HUMANITARIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (HIP)

South and East Asia and the Pacific

The full implementation of this version of the HIP is subject to the adoption of the decision amending Decision C(2016) 8795

AMOUNT: EUR 29 775 000

The present Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) was prepared on the basis of financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000 (Worldwide Decision) and the related General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid (Operational Priorities). The purpose of the HIP and its annex is to serve as a communication tool for ECHO’s partners and to assist in the preparation of their proposals. The provisions of the Worldwide Decision and the General Conditions of the Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

0. First Modification 05/07/2017

Bangladesh/Myanmar: Tropical Cyclone Mora

Tropical Cyclone Mora made landfall along the southeast coast of Bangladesh on 30 May 2017, bringing strong wind and heavy rain that impacted the Cox’s Bazar and the Chittagong Hills Tract areas of Bangladesh and several regions in Myanmar, in particular Rakhine State. According to the Government of Bangladesh close to 3 million people have been affected. Six makeshift camps, hosting a population of 148 100 very vulnerable Rohingya refugees, were severely impacted. In Myanmar, the shelters in the Rohingya camps around Sittwe, housing 120 000 IDPs, and Northern Rakhine State have been particularly hit. The situation in Northern Rakhine is of much concern because the cyclone impacted the same communities that had been affected by the October 2016 events, in the sequence of which more than 2 000 homes had been destroyed and livelihoods seriously disrupted. To address the needs of the most vulnerable people in the most affected areas, an amount of EUR 1 500 000 has been added to this HIP, of which EUR 1 000 000 for Bangladesh and EUR 500 000 for Myanmar. In Bangladesh the response will focus on the provision of food assistance and nutrition, emergency shelter and water and sanitation. In Myanmar the response will focus on food assistance and nutrition, emergency shelter and NFIs; as a particular concern in Northern Rakhine, protection will be mainstreamed in the intervention.

Philippines: Marawi - Mindanao conflict

Since the outbreak of fighting on May 23rd, Marawi city in Mindanao has been heavily bombarded. As of 30 June, about 230 people have been killed due to the conflict and 320 000 people have already fled the city. Over 22 000 people (7% of the total of 320 000 IDPs) are in 79 operating evacuation centres and the rest are with host families. It is reported that 59 people died at the evacuation centres due to dehydration. With this massive number of IDPs, the needs are overwhelming from all sectors. Priority issues remain with food, water, sanitation and hygiene in evacuation centres. The protection situation is also extremely concerning since return is almost impossible as the city has been burnt and destroyed. To address the needs of the most vulnerable people affected by this conflict an amount of EUR 850 000 for Philippines has been added to this HIP. The response will focus to address protection and IHL needs, as well as provide emergency
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assistance more specifically in sectors as food assistance and nutrition, emergency shelter and WASH.

**Inclusion of a beneficiary country in the present HIP**

Malaysia, which has the largest case load of refugees and asylum seekers in South East Asia, is added to the list of beneficiary countries in the present HIP, subject to the adoption of the decision amending Decision C(2016) 8795 (ECHO/WWD/BUD/2017/01000).

1. **CONTEXT**

This HIP covers the response to man-made and natural disasters, as well as disaster risk reduction and resilience activities in South and East Asia and the Pacific. In terms of response, its focus is on Bangladesh, Myanmar/Burma, including the overspill of this crisis in Thailand and Bangladesh, and on the Philippines with the potential for responding to new disasters, also in Bhutan, Cambodia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Fiji, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, the Maldives, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Timor Leste, Vanuatu and Vietnam. These countries have been included because of their high exposure and vulnerability to disasters. As regards Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and resilience, the focus will be on Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Myanmar/Burma, Nepal, the Philippines, Vietnam and regional initiatives in Southeast Asia. DRR and preparedness will also be integrated into humanitarian assistance, as appropriate in each situation.

This is a densely populated region, with over 2 billion people; it is prone to a variety of natural disasters, has rapid urbanization rates and is the site of several conflicts and political volatility. The impact of disasters is not felt uniformly; the poorest and marginalised are typically the worst affected, as they tend to live in risk-prone areas and have low coping mechanisms to deal with the impact of disasters. Demographic pressure, poor urban planning, settlements in high-risk areas and reduced livelihood options lead to high vulnerability to more frequent, intense and unpredictable disasters. Due to rapid and unplanned urbanisation, urban communities are increasingly at risk.

Some 60% (27.5 million) of the world's children suffering from Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) live in countries covered by this HIP, in particular in South Asia.

**Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia**

With a population of 160 million, Bangladesh ranks 142\textsuperscript{nd} in the Human Development Index (HDI) and scores 5.8 in INFORM. The Integrated Analysis Framework (IAF) for 2016 identified high humanitarian needs and the vulnerability of the population affected by the crises is assessed to be very high. It is one of the Flagship Countries under the EU Resilience Action Plan and of ECHO's Forgotten Crises list. In Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT), the formal conflict ended with the signing of the 1997 Peace Accord, however, the accord has not been fully implemented. Recurrent natural disasters and earthquake risks are a concern.

**Rohingya refugees and host communities** – over 250,000 Rohingya refugees (est.) live in Bangladesh. In 2016 the government undertook a headcount of so-called "undocumented Myanmar nationals" in 6 districts where most Rohingya are thought to reside, the objectives of which are not fully clear and some concerns remain unaddressed. Rohingya refugees are often described as one of the most persecuted groups in the world;
they lack freedom of movement and are not officially allowed to work or earn an income, subjecting them to exploitation. Only basic humanitarian assistance is allowed and high GAM rates persist, no food distribution or shelter support is permitted in the makeshift camps, only basic water and sanitation services. Sexual and gender based violence (SGBV) and mental health issues are alarmingly high. Access to judicial reprieve is a challenge due to lack of legal status. Many of the vulnerabilities faced by refugees also apply to the host community.

