

**YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES PROGRAMME**

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR
INTERNALLY DISPLACED PEOPLE ENGAGING IN
ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SECTORS DURING
RESETTLEMENT STAGE
(CASE STUDY: NORTHERN SHAN STATE)**

**Naing Bo Bo Min
EMDevS – 26 (15th BATCH)**

DECEMBER, 2019

**YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES PROGRAMME**

**CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERNALLY
DISPLACED PEOPLE ENGAGING IN ECONOMIC AND
DEVELOPMENT SECTORS DURING RESETTLEMENT STAGE
(Case Study: Northern Shan State)**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master
of Development Studies (MDevS)

Supervised by:

Daw Than Win Htay
Lecturer
Department of Economics
Yangon University of Economics

Submitted by:

Naing Bo Bo Min
Roll No. 26
EMDevS (15th Batch)
2017-2019

DECEMBER, 2019

YANGON UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS
MASTER OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES PROGRAMME

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Challenges and Opportunities for Internally Displaced People Engaging in Economic and Development Sectors During Resettlement Stage (Case Study: Northern Shan State)**”, submitted as a partial fulfillment towards the requirements for the degree of Master of Development Studies had been accepted by the Board of Examiners.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

1. Dr. Tin Win
Rector
Yangon University of Economics (Chief Examiner)

2. Dr. Ni Lar Myint Htoo
Pro-Rector
Yangon University of Economics (Examiner)

3. Dr. Kyaw Min Htun
Pro-Rector (Retired)
Yangon University of Economics (Examiner)

4. Dr. Cho Cho Thein
Professor and Head
Department of Economics
Yangon University of Economics (Examiner)

5. Dr. Tha Pye Nyo
Professor
Department of Economics
Yangon University of Economics (Examiner)

December, 2019

ABSTRACT

The resettlement program is an essential part of internally displaced persons (IDPs) which is an important one to engage the economic development of IDPs and general principle of internal displaced people. The study aimed to determine the challenges and opportunities for IDPs engaging in economic and development sectors during resettlement stage in Northern Shan State. This study applied the qualitative study design. A total of 22 in-depth qualitative consultations with 22 participants from northern Shan State were conducted. The findings indicated the most significant factors for gaps and needs of the resettlement program such as living place, job opportunity, safety and security conditions, accessibilities of education and healthcare service. The findings also mentioned that the government needs to support space and land to do cultivation and farming during resettlement stage and international organizations should be able to reduce conflicts and tensions between the IDPs and the host communities which would foster the economic opportunities within the villages. This study recommended options to fill the gaps of resettlement program in Northern Shan State during resettlement stage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to describe my grateful appreciation to Rector Professor Dr. Tin Win, Pro-rector Professor Dr. Ni Lar Myint Htoo, and the Program Manager of Executive Master of Development Studies, Dr. Cho Cho Thein, Professor/Head Department of Economics, Yangon University of Economics, allowed me to study this valuable programme.

In addition, I want to offer my kind regard to faculty members of the Board of Examiners for their wise comments, thoughtful feedback, and valuable suggestions in strengthening this research paper completely. My sincere appreciation must be given to all lecturers from the Executive Master of Development Studies Programme of Yangon University of Economics.

I would like to express my sincere and special gratitude to my supervisor Daw Than Win Htay, Lecturer, Department of Economics, Yangon University of Economics, for her constant encouragement, valuable advice, and kind supervision in completing my research study.

Moreover, I would like to render my heartfelt gratitude and deep thanks to colleagues from the partner organization and camp committee members for their kind participation through questionnaire survey and conduct personal interview to complete my research paper and to explore the key factors for IDPs. In addition, I would like to extend my thanks to all the responsible people who supported me in my thesis survey data collecting and providing me with the necessary information and for this research.

Last but not least, I would like to offer my special thanks and appreciate to senior lecturers, classmates, and colleagues for their kind support, encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Page
ABSTRACTS	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Rationale of the Study	1
1.2 Objective of the Study	2
1.3 Method of Study	2
1.4 Scope and limitations of the Study	3
1.5 Organization of the Study	3
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Definition and Concept of Internally Displaced Person and Resettlement	4
2.2 Internally Displaced Persons around the World	5
2.3 Highlighting Reasons for Resettlement of IDPs	8
2.4 Challenges and opportunities during resettlement in Global	8
2.5 Roles of Various Organizations during Resettlement in Global	9
2.6 IDP Resettlements, Development Needs and Sustainability	13
2.7 Disaster and Development	14
2.8 Post re-settlement challenges	14
2.9 Review on Previous Study	15
CHAPTER III CONTEXT, CONFLICT AND GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS IN MYANMAR	
3.1 Historical and Regional Context of Conflict in Myanmar	17
3.2 Overview of Conflict, Context and Geographical Analysis in Myanmar	21
3.3 Humanitarian Issues in Shan State	24

3.4	Geographical and Socio-economic Conditions about Northern Shan State	21
3.5	Government Resettlement Program	28
3.6	A Growing Impetus for Returns and Resettlement	29
3.7	Political Will and Prospects for Peace	30
3.8	Ensuring a Safe, Dignified and Voluntary Process	31
CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS ON SURVEY RESULTS		
4.1	Survey Profile	33
4.2	Survey Design	34
4.3	Survey Data Analysis and result	35
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION		
5.1	Findings	43
5.2	Suggestion	45
REFERENCES		
APPENDIXES		

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
3.1	Internally Displace Persons in Myanmar	18
3.2	Armed Conflicts in Northern Shan State by Period, 1949 – 2017	21
3.3	Armed Actors in Northern Shan State, 2018	23
3.4	IDP Camps List in Northern Shan State	25
4.1	Selected IDP Camps in Northern Shan State	34
4.2	Challenges during Resettlement Stage	36
4.3	Basic Requirements of IDPs	37
4.4	Common Livelihood Activities of Original Villages	38
4.5	Reason of choosing specific livelihood activities	39
4.6	Main Infrastructure for Development	40
4.7	Needs support from Government, UN, INGOs	42

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCP	Burmese Communist Party
CPB	Communist Party of Burma
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FPNCC	Federal Political Negotiation Consultative Committee
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
INGO	International Non-Government Organization
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KBC	Kachin Baptist Convention
KBC	Kachin Baptist Convention
KNLP	Kayan New Land Party
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MSWRR	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
NCA	National Ceasefire Agreement
NSS	Northern Shan State
PSLA	Palaung State Liberation Army
RCSS	Restoration Council of Shan State
RCSS	Shan State Restoration Council
SAZs	Self-Administered Zones
SSA	Shan State Army
SSA	Shan State Army
SSPP	Shan State Progressive Party
TNLA	Ta'ang National Liberation Army
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
USDP	Union Solidarity and Development Party
UWSA	United Wa State Army

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale of the Study

The Global report on internal displacement mentioned that new displacements from disasters and conflicts were 28 million atwart 148 countries and territories. Moreover among the ten worst affected countries, nine countries were accounted for more than a million of new displacement each. Several countries such as Ethiopia, Nigeria and Afghanistan, were affected by displacement associated with both conflict and disasters. Many people who fled disasters in countries such as Syria, Somalia, Iraq and Yemen, had already been displaced by conflict. The UNOCHA declare the top three largest number of IDPs in countries in 2018. They were Myanmar, Kenya and Afghanistan (OCHA). Robust information on all of these dimensions is needed to form an evidence base for the decisions and actions of policymakers, planners and responders working to provide durable solutions to IDPs and reduce the risk of future displacement.

This study explored the challenges and opportunities for internal displaced people engaging in economic and development sectors during resettlement stage in northern Shan State of Myanmar. The northern Shan State presents an excellent opportunity to answer this research question given the post-conflict environment and tons of IDPs camp were scattered throughout the state. In addition, there is limited evidence in the area of assessing the challenges and opportunities for IDPs in northern Shan State, and this problem can be underestimated or overestimated without proper assessment and studies. On the other hand, determining the actual burden of IDPs is the important step in combatting this threat. A qualitative interview is commonly used method to enhance the understanding of challenges and barriers for IDPs which can yield highly accurate qualitative information that can be used in designing the strategies for resettlement stage.

Current knowledge relating with economic and development opportunities for IDPs in northern Shan States is currently very limited, and this situation is more evident in remote areas especially for the minorities in the conflict-affected areas of Myanmar.

Moreover, little international support has so far targeted to improve the access to justice for housing, land and property disputes for IDPs in Myanmar was mentioned in IRC report 2018. This highlights the knowledge gaps in this field area of study and it is of great importance to examine actual practices in each setting and then to discuss possible strategies for promoting the economic and development opportunities during resettlement stage. It is very crucial to understand the current situation of IDPs and their recommendation could be considered as an important component of peace process.

The study investigated the multi-dimensional impacts as well as consequence of conflict through conducting the interview with all relevant stakeholders residing in the camp. This examined the impacts of internal displacement on the economic potential of IDPs, vulnerable communities and societies as a whole, improved the linkage between the knowledge gap and policy discussion through the interviews with policy stakeholders and camp leaders concerned with economic development.

A well-designed qualitative approach was used in this study, which can inform economic and development opportunities and help the researchers to understand social relations and context. The findings from this study will provide the linkage between displacement and low levels of socioeconomic development, and the needs for government to promote economic and development opportunities in the favor of an inclusive and sustainable society.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

- 1) to identify the current status of IDPs
- 2) to understand how IDPs will involve in economic and development sector
- 3) to examine the challenges and opportunities of IDPs during resettlement stage

1.3 Method of Study

The qualitative study design was used to explore the involvement of IDPs in economic and development sectors, challenges and opportunities of IDPs during resettlement and recommendation for the improvements assisting IDPs. In comparison with focus groups, these in-depth interviews enabled our fieldworkers to talk to individual participants on a one-on-one basis, which guaranteed more privacy and confidentiality. This interview allowed participants without exposing their identity or exposing their opinions to other people in the community. Participants were selected

through convenience sampling from IDPs camps from northern Shan State. Member of camp management committee members of different ages was selected in order to capture the needs, concerns, opportunities and challenges engaging in economic and development sectors during resettlement.

1.4 Scope and Limitations of the Study

From the researchers' perspective, the twenty-two cases may not adequately represent all the conditions of IDPs from northern Shan State. However, there is unstable political condition making unsecured environment, advocacy with township authorities and ethnic group and the approval from these groups is required to obtain in advance. Language barriers is a major challenge in conducting interview. The researcher recruited the interviewers who can communicate with the local languages and it was mandatory to recruit for data collection and interview. Respondent bias may occur in this study, since respondents may pretend or provide inaccurate information about over protection of community and security commitment. Since the perception and thinking may differ from person to person, depending upon the personality and background environment of each individual and psychological trauma might overwhelm in their way of speaking.

