FOREWORD BY THE HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

In 2015, the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF) provided more funding to partners than during any previous year. A total of US$5.4 million ($5.0 million to programme costs and $0.4 million to audit costs and programme support costs) was allocated to 23 projects. These covered critical life-saving gaps in the Myanmar Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) that were not being addressed by other donors. This life-saving humanitarian intervention included US$1.3 million for the emergency response to the floods and landslides which hit the country in July and August 2015, mainly in Chin, Magway, Rakhine and Sagaing.

Since 2014, the Fund has been positioned to more significantly impact the overall humanitarian response by targeting priority gaps and by providing a contingency response capacity to respond to new emergencies.

This has been a rewarding – and challenging – year for the MHF. Continuing community tensions, lack of security and limited access often mean that the humanitarian community is unable to respond in a timely manner. We continue to appeal for consistent access to ensure that affected populations receive the humanitarian assistance they need.

The introduction of new funding windows has enabled the MHF to be more strategic. The Emergency Reserve and Standard Allocation mechanisms allow us to be responsive to sudden changes in the humanitarian situation, and to ensure that the highest priority issues are addressed in a timely manner.

The MHF will continue to evolve, benefiting from global best practices and further implementation of the reforms introduced during 2015, with the launch of the new global Country-Based Pooled Funds’ Guidelines. This includes strengthening the governance mechanisms and needs-based prioritization of projects; putting in place a risk management framework to increase the transparency, accountability and effectiveness of the Fund; and enhancing field visits to ensure that projects respond to the needs of targeted groups and communities and to improve accountability to the affected population.

Myanmar NGOs are often the only organisations capable of providing assistance directly to people in need, especially in isolated or hard-to-reach areas, and they are often the most cost effective. Despite this fact, few donors fund national NGOs directly. I will continue to support the Fund’s strategy to prioritise those national NGOs who have sufficient capacity for direct implementation of MHF projects whenever possible.

We are grateful to Australia, Sweden and the United Kingdom for their generous donations to the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund since 2007. I would also like to thank the board members, cluster coordinators and the OCHA team for their continual support. Both recipients of humanitarian assistance and our implementing partners benefited greatly from their cooperation and confidence. We have been able to address urgent humanitarian needs of many people in Myanmar due to the joint efforts and commitment of all the stakeholders of the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund.

Renata Lok-Dessallien
United Nations Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator

[Signature]

Cover photo credit: UNICEF Myanmar 2015

1 Until 5 February 2016 the MHF was named Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (ERF).
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Donors’ support for the MHF

The MHF received $3.4 million from its three donors (Australia, Sweden and United Kingdom) during 2015. Despite the increase in donor contributions, the MHF remains a relatively small fund. The aim is to expand the donor base and increase the size of the fund. The Board continues to encourage donors to provide their contributions as early as possible in the calendar year, so that the Fund can be used strategically to address critical gaps in response.

Besides the $3.4 million from donor contributions, the MHF carried over $2.6 million from 2014. In total, the MHF allocated $5.4 million in 2015 ($5.0 million to programme costs and $0.4 million to audit costs and programme support costs) to 23 projects. The remaining $0.5 million were left to carry over to 2016.

2015 MHF Allocations

In early 2015, the MHF released $1.1 million from a 2014 Standard Allocation for three projects to provide multi-sector support for crisis affected rural communities in Rakhine. These funds were to be part of the 2014 Allocation. However, due to a number of proposal revisions, the grant processes were completed only in early 2015.

In March 2015, the MHF provided a special allocation of $0.2 million for a project through a National NGO partner to (1) address emergency shelter requests after a fire in Shinjai camp, Kachin State; and (2) address emergency shelter needs of those displaced people due to conflict in Hpakan, Kachin State.

In August 2015, there was a Reserve Allocation of $1.3 million to eight partners for eight projects (2 National NGOs and 6 International NGOs) to support the flood emergency response and to complement the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) rapid response window, including cash-based activities.

In September 2015, a Standard Allocation of $2.4 million was made to nine partners to fund eleven projects (2 National NGOs and 7 International NGOs) in line with the CERF underfunded emergency window which prioritized supports for vulnerable communities in northern Rakhine State and hard-to-reach areas of Kachin and Shan states.

All allocations were driven by a consultative process, supported by OCHA, and included the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) clusters/sectors members, NGO partners and donors.

The programmatic results shown in this 2015 MHF annual report come from sixteen projects that were implemented during 2015.

- Five of the projects were funded in 2014;
- Eleven projects were funded in 2015 with implementation concluding in 2015.

The total cost of the sixteen projects reporting the results included in this report is $4.1 million.

The remaining twelve projects will conclude in 2016.

MHF Advisory Board and Review Committee

The Advisory Board, bringing together representatives from donors, UN agencies and the NGO community, met once during 2015. During this meeting the MHF Advisory Board endorsed the 2015 global guidelines entitled “Operational Handbook for Country-based Pooled Funds” (CBPFs), the minimum standards for the operation of CBPF and the 2015 Myanmar Humanitarian Fund Operational Manual. The MHF Advisory Board also endorsed the 2015 Resource Mobilization Strategy where the current donors, Australia, Sweden and the United Kingdom, reaffirmed their intention to continue supporting the Fund financially in 2015 and onward.

The Review Committee membership is made of national level Clusters and Sector and Sub-sector Coordinators. Technical consultation at field level was also done with the regional level clusters and sector coordinators as and when required. Members of the Review Committee were involved in the strategic and technical review of proposals. Their involvement ensured that funded projects were aligned to the HRP priorities as well as addressing the requirements of the Allocation Strategy papers.

Grant Management System

In March 2015, after the official release of the Operational Handbook for CBPF, the MHF introduced the new online Grant Management System (GMS). OCHA Myanmar implemented the GMS and moved forward in registering all organizations interested in applying for funds. Following the CBPF Guidelines, these organizations had to follow two processes. First, they needed to complete the GMS due diligence process. Second, they needed to undergo a capacity assessment to determine eligibility for
application of the Fund and to identify their risk level when implementing the grant.