Natural disasters – Bangladesh ranks 7.2/10 for hazards and exposure and 4.8/10 for vulnerability in INFORM. The country is exposed to earthquakes, cyclones, and flooding; every year natural disasters impact on nutrition, food security, livelihoods, shelter, water and sanitation, forcing people to resort to negative coping strategies, such as migration (risk of trafficking) and early child marriage. SGBV is a concern, further exacerbated after each new crisis. The Government's initiatives in cyclone and flood preparedness have much improved and community based rural disaster preparedness is also deemed successful, however, little has been done in regard to earthquake preparedness although densely populated areas, including the capital, sit on seismically active zones.

Bhutan
With a population of 0.8 million, Bhutan ranks 132nd in the HDI and scores 2.9 in INFORM. The country is located in one of the most seismically active zones in the world, which contributes to a serious threat of Glacial Lake Outburst Floods; more than 25 lakes at risk have been identified. Landslides and flash floods cause extensive damage during the monsoon. The concept of Disaster Risk Reduction is new to the country and therefore it is still building its capacity.

Nepal
With a population of 28.8 million, Nepal ranks 145th in the HDI and scores 5 in INFORM. The 2016 IAF identified low humanitarian needs, however, the 2015 earthquake has increased the disaster risk by weakening the mountain slopes, which exacerbates the risk of landslides and floods during the monsoon. The post-earthquake reconstruction process continues at a slow pace, focusing on rebuilding private housing; other sectors are yet to be addressed, delaying the transition between emergency response and rehabilitation. The vulnerability of the population affected by crises is assessed to be high. The country faces frequent natural disasters with approximately 1,000 people killed by landslides and floods annually. Nepal is one of the Flagship Countries under the EU Resilience Action Plan.

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)
The country ranks 148th in the HDI, scores 6.7 in INFORM and ranks 2nd on the Global Climate Risk Index of countries most affected between 1995 and 2014. It is included in ECHO's Forgotten Crisis list and the IAF 2016 identified high humanitarian needs; the vulnerability of the population affected by the crises is assessed to be very high. The country was under military rule for almost 60 years and is confronted with several ethno-nationalist insurgencies; it is on the OECD list of fragile states. Since 2011 it embarked on an ambitious transition process seeking to secure peace and national reconciliation, entrench democracy and revive the economy. The signing (October 2015) of the “Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement” between the government and 8 out of the 15 major ethnic armed groups, the results of the November 2015 elections, and the peaceful transfer of political power to the democratically elected government provide a historic opportunity to consolidate democracy and work towards peace and prosperity.
Nonetheless, conflicts in Kachin and Shan States, protracted displacement and continued inter-communal tensions in Rakhine State, in addition to the country’s vulnerability to natural disasters, result in significant humanitarian needs that will continue for the foreseeable future. The number of people directly affected by humanitarian crises (including the refugees hosted in Thailand) is estimated at 1.5 million. The population (2014 census) is estimated at 51.48 million (24.82 million male and 26.66 million female\(^1\)); ethnic minorities represent 30%. Some 25.6% lives below the poverty line and nearly 85% of the poor live in rural areas\(^2\). Poverty levels vary substantially across regions, with Rakhine and Chin States faring by far the worst (poverty rates of 78% and 71.5% respectively\(^3\)). Whilst the country has made progress in social development, this has neither been equal across regions nor across ethnic groups\(^4\).

In Thailand, 104,627 Myanmar/Burma refugees continue to live in nine camps along the border. While prospects for return have increased following recent contacts between the two countries, the presence of landmines, lack of basic services and limited opportunities for self-reliance are limitations for a large scale return process. A joint Myanmar/Burma – Thailand committee was set up in June 2016 to discuss the return process, although both countries insisted that returns would only occur when conditions are conducive. A full return of refugees in 2017/18 is unlikely. The vulnerability of some 7000 asylum seekers, some of which under detention (numbers fluctuate) is of particular concern.

**The Philippines**

With a population of 101 million, 25.8% live below the poverty line and income inequality is high (Gini Coefficient 0.506). The country ranks 115\(^{th}\) in the HDI and scores 5.5 in INFORM. ECHO's IAF for 2016 identified high humanitarian needs and the vulnerability of the population is assessed to be high for Mindanao and areas affected by natural disasters. The number of people directly affected by different humanitarian crises is currently estimated at 410,000. The conflict in Mindanao is listed among ECHO's Forgotten Crises. It is the poorest region in the Philippines\(^5\) and has endured longstanding and various conflicts, despite several attempts at peace agreements. In the past two decades conflicts have caused 120,000 deaths and displaced more than 4 million people (in 2015 the number of displaced increased by 27%). In 2014 the Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro was signed between the government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front but it was not possible to legislate the Bangsamoro Basic Law before the end of the previous administration's term in 2016. The new government finalised a new Peace and Development Roadmap in July 2016. Natural disasters, such as floods and droughts, regularly affect Mindanao, compounding the humanitarian situation.

