



# Analysis of refugee livelihoods in protracted refugee situations in Central and Western Equatoria

South Sudan



## Acknowledgement

---

We would like to acknowledge the collaborative effort of the Republic of South Sudan, UN agencies and development partners in developing this report. We specifically recognize the support from Commission for Refugee Affairs; local government officials from Yei, Ezo and Yambio Counties, including Commissioners and Payam Administrators; heads of government departments, specifically Agriculture, Education and Health departments.

We are also grateful to the Chamber of Commerce in study locations, private sectors, local host communities and local and international non-government organizations (NGOs). A special thanks to the colleagues from World Vision and ACROSS.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP) and United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) have provided invaluable technical support, data and guidance in the preparation of this report. We especially thank Omar Farook (WFP), Aschalew Feleke (WFP), Mark Apire (WFP), Mohammed Lebbie (UNHCR), James Bwirani (FAO) and Elijah Luak (FAO) who prepared specific chapters of the report. Overall technical editing and layout of the report was done by WFP Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM) Unit and Operational Solutions and Transition Section (OSTS) UNHCR.

We strongly recognize the hard work and contribution of government enumerators who collected household data and consulted with communities and different stakeholders. Lastly, we are indebted to refugee communities who have kindly provided their time and interest to fulfill the study objective.

For questions or comments concerning any aspect of the report please contact:

Bernard Owadi

Head of VAM, WFP

Bernard.owadi@wfp.org

Kate Makanga

Senior Reintegration Officer, UNHCR

makanga@unhcr.org

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Sampling distribution..... 12

Table 2: Age distribution in Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere.....15

Table 3: Wealth categorization in Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere.....15

Table 4: Dwelling types in Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere.....16

Table 5: Types of trainings received among respondents.....18

Table 6: Income sources in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere refugee camps ..... 20

Table 7: Monthly average expenditure among male and female headed households ..... 21

Table 8 a & b: Key expenditure on food and non-food items.....21-22

Table 9: Access to farmland vs land cultivated ..... 23

Table 10: Source of credit..... 24

Table 11: Comparison of FCS and HDDS between male and female headed households ..... 25

**List of Figures**

Figure 1: Location of Lasu, Makpandu and Napere camps with population..... 10

Figure 2: Household distribution by gender..... 14

Figure 3: Average family members in different age group per household ..... 15

Figure 4: Household assets based on responses ..... 16

Figure 5: Livelihoods dependency on multiple income sources ..... 19

Figure 6: Income activity dependency of refugees ..... 20

Figure 7: Comparison between food and non-food expenditure in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere  
refugee camps ..... 21

Figure 8: Food consumption of refugees in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere ..... 25

Figure 9: Dietary diversity in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere refugee camps ..... 25

## List of Acronyms

CAR	Central African Republic
CES	Central Equatoria State
CRA	Commission for Refugee Affairs
C&V	Cash and Voucher
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFA	Food Assistance for Assets
GFD	General Food Distribution
HDDS	Household Dietary Diversity Score
HH	Households
JAM	Joint Assessment Mission
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
NGO	Non-Government Organizations
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
WES	Western Equatoria State
WFP	World Food Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

## Table of Contents

Executive summary .....	6
1. Background .....	9
1.1 Existing Policy Environment .....	10
2. Objectives, Methodology and Limitation.....	11
2.1 Overall Objective .....	11
2.2 Methodology.....	12
2.3 Limitations.....	12
3. Refugee and Host Community Relationship and Coping .....	12
4. Analysis and Findings .....	14
4.1 Socio Economic Situation .....	14
4.1.1 Demographics .....	14
4.1.2 Age Categorization.....	14
4.1.3 Wealth Ranking.....	15
4.1.4 Household Assets and Capacities .....	17
4.1.6 Access to Social Services and Amenities.....	17
4.2 Livelihoods and Income Sources .....	19
4.3 Household Expenditure.....	210
4.4 Agricultural Production .....	232
4.5 Debt, Credit Facility and Capacity .....	233
4.6 Food Consumption .....	243
5. Challenges .....	265
5.1 Limitations in Agricultural Activities .....	265
5.2 Inefficient Labour Market .....	266
5.3 Limited Ability for Asset Building .....	266
5.4 Dependency and Destruction of Natural Resources .....	276
5.5 Limited Market Activities .....	276
5.6 Lack of and Limited Access to Financial Services .....	276
6. Recommendations .....	277
6.1 Conclusion .....	277
6.2 Cross-cutting Recommendations .....	27
6.3 Recommendations for Each Camp ..	287
6.4 Long Term Strategic Recommendations .....	29-30

## ANNEXES

## Executive summary

In 2011-2012, WFP and UNHCR jointly conducted an evaluation to understand the impact of food distribution in areas affected by protracted crises. One of the recommendations from the evaluation was to seek evidence to design pilot programmes where refugees can be engaged in self-reliance activities. As part of the proposed strategy for self-reliance<sup>1</sup> activities, three pilot counties were chosen in Central and East Africa (Chad, Uganda and South Sudan). Being one of the pilot countries, FAO, WFP and UNHCR in South Sudan jointly commissioned a livelihoods study among refugees in Greater Equatoria which are areas with great opportunities for self-reliance activities and with a fairly stable refugee population dating back ten years. The report contains findings and evidence on livelihoods situation of refugees from three camps in Central and Western Equatoria, which will inform the development of a livelihoods strategy for the refugees in these locations.

