KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
With regard to staff knowledge, the following four points should be emphasised through ongoing and regular training and awareness-raising with colleagues:

1. The minimum age for any sexual relations for aid workers, both development and humanitarian, is 18. This is non-negotiable.
2. There are never circumstances where an aid worker can engage a sex worker. This is also non-negotiable.
3. All suspicions of SEA, even if the type of misconduct is unclear, must be reported immediately. Individual staff should not conduct their own investigations, as doing so could pose risks to the survivor as well as the complainant.
4. More time should be spent unpacking reasons why aid workers should not commit SEA, and the consequences if an allegation is found to be true.

Secondly, with regard to engaging with communities on PSEA, organizations need to conduct more awareness-raising activities with beneficiaries on staff standards of conduct so that they are aware of their rights, and know how to report an allegation.

Introduction
A staff Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (‘KAP’) survey on protection against sexual exploitation and abuse (‘PSEA’) was conducted online from 30 July until 31 August 2020, hosted by the Myanmar Information Management Unit (‘MIMU’) and utilising a KoBo tool. The survey was available in Myanmar and English languages. In total, 535 responses were collected, including 280 in English and 255 in Myanmar. The purpose of the survey was not only to have a sense of what colleagues knew about PSEA, but also to gauge if recent training efforts had been effective. In addition, the nature of some of the questions were intended to increase awareness of all respondents in terms of PSEA knowledge and resources; a pop up link to the PSEA MIMU website was provided at the end of the survey to guide those respondents who may not be familiar with this resource.

Questionnaire
The questionnaire commenced with five introductory questions which gathered the respondent’s general background data. These questions and response fields were adapted from MIMU’s client user survey as they had been field tested previously. Following this, the questionnaire contained 17 questions on PSEA, which were intended to test the respondent’s knowledge on basic PSEA principles. This section of the questionnaire was largely based on a KAP survey that had been conducted in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh, in 2019, but was adapted following feedback from PSEA Technical Working Group members as well as PSEA Network members. Colleagues from World Vision International helped to translate

1 While the KAP survey was ready to be launched in May 2020, given the COVID-19 situation in Myanmar, the feedback from a number of PSEA Network members was that agencies were pre-occupied with COVID-19 response and programming. Therefore, the PSEA Technical Working Group decided to postpone the KAP survey until July/August 2020.
the questionnaire into Myanmar language, with inputs from the national PSEA Coordinator. After three days of testing by Myanmar-speaking PSEA Technical Working Group members, the KAP survey was open to any respondent who had received the link.

**Dissemination**
The survey link was disseminated to the PSEA Network members (some 200 individuals on the mailing list from 90 different organisations including UN, INGOs and CSOs) on 30 July 2020 via email. Colleagues were encouraged to share the link with all staff and partners. The link was shared by the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group, the Maungdaw Inter-Agency Group, the INGO Forum, the Protection Sector, as well as other networks. The link was also advertised on the MIMU website, via the job advertisement page.

**Data cleaning and processing**
Once the survey was ‘closed’, colleagues from MIMU analysed the raw data, and commenced data cleaning, in collaboration with the national and inter-agency PSEA Coordinators; for example, some answers of ‘other’ by correspondents regarding their position type could in fact fit under the existing categories. The national PSEA Coordinator provided suggestions to the data cleaning to MIMU colleagues. Headings, questions and responses were shortened/summarised in order to be able to fit into the Power BI dashboard. The Power BI dashboard allows all users with the link to filter various fields to analyse the data further (for example, more specific state/region analysis, humanitarian/development analysis, etc).

**Analysis**
The below analysis is based on: 1) General findings of the survey, where results are not broken down or filtered; and 2) Analysis of those who had undergone PSEA training. Main recommendations are highlighted in the boxed text.

