

Malawi Social Action Fund Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction Experiences

Building Community-based Preparedness
for and Responses to Natural Disasters

Bangkok, Thailand

10-13th June, 2008

Presented By

Paul Chipeta / Charles Mandala



LOCATION OF MALAWI



- ★ Capital City
- ★ Regional Capital City
- Significant City
- Important City - Town
- Association - Landmark
- River
- ▲ Highest Point

MALAWI COUNTRY MAP



OUTLINE OF PRESENTATION

- ◆ BACKGROUND FACTS ON MALAWI
- ◆ EXAMPLES OF DISASTERS
- ◆ RISK REDUCTION INTERVENTIONS
- ◆ INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK
- ◆ ACHIEVEMENTS
- ◆ LESSONS LEARNT
- ◆ KEY ISSUES FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMS



BACKGROUND – Malawi & Malawi Social Action Fund

- ◆ Malawi's population is estimated to be 13.5 million
- ◆ 83% of the people live in the rural areas
- ◆ 52 % of the Malawians live below the poverty line – 2005 IHS
- ◆ Poverty determinants – household size, education, access to non-farm employment, access to irrigation, proximity to markets and trading centres, & access to good roads; access to larger land holding & engagement in cash crop production
- ◆ 22% are ultra poor (2005 IHS) – few or no assets, little or no land, limited or no labour, chronically ill, child / female / elderly headed dependency
- ◆ 30% are moderately poor (2005 IHS) – household with some labour
- ◆ **MASAF started in 1995 – Social Investment type (Empowers communities through provision of funding for socio economic services – health, education, water and sanitation, transport and food security)**



EXAMPLES OF DISASTERS

- ◆ DEFINITIONS – drought, flash floods, wash aways, hailstorm, strong winds (different communities have definitions applicable to their localities)
- ◆ Countrywide - In 2004 / 2005 Malawi experienced a drought that affected the whole country – 4.2 million people were affected, 2.6 million were at highest risk [based on Vulnerability Assessment Mapping (VAM) Report]
- ◆ Localised - In 2006 / 2007 three Districts in Malawi were affected by a localised drought - 200,000 people were affected [based on VAM and Agriculture Divisional Assessment]
- ◆ IMPACTS – loss economic and social livelihoods, malnutrition (coping mechanism – sale of assets)



DESIGN OF RISK REDUCTION INTERVENTIONS funded by MASAF

- ◆ Interventions by MASAF were in form of a special PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM
- ◆ Flexibility of the MASAF resulted in speedy reallocation of resources from a normal PWP
- ◆ National PWP – Objective: transfer income for purchase of food and farm inputs to households at highest risk (470, 000 families, average family size was 5.5 in 2006). Beneficiaries were expected to work on a 10 (ten day) 8 hour task and be paid a total of 1.30US\$ (equivalent to 1 bag of maize and one bag of fertiliser).
- ◆ Localised PWP – Objective: transfer cash income to households with irrigable land (11,000 families) for production of food
- ◆ VAM data on numbers of people affected and their locations was used in the planning for district resource distribution
- ◆ Local Authorities carried out intra – district allocation of resources to determine amount to be transferred to each area and the number of PWP participants
- ◆ District Officials / local communities choose type of labour intensive PWP, link to mobilisation of savings and investment



INSTITUTIONAL SETUP

- ◆ MASAF Management Unit provided funding (wages -80% and administration-20%) implementation guidelines, and IEC and implementation support to Local Authorities, M&E
- ◆ Sector Ministries provided guidelines for specific PWP projects – roads, irrigation schemes, afforestation, land resource conservation.
- ◆ The Local Authorities assisted communities in identification of beneficiaries, supervised projects, paid the beneficiaries, establish linkages with other programs
- ◆ Local communities carried out participatory wealth ranking to identify participants – one person per household was eligible



ACHIEVEMENTS

- ◆ National - a total of 12.5 million US \$ was transferred to 0.5million households (MASAF 3 Impact Evaluation, 2007)
 - A total of 14,600 mt of maize was purchased by PWP participants in 2006 – equivalent to 3% of national food deficit
 - 14 % of subsidised fertiliser was purchased by PWP participants in 2006 - 20,800 mt out of 147,000 mt
 - 22% national staple food was met by PWP participants in 2006 – almost equivalent to 487,000 mt declared surplus in the year
 - Implementation – demonstration of the ability of Local Authorities to mobilise all available logistical resources unlike in the normal PWP



ACHIEVEMENTS (Cont/..)

- ◆ Localised PWP- a total of 600, 000 US\$ was transferred to 11,000 farm families (Bua Dwangwa Evaluation by Kasungu ADD – 2007 / COMSIP Reports)
 - Value of produce (maize, legumes & wheat) was 1 billion Malawi Kwacha in year 1
 - Participants formed savings and investment groups after farm produce investment promotion (1740 farmers)
 - Cooperatives created among PWP beneficiaries have transformed into commercial crop production, 98 ha of wheat planted this year



PWP Participants Cooperative



LESSONS

- ◆ Autonomy and flexibility of MASAF – resulted in design of 12million US\$ emergency PWP within two months, rejuvenating a desperate Bua Dwangwa community into a Cooperative Society
- ◆ Design – amount of transfer per household should be related to objective and other initiatives- input subsidy in the case for Malawi, type / duration of intervention – labour intensive nature, sustainability, what is the cost of administration, upfront information needs / capacity building /transparency – knowledge on entitlements by communities, value addition – socio economic empowerment;
- ◆ Institutional / Operational level– stakeholder roles, human resources requirement for speedy& effective program delivery – teamwork in Local Assemblies;
- ◆ Community – definitions of poverty /targeting, behaviours related to expenditure patterns, frequency of meals, coping mechanisms



WHEAT FIELDS



CONSIDERATION FOR NEW PROGRAMS

- ◆ Concept /policy – is it a safety net or social protection program?
- ◆ Design - what would happen if the program is not implemented?
- ◆ Strategy - what are the linkages with other programs taking place at the same time? Have we made sustainability considerations? What indirect benefits are perceived with such programs?
- ◆ Institutional level – what are specific stakeholder roles? what are the human resource requirements?
- ◆ Operational -how can we ensure effective monitoring? How far can institutions go towards community level targeting? Will the program produce benefits related to community multiplier effects, health, education and other socio economic services?



END OF PRESENTATION

THANK YOU!

<http://www.masaf.org>