With collaboration from government agencies, especially Commission for Refugee Affairs (CRA), the assessment team comprised enumerators from government, UN agencies and partner NGOs. About 400 household interviews and several focus group discussions with community members were conducted to define wealth groups and understand income-expenditure trends, major livelihoods activities and constraints around asset-building.

The main findings are summarized as follows:

### **Policy environment**

South Sudan has existing policies that cater for refugee management. Both the Refugee Act 2012 and the Nationality Act 2011 make reference to refugee integration issues, including naturalization, legal protection, and access to employment, health and education. However, there is lack of direct reference to access to natural resources or land. These policies are relatively new and yet to be operationalized. Advocacy around integration, employment and financial access would provide opportunities for refugee communities to explore diversified livelihoods. This will help communities to build assets and will help both host and refugee communities to grow the local economy.

### **An adult refugee population**

There are approximately 15,500 refugees of Congolese and CAR origin in the three refugee settlements, of which a significant proportion is adult population between 18-60 years. Children aged below 17 years alone account for up to 50% of the overall refugee population in the three camps surveyed. The elderly, aged over 60 years are relatively few, about 6% except in Napere camp with an elderly population comprising 17%. The adult population can support increased agricultural production activities, the main livelihoods opportunity mentioned by the refugees.

### **Refugee assets, livelihoods strategies and income sources**

According to the wealth categorization, 80% of households are poor, 17% of households are medium while only 3% of households are better off. This categorization was based on assets owned and economic occupation of household heads. The study further revealed that a meagre 1% of households among the refugees own capital assets like motorcycles, generators, DVD players and televisions. The most commonly-owned household assets are basic items like hoes, machetes, axes, bicycles, furniture and mobile phones. The main livelihoods opportunities available to refugees are casual labour, crop farming and harvesting of forest products, an environmentally destructive undertaking.

---

<sup>1</sup> Self-reliance is defined as “the ability of people, households or communities to meet their basic needs, including food and nutrition, and enjoy social and economic rights in a sustainable and dignified manner” ([UNHCR Global Strategy for Livelihoods 2014-2015](#)).

Most households depend on more than one income source. About 37% of households depend on at least three income sources with just 2.7% of the refugee population reported not being involved in any income-generating activity. Most refugees originate from agricultural communities, thus they are more likely to have been involved in agriculture-based livelihoods. Due to limited portions of cultivated land, there is inadequacy of viable livelihoods opportunities and refugees are unable to meet basic needs through the available but limited income opportunities. Refugees thus have to depend on host communities to supplement their livelihoods. A large number of refugees depend on casual labour (23.1%) followed by crop sales (22.7%), alcohol sales (14%) and food assistance (12.3%). Female-headed households are more involved in brewing alcohol than their male counterparts.

### **Refugee access to farmland**

The study revealed that 71% of the refugee population have access to agricultural farmland for cultivation, which is mostly subsistence. The government also expressed willingness through local authorities to provide more land for cultivation. Nevertheless, there are some tensions between host communities and refugees over land allocation, especially when refugees ask for additional land. This calls for social cohesion and awareness campaigns by UNHCR, partners, and CRA that would ease the tensions.

### **Refugee food consumption**

Food consumption was measured using food consumption score, dividing the population into three wealth groups: better off, borderline, and poor. Makpandu has higher food consumption relative to the other two locations (48% of the population is better off, compared to 41% in Lasu and 33% in Napere). Almost all of the communities have been receiving food assistance since their relocation into the camps. Consumption patterns among the host communities are better than the refugees. On average, about 25% of the host population has borderline food consumption scores, compared to 33% of the refugee population in the camps, including the host population of 53% in Lasu. The proportion of poor and borderline combined shows that Napere is worse off, as 67% of the households fall in these categories, compared to 52% in Makpandu and 59% in Lasu.

### **General refugee challenges**

Coexistence between the refugees and host community is peaceful in general with the exception of some tensions around land allocations. However, there are numerous challenges affecting the livelihoods and self-reliance of refugees and host communities. Some of these challenges include lack of mobility in some cases due to movement restrictions, limited/restricted participation in the market, lack of financial services in nearby towns and lack of equal employment opportunities. Moreover, the local-level camp economies are based on food assistance and localized labour markets. Food assistance sale is significant (about 12% on average). The community discussions confirmed that crops sold by the refugees include maize, which is part of the food assistance that is not a preferred cereal by the refugee community. Refugees sell the maize to buy rice, their preferred cereal. Other challenges include constraints around asset-building due to lack of sustainable income sources and dependency on and destruction of natural resources especially deforestation, as a coping strategy.

