



# Operational Plan 2011-2015

## DFID BURMA

Updated June 2013

### Contents:

	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
Section 1:	<b>Context</b>	<b>3</b>
Section 2:	<b>Vision</b>	<b>4</b>
Section 3:	<b>Results</b>	<b>5-6</b>
Section 4:	<b>Delivery and Resources</b>	<b>7-9</b>
Section 5:	<b>Delivering Value for Money</b>	<b>10</b>
Section 6:	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>11</b>
Section 7:	<b>Transparency</b>	<b>12</b>
Section 8:	<b>Human Rights Assessment</b>	<b>13</b>
	<b>Annexes</b>	<b>14-15</b>



# Introduction

The UK Government is determined to help end extreme poverty around the world. We believe that international development is not just the right thing to do, but the smart thing to do. Britain has never stood on the sidelines, and it is in all our interests for countries around the world to be stable and secure, to have educated and healthy populations and to have growing economies. DFID aims to end aid dependency through jobs – building the economies of developing countries so that they can stand on their own feet.

No country can develop with only half of the population involved, that is why DFID is scaling up its support for women and girls across all of our country programmes, including an increased emphasis on girls education and preventing violence against women and girls.

We are also focussing on what works, investing in research and taking advantage of new technology to ensure that UK development support has the greatest impact.

DFID is committed to being a global leader on transparency, and in 2012 was ranked the top aid organisation in the world for transparency. Transparency is fundamental to improving accountability both to UK citizens and to citizens in the countries where we work. Transparency also helps us achieve greater value for money and improves the effectiveness of aid. As part of our commitment to transparency we publish Operational Plans for each area of our work setting out what we will achieve and how we will achieve it. In June 2013 DFID launched a new online tool, Development Tracker, to provide an easy way to access information and data about DFID programmes.

With less than 1000 days to go, we will continue to focus our efforts on delivering the Millennium Development Goals, creating wealth in poor countries, strengthening their governance and security and tackling climate change. The prize, in doing so, is huge: a better life for millions of people, and a safer, more prosperous world.



# 1) Context

The context in Burma has changed dramatically since this Plan was originally published. The elections in Burma in November 2010 – though widely seen as falling significantly short of international standards - started a remarkable process of change in the country. Key points in this include: the convening of a largely civilian Parliament in April 2011, which has since enacted a series of economic and political reforms; the signing of ceasefire agreements with all but one of the ethnic armed groups in early 2012; and by-elections in April in which Aung San Suu Kyi's (ASSK) National League for Democracy won 42 out of 44 seats. ASSK herself took her seat as an MP in Parliament in May 2012.

These changes are welcome and the UK has responded in a number of ways, including by:

- A visit by the Prime Minister, culminating in the lifting of EU sanctions (except the arms embargo) in April 2013.
- Stepping up engagement with reformers in government and continued strong support for ASSK, opposition parties & ethnic groups.
- Developing a new programme and taking a lead role in using our aid & coordinating others to support reforms.

Yet fundamental challenges remain. In a region containing some of the fastest growing economies in the world, Burma remains one of the poorest countries in Asia. Data about poverty in Burma is difficult to obtain and some is unreliable, but there is evidence of widespread poverty and vulnerability. According to UNDP's 2010 household survey, a quarter of the population do not have enough money to meet their basic food and living needs. Where reliable data exists, it shows the country is off track to reach many of the Millennium Development Goals. It has some of the worst health indicators in Asia, and suffers amongst the highest rates of malaria, malnutrition (especially amongst children) and tuberculosis in the world.

In addition, underlying ethnic tensions have the potential to undermine the reform process. In Kachin, a longstanding ceasefire broke down in 2012, with the intensified fighting leading to over 80,000 people being internally displaced. And in the southwest, intercommunal violence between the Muslim Rohingya and the Buddhist Rakhine has led to segregation of many communities and a deteriorating humanitarian situation. Intercommunal violence has recently spread to other parts of the country leading to increased displacement. An estimated half a million people are also still internally displaced in eastern Burma and 140,000 people continue to live in refugee camps in Thailand.