1.5 Organization of the Study

The organization of this study arranges into the five main chapters. The first chapter implies the introductory facet reflecting the background, objectives, methodology, scope and limitation of the study and organization of the study. The chapter two compromises the relevant literature review while the third three contains context, conflict and geography analysis in Myanmar. After that, the chapter four includes research methodology, the analysis of the data and analysis result gathered. The final chapter, chapter five provides the findings and suggestion of the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definition and Concept of Internally Displaced Person and Resettlement

In 1951, the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees defines IDPs as “persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border” (Affairs, 2004) (Fact sheet on Internal Displacement, 2019).

The Asian Research Center for Migration at the Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, researched the resettlement system in 2011 and documented the situation of displaced persons as a sustainable solution. Resettlement in this study is that it continues to play a meaningful role in the situation of displaced persons as a palliative, defensive, and sustainable solution. UNHCR has recommended the three equally important resettlement roles that it can be used to address the security or special needs of particular refugees, including those whose fundamental freedoms, safety or health are at risk within the first asylum country. Second, it can act as a major sustainable solution for large refugee populations, with or without the other two long-lasting voluntary repatriation and local integration solutions. Finally, it can act as an example of international solidarity and transfer of the burden on developed nations to host countries. According to circumstances where there are no other ways to secure refugees' legal rights or physical security, it typically becomes priority (Chulalongkorn, 2019).

High-level resettlement engagement by resolving policy and personal constraints is necessary to sustain a carefully tailored system that prevents families from going on with their lives. In addition, combine options for local inclusion and livelihoods to involve IDPs in the economic and development market. In accordance with the guiding principles of the United Nations on internal displacement, internally displaced persons (IDPs) are persons or groups of persons forced or forced to flee or

leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the consequences of armed conflict, circumstances of widespread violence, human rights violations or natural violations. Global Report for 2018 reported that about 41.3 million people had to leave their places and displaced within countries, while 20-25 million people were displaced annually due to natural and man-made disasters.

Over the past few years, many initiatives have focused on supporting and addressing protracted internal displacement of IDPs through a more coordinated approach between the humanitarian and development sectors. The Policy Committee Decision of the Secretary-General on Sustainable Solutions for IDPs and Returns, based on the 2010 Inter-Agency Standing Committee Framework on Sustainable Solutions for IDPs, acknowledged the need to include all humanitarian and development actors, such as the World Bank, in post-conflict efforts to promote solutions. In 2015, the Sustainable Development Goals, taking into account the most vulnerable people, such as IDPs, recognized the importance of governments on their journey to more inclusive and sustainable development. The Humanity Agenda of the Secretary-General called for a 50 percent reduction in the number of IDPs by 2030 in line with international standards. During the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, several nations, UN agencies and NGOs agreed to adopt a new approach to forced displacement, including in prolonged crises (UNHCR, 2017)

2.2 Internally Displaced Persons around the World

According to figures from the Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC), an estimated 41.3 million people were internally displaced as a result of armed conflict, widespread violence or human rights violations at the end of 2018. This is an improvement from the record 40.0 million in 2017. The minor decreases of the previous years have been reversed and in 2018 the internally displaced population was the highest IDMC ever recorded. Since the launch of the inter-agency cluster strategy in January 2006, UNHCR and cluster members have obtained IDP statistics together. UNHCR offices registered a total of 41.4 million at the end of 2018, including those in IDP-like circumstances, compared to 39.1 million at the end of 2017. In 2018, an IDP population was registered by 31 UNHCR operations compared to 32 in the previous year and 29 in 2016. As has been the case since 2015, according to government statistics, Colombia continued to record the highest number of internally displaced persons at 7,816,500 at the end of 2018. 118,200 new displacements were registered

during 2018, without any returns or other decreases. (UNHCR, Global Trend Force Displacement, 2018).

The areas most affected by mass displacements included the north-eastern border of Colombia with Venezuela, the southern border of Ecuador, the Pacific coast bordering Panama, and the north-western border of the provinces of Norte de Santander, Narino, Antioquia and Choco. Similarly, Syria remained the country with the second highest internal displacement point. 256,700 new displacements with a total displaced population of 6,183,900 were registered during 2018. The continuing fighting in Eastern Ghouta and Afrin led to widespread migration to Rural Damascus and northern Syria as the Syrian crisis entered its eighth year. In southern Syria, escalating tensions forced people to flee west to the Jordan border and the Golan Heights. Sporadic shelling and infighting of artillery among non-state armed groups in northwestern Syria and south-east Deir-ez-Zor forced successive waves of new displacement into Idlib Governorate, exacerbating existing pressures. While there have been displacements in many parts of the country, Idlib Governorate has reported more than half of the new displacements. The DRC's IDP population continued to rise from 4,351,400 by the end of 2017 to 4,516,900 by the end of 2018. In 2018, 322,000 new displacements were registered, with the most affected provinces in South Kivu, North Kivu, Tanganyika and Kasai. The ongoing electoral process continued to drive major displacement through active conflicts and political uncertainty. Nevertheless, some spontaneous returns were encouraged by improved security across some Tanganyika territories. At 602,700 new displacements in 2018, Somalia experienced a significant rise in internal displacement. Which brought the total displaced population to approximately 2,648,000, the fourth largest IDP group, and a 25 percent increase over 2018. The highest refugee population in southern central Somalia was concentrated, while by the end of 2018 the bulk of newly displaced people were living in Somaliland. Armed conflict and food insecurity continued to drive large-scale migration, primarily to urban areas, where around 80% of Somali IDPs remained in 2018. Even where violence had ended, many IDPs were hesitant to return because of fear of persecution and limited availability of social services and opportunities for living. Sexual and gender abuse, child recruitment and attacks on civilian areas and infrastructure remained widespread in the humanitarian crisis as violent fighting escalated existing risks (Grandi, 2018).

In Ethiopia, the internally displaced population has increased significantly, more than doubling from 1,078,400 at the beginning of 2018 to 2,615,800 at the end.

The rise is accounted for by more than 1.5 million new displacements, mostly due to the conflict in the Western Guji and Gedeo areas along the border of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Region (SNNPR) and the Somali region of Oromia. While localized, small-scale displacements have always occurred in the country due to community-level disputes across regional borders over pasture and water rights, widespread intercommunal conflict during 2018 resulted in mass displacement, with communities living along contested boundaries most affected (DTM, 2018).

In Nigeria, too, the internally displaced population increased. There were 2,167,900 displaced people in the country at the end of 2018, a rise of 27 percent over the year. Both 581,700 new displacements and 176,200 returns were included in internal movements. At 195,000 but also the highest levels of returning IDPs (80,100), Borno State saw the highest level of new displacement. Though regional military forces made gains against the Boko Haram insurgency in 2018 and managed to temporarily improve the security situation in particular areas of the Lake Chad Basin, the conflict in north-eastern Nigeria has continued for over a decade and showed little sign of decline, with non-state armed attacks driving further displacement throughout 2018. There were 2,144,700 internally displaced people in Yemen at the end of 2018. Although this has been a relatively small overall increase over the year, it has obscured a high level of migration, with 264,300 newly displaced and 133,600 returning to their localities of origin, often to areas still affected by war and with continuing humanitarian needs and limited access. While many regions of Yemen were affected by displacement, Taizz and Al Hudaydah Governorate witnessed the highest level of new displacement, with the largest IDP population overall reported in Taizz Governorate. Since the beginning of escalations, about 60 percent of the refugee population had been returned. At the end of 2018, Afghanistan's internally displaced population stood at 2.1 million compared to 1.8 million at the end of 2017. New displacements and returns have occurred throughout the year, frequently happening in the same province simultaneously. While there was a slight increase in the IDP population in Ghazni Province from 57,800 to 62,400, there were 37,000 new internal displacements and 33,200 returns. Nangarhar with 279,700 people was the province with the highest IDP population, followed by Helmand. At almost two-thirds of the population living in conflict-affected areas, it has become a permanent feature of population movement. A combination of factors resulting from escalating violence, forced displacement, loss of

fundamental livelihoods and inadequate access to basic services exacerbated chronic deprivation, food insecurity and unemployment vulnerabilities (Council, 2019).

2.3 Highlighting Reasons for Resettlement of IDPs

The return and relocation of refugees and IDPs is a situation in which the possibility of a voluntary, secure and dignified return to their homes or resettlement into new homes and communities is guaranteed to all persons displaced from their homes during war. Returnees should agree to property restitution or compensation once they reach their destinations, and should receive strong support for reintegration and recovery to establish their livelihoods and contribute to long-term economic and political stability. Displaced persons will serve as vital and necessary human resources for the rebuilding of the host nation with proper support. Return and resettlement can be a tangible end to violent conflict, legitimize the new political order, and return the violence-affected population to normal life. Resolving national, residential and property rights would lead to an important, trustworthy and lasting relationship between the state and the public.

Free and voluntary return or resettlement requires a return selection guarantee and a security guarantee for those who choose to return. Such mechanisms include reuniting families and separate support systems due to violent conflict and ensuring a secure and voluntary path for refugees returning to their home country, IDPs returning to their hometowns, or any displaced persons or groups resettling in new communities. Planning needs reliable information about the areas where the displaced try to migrate or resettle in order to minimize the challenges they face when they arrive. While collecting credible information about the numbers and conditions of IDPs and refugees is important, it is also important not to jeopardize the security and freedom of movement of displaced people (United State Institute of Peace, 2019).

2.4 Challenges and Opportunities during Resettlement Globally

Relocation of IDPs is a situation in which the option of voluntary, secure and dignified return to their homes or relocation into new homes and communities is guaranteed to all persons displaced from their homes during conflict. A key feature of resettlement is that returning IDPs should use proper compensation and integration to restore their livelihood activities and contribute to the region's long-term economic and political stability. Returnee IDPs will shape very important and vital human resources

to rebuild the region and nation as a whole with proper support from IDPs in the resettlement process. Returning and resettling IDPs are often a clear end to violent conflict, legitimizing the new political order, and returning normal life to the population affected by violence.

UNHCR has warned repeatedly of the difference between the number of refugees in need of resettlement and the resettlement places available. One of the Global Strategic Priorities (GSP) of UNHCR endorsed by its Executive Committee in October 2009 foresees a 10 percent increase in resettlement sites (including emergency/emergency sites) in 2010-2011. Ten percent represents an additional 8,000 resettlement places in the current context. In addition to new resettlement states that announced resettlement programs and began implementing their programs, Canada announced an increase of 500 refugee quota (from 7,500 to 8,000) from their government assisted. Nonetheless, the target will not be reached unless there are new opportunities for additional resettlement countries.