**Respondent profiles**
Below is a summary of the main points of respondents:

- 496 respondents were from Myanmar, while 39 were from other countries.
- 295 respondents stated the focus of their work was in development activities, while 263 stated the focus was in humanitarian activities; 51 stated ‘other’, 38 stated peace-building, with a further 31 stating academic/research.
- 256 respondents stated their position as being in programme, while 123 were involved in administration, 78 in management, 41 in monitoring and evaluation, 14 in information management and 14 in ‘other’.
- Most respondents stated that their duty station was Yangon (288), followed by Rakhine (50), Kachin (40), Kayin (33), Mandalay (23), Shan (21), Tanintharyi and Ayerwaddy (18 each), Magwe (14), Chin and Mon (13 each).
- Most respondents worked with international NGOs (302), while 131 worked with the UN, and 69 worked with national NGOs.
- The survey was available in Myanmar and English languages, and 280 responses were in English and 255 in Myanmar.
GENERAL FINDINGS

Signing of code of conduct and training participation
The first two questions in the survey asked if the respondents had signed a code of conduct in their organisation, and whether they had undergone PSEA/safeguarding training. For the first question on code of conduct, 435 answered they had, while 51 said they did not know, and 49 stated they had not. Out of the 535 respondents who answered the survey, 368 (or 67%) answered they had undergone PSEA training, while 167 (or 31%) had not. Of the 368 who had undergone training, the majority (250) answered they had participated in face-to-face training, and 148 answered the training had been online (respondents could choose both options if they wished).
The results are positive in the sense that most of the respondents were aware of signing a code of conduct and had undergone some form of training. Therefore, it seems that most organisations operating in Myanmar, across humanitarian, development and peace-building fields, have a policy on PSEA in addition to capacity to conduct staff training. This reflects findings from the 2018 PSEA organisational mapping survey, which found that most agencies that responded to the survey (total 91) had systems in place to channel complaints and that almost all agencies were aware of their appointed PSEA focal point.

**Overall knowledge of main principles**

As noted above, the purpose of the survey was not only to have a sense of what colleagues in Myanmar know about PSEA, but also to increase knowledge of those taking the survey. Therefore, it is not surprising that, even if a respondent had not undergone training, they may have answered the questions correctly. Overall, there was a general awareness of the main principles of PSEA. A deeper analysis of the answers provided by those who had undergone training will be provided later in this report.

As seen above, the number of correct responses was higher than the number of respondents who had undergone some form of PSEA training: 368 had undergone training, whereas 388 answered correctly regarding the minimum age for aid workers’ sexual relations, and 447 answered correctly as to whether or not there were any circumstances where aid workers could engage sex workers. A high number (378) of
respondents were also aware of where to report SEA allegations, which again is higher than the number of those trained.

10) Who is responsible for preventing SEA?

As above, despite only 368 of respondents having undergone PSEA training, the vast majority of respondents (502 out of 535 or 94%) answered the above question correctly – that all aid workers had responsibility for preventing SEA. Similar results are displayed below.

12) SEA can occur between

National staff and beneficiary 509
International staff and beneficiary 497
Community worker and beneficiary 487
For the above three questions, the correct answers were all options (except for ‘Nothing’ in question 4 and ‘I don’t know’ in question 7). These three questions were intended more to raise awareness around reasons not to have sexual relations with beneficiaries, as well as highlighting that there are a number of possible consequences to sexual misconduct. Question 12 was intended to draw awareness to the fact that SEA may be perpetrated by any aid worker, regardless of nationality and/or position. Nevertheless, it is positive that most respondents answered correctly, even if they may not have undergone PSEA training.

One recommendation could be that in future PSEA training, more time could be spent unpacking reasons why aid workers should not commit SEA, and the consequences if an allegation is found to be true.

Question 11 was specifically formulated to test the knowledge between GBV and SEA. Again, it is encouraging that most respondents answered correctly (the first 2 options were SEA, whereas the others were GBV).

Questions 8 and 9 were intended to test respondents’ knowledge regarding mandatory reporting obligations – and that even suspicions of SEA must be reported. Quite a large number of respondents thought that one should make own investigations before reporting, which is quite concerning.

Immediate reporting should be emphasised in future training, as conducting investigations by those not trained could pose risks to the survivor as well as the complainant.
Questions 13, 14 and 15 centred around organisational implementation of PSEA obligations, rather than test an individual’s knowledge. For question 13, just over one half of respondents (310 or 58%) stated that their organisation had conducted awareness-raising with communities on staff standards of conduct, with some stating they were unsure (134 or 25%). This is a reasonable percentage given COVID-19 exigencies, however more emphasis on this aspect needs to be made in order to ensure that communities are aware of acceptable standards of conduct.