Economic and social reforms agreed by Parliament have so far failed to release the country's huge economic potential. A particular challenge will be to broaden out the country's modest economic growth, largely as a result of the discovery and exploitation of natural gas, to bring benefits for the large number of poor people. The agricultural sector, once the rice basket of the region, and still the main source of income for 70% of the population, remains unproductive, uncompetitive and low-value and there is a growing number of landless people (15 million) dependent on seasonal, non-farm work which is inadequate across the year. The benefits from natural resources such as oil, gas, mining and timber are controlled by a small elite. The banking sector is weak and over regulated, the country's majority rural population cannot access the credit they need and the small private sector is starved of finance and hamstrung by unreliable infrastructure and red-tape.

Whilst there have been welcome increases in social spending (a doubling in health and a quadrupling in education from 11/12 to 12/13), investment in basic services for the people remains extremely low by international standards (and still lags far behind spending on the military). Skills in public administration at all levels have been in decline for 20-30 years. A key question now is whether the state machinery can deliver its leaders' reform priorities, or if years of military-style command and control decision making will make systemic change impossible.

Aid from the international community is also increasing. Following the cancellation of Burma's outstanding debt payments to the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank both are now starting to design major programmes of support. As one of the few donors with an established presence in Burma, our expert staff play a critical role in ensuring what aid is given is used effectively.



## 2) Vision

### Overview

A resource rich Burma that is accountable to its people and open to responsible foreign investment has great potential to reverse years of decline. Our aim will be to harness this potential - to help create a better governed, more peaceful & prosperous Burma that uses its increased wealth to reduce poverty.

To support this transformation we have started to design support around five key pillars:

- Good governance and public financial management.
- Promoting responsible investment.
- Improving transparency and the rule of law.
- Strengthening the work of parliament.
- Helping the process of ethnic reconciliation.

In addition to consolidating our new programmes covering these areas, our ongoing investments – which are on track to deliver the significant results set out at the start of the plan – will also have a greater focus on these five pillars.

The lifting in April 2013 of EU sanctions (excluding the arms embargo) has allowed us to start a new partnership and dialogue with the government. Yet none of our bilateral aid will be provided through central government systems, only through United Nations organisations, trusted international & local NGOs and, where circumstances allow, to authorities at the township level. We will continue to support efforts to develop national and local strategies that meet people's development needs, and that people have had a say in designing. Where those strategies exist, we will align our support with them.

### Alignment to DFID and wider UK Government priorities

Development is a key part of UK government policy towards Burma. This plan has been developed in close coordination with the Foreign Office.

- Our plan targets key new areas of democratic governance, transparency/ accountability, prosperity and security .
- Our programmes will be designed not only to meet basic needs, but to maximise their contribution to longer-term changes that address the root causes of conflict and fragility in Burma.
- Our plan has a strong focus on girls and women, with targeted interventions to reduce maternal mortality and increase women's access to credit.
- As part of the 2010 Bilateral Aid Review we decided not to take forward new work on climate change in the immediate future, in light of other priorities and the limited scope to achieve tangible results. Several of our programmes contribute to climate change mitigation or adaptation, and some do both.

### What we will stop doing

- We have stopped our post-Cyclone Nargis relief programmes (£5m in 09/10 – 10/11) and have focused on longer-term recovery programmes in the Cyclone-affected areas.
- Two of the multi-donor funds we supported in 09/10 (Three Diseases Fund; UNICEF Education Fund) were redesigned and strengthened to achieve greater results.