The challenge of bridging the gap between needs and capacity for resettlement is not a problem that resides with resettlement states alone. UNHCR is also facing a significant gap between the need for resettlement and its ability to process cases of resettlement. Resettlement is hard labor and requires complex processes. Although UNHCR has enhanced resettlement positions as part of the High Commissioner's Protection Capacity Initiative, the total number of resettlement positions remains small, having to rely heavily on the associated workforce mainly through the UNHCR Resettlement Deployment Program, where resettlement experts are deployed mainly in Africa and the Middle East in UNHCR resettlement operations. Without affiliated workforce, less than half of the projected needs for resettlement in 2011 will be addressed by UNHCR. (UNHCR, Overview of Global Resettlement and current challenges, 2010-2011)

2.5 Roles of Various Organizations during Resettlement in Global

The UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement published in 1998 stress that it is the duty of the national authorities to create conditions for secure, voluntary and dignified return, as well as to provide the means to assist IDPs to voluntarily seek sustainable solutions in safety and dignity. Most states, however, regard guiding principles as non-binding, and even as intervening in a sovereign issue. These authorities are therefore more often than not reluctant or unable to meet these

responsibilities, causing large numbers of IDPs to flee several times as a result of exposure to more crime, starvation and disease. Kellenberger argued that the extent of the internal displacement issue is generally beyond the ability of any single actor, as it needs the participation of various actors, such as bilateral government donors and NGOs, in a systematically organized effort to increase the use of their resources, capacities and competences. In addition, NGOs are currently the second largest source of security and relief because of their position as implementing partners with organizations such as the United Nations. NGOs' work in displacement situations, however, is limited by their lack of formal mandates or charters for working with IDPs, and lack of government collaboration and cooperation. Kellenberger added that international and local actors who aim to assist IDPs face challenges in delivering reliable and comprehensive humanitarian assistance to IDPs returning to their places of origin or settling locally in the community where they were accommodated or moving to another area, more so when governments allow IDPs to return to ensure political stability even when security on the ground does not exist. After several decades of war between the Sinhalese and Tamils, this was the case in Sri Lanka. Chandran observed that the relocation of IDPs after the war in Sri Lanka posed a major challenge to the government as it was hard pressed to inform and reassure people that there would no longer be risks of terrorist attacks and that those affected would actually be able to return and live normal lives (OCHA, 1998).

Chandran observed that governments are challenged during the resettlement of IDPs to provide the displaced population with protection, good pre-return conditions and property recovery. On the other hand, Kuhlman pointed out that IDPs are facing economic challenges due to the lack of infrastructure, land and working resources. He is wondering how people can rebuild their lives in situations where they have lost their homes, jobs, and the trauma of violence is suffering. In a case study of the conflict in Sudan, Chang' (2007) found that the quest for security is a significant trigger for the growth of IDPs in sub-Saharan Africa. He points out that the government of Sudan has been insensitive to sharing national resources with the then southern Sudan region for many years, leading to an increase in the country's IDPs. Chang' (2007) reported that research has shown that Sudan has used the Janjaweed militia to terrorize the territory of South Sudan in an effort to separate communities from the oil-rich territories. In that regard, Sudan's government was slow and reluctant to provide the IDPs with defense, leading to unimagined humanitarian crisis. A sudden change in government policy

could challenge IDPs as well. Yulia & Tabib analyzed IDPs' vulnerabilities and security needs in Arzarbaja and found that IDPs depend for more than half of their income on government transfers. The study found that Arzarbaja's government failed to take into account that during several years of displacement some IDPs have been able to integrate into mainstream society and have improved their lives. In reality, some Arzarbaja IDPs fared better than host communities or gained more from other lands they occupied. The study castigates the overall approach to IDPs by adding that the strategy failed to use effectively the limited state funds allocated for this purpose (Committee, 2010).

Many studies have suggested that settling IDPs is not enough if their livelihoods and survival means are not guaranteed. Each of these studies proposes that the resettlement and integration process of IDPs should involve international and local NGOs. In particular, Goetze argues that the design of policies for relief and development will stress the need to track how humanitarian aid is used to meet their basic needs of displaced persons in order to avoid abuse of the same aid. Kenya's post-conflict research on IDPs indicate that there has been no humanitarian response to the violence (Kamungi and Klopp, 2008; and Kitale, 2011). In particular, the study by Kitale (2011) study shows that the government response to the crisis was timid, and that of the humanitarian NGOs offered a temporary solution, for their response was considerably short-lived probably owing to the position of Kenya in the Horn of Africa, a region that had major conflicts in countries of Somalia, Sudan and Uganda. Unlike Waki (2008) and Kitale (2011), Klopp (2009) accused the government of hypocrisy and lack of policy for IDP resettlement. She states that all stakeholders need to bridge the gap between short-term emergency funding and long-term development assistance if sustainable solutions are to be sought for IDPs. In April 2008 the Kenya government released the National Reconciliation and Emergency Social and Economic Recovery Strategy as a way forward to resettle the displaced persons. The government preferred a quick resettlement in order to promote development, improve the national image abroad, prevent IDP camps from becoming fertile grounds for militia and criminal gang recruitment, and to enhance human rights of the displaced. The government focused on resettling and assisting displaced persons through the National Humanitarian Fund for Mitigation and Resettlement by providing housing accommodation and promoting livelihoods and reconciliation. This activity enabled a number of families to resettle and return to their farms, but the scheme was heavily criticized by a section of civil society

and the media as having been grossly mismanaged. Meanwhile, hundreds of local and foreign NGOs have become involved in the post-election violence follow-up to reduce the IDP's suffering. The IDPs also protested that they were not consulted with some of them satisfied with the agreement to move back to their former residences. There was also a need for a lasting solution to the reintegration of IDPs, instead of providing improved security in the form of many police posts (Okuto, 2018).

The basic definition of internally displaced persons addresses the unique needs of internally displaced people around the world. We recognize rights and protections related to the protection of persons from forced displacement and their security and assistance to their displacement as well as to returning or resettling and reintegrating them. These principles included “Competent authorities have the primary duty and obligation to create conditions and provide the means to enable internally displaced persons to return to their homes or places of habitual residence voluntarily, in safety and dignity, or to resettle voluntarily in another part of the country. Those authorities shall aim to promote the reintegration of internally displaced people who have been released or resettled.” “Special efforts should be made to ensure that internally displaced people are fully involved in planning and managing their return or relocation and reintegration.” “There shall be no discrimination against internally displaced persons who have returned to their homes or places of habitual residence or who have resettled in another part of the country as a result of their displacement. We shall have the right to be fully and fairly involved in public relations at all levels and to have equitable access to public services.” “Competent authorities have the duty and responsibility to support returning and/or resettled internally displaced persons in restoring, to the extent possible, their properties and belongings left behind or dispossessed after their displacement. When recovery of such property and possessions is not possible, the competent authorities shall support or assist those individuals in securing appropriate compensation or other forms of reparation. All the authorities concerned shall grant and promote rapid and unimpeded access for international humanitarian organizations and other related actors to assist in their return or relocation and reintegration in the exercise of their respective mandates to internally displaced persons. (ICRC, 1998).

2.6 IDP Resettlements, Development Needs and Sustainability

The global population of forcibly displaced persons has increased significantly over the past decade, from 43.3 million in 2009 to 70.8 million in 2018, hitting a record high. Around 2012 and 2015, most of this rise was driven by the Syrian conflict. Yet conflicts in other areas have led to this development, including in the Middle East such as Iraq and Yemen, parts of sub-Saharan Africa such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and South Sudan, as well as the large influx of Rohingya refugees to Bangladesh at the end of 2017. The increase in the number of displaced persons due to internal displacement in Ethiopia and new claims for asylum from people fleeing the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela was particularly noteworthy in 2018. The proportion of the world's displaced population has continued to rise as the increase in the world's forcibly displaced population outperformed the growth of the world's population. In 2017, the figure was 1 out of 110 people, but it was 1 out of 108 people in 2018. In contrast, this was about 1 in 160 people a decade ago. Overall, the UNHCR mandate of the refugee population has almost doubled since 2012 (Refugees, 2019).

The international organization assisted the end of migration by promoting the reduction of displacement and seeking a lasting solution. The welfare and protection of IDPs is the government's primary duty with South summary (2008). The provision of services by national governments increases both the stage of the camp and the stage of resettlement. Displaced people need to be generated to enjoy living standards such as housing, health care, food, water and others and reduce discrimination. In order to achieve a sustainable solution, IDPs have access to land, household, livelihoods, mine risk knowledge, jobs and other economic opportunities, as well as access to health care, education. The sustainable resettlement program must be accepted as a sustainable solution and implemented (A Preliminary Operational Guide to the United Nations Secretary-General's Decision on Durable Solutions to Displacement, 2016).

UNDP's support for displaced persons includes the following measures that fit with UNPD's priorities for 2014-2017: ensuring that initiatives and policy resources are evidence-based within their country context. Our evaluation of livelihoods and capacity needs should be able to inform us of key development strategies for displacement; guiding early recovery with a focus on jobs and livelihoods for IDPs and refugees; setting a long-term vision for economic development; helping governments to ensure better governance structures for IDPs and the return of refugees by addressing the rule of law and accommodation (UNDP, 2013).

2.7 Disaster and Development

The IDPs lost social assets including health and services, drinking water, school and housing following the admission of the IDPs camps. During times of crises, it is not possible to increase social development such as healthcare, sanitation, etc. It is understood that individuals are finding opportunities not only to recognize their own quality of life, but also to improve the health and educational achievement of their children. In Sri Lanka, the Refugee Council emphasized the safe return of IDPs. There were many difficulties that included the inability to meet basic needs such as water, food, sanitation, housing, sanitation, medical treatment, privacy, and difficulty in competing with the host community to obtain good jobs. MDGs (Millennium Development Goals) detected the need to solve the economic status and the educational aspect of both man-made disaster and natural disaster people, which are both development interventions that happened a direct impact on post-resettlement human development. Consequently, in reflecting on the Millennium Declaration of the United Nations (UN) adopted in 2000, Schipper and Pelling identified how disasters affect the MDGs. The deficit in development assistance to address the long-term economic and social impacts of displacement cannot be overestimated, according to Harild and Christensen (2010). Design actors are often slow to consider the development needs of IDPs. A lasting solution for IDPs has main hurdles. A fourfold critical development challenges are as indicated below; Rights to land, property and houses that to the displaced are in many return situations contested, or the assets of the returnees have been taken over by others, Deterioration of livelihood or depending on humanitarian aid, and livelihood rehabilitation is critical if solutions to displacement are to be sustainable, both if the displaced return home. Service delivery such as defense, education and health along with basic infrastructure is not adequate or missing in both exile and return locations (Unicef, 2018).