Due to time constraints, as per the Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU)’s proposal, the HC and AB decided that eligible partners were those that met all due diligence requirements. To minimise the financial risks of not conducting a capacity assessment, all partners were treated as high risk.

In March 2015, the HFU started training partners on the GMS registration and due diligence process. In addition, the HFU continued to provide clarification and assistance to partners on issues such as proposal submissions, requests for project revision and no-cost extensions, and reporting.

In August and September, the HFU provided face to face GMS training to cluster coordinators to help them do their reviewing in the GMS.

**Plans for 2016**

The Myanmar HFU will continue ongoing efforts to grow the fund and broaden the donor base. It will also continue to advise on ways to streamline allocation processes to improve ease of use, particularly for national NGOs. The Myanmar HFU will support partners in undertaking the due diligence process, in enhancing their capacity in writing project proposals, and in helping them prepare reports through the online GMS. The HFU plans to conduct capacity assessments for all NGO partners who meet all due diligence requirements, paying special attention to national NGOs.

The HFU will assist the Board in carrying out any further revisions to its Operational Manual that are needed to make the fund more user-friendly (particularly for national NGOs), and more efficient, particularly in responding to rapid onset emergency humanitarian needs.
Project townships funding allocated and implemented during 2015

Allocated Funds by State/Region ($)

1. Kachin: $1.4m
2. Rakhine: $2.6m
3. Shan North: $500,000
4. Sagoing: $150,000
5. Chin: $230,000
6. Magway: $300,000

Project townships implemented in 2015
Myanmar Humanitarian Fund 2015 Overview

Total funding pledged and received (US$)
- $5.9m* Total funding pledged and received
- $5.4m** Total funding disbursed
- $0.5m Total fund balance

92%

Total number of people targeted
- 368,000
  - 162,000 Men
  - 83,000 Women
  - 79,000 Boys
  - 206,000 Girls

Contributions in 2015 (US$)
- 4m
  - Funding
- 1m
  - NGO International NGO
- 17
  - NGO National NGO
- 6
  - NGO International NGO
- 1
  - NGO National NGO

Projects funded (US$)
- $5m
- 23 Projects

Funds by sector/cluster (US$)
- WASH $1.2m
- Education $1.1m
- Health $1.1m
- Food Security $0.7m
- Shelter $0.6m
- Nutrition $0.3m
- Protection $0.2m

No. of people targeted by sector/cluster
- WASH 5,800
- Education 16,000
- Health 17,500
- Food Security 25,700
- Shelter 36,700
- Nutrition 83,400
- Protection 182,800

Timeline of MHF allocations in 2015 (US$)
- Standard allocation for projects in Rakhine and Kachin / Shan $1.36m
  - January / February
- Floods & landslides emergency $1.28m
  - July
- Reserve allocation for floods response $2.4m
  - August
- Standard allocation for under-funded projects in Rakhine and Kachin / Shan

*Includes carry-over of $2.4 million from 2014.
**Includes audit fees and administrative costs.
CHAPTER 1
HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT AND CONTRIBUTION OVERVIEWS

HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT OVERVIEW

In 2015, significant humanitarian needs continued in Myanmar. In Rakhine and Kachin/Shan states, many of the internally displaced persons (IDPs) living in camps or camp-like situations remained dependent on humanitarian assistance largely due to continued restrictions on movements and limited access to livelihood opportunities. The protracted displacement also had adverse effect on the host communities, straining already scarce resources. The situation was further compounded by the countrywide floods that affected over nine million people across the country.

In Kachin/Shan states, approximately 100,000 people remain displaced as a result of the armed conflict that started in 2011. The prolonged nature of displacement requires sustained delivery of assistance, as temporary shelters, other essential facilities such as health care and sanitation services require renovation or replacement. Despite efforts to reach a nationwide ceasefire, armed clashes continued to affect civilian populations leading to the temporary displacement of about 17,000 people (excluding Kokang) in 2015 (most of these newly displaced people returned to their places of origin within weeks). In the Kokang Self-Administered Zone, the conflict displaced approximately 80,000 people, with most of these people crossing the border into China. Around 4,000 remained displaced at the end of 2015.

In Rakhine State, about 140,000 people remain displaced following outbreaks of violence in 2012. Prolonged displacement compounded by ongoing movement restrictions that constrain access to essential services continue to cause increased vulnerability and a high level of dependency on humanitarian assistance. Most facilities and structures, including shelters, in camps have been subjected to a third rainy season. Additional resources are needed to carry out care and maintenance of shelters and other essential facilities in camps to ensure that thousands of the displaced people are protected from the elements and are able to live in dignified conditions. Continued provision of food, education, health care, nutrition and protection services remains crucial in all camps.

In addition to continued humanitarian needs associated with conflict and communal violence, Myanmar was hit by devastating floods and landslides in 2015. According to the Government, 38,000 houses were totally destroyed and 315,000 were heavily damaged. Over 1.4 million acres of farmland were inundated with 841,000 acres destroyed. Of the 1.7 million people who were temporarily displaced by floods and landslides in 2015, all except 9,000 had returned to their villages of origin by the end of December 2015. Although many of the humanitarian activities related to floods/landslides were completed by the end of 2015, some people (particularly those still displaced in temporary sites and those affected by food insecurity) will continue to need some humanitarian support (including support to return or permanently settle elsewhere) in 2016.

CONTRIBUTION OVERVIEW

In 2015, the MHF received US$3,366,615 in contributions from three donors: Australia ($1,112,917), Sweden ($589,901), and the United Kingdom ($1,663,797). 2015 also marked the second time that these three donors contributed simultaneously to the Fund with a cumulative total of $15,484,919 since 2007, making it a true pooled funding mechanism. The MHF received additional contributions from Australia and the United Kingdom to respond to the 2015 countrywide floods.

