



MYANMAR, FIRST QUARTER 2018:

Update on incidents according to the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) - Updated 2nd edition compiled by ACCORD, 20 December 2018

Number of reported incidents with at least one fatality



Number of reported fatalities



National borders: [GADM, November 2015a](#); administrative divisions: [GADM, November 2015b](#); Bhutan/China border status: [CIA, 2012](#); China/India border status: [CIA, 2006](#); geodata of disputed borders: [GADM, November 2015a](#); [Natural Earth, undated](#); incident data: [ACLED, 15 December 2018](#); coastlines and inland waters: [Smith and Wessel, 1 May 2015](#)

Contents


Number of reported fatalities	1
Number of reported incidents with at least one fatality	1
Conflict incidents by category	2
Development of conflict incidents from March 2016 to March 2018	2
Methodology	3
Conflict incidents per province	4
Localization of conflict incidents	4
Disclaimer	5

Conflict incidents by category

Category	Number of incidents	Number of incidents with at least one fatality	Number of fatalities
Battles	132	3	7
Remote violence	62	6	8
Riots/protests	51	1	7
Strategic developments	16	0	0
Violence against civilians	15	2	12
Total	276	12	34

This table is based on data from ACLED (datasets used: [ACLED](#), 15 December 2018).

Development of conflict incidents from March 2016 to March 2018



This graph is based on data from ACLED (datasets used: [ACLED](#), 15 December 2018).

Methodology

The data used in this report was collected by the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED). ACLED collects data on reported conflict events in selected African and Asian countries, Myanmar being among them. ACLED researchers collect event data from a variety of sources and code them by date, location, agent, and event type.

Most of the data collected by ACLED is gathered based on publicly available, secondary reports. It may therefore underestimate the volume of events. Fatality data particularly is vulnerable to bias and inaccurate reporting, and ACLED states to use the most conservative estimate available. ACLED uses the reports' context to estimate fatalities for events with reported fatalities for which the exact number is unknown ("10" for plural fatalities, "100" if "hundreds" are mentioned, etc.). For further details on ACLED and for the full data, see www.acleddata.com and Raleigh; Linke; Hegre, and Karlsen, 2010.

Based on this data, the Austrian Centre for Country of Origin & Asylum Research and Documentation (ACCORD) compiles updates on conflict incidents and publishes them on ecoi.net to offer another access point to the ACLED datasets.

This 2nd edition replaces the previously published overviews on the same reporting period and is based on updated ACLED data.

It is advised to employ extreme caution when using fatality numbers.

Assessments of the security situation should not be based solely on quantitative analysis of event data.

The two maps above serve to compare the number of reported fatalities (potentially containing estimates) to the number of events with reported fatalities.

Geographic map data is primarily based on GADM, complemented with other sources if necessary. ACLED's location data is then used to locate incidents in these maps. Incidents that could not be located are ignored. The numbers included in this overview might therefore differ from the original ACLED data. ACLED uses varying degrees of geographic precision for the individual incidents, depending on what level of detail is reported. Thus, towns may represent the wider region in which an incident occurred, or the provincial capital may be used if only the province is known. Erroneous location data, especially due to identical place names, cannot be fully excluded.

Incidents comprise the following categories: battles, headquarters or bases established, non-violent strategic activities, riots/protests, violence against civilians, non-violent transfer of territory, remote violence. For details on these categories, please see

- ACLED – Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project: Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED) Codebook; ACLED - ASIA, 2015
http://www.acleddata.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/ACLED_Codebook_2015_ASIA-CR.pdf
- ACLED – Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project: Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED) Codebook, 2017
http://www.acleddata.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ACLED_Codebook_2017.pdf
- ACLED – Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project: User Guide, January 2017
http://www.acleddata.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ACLED_User-Guide_2017.pdf

Conflict incidents per province

Province	Number of incidents	Number of incidents with fatalities	Number of fatalities
Ayeyarwady	3	0	0
Bago	3	0	0
Kachin	155	7	19
Kayah	3	0	0
Kayin	18	0	0
Mandalay	8	0	0
Mon	8	0	0
Rakhine	11	1	7
Sagaing	2	0	0
Shan	56	4	8
Tanintharyi	1	0	0
Yangon	8	0	0

Localization of conflict incidents

Note: The following list is an overview of the incident data included in the ACLED dataset. More details are available in the actual dataset (date, location data, event type, involved actors, information sources, etc.). The data's precision varies among the incidents: a town may represent a region, or the provincial capital may be used if the precise location of an incident is unknown. In the following list, the names of event locations are taken from ACLED, while the administrative region names are taken from GADM data which serves as the basis for the maps above.

