; 33% before preparing food;</li> </ul>	<p>- CCCM Cluster use HH size of 5.5 members</p>

					<p>15% before feeding a child; 14% after eating; 9% after disposing of children's faeces; 7% before breastfeeding. Only 28% connected hand washing to preventing disease.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Food hygiene:</b> 69% had uncovered cooked food</li> <li>- <b>Sanitation practices overall (villages and camps):</b> 78% have access to functioning latrine. Open defecation (elderly 10%; adult men 18%; boys 46%; adult women 12%; girls 33%); latrine (elderly 37%; adult men 70%; boys 32%; adult women 74%; girls 43%); within home (elderly 14%; adult men 1%; boys 2%; adult women 1%; girls 2%). Children generally use open defecation and adults mostly use latrines. Open defecation is more common in villages than camps. In camps 85% adults reported to use latrines. 78% people in camps reported to have access to a latrine. Main reason in the camps for not using latrines: non-functioning latrines (40%), prefer open defecation (29%), did not answer (37%). <b>Change place of defecation at night:</b> 13% elderly women, 15% adult women and 9% girls (mostly to home). Main reasons for change: fear of attack or ghosts, 34% not feel safe; 25% fear of dark, 23% access difficulties, 24% general insecurity. Soft infant faeces usually rinsed through gaps in the floor with water only.</li> <li>- <b>Solid waste disposal:</b> 71% regularly use waste collection points in camps</li> <li>- <b>Bathing:</b> Females in camp (1% at water point; 3% at compound; 69% in the home; 27% no answer) males in camp (52% at water point; 12% at compound; 16% in the home; 20% no answer)</li> <li>- <b>Menstrual hygiene:</b> before displacement 78% using traditional cloth; today 91% using sanitary napkins. Mainly due to NGO work, hygiene promotion and distribution of hygiene products. Preference: 46% sanitary napkins, 40% traditional cloth; 12% both.</li> </ul>	
<p>20. NGO Rapid Assessment</p> <p>IRC Rapid Assessment One Page Overview, date???, IRC</p>	<p>Women in IDP camps</p>	<p>Thet Kaye Pyin, Baw Du Pha, Ohn Daw Gyi, Say Tha Mar Gyi, Phwe Yar Kone,</p>	<p>FGDs</p>	<p>WASH - GBV risks associated with WASH facilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Areas of concerns for safety and security:</b> Latrines and bathing spaces in all camps due to damage, lack of sex segregation, lack of lighting, and lack of locks.</li> <li><b>Thet Kaye Pyin:</b> security concerns around lighting and small bridge to access latrines at night (potential ambush and falling).</li> <li><b>Baw Du Pha:</b> Handpumps seen as unsafe as broken, forcing women to travel from camp for water.</li> <li><b>Ohn Daw Gyi:</b> community does not respect the sex segregation of latrines = issues. Damage and lack of lighting also a concern.</li> <li><b>Say Tha Mar Gyi:</b> Latrines and bathing spaces are concern for safety and</li> </ul>	

					security <b>Phwe Yar Kone:</b> Latrines and bathing spaces are concern for safety and security. Recommendations: lighting and building newer female latrines closer to the camp. Rubbish dump unsafe for women as too far from camp.	
21. NGO Assessment  IRC Women's Protection and Empowerment Initial Rapid Assessment: Women and girls' safety in Sittwe IDP camps, October 2014, IRC	Women and girls in IDP camps	Sittwe IDP camps (in which IRC is working)	FGDs; key informant interviews with CMCs, NGOs, women's groups, UN staff; safety audit/mapping of camps	PROTECTION - GBV - Women and girls' safety	- <b>Vulnerable groups:</b> widows and divorced women, single women, married women living without their husbands, women and girls from poor families and women and girls living alone - <b>Common marriage age:</b> 15-18 years for girls in some camps; 18-22 for boys - <b>Types of GBV:</b> intimate partner violence (most often physical abuse by husbands). Sexual abuse and rape common in all camps and early marriage in most. Reported low support for survivors and victim often blamed. Commonly stated that girls should change behavior to avoid GBV. Little or no acknowledgement of the roles of boys and men as perpetrators. Perpetrators reported to rarely face punishment for GBV, if they often detainment by CMCs payment to CMC or the family of the victim or shaving head. One case beating, one case stocks. Need to strengthen informal justice mechanisms for GBV. - <b>Areas of concern for safety:</b> latrines and bathing facilities due to: damage, lack of sex segregation, lack of lighting, and lack of locks. Inappropriate location of bathing spaces some camps. Roads, ditches and bridges (men can hide especially at night), isolated areas (e.g. for firewood and water collection), markets, handpumps - <b>Specialised services for women:</b> only healthcare, lack of women's waiting room at clinics is a concern (intimidation by police)	
22. NGO Assessment  KAP Study on GBV in Displacement Settings in Sittwe Township, Rakhine State, September 2016, IRC	Adults Sittwe camps	5 Muslim camps and 1 Rakhine Camp: Set Yoe Kya 1&2, Say Tha Mar Gyi, Ohn Saw Gyi north, Bw Du Pha 1, Phwe Yar Gone, Thet Kae	FGDs and KIs, random HH survey (634)	PROTECTION - GBV - Gender relations - Trafficking	- <b>Primary educated:</b> Adult Muslim men 32%, women 21%; Adult Rakhine men 100%, women 92% (only 46% Rakhine women attended middle/high school) - <b>Top needs:</b> Muslim women and girls: health (40%), reproductive health 22%, and NFIs; Rakhine women and girls: livelihoods support 30% and cash 16% - <b>Most difficult service to access:</b> Muslim: health; Rakhine: education - <b>Main barriers to access services:</b> women's centres and psychosocial support; lack of available services; lack of female service providers; <b>for health services:</b> too far away and cost; <b>Livelihoods training and education</b> informal payments to access services that should be free - <b>Human trafficking:</b> migration by boat less in 2016 following crackdown in 2015. 23% Muslim and 26% Rakhine families had member leave in past 12 months. 2:1 men : women leaving. Muslims: most leaving illegally to Malaysia,	Psychological, social, economic and environmental impacts of displacement and conflict on affected communities and individuals have resulted in women and girls' increased vulnerability to GBV. In particular, constrained livelihood opportunities, breakdown of community structures, disrupted gender