**Disaster risk reduction and resilience**

All countries of South and East Asia are prone to natural disasters (cyclones, floods, earthquakes, tsunami, landslides, and droughts). Flooding associated with the monsoon is an annual event in most of the region. While the national governments' initial response is usually rapid and effective in terms of search-and-rescue, humanitarian gaps in the post-

---

\(^1\) Ministry of Information and Population – Government of the Union of Myanmar
\(^2\) UNDP, 2011
\(^3\) World Bank, 2014
\(^4\) UNSD, 2015
\(^5\) Eight out of 10 poorest provinces in the Philippines are in Mindanao; the top three are in the conflict-affected areas: 74% poverty incidence in Lanao DS, 68% in Sulu, 59% in Maguindanao, PSA 2016
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disaster phase frequently remain unaddressed. The most vulnerable households are often the most affected, particularly in remote regions and in situations where high frequency of natural disasters combines with the consequences of conflicts and violence, resulting in very low coping capacities among the most fragile and marginalized communities. Poverty and lack of access to government social schemes have a multiplier effect on the impact of natural disasters on those at the lowest levels of the social system (Dalits in South Asia, indigenous tribes, minorities). The main value added of external assistance to victims of natural disasters in the region is to address gaps in the coverage of relief operations and to overcome the barriers limiting access to social schemes.

All the countries of the region are considering actions to improve disaster risk reduction and increase resilience. These include adopting or reinforcing legal frameworks and creating central disaster management bodies. However, the implementation of national disaster laws in different countries is very uneven. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was the first regional body to adopt a legally binding document, the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER, entered into force on 24/12/2009). Its first implementation plan was completed by the end of 2015. A new plan of action (2016-2020) was endorsed in April 2016, based on ASEAN's own priorities and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030. In South Asia, governments are developing legal frameworks and setting up dedicated national platforms, in accordance with their commitment to the Sendai Framework. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation's (SAARC) Disaster Management Centre was set up as a regional unit in Delhi, in 2006; it is currently undergoing a review.

2. **Humanitarian Needs**

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

**Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia**
Rohingya refugees and host communities – some 45,000 Rohingya refugees live in two informal settlements: the Kutupalong Makeshift Camp and Leda Site; they are among the most vulnerable in Bangladesh.

**Bhutan**
All the population of the country is vulnerable to the risks of natural disasters highlighted in the previous section and, as such, are potential beneficiaries.

**Nepal**
Some 200,000 earthquake affected individuals, including more than 21,000 displaced, remain very vulnerable during the monsoon and winter seasons.

**Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)**
The 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan mentions 1,020,000 people in need of protection and/or other forms of humanitarian assistance. By the end of 2015 there were 1.4 million people of concern for UNHCR, a 19% increase, including 938,000 stateless persons (the largest caseload worldwide, mostly Rohingya) and 240,000 IDPs in Rakhine, Kachin, and Shan States.

---

6 Global Focus Myanmar http://reporting.unhcr.org/node/2541#ga=1.61316588.17788400.1466499818
In **Rakhine State** deep mistrust between Buddhist and Muslim communities continues to threaten public security and humanitarian and development interventions. One million Muslims (mostly Rohingya) continue to face institutional discrimination, limiting their capacity for self-reliance through lack of livelihood opportunities and access to basic services (health, education). Some 120,000 IDPs dis located by violence in 2012 remain in squalid camps in flood-prone areas along the coastline. Age and gender analysis reveal a relative balance between genders across age groups except for the 18-25 group, with a significantly higher number of women (14,000 women for 8,000 men) highlighting the fact that men from this age group make up a significant proportion of those migrating. Women and girls in IDP camps are particularly exposed to sexual abuse and exploitation, forced early marriages and complications during pregnancy due to lack of access to health services. Vulnerability analyses indicate that women at risk and single parent families (in general female-headed) are the largest vulnerable group. In northern Rakhine, Muslim communities continue to suffer discrimination, including lack of access to basic services and fundamental rights resulting in very limited opportunities for self-reliance, poor maternal and child health, and high levels of micronutrient deficiencies, anaemia and malnutrition with GAM rates of 15-19%. 

In **Kachin and Shan States**, where armed conflict reignited in 2011, 105,000 people remain displaced, 85% of which in Government Controlled Areas. There are fewer male than female residents registered in the camps (a ratio of 47% to 53%). Priorities of camp residents differ, with women rating cash assistance as the most important need while men state that basic food is the top priority, and children are more concerned about access to school materials/supplies. Protection concerns include: presence of landmines and other Explosive Remnants of War, forced recruitment and use of children by armed forces, SGBV, human trafficking and lack of documentation.

Although most people displaced by floods in 2015 have been resettled, communities in Chin and Rakhine States still suffer from the impact of cyclone Komen (2015); damage to crops increased food insecurity and malnutrition rates in these areas. The 2016 floods have further undermined the resilience of the population in several townships.

Despite a large scale third-country resettlement operation since 2005 (ongoing: 103,000 people resettled as of June 2016) 104,627 **refugees** from Myanmar/Burma remain in **Thailand**. Since 2011 there has been a slow but steady decrease in camp population. Asylum seekers, some of who are in detention, are particularly vulnerable.

**The Philippines**

Of those displaced in Mindanao 100,400 are in need of humanitarian assistance. Women (52%) and children (53%) represent a significant portion. Some ¾ of the population of Mindanao (12.6 million) fall under levels 2, 3, and 4 on the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), with 1.96 million suffering from severe chronic food insecurity. In Zamboanga City, 17,000 IDPs, mostly Tausug and Badjao indigenous tribes, remain in need of humanitarian assistance, in transitional sites. In Northeast
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7 CCCM Cluster Analysis, March & June 2016
8 As above.
10 CCCM cluster analysis Kachin, June 2016.
11 Myanmar Kachin & Northern Shan States camp profiling Rounds 1-3, January 2016
12 IOM-ACCORD Needs Assessment 2016; IOM Displacement Tracking Matrices 2015
13 FAO Philippines Newsletter 2015 Issue 3
Mindanao, the displaced population (3,900) is also mostly from indigenous groups (Lumad). Attacks happen periodically and some people have been displaced several times. Human rights groups advocate for a stop in human rights violations, but relief assistance is minimal. On the islands of Basilan and Sulu, fighting between government forces and the Abu Sayyaf group has displaced thousands. As the islands are generally impoverished (59% poverty), those displaced have very little capacity to satisfy their needs; 7,000 people remain in need of humanitarian assistance.