In **Ayeyarwady**, 3 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following

locations were among the affected: **Labutta, Lemyethna, Pathein**.

In **Bago**, 3 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Bago, Paungde, Taungoo**.

In **Kachin**, 155 incidents killing 19 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Ga Ra Yang, Gaw Ngu Yang, Hpakant, Laiza, Majigung, Man Kawng, Mansi, Mogaung, Momauk, Myitkyina, Nga Gyang, Puta-O, Sumprabum, Tanai, Waingmaw**.

In **Kayah**, 3 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Hpasawng, Loikaw**.

In **Kayin**, 18 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Hlaingbwe, Hpa-an, Hpapun, Myaing Gyi Ngu, Myawaddy**.

In **Mandalay**, 8 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Aungmyaythazan, Madaya, Mandalay, Myingyan**.

In **Mon**, 8 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Hmawbi, Hnipadaw, Kyaikmayaw, Thanbyuzayat, Thein Za Yat, Ye**.

In **Rakhine**, 11 incidents killing 7 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Ann, Buthidaung, Kyauktaw, Maungdaw, Minbya, Mrauk-U, Munaung, Sittwe, Yan Bye Gyi**.

In **Sagaing**, 2 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Hkamti, Wet Hmay**.

In **Shan**, 56 incidents killing 8 people were reported. The following locations were

among the affected: **Hseni, Hsipaw, Kutkai, Kyaukme, Kyethi, Loilen, Manton, Mong Koe, Monghsu, Mongping, Muse, Namhsan, Namtu, Tachileik, Tangyan.**

In **Tanintharyi**, 1 incident killing 0 people was reported. The following location was among the affected: **Yebyu.**

In **Yangon**, 8 incidents killing 0 people were reported. The following locations were among the affected: **Bahan, Dagon Myothit (Seikkan), Dagon Myothit (South), Hlaingthayar, Kamayut, Kyauktada, Yangon.**

Sources

- ACLED – Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project: South & Southeast Asia (Data through 24 November 2018), 15 December 2018
<https://www.acleddata.com/download/2912/>
- CIA – U. S. Central Intelligence Agency: China and India, 2006
<http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gmd/g7820.ct002746>
- CIA – U. S. Central Intelligence Agency: Bhutan Administrative, 2012
https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/resources/cia-maps-publications/map-downloads/Bhutan_Admin.pdf
- GADM – Global Administrative Areas: gadm28_levels.shp, Version 2.8, November 2015a
http://biogeo.ucdavis.edu/data/gadm2.8/gadm28_levels.shp.zip
- GADM – Global Administrative Areas: MMR_adm.zip, Version 2.8, November 2015b
http://biogeo.ucdavis.edu/data/gadm2.8/shp/MMR_adm.zip
- Natural Earth: Admin 0 – Breakaway, Disputed Areas, Version 3.1.0, undated
http://www.naturalearthdata.com/http://www.naturalearthdata.com/download/10m/cultural/ne_10m_admin_0_disputed_areas.zip
- Raleigh, Clionadh; Linke, Andrew; Hegre, Håvard, and Karlsen, Joakim: “Introducing ACLED-Armed Conflict Location and Event Data”, in: Journal of Peace Research (47(5) 2010), pp. 651–660
<http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/47/5/651.full.pdf+html>

- Smith, Walter H. F. and Wessel, Paul: Global Self-consistent Hierarchical High-resolution Geography (GSHHG), Version 2.3.4, 1 May 2015
<https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/shorelines/data/gshhg/latest/>

Disclaimer

Event data may be revised or complemented in future updates. Updates in ACLED's datasets will not necessarily be reflected in ACCORD's reports if the update occurs close to or after the latter's publication. Changes in the sources used by ACLED to collect incident data might affect the comparability of data over time. For more information on ACLED's methodology, please see www.acleddata.com/resources/methodology/. For more information on ACCORD's products based on the data, please see the [ecoi.net blog posts tagged with "ACLED"](#). The lack of information on an event in this report does not permit the inference that it did not take place. The boundaries and names displayed do not imply endorsement or acceptance by the Austrian Red Cross.

Cite as

- ACCORD – Austrian Centre for Country of Origin & Asylum Research and Documentation: Myanmar, first quarter 2018: Update on incidents according to the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) - Updated 2nd edition, 20 December 2018