		<i>Pyin</i>			<p>Thailand or Singapore. Rakhine: most leaving as labour migrants to elsewhere in Myanmar or abroad. Only 1% reported to have returned. 11% total Muslim respondents (half of those with member migrated) responded that migrants were both Insafe and out of contact. Women much more likely to be able to identify a human trafficking scenario. 54% Muslim women rated trafficking as a major threat to their community; 22% Rakhine women. Most thought girls most likely to be trafficked. Rakhine: forced commercial and domestic work considered most likely trafficking threat (51%), Muslims: ransoms (68%)</p> <p>- <b>Early marriage:</b> average marriage age Muslim girls 15-19, boys 18-22. Child marriage endemic in Muslim camps. Increase in early marriage after displacement to protect from higher risk of sexual assault and reduce financial burden, also children more interested in marrying younger. Child marriage and human trafficking more common in Muslim camps.</p> <p>- <b>Intimate partner violence and sexual assault:</b> Equitable views around roles by gender, men sharing in housework, men needing to be tough, and women's perceived culpability for sexual assault. Intimate partner violence is accepted and normalized in both communities: 27% of Muslim women and 78% of Muslim men agreed that "if a wife does something wrong, her husband has the right to punish her," as did 88% of Rakhine women and 47% of Rakhine men. Few thought women to blame if raped (very few among Muslims less so among Rakhine). GBV understood in narrow terms. Main cause of intimate partner violence: disputes over control of resources in the household (especially women wanting to spend more on household needs and men wanting to spend more on drugs and alcohol). Linked to less livelihood opportunities after displacement. CMCs main service provider to help female survivors of violence largely due to lack of other options, NGOs (65%) religious leaders (25%); only Rakhine men mentioned police.</p>	<p>norms and relationships, unsafe shelter and camp design have all been reported as contributing to higher rates of intimate partner violence, child marriage, sexual assault and exploitation, and human trafficking. In Muslim camps especially, these issues have been further exacerbated as movement restrictions continue and a return to normal life appears further away than ever. However, the upheaval of displacement may also present entry points for efforts to improve gender equity, as gender norms shift under pressure from new realities, and communities are exposed to new behavior change and messaging campaigns from humanitarian service providers.</p>
<p>23. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Child Protection: Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices Study, Rakhine State, Myanmar, August 2014, Save the Children International and</i></p>	<p><i>Muslim and Rakhine camps and communities</i></p>	<p><i>Sittwe, Pauktaw, Rauthaut haug</i></p>	<p><i>Household survey (487), FGD (25), KII (12)</i></p>	<p><i>CHILD PROTECTION</i></p> <p>- <i>Population's actions to protection children</i></p> <p>- <i>How children are treated</i></p> <p>- <i>Positive and negative</i></p>	<p>- <b>Trafficking and migration:</b> 40% Muslim adults reported occurrence of trafficking, children being sent away from families and migration. 25% Muslim adults and 15% Rakhine were aware of boys and girls having sex for money.</p> <p>- <b>Physical violence and psychological impact:</b> 90% reported children beaten for discipline. More signs of child aggression since conflict; children in all FGDs expressed lack of hope for the future and low levels of well-being; parents experience stress at being unable to afford to send children to school. Child marriage and sending children to work as coping mechanisms.</p> <p>- <b>Substance abuse:</b> reported by boys, girls and adults. Especially alcohol and</p>	

UNICEF				<p><i>impact of cultural practices and coping mechanisms</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Child protection services</i></li> <li>- <i>Attitudes and knowledge that inform treatment of children</i></li> </ul>	<p>drugs for boys. Possible link to depression.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Reason for not referring cases of child abuse:</b> lack of response to report, not knowing where to report, unable to find transport to report/access service, fear of repercussions and perpetrators are powerful community members. Adults and children expressed that abuse “is for the family to deal with”</li> <li>- <b>Birth registration:</b> 59.2% of children under 5 in Rakhine state are registered; 18% of children between 10-14 years work (UNICEF, MICS 2009-2010)</li> <li>- <b>School attendance:</b> 92% Rakhine, 77% Muslim. Main reason for not attending school: financial constraints (47%)</li> <li>- <b>Child labour:</b> 24% girls and 22% boys working outside of home. Of these 75% of girls said it was not their choice to work and 50% said working conditions were difficult for children of their age. Boys were mainly transporting bags of wood, sand and rice or selling firewood and water. 75% of boys said it was not their choice to work and 50% said the working conditions were difficult. Reasons for working: parents request, to feed siblings, don’t know, nothing else to do. Reports of children sent away for money, trafficking or migrating.</li> <li>- <b>Violence and authorities:</b> 80% said children witnessed community violence sometimes or often. Children often mentioned fear of fighting or violence. 17% children said boys at risk of trouble with authorities. 65% Muslim adults and 47% Rakhine adults say entering forbidden zones is a top danger for boys, less for girls. 30% Muslim adults and 2% Rakhine adults say border areas of communities dangerous for boys.</li> <li>- <b>Child protection groups:</b> Sittwe camps, 77% of adults know about groups and 71% believe they are very or somewhat effective. Most know about CPGs as awareness raising less know about referral services. Most report cases to family or community leader rather than CPG.</li> </ul>	
--------	--	--	--	---	---	--

Safe Activities Boys and Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
	Muslim Adults		Rakhine Adults		Muslim Children		Rakhine Children	
School	86.0%	65.1%	47.6%	68.3%	68.3%	49.6%	32.8%	31.3%
Domestic work	50.4%	83.7%	29.5%	87.8%	38.2%	69.9%	15.3%	49.6%
Work outside of the home (agriculture, business, etc.)	5.4%	0.8%	1.9%	0.8%	4.9%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%
Play and sports	33.3%	2.3%	4.8%	2.4%	29.3%	13.8%	2.3%	0.8%
Practicing religion (mosque/monastery)	77.5%	19.4%	51.4%	20.3%	62.6%	39.0%	33.6%	24.4%
Other	7.8%	37.2%	19.0%	39.0%	1.6%	1.6%	13.7%	14.5%
Don't know	2.3%	14.0%	5.7%	14.6%	1.6%	4.9%	28.2%	17.6%
DA	3.1%	2.3%	6.7%	2.4%	9.8%	13.8%	9.9%	6.9%

24. UN Monitoring System

Food Security Monitoring 2016, WFP

Myanmar

Across Myanmar: Ayeyarwady; Chin; Kachin; Kayin; Magway; Mon; Rakhine State; Shan

HH Survey

FOOD SECURITY  
 - HH Hunger Scale  
 - Food stock  
 - Food consumption  
 - Demographics  
 - Coping mechanisms index  
 - Livelihoods/income  
 - Migration  
 - Credit and debt

Rakhine state:

- Gender of main income earner: 81% male; 19% female
- Average household size: 5
- Average household members: between 0-5months: 0.08; 6-59 months: 0.57; 5-15 years 1.38; 16-60 years 2.61; over 60 0.35
- Female headed households: 20%
- % children less than 5: 11.2%
- % elderly (over 60): 14%
- Food consumption: poor 5.9%; borderline 20%; adequate 74%. Inadequate food consumption (26.1%)
- Number of meals for adults (>15years) the day before the survey: 1= 1.5%; 2 =77.8%; 3=20%; 4=1%. Average number of meals: 2.2
- Number of meals for children (6 months - 15years) the day before the survey: 1=0.7%; 2=53%; 3=38%; 4=7%; 5=1.3%. Average number of meals: 2.55
- Average number of days in the past week ate: cereals and grains: 7.0; white roots and tubers: 1.6; legumes/nuts: 0.75; orange vegetables: 0.3; green leafy vegetables: 4.1; other vegetables: 1.8; orange fruits: 3.3; other fruits: 0.4; meat: 0.06; organ meat: 0.75; fish/shellfish: 3.5; eggs: 0.8; milk and other dairy products: 0.3; oil/fat/butter: 2.9; sugar/sweets: 0.9; condiments/spices: 6.4
- Main source of cereals/grains: own production: 14%; fishing/hunting: 1.5%;