The long-term strategic directions proposed by the study include:

- a. shift from general food distributions to resilience-building activities such as Food Assistance for Assets;
- b. introduce targeted agriculture activities at household-level to achieve a nourished generation;
- c. introduce the latest agriculture technologies to engage both host and refugees for inclusive agricultural value chain development;



- d. provide trainings on agricultural technology and tools, and establish business development services such as storage, preservation, information, transportation and packaging to maximize local economic activities;
- e. develop local self-help groups and savings groups modeled along gender lines, to provide an entry point for community-based decision-making, savings and loan programmes;
- f. enhance partnership with government, local organizations, international organizations and private sector to address infrastructural and institutional needs; and
- g. advocate for refugee inclusiveness in local economic initiatives.

# 1 Background

## 1.1 Refugee history

South Sudan's Central and Western Equatoria states are host to refugees from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the Central African Republic (CAR). The refugees fled attacks by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). The total number of refugees in the three protracted refugee settlements of Greater Equatoria of Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere is 15,540. Lasu (Yei) refugee camp is located in Central Equatoria while Makpandu (Yambio) and Napere (Ezo) are in Western Equatoria State.


Lasu camp hosts 7,961 refugees (about 2,159 households). The camp is located some 32 kilometers from Yei town, which is close to the international borders with DRC and Uganda. The camp benefits from a relatively peaceful environment with host communities and shares many cultural similarities. Ezo refugee camp is located in Ezo County in Western Equatoria State. It is located 165 kilometers from Yambio, the State capital. The refugees in Ezo have been in the area since 2008/2009 with their current numbers estimated at 3,479 refugees (1,427 households). Makpandu camp has a total of 3,420 refugees (1,427 households) and is located in Yambio County, Western Equatoria.

Since their arrival and settlement in refugee camps from 2008/2009, refugees have been engaged in diverse but limited livelihoods activities such as casual and agricultural labour, subsistence farming of maize, rice, sorghum and cassava as well as vegetables. The refugees also provide services as teachers, health workers, cleaners and guards for NGOs, government and private institutions. This is an indication of the various livelihoods refugees engage in and their contribution of needed skills and human resources to the local economy. Other non-farm activities include provision of services as tailors, carpenters, painters and production and marketing of mud bricks for home construction.

The Government of South Sudan has already allocated some land for refugees in Makpandu and Lasu to support their agricultural production. However, the land is infertile and far from the camp hence not readily accessible by the households. Meanwhile, the volatile security situation in the country has impacted the region as United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) projected about 4.6 million people to be in food insecurity in all states of South Sudan. Reduction of fuel production and a decline in global fuel prices have already impacted the country on top of general instability created by the conflict. As a result, food and commodity prices have gone up and often there are crises of fuel and other commodities. A large portion of the population is struggling to restore their livelihoods. An increased number of checkpoints have also restricted the usual trade flow of commodities.

WFP and UNHCR continue to provide health services, primary education, shelter and non-food items, water and sanitation, agriculture inputs, nutrition surveys and training, milling vouchers, income generating activities support, psychosocial support, child protection advocacy, support to victims of SGBV and general food distribution. They have provided these services to the refugee population in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere for about a decade. In 2011-2012, WFP and UNHCR jointly conducted an impact evaluation on the contribution of food assistance to durable solutions in protracted refugee situations. The evaluation recommended the design of pilot projects and programmes to increase self-reliance in protracted refugee settings and reduce refugees' dependency on food aid. In light of that recommendation, UNHCR and WFP South Sudan Offices commissioned a study among refugees in Central and Western Equatoria states, places with relative security, longer duration of stay of refugees, relatively stabilized conditions, proximity to peri-urban centers in some cases and greater potential for sustainable development.

In 2013, the two agencies conducted a Joint Assessment Mission (JAM), which recommended baseline and other vulnerability assessments as well as a socio-economic survey to gather more data to inform livelihoods strategies and decisions for more targeted assistance to vulnerable refugees who cannot participate in income-generating activities.



### 1.2 Existing policy environment

South Sudan has existing policies that cater for refugee management. Both the Refugee Act 2012 and the Nationality Act 2011 make reference to refugee integration issues. However, there is lack of direct reference to access to natural resources or land. Chapter II Article 2 Section 9 (b) of the Refugee Act 2012 says, “persons cease to qualify for refugee status if they become citizens of South Sudan and enjoy the protection of the country of his or her new nationality.” On naturalization, the Nationality Act 2011 says, “the ministry may issue a nationality to an alien who meets eligibility requirement such as attainment of age maturity; been resident in South Sudan for a continuous and uninterrupted period of 10 years; and intention to continue to reside permanently in South Sudan.” Chapter 5 of the Nationality Act 2011 says, “every recognized refugee and family member enjoys full legal protection, which includes entitlement to seek employment and receipt of same health and primary education which nationals of South Sudan receive.” These policies are relatively new and yet to be operationalized. Despite these policies, refugees still face some level of discrimination in their attempts to access limited income and livelihood opportunities, due to their refugee status and restricted access in some cases to move out of the camp areas.

The UNHCR Convention and Protocol relating to Refugee Status Chapter 3 Article 17 and 18, on wage-earning and self-employment, recommends that “restrictive measures imposed on aliens or employment of aliens for the protection of national labour market shall not be applied to refugees who

*were exempted from them at the date of entry into force for the contracting State.”* However, South Sudan has not yet ratified this convention and protocol.

