

**Shelter / NFI / CCCM National Cluster Meeting Minutes**

**10:00 – 12:00, Wednesday, August 14, 2013**

**UNHCR Office, YGN**

**Attendees:** Relief International (RI), DRC, TIKA, Lutheran World Federation, KMSS, ECHO, IOM, CARE, German Embassy, Acted, AusAID, FAO, OCHA, FSD, METTA & Solidarites International (SI), UNHCR & WASH Cluster Coordinator (UNICEF)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action / Actor / Date
<p><b>Introduction</b></p>	<p>Cluster Coordinator (CC) apologised for the longer than usual time since the last meeting, explaining he had to travelled to Kachin and Northern Shan State in the last three weeks, providing support to the Cluster at the field level. This included attending Cluster meetings in Myitkyina, Bhamo and Laisho in Northern Shan.</p> <p>Meeting minutes were reviewed and cleared. CC gave an updt e on action points from the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data errors as pointed by ECHO were being rectified;</li> <li>- Cluster had updated its database for emergency stock and Cluster assessment capacities. With the exception of USAID, all information (which included AusAID’s stock) was available.<sup>1</sup></li> </ul> <p>CC referred to an email from former CARE international Interim <i>Emergency Shelter Coordinator</i> (ESC) for Rakhine who in his departing email to the CC stated various points.<sup>2</sup> Keen to put these concerns to the wider forum the CC fully acknowlwdged that UNHCR was leading the Cluster and was also a Cluster operational partner, notably constructing large numbers of shelters in Rakhine. Having also been a CC for IFRC in other responses, notably Haiti, CC sought to be very mindful of this dual rresponsibility for</p>	<p>CC to upload this data to the website.</p>

<sup>1</sup> See **Contingency Capacity** details at:

<https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Contingency.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> “Finally, I would recommend UNHCR to think about the possibility of having different persons for your two different ‘hats’/roles as Cluster Coordinator and implementing agency. It’d be good if you look at your peer in the Cluster, IFRC; they assign a person 100% for cluster coordination and this facilitates their work and shows a clearer distinction between the two roles” (23.7.’13).

the agency. As part of this, CC noted the presence of UNHCR’s Senior Programme Officer at this forum and at Rakhine State level stressed the enhanced capacity of UNHCR’s shelter roles and responsibilities, three internationals and two national staff, allowing wider scope for separation of roles. This was the first such complaint he had had since arriving in late January but was concerned if others had a similar issue then partners should feel free to raise their concerns in *this* forum or directly to the CC. Responding, Care, like their Country Director had stated in the previous meeting, underscored their appreciation for the support that they had received from the Shelter Cluster in Rakhine.<sup>3</sup> He noted that there had been “some challenges” in terms of coordination with their ESC in Rakhine, who had now departed. ECHO underlined that the difficult balance and risk linked to the cluster system, noting other Cluster Leads had the same challenges, citing for example UNICEF in their role as WASH Cluster Lead and implementing WASH activities. This challenge was known and recognised and it was a much broader question. The CC noted with appreciation *this* support but again reiterated that if partners had a concern they should feel free to raise them with the CC directly. Leading a Cluster was a process and raising issues such as this was an important part of that process. The CC also noted that Care’s former ESC in his parting email had also shared a soft copy of 17 page paper called *Shelter Accountability Resources*. All/any partners should contact him should they wish a copy.

CC introduced Kevin Socquet-Clerc (KSC) Kevin Socquet ([socquet@unhcr.org](mailto:socquet@unhcr.org)), the new Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster Coordinator for Kachin State. The existing structure for these individual sectors will remain in place but KSC will provide additional support for coordination between them. Kevin has several years experience working in Myanmar, most recently in Rakhine State as field coordinator for SI.

