

FSC workshop June 2022

Day 1

Presentation 1: FSC assistance snapshot at Q1/2022

- Recommendations/propositions suggested by FSC are based on discussion with different actors: implementing partners, donors, OCHA, UNCLAs
- Capacities to analyze more diverse data is necessary to understand the dynamics of food security and food security assistance in Myanmar
- Partners were informed about shifting to monthly reporting of the 5Ws (beginning in August)
- Along the 2023HPC (HRP/HNO) process, the question of supporting peri-urban response as in 2022 will be at the core of the process. Peri-urban response (Mandalay, Yangon) was integrated in HRP 2022based on these 3 assumptions:
 1. Development assistance on hold following the coup
 2. Urban settings are less resistant to the crisis compared to rural areas => which was proven wrong by IFPI & FAO/WFP studies
 3. High risk of food crisis in peri-urban area due to the high density of population
- What type of FS programming is the most suitable for peri-urban response in 2023?
- Knowing that the context is deteriorated, in PIN may be higher in 2023 than in 2022. We limit funds allocated to Myanmar, should FSC go for reaching as much people as possible with a limited package or should FSC choose to support less people but with a consistent FS package that goes beyond food assistance to ensure significant impact on beneficiaries' food security status.

Presentation 2: Food security in Myanmar update

- Round 3 of WFP/FAO data was presented, and overall trends were a relative improvement of the FS situation. However, caution in interpreting those results is needed data collection coincided with harvesting period.
- Negative evolution of the situation toward the lean season as the positive results of round 3 are linked to seasonal impact, survey being implemented just after the harvest.
- data representative at State/region level only, going down at township level would require a bigger sample size
- Trends show that rural HHs tend to be more negatively affected especially in Kayah and southern Shan.
- Kayah and Kayin saw heavier reliance on crisis or emergency coping strategies
- Trends show that rural HHs tend to be more negatively affected especially in Kayah and southern Shan.
- HHs saw a reduction of 59% in their overall income and 52% have accumulated more debts
- Estimations of PIN figures now stand at 10.8 million (a reduction from HNO 2022 figures)
- Chin, Kayah and southern Shan are the areas most affected by conflict
- Poverty is an underlying factor in all regions and townships
- HHs seem to be planting less (especially true for rice) as there was a 30% reduction in planted areas (price and access to fertilizers being the key issue) but also access to water was highlighted in Sagain and Mon whereas Rakhine faced issues with accessing seeds
- Harvest is expected to reduce by 55% (rice)
- 42% decline in herd/flocks in Chin, Rakhine, Mon and Ayeryawady (mainly linked to diseases). This was accompanied by a low demand and low prices (difficulties in marketing livestock)

- HKI presented on the importance of integrated programming and the positive results home gardening offers in improving nutritional value of assistance and securing diverse diets

-Results of endline assessment by HKI echo the poverty point raised by WFP/FAO round 3 of data collection: 50% increase in poverty levels and 80% of Ayeryawady live under 1.9\$/day

Presentation 3: Conflict Report Trends Analysis

- Conflict trends and road access map showed how supplies are affected (an operational tool available for partners wanting to import supplies across border points)
- FSC should be able to update the conflict analysis every six months

Presentation 4: Necessity to support agriculture & livelihoods projects for more in-depth impact of the food security assistance provided to targeted groups

- real possibility to integrate?
- need USD to be capable to provide 360° FS assistance
- constraints: access, conflict
- consider cross-border programming

- New & old problem overlapping => lack of capital, lack of inputs (fertilizers), increasing price of inputs (especially fertilizers)
- financial inclusion may be a solution
- options via private financial institutions to get money in country must be investigated
- agriculture/livelihoods assistance is more value for money

-Importance of adopting Early Recovery approaches whilst doing emergency programming was highlighted as there is a direct correlation between poverty and negative impact on FS

- 80% of MMR economy relies on the agricultural sector (encompassing livestock and aquaculture)
- Importance of stepping up in crop and vegetable packages and animal feed assistance (more value for money)

- Need to investigate the status of small businesses – is it possible to provide some type of employment subsidy?
- Professions to avoid in livelihoods programming should be those that have not weathered COVID and the conflict. Anything related to garments, construction and hospitality and tourism should be avoided.
- In terms of early recovery, we need to start meeting with microfinance actors to see how they are mitigating the crisis. Additionally, given that businesses in Myanmar rely overwhelmingly on personal loans and savings, it would be important to see how humanitarian funding could be used to shore up vulnerable businesses

Day 2

Presentation 1: Alternative Food Security programming: Importance of insect feeding Value Chain

- Spectrum pilot projects and studies were brought to light in an effort to pick up on the opportunities insect farming provides for the food and feed sectors

- option as substitute to fertilizers
- market already existing (85% of surveyed people eat insects)
- nutritious & tasty food
- insects farming initiatives are successful
- is expensive food (insects) suitable to support nutrition of IDPs & poor people who cannot afford them?
- generates incomes

-must be integrated in “traditional” agriculture programming

Presentation 2: Cross-sectoral priorities

-need to adapt food to PWD so they can manipulate, chew and swallow it (Nutrition cluster has made some great improvement in adapting nutrition activities towards various groups, FSC is late and must develop its tools/guideline)

-cross-sector programming for more qualitative intervention

-Qualitative intervention (Nutrition top up...) may result in a more expensive cost of intervention/beneficiaries in a context of funds being already limited

-do we go for “cheap” FS assistance to reach the greatest number of beneficiaries or do we scale up to qualitative impactful FS intervention with a reduced number of beneficiaries.

-decreasing the cost of intervention needs a complete analysis of the process of intervention not to only reduce the share given to the beneficiaries => eg, need to implement full FS assessment (FSC, rCSI) when targeting new IDPS (sometimes still on the go), cost efficiency?, meaningful?

-ECHO Protection Matrix => assistance has to be given based on the needs but considering the protection risks

-Protection mainstreaming needs to be more thorough and tools will be developed to help partners better integrate it with a particular attention for inclusion to PWD

-Good examples of Nexus programming were presented by Christian Aid to remind the group of the constant need for building bridges between relief assistance and a more holistic take on drivers of conflict and local dynamics

-Options for strategic categorization and positioning were presented in an aim to mainstream assistance and aim at geo divisions and minimum commitments from partners looking into HRP 2023

There is a need to:

-classify & prioritize per type of action

To better analyze local market

-to support food production

-better forecast FS evolution

-options to transition from blanket cover to targeting in IDP camps

-strengthen collaboration between local partners and FSC