2.8 Post Re-Settlement Challenges

Governments around the world are facing various obstacles in the process of resettlement. Among other places, livelihood conditions have often suffered as a result of displacement, according to Catharine Brun (2005). People generally don't go back to the exact life and culture they left behind, creating a solution that is vague (Brun, 2005). Return or relocation to another area or local incorporation is an appropriate solution to address the issue of IDPs. There is no luxury road, however, as any government should

provide them with a sustainable solution (Institution, 2007). In some situations, local incorporation may be a better solution for long-term IDPs for Puttalam. In addition to returning and settling elsewhere in the region, governments such as Nepal and Burundi have also acknowledged local inclusion for IDPs in their peace agreements. In addition, Burundi, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Russian Federation and Serbia have made several attempts to promote local IDP integration (Brookings Institution, 2007). Therefore, returning to the original places is one option according to Guiding Principles for displaced persons. According to Wessel (2007), the government should plan a system integrated in any resettlement program to provide adequate housing, water and sanitation, their previous livelihoods and new forms of income generation training. (Godagama, 2012).

2.9 Review on Previous Studies

Lall (2014) studied about this was aimed at evaluating the effect of development interventions channeled through IDP camps in Mannar District, Sri Lanka, on key development aspects of resettled IDPs in the first review of the previous study on an evaluation of interventions channeled through IDP camps. The key finding was that the resettlement strategy adopted was ad-hoc and unsuccessful except in the areas of education and health resulting in a lack of positive impact on the quality of life of resettled IDPs due to the optimum efforts of all stakeholders including the government and also the major constraints faced by them. Key research recommendations include revisiting the resettlement scenario and implementing vocational and technical training schools, designing housing policies for resettled IDPs, bi-lateral and donor funding and starting programs for INGOs to improve the health and productivity of IDPs; promoting the establishment of large-scale enterprises and inviting private sector investment. Ultimately, based on the lessons learned from the resettlement approach, the researcher created a model of resettlement that provides a comprehensive and coordinated strategy that can be used anywhere in the world in a similar situation to ensure a permanent and sustainable solution in an IDP or refugee situation.

Carl LeVan (2018) studied on the challenges of internally displaced person (IDPs) Barkin Ladi local government council of Plateau State. Despite the fact that domestic government, international organizations and non-governmental organizations offer one form of assistance in supporting these displaced persons, despite these numerous challenges, the displaced persons continue to experience untold hardship

without any lasting solution, instead of ending their suffering. The results from the study showed that IDPs are facing many challenges, ranging from food shortages, poor sanitation and health care, lack of safety, and the prevalence of rape and abuse in the camp. It suggests, therefore, that the peace-building process of reconciliation, recovery and restoration is the most crucial component of these vulnerable people's resettlement. Government must take proactive steps to provide the necessary incentives and provide the IDPs with protection. Again, good governance is a panacea to peaceful coexistence.

CHAPTER III
CONTEXT, CONFLICT AND GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS
IN MYANMAR

3.1 Historical and Regional Context of Conflict in Myanmar

The internal armed conflict in Myanmar began in 1948 shortly after gaining independence from Britain. The key armed actors in the civil wars of Myanmar included the Myanmar Defense Services, or Tatmadaw and hundreds of armed resistance groups. In 2008, after decades of militarized brutality under civilian and then military regimes, the Tatmadaw launched political reforms that allowed the transition to a quasi-democratic or hybrid system. Since March 2016, these efforts have been continued by the government-led National League for Democracy (NLD). Since 2011, there have been several significant changes in the engagement patterns between the Tatmadaw and EAOs. The first is the promulgation of a multilateral ceasefire agreement involving the civilian government, the Tatmadaw, and ten EAOs. The October 2015 Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) aims to provide a mechanism for dialog to address the conflict-fueled political issues. The second is that the Tatmadaw now accepts discussion of the once-taboo question of federalism, and in principle agrees with its inclusion in Myanmar's future political reform. This topic was historically problematic for the Tatmadaw, and was perceived as a threat to the country's stability. Nevertheless, at the same time there has also been an escalation in violence during this era of change. Some areas have experienced a return to chronic militarized conflict and instability, including but not limited to northern Shan State. The escalation of violence and military operations in these areas further weakened the trust of local EAOs and communities in the cease-fire process, ultimately hampering the overall peace process and peace-building (Policy, 2018)

Table 3.1 shows the number of IDPs in Myanmar from year 2015 to 2019.

Table 3.1: Internally Displace Persons in Myanmar

Townships	Internally Displace Persons				
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Kachin	88,887	88,887	86,900	91,739	97,227
Bhamo	8,790	8,790	7,944	8,306	8,100
Chipwi	2,537	2,537	2,649	2,569	2,904
Hpakant	3,661	3,661	3,867	3,590	3,949
Kaunglanhpu	17	17	17		
Mansi	13,836	13,836	12,661	13,251	13,408
Mogaung	373	373	436	349	1,478
Mohnyin	504	504	338	410	399
Momauk	24,146	24,146	16,134	24,769	24,865
Myitkyina	6,936	6,936	5,959	7,589	12,997
Putao	520	520	388	412	412
Shwegu	2,207	2,207	2,121	2,577	541
Sumprabum	1,232	1,232	1,232	764	1,001
Tanai				1,875	1,285
Waingmaw	24,128	24,128	33,154	25,278	25,888
Shan	7,541	7,541	10,738	15,006	8,815
Hseni	665	665	652	566	168
Hsipaw				178	120
Konkyan				2,149	
Kutai	2,789	2,789	5,071	4,379	4,169
Lashio				146	
Laukkaing				1,555	
Manton	355	355	530	718	541
Muse	1,338	1,338	1,012	2,091	1,051
Namhkan	1,822	1,822	2,832	1,960	2,010
Namtu	572	572	641	1,166	756
Nawngkhio				98	
Rakhine	143,887	143,887	119,876	128,908	128,141
Buthidaung			94,091		
Kyaukphyu	1,601	1,601	1,601	1,274	1,050
Kyauktaw	6,594	6,594	546	546	546
Maungdaw	1,400	1,400	1,148		
Myinbya	5,187	5,187			
Mrauk-U	3,688	3,688			
Myebon	2,899	2,899	2,718	2,606	2,690
Pauktaw	19,524	19,524	15,942	22,239	22,225
Ramree	264	264	264		
Rakhedaung	4,055	4,055	3,566		
Sittwe	98,675	98,675		102,243	101,630
Total Kayin	-	-	-	5,616	10,300
Hlaingbwe				5,616	10,300
Total	240,315	240,315	217,514	241,269	244,483

Source: Humanitarian Needs Overview, Myanmar

Shan State is Myanmar's largest and most populous administrative district, comprising approximately 25 percent of its territory and with a population of 5,824 million. The state has a long international border with northern and eastern China, and southern Thailand and Laos. In Myanmar, Shan State is bordered on the north by Kachin, on the west by Mandalay, on the southwest by Bago and on the south by Kayin and Kayah. The state is divided into three areas for convenience (Shan East, Shan North, and Shan South), representing the division of the military into three commands. Five of the six Self-Administered Zones (SAZs) in Myanmar are in Shan State: Shan South Pa'O and Danu SAZs and Shan North Kokant, Palaung and Wa SAZs. There are a number of other ethnic minorities in Shan State, including Kachin, Intha and Kayan, in addition to these five communities and the Shan. There are also groups that are not among Myanmar's recognized national ethnic races, but still have distinct communities. These include the Panthay, Nepalis, and Indians.

Its location, fertile soil and extensive natural resources make Shan State a trading hub of potential importance. However, insecurity and inaccessibility led to drug trafficking taking precedence over other companies. The economy is dominated by the agricultural sector, followed by mining in importance. A large proportion of the population are also seeking work abroad, mostly in China or Thailand.

Shan State as a single entity or administrative unit is a relatively recent phenomenon; a number of independent kingdoms, with internal boundaries and alliances shifting, were historically the Shan States. Similarly, the relations between the kingdoms and the Burmese empire, but also with other neighboring forces (especially Thailand and China), varied and encompassed conflict, alliance, lack of contact and tributary status at different times. While the British "pacified" the Shan States and integrated them into British Burma's "Frontier Areas" administration, they permitted the ruling princes to maintain a high level of autonomy, so that it wasn't until independence that Shan State was established as a single administrative unit.

The Shan State's unification with Myanmar had led to uprisings in 1962, especially by the Burmese Communist Party (BCP). Also sprang up a plethora of EAOs, particularly in northern Shan State. The first branch of Shan emerged under the banner of Num Sik Han in 1958. It merged with another Shan party in 1964 to form the Shan State Army (SSA), which remains one of the most active and powerful EAOs in Shan

State today, after experiencing many transformations during the 1960s. In 1971, the Shan State Progressive Party (SSPP) was formed as the political wing of the SSA. The proliferation and growing unruliness of local militias, which were formed in 1963 to combat insurgents in remote areas, added to the anarchic situation in Shan State in the 1960s and 1970s. Such organizations were encouraged to develop and enable self-sufficient activity, albeit without central government support. Most turned to drug and mineral trade in these situations to finance their activities.

The dissolution of the BCP and a government actively pursuing ceasefires resulted in two decades in which the situation was relatively stable and little actual conflict occurred.

The peace process became more organized and systematic under the government of the Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP), eventually leading to the signing of the National Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) in 2015. Of the EAOs currently operating in Shan State, two are signatories to the NCA, the Shan State Restoration Council (RCSS) and the Democratic Army of Lahu. The SSA / SSPP and the United Wa State Army (UWSA) have with the government bilateral ceasefires, but they did not join the NCA. After taking office, the government of the National League for Democracy (NLD) has vowed to continue the peace process as part of the NCA. While the process improvements have been relatively small and superficial to some degree, they have impacted the government's relationship with EAOs. The situation in the various areas is very different as of today. The situation is largely peaceful in Shan South and Shan East, with only a few clashes recorded over the past few years, often without casualties. This has led to easier movement and increased trade with Thailand and China in Shan East, as well as a decrease in the number of armed groups patrolling the area. The number of militia groups has increased, however, adding to the picture's difficulty. The situation in Pekon Township in Shan South deserves special consideration. There is a large population of Kayans in this township and there is a notable presence of the Kayan New Land Party (KNLP). Although the KNLP has had a ceasefire with the government since 1994, it remains an influential actor and is committed to securing an SAZ for the Kayan people. The northern Shan State situation is much worse.

