

Building Resilience, Equity and Opportunity in Myanmar: The Role of Social Protection

The experience of public works programs in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective¹

PWPs can be a useful tool for poverty reduction and social protection provision in Myanmar by presenting a coherent framework to achieve several objectives (seasonal income and food security, disaster recovery, community resilience, social cohesion). For PWPs to be effective and sustainable, design should respond to local conditions and implementation should engage government structures that provide a scalable platform.



1. This Note was prepared by Mariana Infante-Villarroel (World Bank), with inputs from the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT), Save the Children (SC), and members of the Cash Working Group. It draws on information from documents and field trips to Magwe, Mandalay, Ayeyarwaddy, and Kachin during April-June 2014 and secondary sources on Rakhine and Tanintharyi kindly shared by WFP, LIFT, SC, and ILO. Comments were provided by Puja Vasudeva Dutta, Brett Ballard, Carlo del Ninno, Nikolas Myint, and Khin Aye Yee (World Bank); Inge Stokkel and Jessica Chaix (WFP); Lou Tessier, Sonish Vaidya, and Mito Tsukamoto (ILO); and Mathew Tasker (SC). Any comments and questions can be addressed to ainfantevillarro@worldbank.org. The team is grateful to the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement and to the Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development for their inputs and facilitation of field trips for the entire assessment; and to the Ministry of Labor, Employment and Social Security, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development for their inputs and guidance. The team benefited from contributions and field support from WFP, ILO, UNOPS-LIFT, SC, HAI, ActionAid, IOM, MDRI, and several UN agencies and NGOs throughout the process. The team is grateful to the Rapid Social Response program and its five donors the Russian Federation, Sweden, Norway, the United Kingdom and Australia for funding this assessment.



1. Overview

Public works programs (PWP), also known as public employment programs (PEPs), are social protection programs that provide temporary employment mainly to unskilled workers in labor-intensive asset-building projects, usually in rural areas. Several development partners (DPs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are implementing cash for work (CFW) and food for work (FFW) in Myanmar, which can provide important lessons about the design and implementation of this instrument in the Myanmar context.

Most PWPs in Myanmar have pursued at least one of the following four main objectives: a) provide food security to communities in situations of emergency and crises; b) contribute to household food and income security, particularly during the lean season; c) support community recovery and resilience through the creation and maintenance of small-scale infrastructure after disasters; and d) help build social cohesion in post-conflict contexts.

DPs and NGOs have implemented PWPs in various agro-ecological zones in Myanmar, with design and implementation adapted to the local context. For instance, in the Dry Zone, seasonal food and livelihood security objectives are the main focus in PWPs. In the Delta, CFW and other programs have focused mainly on post-disaster recovery since Cyclone Nargis brought devastation to the region in 2008. PWPs in conflict and post-conflict areas (the Border States) focus on the multiple ongoing needs of communities, such as post-disaster recovery after Cyclone Giri (Rakhine) and reconciliation and social cohesion (Tanintharyi). These programs remain relatively small in scale, geographically scattered, and without sustainable financial and implementation arrangements. At the same time, this experience of implementing PWPs in Myanmar can yield important operational lessons, as this note documents.

2. Design and implementation arrangements²

2.1 Description of key design parameters

Targeting

As in most PWPs around the world, geographic targeting³ is the primary targeting tool in Myanmar. It is sometimes combined with mechanisms to identify eligible households and/or individuals.

Village/community selection

Geographic targeting occurs where WFP operates through C/FFW schemes (central Dry Zone and Border State⁴ areas), and in current and forthcoming LIFT-supported CFW schemes as part

2. See also Annex 1.

3. Geographic targeting refers to the way location determines eligibility for benefits or allocates budget to concentrate resources on poorer areas.

4. WFP operates in the following Border States: southern and northern Shan state, southern and northern Chin state, northern Rakhine state and Pham Kham (Wa region).

of regional programs such as those implemented by the TatLan Group⁵ in Rakhine. In addition, post-conflict communities in the Border States have seen PWP approaches: an ILO project in Tanintharyi directly addresses the question of social cohesion in villages with high populations of internally displaced people (IDPs) while bringing much-needed community assets.