More awareness-raising with communities on staff standards of conduct, including PSEA, is needed in the future. This will be a challenge in the COVID-19 context; however, it is essential for beneficiaries to fully understand their rights and to build trust to enable them to report concerns.

13) Has your organisation informed communities about staff conduct?

Despite the somewhat low percentage of affirmative answers for question 13 on community engagement, the answers to question 14 seem to indicate that beneficiaries are aware of how to report and can access SEA reporting safely (468 or 87% answered yes to this question). The reasons for this higher number may be a reflection of general awareness work done on accountability to affected populations and/or complaints and feedback mechanisms.
Lastly, question 15 asked respondents whether their organisation’s leadership created an environment that encouraged SEA reporting; 472 or 88% of respondents answered yes to this question.
ANALYSIS: THOSE WHO HAD/HAD NOT UNDERGONE PSEA TRAINING

Using the Power BI tool, it is possible to filter out responses for those answers where respondents had indicated they had undergone PSEA training. As noted above, 368 out of 535 respondents stated that they had some PSEA training (either in-person or online), while 167 stated they had not undergone any PSEA training.

Respondent profiles
Of the 368 responses, there was almost an even split between humanitarian (199) and development (183) focus of work, with 40 responding ‘other’ and 20 involved in peace-building. This is extremely positive as it reflects that all organisations in Myanmar, irrespective of focus, are committed to PSEA and have ensured that staff are trained.

Of the 167 respondents who had not undergone training, the majority were from the development sector: 112 out of 167 or 67%, whereas those engaged in humanitarian activities who had not been trained was 64 out of 167 or 38%.

Overall knowledge of main principles
Unfortunately, the overall knowledge of main principles was not 100% among those respondents who had been trained. For example, when only 268 out of 368 answered that the minimum age of sexual consent for aid workers is 18 years. This represents only 73% of those trained. Similarly, on the question of engaging sex workers, 24 were unsure and 11 answered ‘yes’.

Future training content and ongoing awareness sessions for staff need to highlight these two non-negotiables: that the minimum age for aid workers to engage in sexual relations as being strictly 18 and the fact that it is never permissible for an aid worker to engage a sex worker.

For questions 10 and 12, the number of correct answers were slightly higher amongst those who had undergone training, compared to the overall figure, but the increase was not
significant; for question 10, responsibility for SEA, 353 respondents (96%) answered that all aid workers were responsible for preventing SEA, whereas the percentage amongst all respondents irrespective of having undergone training was 502 out of 535 or 94%. For question 12, a similar increase was noted amongst the percentage of correct answers – all three options should have been selected, and the rate of correct answers was only about 2% higher amongst those who had undergone training compared with the total cohort of respondents.

The results for questions 7 and 11 (on why aid workers could not have sexual relations with beneficiaries, and which situations were SEA compared with GBV) were similar as with the overall cohort, with a slight increase noticeable amongst those who had undergone training. The results for questions 8 and 9, however, clearly indicate a higher proportion of correct answers amongst those who had undergone training compared with those who had not. These are discussed below.

For question 8, on reporting even rumours of SEA, 261 out of 368 or 71% of those who had been trained answered correctly. 102 or 28% answered that they would conduct their own investigation, while 5 stated that they would do nothing as it was considered a private issue. For those who had not undergone training, however, only 83 out of 167 respondents or 50% answered that they would report to their organisation, while the other 50% answered that they would make their own investigation or do nothing.

For those who had undergone training:

For those who had no training:

For question 9, on reporting on sexual harassment or SEA, again there were more correct responses among those who had undergone training; 271 out of 368 or 74% answered that they would report to their organisation, while 94 out of 368 or 25% answered they would
make their own investigation, and 3 responded they would do nothing. For those who had not undergone training, however, 90 out of 167 respondents or 54% answered correctly, while 71 out of 167 or 42% said they would conduct their own investigation and 6 stated it was a private issue.

For those who had undergone training:
9) Unsure if SEA or sexual harassment – what action to take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to organisation</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make own investigation</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private issue - do nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those who had no training:
9) Unsure if SEA or sexual harassment – what action to take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to organisation</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make own investigation</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private issue - do nothing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the correct responses amongst those who had been trained were much higher than those who had received no training, it is still important to reiterate the mandatory obligation to report even rumours of SEA and that staff should not conduct their own investigations. Similarly, if staff are unsure of the nature of the misconduct (i.e. if they are unsure if it constitutes sexual harassment or SEA, they should nonetheless report.