### **1.3 Ongoing humanitarian support to refugees**

UNHCR is providing complete care and maintenance support to the refugee population in Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere through its implementing partners. The care and maintenance activities supported are SGBV prevention and response; protection of children from abuse; provision of primary healthcare services such as health service to children under 5 years, referral and support to critical medical conditions, preventive and reproductive health and HIV services; supply of portable water including repair of boreholes; environmental health and hygiene promotion; and support to persons with special needs including persons with disabilities. Furthermore, support to primary education through construction of schools, supply of scholastic materials and in-service teacher training; support to secondary education; provision of shelter to vulnerable and new arrivals; promotion of self-reliance through agriculture, livestock and fishery kits; and logistics support and maintenance of fleets of implementing partners.

UNHCR also works with Commission of Refugee Affairs (CRA), established by the Government of South Sudan as a Public Office responsible for all administrative matters concerning refugees in South Sudan and for coordination of inter-ministerial and non-governmental activities and programmes relating to refugees.

WFP provides food and nutritional support to the refugee population in all three camp locations in coordination with respective agencies and authorities.

## **2 Objectives, Methodology and Limitations**

The overall purpose of the assessment was to collect and analyze evidence that will help relevant stakeholders to develop timely course of action to maintain sustainable livelihoods amongst refugees. The aim is to increase self-reliance and reduce refugees’ dependency on humanitarian assistance through the provision of evidence-based analysis in a timely manner.

### **2.1 Overall objective**

The overall objective of this study was to review and document evidence to support programming and policy formulation that aims at improving and maintaining sustainable livelihoods among refugees in Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere. At the same time, it also aimed to identify opportunities that can increase self-reliance and reduce refugees’ humanitarian dependency.

#### **2.1.1 Specific objectives**

The specific objectives of this study included:

- a. develop a better understanding of the local economic dynamics;
- b. assess the existing infrastructures, identify gaps and needs;
- c. identify the socio-economic status and livelihoods strategies of refugees;
- d. understand the social relationships between refugees and host communities;
- e. identify and prioritize host communities’ livelihoods support needs;
- f. recommend livelihoods options that could be undertaken by refugees; and
- g. explore possibilities to expand positive coping mechanisms and other options to enhance self-reliance.

## 2.2 Methodology

A combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment tools was applied to collect data. A comprehensive household questionnaire was developed to capture information at the household level. To understand the broader context and to triangulate information, two sets of guidelines were developed to conduct focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs). Twenty-one FGDs were conducted with several groups, disaggregated by gender and location: men and women refugee groups, men and women in host community groups and youth groups. The 23 KIIs included officials from government offices, local NGOs and local private organizations like banks and financial institutions.

In refugee settings, where the camps are classified into blocks with defined numbers of households, cluster sampling was used to select and conduct household surveys. A total of 20 clusters (blocks) were randomly selected from each refugee camp and all households within blocks were surveyed. Randomly selected households from the selected clusters were targeted for the interviews.

### 2.2.1 Sampling for household questionnaire

The sample was designed such that key assessment results were representative at camp level. A total of 406 households were interviewed in all the three camps. Based on the population proportion, the following sampling distribution was used:

Table 1: Sampling distribution

Location	Population	Sample Size
Lasu	2159	177
Makpandu	1366	112
Ezo	1427	117
<b>Total</b>	<b>4925</b>	<b>406</b>

### Calculation

“Population engaged in livelihoods activities” was used as an indicator to calculate the sample size. From anecdotal information from personnel working within the camps, it was estimated that 40% of refugees are engaged in livelihoods activities. With a precision level of 5%, a 95% confidence interval and a design effect of 1.1 (since it is a known and familiar community), the sample size was calculated using the following formula:

**Formula:** 
$$n = \frac{Z_{\alpha/2}^2 P_0(1 - P_0)}{d^2}$$

Where:

n = required sample size

d = design effect

Z<sub>α/2</sub> = Confidence interval

DEEF (Design effect) at 1.10.

## 2.3 Limitations

There was no comprehensive and coherent secondary data for these refugee camps in terms of previous studies on livelihoods activities supported in the three camps. Furthermore, at the national

level, there is no information on a national strategic direction on livelihoods for the country on which to premise or align other livelihoods initiatives.

Administering of the questionnaire in Western Equatoria State was problematic, due to the long distance between Makpandu camp and Yambio where most of the key informants are based. Poor logistics and limited number of enumerators and time for FGDs and KIIs, especially in Makpandu and Yambio also provided limitations.

### 3 Refugee and Host Community Relationships

Overall, there is good will from host community leadership at different levels and the community at large towards the refugee community in all three locations since their arrival in 2008/2009. This is strengthened by the fact that most of the refugee population belong to the same ethnic groups of Zande in Western Equatoria and Kakwa in Central Equatoria. Refugees and host communities share the same dialects making it easier for communication and cultural understanding. Inter-marriages between refugees and the host communities are occurring and host communities welcome refugees. Furthermore, the host communities were previously refugees in DRC and CAR during pre-independence conflicts, where they were hosted by the Kakwa and Zande. This provides a further ground for reciprocation.