### 3) Results

#### Headline results

Pillar / Strategic Priority	Indicator	Baseline (including year)	Expected Results (including year)
MDGs – Health	Number of women and men who receive appropriate treatment to contain the spread of drug-resistant malaria, through DFID funding.	Nil at 2010 (Output indicator)	500,000 (Cumulative to end of 2014). 250,000 women, 250,000 men.
MDGs – Health	Number of unintended pregnancies averted, through DFID funding.	Nil at 2010 (Output indicator)	153,000 unintended pregnancies averted, by the end of 2014.
Wealth Creation	Number of development finance organisations that commit capital or attract private investment into Burma.	Nil at 2012 (Output indicator)	2 by 2015
Wealth Creation/ Poverty, Hunger & Vulnerability	Number of women reached with access to financial services as a result of DFID support.	Nil at 2010 (Output indicator)	110,000 women by 2015
MDGs – Education	Number of girls and boys assisted to overcome barriers to accessing and completing primary school, through DFID support.	Nil at 2010 (Output indicator)	227,000 children by 2015 (113,500 girls and 113,500 boys)
MDGs - Humanitarian	Number of people in conflict-affected communities supported with humanitarian aid, through DFID support.	52,000 people by 2010 (27,000 women & girls, 25,000 men & boys)	155,000 people by 2014 (80,000 women & girls, 75,000 men & boys)
Governance & Security	Improvement in political rights and civil liberties, as measured by Freedom House.	“Not Free” in 2012	“Partially Free” in 2015
Governance & Security	Number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development, through DFID support.	Nil at 2010 (Output indicator)	94,000 people by 2015 (inc. 76,000 women).



## 3) Results (continued)

### Evidence supporting results

The availability of good quality evidence in Burma is generally low. Our ability to engage in large scale, systematic data collection and impact assessment is limited due to capacity constraints and access restrictions. Because data is difficult to obtain and some national data is unreliable, our headline results refer to the direct results of UK-funded programmes, measured through programmes' own monitoring & evaluation (M&E) systems, rather than national data on impact. Our plan is based on the experience of several years of expansion of our aid, which has shown that it is possible to deliver aid, to achieve results and meet needs despite the difficult context. Based on this experience, the results presented in this framework are realistic and achievable, based on partner estimates of what their programmes can deliver, as long as there is no major deterioration in the humanitarian situation, and subject to the detailed design of new programmes.

In health, the emergence of artemisinin-resistant malaria is a threat to global malaria control. The country has developed a strategy in response to the threat called the Myanmar Artemisinin Resistance Containment Framework (MARC) which includes a common M&E framework.

Systems for independently monitoring the impact of our work on education are well established and provide reliable data.

The evidence supporting our investment indicator is straightforward. None of the major finance organisations (CDC, Private Infrastructure Development Group, the Asian Development Bank, International Finance Corporation and the World Bank) had capital resources invested in Burma in July 2012. The changing of their mandate (at the appropriate political moment) and the presence of operations in Burma are both observable. We are supporting analytical work by the World Bank on public financial management and the investment climate to generate baseline evidence for the economy.

Our main investment to reduce poverty, hunger & vulnerability (a multi-donor livelihoods fund) has generated good results to date and been designed with robust M&E systems built in to measure the impact of more innovative work.

The quality of evidence supporting our proposed humanitarian aid is mixed. The impact of aid to refugees in Thailand is relatively easy to measure by NGOs working in the camps. Aid to communities inside Burma affected by conflict is less easy to measure, as access to these areas is more restricted.

The Freedom House indicator is a reasonable overall indicator of progress on democratic governance, political rights, and accountability. There is evidence of impact on communities from long-standing governance and security programmes by UNDP and NGOs. This shows the benefits that self-reliance group membership has had on women's economic opportunities and on their ability to influence community decision making. Support for larger voluntary organisations or networks and coalitions has started more recently, but has shown that it is possible to strengthen the effectiveness of such groups and in some cases to influence policy.

### Value for Money (VFM) rationale

Given the uncertain political situation and levels of fragility, investment in Burma carries a significant level of risk. But the potential rewards of successful investments are also significant, given the high levels of need and the relatively low levels of aid per capita. Our aid has also 'leveraged' in more significant funding and so increased impact (for example our investments in the Three Diseases Fund helped secure the return of the Global Fund for HIV, TB & Malaria, which will significantly improve results in tackling these diseases). Results identified in this plan have been prioritised on the basis of:

- The significant levels of need, and the benefits that can be delivered to Burma's people, which outweigh the costs.
- The potential global impact of aid to Burma – particularly the containment of the emergence of drug-resistant malaria.
- The potential to leverage other resources by working together with other government and private donors to develop programmes that they can fund.
- The potential for different activities to contribute to longer-term processes of peace-building, democracy & accountability and to giving people a greater say in their own development.
- Attention to a balanced portfolio of large, multi-donor funds and smaller, more flexible aid delivery methods..