				<p>gathering 0.5%; loans 2%; market purchase (with cash) 60%; market purchase (on credit): 14.3%; exchange labour or items for food: 3%; gift (food) from civil society, NGOs or friends: 1.5%; food aid from civil society, NGOs, government, WFP etc: 2.0%</p> <p>- Average household food stock (in months): 0.59 months</p> <p><b>Household hunger scale</b></p> <p>- Little to no hunger: 85%; moderate hunger: 13%; severe hunger: 2.5%</p> <p>- How often no food to eat of any kind in your household: Never 85%; Rarely (1-2 times/month): 3%; Sometimes (3-10 times/month): 6.4%; Often (&lt;10 times/month): 2.5%</p> <p>- How often do people in your household go to sleep hungry: Never 74%; Rarely (1-2 times/month): 16%; Sometimes (3-10 times/month): 9%; Often (&lt;10 times/month): 1%</p> <p>- How often do members of your household go a whole day and night without eating: Never 95%; Rarely (1-2 times/month): 3%; Sometimes (3-10 times/month): 2%; Often (&lt;10 times/month): 0%</p> <p><b>Coping mechanisms</b></p> <p>- Daily: no coping mechanisms: 45%; no daily coping mechanisms: 20%; more than daily coping mechanisms: 35%</p> <p>- Days eating rice porridge in last week: 0.22; days prioritising children and elderly for food: 1.14; days reducing the number of meals: 0.71; days reducing rice portion size: 1.32; days consuming only rice at mealtimes: 0.26; days consuming less preferred staple food: 0.79; days changing curry ingredients: 1.08; days begging for food: 0.37; days borrowing food: 1.26; days eating rice seed stocks: 0.09; days eating immature crops: 0; days eating wild animals or plants: .014; days purchasing food on credit: 1.37; days reducing expenditure on health: 0.59; days sending children/elders away to eat: 0.07</p> <p><b>Livelihoods/income</b></p> <p>- % income required for expenditure: 75%; monthly income in last month: mean: 53,365; range; 50,000-300,000</p> <p>- Most common sources of income: casual labour, farming/agriculture; small trade; fishing/fish pond; wood/bamboo cutting</p> <p><b>Migration</b></p> <p>- No household member migrated: 94%; one member migrated: 4%; two or more migrate: 2%</p> <p><b>Credit and debts</b></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently have debt in household: 73%</li> <li>- Taken credit in last 3 months: 54%</li> <li>- Main reason for new debt or credit: to buy food: 42%; health expenses: 13%; buy agricultural inputs: 3.5%; pay education costs: 5.2%; to buy animals: 0.9%; to buy animal feed/vet cost: 0%; to buy or rent land: 0%; to buy/rent house: 2.7%; to pay for social events/ceremonies: 0%; to repay other loans: 7.1%; other: 24.8%</li> <li>- Use of harvest to pay back debt: 30%</li> <li>- Baskets of crops required to pay back debt (average): 9.62 baskets (total baskets harvested in last growing period: 59.3); repayment of debt with cash: 96%; when repaying debt with work, average number of days worked: 71.4 days.</li> </ul>	
<p>25. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Food security and livelihoods assessment, Rakhine State, Myanmar, August 2013, ACF/DRC/Oxfam/RI / SC/ SI</p>	<p>Camps, nearby villages, isolated villages</p>	<p>Sittwe (Baw Du Pha, Ohn Taw Gyi &amp; 2, Basara; villages: Thea Cheung, Ohn Taw Gyi, Baw Du Pha, By May, Pyin Shey, Pa Lin Pyin, Zaw By Gyar, Thae Chaung market and traders, Set Yoe Kya, Sittwe market, Ah Nauk Pyin, Nyaung Pin Gyi),</p>	<p>Key informant interview s; FGDs, market assessment</p>	<p>LIVELIHOODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- limitations and opportunities</li> <li>- household economy</li> <li>- productive constraints</li> <li>- Wealth groups</li> </ul>	<p><b>Sources of livelihoods (Rakhine State):</b> rice production, fishing and aquaculture, trade. Paddy rice = cash and food employment for casual labourers and farmers. IDPs often from urban context and not familiar with agriculture/fishing. Authorizations and fees limit sea access for fishing</p> <p>- <b>Intercommunal connections:</b> Re-emergence of economic and social links between communities especially in Sittwe e.g. gateway market of Thea Cheung and Thet Kal Pyin. Rakhine in Thea Cheung and Pauktaw willing to work with Muslim neighbours. Very limited connections between communities in Myebon, Rathedaung and Kyaukphyu. Movement restrictions restrict ability for Muslims to trade or seek casual labour with Rakhine. Muslim dominated sections of the economy before displacement most affected including fishing, vegetable production, poultry. Serious shortage of fuel (firewood) in areas of displacement</p> <p>- <b>Shops/markets:</b> Thea Cheung market = opportunities for petty trade and casual labour, extensive range of food and NFIs available. All IDP camps have at least a small number of shops, some medium sized market.</p> <p>- <b>Livelihoods of Muslim IDPs:</b> better off: NGO staff, remittances, fishing business, trading, asset sales, income 60,000-120,000, assets: boats and nets, shops, mobile phones, savings, gold; middle: NGO volunteers, casual labour, small shops, firewood trading, trishaw drivers, asset sales, income: 30,000-60,000 monthly, assets: small shops, tools; poor: irregular casual labour, gifts, petty trade, asset sales, income 15,000-30,000, assets: few chickens; very poor: casual labour, gifts, begging, selling food aid and NFOs, cash aid, asset sales (few), petty trade in vegetables and firewood, income 10-10,000-15,000,</p>	

		<p><i>Pauktaw (Sin Taw aw: Kyauk Phyu camp, Kyein No Pyin camp, Ah Nauk Ywe camp, Ah Naik Ywe village), Rathedaung (Ah Nauk Pyin, Nyaung Pin Gyi), Myebon (Taung Paw, Kan Thar Htwat Wa)</i></p>		<p>asses: few chickens. 55-70% poor or very poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Livelihoods of Rakhine IDPs:</b> better off: trading/business, remittances, employment, asset sales, fishing, income 100,000-300,000, assets: boats and nets, motorcycles, TV, capital/stock, mobile phones, savings, gold; middle: skilled casual labour, trishaw owner, small business, asset sales, income: 50,000-100,000 monthly, assets: small shops, tool, golds; poor: casual labour, petty trade, trishaw driver, asset sales, income 30,000-50,000, assets: trade assets, tools, nets, gold; very poor: casual labour,, snack selling, gifts, selling food aid and NFOs, asset sales, income 15,000-30,000, assets: few chickens. Same food sources as host communities. No specific risks for future food instability.</li> <li>- <b>Dietary diversity:</b> All groups purchase food in addition to food aid. Food ratio does not meet dietary diversity and not culturally considered to meet basic food needs of households.</li> <li>- <b>Remittances:</b> Poor, very poor and middle groups get about 10% income through remittances; wealthier get 20%</li> <li>- <b>Migration to camps:</b> from isolated villages to IDP camps in rural Sittwe. Pull factors: aid, food. Tend to be poorest, landless, no productive assets, less able to access casual labour e.g. 235 out of 420 households in Hlay Ma Shey left village to go to IDP camps especially Hmanzi junction and Ohn Daw Gyi area.</li> <li>- <b>Rakhine isolated villages:</b> households not entirely cut off from sources of livelihoods, in Rathedaung villages suffer from absence of labour and economic contacts from before conflict. Poorest households elderly or female headed</li> <li>- <b>Muslim isolated villages:</b> similar livelihood constraints to host villages. Main constraints: access to farming land, prawn ponds and fishing areas. Leads to higher competition for resources and job opportunities. Poor and very poor have similar sources of income to IDPs.</li> <li>- <b>Prices</b> for several consumables including vegetables and fish are cheaper in markets on Muslim side than in Sittwe township, big increase in daily wage rates for unskilled workers in Sittwe urban (2,500 up to 5,000 per day), decreased in Muslim areas (2,500 down to 1,500 per day)</li> <li>- <b>Infrastructure:</b> Rakhine state lacks major communication links. 2 days to Yangon with unpaved road. Existing ports only for small tonnage freighters. Plans for expansion. Airports in Sittwe, Kyaukpyu, Thandwe and Ann</li> <li><b>Land use:</b> governed by law. Conversion from paddy to other uses is complicated and expensive process. Paddy rice: 75% of land use, fruit and palm</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--