3.2 Overview of Conflict, Context and Geographical Analysis in Northern Shan State

Since Myanmar's independence, armed conflicts in northern Shan State first erupted, involving hundreds of armed groups. Among the first actions of the Tatmadaw were those against the incursions of Chinese forces from the Kuomintang (KMT) of Chiang Kai-shek in 1949. At the same time, militarized conflict began in the late 1940s in Myanmar between the Tatmadaw and several ethno-nationalist and ideologically motivated organizations, and the Tatmadaw and these armed groups were engaged in ongoing civil wars for the next several decades. In addition to the Communist Party of Burma (CPB), the Shan State Army/Shan State Progress Party (SSA/SSPP), the Kachin Independence Organization (KIO) and the Palaung State Liberation Army (PSLA) were among the largest and most influential ethnic armed organizations (EAOs) operating in northern Shan State. There was also an unknown number of militias largely associated with Tatmadaw. While the main axis of struggle was between the Tatmadaw and armed groups, instances of conflict between EAOs occurred, and alliances were formed between EAOs that waxed and waned over the post-independence period in terms of strength and power. A series of arrangements between EAOs and the military government were concluded between 1989 and 1996 after several decades of fighting, resulting in a reduction of militarized conflicts in northern Shan State. Although armed violence subsided in the post-1996 ceasefire period, key political issues surrounding EAO's demands for greater autonomy and federalism remained unresolved. In addition, armed actors did not fully demobilize. This created a situation that academics described as "neither war nor peace". The following Table 3.2 shows the Armed Conflicts in Northern Shan State by Period from 1949 to 2017.

Table 3.2: Armed Conflicts in Northern Shan State by Period (1949 – 2017)

No.	Time	Period
1	1949-1958	Onset of Armed Conflict
2	1959-1967	The Rise of Armed Ethno-nationalist Movements
3	1968 – 1989	The Communist Party of Burma: Its Expansion and Collapse
4	1989 – 2009	The Ceasefire Period
5	2009 – 2017	The Return of Armed Conflicts

Source: A Return to War: Militarized Conflicts in Northern Shan State (2018)

At present, armed conflicts in the northern Shan State have come into full circle with their current patterns resembling those of earlier ones in the pre-ceasefire era before 1989. While the causes of conflict re-escalation are complex and varied, a breakdown in existing ceasefire arrangements has preceded them. Many parts of northern Shan State have become areas of armed violence in which multiple armed actors operate since 2009. These are the Tatmadaw, seven EAOs, and several allies of Tatmadaw. The presence of so many ethnic armed groups distinguishes it from other parts of the country and partly reflects the high level of ethnic heterogeneity in the northern Shan State. This diversity of ethnic populations provides useful conditions for the mobilization of ethnic identity by armed groups as a basis for support. These include the Kachin Independence Army (KIA), the Shan State Army/Shan State Progress Party (SSA / SSPP, also known as SSA North), and the Shan State Army/Restoration Council of the Shan State (SSA / RCSS, also known as SSA-South). The United Wa State Army (UWSA), established in 1989, although not currently engaged in armed conflict with the Tatmadaw, is the EAO's strongest military. Three other EAOs work in northern Shan State are MNDAA, the Ta'ang National Liberation Army (TNLA), and the Arakan Army (AA). Relatively recently, the latter two organizations were founded in 2009. Of the seven EAOs in northern Shan State, only the SSA/RCSS is a signatory to the NCA under the previous USDP government signed in October 2015.

In addition, the Federal Political Negotiation Consultative Committee (FPNCC) was formed in April 2017 in a significant development, which is a Northern EAO political alliance led by UWSA in opposition to the NCA. The coalition comprises the UWSA, KIA, SSA / SSPP, MNDAA, TNLA, and AA, and the National Democratic Coalition Army (NDAA), primarily based in eastern Shan State. The coalition is largely political in nature, but together controls the largest combined force outside of the Tatmadaw in Myanmar and has gradually pulled China into the peace process. This northern bloc's involvement in a national peace process is potentially "the secret to resolving the conflict." Such developments pose serious challenges to the reformist agenda of the current NLD-led government and its stated goals of resolving Myanmar's decades-long civil wars through a multilateral peace process. Moreover, the effect of violence on the everyday socio-economic life of the local population, such as access to education, freedom of movement and basic healthcare, is often overlooked.

The following Table 3.3 illustrates the armed actors in northern Shan State.

Table 3.3: Armed Actors in Northern Shan State, 2018

Actor	Date Founded	Areas of Operation within northern Shan State
Government Forces		
Defense Services (Tatmadaw)	1948	Most Areas
Tatmadaw-allied Militias	Varies	Most Areas
Ethnic Armed Organizations		
Arakan Army (AA) ¹⁵	2009	Muse
Kachin Independence Army (KIA), 4th and 6th Brigades	1961	Kutkai, Muse, Lashio, Hsenwi, Namkham, Mongmit, Namtu
Myanmar National Democratic Alliance Army (MNDAA) (Kokang)	1989	Muse, Kutkai, Laukkai, Konkyan
Shan State Army/ Restoration Council of the Shan State (SSA/RCSS) (SSA-South)*	1997	Namkham, Kyaukme, Hsipaw, Manton, Namtu, Namsan, Mongmit
Shan State Army/ Shan State Progress Party (SSA/SSPP) (SSANorth)	1964	Hsenwi, Hsipaw, Kyaukme, Tangyan, Mongyai, Lashio
Ta'ang National Liberation Army (TNLA)	2009	Nawngkhio, Lashio, Kyaukme, Hsipaw, Kutkai, Namtu, Manton, Namhsan, Mongmit
United Wa State Army (UWSA) 1	1989	Pangsang, Mongmao, Pangwaun, Narphan, Hopang

Source: A Return to War: Militarized Conflicts in Northern Shan State (2018)

3.3 Humanitarian Issues in Shan State

Shan State is not currently facing an acute humanitarian crisis, but there are a number of chronic issues, including lack of preparedness for natural disasters, the impact of combating drug use and drug trafficking issues. Continuing fighting is a significant cause of lack of security and insecurity in Shan North. On the other hand, Shan South and East responses suggest a positive effect of ceasefires between government and EAOs. However, relics of conflict, especially landmines, have an ongoing impact on the safety of the population even in ceasefire areas. There is also an immediate need in all sections of the population to tackle the psychological impact of the violence and for trauma recovery. Displacement due to long and short-term conflict continues to be a concern in both Shan North and South. There are also communities in all parts of the state that have been stuck in their villages as a result of the violence and poverty suffered. Earlier displaced persons returning to their villages may also need aid in restoring their livelihoods. Drug use across Shan State has reached epidemic proportions. The causes are complicated, but they include drug trafficking, lack of good job opportunities, depression, relocation, injury, and accidental drug exposure. Drug use in turn has an impact on productivity, health and safety. In this sense, drug use cannot be isolated from drug trafficking, which is itself closely linked to conflict and security.

At the same time, Northern Shan and Kachin State situation has worsen again with ethnic conflict and civil wars and even can attack at the urban townships of Lashio, northern Shan State. The landmines and explosive remnants of war are still a major threat to civilians becoming difficult access to livelihood opportunities and sustainable solutions (UNOCHA, 2018). According to data of CCCM on 31st July 2019, a total 9,048 IDPs are living in 33 IDPs Camps in northern Shan State as shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: IDP Camps List in Northern Shan State

Township	Camp Name	Households	IDPs
Hseni	Nam Sa Larp	35	183
Hseni Total		35	183
Kutkai	Kutkai downtown (KBC Church)	53	311
	Kutkai downtown (RC Church)	26	132
	Mungji Pa Dabang (Baptist Church)	38	210
	Nam Hpak Ka Mare	53	256
	Zup Aung Camp	206	1,053
	Mungji Pa Dabang (Catholic Church)	19	89
	New Pang Ku	105	649
	Mung Hawm	30	170
	Kutkai downtown (KBC Church-2)	36	153
	Man Loi	24	84
	Pan Law	36	189
	Nam Hpak Ka Ta'ang (Aung Tha Pyay)	36	120
	Mine Yu Lay village (Old)	76	344
	Mai Yu Lay New (Ta'ang)	66	346
	Galeng (Palaung) & Kone Khem	86	525
Hu Hku & Ho Hko	32	146	
Kutkai Total		922	4,777
Manton	Mandung - Jinghpaw	28	151
	Mandung - RC	30	155
Manton Total		58	306
Muse	Muse Baptist Church	40	180
	Muse Catholic Church	17	80
	Hpai Kawng	152	790
Muse Total		209	1,050
Namhkan	Nam Hkam - Nay Win Ni (Palawng)	77	388
	Nam Hkam (KBC Jaw Wang)	62	337
	Nam Hkam Catholic Church (St. Thomas I)	42	216
	Nam Hkam (KBC Jaw Wang) II	36	193
	Namhkan - Pang Long KBC	110	530
	Mong Wee Shan	62	328
Namhkan Total		389	1,992
Namtu	Nam Tu Baptist	37	156
	Pan Ta Pyae	6	27
	Lisu Church Namtu	30	156
	Kyu Sot	60	281
Namtu Total		133	620
Hsipaw	Man Kaung/Naung Ti Kyar Village	37	120
Hsipaw Total		37	120
Northern Shan State Total		1,783	9,048

Source: Shelter Cluster Report, July 2019

3.4 Geographical and Socio-economic Conditions about Northern Shan State

Number of Districts	14		
Number of Townships/ Sub-Township	83		
Total Population	5,824,432		
Population Male	2,910,710 (49.97%)		
Population Female	2,913,722 (50.03%)		
Area (Km2)	155,801.38		
Population density (persons per Km2)	37.4		
Median Age	24.4		
Number of village tracts	39		
	Total	Urban	Rural
Population in conventional households	97,955	23,782	74,173
Number of conventional households	19,031	4,683	14,348

Source: 2014 Census Report

Most of the Shan State is a hilly plateau, the Shan Plateau, which together with the higher mountains in the north and south forms the Shan Hills system. The gorge of the Thanlwin (Salween/Namhkong) River cuts across the state. Inle Lake where the leg-rowing Intha people live in floating villages, in the great Nyung Shwe “plain”, is the second largest natural expanse of water in Burma, shallow but 14 miles (23 km) long and 7 miles (11km) wide. Pindaya Caves near Aungpan are vast limestone caverns which contain 6,226 Buddha images.

There are many challenges for economic development in Shan State which included low skill levels and lack of skilled workers; lack of economic opportunities; and extensive economic migration. The lack of economic opportunities in Shan State led to migration abroad, while the lack of skilled workers impacts the State’s economic development. Land grabbing, both by private mining companies and for governmental development projects, and Chinese investors also poses a threat to livelihoods, while poor infrastructure impact all economic sectors.

The largest economic sector is agriculture in Shan State, the mining and tourism are the second and third economic sectors. Due to access restrictions and lack of

infrastructure, it have inhibited the development of tourism. In the agricultural sector, lack of farming techniques and choice of crops and varieties become poorer outputs and contribute to the high use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and environmental degradation which lead to poor quality nutrition, despite no reported shortage of food.

Due to lack of knowledge and lack of infrastructure, there are many barriers to improving farming techniques. While local markets are generally easy to access, farmers report little access to more distant internal or international markets. An additional problem is that opium poppies are a low effort crop and provide a guaranteed return. In order to be attractive, alternative crops will need to offer quick and sustainable returns.

