



Meeting Minutes (July 2023)

Title: FSC Myanmar National Coordination Meeting

Location: Online via Zoom

Date: 11.07.2022 (Tuesday)

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

Meeting Chair: Laurent GIMENEZ (Cluster Coordinator)

PARTICIPANTS

30 Organisations including **4** donors, **18** INGOs, **2** NNGO and **6** UN Agencies, (**63** individuals) attended in the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Food Security R6 assessment results by FAO/WFP
2. Post Mocha Food security assessment (preliminary findings) by FAO
3. Remittances study by IFPRI
4. Protection: Cross-cutting topics update by WFP
5. FSC key achievements on the field since last FSC coordination meeting
6. FSC Q2 Report
7. MHF SA1
8. AOB

SUMMARY OF MEETING DISCUSSIONS AND ACTION POINTS

PROCEEDING	Action Point/ Remark
<p>1. Welcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting commenced at 3:00 PM and was chaired by the cluster coordinator. The cluster coordinator welcomed the participants to the meeting and presented the agenda for the meeting. 	
<p>2. Joint Food Security and Agriculture Livelihoods R6 assessment results, presented by FAO/WFP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The survey for April-May 2023 was conducted as part of the sixth round of the Joint Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods Assessment, consisting of 3,748 households conducted through computer-assisted telephone interviewing. Data was represented at the state and regional level, with small sample in Kayah, Tanintharyi, and Chin but still considered representative. Trends showed an increase in certain shocks, such as high food and fuel prices and job losses, while idiosyncratic shocks decreased. Overall, the proportion of households not affected by shocks increased from 36% in September 2022 to 52% in January 2023, and further to 56% in May 2023. Agricultural shocks, natural hazards, and conflict/violence remained location-specific, while food inflation appeared to be a shock in conflict-affected areas. Households engaged in farming were found to be less vulnerable to economic shocks. In terms of food security situation before and after cyclone, households interviewed before the cyclone did not experience deteriorated food consumption. However, there was an increased use of coping strategies from 24% medium coping before the cyclone to 30% medium coping after the cyclone. The loss of assets pushed more households into crisis and emergency levels. Access to the market was a common difficulty, mainly due to distance or high transportation costs. Conflict, insecurity, and market closures were also challenges, particularly in Chin State. Livestock producers showed a decrease in the number of cattle and poultry due to high mortality rates. Difficulties in purchasing feed, diseases and access to veterinary services were the most common challenges. Market issues for livestock producers included lower prices, transportation costs, and lower demand. In term of crop production, lower share of farmers reported a drop in the planted area, potentially due to seasonality. Reductions in area were more common in urban areas, Magway, Rakhine, Sagaing, and Shan. Among agricultural households, 62% expressed the need for humanitarian assistance, while 58% of non-agricultural households also shared the same need. In Rakhine, 78% of agricultural households reported having needs. The most common needs, as observed in previous rounds, were for cash (61%), followed by food (30%), and agricultural inputs (19%). Overall trends of food insecurity situation are slight deterioration from 22% food insecure in R5 to 24% food insecure in R6. Regions such as Chin, Kayah, Rakhine, Kayin, and Magway experienced a higher prevalence of food insecurity compared to other areas. The availability of seeds is a crucial for farmers, as it directly impacts the area planted. 	<p>FAO/WFP R6 Assessment</p>