The MHF allocated almost all of its available resources through a Reserve Allocation for floods response and through a Standard Allocation for core gaps in the 2015 HRP. Both allocations complemented the CERF Rapid Response and Under-funded Emergency grants.

The MHF remains a small fund, with $3.4 million in donor contributions in 2015. In 2016, the Fund will need to increase donor outreach to broaden the donor base, ensure a multi-year funding commitment from at least one donor and encourage existing donors to increase their contributions.

Also, in order to effectively serve as a reliable and efficient humanitarian funding mechanism, the MHF will require predictable financing, with timely funding commitments and fast-track funds disbursement in the calendar year, in alignment with the principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship.
2015 donor contributions: by date of payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Contribution (USD)</th>
<th>Date of Pledge</th>
<th>Date of Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>391 850</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
<td>Mar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>391 850</td>
<td>Mar 2014</td>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>762 777</td>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
<td>Jun 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>589 901</td>
<td>Jul 2015</td>
<td>Jul 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>384 615</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Oct 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>350 140</td>
<td>Sep 2015</td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>495 482</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 366 615</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions in 2015 (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual donor contributions 2007 to 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>801 603</td>
<td>1 086 957</td>
<td>1 978 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1 086 957</td>
<td>414 594</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2 199 674</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2 199 674</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1 047 200</td>
<td>762 079</td>
<td>242 657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 047 200</td>
<td>762 079</td>
<td>242 657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1 112 917</td>
<td>589 901</td>
<td>1 163 797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1 663 797</td>
<td>725 163</td>
<td>3 366 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 484 919</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2
ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

2.1. ALLOCATION STRATEGY
The Global Guidelines entitled “Operational Handbook for Country-based Pooled Funds (CBPFs)” issued in February 2015 outlined harmonized processes and tools across all CBPFs managed by OCHA. The country specific guidelines, “Myanmar Emergency Response Fund Operational Manual”, was developed and endorsed by the Advisory Board in July 2015. The allocation strategy of the MHF reflected the strategic goals of the HRP, while ensuring flexibility to allocate funds for unforeseen emergencies/crises.

In 2015, the MHF launched two calls through a Reserve Allocation and a Standard Allocation. These allocations were aligned with the CERF rapid response and under-funded emergency allocation processes, using the same methodology for project prioritization. The timing of these allocations also enhanced complementariness of the two funds and increased the impact of the response by ensuring that the highest priority issues were addressed.

The MHF continued to use the funding strategy that had been endorsed by the MHF Advisory Board (AB) in September 2013 and updated in May 2015. This strategy allowed the MHF to support new emergency needs caused by natural disasters or conflicts throughout Myanmar, and to fill funding gaps within the on-going core humanitarian response under the 2015 HRP.

Funding Windows:

2015 Reserve Allocation (Myanmar Floods Response)
On 30 July, Cyclone Komen made landfall in Bangladesh bringing strong winds and additional heavy rains to Myanmar, which resulted in a significant expansion of flood water and caused landslides across 12 of the country’s 14 states and regions: Rakhine, Magway, Sagaing, Chin, Mandalay, Kayin, Mon, Ayeyarwady, Yangon, Kachin, Shan and Bago. On 31 July, the President declared Chin and Rakhine states, and Magway and Sagaing regions as natural disaster zones. According to the National Natural Disaster Management Committee (NNDMC), 125 people were killed and some 1.7 million people were temporarily displaced by floods and landslides. The Government estimated that 38 000 houses were totally destroyed and 315 000 were heavily damaged. Over 1.4 million acres of farmland were inundated with 841 000 acres destroyed. In total, over nine million people were affected by the floods.

In order to complement humanitarian efforts in the floods affected areas declared as natural disaster zones, the MHF launched $1.3 million Reserve Allocation to address priority life-saving humanitarian needs in health, protection, WASH, shelter and food security sectors as well as immediate needs of affected population returning to their homes.

This reserve allocation targeted 160,000 affected people in line with the CERF Rapid Response window prioritization. The allocation ceiling was $250 000 for international and national NGOs with the minimum allocation per project of $100 000. Clusters / Sector’s coordinators prioritized activities to address life-saving humanitarian needs. The OCHA HFU facilitated the allocation process through project review, HC approval, grant agreement finalization and disbursement.

In addition, the MHF launched the following special allocation to NGO partners:

- Allocation to address emergency shelter requests after a fire incident in Shinjai camp, Kachin; and
- Allocation to address emergency shelter needs of people displaced by conflict in Hpakan, Kachin.

2015 Standard Allocation
More than 500,000 people are in need of humanitarian assistance in Myanmar in 2015 as a result of unresolved conflict or inter-communal violence. This includes about 130 000 people in Rakhine State, who remain displaced following outbreaks of inter-communal violence in 2012, and over 100 000 people displaced by conflict in Kachin and northern Shan states since 2011.

The MHF Advisory Board agreed in 2015 to align the MHF Call for Proposals with the CERF under-funded allocation process, using the same outline of a prioritization strategy to enhance complementarity of the two funds and to increase the impact of the response targeting the same priority geographical areas and people in need of humanitarian assistance. The overall aim was to ensure that the highest priority needs are addressed in a timely manner.

The Standard Allocation supported humanitarian priorities identified through the prioritization strategy jointly developed by the HCT/ICCG
members and other humanitarian stakeholders for the allocation of CERF and MHF. This allocation focused on the highest priority life-saving humanitarian response in the health, protection, WASH, nutrition, shelter and education sectors. The Humanitarian Coordinator approved the allocation of US$2.4 million after extensive consultations with Cluster/Sectors coordinators and the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT). The allocation ceiling and minimum allocation per project were $450,000 and $100,000 respectively.