## 4) Delivery and Resources

The DFID Burma team comprises a decentralised office with UK and local staff in the British Embassy in Rangoon and support staff in Bangkok and Hanoi. Officials in Rangoon work closely with Foreign Office, UKTI, MoD & British Council colleagues. The team in Rangoon is further supported by staff in London to respond to the considerable public and political interest which Burma attracts. London staff also provide technical advice on social development, statistics and results. To deliver the Operational Plan we have already brought in new staff with a range of technical expertise and will continue to strengthen the team over the coming years.

Partnerships are key to DFID's effectiveness in Burma. They enable DFID to enhance its impact and extend its influence. At the moment all DFID resources are channelled through third parties, primarily the UN, the British Council and NGOs; none goes through central Government systems. DFID has been successful in leveraging donor resources for key development priorities. We have provided the leadership to construct multi-donor funding mechanisms into which others have contributed. Examples include the Three MDG Fund in health and our work in the Irrawaddy Delta following Cyclone Nargis. Our share of overall development assistance to Burma is high in terms of aid volumes (in 2011 the UK was the largest provider of ODA) and higher still in terms of policy and programme leadership. The recent political changes have resulted in many new bilateral and multilateral donors, including the World Bank, wanting to work in Burma. We are playing a key role in coordinating this influx, avoiding duplication of effort, ensuring the government is not inundated with offers of assistance that it cannot manage and, above all, using the expertise we have built up in Burma to ensure aid reaches the poorest and achieves maximum impact. Despite these new actors we are still likely to remain significant funders in the medium term, alongside the EC, Australia, Japan and the US.

Our UN delivery partners include the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In both cases, our assessments locally match those of the 2010 Multilateral Aid Review (MAR). UNICEF demonstrates strong delivery in this fragile environment. UNDP plays an important governance and gender role within its restricted mandate. Both of these organisations could work more effectively with other each other and parts of the UN and we will press them to improve this. A significant proportion of our scaling up will potentially be channelled through the UN Office for Project Services (UNOPS) which was not assessed as part of the MAR. Maintaining its effectiveness will be a priority for us.

Our number of staff (we have the largest donor mission in-country) means that we have the capacity and some responsibility to provide technical and policy leadership. Support on maternal & child health and to strengthened civil society are good examples. UK leadership is appreciated by others and helps to extend wider UK influence. However, it also imposes greater demands on DFID programme staff and these are reflected in our proposals for organisational design.

The lifting of EU sanctions (except the arms embargo) in April 2013, including those on aid delivery, has opened up to us a wider choice of aid instruments and we have the chance now to develop additional options. For example, we have conducted a World Bank assessment of the Government's financial management as a first step in considering how we might strengthen government resource allocation & delivery systems.



## 4) Delivery and Resources (cont)

### Programme Spend

Pillar/Strategic priority	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15		TOTAL	
	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000	Resource £'000,000	Capital £'000
Wealth Creation	4	0	13	0	4	0	11	0	4	0	33	0
Governance and Security	2	0	3	0	2	0	6	0	8	0	19	0
Education	3	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	10	0
Reproductive, Maternal and Newborn Health	1	0	3	0	9	0	14	0	17	0	43	0
Malaria	3	0	2	0	3	0	8	0	14	0	28	0
HIV/Aids	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	6	0
Other Health	3	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	4	0	12	0
Poverty, Hunger and Vulnerability	2	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	11	0
Humanitarian	6	0	4	0	6	0	5	0	5	0	19	0
Water and Sanitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Global Partnerships	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>0</b>