---

<sup>3</sup> See minutes dated 10.7.’13 at:  
[https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting\\_Minutes.aspx](https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Meeting_Minutes.aspx)

<p><b>Coordination of (NFI) Hygiene and Sanitation Items</b></p>	<p>CC had recently met the newly appointed national WaSH Cluster Coordinator to discuss the issue of NFI hygiene and sanitation items, and coordination of these items. Confirming what had been discussed, from this point on the WaSH Cluster will take the responsibility for coordinating and gathering data in relation to distribution of hygiene and sanitation (H&amp;S) items. As needed the WASH Cluster will share its data with the shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster but the CC stressed that collection and dissemination of H&amp;S data would now rest with the WaSH Cluster at a national and state level. <i>This</i> Cluster would focus solely on NFI core items. The WaSH cluster coordinator explained he will ensure that these data are collected regularly and thoroughly.</p> <p>ECHO pointed out that the logistic aspects should not be overlooked as separating the responsibility for distribution of NFI could lead to multiplying the distributions. WaSH cluster coordinator specified that in the field WaSH agencies were already taking care of the distributions of these items, so that it was a question of good inter-cluster coordination to avoid duplication.</p> <p>Finally, the CC insisted that the standard for hygiene kits (HK) needs to be harmonised also at national level. The WaSH Cluster Coordinator mentioned it was already done and he will transmit the approved list. He informed that a technical working group had been created in Rakhine, which should facilitate the monitoring and standard issues. Responding the CC stressed that the HK standards as they stood had been agreed after many weeks of discussion between <i>this</i> Cluster and the WaSH Cluster late in 2012 and early 2013. Following, Cluster partners had made procurements based on these agreed standards, in some cases running into many 100,000s of US\$. Significant altering of standards would have major impacts and it was <u>vital</u> that what was discussed at the state level also be taken to the national level, before sign-off.</p>	
<p><b>Kachin State</b></p> <p><i>a. Camp Profiling Presentation</i></p>	<p>UNHCR IM officer for Kachin, who led the camp-profiling, presented the exercise and the results.</p> <p>There are 153 identified IDP camps in Kachin and Northern Shan State, containing around 85,000 IDPs. The largest camps around 3,000 IDPs. Many of them only a few hundred, and sometimes down to a few HH sometimes plus IDPs staying with host families or in small dwellings in the forest. Altogether, it is estimated there are just over 100,000 IDPs in the area, with slightly more in NGCA areas (around 60,000). GCA counts more camps (around 100) but of smaller size than in NGCA.</p> <p>Out of the 153 camps the team was able to profile 126. The issue for the remaining 20% not profiled is</p>	

	<p>mainly logistic, difficult to access and limited number of teams to conduct the assessment. Indeed at the time of profiling, CCCM had focal points only in 84 camps, so the remaining had to be profiled by mobile teams. There was no problem of access linked to security or politics. IDPs and their representatives were very cooperative and the exercise went down smoothly.</p> <p>Over 200 indicators were used during the profiling exercise, covering all sectors.</p> <p>The results will be shared widely with actors. It will include for each camp a summarised general presentation in a one page infographic, and a detailed document containing all answers to all questions. The Cluster will provide some initial cross-camp analysis and then all actors will be able to use the raw data for their own analysis.</p> <p>Participants discussed if the information should be shared only amongst humanitarian actors or if it should be posted on the website. KMSS informed that they generally use information collected only for restricted circulation. SI underlined that as some of their operations in NGCA were tolerated but not officially recognised by the government and it might be sensitive to publish the whole result of the camp profiling. However, most partners thought that as the Government is already aware of these activities it was actually a good opportunity to push further by making this available via the website. IM Officer Kachin stressed that the questionnaire was designed such that no sensitive information was asked in order to facilitate its public release. ECHO underlined that KIO having an office in Myitkyina demonstrated that the issue of NGCA was probably not “so sensitive”. OCHA specified that each agencies working in the NGCA areas should be consulted if they would like their name and activities to appear in case the results would be released on internet. CC concluded saying that as it was the general consensus the camp profile information will be posted on the website once validated at all levels, and encouraged individual agencies to contact the Cluster directly if they had specific issue with this decision.</p> <p>Ideally, and if resources can be mobilised, the complete exercise of camp profiling will be carried out every six-months.</p> <p>The IM Officer informed that the Cluster posts monthly updated list of all known IDP camps, their population and status. It receives information from the RRD for GCA and the IRRC (equivalent of the RRD for the KIO areas) for NGCA, cross-checking as much as possible this information through teams</p>	<p>CC to share draft version of infographic with all Cluster partners for their comments before finalisation. Thereafter, one for every camp profiled would be generated, 126 in total.</p>
--	---	---