Clusters/Sector coordinators undertook a prioritization of activities to meet the highest needs, using the MHF Scorecards for Project Prioritization. OCHA HFU facilitated the allocation process through project review, HC approval, grant agreement finalization and disbursement.

Since the capacity assessment for partners had not been completed at the time of funds allocation, the same processes outlined in the Reserve Allocation were applied to the current implementing partners.

In addition, the 2014 Standard Allocation of $1.2 million released in October 2014 funded three projects to provide multi-sector support for crisis affected rural communities in Rakhine. Given the need for revision of a number of proposals, the grant processes were completed only in early 2015.

**MHF Funding Eligibility**

Since its creation in 2007, the MHF has focused on providing funding assistance to national and international NGOs. In 2013, the Advisory Board agreed to include proposals from the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement. In 2015, following the 2015 CBPF guidelines, the Advisory Board agreed to expand the eligibility of MHF funding to UN agencies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

International and national NGOs must undergo the capacity assessment process to be eligible to receive funding from CBPFs. All UN agencies and IOM are eligible to receive funding.
2.2. ALLOCATION BREAKDOWN

MHF funds available

During 2015, the MHF had a total $5.9 million available for allocations. It includes $3.4 million of new donor contributions for 2015 and $2.6 million carried over from 2014.

MHF funds allocated to projects

The MHF allocated $5.4 million ($5.0 million to programme cost and $0.4 million to audit and programme support costs) to 23 projects during 2015, with an average of $210,000 per project.

Although the MHF expanded its eligibility to UN agencies and IOM, 2015 allocation prioritized funding for NGOs as UN agencies were the main recipients of CERF. The MHF entered into 17 agreements with international NGOs (INGOs), and six agreements with national NGOs (NNGOs).

MHF funds allocated to projects during 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Type</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Allocated to projects US$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INGOs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,073,105</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGOs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>947,857</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,020,962</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total of 23 projects funded in 2015, 12 were implemented solely by international NGOs, five by international NGOs in partnership with national NGOs, and six solely by national NGOs. It means that more than a third of all funding allocated during the year was channelled through national NGOs.

MHF funds implemented by partners during 2015

Summary of MHF funds available in 2015 (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Funds available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry over 2014</td>
<td>2,590,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 contributions</td>
<td>3,366,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total available 2015</td>
<td>5,957,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the $5 million allocated by the MHF during 2015, $4.7 million was allocated to 22 projects for emergency response in Myanmar. One early action project took 0.23 million. All projects fell under the 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan.

MHF funds allocated to projects during 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>No. of projects</th>
<th>Allocated to projects US$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,751,244</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>269,718</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,020,962</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MHF funds allocated by region

MHF funds allocated by sector (millions US$)
CHAPTER 3
PERFORMANCE

3.1. FUND PERFORMANCE AND MANAGEMENT

MHF and humanitarian priorities

In 2015, the MHF successfully responded to key humanitarian needs in health, protection, WASH, shelter and food security sectors, as well as supported early recovery and rehabilitation needs to alleviate immediate needs of those returning to their places of origin.

Also, building on lessons learnt from Nargis response, the 2015 MHF allocation provided in-kind and in-cash relief assistance in the floods affected areas of Chin State, Magway Region Rakhine State and Sagaing Region.

The timeliness of MHF processes

A key challenge faced by the MHF was to follow the CBFP’s workflow established in the guidelines. The processing of standard grants took 124 working days and the reserve grants 64 working days. This means the pre-established timeline for the whole grant process was not accomplished. OCHA Myanmar has been working closely with its HQ’s Funding Coordination Section (FCS) to find ways to expedite grant processing.

Five common delays identified are as follows.

First, the Myanmar HFU had to introduce the online GMS between March and June 2015. This created a considerable increase in the workload of the unit.

Second, in July 2015, a countrywide flood affected more than nine million people throughout Myanmar. This meant that the roll-out of the GMS coincided with the flood emergency, further stretching HFU human resources.

Third, the GMS required adequate internet capacity, which was not available in Myanmar. This considerably delayed the submission of proposals, as well as the technical review process.

Fourth, potential partners were slow in responding to comments provided by the Review Committee.

Fifth, there were delays in the disbursement of the grants (an average of 37 working days for standard grants and 33 working days for reserve grants). Although the grant agreement stated a maximum of ten business days to process the first payment, this target was not reached during 2015. The average disbursement time was considerably extended after one partner, who signed the grant agreement on 1 December 2015, did not receive the first disbursement until March 2016.

Reserve Allocation Grant Processing

The MHF Reserve Allocation was launched in August 2015 to respond to the flood emergency. Since the roll out of the Grant Management System (GMS) coincided with the flood emergency, only some existing partners had completed due diligence process at that time while others had not even registered themselves in the system.

The GMS format, and poor in-country internet connectivity, resulted in considerable delays for partners to complete registration and due diligence exercise. Given the urgent need to expedite the grant disbursement, the HC and AB decided to treat all applicants as high risk partners to minimise the financial risks of not conducting a capacity assessment.

The GMS design, and its reliance on high speed internet, also led to several delays throughout the allocation process, particularly in submission and review of proposals.

Finally, several delays were experienced during the disbursement process. These delays meant that it took an average of 64 working days (or 2.8 months) to process the grants.
### 2015 Reserve Allocation projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Scheduled time</th>
<th>Actual time</th>
<th>No. of grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial review</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approved by HC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Average Working Days for Reserve Allocations (Real vs Estimated)

- **Total**: 41 vs 64 days
- **Step 4: Disbursement**: 21 vs 33 days
- **Step 3: Final approval by HC**: 8 vs 8 days
- **Step 2: Technical and financial review**: 8 vs 16 days
- **Step 1: Submission of proposal**: 4 vs 7 days

#### Disbursement for Reserve Grants (%), 64 days

- Step 1: Submission of proposal: 11%
- Step 2: Technical and financial review: 25%
- Step 3: Final approval by HC: 12%
- Step 4: Disbursement: 52%
Standard Allocation

In comparison to the Reserve Allocation, the Standard Allocation took almost double the number of days (124 working days) of the reserve allocations.