## 4) Delivery and Resources (cont)

### Efficiency savings

Delivering Programme Efficiencies		
Category	Details	Residual cost in the SR period £'000
Strategic Reprioritisation	The Delta regiona will remain a geographical focus for DFID Burma. However, support to communities affected by Cyclone Nargis in 2008 will be mainstreamed within larger programmes over the Plan period.	5793

### Administrative cost savings

Over the course of this Operational Planning period our programme will almost double. To support delivery of this increase the number of full-time equivalent Frontline staff will also double . Frontline costs will therefore increase over the Plan period from £767,000 in 2010/11 to £2.383m in 2014/15. This reflects a higher proportion of UK based staff in-country and the increasing costs of staff being based in Rangoon. DFID Burma's administration budget will increase from £61,000 in 2010/11 to £281,000 in 2014/15. Following steps will be taken to further bring down administrative costs.

- Improving the value for money of our procurement (in both programme and admin spending). Staff received professional training from Crown Agents and we are considering a Commercial Capability Review to asses our systems and those of our partners.
- Achieving savings by working with other government departments and exploring further opportunities to share services with the FCO to reduce administrative cost and increase efficiency. Establishing a Joint Housing Committee and a Joint Management Board will help identify areas for further savings.
- Establishing baseline indicators in key areas such as energy consumption, travel, water consumption and stationery use to reduce staff-associated costs.
- Conducting annual 'mini market surveys' to drive greater competitiveness among currently used travel suppliers.
- Identifying and developing locally employed staff to strengthen local knowledge and gradually to bring down staff costs as these staff take over more advisory work from more expensive international staff.



## 5) Delivering Value for Money

DFID Burma works in a challenging, unpredictable environment, and its programmes are subject to high levels of scrutiny. So delivery of value for money is already a high priority. By balancing risk and diversifying our portfolio; working through a mixture of large-scale multi donor trust funds, UN agencies, international NGOs and local NGOs and community-based organisations, we have demonstrated that aid can deliver results in Burma for the poor people who most need it. Within the donor community DFID Burma leads the way in demanding greater clarity of measurement of results, and improving value for money.

There are **challenges** to delivering this agenda over the operational plan period:

- Burma is a quasi fragile state with a young reform process where the costs of delivering aid can be relatively high.
- Significant influx of new donors and potential for uncoordinated aid.
- Limited access to areas affected by conflict makes measurement of impact challenging. But these are the areas with some of the greatest humanitarian need.
- Although there have been improvements in data transparency and a census is planned for 2014, national data remains incomplete and of variable quality.
- In spite of an increasing focus on economics and measuring economic impact, there remains limited economic capacity to do this in-country.
- Measurement of the value of our work is difficult where the impact and outcomes do not lend themselves to quantification of benefits – for example development of more democratic and accountable institutions.
- We are expanding into new areas and so there will be a lead time as we build up our skills and knowledge and develop partnerships with organisations that have complementary skills or are only just entering the country.

### Actions

- To add to the full-time economist and Evaluation Advisor recruited in 2011/12, in 2012/13 we recruited a another full-time economist in-country. This has further increased our capacity on economic appraisal and evaluation.
- Elsewhere in our workforce we have recruited new advisory and programme staff to strengthen the delivery of value for money across the portfolio, and we anticipate further recruitment in 2013/14. Please refer to Section 5.

With these new resources and the existing resources in the team, we will:

- Build on our strong value for money analysis and take additional steps to integrate this into all stages of programme management.
- Implement our value for money framework to improve our ability to assess the impact of the programme and identify ways of further improving value for money.
- Continue to identify areas – subject to strict criteria on accountability, governance and transparency – where by working closely with Government or working through national systems we can deliver real improvements for poor people, economies of scale and greater value for money.
- Continue to design monitoring and evaluation frameworks that include targets and indicators for driving down implementing partners' unit costs.
- Enhance, as planned, our use of local knowledge and experience in our programmes, to drive down the unit costs of that expertise.