2) Description of the most acute humanitarian needs

Protection is a major concern. Depending on the context, one or several of these needs can be identified: documentation, status and protection of individuals; prevention and response to violence (including SGBV); child protection, housing, land and property rights; mine action, community-based protection; information dissemination; information management; durable solutions; coordination and advocacy.

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia

Rohingya refugees and host communities: protection is at the core of humanitarian needs due to the absence of a legal status as refugees. GAM rates remain persistently above the WHO emergency threshold. The situation is compounded by mental health issues, lack of proper access to water and sanitation, and limited access to livelihood opportunities. In the Kutupalong makeshift camp, temporary shelter and shelter repair are urgently needed. Humanitarian coordination is critical and should be strengthened.

Natural disasters: food, shelter and water/sanitation are the most common needs.

Bhutan

The geological situation of Bhutan puts its population at risk of massive earthquakes, landslides and floods during monsoon. The country is seeking to upgrade its capacity for DP/DRR/resilience.

Nepal

Due to the slow pace of reconstruction, large numbers of earthquake affected people will remain in temporary shelters for the next few years. Based on current La Niña forecasts, increased humanitarian needs for shelter, water, sanitation and food can be expected.

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)

In Rakhine State the most acute humanitarian needs are protection, shelter and non-food-items, education, health, food assistance and nutrition, water and sanitation, livelihood support, camp management and coordination. There is a continued need for conflict-sensitive and protection-focused programming aimed at increasing self-reliance opportunities for both communities, and ensuring that international humanitarian assistance is delivered on a neutral and impartial basis. Interventions promoting peaceful co-existence and inter-community dialogue are needed and the restoration of economic dynamics involving participation of both communities would benefit both groups. In northern Rakhine State, nutrition and livelihood support are priorities.

In Kachin and Shan States, the most acute needs are protection, food, education (including mine risk education), shelter, non-food-items, health and livelihood support, particularly in areas outside government control. SGBV, forced conscription of minors and the presence of anti-personnel mines require targeted sensitization and response, focused on the particular needs of women and children. There are no solid conditions for return but resettlement opportunities should be further explored in order to improve the displaced population’s self-reliance.
Given Myanmar/Burma’s exposure to natural hazards and low coping capacity, DRR measures must be mainstreamed whenever relevant and supported by targeted DRR interventions. The population and authorities are broadly aware of disasters, but understanding of how to reduce risks is insufficient.

The main humanitarian needs of the refugees from Myanmar/Burma in Thailand relate to health, food, shelter, water supply and sanitation. Regarding asylum seekers, protection and health remain the top concerns.

The Philippines
Protection is the most acute need. Displacement often entails food insecurity, and while many IDPs are resilient enough to be able to feed themselves during the initial weeks of displacement, prolonged/repeated movements exhaust this capacity. In Central Mindanao 92% of households are food insecure.\textsuperscript{14} Prevalence of GAM in the Zamboanga transitional sites is 13.9\%.\textsuperscript{15} IDPs have low nutritional literacy and low health-seeking behaviour. In IDP camps lack of water and sanitation facilities are a concern.

3. Humanitarian Response

1) National / local response and involvement

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
In 2014 the government presented a strategy on "undocumented Myanmar nationals", acknowledging the humanitarian needs of undocumented Rohingya refugees. Protection concerns remain unaddressed following the headcount exercise that took place in 2016; its final analysis report is due in November 2016. ECHO remains engaged and ready to respond to humanitarian needs, provided the humanitarian space remains open. The government has demonstrated the effectiveness of its disaster preparedness measures and usually provides some assistance to those affected by natural disasters. However, needs usually exceed the assistance offered. For earthquake preparedness, clear gaps remain.

Bhutan
The introduction of DM/DRR is recent, nevertheless there is considerable commitment both at political and technical level and capacity is improving. ECHO has been engaged in DP/DRR for the Education and Health sectors.

Nepal
Every year disasters such as floods and landslides weaken the coping capacity of communities, increasing their vulnerability. The government has the capacity to respond to small/medium-scale disasters, but the 2015 earthquake highlighted several areas in need of substantial improvement and the country lacks the institutional framework to coordinate the response. At community level DIPECHO has established disaster management committees and task forces. Partners are replicating CBDRR models, developed in previous DIPECHO cycles, in earthquake affected districts to demonstrate best practices. School-based disaster management, also initiated under DIPECHO, has led to significant achievements including a chapter on DRR in the national school development plan and the development of curricula and teaching materials. These initiatives need to be rolled out and institutionalized at the local level. DIPECHO-funded emergency health preparedness was instrumental in responding to the 2015 earthquake.

\textsuperscript{14} Philippine Mindanao Profile, OCHA, December 2015
\textsuperscript{15} SMART Survey, ACF, November 2015
Based on this experience the government intends to extend emergency health preparedness beyond the Kathmandu Valley; external technical support will be required.

**Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)**
The 2014 National Social Protection Strategic Plan takes steps to support vulnerable households in protecting their livelihood assets. The government is piloting a cash-transfer strategy in Chin State and plans to expand its coverage. The government has systems and procedures at all levels for disaster management. The National Disaster Preparedness Central Committee has elaborated a Disaster Risk Reduction, Preparedness, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Action Plan, complemented by the Myanmar Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction (MAPDRR) which is currently being updated. A Disaster Emergency Relief Fund is established at the central level to provide immediate relief when a disaster occurs. However, when disasters attain a mid-to-large scale, external assistance is required.