Standard grants were processed according to the workflow provided in the CBPF guidelines. A significant difference between standard and reserve processing was the time it took for partners to respond to strategic and technical comments provided by the Review Committees. Another delay was the result of the various stakeholders involved in the grant disbursement (a total of 37 days). Overall, all these delays meant that almost 5.5 months had passed when all partners confirmed to HFU that they received the first grant payment.

2015 Standard Allocation projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of working days</th>
<th>Scheduled time</th>
<th>Actual time</th>
<th>No. of grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch of allocation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval &amp; AB consultation review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and financial review</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval by HC Disbursement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursement of Standard Grants (%), 124 working days

Average Working Days to Process Standard Grants

Step 1: Launch of allocation
Step 2: Submission of proposal
Step 3: Strategic review
Step 4: HC preliminary approval and AB consultation
Step 5: Financial and technical review
Step 6: Final HC approval
Step 7: Disbursement

Total: 86
Estimated: 124

Strengthening leadership with MHF funds

Thanks to the MHF, OCHA Myanmar and the ICCG were able to identify the highest priority humanitarian needs through a consultative process. The MHF process also enabled the Humanitarian Coordinator to ensure that the MHF resources were used to address agreed priorities through her endorsement of each call-for-proposal.

Also, special allocations were made by the HC after consultation with the clusters coordinators on specific humanitarian needs.

Delays in disbursement

During the 2015 Global Pooled Fund workshop, the issue of delays in disbursement was seriously discussed as it is a common issue across all CBPFs. Some were due to banking process of recipient countries, insufficient banking information of the partners, weakness in Umoja system and insufficient human resources to undertake intensive payments process, etc. Those who did not have pre-financing capacities, such as national NGOs, experienced long delays in the implementation of the projects due to delays in the disbursement of the second payment. This means that delays in disbursements impacted the programme implementation, as well as unnecessarily increasing work for the HFU through the arrangement of reprogramming or no-cost extensions.

With the aim of increasing the focus on fund-level performance introduced by the FCS, in May 2016 the MHF will introduce performance indicators to be included in the next annual report. This will enhance coordination and support mobilization of resources, strengthen leadership of the HC and improve effectiveness of humanitarian response.

2 The grant process for three out of the 14 Standard Allocation 14 projects started at the end of 2014. However, the first disbursement was received in February 2015. Therefore, they are counted as 2015 projects.
MHF Partnerships with National NGOs

The MHF focused on strengthening partnership with national NGOs. In 2015, the MHF funded national NGOs 32 per cent of its total allocations (both through direct and indirect funding).

Seven of eight projects funded by the MHF in Kachin/Shan crisis were implemented fully or partly by national NGOs. International NGOs working in partnership with national NGOs helped strengthening project implementation and financial management, and improving monitoring systems of national partners. These national NGOs are critical to the overall humanitarian response, as they are often the only entities that have access to the affected population.

Throughout 2015, the HFU met extensively with national organisations, both in Yangon and the field locations (Kachin/Shan and Rakhine), to increase their awareness of the MHF (including the Grant Management System), and encourage their application for funding through the MHF.

3.2. ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISKS MANAGEMENT

Advisory Board structure and function

The MHF Advisory Board comprises the Humanitarian Coordinator (Chairperson), representatives from contributing member states, three UN representatives, three NNGO representatives, the OCHA Head of Office, and a Gender advisor (if available). During 2015, the MHF Advisory Board supported the HC through advising on strategic and policy issues such as the review and endorsement of the MHF Resource Mobilization Strategy, the MHF Operational Manual and the Allocation Strategy Papers of the different allocation processes.

MHF Risks

Strategic Risk

Despite managing the MHF in accordance with the 2015 CBPF Guidelines, the HFU recognised that the AB participation was very limited. A review of the AB membership and its communication strategy is prioritized for 2016 to make it more relevant, inclusive and active.

Risk due to Volatility of Funding

One important risk is the unpredictability of donor contributions towards MHF. While 2015 was the second year that the MHF received contributions from three donors, the number of donors contributing to the fund remains low. Also, the MHF is one of the smallest OCHA funds with a total portfolio of $3.4 million. A lack of predictability in funding contributions, compounded by considerable delays in fund disbursement, makes it difficult for the MHF to plan standard allocations or develop strategies for the call-for-proposals. Earlier and more predictable donor contributions would improve the management of the MHF.

To partially address this risk, the United Kingdom (DfID) has entered into a multi-year (2014-2015) funding agreement with OCHA, which included a payment schedule, ensuring predictable funding. Australia and Sweden were unable to make a commitment to the MHF until mid-year. More efforts will be put in 2016 to address this risk.

Financial Risk after Grant Allocation

A number of strategic, programmatic, financial and management risks are inherent as part of the administration of any funding mechanism. The following points explain how these financial risks were addressed by the HFU.

- The Review Committee helped to identify, analyse and categorize the risk of proposals received. This strategic review enabled the HFU and the HC, supported by the AB, to ensure strategic decision-making and reduced inherent risks embedded in grant allocation.
- To ensure that MHF partners had the capacity to financially manage projects, the HFU chose partners that have had experience in managing grants of comparable size, and worked with a range of multiple donors, including bilateral, UN and other NGOs.
- To reduce the risk of fraud, corruption and theft, the HFU conducted site visits to monitor 73% of funded projects, including a spot check of financial procedures.

Hazard Risk

Unforeseen hazards such as natural disasters and political violence can create risks for smooth implementation of on-going projects. To address these risks, the management of the MHF must allow projects to adapt to the changing operational environment.

