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Introduction

• Health crisis created by COVID-19 has led to an economic crisis
• Measures adopted to fight the virus have led to a deep recession in the global economy
  ➢ IMF’s June projection: 4.9% decline in world output in 2020
  ➢ Forecast for developed countries indicate sharper declines in GDP growth
  ➢ Positive GDP growth expected only in early 2021
• Bangladesh economy: GDP growth
  ➢ 2019-20: government projection: 5.2%
  ➢ 2020-21: government projection: 8.2%, IMF: 5.7%, World Bank: 1%
• Economic crisis usually gets transformed into a crisis of livelihoods
  ➢ Labour market gets affected quickly
  ➢ And past experience shows that labour markets recover with a lag
Introduction (contd.)

• Need to distinguish between two broad phases
  ➢ During the period of shutdown - the immediate effect
  ➢ Lingering effect after reopening – economic downturn and the cyclical effect

• Different sectors and segments of the economy are facing different degrees of risk
  ➢ Agriculture vs non-agriculture
  ➢ Domestic market vs export oriented
  ➢ Informal vs formal
  ➢ Gender
  ➢ Education
Channels of Transmission: From COVID to Job Loss

Response to COVID-19

**Domestic:**
- Shutdown of public life and economy
  - Disruption in production and supply
  - Job loss and decline in demand for goods and services
  - Decline in demand due to X factors

**Global:**
- Shutdown and global recession
  - Decline in demand for exports leading to job loss
  - Negative multiplier effect on production and employment
  - Decline in overseas employment and remittances
  - Decline in income and demand of remittance receiving households
## Degree of Risk Faced by Various Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Severity of Impact During shutdown</th>
<th>Severity of Impact During recovery after the end of shutdown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
<td>Low-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and restaurants</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High-medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Employed Labour Force by Severity of Impact of Shutdown
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Percentage of Non-agricultural Employment in Informal Sector Heavy Activities, 2016-17

- Very high: 59%
- Medium-high: 26%
- High: 11%
- Low: 4%
An Estimate of Job Loss during the Period of Shutdown

• Assumptions about who lost work
  ➢ Those employed on a daily basis or on precarious contract, e.g., in construction, informal service, transport, etc.
  ➢ Those in petty self-employment in retail trade, food service, repairs, etc.
  ➢ Those engaged in organized manufacturing would be able to go back to their existing jobs
    ➢ lay-offs will be limited to about ten per cent of their workforce

• Using 2016-17 LFS data, projected (for 2020) the number of “employees” in selected sectors that are likely to have been hit hardest

• Estimated the number of “day labourers” (using the proportion of employees from the LFS 2013) – shown in the following slide
An Estimate of Job Loss during the Period of Shutdown

The number of the self-employed in urban areas is 6.05 million of which 85% (i.e., 5.19 million) are informally employed. (2)

Assuming that 10% of those employed in the manufacturing sector have been laid off, the number works out to be about 0.9 million (3)

The total number of workers who may have lost their jobs: Total of (1) + (2) + (3).

That gives us: $4.47 + 5.19 + 0.9 = 10.56$ (million).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated number of day labourers (million) (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Estimate of Job Loss during the Period of Shutdown

• Backlog of unemployment: 3 million (approx.)
• New jobless in April-May: 10.56 million
• Total: 13.56 million
• Projected labour force for 2020: 67.51 to 67.88 m
• Unemployment in April-May as % of LF: approx. 20%
## Estimates of Job Loss in 2019-20
(by broad sector – figures in million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2016-17 (LFS)</th>
<th>Projection for 2019-20 without COVID (GDP growth 8.2%)</th>
<th>Projection for 2019-20 (with COVID-affected GDP growth 5.2%)</th>
<th>Job loss (million)</th>
<th>Job loss as percentage of without COVID projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>63.99</td>
<td>61.98</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Projections reported in this table have been made by using a disaggregated model with sectoral elasticity of employment with respect to output growth.
### Estimates of Job Loss: Rural and Urban
(Figures in million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17 (LFS)</th>
<th>Projection for 2019-20 (Without COVID, GDP growth 8.2%)</th>
<th>Projection for 2019-20 (COVID-affected, GDP growth 5.2%)</th>
<th>Job loss (million)</th>
<th>Job loss as percentage of (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.18</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban informal</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Projections reported in this table have been made by using an aggregate model with elasticity of total employment with respect to GDP growth.
Growth (%) of RMG Exports in 2019-20 Compared to the Corresponding Month of 2018-19
Job Loss in the RMG Industry

• BGMEA press release (6 June) mentioned that in two months (April and May), 348 factories closed down

• Closure of 348 factories would imply that 324,684 workers may have lost their jobs
  ➢ (average number of workers per factory, according to a CPD study, is 933).

• Remaining 1926 are operating at much less than full capacity;
  ➢ Which means some in those factories may have lost their jobs
Livelihoods of Workers

• Worst affected:
  ➢ Workers working on daily wage or casual basis
  ➢ Self-employed in petty business, repairs, and various informal services

• BRAC-BIGD survey (5471 slum households) on the impact:
  ➢ Wage and casual labourer: 70%
  ➢ Petty business: 18%
  ➢ 71% of those in urban slums lost jobs
  ➢ Drop in income in April compared to February
    ➢ Urban slumdwellers: 75%
    ➢ Rural slumdwellers: 63%
Livelihoods of Workers (contd.)