Conclusions and recommendations

It is encouraging that the large majority of respondents were from Myanmar and that they volunteered to answer the survey questions. The fact that 255 out of 535 respondents, or almost 48% of those who participated preferred to take the survey in Myanmar language highlights the need to ensure that PSEA messages are conveyed in Myanmar as well as other ethnic languages. It is also positive that the number of those who had undergone some PSEA training were spread evenly between humanitarian and development work, emphasizing that there is strong overall commitment to PSEA within Myanmar and not just limited to the humanitarian context, as may be the case in other country operations.

However, there are still gaps in knowledge even among those who have been trained in PSEA, including the basic non-negotiable elements. While there is a better understanding of the mandatory obligation to report SEA incidents amongst those who have been trained,
there were nonetheless some responses that indicate the need to reiterate this obligation. In addition, organizations must do more in terms of awareness-raising with communities on staff standards of conduct so that beneficiaries are aware of their rights and know how to report.

The following four points should be emphasised through ongoing and regular training and awareness-raising with colleagues:

5. The minimum age for any sexual relations for aid workers, both development and humanitarian, is 18. This is non-negotiable.

6. There are never circumstances where an aid worker can engage a sex worker. This is also non-negotiable.

7. All suspicions of SEA, even if the type of misconduct is unclear, must be reported immediately. Individual staff should not conduct their own investigations.

8. Reasons why aid workers should not engage in SEA and the consequences for SEA should be discussed in training and amongst colleagues.
Annex A: KAP Survey Questions

The PSEA Network in Myanmar is conducting a survey with individual humanitarian and development workers to understand the level of knowledge of sexual exploitation and abuse, its consequences and reporting systems put in place by organizations. The survey should take 15-20 minutes to complete and will be used to help us to develop training resources and materials.

The answers are anonymous, unless you choose to give your personal details at the end, and summarized data will be analyzed to understand the overall knowledge of SEA amongst humanitarian and development staff in Myanmar. Please don’t worry about what you know or don’t know – we just need to understand the level of knowledge overall, in order to address any gaps. Thanks in advance for participating in this survey.

General information

1. Where are you from?
   a. Myanmar
   b. Other country

2. Where in Myanmar is your duty station?
   a. Ayerwaddy
   b. Bago
   c. Chin
   d. Kachin
   e. Kayah
   f. Kayin
   g. Magway
   h. Mandalay
   i. Mon
   j. Nay Pyi Taw
   k. Rakhine
   l. Sagaing
   m. Shan
   n. Tanintharyi
   o. Yangon

3. Your position:
   a. Management
   b. Admin/Support
   c. Programme
   d. Communication
   e. Information Management
   f. Monitoring and Evaluation
   g. Other (please specify)
4. Type of organization/agency  
   a. Myanmar government  
   b. UN  
   c. International NGO  
   d. National NGO  
   e. Community based organization  
   f. Red cross  
   g. Donor/embassy  
   h. Academic/Research institute  
   i. Development consultancy  
   j. Private sector/Company  
   k. Other (please specify)  

5. The focus of your work:  
   a. Development activities  
   b. Humanitarian activities  
   c. Peace-building activities  
   d. Research/academic  
   e. Private sector  
   f. Other (please specify)  

Your knowledge, attitude and practice about PSEA

1. Did you read and sign a document (e.g. a Code of Conduct or other) which prohibits sexual exploitation when you joined your organization?  
   a) Yes  
   b) No  
   c) I don’t know/can’t remember  

2. Have you received any PSEA specific training since you started working in your organization?  
   a) Yes  
   b) No  
   1. If yes, when?____________________  
   2. If yes, was it: i) online, ii) face-to-face, or iii) other?  