Depending on the program objectives, there appear to be two main criteria based on local needs to prioritize communities within region/states: a) food and income insecurity; and/or b) infrastructure needs. For instance, WFP selects townships based on WFP food security and monitoring data. Villages are selected based on village profiles that include food security and livelihood data,⁶ as well as on consultations with village tract and village leaders. LIFT-supported NGOs have focused on the provision of critical infrastructure for livelihood and food security through CFW schemes. Thus village selection is based primarily on infrastructure needs as part of regional development approaches.

Similarly, in the Delta, restoration of the infrastructure Cyclone Nargis destroyed in 2008 means such needs often determine the location of CFW activities and likely benefit more than one village. For instance, an ILO employment-intensive infrastructure program in Mawlamyainggyun township (Ayeyarwaddy) benefited several villages through ensuring connectivity restoration. LIFT-supported NGOs in the Delta also prioritized villages in need of critical infrastructure for post-disaster connectivity recovery and food security (bridges, road construction, embankments, paddy production).⁷

Household and individual selection

In selected villages, households that will benefit from the program need to be identified using different approaches. WFP uses community-based targeting; in some contexts, self-targeting (households self-selecting) is also necessary— particularly if additional manpower is required. Cooperating partners facilitate the process, whereby communities make decisions on which households to prioritize for the program. Communities use guiding criteria from WFP and cooperating partners⁸ as well as context-specific criteria. For instance, in Magwe criteria such as women-headed households and those headed by migrants not sending back remittances are also important for communities. Therefore, beneficiary profiles tend to be different across agro-ecological zones. In the Dry Zone, 47% of WFP beneficiaries have casual labor as a main source of income; in the Border States agriculture is by far the biggest source of income (up to 84% of beneficiaries said so in northern Shan state).⁹ In Rakhine, the TatLan Group also uses community-based targeting as its primary household targeting mechanism, informed by criteria from a Household Economy Assessment (HEA, see Annex 2).

5. The Tat Lan Group comprises NGOs in charge of CFW schemes in the LIFT-supported Tat Lan Program: SC, the International Rescue Committee (IRC), Better Life Organization (BLO), and Oxfam.

6. Although projects benefit entire communities, WFP projects include at least 50 percent of the households in a community as direct beneficiaries.

7. Most LIFT-supported CFW projects in the Delta have already ended.

8. These criteria are a) vulnerable households with severe food shortages and no other source of income; b) landless households; c) households that will be users of the asset or economic opportunity created or developed; d) household members who are unemployed for the period and timing of FFW activities; e) large households; f) those with only one income earner; g) households borrowing money to meet rice consumption; and h) casual labor as a main source of income.

9. WFP monitoring data, June 2014.

Figure 1: Pond renovation, Taung Sin village, Magwe



Some programs also lay down eligibility criteria for individuals from beneficiary households. There are several reasons for this: a) it prevents the use of child labor¹⁰ and ensures the elderly do not perform inappropriate tasks; b) it ensures women and other priority groups can benefit and be appropriately represented; and c) it ensures assets can be completed by at least one (or more) member(s) of the household. Child labor is not allowed in DP-supported PWPs in Myanmar and workdays of eight hours/day are part of the work norms. Furthermore, WFP does not allow those over 60 to participate in F/CFW, although in practice some elderly people in need perform light and appropriate tasks (e.g. maintenance). In order to ensure women can participate, some project sites provide lighter work and child care (WFP) or flexible working hours to allow breast feeding women to join in (WFP and TatLan). To maximize the number of households benefiting from the project, one member (able to perform physical work) per household of five can participate at a time on a rotational basis in WFP-supported PWPs. The Tat Lan Group prioritizes households with sufficient members to ensure the project is completed; households in need that do not have members capable of performing physical work receive a direct transfer.¹¹

10. In SC's CFW projects, children under 16 are not eligible and children aged 16-17 are eligible to do light work only.

11. This unconditional cash transfer support linked to PWPs is present in large-scale programs such as the Productive Safety Net Program in Ethiopia.

Project timing

Most PWPs cannot be implemented during the rainy season¹² but are an interesting employment option during the agricultural lean season.¹³ PWPs in the Dry Zone aim to provide income and food support between February and May, with WFP's programs providing a maximum of 60 days/household during this period (the average is 45 days). LIFT-supported PWPs in the Delta and the Dry Zone are usually implemented during the lean season as well, albeit for shorter periods (e.g. 25 days), based on the workdays needed to complete the asset. In the case of the Tat Lan Group's program in Rakhine, assets are built during the dry season (mid-October-end of May). Since embankments are the asset to be constructed (see next section), and they vary in size, the amount of work needed varies significantly between villages. For this reason, the Tat Lan Group provides a flexible 50-90 work days per household.