<p><i>b. Shelter Designs</i></p> <p><i>c. Northern Shan</i></p>	<p>going to the camps for various activities.</p> <p>LWF asked if a similar exercise was planned to take place in Rakhine State. CC explained that it was not considered as an immediate priority at this stage, but should not be ruled out for the future and the bottom line was that some form of camp profiling would need to happen in Rakhine.</p> <p>ECHO specified that for donors it would be useful if camp profiles would include the assistance that had and is being provided to each camp. The WaSH cluster coordinator mentioned that that this information was with each cluster and that maybe OCHA can compile the various 3Ws for donors. CC confirmed that this cluster did not mean to get further involved in what is managed by other clusters and that such information, due to its complexity might be difficult to include in the camp profile while keeping it easy to use.</p> <p>CC exposed the difficulties faced to standardise shelter design in Kachin State in terms of size, height, and material used. Additionally, it is very difficult to obtain a good general picture as to the range of shelters that have been built over 18 months, by many different actors and with seemingly little coordination. The newly appointed Shelter Expert, introduced at the last national Cluster meeting, is now in Kachin and has formed a Technical Working Group (TWiG) to try and address some of these problems. It is recognised this is a <u>significant</u> challenge. It was noted that an approved Cluster design for a five-unit shelter, specifically for Kachin, was available and accessible via the website. Relatively new partner to the Cluster FSD noted that their ambitions in Northern Shan were to build <u>transitional</u> shelters. CC requested them to share a copy of their proposed design.</p> <p>CC travelled to Northern Shan State to attend the second Cluster meeting there, August 7th and took the opportunity to visit several IDP camps in the area. Regarding the Cluster meeting, the attendance was satisfactory and the issue of lack of coordination in this area appears to be on the way to being solved. For more details of this forum partners were encouraged to consult the website.<sup>4</sup> There are approximately 10,000 IDPs in Northern Shan State, spread over 14 camps. The gaps, in relative terms, are modest. In some of the locations visited, land is available in the area and many IDPs appear to have</p>	<p>FSD to share copy of their proposed transitional shelter design with Cluster.</p>
---	---	--

<sup>4</sup> See minutes dated 14.6.'13 at:  
<https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Kachin-meeting-minutes.aspx>

	<p>received a piece of land to build shelters. The outcome appears a shelter that is more transitional than temporary; photos were shown.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>The CC also underlined one problem linked to the use of bamboo harvested at the wrong time, leading to reduced solidity and potential skin rashes for children; photos were also shown.<sup>6</sup></p> <p>Cluster partner UNHCR will ensure blanket NFI coverage for all IDPs in Northern Shan. CCCM needs are, relatively, limited. Some training has already been conducted, more is planned plus support for camp focal points and camp running costs with a view to ensure that all the camps are covered.</p> <p>As part of efforts to have greater engagement from LNGOs that have a Yangon presence at this forum, CC welcomed today the presence of Metta and KMSS. He hoped they would attend meetings in the future and was keen to see if Shalom could also attend. Not least, Metta was a key shelter provider in Bhamo and had presence in Northern Shan. The Cluster was keen to obtain figures and update the general shelter data for Kachin and Northern Shan State.</p> <p>UNHCR Senior Programme Officer informed that new funding received for CCCM will allow extending CCCM activities to 140 camps and building an additional 1,000 shelters for Kachin IDPs. CC renewed his thank you to German government for their vital contribution to the sector and equally welcomed their presence at <i>this</i> meeting.</p>	<p>By next meeting CC (as done with Metta) to make direct contact with Shalom office in YGN. CC to write to Metta to request their data, which would be fed into the monthly <i>Cluster Analysis Report</i>.</p>
<p><b>Rakhine State Update</b></p> <p><i>Relief International presentation on Myebon</i></p>	<p>Relief International (RI) presented the <u>very</u> worrying situation of Muslim IDPs in Myebon Township (T/S) (one camp). RI focuses its activities on WaSH and child protection.</p> <p>RI is the only organisation to have regular presence in Myebon IDP camps, housing 4,000 IDPs in 2 camps: around 3,500 Muslims and 500 Buddhist. There is no problem providing assistance to the Buddhist camp, but regarding the Muslims camp, even though it is only ½ mile from the town itself, the access is very difficult. The Buddhist community prevents the assistance from reaching the camp (example given of a women’s group stopping boats delivering rice) and local shops and contractors refuse to sell items that would be used to assist Muslims.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ As the IDPs cannot access outside the camp they started dismantling walkways to use the bamboo for firewood to cook.</li> </ul>	