The *Thai* government is not a signatory to the 1951 Refugee Convention. The Ministry of Interior controls the day-to-day running of refugee camps, in collaboration with refugee committees. Refugees are not allowed to move freely outside the camps. Humanitarian aid to the nine refugee camps is mostly provided by international donors.

**The Philippines**
While the government has made substantial progress in terms of preparedness for and provision of humanitarian assistance during natural disasters, the same level of response is not mobilised in man-made crises\(^{16}\). Relief assistance to IDP camps is only provided by local governments, whose resources are limited, sometimes none. In some cases, recovery action plans do exist, but they are not comprehensive enough or remain unfunded. The government has adopted the “Mindanao 2020” and the "Peace and Development Framework Plan for Mindanao 2011-2030", which aim to provide a framework for a wide range of services that could serve as a basis for short-term integrated budgeting and planning. It is expected that the recent change of President and other high-ranking national and local officials will not alter this long-term framework.

2) **International Humanitarian Response**

**Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia**
The humanitarian coordination mechanism has improved with the activation of an informal cluster system in 2012 and the reconvening of the Humanitarian Country Task Team in June 2015. However, timeliness of response, identification of gaps, action planning and information management still need to be reinforced. Along with the EU development funds, the USA, Sweden, DFID and Australia support the official Rohingya refugee camps and host communities. The USA and SIDA provide support in the Kutupalong and Leda makeshift camps. The World Bank, JICA and USAID are focusing on earthquake preparedness, in specific sectors such as infrastructure, capacity building of government services to respond to an emergency and healthcare.

**Bhutan**

---

There is limited international presence in the country, with few INGOs and UN agencies. The country does not have a national Red Cross and no member of the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement is present.

Nepal
The international response during the emergency phase in 2015 was positive. The national emergency preparedness process has been restarted with the Emergency Response Plan on earthquake (phase 2), supported by OCHA. The contingency plans for floods and earthquake response have been finalized (coordinated by the HCT). All major humanitarian and development donors (World Bank, UK, USA, EU, JICA, ADB) are present and have the capacity and willingness to respond to major disasters; they also allocate funds for DP/DRR.

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)
According to OCHA's mid-year monitoring report, contributions towards the 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) amount to USD 93.3 million, corresponding to 49% of the appeal. However, the Rakhine and Kachin/Shan States components appear only 22% covered. In Thailand, ECHO estimates that international funding to assist the refugees is close to EUR 40 million/year.

The Philippines
Despite prolonged displacement in Mindanao, appeals for international humanitarian assistance have been very limited. Of the USD 30.2 million in international humanitarian support received by the Philippines in 2015, only USD 1.85 million (or 6%) are directly associated with the Mindanao conflict. Even at the height of armed clashes, new and larger displacements did not translate into increased funding support. The last OCHA action plan was for the 2014 Zamboanga crisis, with a USD 13 million requirement, which remained 54% unmet. Absence of a formal government request for assistance contributes to the very limited international support.

3) Constraints and ECHO response capacity
Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
Access is possible after natural disasters, however, implementation requires government approval, which can be a lengthy process and is not always successful. Socio-political strife can hamper access and logistics are challenging in areas like the coastal belt and CHT. In some areas of CHT, access for international staff is restricted. Humanitarian activities in Cox’s Bazar are limited to life-saving activities. Provision of assistance to unregistered Rohingya remains challenging. Security is deteriorating with attacks on foreigners, minorities, human rights defenders and bloggers; it may have an impact in terms of movement restrictions.

Bhutan
Due to its landscape, access to remote areas is logistically challenging. ECHO has only a very limited number of partners that are active in the country.

Nepal

---

17 2015 Financial Tracking System, OCHA
18 ECHO and Canada are the visible donors for the Mindanao crisis in 2015. Most recently in June 2016, Canada allocated PHP 43 million for food security and health related projects.
Logistics are a major challenge due to high mountains and underdeveloped road infrastructure; most of the remote areas are inaccessible by motorized vehicles. Most partners have built up their previously insufficient emergency response capacity, following the massive earthquake in 2015. Today there is sufficient partner presence and capacity to respond to small/medium scale disasters. Lessons learnt from the 2015 earthquake indicate that operations’ efficiency varied from very poor to acceptable (appropriateness and timeliness).

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)
Access constraints are a recurrent matter of concern: cumbersome and lengthy procedures to obtain visas, travel authorisations and Memoranda of Understanding lead to delays. Security concerns and hostility by some groups (in particular in Rakhine State) hinder effective implementation. In Rakhine State, administrative impediments and the poor performance of Camp Management Committees make it impossible to address some of the most pressing humanitarian needs. In Kachin and Shan States humanitarian access is often restricted due to insecurity and lack of government authorization. Local NGOs have greater (but far from unrestricted) access to areas outside the control of government. In Thailand there are no major constraints in access to refugee populations. The main challenge relates to finding durable solutions after 30 years of refugee encampment. A definitive solution can only be found at political level.

The Philippines
Security is the main constraint. Mindanao is generally accessible except for some specific areas and times, but the islands of Sulu and Basilan are particularly risky. Several ECHO partners are present in different parts of Mindanao and can operate without major constraints. Given the context, the visible abidance by the principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence is particularly relevant. Partners’ capacity is quite high and therefore humanitarian operations could be easily up-scaled.

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

In all actions, Partners will be expected to ensure full compliance with **visibility** requirements and to acknowledge the funding role of the EU/ECHO, as set out in the applicable contractual arrangements. Derogations can be awarded on security grounds.

For further guidance on sectors and geographical zones, please see the Technical Annex.