Benefits

In the absence of minimum wages that can be used as benchmarks for setting PWP wages, implementing agencies have resorted to criteria such as local market wages for skilled and unskilled labor (see wage rates in Annex 1). Wages should also respond to community expectations, stay within project budgets, and be sufficient to have the desired impact on objectives such as household food security. The TatLan Group¹⁴ and WFP¹⁵ set the wage rate below the market rate in order to minimize the distortion of agricultural labor markets and prevent oversubscription where poor households are supposed to self-select into the program, given that PWPs that pay wages above those paid for local agricultural labor can reduce the labor supply in those activities.¹⁶ ILO's program in Tanintharyi set above-market wages for skilled and unskilled labor that were sufficiently high to compete with wages offered in neighboring Thailand.

Men and women are paid equally in all DP-implemented PWPs. The Tat Lan Group in Rakhine has reported cultural issues arising from equal payment to men and women, although implementing partners in other areas, such as the Dry Zone, have not encountered such issues.¹⁷ Partners implementing PWPs in Myanmar observe that relatively low wage levels can attract more women who want to remain close to home, whereas men resort to migration to look for higher-paid activities.

12. Only tree and crop plantation projects can be implemented during the rainy season.

13. Typically the lean season in the Dry Zone coincides with the driest months (October-May) though it varies in the highlands and areas with more than one harvest per year.

14. SC also revises each year the wage based on market rates and inflation and uses Cost of Diet and HEA analysis (see Annex 2) to ensure enough income (through wage rate and number of days) is provided to make a significant contribution to the cost of a nutritious diet.

15. WFP's wage rates are typically 80 percent of the local labor market rate and are always above the transfer value of the food basket. Current WFP wage rates range between MMK1,600 and MMK 2,500.

16. PWPs that pay wages above those paid for local agricultural labor can reduce the labor supply in those activities.

17. Issues around equal pay for men and women have also been encountered during the implementation of the National Community-Driven Development Project (NCDDP). Often communities consider unfair that men and women receive equal wages since men can carry heavier loads; hence they prefer men to be paid slightly higher wages (e.g. MMK 500 more).

Payments can be done monthly, weekly, every three days, or on an output-based basis (once a certain construction target is met). Given the food security objective of WFP's PWP, wages are in food and/or cash depending on market conditions, availability of banking services, security, and beneficiary preference.¹⁸

Assets and selection process

Assets are typically selected through participatory methods with community committees and therefore emphasize context-specific needs. Implementing partners often facilitate the processes, drawing on local knowledge to develop a menu of options that communities discuss and rank. Access to water has been identified as a key constraint facing communities, one that directly compromises food security and nutritional status in the Dry Zone.¹⁹ Therefore, assets facilitate access to drinking water, irrigation, and soil conservation. Communities often regard the asset as equally or even more important than the household-level support received. In the Delta, connectivity and infrastructure restoration after Nargis have been prioritized, with assets the main focus of support. WFP's objectives of improving short- and long-term food security through CFF and FFW translate in the conflict and post-conflict Border States into assets focused on the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure in isolated and conflict-affected communities. Emphasis on asset creation is prominent in Gari-affected villages in Rakhine supported by LIFT. The project selection process was managed exclusively by LIFT and focuses on sustainable livelihood and food security through infrastructure for paddy production, of which embankments are the asset to be built in certain villages.

2.2 Implementation arrangements

WFP- and LIFT- supported programs have set up project management structures at village level elected by the community. Project Management Committees (PMCs) in WFP-implemented PWPs are responsible for all operations, such as facilitation of discussions on beneficiary and project selection, record-keeping, manual cash/food distribution, and coordination of future maintenance of assets. LIFT-supported projects (not only PWPs) rely on Village Development Committees (VDCs) for these activities under PWP implementation but also to coordinate various other projects financed through community transfers. WFP and ILO have pursued consultation with village tracts (Ayeyarwaddy project), although the role of government structures remains limited, as PMCs and VDCs do not always overlap with (and in some cases explicitly exclude) village administrators (VAs).