<sup>5</sup> See foot of email for photos of different shelters.

<sup>6</sup> See foot of email for photo of bamboo issue.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Regarding education, even though some teaching is happening in the camp, there is no appropriate learning space, and teachers started using common kitchens as classroom. RI identified an abandoned building 300 meters from the camp that could be used for this purpose.</li> <li>✓ Health is identified as the main issue, with no referral possible and MSF being the main primary health care provider but able to spend hardly a day/week in the camp.</li> <li>✓ Livelihood: there is no livelihood option in the camp and even though some opportunities would be created IDPs would have no access to markets. DRC underlined that they had budget for livelihood activities but were so far unable to identify any viable option.</li> </ul> <p>RI specified that risk of new surge of violence seems unlikely due to heavy military presence, but that the situation of the IDPs was nonetheless not sustainable. In Myebon, any chance of reconciliation seems very remote as the Buddhist population is adamant that they want the Muslims to leave. On a more optimistic note, RI mentioned that since they have been present in Myebon (since May 2013) they could notice a slight improvement of acceptance, maybe thanks to informal contacts made in town.</p> <p>LWF reminded all that it had been discussed at the Sittwe level for a coordinated approach of authorities in Myebon by humanitarian actors, to try and push for action but that it never properly realised.</p> <p>SI explained that one of their teams faced similar problems while assessing villages and IDP camps in Rathedaung T/S. A Buddhist village refused to receive the assessment team because they were also assessing Muslim camps and in another Buddhist village the community blocked for several hours the SI team when they tried to reach back to their boat.</p> <p>DRC insisted that strong measures needed to be taken and that the government needed to be more involved, and that the possibility of military escorted assistance should be considered if it appears to be the only solution. To improve the access, a possibility could be an alternative road or the construction of a new pier allowing going around the town of Myebon.</p> <p>CC confirmed that Myebon needs to be high on the agenda, the situation was getting. Responding critical TIKA stated that they are very keen to fund projects in Myebon T/S. The WasH Cluster Coordinator suggested that this is more an inter-cluster/humanitarian issue rather than shelter/NFI/CCCM cluster issue. All present and agreed that there was a need for stronger advocacy</p>	
--	---	--

<p><i>Shelter, NFI &amp; CCCM – include. Rakhine Response Plan</i></p>	<p>from OCHA to the State and central government on this issue.<sup>7</sup> CC understood this point and explained that originally RI had come to the Cluster Lead in terms of the massive CCCM challenges they were facing in Myebon. He agreed that the wider issues beyond this Cluster needed to be raised with OCHA.</p> <p>All present agreed that Myebon presented a very complex problem with potential repercussions throughout Rakhine State. CC noted that immediately following this meeting there would be an “extraordinary” Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) meeting solely focussed on this Myebon issue: CC, RI, DRC and SI were all confirmed. International Rescue Committee (IRC) had also been contacted about this meeting.<sup>8</sup> The results would be sent to the Head of OCHA for next steps.</p> <p>The Rakhine Response Plan (RRP) is finalised. OCHA will give a presentation August 14<sup>th</sup> (afternoon) to donors, and the CC will attend to answer any specific questions on this Cluster’s inputs. The CC appreciated the input given by partners and sought to feed them into OCHA to be reflected in the final document. For those who wanted to access the final RRP they should click on the following link.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>Overall the CC explained that this Cluster’s funding situation in NFI and shelter needs is positive. NFIs needs are 73% funded and the gap primarily concerns the “affected communities”, not the core IDP caseload, which is covered. Shelter is 86% funded; significantly improved thanks to the Myanmar Government’s participation and accounts for over 40% of all temporary shelter needs. The important gap remains in CCCM. The RRP shows it funded at 17%. Thanks to funds received recently, it now reaches closer to 50%. However, a gap of about USD\$0.5 million remains for 2013. In reality this means a few US\$ cents per IDP per day is available to meet all the CCCM critical needs. Despite funding issues, the CCCM Cluster in Rakhine was now meeting weekly.<sup>10</sup></p> <p>Finally, the Cluster has noticed that an excess number of shelters were being built in Rakhine (a further</p>	
--	---	--