The refugees and host communities share common social services like schools, health facilities and water points. The mutual dependence of refugees and host communities is further manifested by refugees providing valuable services like casual labour to the middle and wealthier households who can afford hired services for agricultural or non-agricultural activities within host communities. The host community and refugees also share cultural and social events such as cultural dances, football/sports, church functions and inter-marriage/marriage ceremonies. The local authorities in all three locations indicated being in full agreement that the refugees should continue to be hosted; that the refugees can stay where they are for as long as they wish; and that when there is peace and stability in their countries of origin, refugees can leave or opt to integrate in South Sudan. Furthermore, the willingness of local authorities to provide land to refugees for agricultural purposes reiterates the peaceful co-existence between the two communities.

The refugees are generally hardworking communities and local people believe that they have contributed to increased local agricultural production and provided additional market supply for commodities imported from neighboring countries, especially in the case of Lasu refugees in Yei, Central Equatoria State. For example, cassava and groundnuts used to be supplied to the local markets primarily from Uganda. However, following the arrival of Congolese refugees, these crops are now grown locally and traded in the local markets. The local community also benefits from the availability of locally-produced staple food commodities and relatively low prices of humanitarian grain that refugees sell to cover household needs.

Notwithstanding the seemingly cordial relationships highlighted above, some level of tension, albeit minimal, is occurring between the two communities. The major source of this tension reported by host community is the destruction of forests through cutting of trees outside the lands allocated to refugees either for settlement or farming. In Makpandu and Lasu, members of the refugee community have been reported to be involved in excessive cutting of trees for wood, poles and charcoal. Host communities in Makpandu cited cases in which the refugee community has been found encroaching into the protected teak plantations located near the refugee camp. Host community members also expressed concern with the limited absorption in the various menial job opportunities offered by humanitarian agencies working for refugees. Disputes over boundaries for farmland allocated to refugees occasionally occur and are primarily attributed to lack of information sharing, lack of

involvement and participation of landholders by the authorities when such land is being allocated to refugees. Local administrators also allege that refugees are involved in trading of prohibited items such as ammunitions and drugs. To a smaller extent, refugees are also viewed negatively due to their foreign lifestyle, which is perceived as anti-social behavior reportedly resulting into increased instances of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) cases in the refugee settlements.

There are concerns on the part of refugee community in Lasu and Makpandu camps that the land that was allocated to their community is too remote with no access road and lack safe drinking water.

Refugees also complained of being restricted by hosts in accessing natural resources such as water for fishing purpose and adequate land for cultivation of crops. However, the host community contends that the refugees are already given food by WFP and therefore do not need any more land for cultivating crops. Thus, refugees consider that the host communities lack appreciation of their livelihoods challenges. In Makpandu, tensions were reported between women from host communities who fetch water from boreholes in the camp over misuse of water pumps installed on the boreholes.

Despite these examples of mostly isolated tensions that exist with the host communities, the refugees have been generally welcomed based on the overarching ethno-cultural bond strengthened by the reciprocity obligation.

The relationship between the refugees and host community presents both opportunities and challenges for comprehensive livelihoods interventions that can benefit both communities. Some of the opportunities include willingness by humanitarian communities to extend support and provision of basic services to encompass both refugee and host communities. Such deliberate efforts would help to defuse potential tensions among the communities.

Refugees can also contribute to the local economic development of the locations where they are settled given that they are hardworking and are already providing services like production of local food stuff sold to both refugees and host communities at relatively lower prices. Furthermore, refugees provide farm and casual labor to the middle and wealthier groups in host community households. The adult host and refugee population is an opportunity for labour-based interventions that target community asset creation, developmental projects like feeder roads and other public infrastructure that could benefit both communities.

Destruction of the forest natural resource base by refugees presents both a threat to environmental degradation as well as an opportunity for long-term interventions such agro-forestry schemes in partnership with government and development actors that would provide employment for the communities including refugees.

## 4 Analysis and Findings

### 4.1 Socio economic situation


#### 4.1.1 Demographics

The population of the three refugee camps stands at 15,554 (Lasu: 8,232; Napere: 3,670 and Makpandu: 3,652). The predominant nationality among the population is Congolese (15,145 refugees) with few from CAR (409 refugees). The CAR refugees are in Makpandu (229) and Napere (176). Lasu hosts 8,071 Congolese; Napere hosts 3,635 and Makpandu hosts 3,439.

The average household size among the refugee population in the three locations is six. There are, however, slight variations across camps: Makpandu has seven, Lasu has six and Napere has five average members per household. These family sizes are similar to what is observed in the host

communities that report an average family size of five. In the refugee camps, the study shows that there are more male-headed households (71%) than female-headed households (29%) in the camps.

Figure 2: Household distribution by gender



**4.1.2 Age categorization**

Around 17% of the population in the refugee camps is made up of children under five years of age, although Makpandu camp has slightly less children (14% children under five years). In comparison to the other two camps, Napere has the highest proportion of female-headed households (34%), as well as the highest proportion of older population of 60+ years (17%). It should be noted that households headed by the elderly and women tend to be more vulnerable to food insecurity because they generally are not able to cultivate more than one feddan<sup>2</sup>.

The table below shows the age distribution in the three refugee camps of Lasu, Makpandu, and Napere.