In July 2015, Myanmar was hit by devastating floods and landslides that affected 12 of the country’s 14 states and regions. A MHF-funded WASH project was impacted by the floods in Rakhine area, and required additional time and budget modifications to complete implementation.

While the security situation has remained fragile in Kachin, it has deteriorated and remained unstable in northern Shan State, with heavy fighting in Kokang in February, as well as repeated clashes between the Tatmadaw and armed groups such as the RCSS, TNLA and KIA in that area. These clashes have had temporary
implications on agencies’ operations in the area. In 2015, access to the Kokang Self-Administered Zone (Shan State) was blocked for months, until the UN and international organizations were granted access in July. Between July and November 2015, no humanitarian access was granted by the authorities to 1,200 conflict-affected people in Sumprabum area.

In Rakhine State, severe movement restrictions continued to be imposed on Muslim communities (including IDPs), affecting their access to healthcare, education, trade and livelihood. To ensure that assistance reaches the population in need, outreach and coordination with national NGOs, who provide most assistance in those areas is required. The MHF prioritised implementation though national NGOs to reduce the risk of access constraints negatively impacting project implementation.

**Monitoring and Reporting**

The HFU developed a monitoring and reporting (financial and programmatic) framework based on the assumption that partner organizations will have adequate internal mechanisms to meet project management, monitoring and reporting requirements.

In order to improve the Monitoring and Reporting (M&R) functions, OCHA recruited a Grant Management Officer to focus on project monitoring and support the Fund management.

In addition to the monitoring done by implementing partners, the HFU decided to conduct at least one monitoring visit to each MHF project during project implementation. Eight of the 23 MHF-funded projects funded during 2015 were visited at least once during the year. The remaining 15 projects will be monitored during 2016.

Field monitoring of individual projects included an assessment of progress and achievements against the project’s implementation plan, interaction and discussion with beneficiaries to understand their perspectives on the projects, and financial spot check.

In addition to monitoring site visits, the HFU systematically reviewed the narrative and financial reports submitted by implementing partners. When necessary, the partner was requested to provide additional information or clarification before the reports are accepted. The HFU also subsequently provided individual feedback and guidance on any adjustments required to the project’s implementation.

Together, the project monitoring visits and the review of project reports helped the HFU to identify areas where partners required further support. For example, the HFU in 2015 found that partners required more information on how to fulfill the GMS financial procedures. To address this gap, the HFU helped explaining the MHF procedures and processes to the partners in inter-cluster meetings and other coordination meetings (in Yangon as well as in the field).

**Gender Mainstreaming**

MHF partners are expected to mainstream gender consideration in the project designs. To ensure a project proposal to successfully integrate gender consideration in its design, it must describe different needs of girls, boys, women, and men and propose a humanitarian response that equitably addresses these needs. To encourage MHF partners to better integrate gender, they are required to evaluate their project proposals prior to submission using the Gender Marker (GM). Starting from 2013, MHF partners began to regularly employ the GM in the evaluation of their project proposals.

During 2015, a GenCap advisor served as a member of both the MHF Advisory Board and the Review Board, and actively participated in the 2015 technical review of proposals. To ensure that gender is properly considered during project design process, the GenCap Advisor provided several trainings for MHF partners on the Gender Marker both in Yangon and the field.

During the project design, each partner assigns a GM score (0, 1, 2a, or 2b) to the project proposal indicating the degree to which the project will ensure that women, men, girls, and boys will benefit equally from the humanitarian response and whether the project will advance gender equality. The use of the GM tool during the design of the project proposal helps to ensure that gender is considered throughout the assessment, planning, implementation and monitoring of a project. During the proposal review process, the Review Board, with support of the IASC Gender Capacity (GenCap) Advisor, assigns a GM score to the proposal.

Out of 23 MHF-funded projects during 2015, 22 projects proposals were rated at GM 2a or 2b indicating that the project is expected to significantly contribute to gender equality.
CHAPTER 4
ACHIEVEMENTS

The MHF allocates funding to projects in priority areas throughout the year. Project implementation may take place during more than one calendar year, and many of the projects funded during 2015 will be substantially implemented during 2016. To ensure coherence of project results, the allocation results section will review results of only those projects that completed implementation during 2015. Results described in this section are for projects that were funded by the MHF during 2014 and 2015, but had completed implementation by the end of 2015.

Of the 16 MHF-funded projects that completed implementation during 2015, five received funding in 2014 and 11 in 2015. Those 16 projects covered the sectors of food security and livelihoods, education in emergency, health, protection, emergency shelter/NFIs and WASH, with a total cost of $4.1 million. The total number of people covered by these projects was approximately 265,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Achievements 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Allocation Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015 Myanmar Humanitarian Fund</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>US$ 1.1 million Amount Allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☹</td>
<td>18% of MHF Funding in HRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>3 partners 4 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People targeted total</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education 2015 Output indicators</th>
<th>HRP Target</th>
<th>MHF Reached %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of emergency-affected children (3-17 years) accessing education</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>12,085 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency-affected children (5-11 years) accessing primary education</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>1,272 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of emergency-affected children (12-17 years) accessing education</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>1,272 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (3-17 years) receiving education which integrates initiatives to mitigate contextual protection risks</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>11,713 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: In 2015, total 4 Education MHF projects implemented and 1 is 2014 on-going project which was started in Dec 2014. Although 4 Educations MHF projects implemented in 2015, 1 project is completed and 3 are on-going in 2015. The rest of achievement from 3 on-going projects will be reported in 2016.

Allocations

During 2015, the MHF allocated US$1.1 million to four projects through standard and reserve allocations.

Target Locations
Kachin, northern Shan and Rakhine States

Achievements

Improved physical environment of conflict-affected schools lessened the high drop-out rates among adolescents (12-17 years) affected by violence in Rakhine State with Non-Formal Education sessions (accessing post-primary education (formal and non-formal, aiming at gender parity, mine risk education, psychosocial support, life-skills, child protection mechanisms); Training provided to teachers reduced incidents of school violence.