<sup>7</sup> By this juncture OCHA had left the meeting.

<sup>8</sup> It later transpired that there had been confusion as to where this meeting was happening but IRC had sought to attend. The Sector Lead for Early Recovery was also due to join the SAG but was unable to attend due to a pressing (last minute) engagement.

<sup>9</sup> [http://themimu.info/download.php?file=docs/Snapshot\\_Rakhine\\_UNOCHA\\_12%20Aug2013.pdf](http://themimu.info/download.php?file=docs/Snapshot_Rakhine_UNOCHA_12%20Aug2013.pdf). The RRP is now also available on the Shelter/NFI/CCCM website at: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-documents.aspx>.

<sup>10</sup> For details of this Cluster forum see: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx>

	<p>200 long houses construction have been recently announced). It is unclear how the Government plans to use these extra shelters. There are concerns that they would be used to house non-Muslim IDPs from surrounding villages or from the ward of Aung Mingalar in Sittwe Town. The Cluster is taking this concern very seriously and therefore requested some actors to put their shelter construction on stand-by until the situation can be clarified. The CC appreciated the support they were receiving on this matter from Cluster partners. An advocacy paper produced by the humanitarian community in Rakhine was shared in hard copy at this meeting.</p> <p>Most of the non-Muslim IDPs in Sittwe T/S have been transferred to permanent housing. The process of decommissioning the temporary shelter areas is starting.<sup>11</sup> 634 of 669 permanent houses were already occupied.</p>	
<p><b>AOB</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CC attended a meeting in Naypldaw in mid-July, Chaired the Deputy Minister of NATALA. Following, a document was sent to the UN detailing the government response plan for Rakhine State for 2014 and 2015. The document was being translated and considered by the UN.</li> <li>- DRC mentioned that as the CCCM structure developed, camp managers will have to be in charge of calling for cross-sectors coordination meetings at camp level.</li> <li>- UNOPS will carry out a mission in Rakhine, looking into building roads and bridges. However, they require funding support. This mission was being supported by the Cluster Lead.</li> <li>- SI reported two incidents that occurred in rural Sittwe camps since the beginning of August involving local police forces. In one occurrence, local forces insisted to supervise HK distribution, hassled the SI team by questioning why SI was providing so many of them to Muslims, suggesting they should divide the number by two. Another time, SI staff was questioned for over an hour in Dar Pain camp by Police Officers about the organisation and its activities. Even though in both cases the situation was easily solved SI wanted to underline that this is a worrying development in terms of humanitarian access.</li> <li>-CC noted the recent press release issued by the Cluster Lead that had cited the fact that “[w]ith most temporary shelters completed, camp coordination and camp management activities are of paramount</li> </ul>	

<sup>11</sup> For more details on the CCCM Cluster meeting in Rakhine to address this issue see minutes dated 29.7.'13: <https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Rakhine-Meeting-Minutes.aspx>. Decommissioning and camp closure guidelines can also be found at: [https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Standards\\_Guidelines.aspx](https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/Standards_Guidelines.aspx).