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
The focus will be on life-saving operations for Rohingya refugees and host communities in Leda and Kutupalong. Advocacy will be pursued to ensure that stakeholders adhere to humanitarian principles, safeguard humanitarian space and service provision and promote durable solutions. Refugee camps (official or unofficial) cannot be a long term option. Humanitarian assistance to Rohingya refugees and host communities needs to encourage increased access to self-reliance activities.

Humanitarian coordination, within the framework of disaster preparedness and response, remains vital. The Commission can support humanitarian response to natural disasters and ensure the mainstreaming of DRR in the response. Urban DRR will be a priority, focusing on multi-risk situations and earthquake in particular. The Commission will contribute to the EU’s resilience roadmap, in coherence with the Government’s 7th 5-year plan and integrating risk awareness in every sector of development, and support multi-
scale and multi-sector resilience actions, aimed at strengthening local capacities to adapt livelihoods and coping mechanisms.

**Bhutan**

ECHO will continue to contribute to strengthening the country's capacity for DP/DRR, in particular in the education sector, as activities funded in previous years are now ready to roll out to the local level including: the National Education Disaster Risk Management and Contingency Plan, the first of its kind among all Ministries in Bhutan, teacher training and links between school and community DRR activities. DRR activities in monastic institutions need to be finalised.

**Nepal**

There is a growing interest from national and local authorities on urban DRR, since the 2015 earthquake. The involvement of the private sector and issues of compliance with existing building codes are key for further developments on this subject. ECHO is considering supporting a pilot program bringing together private sector, government and civil society to improve Emergency Earthquake Response Capacity in urban areas.

Pockets of high vulnerability persist among victims of the 2015 earthquake, in particular among IDPs; if the 2017 winter season turn out to be severe, these communities may require additional humanitarian assistance.

**Myanmar/Burma and Regional allocation for refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)**

ECHO aims to address acute humanitarian needs and improve the resilience and self-reliance of the most vulnerable people affected by violence, conflict or natural disasters. ECHO remains committed to supporting coordination mechanisms and links between humanitarian and development actions. Humanitarian advocacy: partners are expected to actively advocate promoting humanitarian space and principles.

The protection of civilians remains a top priority. A protection-sensitive approach, in line with the do-no-harm principle, integrating vulnerabilities and conflict sensitivity into project design and targeting of assistance is crucial to mitigate individuals’ risks. ECHO supports timely emergency response, hence stockpiling and stock replenishment should be considered; disaster preparedness and risk reduction should be mainstreamed.

Education in Emergencies (EiE) – child protection in northern Rakhine and mine risk education in the south east may be supported under the EiE provisions of this HIP.

In **Thailand** ECHO assistance to the displaced population in the camps may focus on two priorities: a) gaps in health care in the refugee camps; b) support to the facilitation of returns (on a strictly voluntary basis). The final outcomes of the DEVCO AUP budget line allocation in 2016 will influence the priority setting. Protection activities benefitting asylum seekers (including in detention) may be covered under this HIP.

**The Philippines**

ECHO assistance will target the most vulnerable IDPs in the most affected areas of Mindanao. All interventions should focus on protection as a core element. Advocacy, both in country and externally, should be pursued to highlight this forgotten crisis and its humanitarian consequences. Actions should ensure a meaningful participation of affected communities and local institutions to develop IDPs' resilience and self-reliance, developing local skills while building back better and strengthening local systems for future needs is crucial to improve the IDPs’ resilience to withstand repeated displacements and reduce their vulnerability. As most IDPs are women, actions should consider their specific conditions, such as livelihood strategies compatible with childcare.
Natural disasters
All the countries mentioned under section 1 are disaster prone. DRR, preparedness and contingency planning should be appropriately factored into all humanitarian assistance.

Should new natural disasters occur in the region, entailing a high humanitarian impact, ECHO could adapt this HIP and increase its budget to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims, provided that the outstanding needs surpass the local capacity to respond. For the Pacific, after due consideration of the above criteria, a potential ECHO response to natural disasters would be considered as follows:

- For an affected population between 10,000 and 100,000 people, potential use of the instruments in the 2017 Emergency Toolbox HIP (Epidemics, Small-Scale Response and contribution to the DREF).
- For an affected population above 100,000 people, a potential increase of the total amount of this HIP.

Disaster risk reduction and resilience
The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 defines 7 global targets and 4 priority areas, through up to 91 types of actions. The Commission intends to contribute to its dissemination and implementation through this HIP. In what concerns ASEAN States, priority will be given to actions supporting the AADMER Work plan 2016-2020; these can cover one or several countries. In South Asia, ECHO will focus on:

1. earthquake preparedness, with an emphasis on high population density urban areas;
2. reinforcing institutional capacities;
3. school based DP and
4. preparedness for emergency response.

Special attention will be given to interventions promoting i) links with development processes ii) strengthening local capacities and systems; iii) dissemination, promotion and replication of good practices based on evidence; iv) implementation of the ISDR Global DRR Campaigns on "Safe Schools and Hospitals" and "Making Cities Resilient"; v) multi-country initiatives that harmonize and consolidate expertise. Partners are expected to actively coordinate at country and field level to create synergies, including through joint initiatives and joint advocacy. They are also expected to harmonize their models and methodologies, which must be inclusive and culturally appropriate. When relevant, interventions must encompass the impact of climate change on the increasing frequency, intensity and unpredictability of natural hazards. Small scale infrastructure and services, at community level can be included, as well as stock-piling of emergency and relief items, to strengthen the early response capacity of local actors and institutions. In line with ECHO’s commitment to promoting resilience, further attention is to be given to integrating a risk reduction approach in humanitarian assistance operations from the initial response to natural disasters.

