



Minutes Minutes (June 2021)

Location: Microsoft Teams

Date: 08.06.2021 (Tuesday)

Time: 3:30PM - 5:00PM (Yangon Time)

Meeting Recording: [Link](#)

PARTICIPANTS

FCA, SI, PIN, HEKS/EPER, WVM, FCDO, HARP, LIFT, Mercy Corps, CSI, AVSI, ACF, DRC, FAO and UNWFP.

AGENDA

1. **Introduction**
2. **Presentation of FSS IM products** (January to May 2021)
 - Partners' presence map
 - gap analysis (draft)
3. **FSS key achievements on the field since last FSS coordination meeting**
4. **Presentations**
 - FAO's assessment conducted in Ayeyarwady
Situation in Myanmar from a food security perspective as well as FAO strategic advice as a priority response to prevent major food insecurity
 - Tveg programme presentation (by Mercy Corps)
5. **Addendum HRP** (project submission process)
6. **MHF** (review committee for Strategic and Technical review)
7. **FS activities (for HRP 2021 & ahead of HNO/HRP 2022)**
 - types of FS activities + minimum package + frequency of package provision (with rationale behind all these aspects)
 - direct costs (food rations, kits...) (may vary from a State/Region to another) + how the costing was established
 - transfer fees costs
8. **FSS coordination mechanisms**
 - FS co-coordinator election/introduction of the candidates and voting mechanism
 - Confidentiality of intervention in Yangon and in general for better information sharing
 - FS assessment being implemented/ need of coordinated FS assessment
9. **Follow-up**
10. **AOB**

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS

1. Introduction

- The workshop commenced at 3:30 PM with welcome speeches by WFP FSS Coordinator
- Each participant also introduced oneself.

2. Presentation of FSS IM Product based on 5Ws

- Firstly, Laurent Gimenez (Food Security Sector Coordinator) took the presentation of two IM Products as follows
 - (1) [Myanmar FSS Partners' Presence and Donors' Presence Map](#)
 - (2) [Myanmar – FSS Gap Analysis dashboard for SO1 Food Assistance](#)

3. FSS key achievements on the field since last FSS coordination meeting

Solidarities International

- Continuing the Cash for work activities and farm related activities in Pauktaw Township
- Managing the cash availability issues

People in Need (PIN)

- Conducted the food distribution in Shwepyithar Township (Reached 50 HHs and still conducting cash distribution to reach 600 HHs)

CSI

- Continuing the food distribution in Rakhine State (Buthidaung and Maungdaw)
- Effective by cash issues which have been slowing down the implementation progress.
- Currently functioning the cash modality but we were exploring and going back to in-kind support (may be mixed cash and in-kind support)

FAO

- Has been implementing cash for work activities in 4 townships in northern and central Rakhine. Ongoing process of cash for work irrigation, infrastructure renovation and construction in 4 townships.

FCA

- Supported the emergency cash for food assistant in 293 newly IDPs in Bhamo Township especially in Nan Hlaing Village Area.

4. Presentations

- FAO conducted the 15 mins of 1st presentation on Rapid Assessment in Ayeyarwaddy Region. [Title of Assessment](#) – Rapid Agricultural Livelihoods and Food Security Assessment of Migrants and Host Families in Bogale, Mawlamyaing Kyun, Labutta Townships in Ayeyarwaddy Region. Detail presentation can be seen in this link [Ppt presentation](#) .

Key Conclusions

- (1) Most migrant households are composed of one or two members and rely on some type of agricultural activity to generate income: 86% of respondents received an income related to agriculture (farming, wage agricultural labour and/or fishery and aquaculture).
- (2) Despite the high proportion of households relying on agricultural income, only 29% of total (315) respondents can access farmland (land ownership or through land rental or share cropping). Share cropping seems associated with lower wealth index, supporting the hypothesis that, not only land is a major constraint, but also capital.
- (3) The major constraint in agriculture is lack of capital (82% of respondents). The two other limitations are the accessibility of land (59%) and difficulty to access seeds (40%).
- (4) Around 90 % of interviewed households adopted crises and emergency coping mechanisms (77% and 13%, respectively) that deplete assets and decrease production. Farmers and

households engaging in small business (mat-making, snack Households engaging in agricultural labour and fishery/aquaculture as primary source of income, those with pregnant and lactating women and female-headed household are also employing crisis and emergency coping mechanism above this average. elling, etc.) are more frequently adopting these decapitalising strategies.