					Health (Diarrhoea, Dengue, Malaria)	↑	↑									↑	↑	
					Hunger or Lean Period													
					Firewood/Wild Product Collection	↓	↓	↓										↓
					Availability of water									↓	↓	↓	↓	
					Access to markets and work	↓	↓	↓										↓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Casual labour opportunities in rural areas low outside November to April</li> <li>• Casual labour opportunities (including in fishing) in urban areas lower in rainy season</li> <li>• Lean season: pre-harvest period and rainy season: food prices slightly higher and less labour opportunities</li> <li>• Water scarcity in some locations: February to April for crops and household consumption especially coastal Pauktaw</li> </ul>																		
26. UN Assessment <i>Rakhine Community Crisis Needs Assessment, January 2013, FAO</i>	??	17 villages in Sittwe, Mrauk-U and Pauktaw	??	??	Displacement caused breakdown of value chains, and destruction of productive assets. 2012 paddy rice crop not fully cultivated due to security concerns and lack of access to inputs. Muslim villages are net suppliers of labour and Rakhine villages net purchasers of labour, due to disparities in land holdings and population sizes. Daily labour rates in Rakhine areas increased by 50% or more since before crisis. Rakhine villages disproportionately affected by labor shortages and high labor costs; Muslim villages suffering from acute unemployment. Access for upstream communities to the sea via rivers and creeks, being denied by downstream communities. Extensive damage to fishing assets. Indebtedness of farmers emerging problem.													
27. UN Assessment <i>Rakhine Post-Crisis Livelihood and Early Recovery Sector Assessment Report, February 2013, UNDP</i>	IDP camps and nearby villages	??	??	??	Extensive loss of assets, both productive and non-productive, for households affected by the conflict. This includes livestock, fishing equipment, agriculture (including damaged standing crops and fruit trees, and draught animals and ploughs). Restrictions in movement for Muslims, in both IDP camps and villages, were the main impediment to resuming livelihoods activities. Most of the village population assessed was landless, and rely on casual labour job opportunities in agriculture and fishing. 22% of the Rakhine communities assessed were engaged in agriculture as a main source of livelihoods, as against only 10% in case of Muslim communities. Job creation for casual labourers was therefore expressed as the main priority in both villages and IDP camps. All of the IDP camps were receiving external assistance of food, non-food items and shelter, but they still needed additional money for buying													

					cooking fuel (firewood), and other basic household items. Based on their past experience, IDPs were interested to start small scale income generation activities, but were lacking the initial investment to start. As the majority of IDPs in Sittwe locations originated from Sittwe town and its periphery, their primary livelihoods depended on casual labour and small scale trading, fishing, and transportation (eg trishaws).	
28. NGO Survey  SMART Survey, December 2012, Save the Children	??	??	SMART	NUTRITION - GAM and SAM rates	<b>GAM</b> rate of 14.4% (WHO emergency threshold 15%) and <b>SAM</b> rate of 4.5% in children aged 6-59 months in Muslim IDP camps located in rural Sittwe (lower in Rakhine camps) ACF and SCI conducting CMAM and outpatient therapy programmes	
29. UN Report  Mission Report: Transfer Modality Scoping Mission in Southern Rakhine/Sittwe, Myanmar, March 2015, WFP	WFP food aid beneficiaries and market traders	Sittwe, Pauktaw, Mrauk U, Kyaukta; 5 Muslim camps, 2 Rakhine camps, 1 mixed Muslim/Kaman IDP camp; 3 isolated Muslim villages	FGDs (200 beneficiaries/CMC/FMC members, 90 traders)	FOOD SECURITY - Scoping mission for opportunities/bottlenecks for introduction of cash or food vouchers - Market access	<p>- <b>Dietary diversity:</b> Limited dietary diversity. Food basket well received but not diverse enough. Portion often sold to buy other commodities (89%) e.g. green vegetables, chilli, onion and garlic to supplement their meals. In-kind food distributions preferred by all FGDs in Muslim camps.</p> <p>- <b>Potential issues from a switch to cash:</b> lack of market access, protection concerns when travelling to the market, lack of supply, and high price fluctuation, unable to buy rice at markets at a reasonable price. 8% pay illegal fees for in-kind food distributions 64% of these were to FMC directly (PMD 2014) Fear that extortion would increase if switch to cash, or household spend on other goods (e.g. alcohol, beetlenut etc)</p> <p>- <b>Access to markets:</b> lack of economic access, difficult physical access (movement restrictions), violence and discrimination so do not feel safe, women encouraged not to leave camp, high rates of extortion to access market (e.g. Mimbya must give police 10% of cost of all goods bought)</p> <p>- <b>Trade in camps:</b> formally illegal though small scale trade continuing. Basic shops selling condiments, garlic, dry fish, onions, chillies, tea/coffee mix and small snacks available in most camps, some locations also had bigger shops selling rice, pulses, fuel, fabric and NFIs. Normally brought to camps through intermediaries (high transport costs and checkpoint fees). Main markets in Thea Chung, Thet Kae Pyin and Kyauwtaw are relatively well supplied. Sittwe township market is the main supplier. Thea Chung supplied from Yangon. Pauktaw township relies on Thea Chung market. Evidence of WFP in-kind food assistance in markets. The trade and movement restrictions have the potential to block the supply for all actors at every stage in the supply chain.</p> <p>- <b>Commodity prices at village/camp level</b> high (sometimes double that in main township market)</p>	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Financial brokers:</b> Muslims have no formal access to financial services to use a broker who charges transportation and payment fees. Generally a trusted Muslim third party with good relationship with Muslim and Rakhine traders prior to conflict.</li> <li>- <b>Targeting of food distributions</b> highly charged and politically sensitive. Muslims fear updating household list due to perceived threat of persecution.</li> </ul>	
<p>30. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Rapid HEA, Assessment Report, Rakhine State, MUSLIM CAMPS, Myanmar, August 2013, Save the Children and Oxfam</p>	Muslim IDPs in camps	Muslim Coastal IDP Camps	Household Survey; FGDS	<p>LIVELIHOODS - Main sources of livelihoods compared with pre-2012 baseline</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Food needs</b> largely met through WFP food aid, with some selling of rations to diversify diet</li> <li>- Majority IDPs lost the most of their <b>productive</b> (fishing equipment, business premises) and <b>non-productive assets</b> (home, clothes)</li> <li>- <b>Commodity prices:</b> increased 10-20% (except where fishing and farming is being conducted = prices are lower than pre-displacement); income levels are drastically reduced</li> <li>- <b>Income brackets:</b> 25-35% very poor (12,500-20,000 kyat per month); 25-35% poor (20,000-50,000kyats); 20-30% middle (50,000-125,000); 10-20% better off (125,000-500,000). Poorer households do casual labour, petty trade while better off households with higher levels of education, savings and connections are more able to gain employment in NGOs or start new businesses</li> <li>Income is the main determinant of wealth as well as sale of assets and ownership of some jewellery.</li> <li>- <b>Travel restrictions</b> = major constraint to increasing income. Poorer groups unable to access unskilled and skilled labour opportunities</li> <li>- <b>Expenses:</b> Very poor spend approximately 65% on food, better off spend 55%. Main items purchased were charcoal/firewood for cooking and candles. 15-20% across all groups spent largely on betel and/or tobacco. Only middle and better off groups spending money on education.</li> <li>- <b>Markets:</b> large variety of goods available at markets between Rakhine and Muslim areas, goods which are not available can usually be ordered. Most large shops on the Muslim side owned by host community members or Muslims from the camps who were larger traders before 2012. Rakhine traders reported to face pressure from local groups who do not want them to maintain links with Muslim traders. If this happens, the Muslim enclave will be cut-off with a large impact on people's ability to meet needs.</li> <li>- <b>Main coping mechanisms:</b> reduction in food expenditure and reduction in other expenditure, child labour. Poor and very poor unable to meet their basic survival and livelihood protection needs without on-going external assistance.</li> </ul>	