Table 2: Demographic break down: Lasu, Makpandu and Napere camps


Location	Age distribution (%)			
	0-5 years	5-17 years	18-60 years	60+ years
Lasu	20%	40%	40%	-
Makpandu	14%	43%	43%	-
Napere	17%	33%	33%	17%

The above clearly indicates that the adult population of 18-60 years makes up over 39% of the population which presents an opportunity of labor force available to engage in increased agricultural production activities as the main livelihoods strategy in the camps.

<sup>2</sup> Feddan is defined as plot size equivalent to 1.2 acres of farmland, a unit of measurement adopted from Arabic and used in South Sudan



Figure 3: Average Family Members in different age group per household



### 4.1.3 Wealth ranking

Through the qualitative assessments, the refugee community classified households into three wealth groups (better off, average and poor) based on their farm sizes, ownership of shops, livestock, transport equipment such as motorbikes and bicycles, employment status primarily with humanitarian agencies as incentive workers, engagement as casual labourers and petty trading among others.

Table 4: Wealth categories of Makpandu, Lasu and Napere camps

Wealth Categories (HH)			
Camp	Better-off	Average	Poor
Makpandu	23%	30%	47%
Lasu	8%	12%	80%
Napere	3%	20%	77%

The survey reveals that Makpandu is relatively better-off with only half of its households categorized as poor compared to the other two camps with the estimated poor at nearly eight out of ten households. Makpandu indicated a consistent receipt of food and had better access to bush products or natural resources (sale of charcoal burning, poles, firewood etc.) that they sell for income. They also report higher ownership of motorbikes, a major income generating asset. This may explain their relatively better status.


### 4.1.4 Household assets and capacities

Overall, 71% of the refugee respondents have access to farmland, mostly provided by the communities through local authorities' good gesture and negotiations by CRA and UNHCR. Refugees also individually negotiate for additional land with shared cropping arrangements. The level of access to farmland varies from one camp to another. In Lasu, 87.3% of the population report access to farmland as compared to 75.2% in Napere and only 41.6% in Makpandu.

Rudimentary land preparation and cultivation tools such as hoes, machetes, and axes are the main assets owned by refugee households. Other assets available to households are bicycles, mobile

phones, radios, hand mills, backpack sprayers and basic household furniture such as chairs, beds and tables. On the other hand, households rarely own assets such as motorcycles, generators, ox-ploughs and fishing nets.

Figure 5: Household assets based on responses



Most dwellings are constructed with mud bricks, and have mud or sand floors and grass-thatched roofs. Some are made from wattle, particularly in Lasu as indicated in the table below.

Table 4: Types of dwelling in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere camps

Type of dwelling	Percentage per location		
	Lasu	Makpandu	Napere
Mud brick houses	72%	72%	72%
Wattle houses	33%	13%	14%
Grass-thatched roofs	97%	97%	97%
Floor (mud or sand)	92%	92%	92%

4.1.5 Household capacities

Refugees report diverse skills acquired prior to their arrival. Some of these skills include tailoring, farming skills, numeracy and literacy. Refugees therefore offer services as teachers, health workers and provide farming skills as casual labourers to the communities where they reside. Additionally, humanitarian agencies provide capacity enhancement services through training and on-the-job initiatives that impart practical skills.

The study showed that 36.4% of the refugees have benefited from vocational training, 33% from agricultural training and 19% on how to manage agriculture inputs (handling of inputs 9%, post-harvest practice 6% and storage practices 4%). In addition, some 4% have been trained in credit and microfinance management and 4% in livestock servicing. However, there is still overwhelming demand

for training on grant management and business skills, considering that a significant refugee population is engaged in petty trading and businesses.

**4.1.6 Access to social services and amenities**

The humanitarian community supports refugees through provision of basic social services. Significantly, since the arrival of Congolese and CAR refugees, basic social amenities and infrastructures have been established in the camps that benefit both refugees and host communities. The available established infrastructures include primary and secondary schools, kindergartens, health services, water, mobile networks, markets, restaurants and road access. There are four primary schools, two kindergartens, and three health centers in the three camp locations. The total number of school-going age children in the three refugee locations is 3,436, of which Lasu has the highest (1,902 children), with only two primary schools. Given this context, access to primary school can be determined as basic. There are all weather roads leading to the camps, plied throughout the year. The markets within the refugee camps are small with limited traders; however, the refugee market in Lasu is bigger in terms of number of participants than the other two settlements. Furthermore, refugees benefit from cooperatives, farming groups, chambers of commerce, which support the efforts of farmers and small businesses. Although the refugees have access to these services and are welcome to register as members, the cooperatives are not functioning properly, and their services are limited. Similarly, the government has developed trade policies but the refugees are not aware of these policies which have not been disseminated even among the host communities.

The main sources of drinking water for refugees are boreholes, with over 80% of the population having access. Other major sources of drinking water are streams and rivers. There is also a general lack of or inadequate public tap water system in the three settlements.

Over 80% of the refugees have access to toilets (mainly pit latrines). Despite the relatively good coverage, some 21% of residents in Lasu and 8% in Napere do not have access to any form of toilet facility which has compromised the hygiene and sanitary situation among the refugees and remains a significant challenge.