	<p>importance to assist in ensuring constructive dialogue with the authorities in order to prevent future incidents". This was in relation to recent violent clashes between displaced Muslims and security forces in Rakhine in Ohn Taw Gyi Camp in rural Sittwe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LWF raised the issue of delays in obtaining travel authorisations. CC mentioned that this issue would need to be raised with OCHA.<sup>12</sup></li> <li>- SI mentioned the problem of putting gutters on shelters in Rakhine and whether this was being done by Cluster partners in Rakhine, notably UNHCR. Agreed this would be followed-up with the relevant persons in Rakhine State.</li> <li>- CC underlined that some talking points that InterAction (IA) had shared with the Cluster Lead in advance of a meeting they were calling in Washington following their visit to Myanmar. Detailed comments reflecting the concerns that the Cluster had in terms of IA's understanding of the situation had been shared with IA. Any partners (if they wanted to see these talking points and comments) should contact the CC.<sup>13</sup> Partners voiced particular concern that they commented on Kachin State but did not visit Kachin State. The Cluster was not averse to criticism or the need for self-reflection but comments should be more qualified.</li> <li>- CC noted with some encouragement a recent story in the Myanmar Times that cited comments made by Human Rights Watch in terms of the rate of progress in Rakhine.<sup>14</sup></li> <li>- Though not mentioned in the meeting, by way of these minutes the CC was keen to circulate a recent story on the BBC for an ingenious way to provide light in shelters.<sup>15</sup></li> <li>- Though not mentioned in the meeting, by way of these minutes the CC was keen to highlight the fact</li> </ul>	<p>CC to contact Cluster Coordinator in Rakhine and revert.</p>
--	--	---

<sup>12</sup> By this juncture OCHA had left the meeting.

<sup>13</sup> Note that the CC had followed-up with Refugees International after a report they wrote stated that "only three clusters are in place in the country, and many of them lack senior leadership in Rakhine and Kachin States"? When the CC questioned the specifics of what they meant, their response was that they were referring to a specific Cluster but not *this* Cluster. Responding the CC had suggested that Refugees International should perhaps have clarified this point should they wish to put it in such a public document?

<sup>14</sup> For more details on this story see **Shelter Cluster News** at bottom right-hand side of following link:

<https://www.sheltercluster.org/Asia/Myanmar/RakhineAndKachin/Pages/default.aspx>.

<sup>15</sup> For more details on this story see: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-23536914>

	<p>that CCCM training will be organized in Rakhine 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> September 2013. This is comparable with the CCCM training that was delivered for Kachin towards the end of last year. The time is pressing to deliver the same CCCM training in Rakhine and the Cluster requested all actors who are working in the IDP sites in Rakhine to nominate 2 - 3 staff (English speakers) to participate. This is a rigorous training and it is vital that those that are engaged at that field level engage.</p>	
--	--	--

For next YGN meeting partners were encouraged to check the [http://themimu.info/Meeting\\_Schedule/index.php](http://themimu.info/Meeting_Schedule/index.php) and the Cluster website (see **Up Coming Events** section). Also nearer the time the CC would send an email confirmation and as usual, an agenda.

**Documents shared in hard copy with the participants at the meeting included:**

*Locations for Camp Profiling, Kachin and Northern Shan States, 15<sup>th</sup> July 2013* – also shared in soft copy following the meeting

Suggested one page camp profiling infographic per camp as part of Camp Profiling, Kachin and Northern Shan States – also shared in soft copy following the meeting

*Advocacy Paper - Shelter & Resettlement in Rakhine, Aug 2013* – also shared in soft copy following the meeting

*Myanmar Shelter/NFI/CCCM Cluster – Key Message and Frequently Asked Questions, 24th July '13* – also shared in soft copy following the meeting

*Myanmar Response Plan, July 2012 – December 2013, Funding Requirements, page 18* – full report shared in soft copy following the meeting

*Inter-Sector-Cluster Meeting, Minutes, 11th July '13* – shared in soft copy following the meeting



Maiyu Lay Camp, Kutkai Township, Northern Shan	Galeng Kachin Camp, Kutkai Township, Northern Shan	Galeng Kachin Camp, Kutkai Township, Northern Shan
--	--	--



**Galeng Kachin Camp, Kutkai Township, Northern Shan**



**Kutkai KMSS Camp, Kutkai T-ship, Northern Shan –  
consequences of harvesting bamboo at the wrong time,  
leading to reduced solidity and skin rashes for children.**