Implementing partners of WFP programs visited in the Dry Zone facilitate village-level discussions around project and beneficiary selection. The TatLan Group also facilitates discussions on beneficiary selection and consults with communities in Rakhine on the adequacy of wage levels. ILO fa-

18. WFP's food ration includes a full basket 2.25 kg of rice, 0.3 kg of pulses, 0.1 kg of oil, and 25 g of salt per person/day/work norm to diversify nutritional value. The appropriateness of using cash assistance in Myanmar is discussed in the Note on 'The experience of cash transfers in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective.'

19. For instance, the WFP Dry Zone Food Security Assessment finds flood plains and irrigated areas are better off.

Figure 2: Cash distribution in Shan

cilitated discussions on project selection with IDP communities while helping establish linkages between government and non-government actors around village selection, coordination, security, and monitoring tasks (see Annex 1).

An alternative way of implementing infrastructure development programs at local level uses community-driven development (CDD) approaches. These models provide a fund to communities for the implementation of infrastructure and other development projects chosen by communities themselves. Although not a CFW scheme as such,²⁰ the National Community-Driven Development Program (NCDDP), implemented by the Department of Rural Development (DRD) in the Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Rural Development (MLFRD) and supported by the World Bank, has involved government at different stages of implementation and can provide useful lessons on working with government structures in infrastructure development projects.

In NCDDP, DRD along with township authorities verifies that infrastructure sub-projects (assets) proposed by villages and village tracts do not duplicate existing government efforts. Village tracts

20. Guidelines for CDD programs often do not have specification for household selection or safety net provision (e.g. seasonal response), as the main objective is to develop infrastructure and other projects the community needs. Hence, the relevance of this program is mainly around the institutional arrangements and engagement with government structures and not around the particular guidelines for infrastructure development.

are the main planning and supporting unit at community level. Village Tract Project Support Committees (VTPSCs) are responsible for consolidating and submitting proposed projects made up of sub-projects proposed by communities; at least one sub-project coming from villages must be formulated by women. A Finance Sub-Committee is formed at the village tract level to manage the block grants for village tract and village level, along with other sub-committees for monitoring and procurement.²¹ NCDDP includes local-level capacity development, facilitated by partner NGOs, to support local government structures, including in community mobilization and the implementation of grievance and redress mechanisms.

3. Outcomes of PWP in Myanmar

The level of impact of PWPs at household and community levels depends on the objectives stated for the program and the way the program balances the importance of the transfer to households (beneficiary profile and benefit levels, number of days, timing of the intervention) and the asset (relevance and quality of the infrastructure provided).

PWPs in Myanmar at community and household level have promoted **livelihood and food security**. Based on WFP's monitoring and implementation experience, CFW and FFW programs have contributed to enhancing household-level food security, with outcomes including shorter food gaps, increased income, and coping mechanisms that are less negative, as well as community-level food security through enhanced community resilience against disasters and better access to markets and health and education services. WFP monitoring data shows CFW beneficiaries spend on average 70% of the cash on purchasing food and 17% on accessing health and education services. Alternatives to migration, at least for women,²² as well as diversified household income were outcomes found among beneficiaries of WFP-supported PWPs.

PWPs in Myanmar have also created **community assets** that support community development and food security. ILO prioritized post-disaster recovery in Ayeyarwaddy, creating some 87.6 km of access tracks, 25 jetties, 55 foot-bridges, and 40 latrines, employing over 7,400 workers and providing training to over 7,700 persons in contracting, management, and other vocational skills. In 2013, communities benefited from WFP programs through 764 km of renovated road, 205 km of irrigation and contour trenches, 2,200 ha of land development and agro-forestry, 3,194 latrines and energy-saving stoves, 97 drink water supply facilities and 42 fish ponds, 21 schools and 19 dams renovated/constructed, and 1,161 ha of soil-conserved farmland. LIFT-supported programs report communities benefiting from ponds in the Dry Zone and higher productivity in Rakhine after embankments decreased soil salinity, which contribute to the objectives set by the programs: increased household income among the poorest/most vulnerable to improve food and nutrition security.

21. Support is envisaged in the near future through a finance clerk in each village, as these tasks are challenging and time-consuming for committee members.