DFID Burma will continue to seek opportunities to strengthen value for money in its own **operations**. We will:

- Assess options for sharing more services with the FCO in ways that deliver real cost savings and efficiencies.
- Negotiate annually with the FCO locally to ensure a good deal for DFID for services provided under our local service agreement. (Dom to consider rewording).
- Continue to conduct competitive tendering for contracts for goods and services procured locally and identify ways of bringing in further expertise on procurement from within DFID and externally.
- Continue to proactively manage and monitor delivery of our learning and develop plan objectives to ensure spend to budget.
- Continue rigorously monitoring staff travel to ensure opportunities to conduct meetings via telephone or video conference are maximised.



## 6) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

### Monitoring

**How.** Each of our programmes will have an appropriate monitoring framework. Selected programmes have a separate output on M&E to ensure sufficient funding and arrangements for effective M&E. In the large multi-donor funds we will build on the progress we've made in ensuring DFID's standards, and particularly key indicators in our 'logical frameworks', are adopted by all partners. Implementing agencies will be responsible for continuous day-to-day monitoring of progress. We will involve independent external reviewers at appropriate intervals through the life of the programme. Regular field visits are undertaken by DFID Burma staff, in particular utilising the experience and insights of our local staff, will allow us to report on the impact on the ground.

**Who.** Overall responsibility for monitoring will sit with the respective programme managers and advisors within DFID Burma. These resources will be augmented by external expertise when necessary. The Team will liaise closely with partners on their monitoring activities, ensuring that good quality reporting is provided to agreed timetables.

**When.** Monitoring is a continuous process. We will continue to rigorously track reporting timetables and proactively engage with partners to ensure that good quality information is provided to DFID Burma.

**What.** We will monitor programme progress against key targets, and develop a framework to assess their impact against longer term, transformational criteria.

### Evaluation

DFID Burma's capacity in evaluation was strengthened significantly in 2011/12 with the recruitment of 50% of an Evaluation Adviser based in Hanoi, Vietnam. An Evaluation Plan has been developed and agreed with the following priorities:

- To ensure DFID Burma designs better, more cost effective interventions based on high quality and timely evaluations of our programmes and learn lessons.
- To ensure that 1-5% of new programme expenditure will be allocated to evaluation and to wider investment in monitoring and assessment of results. All DFID's major programmes including the 3 MDG Fund, the LIFT and the new Refugee/ IDP Programme will be independently evaluated.
- To ensure all of our partners plan and budget for appropriate evaluations when designing programmes, that these are independent wherever possible; and actions are taken to address recommendations.
- To peer review and quality assure all major evaluations, including using DFID Evaluation Department's Support Services and Agreement Framework;
- To develop an approach to process evaluation that can measure the contribution our programmes make to the changes that are important for the longer-term development of Burma.
- To share the lessons learnt from these evaluations across the DFID network, government & civil society counterparts and donors.

### Building capacity of partners

The variable quality of national statistics means we do not generally rely on them for monitoring purposes. We will continue to support opportunities to collect better survey data where they arise, and draw on the services of a Results Adviser to assess the quality of data from surveys that are planned and carried out. Where national data are not reliable, we will ensure our partners gather sufficient programme-level data to show the impact of the programme activities.

We will continue to support implementing partners in their efforts to secure access for monitoring, data collection and independent analysis, and to analyse this data. The Education, Health and Livelihoods/ economic sectors will be priorities for this work, but we will also develop more innovative M&E tools to measure the impact of our support for civil society.



## 7) Transparency

Transparency is one of the top priorities for the UK Government. We will ensure that we continue to meet our commitments under the UK Aid Transparency Guarantee including publishing detailed information about DFID projects, including programme documents, and we will provide opportunities for those directly affected by our projects to provide feedback. DFID Burma will take the following actions to ensure DFID meets its commitments in the UK Aid Transparency Guarantee:

We will publish detailed information of all new programmes on the DFID website where this does not put local partners at risk (see below). Annual project performance reporting and end of project evaluation have been published for programmes approved from 2011 onwards. Annual project performance reporting and end of project evaluation from April 2011 has been published. We will ensure that wherever possible all information in the public domain is comprehensive, accessible, comparable, accurate and timely.