Challenges

Limited Human Resources in Rakhine state and there were faced with a delay in staff recruitment process and staffing gaps hindered capacity to implement priorities.
**Allocations**

During 2015, the MHF allocated US$0.7 million to four projects through reserve allocation.

**Target Locations**

Rakhine and Chin States

**Achievements**

The projects improved the resilience capacities of the people for food consumption through cash assistant and livelihood access for the most vulnerable population.

**Challenges**

Supporting livestock breeding for most vulnerable household’s activities were not started yet timely due to late recruitment of staff and seasonal poultry disease outbreak occurred in November 2015 in Mrauk-U and Pauktaw Township in Rakhine State.

---

**Food Security**

**Achievements 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Allocation Summary</th>
<th>2015 Myanmar Humanitarian Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$</strong> US$ 0.7 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$</strong> 1% of MHF Funding in HRP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 partners</td>
<td>4 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People targeted total</td>
<td>36,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,882</td>
<td>13,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>8,742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Food Security 2015 Output indicators**

- Number of people who received food and/or cash assistance: 761,000
- Percentage of households with an adequate Food Consumption Score (FCS≥35): 80%
- Number of people who receive agriculture inputs, livestock assistance and sustainable income support: 153,000

**Remark:** Although 4 Food Security ERF projects implemented in 2015, 3 are on-going and their achievements will be reported in 2016.

Support to vegetable home gardening in Taung Pauk Village, Kyauktaw Township, Rakhine, December 2015.
Allocations
During 2015, the MHF allocated US$1.1 million to seven projects through standard and reserve allocations.

Target Locations
Kachin, northern Shan, Rakhine and Chin States

Achievements
Mobile clinics served in the affected community, Health education was valued by communities; all communities relied mobile clinic team and consult their health problem and diseases

Challenges
Limited Human Resources in Rakhine state and there were faced a delay in staff recruitment process for Medical Officer and Community Nurse/Health Assistant. Furthermore, emergency flood response in July and August 2015 was occurred in project implementation area.

Remark In 2015, total 7 Health MHF projects implemented and 1 is 2014 on-going project which was started in Oct 2014. Although 7 Health MHF projects implemented in 2015, 6 are on-going and the rest of their achievements will be reported in 2016.

Credit: Pike Pike Aye / OCHA

Health services provision through Mobile Clinic in Pan Maw Village, Mrauk U Township, Rakhine, December 2015.
Remark: Out of 5 Protection MHF projects, 3 projects funded during 2014 were continued implementing in 2015. 2 projects funded during 2015 were ongoing projects and their achievements will be reported in 2016.

Allocations
During 2015, the MHF allocated US$0.2 million to two projects through standard allocation.

Target Locations
Northern Shan, Chin and Rakhine States

Achievements
Emergency effected people received the minimum available protection services with appropriate mine risk education messages and a positive development in Gender-Based Violence (GBV) programming.

Challenges
There were faced with unforeseen hazards risks such as language barrier between trainee and trainer in Mine risk education sessions, hard weather from June to September, lengthy activity approval process from Township Education Officers and Township Administration Officer and unstable constraints in project implemented areas.

Remark: In 2015, total 10 WASH MHF projects implemented and 2 are 2014 on-going project which were started in Sept 2014 and Oct 2014. Although 9 WASH MHF projects implemented in 2015, 1 project is completed and 8 are on-going in 2015. The rest of achievements from 8 on-going projects will be reported in 2016.

Allocations
During 2015, the MHF allocated US$1.2 million to nine projects through reserve allocations.

Target Locations
Kachin, northern Shan, Rakhine States and Magway, Sagaing Regions

Achievements
Emergency effected community people received equitable and sustainable access to sufficient quantity of safe drinking and domestic water through new tube well, hand dug wells and latrine pans and pipes distribution.

Challenges
Some projects faced with overlapping activities and locations with other donors and it was solved with changed the activities and locations with reprogramming request.
Remark Although 4 NFIs MHF projects implemented in 2015, 2 projects completed and 2 are on-going in 2015. The rest of achievements from 2 on-going projects will be reported in 2016.

Provision of shelter for Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) to improve safety and protection in Putao camp, Kachin, October 2015.
2015 has seen increased humanitarian needs in Myanmar with additional displacements and vulnerability resulting from renewed conflicts in Kachin and Shan states, and devastating floods that affected over nine million people in 12 of the country’s 14 states/regions. In Rakhine and Kachin/Shan states, many of the IDPs living in camps or camp-like situations remain dependent on humanitarian assistance to meet their basic needs largely due to continued restrictions on movements and limited access to livelihood opportunities. The protracted displacement also has an adverse effect on the host communities, straining already scarce resources.

The MHF in 2015

In 2015, the MHF received a total contribution of $3.4 million and allocated the highest level of funding ($5.4 million for 23 projects) in a single year since its creation.

The HFU made extensive efforts to promote the Fund to raise its visibility during the year, providing regular briefings to all clusters, and visiting project locations in Kachin and Rakhine. As the visibility of the Fund has increased, so has the demand for MHF support. The MHF received 40 proposals/concept papers during 2015 (double the number received in 2014 and more than any previous year).

Challenges for 2016

The first challenge is to increase the financial contributions to the MHF up to 10 per cent of the overall humanitarian funding provided in-country as well as to broaden the donor base. While the Financial Tracking Service (FTS) managed by OCHA identified $143.2 million in donor contributions provided under the 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan for Myanmar, the MHF received only $3.4 million (2.3%). Increased fund allocation through identifying new potential donors and broadening the donor base of contribution is one of the greatest challenges for 2016.

The second challenge will be to reduce the length of the disbursement process. Efforts are already being made to substantially reduce disbursement times for both Standard and Reserve allocations.