22. Low benefit levels of PWPs can be attractive for women but may not be enough to discourage men from migrating.

PWP models typically promote **social cohesion**, and Myanmar is no exception, as planning processes of PWPs reviewed emphasize community participation. ILO in Tanintharyi provides an example of how PWPs can achieve social cohesion: IDP communities were explicitly included in planning, execution, and monitoring processes for infrastructure development. This made them feel exclusionary practices had been rectified.²³ Community contractors coordinated ILO's labor-intensive and decent work-oriented project, which translated into increased income, empowered communities, increased access to safe drinking water, and skills development among beneficiaries.²⁴ Gender awareness, community development, and leadership trainings helped reduce the dominance of particular groups and the privileging of men. Public hearings with a wide range of stakeholders provided a participatory platform to better understand the project, raise grievances about project implementation, and facilitate interaction with local government and leaders.

Participatory processes facilitate the identification not only of assets to be built through PWPs but also of those that may need a different approach, given the high technical standards required. For instance, PWPs in Myanmar have successfully achieved road rehabilitation and pond construction/renovation, while communities identify electrification and building schools as needing another approach (e.g. higher technical skills, higher investment, multi-sectoral planning).²⁵

4. Lessons

Sustainable and government-led PWPs can be a powerful instrument for social protection and poverty reduction in Myanmar. The Rural Development Strategic Framework and the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement's Social Protection Strategic Plan (2014) identify PWPs as key instruments to address the vulnerabilities of the rural population in Myanmar (*see also* ILO, 2015). The objectives of PWP models implemented so far are relevant and will continue to be so in the future. With a quarter of Myanmar's population living in poverty in 2009/10, and 87% of the poor and 85% of the food-poor living in rural areas (UNDP, 2011), there is considerable potential for PWPs to address issues of **seasonal unemployment and food insecurity** faced by poor and vulnerable households in rural Myanmar across agro-ecological zones. Weather-related shocks (floods, droughts, cyclones) will continue to be a major source of vulnerability for rural households across the country, so PWPs can contribute to **emergency response, post-disaster recovery, and building community resilience**. Lastly, finding practical approaches to peace-building and **social cohesion** are important to contribute to national reconciliation efforts.

Government-led PWPs should be pursued in the short term, starting by considering several operational lessons from current models. It will be important to define program objectives: emphasizing employment intensity for greater household protection may need to be prioritized over efficient completion of infrastructure projects if PWPs are to become an instrument to effectively

23. These lessons are based on discussions with the ILO implementing team.

24. Before the project, IDP villagers had no experience in carrying out concrete works. Skilled workers were recruited from outside the village to provide on-the-job training to interested villagers. Now trained persons can give their services to other villages, such as second-phase villages.

25. Communities have contacted government stakeholders to support the implementation of more sophisticated projects identified through consultations for PWP project selection.

support poor households' food and income security.²⁶ Labor-intensive approaches need to be prioritized over mechanization to ensure PWP can be an effective safety net in Myanmar. At the same time, assets have been an important outcome of PWP in the country as part of rural development and livelihood strategies. It will be important to continue to promote the selection of relevant infrastructure and ensure acceptable quality of finished assets, particularly in contexts where community resilience (e.g. to disasters) is needed. The current practice of fine-tuning beneficiary selection and benefit levels based on local contexts and labor/food markets makes the programs locally relevant. The prioritization of asset-building during the lean season ensures employment when households are most in need. Inclusive participatory planning processes and ensuring the inclusion of certain vulnerable groups can be emphasized even further in contexts where there is an additional focus on building social cohesion.²⁷ Coherence of objectives and potential for rapid and effective response to local needs require government systems that can both ensure sustained financing and coherence with national and regional/state objectives and respond to local needs.

Government structures need to become the axis of effective PWP implementation. PWP effectiveness, particularly at scale, relies on sustainable implementation and financing arrangements that only government structures can provide in the long term. Limited government involvement in PWP in the past meant DPs and NGOs helped with community mobilization and planning, while trying to ensure consistency of support in communities by building on previous experience. However, DP and NGO priorities are inevitably emphasized in program objectives and project selection, sustainability of support is not guaranteed or predictable, and other areas in need of support are left out. Hence, donor coordination is not enough to ensure effective implementation of a national PWP that can help reduce poverty and serve as an effective safety net in times of hardship. With strengthened government systems as platforms for implementation, DPs and NGOs can contribute technical expertise in designing, implementing, and monitoring PWP in a coordinated way.