					<p>- <b>Market monitoring</b> through: labour wage rates, trishaw rates, market prices (fish, beef, leafy green vegetables), charcoal, firewood, betel, tobacco, no. traders, quality firewood/charcoal sales, availability of casual labour</p>	
<p>31. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Rapid HEA, Assessment Report, Rakhine State, Myanmar, August 2013, Save the Children and Oxfam</p>	<p>Muslim host communities</p>	<p>Muslim Coastal Host Communities</p>	<p>Household Survey (?); key informant interview s; FGDs</p>	<p>LIVELIHOODS - Main sources of livelihoods compared with pre-2012 baseline</p>	<p>- <b>Main determinants of wealth:</b> incomes and ownership of land and/or fishing equipment</p> <p>- <b>Remittances:</b> Small but significant for poor and very poor households</p> <p>- Very poor households were able to obtain 90-100% of food needs. Over two-thirds of food from market purchase; 10-30% of food needs through own rice production (overall). Most expenditure on rice followed by protein items including beef and dried fish</p> <p>- <b>Income</b> 20-30% lower than pre-conflict levels. - 20-30% very poor (15,000-75,000 kyats); 40-50% poor (75,000-150,000 kyats). Casual labour still largest income source for very poor households. Gifts/donations about one-third of total income for very poor households</p> <p>- <b>Coping strategies:</b> reduce expenditure on food and others (e.g. tea shops, tobacco and betel)</p>	
<p>32. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Rapid HEA, Assessment Report, Rakhine State, Myanmar, August 2013, Save the Children and Oxfam</p>	<p>Rakhine Urban/Pe r-Urban Conflict Affected Sub-zone</p>	<p>Muslim Coastal Host Communities</p>	<p>Key informant interview s; FGDs</p>	<p>LIVELIHOODS - Main sources of livelihoods compared with pre-2012 baseline</p>	<p>- <b>Main sources of income:</b> labour, trade and business</p> <p>- <b>Ability to expand incomes</b> constrained by availability of labour for very poor groups and lack of access to affordable capital/credit across all wealth groups</p> <p>- Most households continued pre-conflict income sources</p> <p>- Very poor gain majority of income from remittances and gifts and have few opportunities as they are often labour poor (e.g. elderly headed).</p> <p>- Markets for commodities are functioning normally and expanded, market systems not impacted by crisis</p> <p>- Low supply and higher wages for daily labourers</p> <p>-15-25% very poor (50,000-110,000 kyats), 30-40% poor (110,000-200,000 kyats), 25-35% middle (200,000-400,000 kyats), 10-20% better off (400,000-620,000 kyats)</p>	



<p>33. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Livelihood Profiles: Three Livelihood Zones in Tatlan Project Areas of Rakhine State, Myanmar, November 2013, SC, IRC, LB</i></p>	<p>Rakhine rural population</p>	<p>Myebon, Pauktaw, Kyaukpyu, Minbya township</p>	<p>Key informant interviews; FGDs</p>	<p>LIVELIHOODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Livelihoods currently available</li> <li>- Cost of diet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Embankment Paddy Livelihood Zone:</b> sources of livelihood: agriculture, fishing and crab collecting, labour and trade. Sharecropping and land rental not common. Poorer households own chickens and pigs, better off also own buffaloes or cattle. Very poor purchase most food needs from market; better off produce own crops.</li> <li>- <b>Coastal fishing livelihood zone:</b> sources of livelihood: fishing, casual labour, business, self-employment, livestock sales. Produce shrimp/fish paste. Small amount of food from fishing, poor purchase rest of food from markets. Higher income than other zones.</li> <li>- <b>Inland agriculture livelihood zone:</b> main sources of livelihoods: agriculture, labour, livestock rearing, trade. Households own chickens and pigs, more wealthy own cattle and buffaloes. Most households are landless and rely on casual labour/self-employment. Poor get all food from markets, middle and better off have own crops.</li> <li>- <b>Livestock ownership and land ownership</b> by different wealth groups in full</li> <li>- <b>WASH:</b> Water sources: ponds, wells and natural springs. Can run dry in summer forcing people to travel further. Open defecation mainly used in nearby forests or streams</li> <li>- <b>Expenses:</b> Average spent on healthcare: 1-2%, tradition healer in most villages. No formal school fees but pay for tuition, uniforms and stationary. Middle/high school largely unaffordable for poor.</li> <li>- <b>Debt and social support:</b> Fishermen and crab catchers often become indebted to middle-men. Shopkeepers provide food on credit with interest now charged. Most savings in gold or productive assets. No social protection schemes.</li> <li>- <b>Light sources:</b> Most households use candles, battery-driven lights, kerosene lamps, some better off have solar panels.</li> <li>- <b>Coping strategies:</b> switch expenditure to staple foods, remove children from school. Labour migration to elsewhere in Myanmar and neighbouring countries; increased loan-taking and livestock sales, sale of land and gold, advanced selling of labour (very poor in difficult times), increased fishing and firewood sales, increase nipa sales.</li> </ul>	
<p>34. NGO Report</p> <p><i>Tat Lan Sustainable Food Security and Livelihoods</i></p>	<p>Rakhine rural population – Beneficiaries of</p>	<p>Myebon, Kyaukpyu, Minbya, Pauktaw</p>	<p>Household survey (600), 12 FGDs</p>	<p>LIVELIHOODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Sources of income</li> <li>- Debt</li> <li>- Coping strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Sources of income:</b> 54% sold crops, livestock, aquaculture or fishing products, only 27% for female-headed households</li> <li>- <b>Prices:</b> 25% able to access information about prices</li> <li>- <b>WASH:</b> 2/3 depend on unprotected drinking water source. 86% use open</li> </ul>	

<p><i>Program: Baseline Assessment, Final Report, November 2014, CARE International</i></p>	<p><i>Tat Lan project</i></p>			<p><i>- Land ownership</i></p>	<p>defecation, 13% use pit latrines. 44% never use soap to wash hands.  <b>- Average land ownership:</b> 6.2 acres of which 5.3 acres cultivated. Half do not have more than 4 acres.  <b>- Average monthly household income:</b> 75,000 kyat  <b>- Loans:</b> ¾ taken out a loan in previous year; 55% from friends or family; 33% from Government loan. Use of loan: 44% food, 33% economic purpose, 20% health/education. No difference between male and female headed households. 96% of those who took loan in past year had a debt.</p>	
<p><i>35. NGO Assessment</i></p> <p><i>Interagency Assessment – Physical Safety in camps for Children, 2015, DRC, DCI, IRC, PLAN, RI</i></p>	<p><i>Children in camps</i></p>	<p><i>Sittwe and Pauktaw</i></p>	<p><i>FGDs with children and adults</i></p>	<p><i>CHILD PROTECTION - Physical risks for children</i></p>	<p><b>Unsafe places for children in camps:</b> 1. Creek/pond (drown or play unsupervised); 2. Latrines; 3 Drains and ditches. Also roads and construction sites. In Say Tha Ma Gyi also cemetery.  <b>Safe places for children in camps:</b> 1. School; 2. Child friendly spaces. 3. Shelter. In Saw Du Pa also mosque.  <b>Unsafe places for adolescent girls in camps:</b> 1. Pond/lake; 2. Latrines; 3. Drainage/ditches. Particular insecurity of isolated places such as latrines and bathing areas and fear of drink men in these areas. Would prefer more shelter around these areas. Also marketplace in Thet Kay Pyin camp  <b>Safe places for adolescent girls in camps:</b> 1. Shelter (home); 2. CFS; 3. School  <b>Unsafe places for adolescent boys:</b> 1. Pond/lake; 2. Latrines (often play football as only open spaces); 3. Drainage/ditches  <b>Safe places for adolescent boys:</b> 1. School; 2. CFS; 3. Mosque</p>	
<p><i>36. UN Report</i></p> <p><i>Overview of the March 2016 3W, Rakhine State, March 2016, MIMU</i></p>	<p><i>Overview of humanitarian activities in Rakhine</i></p>	<p><i>Rakhine state</i></p>	<p><i>Secondary data</i></p>	<p><i>COORDINATION - Who is doing what where on humanitarian response</i></p>	<p><b>- Organisations active:</b> 55 organisations operating in Rakhine state. 52 working in development focused activities, 16 engaged in activities that target IDP and host communities (489 villages), 12 active in IDP-only activities. IDP related projects in 84 camp or camp-like settings. 26 INGOS, 12 NNGOs, 12 UN, 2 Red Cross, 2 Community based organisations, 1 donor, in total in Rakhine in all projects.  <b>- Type of projects:</b> 114 development-focused activities, 42 IDP-related projects. Most projects in Pauktaw (202 villages and 6 camps), Sittwe (98 villages and 32 camps), Minbya (75 villages and 9 camps), Maungdaw (70 villages and 8 camps) and Kyauktaw (21 villages and 11 camps)  <b>- Types of intervention in IDP and host community</b> (most widespread to least): protection (9 organisations), WASH, health (8), nutrition, food (4), CCCM (4), education (3), shelter (2), DRR (1), livelihoods (4), NFIs (3), agriculture (1), infrastructure (1)</p>	
<p><i>37. UN Assessment</i></p>	<p><i>People affected</i></p>	<p><i>11 of 15 regions/s</i></p>	<p><i>Meetings with</i></p>	<p><i>FOOD SECURITY</i></p>	<p><b>- Main crops:</b> Rice is the country's main crop and staple food. Other major</p>	