The majority of the refugee households rely on torches/spotlights to power their homes at night, followed by firewood and candles. Despite the abundance of sunlight, the use of solar power is non-existent. Tin-lamps using paraffin are also used, though minimally. The main fuel used for cooking is firewood, reported by over 85% of households, followed by the use of charcoal reported by 4%. Other minimally used sources of fuel for cooking include kerosene, grass and gas. None of the refugee or host household use electricity for cooking.

About 41% of the total refugee households have received at least one type of training or another. Among the most common trainings were vocational and agricultural production related trainings, reported by 36% and 33% respectively.

*Table 5: Types of trainings received among responders*


<b>Types of Trainings Received</b>										
	<b>Vocational</b>	<b>Agricultural</b>	<b>Credit/ Microfinance</b>	<b>Sales (product/ service)</b>	<b>Agri. Input</b>	<b>Non- agri. input</b>	<b>Small grants</b>	<b>Storage</b>	<b>Livestock services</b>	<b>Others</b>
<b>Male</b>	35.4%	33.8%	3.8%	4.8%	9.6%	1.5%	.3%	3.5%	4.3%	3.0%
<b>Female</b>	39.1%	29.8%	4.3%	9.3%	5.6%	1.2%	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	.6%
<b>Total</b>	36.4%	32.7%	3.9%	6.1%	8.4%	1.4%	.2%	3.9%	4.5%	2.3%

Among the training recipients, the difference between males and females receiving trainings is small: 39% female participants reported receipt of vocational training compared to 35% of men. The difference is between male and female receiving microfinance, sales and livestock services trainings is negligible. However, men are more likely to have received agricultural training compared to females.

**4.2 Livelihoods and income sources**


According to the household survey, the refugee population is significantly dependent on selling crops (22%) including cereals as their second main income source, after casual labour. Being an agricultural community, their reliance on crop sales is normal. However, due to seasonal lows in agricultural production, they have to depend on other income sources to supplement agriculture. Some of these alternative sources of income are also seasonal though. About 37% refugee households depend on at least three sources of income for the whole year; some 34% on at least two income sources; and 27% reported dependence on one income source.

*Figure 6: Livelihoods dependency on multiple income sources*



Due to restrictions to move outside the camp in some cases, to search for diversified income opportunities including casual work, refugees tend to depend a lot on host communities for support. Qualitative assessments revealed that the labour market is highly controlled by the host community, including in the fixing of labour wages. Although the relationship between host and refugees is generally peaceful, some tensions around wage equality are evident. Refugees tend to be paid a lower rate compared to their community residents involved in similar kinds of casual work, which is viewed as discriminative. Figure 6 shows the average dependency of refugees on particular income activities. It shows that they highly rely on casual labor and agriculture labour followed by agriculture and crop sales, with nearly a quarter of residents indicating reliance on either of these two activities.

Figure 7: Income activity dependency of refugees



Brewing alcohol mainly by women and selling natural resources are also significant sources of income, reported by 14% and 12% of households respectively, men from both host and refugee communities were reported to be regular alcohol customers. Women are also involved in selling poles/firewood, charcoal and fish.

Dependency on sale of natural resources<sup>3</sup> is more prominent and the second most important income source in Makpandu (18%) compared to Lasu (5%) and Napere (15%). The youths in the refugee communities are engaged in transport businesses, primarily using motorbikes. Other income-generating activities include petty trading and sale of food assistance.

Table 6: Income sources in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere refugee camps

Multiple Key Income Sources	Lasu	Makpandu	Napere	Average
Sale of Agricultural products	28.8%	22.0%	14.8%	22.7%
Sale of animal products	1.7%	1.2%	2.3%	1.8%
Sale of Alcoholic Beverages	10.7%	10.8%	21.5%	14.0%
Casual Labour	31.4%	16.6%	18.0%	23.1%
Skilled/ Salaried	4.0%	7.5%	11.7%	7.3%
Natural resources	5.4%	18.3%	14.5%	11.8%
Petty Traders	6.8%	2.1%	3.1%	4.3%
Food Aid	9.3%	18.3%	10.9%	12.3%
Others	2.0%	3.3%	3.1%	2.7%

<sup>3</sup> Sale of natural resources include sale of charcoal, firewood, poles, grass and even little catches of fish from local rivers.

Sale of food assistance is highest in Makpandu (18%) compared to the other two camps. However, this should be interpreted with caution, as it could indicate that local production is limited but also that the cereal ration of sorghum or maize, is not a preferred/stable commodity for consumption by refugees. Discussions with the refugee communities and the key informants highlighted that the food assistance rations are not favored mainly because maize and sorghum is not their staple food. Thus, most households sell or even exchange these rations with their preferred commodities such as rice, meat, and fish. Community discussions indicate that refugees primarily buy cassava and rice from markets, as they are not used to eating maize that they receive as food assistance. The sale of food assistance is however, a concern to host communities indicating that it distorts the market prices as the host traders cannot make profit out of similar commodities.

Livestock sale is not common in camps, and if reported, it is mostly poultry. Chicken and duck rearing are common activities in camps and regarded as a significant source of livelihoods to women in refugee households.

In terms of dependency on the primary income sources which are mainly crop sales and labour, male members contribute more than female members to the household. About 40% of households’ primary income activity involves males, whereas 33% household depend on females. Twenty-four percent of households’ primary income is dependent on both male and female members of the household. About 1% of children are involved in selling commodities as the primary income source for the household.