A pilot PWP with clearly defined objectives, design parameters, and implementation arrangements with decent work practices can help the government take an initial step towards sustainable PWP in Myanmar. A pilot PWP can test mechanisms to inform design and implementation arrangements for a national program to respond to desired objectives. In terms of design, the pilot would need to identify appropriate mechanisms for beneficiary selection, timing and benefit levels (e.g. that minimize distortions to local labor markets, that provide an attractive alternative to migration), and community infrastructure assets. DPs and NGOs have useful experience that can inform technical design (see Annex 2). The pilot could be implemented in two ways:

- **One could explore a national/regional PWP pilot model based on current, DP/NGO models. In current PWP, project management structures do not explicitly make the linkage with government structures.** There is potential to explicitly link PWP to village and village tract structures and build capacity beyond single-project implementation,²⁸ and also to support the

26. For instance, households with ox-carts were paid higher wages in some LIFT-supported PWP in the Dry Zone as their contribution to the rapid completion of infrastructure was higher. However, if the emphasis of PWP shifts to providing protection to poor households, this practice may need to change (e.g. better-off households with ox-carts are not encouraged to participate and poor households with no assets are prioritized).

27. While CDD projects such as the ILO one in Tanintharyi are effective in this regard, international experience in post-conflict contexts (Burundi, El Salvador, Sierra Leone) also offers lessons on successful PWP coordinated as part of regional/national programs.

28. For instance, PWP models can encourage VAs to establish better linkages with township authorities around, for instance, projects that PWP models cannot meet.

delivery of quality infrastructure through PWP models by linking with technical entities in government (e.g. DRD and other township-level officials). Ways to support women's empowerment in village-level decision-making processes represent another important lesson from the current implementation of NCDDP that can be useful to support government in piloting gender-sensitive PWPs in Myanmar.

- **A second option is by strengthening the emphasis on pro-poor investments and resilience-building in infrastructure development programs such as the NCDDP:**²⁹ features of PWPs such as labor-intensive approaches and encouraging the participation of the poor through community-based targeting can be promoted in order to provide a safety net for income- and food-insecure households as part of CDD platforms. Pro-poor infrastructure can be encouraged through active participation of poor households in community decision-making process and a pro-poor menu of projects. Incorporating these features can also support community resilience-building, provide a mechanism to channel resources for household support in time of crises, and become a vehicle to further support social cohesion in post-conflict contexts. The NCDDP already works through village tract administrators and supports engagement and capacity-building in the delivery of basic infrastructure.

Transitioning to government systems needs to ensure decent work practices such as reasonable working hours, health and safety standards, fair compensation for work performed, and prevention of child labor. These practices currently promoted by DP-led PWPs should continue to be promoted in eventual government-led PWPs. Government will need to ensure local employment is maximized and fair wages are paid to workers, minimizing the chances of exploitation by middlemen and contractors. Given the growing trend of infrastructure development in Myanmar,³⁰ the stage is set for PWPs to support implementation of basic community infrastructure, reinforcing decent work practices and promoting local employment in the process.

PWPs can be affordable poverty reduction mechanisms that protect households, help build resilient communities, and promote social cohesion in Myanmar. The cost-effectiveness of PWPs would depend on decisions on maximizing job provision and benefits vis-à-vis ensuring asset quality. For instance, WFP programs typically maximize the amount transferred to households (about 95% of project costs are labor costs). On the other hand, ILO programs allocate around 50% of the budget to labor costs. Hence, decisions on where to place the emphasis (household transfers, quality of assets, and/or skills development) need to be made based on program objectives and budget constraints. The Assessment-Based National Dialogue supported by ILO in 2014 showed different scenarios of how a PWP in Myanmar targeting rural areas and providing between 40 and 100 days of work can cost as little as 0.23% of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2024.³¹

29. See Note on 'Social protection delivery through community-driven development platforms: International experience and key considerations for Myanmar'.

30. For instance, DRD has increased the number of contractors developing infrastructure in the past few years from one to two per state/region to about thirty per state/region.

31. See ILO (2015). Parameters for this model assumed a daily wage of MMK 3,000 and estimated different scenarios of 40, 60, or 100 days covering the Dry Zone (Magwe and Mandalay regions) or all rural areas in Myanmar. Hence cost estimations can be even lower if the model is estimated with a lower daily wage and can vary according to different geographical locations.

References

ILO (International Labour Organization) (2015) 'Social Protection Assessment Based National Dialogue: Towards a Nationally Defined Social Protection Floor in Myanmar'. Yangon: ILO. <http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProject.action?id=2487>

UNDP (UN Development Programme) (2011) 'Integrated Households Living Conditions Survey in Myanmar (2009-2010) Poverty Profile'. Yangon: IHLCA Project Technical Unit, UNDP.