<p><i>Special Report: FAO/WFP Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission to Myanmar, March 2016, WFP/FAO</i></p>	<p><i>by floods to forecast 2015 cereal production</i></p>	<p><i>tates in Myanmar</i></p>	<p><i>governme nt agencies, key informant interviews, normalized difference vegetation index images, market survey, small-scale household survey</i></p>	<p><i>- Food security - Nutrition</i></p>	<p>crops include maize, pulses, oilseeds, sugarcane, rubber, tea and timber.</p> <p>- <b>Land policy:</b> Until 2012 all land belonged to the state. Under the policy of state ownership, farmers were given the right to cultivate the land but they could not sell, divide or mortgage it. Land use rights (and occupancy right) were legally inheritable so would pass from one generation to the next. Absentee land ownership was illegal, and if holding was abandoned for any reason, the Land Committee had the right to transfer it to landless farmers. This policy was abandoned, when the Farm Land Law was passed in March 2012. Under this law, existing farmers are, in theory, allowed to mortgage, rent, and exchange or sell their land. There remains, however, numerous bureaucratic procedures that complicate the selling and buying of land, and it would appear that few farmers have actually been able to take advantage of the new law. The Vacant, Fallow and Virgin Land Management Law, passed at the same time as the Farm Land Law, allows national companies, private investors and others to utilize vacant, fallow and virgin land for agricultural and livestock projects.</p> <p>- <b>Rakhine area affected by 2015 floods:</b> 20 percent of the state’s paddy fields were damaged by floods; of these, 50 percent were replanted, but not all is expected to be harvestable.</p>	
<p><i>38. UN Report  Situation of human rights of Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar, June 2016, OHCHR</i></p>	<p><i>Muslims in Rakhine state</i></p>	<p><i>Myanmar</i></p>	<p><i>Secondary data</i></p>	<p><i>GENERAL - Health - Education - Migration - Access to justice - Relevant laws - Freedom of movement</i></p>	<p>-<b>Migration:</b> &gt;94,000 Muslims departed since early 2014, a peak of 31,000 in the first half of 2015 (UNHCR)</p> <p>- <b>Access to justice:</b> military and other security forces act with impunity, endemic corruption and limited capacity to conduct investigations. General lack of public trust in the administration of justice. Social and cultural stigma prevents victims of SGBV from reporting. Minorities face additional obstacles including language, geography and fears of reprisals.</p> <p>- <b>Citizenship Law:</b> three types of citizenship. ‘Full citizenship’ reserved for 135 ethnic groups “who settled in Myanmar before 1823. “Associate citizenship” applies to those whose application for citizenship under the 1948 “Citizenship Law” was pending when the 1982 law entered into force. “Naturalized citizenship” can be granted to those furnishing “conclusive evidence” of entry and residence in Myanmar before 1948, who have command of one of the national languages, and whose children were born in Myanmar. June 2014: citizenship verification process, piloted in Myebon but Muslims (non-Kaman) refusing to identify as “Bengali” were arbitrarily excluded. Suspended in 2015. Those granted citizenship in Myebon were allowed to vote in 2015 but still</p>	

				<p>limited freedom of movement and access to basic services and livelihoods. June 2016: citizenship verification process was relaunched in Kyaukpyu, Myebon and Ponnagyun. February 2015, Government announced the expiry of “temporary identity certificates” (TICs) held by some 700,000 stateless people across the country (confirmed legal residence in Myanmar). June 2015, a new “identity card for nationality verification” was announced but viewed with suspicion and low rates of acceptance. Hundreds of thousands of stateless people in Rakhine have no valid individual identity document confirming their legal residence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Freedom of movement:</b> Movement restrictions place for decades but tightened after 2012 and differ in severity between towns. Procedures to secure travel are onerous and time-consuming, failure to comply can lead to arrest and prosecution. Restrictions routinely lead to extortion and harassment by law enforcement and public officials. Curfew in northern Rakhine state since 2012: prohibition on night-time movement and assembly of more than five people. People vulnerable to extortion and onerous bribes.</li> <li>- <b>Domestic violence:</b> Protracted displacement, overcrowding in camps and the lack of livelihoods exacerbate tensions and risks of domestic violence.</li> <li>- <b>Health care:</b> Availability, accessibility, affordability and quality of health facilities, goods and services are extremely poor across Rakhine State. Leads to delays in treatment, reliance on alternative healthcare and escalation of preventable diseases. Muslims cannot freely access township hospitals, must be referred to Sittwe General Hospital through onerous and time-consuming referral process. In hospital patients restricted to segregated ward with rumors of discriminatory treatment leads to general reluctance to receive treatment at facility. In NRS patients can access township hospitals but costly time-consuming travel authorizations, pass checkpoints and face limitations of curfew. This can cause serious and life-threatening delays in emergency situations, particularly devastating for women and babies.</li> <li>- <b>Education:</b> 30,000 Muslim children in IDP camps depend on temporary learning spaces supported by humanitarian organizations. Lack of qualified teachers, textbooks, teaching materials, and insufficient instructional time. Segregation of schools restricts opportunities for interaction and reconciliation.</li> <li>- <b>Local orders in NRS:</b> E.g. costly and arduous process to secure permission to marry, restrictions on the number of children, requirement to use</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>contraception. Many have no legal basis but are policies and directives from authorities purportedly to prevent illegal immigration and control movement and population growth. Not clear how enforced. Non-compliance punishable by up to 10 years in prison.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <b>Registration of births:</b> 5,000 children born in contravention of local orders are excluded from the official household lists and placed on a separate list (known as a "blacklist"). Muslim (non-Kaman) children not issued with birth certificates since the 1990s. Heightens vulnerability to human rights violations including arbitrary arrest and detention.</li><li>- <b>Reintegration of IDPs in NRS:</b> 25,000 IDPs returned or were integrated at the site of displacement in 2015 through the Rakhine State Government Resettlement Plan.</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