4. LINKING RELIEF, REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT (LRRD), COORDINATION AND TRANSITION

1) Other ECHO interventions
Small scale humanitarian actions in response to new crises can be funded by the Emergency Toolbox instruments, in complement to this HIP.

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
The 2016 HIP included an initial allocation of EUR 6.3 million for Bangladesh, which is being implemented with a focus on the Rohingya crisis and support to multi-scale and
multi-sector resilience actions in Khulna division, CHT and Cox’s Bazar. A HIP modification in June 2016 added a further EUR 2 million for response to Cyclone Roanu, also under implementation.

**Bhutan**
In the 2016 HIP, EUR 0.3 million were allocated for DRR in the Health sector, in particular for a mass casualty management plan. The 2015 DIPECHO focused on School Based DRR; its activities are nearing conclusion.

**Nepal**
In the 2016 HIP, EUR 2.4 million were allocated for addressing early recovery needs of earthquake affected population and EUR 3.1 million for DRR, for training for building back better and to prepare earthquake affected communities for future disasters. The 2015 HIP included DP/DRR/Resilience funding for flood preparedness in the Western region and hospital preparedness (mass casualty management) in Kathmandu; these initiatives are nearing conclusion.

**Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)**
The 2016 HIP included EUR 11.4 million for Myanmar/Burma, focusing on the populations referred above who have been affected by conflict for several years. That HIP also allocates EUR 1.3 million for the Myanmar/Burma refugees in Thailand. Under the EU Children of Peace Initiative, ECHO is funding two projects aimed at providing safe and quality education to conflict-affected children (EUR 1.5 million). DRR activities are funded for an amount of EUR 1.75 million. Small scale actions in Thailand to support asylum seekers and Rohingyas under detention are also implemented during 2016.

**The Philippines**
The 2016 HIP included EUR 3 million for the Philippines, of which EUR 1.5 million for communities affected by conflict in Mindanao and another EUR 1.5 million for victims of Typhoon Melor. Under the EU Children of Peace Initiative, ECHO is funding a project aimed at providing safe and quality education to conflict-affected children in Mindanao (EUR 1 million). DRR activities are also funded (EUR 0.85 million).

2) **Other concomitant EU interventions**

**Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia**
Assistance for chronic food insecurity in the CHT will be provided under the "Resilient Livelihoods" programme, managed by DEVCO. The EU Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020 prioritizes (1) Strengthening Democratic Government and human rights; (2) Food security and nutrition; and (3) Education and skills development. Other programmes managed by the EU Delegation include: (a) Ujibitto Safety Net Program 2013-2019 – EUR 38 million, (b) Protection, essential services and durable solutions for refugees in Bangladesh: programme in support of long-term solutions to the protracted situation in Bangladesh of the refugees from northern Rakhine State and enhancement of social cohesion for the vulnerable population in Cox's Bazar– 2015-2017, EUR 6 million. Support to the CHT will be done through a mainstreaming approach under the MIP 2014-2020 which envisages that "Support to the implementation of the Peace Accord in the CHT will continue" under the three priority sectors (i.e.
strengthening governance, food and nutrition security, and education and skills development) with the aim to reduce regional disparity. A new "Resilient Livelihoods" programme is in the course of being finalized by DEVCO; it intends to contribute to the creation of sustained pathways out of poverty in most vulnerable areas in Bangladesh. A Food and Nutrition Security Programme is in the pipeline for 2017. A new action titled “Support for Enhancing Communities’ Resilience to Climate Change and Related Disasters” for a total value of EUR 8 million funded by the Global Climate Change Alliance + Flagship Initiative (GCCA+) is in the pipeline; it will directly benefit 200,000 households helping them to build resilience to climate change and related disasters in the most vulnerable communities of hard to reach areas of Bangladesh, it is a four-year project to be implemented by the Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Cooperatives through a Delegation Agreement with the UNDP and UNCDF (UN Capital Development Fund).

**Bhutan**

DEVCO’s multiannual assistance, focusing on climate change response programmes, will materialize in the course of 2017.

**Nepal**

The EU’s Multi Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020 sets a specific objective on DRR under two key priority sectors (Education and Rural Development). The key milestones of the EU Resilience Flagship programme are: strengthening the disaster preparedness capacity of local stakeholders and promoting the resilience agenda by mainstreaming DRR activities in development planning and activities.

**Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)**

LRRD is challenging regarding natural disaster response and early recovery, to a certain extent due to the long development funding cycles, but ECHO continues to advocate towards development partners and multi-donor initiatives, such as the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT), QBEP (education fund) and 3MDG (health fund), and provides technical support to the EU Delegation. Over the last 2 years, successful LRRD initiatives include a Children of Peace intervention that was continued with DEVCO funds under the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) and an IOM intervention in Rakhine, now funded by the Foreign Policy Instrument (FPI) under the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP).

On 1 June 2016 a Joint Communication: ‘Elements for an EU strategy vis-à-vis Myanmar/Burma: A Special Partnership for Democracy, Peace and Prosperity’ was adopted, followed by Council conclusions on EU strategy with Myanmar/Burma on 20 June. The Joint Communication sets out a vision and concrete proposals in terms of the EU’s engagement with Myanmar in the following areas: 1) democracy, rule of law and good governance; 2) the peace process; 3) human rights; 4) poverty reduction and sustainable development; 5) economic engagement; and 6) Working together with Myanmar in ASEAN and the region.

The 2014-2020 MIP (EUR 688 million) targets four sectors: 1) Rural Development, Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Security; 2) Education; 3) Governance, Rule of Law and State Capacity Building; and 4) Peace Building Support. The EU and its Member States

---


agreed on a Joint Programming Strategy for Myanmar 2014-2016. This is set to continue to align with the priorities of the new government. Myanmar/Burma will continue to receive support under other EU thematic and regional instruments and programmes, covering a wide range of issues, including democracy and human rights, civil society, environment and climate change, human development, sustainable energy and trade.