Annex 1:

Examples of public works programs in Myanmar

	WFP	SC, BLO, IRC, Oxfam	ILO*
Name	Cash/food for assets(ongoing)	CFW – Tat Lan Program (ongoing-2016)	Community-driven labor-intensive infrastructure development (2012)
Main objective	Food security and post-disaster recovery	Food and nutrition security through delivery of key infrastructure	Social cohesion
Description/emphasis	Provision of unskilled work mainly during lean season (seasonal)	Provision of key infrastructure for food and nutrition security through CFW scheme (seasonal)	Trust-building in post-conflict communities through provision of employment, needed community assets, and skills to IDPs for infrastructure development (1 time; 6 months)
Geographical scope	Northern Rakhine state, Chin state, Shan state, central Dry Zone, and Phangkhram, Wa special region	Rakhine state: Myebon (SC, IRC), Pauktaw (SC), Kyaukpyu (BLO), and Minbya (IRC) townships	Tanintharyi division (Krang Batoi, Sneh Kwee, Myreh Chai, and Pala Traou villages)
Village selection criteria	Villages with high landless and food-insecure population and few work opportunities	Need infrastructure for paddy production (food security); villages identified by the donor as moderately to severely impacted by Cyclone Giri	Nominated by the New Mon State Party (NMSP), high population of IDPs
Household targeting	Community-based targeting prioritizing poor and vulnerable households, and self-targeting if additional manpower is needed	Community-based targeting following criteria on poverty and number of family members able to complete project	Internally displaced households
No. of beneficiaries	54,242 participants (283,000 beneficiaries) (2013)	3,833 people	202 households (1,140 people), 50% women
Coverage/village	Minimum 50% (typically 70-75% in Magwe)	-	-
No. of workdays provided (average)	Maximum 60 per household (average 45)	50-90 days per household	1,243 person days of work, 40% women**
Wage levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately MMK 1,600-2,500 depending on local unskilled wage rates (80% of agricultural wages) Food basket (rice, salt, oil, pulses) (cash and food) 	MMK 3,000 (cash)	MMK 8,000 for skilled labor; MMK 5,000 for unskilled labor (cash; higher than market wages)
Frequency of payments	Monthly	Every 6-8 days and up to 10 days for exceptional circumstances	Community contractor paid on output basis and worker every three days

Notes:

* Although this program follows a community-driven infrastructure approach rather than a traditional PWP implementation modality, it is relevant for discussion in the framework of PWPs given its objectives and achievements.

** Unit person/days estimates the total number of days of work the project generates (e.g. if this project were to be completed in a day it would need 1,243 people). Women constituted 40 percent of the workforce, although they represented 50 percent of beneficiaries. This means men's participation was slightly higher in the actual work.

	WFP	SC, BLO, IRC, Oxfam	ILO*
Types of assets	Road renovation, ponds, irrigation canals, embankments, dykes, dams, ponds, tree plantation, soil conservation, land development/ terracing, school renovation, fish pond construction	Infrastructure for paddy production: embankment construction/repair; pond construction and maintenance for community water harvesting; sluice gates	Water tank/water supply, dug wells
Role of government	Consultation with village tracts to prioritize villages in some cases	Consultations held with village tract, township, and village administrators plus the Department of Irrigation	NMSP: village selection; government and NMSP: coordination and security; two regional ministers and NMSP Dawei district head: monitoring visits
Impact	Income diversification, increased income, shorter food gap, increased access to markets and services through road rehabilitation; access to drinking water; increased food production through land development/soil conservation/irrigation	Increased income, increased productivity, improved connectivity, vibrant markets on pay day	Increased income, empowered communities, increased access to safe drinking water, reconciliation, social inclusion of IDPs, skills development

Notes:

- * Although this program follows a community-driven infrastructure approach rather than a traditional PWP implementation modality, it is relevant for discussion in the framework of PWPs given its objectives and achievements.

Annex 2:**Studies conducted by DPs and NGOs to inform the implementation of PWP**

Cash Emergency Preparedness (CEP) Assessment (October 2013, SC): A CEP assessment was completed in Rakhine state (excluding camps and host communities) to assess the feasibility and appropriateness of undertaking cash transfer programming and to make operational recommendations for potential scale-up. A host of qualitative methods were used to conduct the assessment, including inception workshops with staff, community focus groups, stakeholder interviews (banks, hundis, traders, staff, consultants, etc.), and broader discussions with government and development agency representatives.