3. Do you know where to report SEA cases? (if yes, say where)  
   a) Yes  
   b) No  
   If yes where ________________
4. As a humanitarian or development worker, what is the consequence of behaving in a sexually inappropriate way, or behaving unacceptably in your sexual relations with beneficiaries? Select all that apply
   a) I can be fired
   b) I can be disciplined
   c) I might be investigated
   d) I might be turned over to the police
   e) Nothing

5. As a humanitarian or development worker, what is the minimum age of a person that you are allowed to have sexual relations with?
   a) The age of sexual consent in Myanmar
   b) 16 years old
   c) 18 years old
   d) 21 years old
   e) I don’t know
   f) Other, please specify

6. As a humanitarian or development worker, is there any situation where you are allowed to pay for sexual interactions with a sex worker?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) I don’t know

7. As a humanitarian or development worker, why is it important that you do not have sexual relations with someone affected by a humanitarian emergency? (select all that apply)
   a) Because it can affect my career
   b) Because the person affected could feel they have to have sex with you to get assistance
   c) Other people could assume that is the case since humanitarian workers are perceived as powerful
   d) Because I may be at risk from catching or transmitting an STD
   e) Because it can affect the reputation of my organization
   f) I don’t know

8. What should you do if you think one of your colleagues is breaking rules on sexual conduct with affected communities but you have not seen it happen with your own eyes?
   a. Report to my organization even if I don’t have all the information
   b. Make preliminary investigations myself before reporting it
   c. This is their private issue, and I should not talk to anyone about it.
9. Let’s say you have heard an allegation of sexual misconduct against one of your colleagues, but you are unsure if it is sexual harassment or if it is sexual exploitation and abuse. What should you do?
   a) Report to my organization even if I don’t have all the information
   b) Make preliminary investigations myself before reporting it
   c) This is a private issue, and I should not talk to anyone about it.

10. Who is responsible for upholding the rules on preventing unacceptable sexual behavior amongst humanitarian and development workers with affected communities?
    a) The leadership of my organization
    b) All humanitarian and development workers share this responsibility
    c) I don’t know
    d) Other

11. Which of the following situations would require you to report suspected SEA? Select all that apply
    a) You hear a rumor that a woman who lives near the edge of an IDP camp was raped by a group of unknown men while walking back home from the latrine last night.
    b) A woman tells you she obtains additional food for her children by agreeing to have sex with a staff member at an IDP camp Nutrition Center
    c) You learn that the village leader at one of your program sites beat his wife severely last night
    d) You overhear camp residents discussing that the doctor in the NGO health clinic is having a relationship with a UN protection officer.
    e) A volunteer in Village C tells you that the Livelihoods Manager only gives incentive worker positions to young men who will sleep with her
    f) None of the above

12. Sexual exploitation and abuse can occur between (select all that apply):
    a) An international staff member and a member of the affected community/beneficiary
    b) A national/Myanmar staff member and a member of the affected community/beneficiary
    c) A community worker or volunteer and a member of the affected community/beneficiary

13. To your knowledge have you or your organization informed communities about the code of conduct of staff? This may be awareness-raising activities such as discussions, messages on radios, posters etc.
1. Are you aware of the definition of PSEA?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Don't know

2. If yes, what method was used? E.g. focus group discussions, posters, radio messages, etc.

14. Do you think beneficiaries are able to access reporting channels to report an allegation of SEA safely?
   a) Yes, they are able to access reporting channels
   b) No, they are not able to access reporting channels
   If no, why not?

15. In your opinion, does the leadership or senior management of your organization do all they can to create an environment where it is easy to report any allegations of SEA to the organization?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   Please explain your answer

16. Have you found this questionnaire difficult or easy to answer
   a) Very difficult
   b) Difficult
   c) Easy
   d) Very easy

17. Are there any resources on PSEA that you have found useful and would suggest to others? Free text.
Annex B: KAP Survey Questions (Myanmar)
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Annex B: KAP Survey Questions (Myanmar)

အချင့်အာချင်အားလုံး:

၁။ အပေါ်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၂။ စိုက်ပျိုးလိုသည်မှားသည်မှားသည်
   အဆောက်အဦကိုလျင်ရာလော
   အဆောက်အဦကိုလျင်ရာလော

၃။ သင့်ကြားလိုသည်မှားသည်မှားသည်
   အဆောက်အဦကိုလျင်ရာလော
   အဆောက်အဦကိုလျင်ရာလော

၄။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၅။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၆။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၇။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၈။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၉။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၀။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၁။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၂။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၃။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၄။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော

၁၅။ ကြီးနားလည်ကျောက်လာနိုင်သလော
   အခါ၊ရမြန်းနေ
   အခါ၊ဘက်လော
ပါဝင်သောအလောင်းများ (ကိုယ်စားလှယ်အဖွဲ့အစည်းဖြင့်အကူအညီ)

ရှိပေမှု/အကြံပေးချက်များအားလုံး:

၁. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၂. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၃. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၄. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၅. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၆. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၇. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၈. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၉. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၁၀. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၁၁. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး

၁၂. မြန်မာအစိုးရအစိုးရစာန်စီ/အစိုးရစာန်စီအပြုလေး
၁. ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်
ပြည့်စိုးခြင်း အခွင့်အရေး

၂. ကပ်ခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်
အခွင့်အရေး (အခြေခံ အဆောက်အဦများ)

၃. ဝင်ရောက် အခွင့်အရေး-
ကပ်ခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်

၄. ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်
ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး

၅. ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်
ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး

PSEA အခြေခံများ အောက်ကြည် အချက်အလက်များ နေထိုင်ရာ

အောက်ကြည် အခြေခံများ ထိပ်ကြီး အဖြစ်ဖြင့် ကြည့်ရှုမည် ပညာရေး/ အခွင့်အရေး ခွင့်

မှ အခြေခံများ လိုင်စား (မုန်း) အခြေခံများ

၁) သင်တန်း တစ်မျိုး မျိုး
၂) သင်တန်း တစ်မျိုး မျိုး
၃) သင်တန်း တစ်မျိုး မျိုး
ဘယ်-စ်-စ် ြဖစ်သနည်း။ လေရွးချယ်ေပးပါရန်။ မည်သည့်အရာများ ြဖစ်ေပျက်ပါသနည်း။ ြဖစ်ခံချင်ပါသားဆိုင်ရာပတ်သက်များ ြပြံ့လာပါသာများ ြပြံ့ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ မသိ,-ိပါက ျခင်းစံ)စမ်းစစ်ေဆးြခင်းအလ်ထားခံရပါများ လာသားချင်းစာနာမသိ,-ိပါသည်

PSEA နိုင်ငံတကာ အလူးရိုးစံပါသလား (ဝသာပါဝင်)

၂) ဗလားချင်းစာနာမသိ,-ိပါသည်

၃) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၄) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၅) ပါသည်။

၆) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၇) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၈) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၉) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၁၀) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ

၁၁) အခြေခံလောက်ကိုရာမှု့သားချင်းစာနာ
၃) ကြိုးရောက်၊ စိတ်ပြူတာ စိတ်ဝင်စားနေမှုအစား ပြောင်းခြင်း ကို ပြန်လည်သော ပညာရေး ကို လုပ်ဆောင်နိုင်မည်။
   a) မြို့တော်
   b) မြို့ထောင်
   c) ကျေးရွာ

၄) လုပ်ဆောင်သော လုပ်ငန်းများ အချက်အလက်များ လုပ်ဆောင်ရာတွင် ပြောင်းခြင်း ကို ပြန်လည်သော ပညာရေး ကို လုပ်ဆောင်နိုင်မည်။
   a) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်းအဖွဲ့ စီမံခန့်ခွဲခြင်း
   b) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်းအဖွဲ့ လုပ်ငန်းဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်း
   c) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းခွဲခြားခြင်း
   d) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း ကူညီပေးခြင်း
   e) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းပြုပြင်ခြင်း
   f) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းပြောင်းလဲခြင်း
   g) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းပြင်ဆင်ခြင်း
   h) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းပြောင်းခြင်း
   i) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလူ့လုပ်ငန်း
   j) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းစီမံခန့်ခွဲခြင်း
   k) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   l) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   m) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   n) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   o) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   p) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   q) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်ငန်း
   r) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   s) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   t) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   u) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   v) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   w) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   x) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   y) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
   z) အဖွဲ့အစည်း/လုပ်ငန်း လုပ်ငန်းလုပ်င်း
ယခုဆက်လက်မှာ ဗဟိုရာ နှင့် ပြည်သူအခြေအနေများသည် အင်္ဂါဖောင်ရေးကို လေးများကို ပေးထားပါသည်။ အကျဉ်း၀င်ရာအားလုံးကို တစ်ချက်မှတစ်ချက် ပြုလုပ်ရာမှာ လေးများကို မှတ်စုပေးနိုင်ပါသည်။