<p>39. UN Report</p> <p><i>Movement Restrictions for Stateless Residents in Rakhine State, Myanmar, Information Note, April 2016, UNHCR</i></p>	<p>Muslims</p>	<p>Rakhine State</p>	<p>Secondary data</p>	<p><b>MOVEMENT RESTRICTIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Various identity cards</li> <li>- Policies around movement restrictions</li> </ul>	<p><b>Movement restrictions:</b> since 1990s. Historically implemented in Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung but also in central Rakhine since 2012.</p> <p><b>1997 Government instruction:</b> “Bengali races” residing in Rakhine must obtain a temporary travel permit to leave their township of origin and penalties for non-compliance</p> <p><b>TICs March 2015</b> temporary identity certificates (white cards) expired, 390,000 surrendered. Initially given receipt that could be used to apply to temporary travel permit. From June 2015 receipt swapped for Identity Card for Nationality Verification (legal status unclear so communities reluctant to accept them, only 1,200 ICNVs issued) but still subject to travel authorization process. Most people only told the TIC receipt and have more restricted travel.</p> <p><b>Travelling between villages in same township: NRS:</b> village departure certificate required to stay overnight in any other village as well as registration on guest list of host family. Cost 500-1,000MMK. Central Rakhine State: restrictions vary and are imposed by local authorities. Residents in Aung Mingalar, Sittwe are not able to leave without a police escort, cannot go to Sittwe market but can spend nights in Sittwe rural areas. IDPs can visit relatives in Aung Mingalar in the same way. Mrauk U, Minbya and Kyauk Taw: easing of community-imposed restrictions between some villages.</p> <p><b>Travelling between townships:</b> need to apply for temporary travel permit (form 4) valid for specified time period. Applies to Muslims but also affected Kaman. Need to provide white card receipt or ICNV as well as copy of household list. Not permitted to travel from Maungdaw or Buthidaung to Rathedaung or Sittwe citing security reasons. Some informal travel without a form 4. Generally IDPs can move from one camp to another to visit relatives without a Form 4.</p> <p><b>Travel from Rakhine to Yangon:</b> a INCV is required, only about 1,200 hold these and are eligible. To get a Form 4 to leave Rakhine, the following is required: family list, village departure certificate, police recommendation and letter of agreement with three guarantors and three witnesses is required. High official and unofficial costs. Travel authorization valid for 45 days</p> <p><b>Harsh penalties</b> including detention if not complying with these requirements. Failure to produce a required document up to 2 years prison. Cases of arbitrary arrest and confiscation of travel documents.</p> <p><b>Impact on stateless communities:</b> already high <b>poverty</b> exacerbated by limited physical access to income and livelihoods. And fees to travelling/trade. Fees</p>	<p><b>Nutrition secondary data:</b></p> <p>In Maungdaw, 45.7% of children under 5 years old are stunted and in Buthidaung 46.6%, which is significantly higher than the Myanmar average of 35% and also higher than the WHO emergency threshold of 40%. (WFP NRS Nutrition Strategy 2015, Final Draft)</p>
---	----------------	----------------------	-----------------------	---	--	--

					<p>etc for traders increases <b>commodity prices</b> and negative effect on food security and nutrition. Travel for medical reasons subject to the same restrictions = dire consequences for those requiring emergency <b>healthcare</b>. In Rathedaung, Buthidaung and Maungdaw Muslims have virtually no public health services and travel (with restrictions) is required even for basic medical care. Mobile clinics visit IDP camps. To visit Sittwe General Hospital a special permit is required, may not be issued in all cases, problematic for emergency cases that occur at night. Muslim patients must be escorted by police to Sittwe hospital so access contingent on availability of police escorts. Emergency medical evacuation from Pauktaw may take one day to arrange, and two days from Myebon. <b>Education:</b> Pre-2012 Muslims able to study at Sittwe University if authorized to travel but excluded from some subjects. Travel authorisations often issued too late to attend classes/exams. The only accessible High School for Sittwe, Pauktaw and Myebon is in Sittwe rural (typically charges 50,000MMK per month). Since 2012, Muslims not allowed to attend Sittwe University, distance learning available but not common. <b>Irregular migration/smuggling/trafficking:</b> since 2012 nearly 170,000 refugees and migrants left by sea from Bangladesh and Myanmar. Movement restrictions is a major push factor. If they leave, Muslims do not have the option of returning. Many families unable to travel legally for family reunification. High chance of arrest for overland routes. <b>Peaceful co-existence:</b> continued segregation has negative effect on efforts to overcome long-standing fear and resentment towards each other, feeding mistrust. High impact on younger people.</p>	
<p>40. NGO Report <i>Intercommunal violence in Myanmar: Risks and Opportunities for International Assistance, April 2014, Adapt</i></p>	<p><i>Muslim relations countrywide</i></p>	<p><i>Yangon (countrywide)</i></p>	<p><i>Secondary data review, 15 key informant interviews in Yangon, one</i></p>	<p><b>CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS - Root causes of conflict and drivers of conflict</b></p>	<p><b>Root causes:</b> Complex historical roots. <b>State policies</b> and practices sought unity by promoting Buddhism and discriminating against alternative religious (and ethnic) identities. Buddhist nationalism is resurgent in a transition context characterised by instability, increased freedoms, rising economic and political stakes, and perceptions of external threats. <b>Fear of Islamification and demographic</b> besiegement provide powerful driving forces for the conflict. <b>Historical stratification in wealth and land ownership</b> contributes to economic</p>	

<p><i>Research and Consulting/Mercy Corps</i></p>			<p><i>mapping exercise</i></p>		<p>grievances. The 969 "buy Buddhist" campaign is in part a response to this. Resource development and economic factors are implicated in Buddhist-Muslim conflicts. <b>Weak property rights and lack of access to justice</b> has created a climate in which people to take the law into their own hands.</p> <p><b>Polarised discourse and propagandizing:</b> Propaganda networks are highly effective in spreading anti-Islamic sentiment, especially when propagated by religious figures and friends, and are directly linked to the instigation of violence. The Myanmar and international (particularly Western) communities produce and respond to fundamentally different discourses about the conflict, creating a polarisation that limits opportunities for constructive, impartial voices and actions. The Myanmar narrative refrains from criticising Buddhists, and contributes to a climate of impunity and intolerance. The international narrative tends to be ignorant of the conflict's causes, and employs a name and shame strategy that serves to reinforce threat perceptions and renders the perception that international actors are biased.</p> <p>- <b>Conflict risk factors:</b> 1) history of violence, 2) rural location, 3) predominantly Buddhist with significant Muslim minority, 4) 969 strongholds and areas of anti-Islamic propagandising, 5) disputed ownership of land and businesses, 6) high political stakes related to the census, elections, or peace process, and 7) absence or erosion of intercommunal linkages and networks for conflict management.</p> <p>- <b>Perceive bias of international interventions:</b> Interventions that are perceived as biased towards Islamic communities can reinforce the perception that Buddhism is under threat, and that international actors don't understand. Constructive and legitimate actors risk being undermined or tarnished by association or competition with visibly international efforts in their communities</p>	
<p>41. NGO Assessment</p> <p><i>Psychosocial Assessment, Sittwe, Myanmar, 2013, LW/Church of Sweden/ACTAlliance</i></p>		<p>4 Muslim camps: OTG 1, OTG 4, OTG 5, Baw Du Pha; 2 Rakhine camps L Set Yone Su, Set Yone Kya</p>	<p>FGDs (24); Individual interviews (72)</p>	<p>PSYCHOSOCIAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Needs</li> <li>- Causes of distress</li> <li>- Coping mechanisms</li> </ul>	<p><b>Camp management and power dynamics:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community members lack trust in CMCs e.g. sent to prison for asking about food distribution plans and bribes to leave camps.</li> <li>- No females or vulnerable people on CMCs, also exclude youth</li> <li>- Religious leaders often have other perceptions/interests to CMCs</li> <li>- Government administrator controls the use of land and considered as person with most power in the camp (often viewed negatively and obstructionist)</li> <li>- Community volunteers collaborating with INGOs: powerful and influential, young and educated. Tend to link friends and relatives with INGOs adding to</li> </ul>	