The third challenge is related to delays in the strategic and technical reviews of proposals submitted for Standard Allocation grants (an average of 30 days). Most delays were due to implementing partners not responding to comments in a timely manner. The HFU has already addressed these delays by providing training to improve the quality of the proposals submitted by implementing partners.

The fourth challenge is enhancing the efficient use of the Grant Management System (GMS) and Umoja system. Both programmes were new to OCHA HQ and Myanmar HFU staff. In particular, the Myanmar HFU spent a considerable amount of time not only to upload documents in the GMS system but also to help partners with finalizing their inputs in the GMS proposal template which was rather complicated especially for national NGOs. The situation was further compounded by the flood emergency in the second half of 2015, prompting the need for the Myanmar HFU to launch a Reserve Call for Proposals, while learning to navigate the GMS.

The final challenge is related to the poor internet connectivity in Yangon, Kachin and Rakhine. A mixed system (offline / online) for the grant processing remains the best option for the MHF to successfully fulfil the 2016 targets. OCHA is already piloting this offline/online system; considerably reducing the time spent processing MHF grants.

Way Forward

In 2016, OCHA Myanmar will plan to grow the Myanmar Humanitarian Fund. To this end, the Myanmar HFU will conduct a review of the existing funding processes to improve its effectiveness. This internal assessment is expected to help address donors’ concerns regarding the MHF and raise the Fund’s profile among implementing partners. It is also expected that the Fund will become a tool for the HC to address the urgent and chronic humanitarian needs in priority/gap areas, improve confidence-building with stakeholders and attract new donors to the fund. Concrete actions will be taken to achieve these objectives:

1. The Myanmar HFU will work closely with the OCHA FCS Finance to improve and reduce the disbursement time for allocations.

2. The MHF needs to be able to work offline on the GMS in Yangon, Rakhine and Kachin where internet services are extremely poor. This will significantly reduce the time required by partners to apply for eligibility, finalize proposals, and submit all reporting requirements, while maintaining transparency and accountability. In any case, OCHA Myanmar is upgrading its
internet connectivity in Yangon as well as Kachin and Rakhine sub-offices.

3. Given that GMS roll-out coincided with the flood emergency in Myanmar, the MHF will focus on strengthening its internal capacity and knowledge about the system, simultaneously increasing partners’ capacity in the use of GMS and MHF processes.

4. To align with other CBPFs, the name of the fund (formerly Emergency Response Fund) was officially changed to Myanmar Humanitarian Fund in the first quarter of 2016, for which the HC and AB will be fully informed and consulted.

5. The membership of the AB will also be reviewed in 2016 and will aim to include more relevant NGO members.
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ANNEX

Health care for displaced people in northern Shan State

(April 2015) - "I visit the clinic all the time!" said JaSeng,* a 59-year-old woman who has spent the last three years living in a camp for displaced people in Myanmar. "At my age, there is always something that hurts," she adds, laughing contagiously—something that she does easily, despite the challenges of being uprooted.

JaSeng lives in Jaw 1 camp, along with some 400 other people. But the camp’s small health clinic has extremely basic facilities. Light streams through the clinic’s thatched walls, and a flimsy shower curtain provides minor privacy for examinations. But the health staff have welcoming smiles. They work for the local NGO Karuna Myanmar Social Services (KMSS) which is one of the main organizations providing assistance to more than 7,000 people displaced by the conflict in northern Shan State.

The KMSS staff ensure that the camp’s residents have access to basic primary health-care services five days a week. Every Friday morning, they are joined by a trained medical doctor, two nurses and a health promoter from the International Rescue Committee (IRC). This team provides medical consultations, conducts health-education sessions and, when necessary, supports emergency referrals for camp residents.

"We typically see some 20 patients during our weekly visits to Jaw 1 camp, and in some of the bigger camps more patients come to the clinic," explains Dr. Soe Win Naing, the IRC doctor responsible for coordinating the project.

Since late 2014, IRC and KMSS, with funding from the OCHA-managed Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF), have provided primary and reproductive health services in 15 camps for displaced people in the area. This year, they will also begin services in four camps in southern Kachin State. Both organizations also rehabilitate and build clinics in several locations to improve patients’ access to quality care. Patients requiring specialist treatment are referred to local hospitals nearby.

Developing local skills

As the IRC project will end in June, one of IRC’s biggest goals is to build the capacity of KMSS staff to improve health services offered in the camp. To achieve this, IRC offers on-the-job training on skills ranging from diagnosis and clinical management, to natal and newborn care.

"I’m really happy with the training we are receiving. We have been learning about malaria and diarrhoea diagnosis and treatment," explains Ms. HkawngTsae, a KMSS Health Assistant trained by IRC in the camp.

To complement health-clinic services, IRC also trains KMSS staff and camp-based volunteers to promote safe hygiene practices, such as hand washing. It also offers sessions on reproductive health to promote the importance of natal care, breastfeeding and immunization for children under age 2.

---

* Until 5 February 2016 the MHF was named Myanmar Emergency Response Fund (ERF).
Critical health services are underfunded and affected by insecurity

Displaced people urgently need access to adequate health services. But most camps lack adequate medical supplies, and there are few qualified medical personnel who know how to safely store and administer medicine. Yet the sector is consistently and severely underfunded, with only 23 per cent of requirements met in 2014. This year, health groups will need US$5.7 million to help 120,000 people in Kachin and northern Shan States.

Renewed fighting broke out in January and has continued sporadically over the past two months. This conflict is having a critical effect on the delivery of health and other essential forms of assistance for displaced people. The unfortunate result is that many organizations, including IRC, are forced to intermittently suspend their activities, putting already vulnerable and sick people at further risk.

For more information on the MHF (until February 2015 named Myanmar Emergency Response Fund – ERF) and proposal templates, please email mhf-myanmar@un.org or visit: http://www.unocha.org/myanmar/humanitarian-financing/emergency-response-fund-erf.