Remittances from those working abroad are a major source of income in some areas and help families survive. However, it reduces the skilled workforce because this irregular migration reduces the skilled workforce in the State and puts the migrants at risk of trafficking or ending up in illegal, unsafe or under-protected work.

3.4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Kut Kai Township

Total population	101,334		
Males	50,247		
Females	51,087		
Sex ratio	98 males per 100 females		
Percentage of urban population	24.6%		
Area (Km ²)	3,008.4		
Population density (persons per Km ²)	33.7 persons		
Number of wards	8		
Number of village tracts	39		
	Total	Urban	Rural
Population in conventional households	97,955	23,782	74,173
Number of conventional households	19,031	4,683	14,348

Source: 2014 Census

In Kukai Township, there are more females than males with 98 males per 100 females. The majority of the people in the Township live in rural areas with only (24.6%) living in urban areas. The population density of Kukai Township is 34 persons

per square kilometre. There are 5.1 persons living in each household in Kukai Township. This is higher than to the Union average.

3.4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Namkham Township

Total population	107,034		
Males	51,315		
Females	55,719		
Sex ratio	92 males per 100 females		
Percentage of urban population	28.3%		
Area (Km2)	1,209.1		
Population density (persons per Km2)	88.5 persons		
Number of wards	14		
Number of village tracts	43		
	Total	Urban	Rural
Population in conventional households	104,198	28,748	75,450
Number of conventional households	21,417	6,132	15,285

Source: 2014 Census

In Namkham Township, there are more females than males with 92 males per 100 females. The majority of the people in the Township live in rural areas with only (28.3%) living in urban areas. The population density of Namkham Township is 89 persons per square kilometre. There are 4.9 persons living in each household in Namkham Township. This is higher than the Union average.

3.5 Government Resettlement Program

The Myanmar government wish to close internally displaced person (IDP) camps and the unilateral ceasefire have done. It is an opportunity to return or resettle displaced people in the country's north. Civil society groups representing the largely ethnic Kachin IDPs and discussed with government how this might unfold. As long as the displacement, more than 100,000 IDPs have been displaced in camps in northern Myanmar, where they are facing in poverty and vulnerable to abuse. A limited number of IDPs were allowed to leave the camps in the short term, potentially setting the way for larger numbers to follow. Responsibility for IDP return and resettlement should be

assumed by civil government, working with civil society and donors and observing best practices to support ensure a safe, voluntary and dignified process. Several recent developments have started a potential creating for a limited number of these IDPs to return to their homes or be resettle in new locations. The Myanmar government announced plans to close IDP camps across the country in June 2018. In Dec 2018, the Myanmar military also proclaimed a unilateral ceasefire until 30 April 2019 covering Kachin and northern Shan. The latter declaration included a pledge to help people displaced by war return to where they had come from. Prior to the ceasefire announcement, ethnic Kachin leaders have been prepared to start for IDP returns and resettlement. Some have publicly estimated that between 6,000 and 10,000 IDPs might be able to return to their places of origin or resettle in the near term. Pursuing these opportunities could enable some IDPs to begin rebuilding their lives (Group, May 2019). Union Minister of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement said that MoSWRR had started systematic closure of unnecessary IDP camps in the country. The minister of MoSWRR announced a plan to close camps for internally displaced persons (IDPs) in four states of Myanmar in June 2018. He said “If the camps are open for too long, this may hinder the social and educational development of those staying at camps as well as their livelihoods”. The minister also said that closure of all of these IDP camps would not be possible in the remaining tenure of this government so that they would close some IDP camps permanently where possible. Union Minister of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement said “The strategy for entire country has been drafted. We will keep some IDP camps where they are still needed such as Kachin and Shan States. And we will close some camos which are no longer needed and necessary. And then we will make fair resettlement for these IDPs who really need our help. International organizations are also included in this work”.

3.6 A Growing Impetus for Returns and Resettlement

The June 2011 outbreak of conflict between Myanmar’s military and the Kachin Independence Organization ended a seventeen-year ceasefire. Tens of thousands of people immediately displaced in IDP camps. Within a year, the IDP population had been at around 100,000. According to the MIMU, more than 106,537 people were living in 169 IDP camps or camp-like settings in Northern Shan and Kachin state at the end of 2018, of which around 40 per cent were located in non-government-controlled areas, and over 9,000 people were displaced and are settled in 33 camps in the northern part

of Shan state. Among displaced population, 76 per cent in Kachin state and 78 per cent in northern Shan state are women and children. After seven years away from their original villages, long-term residents of IDP camps want to avoid even more prolonged displacement. Among the many IDPs who come from rural areas were formerly farmers, there are also growing concerns about the status of the land they cultivated before displacement. Few farmers have the documents of land ownership because land tended to be managed under informal arrangements prior displacement, and the security of their claims was based on community recognition. State security forces and agribusinesses have formally or informally appropriated at least some land formerly cultivated by IDPs. Starting from 2012, legal changes have undermined IDPs' already tenuous rights to the land they previously farmed. Pursuant to these changes, only land being used for a recognized agricultural activity can be registered for ownership.

3.7 Political Will and Prospects for Peace

Since early 2018, Myanmar's political leaders have increasingly emphasized the return and resettlement of IDPs across Myanmar. Having IDPs mean a visible sign of remaining conflict. In accordance with the vision of political leaders, reduction in IDPs mean that conflict is diminishing. The government in Naypyitaw began working on a national IDP camp closure strategy in June 2018. However, policy set from Naypyitaw seems only go so far in resolving displacement issues for IDP. Return and resettlement activities led by government will also require close cooperation with ethnic groups and civil society. Religious leaders and organizations especially in Kachin are quite influential among IDP community because a significant source of material and spiritual support by them over the past seven years. For example, as one leader of an IDP camp told Crisis Group, "Whatever happens, without instructions from the KBC (Kachin Baptist Convention) we will not leave our camp". That said, many religious, community and humanitarian leaders are increasingly favorable to the idea of commencing returns and resettlement and have begun discussing the possibility in earnest.

For Kachin leaders and organizations, including the Kachin Independence Organization and the powerful Kachin Baptist Convention, the key motivation appears to be pressure from their own communities, including IDPs.

On 10 February, the Kachin Humanitarian Concern Committee held informal talks with members of the government's peace negotiating team, the National

Reconciliation and Peace Committee, as well as representatives of the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement, and the Kachin State government. The ministry agreed to disseminate its draft national camp closure strategy with Kachin humanitarian groups. The Kachin Humanitarian Concern Committee has conducted discussion with representatives of the Kachin Independence Organization and the Chinese government.

On 26 April, the Kachin Humanitarian Concern Committee and National Reconciliation and Peace Committee reached a five-point agreement to cooperate on the return and resettlement of IDPs. Under this agreement, the two sides will work together “based on international humanitarian policies” so that IDPs can return or resettle “safely and with dignity”. They will jointly identify prospective returnees and cooperate on pilot locations, while the Kachin Humanitarian Concern Committee will provide aid and development support and negotiate arrangements with the Kachin Independence Organization as needed.

The peace talks prompted the Myanmar military to announce a two-month extension of its unilateral ceasefire, to 30 June, just hours before the original deadline passed. While the extension is welcome and indicative of positive progress, a time-bound, unilateral ceasefire is unlikely to create the conditions necessary for large-scale returns and resettlement to begin. “The resettlement issue really needs a ceasefire with no time limit”, said a Kachin Independence Organization representative. “Guaranteeing the safety of civilians is the most important factor for facilitating IDP resettlement”.

For the time being, however, the optimism of local leaders has been buoyed. Following a coordination meeting with the Peace-talk Creation Group on 20 February, the Kachin Humanitarian Concern Committee estimated that from 6,000 to 10,000 IDPs from 100 camps might be able to return to their homes or resettle in the near term.

3.8 Ensuring a Safe, Dignified and Voluntary Process

Most IDP return and resettlement efforts will be limited in scope due to lack of bilateral ceasefire between the military and Kachin Independence Organization. Due to IDP preferences and security considerations, they focus on IDPs currently in government-controlled areas.

According to recent conflict assessment, it estimated conservatively that 2,000 households per year in government-controlled areas could move out of the camps with

international humanitarian support. Up to 60,000 IDPs would return to their places of origin or resettle in five years.

There is strong evidence that most IDPs wish to return to their places of origin when the political and conflict situations are stable. According to a recent survey of long term intentions, among 1,123 IDP household representatives, 65 per cent answered that they intended to return to their village of origin, but just 6 percent said it was possible to return immediately. The major barriers are the risk of happening fighting again, and the presence of armed groups and landmines. Most of the farmers work in the forest and they are afraid of landmines.

A combination of events, including the declaration of a ceasefire by the military, the drafting of the government's national camp closure strategy and the prioritization of the IDP issue among the Kachin, has presented an important opportunity to lay the groundwork for IDP returns and resettlement in the years ahead. Much will depend on the outcome of ongoing discussions between the Myanmar military and Kachin Independence Organization. Conditions are not yet conducive for large-scale returns in Kachin state, but in the short term it may be possible to identify resettlement opportunities away from conflict zones and to provide support to communities that receive IDPs.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS ON SURVEY RESULTS

4.1 Survey profile

Due to armed conflicts between the military (Tatmadaw) and ethnic group, the conflict affected people moved from their villages to other places. They lived in the IDP camps for a long time since 2014. In the camps, the camp community set up the camp management committee to manage the camps and coordination with other developmental aid organization. Camp Management Committee members (CMCs) actively work at receiving information of issues/needs/gaps in their respective area of the site. CMCs are to meet at agreed upon intervals with partners, site manager, other stakeholders to discuss site-level issues. CMCs are to have a maximum of 15 and a minimum of 5 members based on a sites population. The addition of 2 host community leaders is optional based on the context that partners are working in. Partners and community members are to agree on a list of roles and responsibilities for the CMC specific to the site of intervention. All active members of the committee are to agree on these aforementioned roles and sign term of references agreeing to carry out all highlighted tasks. According to August 2019 data from Camp Coordination and Camp management sector, a total number IDP camps in northern Shan State are 33 IDPs camps. This chapter presents the key findings base on primary data which collected in September 2019. I conducted individual in-depth interview process with CMC members in selected 13 IDPs camps from northern Shan State until the sufficient data have been received. (Jaw 2, Mang Weing Gyi KBC 1, Bang Laung, St. Thomas, Nay Wun Ni, Nant Phat Khar (KBC), Mine Yu Lay, Mine Yu Lay (New), St. Thomas, Jaw 1, KBC 2, RC 2, Nant Phat Khar (Ta Aang)). The age range of participants are between 30 and 50 year old. The majority of participants are male. The finding will provide the challenges of IDPs in resettlement stage, the contributions of IDPs on economic engagement and recommendation support to IDPs from Government, UN, and INGOs during resettlement stage.