SC (Save the Children) (2013) 'Cash Emergency Preparedness Assessment'. External Version. Yangon: Save the Children.

Cost of the Diet (SC): Cost of the Diet is an innovative method and software that estimates the amount, combination, and cost of local foods needed to provide individuals or typical families with their average needs for energy and their recommended intakes of protein, fat, and micronutrients. The software can calculate the cost of a nutritious diet for up to six seasons in one year and offers a unique perspective on the effect of seasonal changes on the price and availability of foods, identifying periods when households may be vulnerable to high food prices.

When the results of the Cost of the Diet are compared with income and expenditure data generated by anHEA from the same livelihood zone, it is possible to estimate the affordability of a nutritious diet for different wealth groups. Information on the affordability of the diet can be used to estimate the size of cash transfers for social protection programs that intend to have an impact on nutrition through the diet.

SC (Save the Children) (2013) 'A Cost of Diet Analysis in the Peri-Urban Township of Hlaingthayar, Myanmar'. Yangon: Save the Children.

HEA – Livelihood Profiles: Three Livelihood Zones in Rakhine State (November 2013, SC): The HEA is a livelihood-based framework for analyzing how people obtain food, non-food goods, and services, and how they might respond to changes in their external environment, like a drought or a rise in food prices. The HEA enables planners to predict communities' vulnerability to different crises and shocks and is a useful tool for designing development programs and shaping policies.

FEG (Food Economy Group) (2013) 'Tatlan Project Rakhine State Household Economy Analysis 2013 Preliminary Findings'. Yangon: FEG.

32. An informal transfer system using a mix of agents and middlemen along a cash- and trust-based word-of-mouth chain.

33. A livelihood zone is an area within which people share a production system (that is, they grow the same crops or keep the same types of livestock) and have the same access to markets. In this case, analysis was conducted in the three livelihood zones identified by the HEA: coastal fishing, embankment paddy, and inland agriculture.

Food Security Assessments (2014, WFP): Food Security Assessments were conducted to support the design of poverty alleviation strategies and programs. Food security data were collected to inform on food security patterns across Myanmar and estimated poverty levels. The surveys identify differences in food security for different livelihood groups. Food security was assessed based on availability of food, access to food (income levels, diets, and hunger levels), utilization (access to water), and stability factors (food gap, coping mechanisms). For the Dry Zone, a nutrition study was included to improve understanding of the determinants of under-nutrition, in particular those related to food security, to improve program design and decision-making. To date, food security assessments have been conducted for the Dry Zone; Bago, Yangon, and Ayeyarwaddy regions; Shan, Kachin, and Chin states; and Sagaing region.

<http://www.fsinmyanmar.net/publications/item list/category/5-food-security-and-nutrition>

'The experience of public works programs in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective' is the fourth note in the series Building Resilience, Equity and Opportunity in Myanmar: the Role of Social Protection. All notes are available at www.worldbank.org/myanmar.

Myanmar Social Protection Notes Series

The note – 'Building resilience, equity, and opportunity in Myanmar: The role of social protection' – provides an overview of the technical notes in the series. These include:

1. Risks and vulnerabilities along the lifecycle: Role for social protection in Myanmar
2. Framework for the development of social protection systems: Lessons from international experience
3. Inventory of social protection programs in Myanmar
4. **The experience of public works programs in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective**
5. The experience of cash transfers in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective
6. Social protection for disaster risk management: Opportunities for Myanmar
7. Strengthening social security provision in Myanmar
8. Institutional landscape for implementation and financing of social protection programs: Towards effective service delivery in Myanmar
9. Social protection delivery through community-driven development platforms: International experience and key considerations for Myanmar
10. Reaching the poor and vulnerable: Key considerations in designing targeting systems
11. Reaching the poor and vulnerable in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective
12. Developing scalable and transparent benefit payment systems in Myanmar



WORLD BANK GROUP

World Bank Office Yangon

57 Pyay Road, Corner of Shwe Hinthar Road,
6 1/2 Mile, Hlaing Township, Yangon
Republic of the Union of Myanmar. Tel: +95 1 654824
www.worldbank.org/myanmar
www.facebook.com/WorldBankMyanmar



RAPID SOCIAL RESPONSE