As well as publishing this Operational Plan in English, the revised Sections 1-4 will be translated into Burmese. This is the first language of around two thirds of the people of Burma, is understood by most of the remainder, and is taught in local schools from an early age. We will consider the need for translation of specific project information into other languages, where there is a particular need to do so – for example for a public education project to reach a particular target group. In these cases our implementing partners would make arrangements for translation to local languages.

DFID Burma will promote access to information in Burma in other ways too, for example in partnership with the BBC Media Access Trust. A long-standing priority is to make our aid accessible to local civil society organisations. We will also continue to input into the Embassy's communication materials such as the *UK in Burma* website.

We will meet the standards set out in the International Aid Transparency Initiative, and encourage our partners in civil society, multilateral organisations and other donors to do the same. We will ensure that large multi-donor funds to which we contribute make relevant information available on their website: the two largest funds that we currently support already do so. We will continue to maximise opportunities to support greater government transparency. We, along with the World Bank and the Government Budget Department, have conducted an assessment of the Government's public financial management systems which will be publicly available in May 2013. We are also participating in a similar review of public expenditure and are leading donor engagement (along with the World Bank, AusAID and the EU) to support the Government's commitment to join the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.

We will not insist on transparency where it could endanger the safety and security of our implementing agencies or their beneficiaries. In all cases we will seek and be guided by implementing partners' and communities' view on what sorts of transparency would not compromise their security. We will also insist that international organisations funded by DFID follow the same principles in their dealings with local partners and communities.

We will increase opportunities for feedback by those benefiting from DFID programmes. The major Trust Funds we support (3 MDG Fund, LIFT, MDEF) have established processes for feedback from Implementing Partners – and we will make sure these are maintained in the successor to the 3DF. Internet access and mobile phone coverage in Burma are very limited, but if they improve in future DFID will investigate options for building feedback from beneficiaries by internet or SMS into our programme monitoring.

DFID does not have a dedicated communications officer in Rangoon. However we will allocate dedicated staff to ensure accurate and timely input of all relevant documentation and data. The requirement to meet our transparency obligations will be included in individual Job Objectives and individual performance will be assessed annually. Further support will be provided the team in London. We will continue to work closely with FCO, with whom we share an objective on stepping up public diplomacy around UK Government's work in Burma.



## 8) UK Human Rights Assessment - Burma

The UK recognises that the realisation of all human rights underpins sustainable development. Through its development programmes, the UK aims to support civil society and governments to build open economies and open societies in which citizens have freedom, dignity, choice and control over their lives, and institutions are accountable, inclusive and responsive.

### **Human Rights Context:**

- **Economic and social rights:** Burma is ranked 149th out of 187 countries in the Human Development Index (2012), Burma is the poorest country in the region with GDP per capita at US\$742 according to latest IMF estimates. Burma is off track to meet many of the Millennium Development Goals. It has some of the worst health indicators in Asia, with child mortality at 57 deaths per 1000 live births.
- **Non-discrimination:** Burma is ranked 96 out of 144 countries on the Gender Equality Index. Only 18% of women have at least secondary education. Maternal mortality estimate is high for the region at 200 per 100,000 live births. Legacy colonial era laws criminalising same sex acts remain but are not enforced. Regional inequality remains high with ethnic states and regions tending to be significantly poorer. There is religious inequality with minority groups particularly Muslims under represented in senior government and military positions.
- **Civil and political rights:** Freedom House rates Burma as “Not Free” in its 2012 report, whilst noting a significant improvement in civil liberties recently. The **legal and institutional** framework is weak, law enforcement is arbitrary and subject to influence by the executive.
- **Conflict:** A number of conflicts in ethnic areas have been on-going for the last six decades, leading to an estimated half a million people internally displaced in eastern Burma alone, and 140,000 live in refugee camps in Thailand. The conflicts led to significant human rights abuses of the civilian population. Recent ethnic and inter-communal violence is also a threat to the reform process.
- The **Universal Periodic Review** reported in January 2011 and the Government accepted 77 of the 197 recommendations put forward but declined 95. Implementation of recommendations will be reviewed at the next UPR process in 2015.