• BIDS study (Binayak Sen): Short term impact during Q2 of 2020
  ➢ National headcount poverty incidence is likely to have increased by 10.4 percentage points
  ➢ From 20% the headcount may have gone up to over 30%
  ➢ An additional 16.4 million people may have joined those already poor
Livelihoods of Workers (contd.)

• How are the poor and new-poor coping? BRAC-BIGD survey finds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban (%)</th>
<th>Rural (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced food intake</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used own savings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorted to borrowing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many more days households could feed with available income</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>13 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Economic recovery (stimulus) package of Tk, 1,03.117 crore
  ➢ Tk 5,000 cr.: Export-oriented industries – for payment of wages and salaries
  ➢ Tk 30,000 cr. : Loan at subsidised interest for large industries
  ➢ Tk 20,000 cr. : Loan at subsidised interest for CMSMEs
  ➢ Export Development Fund raised from USD 3.5 b to USD 5 b
  ➢ Agricultural credits increased to Tk 9,500 cr.
  ➢ Tk 3,000 cr. refinance scheme for small farmers and small traders in agriculture
  ➢ Low-interest credit for poor farmers, returning migrant workers, and unemployed youth
Policy Measures Adopted (contd.)

• Social safety net
  ➢ Free food and subsidised food for the poor
  ➢ Widen social safety net for the poor – includes:
    ☐ Direct cash transfer - Tk. 2,500 each for 50 lakh hhs
    ☐ Old age allowance : 5 lakh added to the existing 40 lakh

• Other measures
  ➢ Agriculture refinance
  ➢ Incentive for health sector workers
Implementation of the Recovery Package

• Export-oriented industries
  ➢ Allocation supposed to cover three months’ wage/salary payment
  ➢ Not clear whether full or partial wage payment
  ➢ BGMEA says: monthly wage bill of the RMG industry is TK 4,000 crore
  ➢ Payment to be made directly to bank/MFS account of workers
  ➢ Any information about progress made?

• Cash transfer (Tk 2,500)
  ➢ 50 lakh families would cover 2 crore people – Total poor 5 crore (including the new poor)
  ➢ Poverty line income per household is Tk 10,000 per month
  ➢ 16.16 lakh families received up to 8 July (*Daily Star*, 9 July 2020)
  ➢ High “inclusion error” in the list of recipients
The Policy and Regulatory Framework

• The basic framework provided by
  ➢ Bangladesh Labour Act (BLA) 2006 and subsequent amendments
  ➢ National Labour Policy (NLP) 2012

• BLA 2006 includes wide ranging provisions governing the world of work

• But faced criticism as being anti-labour and not conforming to a few basic international labour standards

• Improvements brought through amendments in 2013 and 2018

• The condition of a minimum of 30% of total number of workers for forming a trade union relaxed to 20% (in 2018)

• But the proportion of workers covered by trade unions remains low
The Policy and Regulatory Framework (contd.)

• NLP 2012 outlines the government’s objectives and commitments
  ➢ promotion of employment and decent work
  ➢ skill development
  ➢ wage determination
  ➢ ending gender discrimination
  ➢ elimination of child labour
  ➢ Social protection
  ➢ Rights and welfare of informal sector workers

• But many of these remain at the level pf declared objectives
Economic Recovery: Alternative Scenarios (Projections for GDP Growth %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMF</th>
<th>World Bank</th>
<th>ADB</th>
<th>GoB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making Economic Recovery Inclusive and Sustainable
(Results from telephone interviews/mini survey)

• Seven out of 12 say the current situation is 50-70% of normal
  • One-third say less than 50% of normal
• Five out of 12 think normalcy will return by mid-2021 (only 4 say by Dec 2020)
• Half the respondents say over three lakh RMG workers will lose jobs
• Only one-third say RMG sector has good prospect of returning to the pre-COVID situation
• Possibility of CMSMEs benefiting from govt stimulus rather slim: (9/12)
• The effort for a one-off small cash transfer has had limited success

• All respondents said strategies are needed for employment and social protection
Beyond Growth: Making Economic Recovery Inclusive and Sustainable

• The current debate about recovery focuses on its shape: V, W, U, L, I
• The debate needs to move beyond exclusive focus on growth
• Questions should be:
  ➢ Jobless and protection-less recovery or inclusive recovery?
  ➢ Return to the pre-COVID pattern of growth or make it more inclusive?
• Basic characteristics of inclusive and sustainable growth
  • Productive employment and decent work
  • Reduction of poverty and inequality
  • Social protection (including protection against unemployment and old age)
  • Basic health care
Making Economic Recovery Inclusive and Sustainable: What Needs to be Done

• GoB five-year plans include employment in their objectives and set targets
• The budget for 2020-21 mentions employment promotion alongside economic recovery (stimulus) package
• But we need a detailed strategy for employment – like the one being done by MOLE in collaboration with ILO and World Bank
• Including strategies for protection against unemployment and old age
• Need of time: an integrated strategy for promoting employment and social protection
What Role Can Stakeholders Play?

• Fight the virus together
• Work together to find solutions to the complex problems
• Talk among themselves
  ➢ To find ways and means of avoiding lay-offs and retrenchments
  ➢ To find ways of avoiding jobless recovery
  ➢ And to develop feasible measures of social protection
• Time of crisis is the time for more rather than less dialogue