In Thailand the coordination established between the EU Delegation and ECHO on support to the refugee camps will continue. Since 2008, ECHO has gradually decreased its assistance to the refugee camps, while longer-term actions such as education and training, mother and child health, water, sanitation and hygiene promotion are funded under the Aid to Uprooted People programme under DCI, managed by the EU Delegation. In 2016, the EU has launched a call for proposals of EUR 7.5 million for Myanmar/Burma refugee camps with a tentative implementation period up to 2019; the assessment is on-going.

The Philippines
The EU allocated EUR 5.5 million under IcSP for 2015-2016, as a contribution to the peace process. DEVCO has identified Mindanao as a priority area; current funding amounts to approximately EUR 34 million: EUR 13.6 million as a contribution to the World Bank-administered Mindanao Trust Fund (2008-2017), EUR 10.5 million for health, EUR 4.1 million for local governance and EUR 6.0 million under EIHDR21.

3) Other donors availability

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
ECHO has supported the provision of food assistance in the CHT for several years; it has now been prioritized for the EU's resilience agenda and EU support is currently transitioning from ECHO’s humanitarian assistance to DEVCO’s longer term food security and nutrition support. Parts of the South West of the country are subject to almost permanent water-logging and ECHO has been providing assistance to these communities; in the context of the EU resilience agenda, this situation will be included in DEVCO and DFID’s “Resilient Livelihoods” program, allowing ECHO to exit this crisis.

Nepal
The main donors are: DFID with DRR in Western regions and urban areas and a 5-year reconstruction programme in four of the districts most affected by the earthquake; USAID with a national flood early warning system; World Bank with rural housing reconstruction; ADB, and JICA in various sectors.

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)
The 2016 HRP, appealing for USD 190 million, is only 49% funded22. ECHO actively seeks complementarity with other donors and coordinates with other Commission services to increase the possibility of transferring longer term activities to development partners. ECHO’s DRR and resilience strategy seeks complementarity with resilience priorities funded by other EU instruments and EU Member States' programmes, as well as other donors (e.g. USAID, World Bank, ADB).

21 The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
22 OCHA mid-year monitoring report
Major donors to the refugee camps in Thailand include USA, Sweden and the UK. ECHO seeks complementarity with other donors in view of increasing the possibility of transferring some activities to development partners.

The Philippines
Development assistance from Canada, USA, ADB, Japan, New Zealand and Australia is being provided for Mindanao. The South Central Mindanao Corridor agribusiness and logistics hub is supported by USAID and ADB. Australia funds multi-development projects, while Japan recently launched another J-BIRD development project. Besides the EU, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden and USA contribute to the World Bank-administered Mindanao Trust Fund.

4) Exit scenarios

Bangladesh and the consequences of the Rohingya crisis in South Asia
The EU Resilience Flagship initiative is the main vector of ECHO's exit strategy from non-emergency situations, which will be supported under the common framework of long-term actions agreed by DEVCO and DFID. The CHT, coastal belt, islands and Cox's Bazar are the priority areas for transition into development programmes. An exit from the Rohingya crisis cannot be envisaged in the short-term and will much depend on the way the government's strategy on "undocumented Myanmar nationals" will be implemented, as well as on developments in Myanmar.

Bhutan
The government is keen to mainstream DRR in its development plans and build emergency plans in all ministries and at the community level. ECHO has been supporting Bhutan’s DP/DRR capacity since 2011. Progress is visible: the activities within the education sector will enter the final stage, with a focus now on institutionalization; ECHO intends to exit this sector after this 2017 programming cycle. The Department of Disaster Management is progressively taking over the DM/DDR process.

Nepal
The emergency phase of the 2015 earthquake response is over. In spite of delays, in particular in shelter, development partners are now operational and supporting the national reconstruction programme, therefore ECHO can disengage from this crisis. In what concerns DP/DRR, the magnitude and variety of risks, the high vulnerability of large pockets of the population and the absence of a National Disaster Management institution render an exit strategy particularly challenging; partners cannot handover the good practices/models developed, including with ECHO funding, in absence of an official dedicated agency.

Myanmar/Burma and refugees in Southeast Asia (Thailand)
The democratic transition allows for a cautiously optimistic outlook, but challenges are many and diverse; 60 years of socio-economic stagnation will take years to reverse. Reactions by some groups against government efforts to address the Rohingya issue are generating tensions at national level, with Muslim communities targeted in different regions. The citizenship verification exercise and lifting of movement restrictions are very sensitive processes. Despite Government efforts to advance the peace process, further conflicts and displacement in the short and medium term cannot be discarded.

---

23 Japan-Bangsamoro Initiatives for Reconstruction and Development
The protracted nature of the crises that keep generating acute humanitarian needs does not allow for a quick phase-out of humanitarian aid. The camp population in Thailand has been decreasing by 8-10% annually. The evolution of the democratic transition in Myanmar/Burma and the development of border areas will be key factors determining the returns process. Returns must be informed and voluntary. Key concerns include: mine infestation, land titles, livelihood options and the dearth of basic services (education and health). ECHO has been gradually and substantially decreasing its funding for this crisis, but a final cut-off date is still not possible to determine at this stage.

**The Philippines**

Predictions are particularly difficult, due to uncertainty about the status of the Comprehensive Agreement on Bangsamoro. Although the new government has taken a promising start to deal with the peace processes, progress will be challenging. Other factors, such as violence related to armed groups, contribute to the occurrence of new incidents and to the constant volatility of the situation.