- (5) More than half of respondents mentioned having experienced four or more among the food insecurity experiences of the standard FIES module.
- (6) Together with the finding that most households adopted crisis and emergency coping mechanisms, these results suggest that the target population is currently facing extreme food consumption gaps, likely resulting in high levels of acute malnutrition, and/or extreme loss of livelihood assets that will lead to food consumption

Key Recommendations

- (1) The analysis suggests that external responses are necessary to avoid the deterioration of humanitarian conditions among the returnee population and their host families in the Ayeyarwady Region.
 - (2) Actions should ideally consider a coordinated intervention along both food assistance and livelihood support, and not necessarily to the same beneficiaries.
 - Short-term food assistance is required to avoid worsening consumption gaps. Other, more in-depth evaluations will be necessary to determine the best modality for its delivery, to whom and how long. But the coordination in the response should provide for part of this food assistance also to protect livelihoods and assets, for example with seed protection.
 - The promotion of agricultural livelihoods seems to be the most efficient and rapid way to secure an income to returnee households and their host families. Financial support is the most frequently mentioned need among the respondents (82%), cash transfer is therefore recommended if the condition allows in coordination with other type of supports.
- Then, FAO also conducted the 2nd Presentation on “Recover the livelihoods of most vulnerable farming households in Myanmar following the 1st February coup” about 10 mins. Following Q&A. Presentation focused on two points about impact on agriculture and livelihoods and food security, and priority area of interventions. Details presentation can be seen in this link [Ppt presentation](#) .
 - 20 mins of 3rd presentation about the Case Study on “Transforming Rakhine’s Vegetable Markets (TVeg)” was given by Mercy Corps. Presentation focused on (1) TVeg Goal ? (2) What is TVeg? and TVeg Workstreams (3) Recommendations (4) Acknowledges. Details presentation and full report can be seen in these two links (1) [Ppt presentation](#) and (2) [Full Report](#).

5. Addendum HRP (project submission process)

- Instruction for HRP project submission can be seen in email sent by OCHA.
- Any clarification for addendum HRP can be raised to OCHA.

6. MHF (review committee for Strategic and Technical review)

- FSS coordinator will send an email to all FSS partners to request some partners to participate in the MHF SA1 strategic & technical review.

7. FS activities (for HRP 2021 & ahead of HNO/HRP 2022)

- Due to the changing the context including banking issue and the raise of market price, it has become necessary for the FSS to identify the most suitable activities for food security per area, along with a minimum package, and how many time of package has to be provided The evolution of the context makes necessary to update the costing of FSS package. Costings may vary from an area to another
-

8. FSS coordination mechanisms

- FS co-coordinator election/introduction of the candidates and voting mechanism A specific mail to be sent to all FSS partners to plan the election of the FSS co-coordinator. The process must be:
 1. inclusive (local partners from the field have to be registered so they can vote)
 2. Fair (only 1 person per organization can vote, so big organizations do not “weight” too much on the election process)
- Confidentiality of intervention in Yangon and in general for better information sharing
Specific email will be sent to discuss the relevance of set a mechanism that guaranty confidentiality for implementing partners to make sharing documents (assessments, reports...) within the FSS sector more secure.
- FS assessment being implemented/ need of coordinated FS assessment
With the recent evolution of the context, assessing the people’s food security status has become necessary to plan/readapt FSS interventions, not only in newly targeted areas. Some partners are taking some initiatives. However, methodologies may differ. This makes difficult to compare data from several partners. There is a need to harmonize assessment methodologies to ensure that assessments allow food security analysis at country level.

9. Follow-up

- Received the only four feedbacks on FS Response capacities. This information will help to make projections of Food Security achievements at the end of the year and will help, when necessary, to reorient activities. Registering FS capacities may help to deliver FS response on short notice in case of new emergencies (displacements...)
- Received 11 responses FSS satisfaction survey and 14 on Cross-cutting issues survey. The result of these two surveys will be presented in FS coordination meeting in July.
- Regarding of HRP indicator matrix, each partner in Rakhine State need to add one fact for the “Non-displacement stateless people in Rakhine State” in “Beneficiaries Types Column” of 5Ws format. Please use this update format start in July 2021.

10. AOB

- Discussed nothing