<p>3. Post Mocha Food security assessment (preliminary findings), presented by FAO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preliminary findings on the impact of Cyclone Mocha on agricultural livelihoods and food security was presented. • The data came from three sources: GIS analysis, household surveys, and key informant interviews. • The household survey revealed that 43% of farmers in the six states and regions such as Rakhine, Magway, Chin, Sagaing, Kachin and Ayeerwaddy were affected by the cyclone, with 51% reporting asset losses. • Severe damage to fields, irrigation infrastructure, and farmland was reported. 13% of seed stocks were lost. • Livestock sector was relatively less affected, but among those affected, significant losses were seen in poultry (70%) and swine (62%). • The impact on fisheries and aquaculture couldn't be quantified due to small sample size. • The household survey showed no impact on food security, but significant impact on productive assets. • Coping strategy index indicated increased decapitalization and expressed needs for cash, agricultural inputs, and food. • Key informant interviews provided insights into the situation in different village tracks, highlighting varying degrees of impact of Cyclone Mocha on crop production, livestock losses, and fishery infrastructure. 	<p>Post Mocha Food Security Assessment</p>
<p>4. Remittances study, presented by IFPRI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic of remittances and their impact on household welfare was presented. The data were used from the Myanmar Household Welfare Survey, covering the period from December 2021 to December 2022. • Remittances in this analysis referred to all transfers, whether in cash or in kind, received by households from individuals living outside of the household, regardless of the sender's source of income or relationship with the household. • In any three-month period between September 2021 and December 2022, 15.5% of respondent households received remittances at the national level. This included 10.4% receiving remittances from domestic migrants and 5.8% from migrants living abroad. Rural households had a slightly higher share of remittance recipients compared to urban households. • Among panel respondents, within a 12-month period, 32.5% of households received remittances. • The panel estimate was higher than the pooled estimate due to most households receiving remittances in only one of the quarters. • Income-poor households relying on remittances had remittances contributing to nearly half (49.5%) of their income, compared to 37% for non-poor households. • The share of households receiving remittances and the amount varied across states and regions, with more households in Chin, Kayin, and Mon receiving remittances. • The value of remittances decreased by 28% between 2022 and 2017, despite an increase in the number of households receiving remittances. • Domestic remittances were mainly sent from Yangon (43% of domestic remittance senders), followed by Mandalay (13%) and Shan (10%). • Thailand and Malaysia were the primary origins of international remittances received in Myanmar, accounting for 54% and 22% respectively. • The likelihood of receiving remittances and the amount received were influenced by factors such as exposure to conflict and household income status in the previous quarter. 	<p>Remittances Study</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receiving remittances was associated with positive impacts on various welfare indicators, including food consumption, dietary diversity, coping strategies, economic resilience, and income poverty reduction. 	
<p>5. Cross-cutting updates, presented by WFP</p> <p>Hot Topic: Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A report from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, highlighting the right to adequate food and human rights violations impacting food security. Various protection risks are affecting food security, including the destruction of food stocks, looting of livestock, burning of harvests and food supplies, and obstruction of food transportation. Protection concerns were identified in some specific areas, such as Chin, Sagaing, Magway and South East, where agricultural land destruction and arson of civilian infrastructure. In Rakhine, the closure of camps and potential pressure for returns from Bangladesh, with contingency planning needed in case of return movements. Forced recruitment into armed groups, particularly affecting male youth, was highlighted as an issue in Kachin and northern Shan. <p>Focus Topic: Child Labor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A report by the International Labour Organization (ILO) highlighted on the increase in child labor due to the combination of COVID-19 and the coup. Not all child work qualifies as child labor, considering factors such as age, working hours, hazardous conditions, voluntariness, and disruption to education. The majority of interviewed children were engaged in child labor, with boys being more affected. Poverty and the impact of COVID-19 were identified as key factors contributing to child labor. Highlighted the importance of avoiding child labor in their activities and targeting families in highly food-insecure situations to reduce their reliance on child labor as a coping mechanism. <p>Additional Discussions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shared the report of Secretary General on Conflict-related sexual violence (2022) Discussed the self-paced training opportunities available for partners, focusing on accountability to affected populations. Another online training available in Myanmar language, specifically addressing protection from sexual exploitation and abuse, emphasizing the importance of preventing any behavior. But specific links and details were not included in the minutes, but participants were encouraged to reach out to cluster coordinator for further information. 	<p>Cross-cutting updates</p> <p>Report of UN Human Right Office of the High Commissioner</p> <p>ILO's Report on Child Labor</p>
<p>6. FSC key achievements on the field since last FSC coordination meeting</p> <p>Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WFP and its partners successfully reached around 696,000 beneficiaries, achieving 61% of their monthly plan in various regions, including Magway, Yangon, Rakhine, Kachin, Shan, Kachin, Kayah, and Chin. Among the total beneficiaries reached, approximately 42% received cash or mixed rice plus cash, enabling them to access functioning markets. FAO conducted paddy seed and fertilizer distribution in three townships in Rakhine, benefiting 2,050 beneficiaries and planned to implement the same activities in another three 	

<p>townships in Rakhine State. Furthermore, FAO reached to 120 women headed households in Ayeyarwaddy Region with the distribution of different kinds of commodities including not only seeds but also mechanization inputs and cash as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Sagaing, one partner completed the first round of multi-purpose cash assistance. • In Magway Region, one partner distributed a total of 452 paddy seeds baskets to 226 farmers in Salin township. • In Rakhine, one partner distributed second round of cash for food to 17,000 beneficiaries and 3,200 households in Buthidaung and Maungdaw and planned for third round of distribution. Another one partner secured new funding for two projects in Central Rakhine, targeting 600 households with nutrient dense diversified vegetable home gardening, mushroom production, productive grants for income-generating activities, and nutrition sensitive education. Initiated a project funded by LIFT, covering 43 villages in Northern Rakhine State. Another one partner engaged in home gardening, income generation, and fisheries support activities in Rohingya camps. Another one partner distributed cash in Kyauktaw township. • In Kayah, one partner initiated a project in Kayah targeting 500 households for vegetable gardening and planned distribution of nutritious food baskets to 1,000 IDPs. Another one partner distributed multi-purpose cash to 642 households in Pekon Township. • In Kachin, one partner distributed paddy seeds and almost completed a farmer field school construction in Bhamo District. • In Northwest, one partner distributed multipurpose cash assistance to approximately 17,000 households in Sagaing, Magway, and Chin. 	
<p>7. FSC Q2 Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reminder to submit the FSC 5W report for June 2023 that feeds into the cluster’s Q2 report. The deadline was set on July 15. 	
<p>8. MHF SA1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on MHF project proposals has been sent to those who submitted, including information on funding status (fully funded, partially funded) and the need for resubmission. • Technical review of the proposals is in progress, and a final decision will be communicated before the deadline of July 14. • The cluster aims to close all processes by July 14, unless additional support is requested by OCHA 	
<p>9. AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next FSC Meeting on August 8, 2023 • The new cluster co-coordinator for FSC will be hosted by Mercy Corps for 2 years. 	