က) အခြားအခြေအနေများသည် အင်္ဂါဖောင်ရေးကို လေးများကို ပေးထားပါသည်။

ခ) လေးများကို နေထိုင်ခြင်းအားလုံးကို ပေးထားပါသည်။

ဂ) SEA စိတ်ဝင်စားရေးရာများကို အကြံပေးချက်များအား လေးများကို ပေးထားပါသည်။

င) IDP ဆက်လက်မှာ လေးများကို ဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်းအားလုံးကို အကြံပေးချက်များအား ပေးထားပါသည်။

 recognizable
၁) အခြားဝိုင်းရောဂါ အားလုံး IDP တိုင်း ထိရိတ်စွာ ရရှိသောစွေ့ထောင်သော ဝါဒကြောင့် အသိပေးထားသော အခြားသောချက်များ အခြေခံအတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။

၂) အခြားဝိုင်းရောဂါ NGO ကျန်တွေ့မှ ရရှိသော အခြားသော ဝါဒကြောင့် အခြေခံအတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။

၃) အခြားဝိုင်းရောဂါ NGO ကျန်တွေ့မှ ရရှိသော အခြားသော ဝါဒကြောင့် အခြေခံအတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။

၄) အခြားဝိုင်းရောဂါ NGO ကျန်တွေ့မှ ရရှိသော အခြားသော ဝါဒကြောင့် အခြေခံအတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။

၅) အခြားဝိုင်းရောဂါ NGO ကျန်တွေ့မှ ရရှိသော အခြားသော ဝါဒကြောင့် အခြေခံအတွက် ပြောပြပါသည်။

၁၂) လိင်ပိုင်းဆိုင်ရာ အချက်များအားလို့ ပြောပြပါသည်။

၁၃) သင်သိရှိသည်ကောင်း၊ သင်ပင် ကျွန်တော်တို့က သင်ကြားထားသော အချက်များအားလို့ ပြောပြပါသည်။

၁၄) သင်သိရှိသည်ကောင်း၊ သင်ပင် ကျွန်တော်တို့က သင်ကြားထားသော အချက်များအားလို့ ပြောပြပါသည်။

၁၅) သင်သိရှိသည်ကောင်း၊ သင်ပင် ကျွန်တော်တို့က သင်ကြားထားသော အချက်များအားလို့ ပြောပြပါသည်။
တပ်မှုအားလုံးအားလုံးနှင့် အဖျင်ရာ အတုအဖျင် အဖျင်ချက်ထွက်ခြင်းမှာ ရှိရန် ဖြစ်သည်။

၁) အဖျင်ချက်

၂) အဖျင်ချက်

စီးပွားရေးအဖျင်အဖျင်ပါ အဖျင်ချက်အားလုံးကို အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

ဤစာရင်းသည် အဖျင်ချက်မှာ အဖျင်ချက်အားလုံးကို အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၁၀) အဖျင်ချက်

၁၂) အဖျင်ချက်

အဖျင်ချက်မှာ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၁၃) အဖျင်ချက်

၁၄) အဖျင်ချက်

အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၁၅) အဖျင်ချက်

၁၆) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

ချက်ချက်ပါသည် သင်၏ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၁၇) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

၁၈) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

ချက်ချက်ပါသည် သင်၏ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၁၉) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

၂၀) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

ချက်ချက်ပါသည် သင်၏ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၂၁) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

၂၂) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

ချက်ချက်ပါသည် သင်၏ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၂၃) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

၂၄) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်

ချက်ချက်ပါသည် သင်၏ အဖျင်ချက်မှာ မပါကြည့်ရှုစေပို့သည်။

၂၅) ချက်ချက်ပါသည်
၃) အခြေခံချက်များ

့် အထူးသဖောင်တွင် အချက်အလက်များနှင့် ပတ်သက်သော PESA အဆင့် အခြေခံချက်များ ဖော်ပြသည်။ ပြည်သူများ အခြေခံချက်များကို ထောက်ပံ့ပါ။