The survey design is the primary data collection by conducting individual in depth interview with camp management committee members. It was analyzed between September 2019 to October 2019 and the study involved 22 participants from Kut Kai, Nakham, Muse from northern Shan State.

Table 4.1: Selected IDP Camps in Northern Shan State

State	Township	Camp		Ethnicity	Population
Northern Shan	Kut Kai	1	Kar Laing 1	Kachin	1053
		2	Kar Laing 2	Ta'ang	410
		3	Nam Phat Khar KBC	Kachin	258
		4	Nam Phat Khar Ta'ang	Ta'ang	111
		5	Mine Yu Lay - Old	Ta'ang	312
		6	Mine Yu Lay- New	Kachin	332
		7	Kutkai KBC	Kachin	256
		8	Kut Kai RC	Kachin	128
	Nakham	9	Jaw 1	Kachin	341
		10	Banglung	Kachin	519
		11	Nay Win Ni	Ta'ang	376
		12	St Thomas	Kachin	210
		13	Mann Weinggyi-KBC2	Kachin	755

Resource: Camp Profiling Report (Round 9) (Mar-Apr 2019)

4.2 Survey Design

I conducted a desk review and developed a semi-structured interview tool to conduct 22 in-depth qualitative consultations with 22 participants across Lashio, Kutkai, and Namkham townships in northern Shan State. The qualitative study design was used to explore the involvement of IDPs in economic and development sectors, challenges and opportunities of IDPs during resettlement and recommendation for the improvements assisting IDPs. I wanted to provide a safe space to all interviewees to participate in these consultations in an inclusive, acceptable and feasible way so that the voice of vulnerable communities could be heard. It included listening to camp committee members as the representative of IDPs camps descriptions of their needs, concerns, opportunities and challenges engaging in economic and development sectors during resettlement. The expected outputs and results of the study are scientific, robust data and evidence to support an essential preliminary step toward future policy or

implementation recommendations. In comparison with focus groups, these in-depth interviews enabled our fieldworkers to talk to individual participants on a one-on-one basis, which guaranteed more privacy and confidentiality. This interview allows participants without exposing their identity or exposing their opinions to other people in the community. Participants were selected through convenience sampling from IDPs camps from northern Shan State. Member of camp management committee members of different ages was selected in order to capture the needs, concerns, opportunities and challenges engaging in economic and development sectors during resettlement.

4.3 Survey Data Analysis and Result

This survey data analysis provided information of coming challenges of IDPs during resettlement stage and involvement of IDPs in engagement of economic development in resettlement stage. This survey also supported the recommendation for UN, INGOs in supporting IDPs people in resettlement stage.

4.3.1 Challenges of IDPs during Resettlement Stage

The participants provided the information of challenges during resettlement stage. Eighty percent of responded that the challenges for livelihood activities during resettlement were money for renovation of lands, machine and cattle and A few respondents (18%) said that farms and lands had been destroyed so they may need money to renovate the wild land for farming and cultivation. More than 90% of the participants indicated that landmine and insecurity are their main challenges in resettlement stage. They also worried that the availability of food and living spaces in their original villages will be a concern because they left their cultivation sites and home for a long time. So. They are concerned that they cannot do farming immediately. The wild land need to be taken time to cultivate again. The participants indicated that they need money to invest again for buying animals for farming.

Table 4.2: Challenges during Resettlement Stage

No.	Challenges during resettlement	Percentage of respondents
1	Money for renovation of lands, machine and cattle	82%
2	Renovate the wild land for farming and cultivation.	18%
3	Land mine and insecurity	100%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

The respondents also mentioned the safety and security conditions of their original villages. All of the participants said that the peace process is pending and the security condition is not stable around their villages. They left their home for many years so that they do not know their house are still present or not and the conditions of their house would be deteriorated. The main challenges for most of IDPs have been identified as the security instability based on the responses of participants. The participants responded that the armed groups based their location near the villages. Therefore, they worried that the armed conflict would be happened near their villages when they resettle back. More than 90 percent said that they worried the landmine and bombs around the villages. The peace process cannot be estimated situation which can happen the terrain anytime and anywhere.

The Camp Management Committee answered the basic requirement of IDPs community during resettlement stage. Most of the participants (15 out of 22 participants) responded that the basic requirements during resettlement would be the infrastructure buildings for education, religion, health facility and milling machine. Few participants (7 out of 22 participants) answered that IDPs also require some livelihood skill trainings. All participants said that the basic challenges are food, clothes and houses in resettlement stage.

Table 4.3: Basic Requirements of IDPs

No.	Basic requirement of IDPs	Percentage of respondents
1	Infrastructure buildings for education, religion, health facility and milling machine.	68%
2	Livelihood skill trainings	32%
3	Food, clothes and houses	100%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

4.3.2 IDPs involve in Economic and Development Sectors

The workforce from employment of IDPs are the main consideration of economic and development in resettlement stage. This research provided the employment status of IDPs, their income of IDP camps and their original villages, job opportunities in IDPs camps, livelihood activities in their original villages, their current existing capacity, their desirable the self-business plan.

Participants described the different types of job opportunities in the camps. Most often villagers reported that most community members individually work daily wages jobs which hired from host community. In some cases, respondents did cultivation in the farm which owned by host community.

The respondents also explained the employment status in the IDP camps. Most of the respondents provided that the range between 50% and 70% of working age people are jobless in IDP camps because there is no opportunity to earn livelihood activities in the camp. They were not hired regularly from business owners from host community. They do not have their own land for cultivation because there is no space to do cultivation in the IDP camps. Some respondents indicated that they cannot easily travel to another place for work because of transportation difficulties from one place to another place. Another reason is that they do not have vehicles (e.g motorcycles) for transportation from one place to another place.

The participants answered that the comparison of the sources and status of daily income between IDPs camps and their original villages. While they were living in the villages, they had regular jobs for their daily income. They could sell their local materials and earned enough for their family. Moreover, the daily consumed food were

not needed to buy from others. It could reduce the daily expenses of our family. In IDP camps, most of the people are difficulties to find out their daily job. They could not get enough income in the camp. Even they have daily jobs in IDPs camps which is less than the expenses of daily living cost. They said that the imbalance between income and expenses of IDP community and the economic condition have been deteriorated.

The respondents explained the barriers of getting job opportunities in IDPs camps. Majority of respondents described that the barriers of their job opportunity are the education status and limited technical skills to seek the jobs.

Participants answered that the common livelihood activities of their original villages. Two third of the participants mentioned that cultivation and farming are the major livelihood activities in their villages. Nearly 25 percent of participants responded that the tea leaf cultivation, livestock and gardening are also common livelihood activities in their villages. Only 14 percentage responded that maize and paddy farming are also main livelihood activities in the villages.

Table 4.4: Common Livelihood Activities of Original Villages

No.	Common livelihood activities of their original villages	Percentage of respondents
1	Cultivation and farming	64%
2	Tea leaf cultivation, Livestock and Gardening	23%
3	Maize and Paddy farming	14%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

Participants described the reasons of choosing these livelihood activities in their original villages. A 68 percent of respondents said that they are familiar with only these livelihood activities such as cultivation and farming and 32 percent responded that they cannot able to do other works out of these livelihood activities because of limited technical skills to do other jobs. Only a few respondents also said that they have limited budget and human resources for their desirable livelihoods activities.

Table 4.5: Reason of choosing specific livelihood activities

No.	Reason of choosing specific livelihood activities	Percentage of respondents
1	Familiar with routine livelihood activities	68%
2	Limited Technical Skills for other Livelihood activities	32%
3	Limited Budget and Human Resource	14%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

The interviewees mentioned that the main barriers of their livelihood activities in original villages. Almost all of the interviewees indicated that the conflict and unstable situations of security can much effects on economic development in the resettlement villages.

Participants also described the main income in their job in the original villages. Most of the participants answered that the selling of local materials, tea leaf firming and livestock (Chicken, Cattles) are the major income for their livelihood activities. A considerable number of the participants (n=13) responded that the farming and cultivation are the also their main income in their original villages. A few number of participants (n=6) provided the information that maize and orange farming are also their main income. They also work as daily wages workers in land which owned by other people.

The interview questions included desire of IDP community on self-business considerations. All of the respondents answered that they want to implement self-business if they have chances. Livestock, farming and cultivation are the main activities which the community want to do self-business. Some people are interested to earn their daily income like car/motorcycle workshop and want to open small grocery store in the villages.

The participants also mentioned the reasons of working self-business and choosing these kinds of self-business. The respondents also explained the barriers of implementation of self-business. All of the participants explained that they want to earn enough money for their children's education and supporting their family. They want to do these kind of self-business consideration because they are not familiar with other

jobs and do not have opportunity for other jobs. The main barriers of self- business are no money for investment.

The participants also indicated existing capacity of IDPs. The participants mentioned that the community already had some extend of skills to do pig farming, tea leaf cultivation, sugarcane, farming, grocery store and livestock. However, they do not have systematic skills and knowledge for these livelihood activities.

Regarding infrastructure, participants mentioned that most of their original villages had infrastructures of primary school and religious building. However, most of the villages do not have the health facilities.

The participants also described their needs for infrastructure for development of their villages during resettlement stage. Participants in 82 percent of community reported that the key infrastructures for development are transportation and electricity. Among them, 45 percentage of respondents reported that the health facilities are the major concern for development during resettlement stage. Only 27 percent reported that the market and school buildings are the essential components of the development during resettlement stage.

Table 4.6: Main Infrastructure for Development

No.	Infrastructure for development	Percentage of respondents
1	Transportation and Electricity	82%
2	Health Facilities	45%
3	Market and School Buildings	27%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

The participants also described the gender issues of job opportunity and benefits in both IDPs camps and villages. More than 90 percentage of respondents said that most of women are discriminated and do not get same opportunities with men in livelihoods activities. The women are discriminated in the rate of payment for job and job opportunities in such kind of jobs.

4.3.3 Recommendation for UN and INGOs for assisting IDPs

The respondents provided their desirable support and needs from government, UN, INGOs during resettlement stage. More than 80 percent of participants requested that if they have enough money to own the land for cultivation which can reduce the jobless status of their community. There are 41 percent of participants who requested technical skills for sewing, farming, livestock and cultivation which can be covered their daily expenses of family. More than 30 percent provided that the education is important for their daily income and livelihood activities. Only 23 percent would like to resettle the location where is located the accessible place near the school. All participants requested to provide financial support for investment and foods during the resettlement stage. Their field were destroyed and cannot use immediately for farming. During this period, the community take time to clear wild land. So, the 68 percent of respondents indicated that the government, INGO and NGO should create the job opportunities for IDP population during this period and it can reduce the jobless population. Small scale business (E.g. Sewing, small grocery store) are requested to provide by 27 percent of IDP community. More than 70 percent of participants indicated that the government should support technical training for revise the land to do cultivation, farming as soon as possible because they left all of their fields and farm for long time. The moderate number of participants (n=14) indicated that they want to request to do renovation for good transportation, water supply and electricity for their community during resettlement stage. Respondents reported that the main needs of technical skills are systematic skills of agricultural and livestock. The participants from IDP camps mentioned that the host community do not want to compete the job opportunities with IDPs population and also discriminated to IDP population. Therefore, some participants requested the INGO organization to reduce the tension between the community and host community.