### **Direction of Travel**

- **Economic and social rights** - improving The opening up of Burma’s economy could stimulate strong economic growth. According to the Asian Development Bank Burma could grow by 7-8% per year for a decade or more, raising per capita income to \$2-3,000 by 2030.
- **Civil and Political rights**- improving. Recent reforms included the **release of many hundreds of political prisoners** and the loosening of political and media restrictions. In by elections in April 2012 with Aung San Suu Kyi’s opposition National League for Democracy won 43 out of 45 seats up for election. However the military still nominate 25% of MP’s giving them a veto over constitutional change.
- **Non discrimination:** Inter-communal violence in Rakhine State led to displacement of tens of thousands of people, particularly Rohingya Muslims. Recent violence targeted against the Muslim community in central Burma, and the authorities failed to intervene effectively
- **Conflict:** the Government has agreed significant ceasefires to some long running conflicts in ethnic areas in Burma. This is a significant positive development, although the most important stage of political dialogue lies ahead. Fighting does however continue in Kachin.

### **DFID approach**

- DFID will help **improve economic freedoms** through increased support for **private sector development, economic reform and responsible investment that respects human rights.**
- DFID is **supporting improved transparency, accountability, and empowerment** including through existing support for civil society, and scoping new support for parliament, media and the judiciary to build opportunities for Burmese people to exercise their political rights.
- DFID will support immediate peace-building work; and invest in improved economic opportunities and service delivery in the ceasefire areas. DFID programmes provide humanitarian support to internally displaced people and refugees.



## Annex A: Revisions to Operational Plan 2011/12

Brief summary of key revisions to Operational Plan (OP):

- The context for the OP has been updated to reflect continued broad progress on change in Burma but also concerns about the situations in Kachin State and Rakhine State.
- The variation in the overall country allocation is a consequence of a recalculated GNI lowering the spend required to achieve the 0.7% GNI target. Country programme allocations are reviewed on a regular basis and we expect there may be scope to revise upwards as resources become available.
- A new Human Rights annex has been added.
- The refreshed OP also highlights progress on results, transparency, value for money and evaluation since the plan was first published.



# Annex B: Results Progress

## Progress towards headline results\*

Pillar/ Strategic Priority	Indicator	Baseline (include year)	Progress towards results (include year)	Expected Results (include year)
<b>Wealth Creation</b>	<i>Number of development finance organisations that commit capital or attract private investment to Burma</i>	0 (2012)	1 as of March 2013 (we assess that 1 of the targeted 2 IFIs is committing capital. This is the IFC investment in ACLEDA the microfinance organisation)	2 (2015)
<b>Wealth Creation</b>	<i>Number of women reached with access to financial services as a result of DFID support</i>	0 (2010)	27,000 as of Dec 2012.	110,000 (2015)
<b>Governance</b>	<i>Improvements in political rights and civil liberties as measured by Freedom House</i>	Not free (2012)	Not free as of end 2012. With positive developments and trend.	Partially free (2015)
<b>Governance</b>	<i>Number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development through DFID support</i>	0 (2010)	120,000 as of Sept 2012. Exceeded.	94,000 (2015)
<b>MDGs Health</b>	<i>Number of unintended pregnancies averted through DFID funding</i>	0 (2010)	80,000 as of March 2013. On track.	153,000 (2014)
<b>MDGs Health</b>	<i>Number of women and men who receive appropriate treatment to contain the spread of drug resistant malaria through DFID funding</i>	0 (2010)	200,000 as of March 2013. On track.	500,000 (2014)
<b>MDGs Education</b>	<i>Number of girls and boys assisted to overcome barriers to accessing and completing primary school through DFID support</i>	0 (2010)	150,000.	227,000 (2015)
<b>Humanitarian support</b>	<i>Number of people in conflict affected communities supported with DFID humanitarian aid.</i>	52,000 (2010)	210,000.	155,000 (2014)

\* These results may not directly aggregate with other country results due to different measurement methodologies