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# High Frequency Phone Survey of Households in Cambodia

## Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey period</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11–26 May 2020 (LSMS) 11–28 June 2020 (IDPoor) | 1,684 respondents  
• 700 respondents (LSMS)  
• 984 respondents (IDPoor) | LSMS: National, Urban and Rural IDPoor: National | World Bank; Ministry of Planning (MOP, the National Institute of Statistic); Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY). Coordinated with other DPs, shared instruments and received feedback |

## Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey period</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17 August–07 September 2020 | 1,667 respondents  
• 612 respondents (LSMS)  
• 1055 respondents (IDPoor) | LSMS: National, Urban and Rural IDPoor: National | World Bank; Ministry of Planning (MOP, the National Institute of Statistic); Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY), National Social Protection Council (NSPC) |
Key Findings (I)

Employment and Income

• Negative impacts of the pandemic on employment and non-family businesses are less severe between May and August.

• 7 in 10 respondents were working since May 2020.

• 61% of households that relied on non-farm family business reported a reduction in sales income in August, compared with 73% in May. But many households are still suffering losses due to weak demand.

• Migrant workers have lost jobs or wages since the outbreak, reducing the amount of remittances migrant-sending households received.

• Although declines in household income have slowed since May, more than half of the respondents reported that household income had declined.

• However, about 40% of the respondents reported an increase in assistance from government and NGOs.
Key Findings (II)

Social Assistance Program

- 9 in 10 IDPoor households received some form of social assistance since June 2020.
- A small fraction remain uncovered: 1 in 10 IDPoor households had yet to receive the relief cash transfers for poor and vulnerable households during COVID-19 which launched on 24 June 2020.
- Take-up is very high (97%) among those who registered for the relief transfer program.

Food Security

- Significant reduction in households experiencing food shortages since May 2020.

Access to Education and Health Services

- Access to staples foods and health services remained high both in May and August.
- Increased involvement of children in educational activities between May and August.
  - 75% of households with children aged 6-17 engaged in education activities in August, an increase of 12 percentage points from May 2020.
  - A shift towards more face-to-face learning from remote learning (mobile applications or educational TV programs) since May 2020.
Employment remained steady between May and August

In the last 7 days, did you do any work?

- Round 1: 17% did not work, 11% currently not working, 6% currently working (change job), 66% currently working (same job)
- Round 2: 20% did not work, 10% currently not working, 5% currently working (change job), 65% currently working (same job)

Why did you stop working?

- Business/office closed due to Covid-19: 13% (Round 1), 19% (Round 2)
- Furlough (temporarily laid off): 8% (Round 1), 28% (Round 2)
- Seasonal Worker: 6% (Round 1), 8% (Round 2)
- Not farming season: 7% (Round 1), 21% (Round 2)
- Ill/quarantined: 7% (Round 1), 21% (Round 2)
- Other: 5% (Round 1), 32% (Round 2)
- Need to care for ill relative: 3% (Round 1), 3% (Round 2)
- Business/office closed due to other reasons: 9% (Round 1), 9% (Round 2)
- Not able to farm due to lack of inputs: 3% (Round 1), 9% (Round 2)
- Vacation: 6% (Round 1), 2% (Round 2)
- Retired: 2% (Round 1), 0% (Round 2)
- Not able to go to farm due to movement restriction: 5% (Round 1), 0% (Round 2)
- Maternity leave: 1% (Round 1), 5% (Round 2)

Source: LSMS Sample
Negative impacts on non-farm family businesses is less severe in August compared to May

Compared to last month, revenue from business sales… ?

Reasons for having less or no revenue?

- No customers/few customers
- Usual place of business closed due to Covid-19
- Can’t travel/transport travel
- Can’t get inputs
- Need to take care of a family member
- Vacation
- Usual place of business closed for another reason
- Seasonal closure
- Other
- Ill with another disease

Source: LSMS Sample
COVID-19 has forced the return of some migrants. Since the COVID-19 outbreak, 1 in 10 households had a migrant return home, while 2 in 10 households had a migrant currently away from the residence.
Most migrant workers returned home because of factory closures (36%) and a lack of work (24% of return migrant households)

“Why did they return…?”

LSMS

- Factory shut down: 24%
- No work: 36%
- School/university close: 15%
- Deported: 9%
- Family reason at home: 8%
- Other: 8%

IDPoor

- Factory shut down: 20%
- No work: 48%
- School/university close: 2%
- Deported: 2%
- Family reason at home: 9%
- Other: 15%
- Cannot pay rent: 4%
Returnees are currently out of work among 3 in 10 return migrant households. The estimate is lower for the IDPoor sample.

“What is she/he currently doing?”
6 in 10 migrant households reported a decline in the migrant's income

Changes in income since the Covid-19 outbreak (mid-March)

% reduction in income

- LSMS: -47%
- ID Poor: -42%
7 in 10 migrant households have received remittances, but the amount of remittances has declined.
Declines in household income slowed, but income losses remained widespread for most income sources

How has your income from … changed?