Table 4.7: Needs support from Government, UN, INGOs

No.	Infrastructure for development	Percentage of respondents
1	Money to own the land and field	82%
2	Technical training for rehabilitation of land for cultivation	77%
3	Creation Job Opportunity	68%
4	Renovation for transportation, water supply and Electricity	64%
5	Small Scale Business	27%
6	Location of resettlement accessible with education	23%

Source: Survey Data, September 2019

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Findings

In this study, an attempt is made to explore about the challenges and opportunities for engaging the economic development during resettlement stage. In order to investigate several questions were asked, participants were asked which challenges can be faced during resettlement stage. A total number of 22 participants from 13 IDPs camps joined in this study. The study found barriers/challenges of livelihood and income generation in resettlement stage.

For current camp situation, overall 60-80% of working age people are jobless as they do not have land to do cultivation. They do not have regular source of income and hard to seeking the job because the accessible jobs in IDPs are not familiar with their existing skills and knowledge which worked in original villages. Low education level does not create job opportunities and economic opportunities near IDPs camps. Moreover, drug use is the major challenges of unemployment in IDPs camps. Another main cause of unemployment is that the geographic areas near IDP camps are not familiar with us. Most of the people cannot get the daily job because there is no opportunity to do livelihoods activities. So, the income is not enough for their family in the IDP camps. Before displacement, the main livelihood activities of IDPs are farming, cultivation, livestock and agriculture. The main reasons for choosing these livelihood activities such as farming and cultivation are the knowledge and skills for cultivation which can provide the financial stability for the community in villages. In addition to this, if they worked as a farmer, it will allow them to stay in their own communities and it does not need to travel apart from their family. Most of the people do not want to leave their land, farm without cultivation as they are lack of kills for other job opportunities. Farming and Cultivation, Livestock, Grocery store and selling fruits and vegetables are the major income in their villages. For perceptions in resettlement stage, the majority of people want to seek economic opportunities in the areas of cultivation, farm, pigsty, livestock, agriculture and trading business in border

areas. The expected basic needs of communities during resettlement stage noted as money, machine for restore the land for cultivation, manpower for cultivation and farming, cattles, improving knowledge and technologies. For skills and working experience of IDPs, they have experiences mainly working for cultivation, sugarcane, grocery store, farming and livestock. The main infrastructure of their original villages are primary school, religious buildings. The following items are utmost importance for economic development: secondary school, health facilities, transportation, water, electricity, job opportunities, financial support, water well and machine. The major barriers of development in their original villages are that they do not have enough money to own the land for cultivation and in addition, it in turn makes the difficulties to earn daily income on a regular basis. For safety and security, this is still an issue in that area and mining around their community superimposes the conflict. The most interesting finding was that armed group are based near the villages which could alter the economic opportunities of the camp people in resettlement stage. Frequent investigation by armed group can be considered as an important issue of the development of the communities. Low education level is found to be the major challenges for them to employ them in other job opportunities. For challenges related with employment during resettlement stage, the camp people do not have cattle for farming as all animals were killed in the armed conflict. The advancement in technologies for systematic cultivation and farming are crucial in resettlement stage. Not having good transportation and road condition in their village for safety and security and terrain difficulties are another important concern. For their perceptive of overcoming barriers, the present results are significant in at least two major respects particularly for financial support and peace process. A common view amongst interviewees was that if government create job opportunities in the village, it can reduce the unemployment rate in villages. The government needs to support space and land to do cultivation and farming during resettlement stage. To increase economic opportunities, their perspective is that international organizations should be able to reduce conflicts and tensions between the IDPs and the host communities which would foster the economic opportunities within the villages.

5.2 Suggestions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the challenges and opportunities for engaging economic development during resettlement stage in northern Shan State. This study was conducted to understand how IDPs will involve in economic and development sector, to identify the challenges and opportunities of IDPs during resettlement stage and to improve development assistance and find out the recommendation for Government, UN, INGOs and CSO for assisting IDPs. It has found many challenges and opportunities during resettlement stage. It is recommended that

- 1) Engaging local and international donors in the development and resettlement stage aiming towards sustainable solutions to the specific needs of the IDPs need to be identified,
- 2) Financial support and providing machines are the major necessity to restore the land for cultivation that can improve economic development in resettlement stage,
- 3) Technical support training for cultivation and agriculture is required to provide community,
- 4) Negotiation with government and Ethnic armed group should make proper agreement on not setting armed group near the villages because unexpected armed conflict can be happened near the base of armed group which can impact on economic development of the community,
- 5) Strengthening and enforcing the peace process between government military and ethnic armed group, together in considering the real voice of survivors and IDPs has to facilitate
- 6) The clearance of mine in their resettlement place has to prioritized,
- 7) Suggestion to do any systematic research to community related to drug use, are still need to be in place
- 8) Creation of the job opportunity by government in the resettled village can reduce the unemployment rate in villages,
- 9) Establishment of participatory processes among the IDPs and the host communities, international organizations should try to reduce conflicts and tensions between the IDPs and the host communities that would foster the economic opportunities within the villages,
- 10) When sound policies and support systems are in place, greater economic integration can bring benefits not only to IDPs, but also to host communities, benefit from IDPs' economic contributions.

It strongly believes that suggesting future implementation of resettlement program that would involve investigating and learning by other academic learning such as libraries, university portals and using focus groups with a few individuals from our research sample could prove to be part in finding evidence of an association with challenges, engaging in economic development of internal displaced persons during resettlement.

REFERENCES

- A Preliminary Operational Guide to the United Nations Secretary-General's Decision on Durable Solutions to Displacement.* (2016). UNDP and UNHCR, Global Cluster for Early Recovery, (Technical Working Group on Durable Solutions) with the Global Protection Cluster.
- A. Carl LeVan, A. U. (2018). *Study on Marginalized Groups in the Context of ID in Nigeria.* Work Bank Document.
- Chulalongorn, U. (2019, October 13). *Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM).* Retrieved from ILO AP Migration: <http://apmigration.ilo.org/network/asian-research-center-for-migration-arc-m-chulalongkorn-university>
- Cohen, & Deng. (2018). *bb.* 11: 11.
- Committee, I.-A. S. (2010). *IASC Framework On Durable Solution for Internally Displaced Person.* The Brookings Institution – University of Bern.
- Council, N. R. (2019). *Internal Displacement Monitoring Center.* Retrieved from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/about-us>
- DTM. (2018). *Ethiopia National Displacement Report 1.* IOM.
- Fact sheet on Internal Displacement.* (2019, October 14). Retrieved from Global Protection Cluis: <https://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/>
- Godagama, A. (2012). *Development Impacts on Resettled IDPs .* University of Agder, 2012.
- Grandi, F. (2018). *Global Trend Force Displacement.* UNHCR.
- ICRC. (1998). General Principle on Internal Displacement. *30-09-1998 Article, International Review of the Red Cross, No. 324.*
- Lall, C. S. (2014). *Resettlement of conflict-induced IDPs in Northern Sri Lanka Political economy of state policy and practice.* Secure Livelihood Research Consortium.
- OCHA. (1998). *Guiding Principle on Internal Displacement.* OCHA.

- Okuto, E. (2018). *The Strategies of Government and Non-Governmental Actors in the Resettlement and ReIntegration of IDPs in Eldoret, Kenya*. Horizon Research.
- Policy, I. f. (2018). *A Return to War: Militarized Conflicts in Northern Shan State*. European Union and ISDP.
- Refugees, U. N. (2019). Retrieved from Retrieved from Analysis and Policy Observatory Website: <https://apo.org.au/node/242956>
- UNDP, U. (2013). *Draft UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017*. United Nation.
- UNHCR. (2010-2011). *Overview of Global Resettlement and current challenges*. UNHCR.
- UNHCR. (2017). *Operational review of UNHCR's engagement in situations of internal displacement*. UNHCR.
- UNHCR. (2018). *Global Trend Force Displacement*. UNHCR.
- Unicef, M. K. (2018). *Protecting and supporting internally displaced children in urban settings*. Unicef.
- United State Institute of Peace. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.usip.org/>

APPENDIEX A. Questionnaires

Barriers/Challenges of Livelihood and Income generation in resettlement stage

- Which employment/Livelihood activities will you plan to do when you arrive to your original village/ or when you are resettled back to original village?

- What are the basic need to your livelihood activities?

- Why do you want to choose this option?

- Which challenges do you think to face during resettlement in relation to employment?

- What type of work do the majority of the people involved in your community?

- The safety and security condition of their original village?

- Which barriers have you already experienced regarding employment in native village?

- Which recommendations/suggestions to overcome these barriers do you want to provide?

Skill and Working experience

- Which kind of task can you do in your village?

- What kind of skills or prior experience did you need?

Professional Aspiration

- Do you plan to set up own business in your villages? Which type and why?

- What barriers or factors are preventing you from this kind of work?

- Have you ever considered self-employment (starting your own business)?
Why or why not?

Involvement of economic sector

- What are the main income in your village?

- What are main infrastructures in your village? (E.g School, Clinic, Market, Industry ...)

- What are the key concern or main concern of economic development in villages?

Impact of productivity of IDP in resettlement stage

- What do you do in IDPs camps?

- Why do you work this job in IDP camps?

- Are you satisfied in working this job?

- How many percentage of working age people are present in this camps? How many jobless people are living in IDP camps? What are the main reason of jobless in IDP camps?

- How do you think the income of livelihood activities in villages which compared with income in IDP camps? Is there any different?

- How do you think the jobless percentage will increase or decrease in the villages during resettlement period? Why?

- Which factors will be improved daily income and reduced the jobless percentage in IDP camps?

- Which factors can provide improvement of daily income and reduce the jobless nature of in villages?

- Which factors can provide improvement of daily income and reduce the jobless nature of IDP camps and also in villages?

To explore needs of community in resettlement stage

- What support do you need from government support and international aid support in resettlement stage?

- Which support do you need from government and international aid in resettlement stage?

- Why do you need these provision in resettlement stage?

- Which skill do you want to improve income and economic of your community?

To explore the gender impact on economic development

- Is there any difference between men and women in accessing job opportunities in the camp?

- In jobless percentage, which ones are common, men or women?

- Is there any different needs of providing government and international aid for men and women in resettlement stage? What are these needs?