				<p>perceived lack of transparency</p> <p><b>Protection and freedom of movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Muslims have no freedom of movement or free access to public services: education, health, livelihoods and markets. Police and CMCs take bribes to let people leave the camp</li> <li>- Camps overcrowded = increased risk of SGBV</li> <li>- <b>'Economic IDPs'</b>: not recognised as IDPs, no WFP food, not clear how many. In LWF camps there are around 204 families in OTG 4 (no access to WASH facilities). Particularly vulnerable</li> </ul> <p>Psychosocial wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Causes of distress:</b> lack of schooling, not living at home, not playing with toys, missing friends. Many girls are now isolated with severe movement restrictions outside of their houses. Boys increasingly have same income etc concerns as their fathers. <b>Positives:</b> playing at child friendly spaces and in safe areas, importance of good family relations and feeling safe with their families. CFS for small children but not for teenagers.</li> <li>- <b>Main needs expressed by women:</b> stop CMC abuse, clothes and soap, space for free time, return to homes; representation in committees, reproductive healthcare, nutritional food for babies, hygiene towels; bathing facilities, literacy.</li> <li>- <b>Main needs expressed by men:</b> return home; food and water; better shelter; education; security; vocational training; income generating activities</li> <li>- <b>Factors affecting psychosocial wellbeing:</b> lack of food, employment, information, basic services, freedom of movement, personal space, social support networks and firewood; lack of family life due to overcrowded conditions; selling food to generate income and buy vegetables; lack of activity and income; breakdown of family support structures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Coping mechanisms:</b> used to find support in families and communities through sharing special moments, now many feel overwhelmed and isolated</p> <p>Manifestations of stress/grief: lack of sleep and appetite, sad and crying, no energy and feeling hopeless, thinking constantly about the past, anxiety.</p> <p>Perceptions of INGOs among camp and host communities: dissatisfied that 90 per cent of aid projects target areas with Muslim majorities, poor communicating with communities,</p>	
42. NGO Assessment	Persons with disabilities	Rakhine State	Survey (334 PWD),	PROTECTION – PERSONS WITH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Medical services:</b> Despite primary health service coverage of 69%, 75% had unmet medical needs. Main reasons: unavailability of the service (45%), lack</li> </ul>

<p><i>Needs Assessment, Persons with Disabilities, Rakhine State, Myanmar, June 2016, Handicap International/WTF</i></p>	<p>s</p>		<p><i>FGDs (58 PWD), Key informant interviews (20 PWD)</i></p>	<p><i>DISABILITIES - situation - needs and access to basic services</i></p>	<p>financial resources (27%) and distance (19%). Persons with the most recent onset of disabilities and severe hearing impairment were the most at risks for not receiving appropriate medical care. In persons with some mobility impairment, 78% were not using any assistive device.</p> <p>- <b>Employment/training:</b> In respondents aged of 15 years old or more, the unemployment rate was 78% and higher in females, persons with severe functional impairment, and from Myauk-U district. Only 3% received a vocational training and they were 4 times more likely to currently work compared to other persons with disabilities.</p> <p>- <b>Pension/social service assistance:</b> Only 3% of the persons with disabilities were receiving a pension, principally males over 50 years old. Overall, 81% of the respondents did not receive any assistance or social service within the last two years in particular in Myauk-U and Thandwe districts.</p> <p>- <b>Assistive devices:</b> The most frequent assistive devices or services needed to improve the function of the respondent were related to mobility (46%), physiotherapy, glasses, and hearing aids. The highest priorities reported for improving the living conditions were engaging in business, micro-credit, employment, physical rehabilitation and medication</p> <p>-<b>Education:</b> Higher risk for illiteracy in persons with congenital disabilities and severe hearing impairment revealed that children were not adequately included in educational programs. Distance, access to a bathroom at school, lack of self-confidence, discrimination associated with the financial difficulties of the parents to pay for school costs were the main difficulties faced by the families to send their children to school.</p> <p><b>Psychological distress:</b> Higher psychological distress scores were detected in respondents under 50 years old, from Sittwe and having no access to bathroom facilities.</p>	
--	----------	--	--	---	--	--

<p>44. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Knowledge Attitudes and Practices Survey of Hygiene Behaviors in Sittwe Township, Rakhine State, May 2016, Oxfam/SC/SI</p>	<p>IDP (Muslim and Rakhine) camps and host villages</p>	<p>12 IDP Sittwe camps (Rakhine and Muslims) and villages in which consortium partners working</p>	<p>Household survey (random selection of 260 from 122,000 beneficiaries)</p>	<p>WASH - WASH behaviours</p>	<p><b>Compared with 2015 WASH KAP Survey:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement but still poor understanding of causes of diarrhea</li> <li>- Increase in handwashing with soap or ask to 67% to prevent diarrhea</li> </ul> <p><b>Water:</b> using some method to keep water safe up from 95% to 100%. Muslim camps use ceramic filters more often than Rakhine IDPs; Rakhine IDPs use boiling and cloth filter more often.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Low levels of knowledge about safe water storage</li> </ul> <p><b>Hygiene:</b> Soap less available in Muslim camps than Rakhine, probably due to market access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Better knowledge about critical times for handwashing</li> <li>- Good understanding of food hygiene</li> </ul> <p><b>Sanitation:</b> 88% have access to a functioning latrine, not certain whether adheres to SPHERE standards. Disposal of infant feces still a major concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved access to latrines compared with 2015; only 7% have difficulty accessing latrines in camps. Fear of meeting new people down from 33% in 2015 to 0% in 2016.</li> <li>- Increased sense of latrine ownership (including desludging when full)</li> <li>- <b>Solid waste disposal:</b> Compared with 2015 camps increasingly used waste collection points while villages increasingly burnt solid waste.</li> <li>- <b>Bathing:</b> Many beneficiaries have constructed private bathing areas inside shelters and household compounds. Men and boys increasingly also bathing at household compounds rather than at water points. Large increase in private bathing areas for women and girls almost always within houses.</li> <li>- <b>Menstrual hygiene:</b> 54% increase in use of sanitary pads (from 45% to 98%)</li> </ul> <p><b>WASH:</b> Although WASH agencies have been actively promoting improved hygiene behaviours in the target area for almost 3 years, using a limited range of messaging, both knowledge and subsequently safe hygiene practices remains very low when compared to similar WASH projects conducted in other parts of Myanmar in both emergency and development settings</p>	
---	---	--	--	-------------------------------	--	--

<p>45. NGO Assessment</p> <p>Multi-Camp Shelter Analysis, May 2015, IRC</p>	<p>IDP camps</p>	<p>Sittwe camps</p>	<p>CCCM headcounts; shelter design specifications</p>	<p>SHELTER - % shelters meeting SPHERE standards</p>		Phwe Yar Gone & Set Tar Mar Gyi	Basara	Ohn Taw Gyi 2	Da Pine	Khone Doke Kar 2
					Less than 2m	5%	4%	1%	7%	100%
					2m - 3m	66%	58%	64%	88%	0%
					3m - 3.5m	16%	31%	24%	2%	0%
					Above 3.5m	12%	8%	11%	3%	0%