Source: LSMS Sample
Declines in household income slowed, but income losses remained widespread

Changes in household income between May and August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSMS Sample
Increased coverage of SA: 9 in 10 IDPoor households have received social assistance since June 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>LSMS</th>
<th>ID Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of social assistance**
- Government: 97%
- NGO: 1%
- Religious body: 1%
- Other: 1%

**Types of social assistance**
- Food: 90%
- Direct cash transfers: 8%
- Other in-kind transfers (excluding food): 2%

*Source: IDPoor Sample*
## Social assistance programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility criteria</th>
<th>Transfer amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID-19 related Social Assistance Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfer program for poor and vulnerable households</td>
<td>IDPoor households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefits for suspended workers in garment and tourism sector</td>
<td>Garment and tourism workers in the formal sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-COVID-19 related Social Assistance Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional cash transfer for pregnant women and child under 2</td>
<td>IDPoor households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home grown school feeding program</td>
<td>All household with children in the targeted schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship program</td>
<td>Performance based (school) IDPoor households (government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relief cash transfer program for poor and vulnerable households during COVID-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDPoor1 households (very poor) are estimated to receive on average</th>
<th>IDPoor2 households (poor) are estimated to receive on average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phnom Penh</th>
<th>Other urban</th>
<th>Other rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each member</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vulnerable member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ID Poor 1</th>
<th>ID Poor 2</th>
<th>ID Poor 1</th>
<th>ID Poor 2</th>
<th>ID Poor 1</th>
<th>ID Poor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child aged 0-5</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult aged 60+</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relief cash transfer program dominates SA; but beneficiaries of cash transfer programs for pregnant women also continue receiving their benefits
Relief cash transfer program has reached many IDPoor HHs, but a small proportion are still uncovered.

Did you register at commune council to receive the transfer?
- Yes: 26%
- No: 74%

Why did you not register?
- Unaware of the program: 53%
- Didn’t know the transfer is for them: 27%
- Other: 14%

Source: IDPoor Sample
Take-up is high (97 percent) among those who registered for the relief cash transfer program.

Source: ID Poor Sample
Cash transfers frequency and amounts as expected: Beneficiaries received an average of US$113 from the relief cash transfer program since June 2020.

How many times did you receive the transfer so far?

- 1 time: 4%
- 2 times: 43%
- 3 times: 53%

Source: IDPoor Sample

How much did you receive in total?

- $47
- $91
- $136
- $113

Source: IDPoor Sample
Most households spend the cash transfers on **food**, a significant portion also spend on **essential items**

What did you do with the money that you received?

- **Food**: 98%
- **Other essential items**: 58%
- **Paid back loan**: 15%
- **Other**: 2%

**ID Poor** vs **LSMS**

- **ID Poor**: 100%
- **LSMS**: 98%
Markets continue to function well ensuring food availability remains robust

In the last 7 days, was your household able to buy…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Poor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish or meat</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Poor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable or</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSMS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the proportion difference between round 1 and round 2
Most households were able to access health services between May and August

In the last 7 days, was your household able to buy medicine…?

Since the last interview, have you or any household members …?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSMS</th>
<th>ID Poor</th>
<th>LSMS</th>
<th>ID Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need medical treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access medical treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not try</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 in 10 households had children attending school before the school closures due to COVID-19

“Before the school closures due to COVID-19, have children aged 6-17 attended school …? ”
The share of households with children engaged in learning activities increased since May 2020

Note: Schools were closed in mid-March and partially reopened on 7 September 2020
Children in the poorest households are less likely to have met with a teacher than richer households

Types of education or learning activities by urban and rural

- Met with teacher: Rural -36, Urban -14
- Listened to radio: Rural -5, Urban -2
- Watched TV: Rural -26, Urban -24
- Mobile apps learning: Rural -28, Urban -28
- Completed assignment: Rural -9, Urban -2

Types of education or learning activities by bottom 40 and top 60

- Met with teacher: Bottom 40 -33, Top 60 -32
- Listened to radio: Bottom 40 -2, Top 60 -1
- Watched TV: Bottom 40 -33, Top 60 -33
- Mobile apps learning: Bottom 40 -28, Top 60 -28
- Completed assignment: Bottom 40 -5, Top 60 -10

Source: LSMS Sample
Note: the proportion difference between round 1 and round 2
Implementation plan

Baseline (Round 1)
May–June 2020
Knowledge, Behavior, Access, Employment, Income Loss, Food insecurity, Coping mechanism, Safety Net

Follow-up (Round 2)
August–September 2020
Access, Employment, Income Loss, Food insecurity, Safety Net, Migration

Follow-up (Round 3)
October–November 2020
Thank you

Wendy Karamba and Kimsun Tong led the Cambodia High Frequency Phone Survey (HFPS) that comprised of Maheshwor Shrestha and Sokbunthoeun So. Nuppun Research Consulting implemented the survey with technical and financial support from the World Bank. Additional contributions for the HFPS were received from the Public Financial Management and Service Delivery Trust Fund contributed by Australia and the European Union. The team is grateful to the National Institute of Statistics of the Ministry of Planning and the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation for their collaboration.

Contact:
Wendy Karamba (wkaramba@worldbank.org)
Kimsun Tong (ktong@worldbank.org)