**4.3 Household expenditure**


On average, all three refugee camps spend about SSP62 per capita per month. Makpandu has the highest expenditure per capita (SSP69). Lasu and Napere have average expenditures per capita of about SSP64 and SSP48 respectively. On average, male-headed households spend nearly 57% more than the female headed households. Female-headed households spend about SSP33 per capita on food per month, whereas male headed households spend almost double (SSP50 per capita).

*Table 7: Monthly average expenditure in male vs female headed households*

	<b>Total monthly expenditure (SSP)</b>	<b>Food Ex (SSP)</b>	<b>Per Capita Ex on Food (SSP)</b>	<b>Non Food Ex (SSP)</b>	<b>Per Capita Ex on Non Food (SSP)</b>
Male HH	427	302	50	124	21
Female HH	239	166	33	72	12

This gender variation in expenditure indicates that the purchasing power of women-headed households is more constrained. The expenditure pattern also reflects income differences between men and women. From community discussions, women-headed households are involved in petty trading whereas men easily access casual labour opportunities. Savings patterns show women being mostly custodians of household savings; however, the control and decision to spend savings lie with men for male headed households.

*Figure 8: Comparison between Food and Non-Food Expenditure in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere refugee camps*



Households allocate significantly large shares of their expenditure on food despite receiving food aid. On average, about 66% of household expenditure is used to purchase food: mainly cereals, vegetables, protein and oil. The high expenditure on food is attributed to the fact that the general food distribution rations of cereals, sorghum and maize, are not staples among the refugees. Hence refugees sell them in order to purchase their preferred commodities (e.g. rice, cassava, meat, fish etc.). The high expenditure on food is usually at the expense of other basic needs including assets or investments in livelihoods activities.

Table 8 (a) and (b): Key expenditure on food and non-food items

Table 8 a: Key expenditure on food items

Camp	Food items (%)								
	Cereals	Roots	Lentils	Vegetables	Fruits	Fish	Milk	Oil	Others
Lasu	9.0	6.0	10.0	24.0	1.0	19.0	1.0	11.0	19.0
Makpandu	13.4	7.1	3.0	11.2	0.69	16.1	1.61	7.9	7.0
Napere	18.0	18.0	3.0	11.0	0.0	19.0	1.0	23.0	7.0

Table 8 b: Key expenditure on non-food items

Camp	Non-food items (%)				
	Alcohol	Detergent	Transport	Energy	Communication
Lasu	5.7	7.9	1.4	0.9	3.4
Makpandu	3.4	7.0	5.3	1.3	3.7
Napere	4.3	6.7	0.6	2.9	2.2

The tables show percentages of main commodities and services that refugees spend on. Among the food expenditures, refugees spend more on proteins, mainly fish, lentils followed by vegetables, oil and fats. Fish is among top two food items in all three locations. In Lasu, 12% of the food expenditure goes to fish; 16% and 14% in Makpandu and Napere respectively. Lasu spends less on cereals than the other two camps (6%, compare to 13% and 18% in Makpandu and Napere). In all three camps, very little is spent on milk/milk based products. Among non-food expenditures, detergents including soaps are the most common followed by alcohol, except in Makpandu where transportation ranks second.

#### 4.4 Agricultural production

Agricultural activities are prominent in all camps as most refugees have an agriculture background. Thus, most of them continue to be involved in agriculture-related activities. About a quarter of total refugee households (23%) depend on subsistence farming, including sale of cereals, as their primary income source and at least 71% reported access to farmland, on average, refugees have 1.1 feddans of cultivable land. The Makpandu refugee population has less access to land (42%) compared to Lasu (87%) and Napere (75%). On average, refugees in Makpandu report cultivation of 0.3 feddans in two seasons compared to Lasu and Napere with about 1.0 and 0.7 feddans respectively. The main crops cultivated by the refugees include maize which they sell to the host community, rice, cassava and vegetables. The rainfall situation has been favorable in all three locations, allowing two seasons for agricultural production.

The refugee communities also received agriculture-related trainings from different local and international organizations and are better equipped to be involved in agriculture production compared to any other activity. It is significant to note that casual labour opportunities are easily available and are primarily within the agriculture sector.

Table 4 shows the involvement of refugees in subsistence farming by refugee camp.

*Table 9: Access to farmland vs land cultivated*

	Access to farm land, %	Land Cultivated (Season 1), feddans	Land Cultivated (Season 2), feddans
<b>Lasu</b>	87.3%	.97	.94
<b>Makpandu</b>	41.6%	.26	.26
<b>Napere</b>	75.2%	.76	.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>71.3%</b>	<b>.72</b>	<b>.69</b>

The Government of South Sudan, through their respective local authorities at county level, has allocated land to refugees for agriculture production in both Lasu and Makpandu camps. However, the land in Lasu still remains inaccessible due to lack of roads. In Makpandu, the refugees complain that the allocated land is relatively less fertile for meaningful productivity. There is a growing dissatisfaction by the refugee communities over the quality of land.

#### 4.5 Debt, credit facility and capacity

Table 10 shows that the majority of refugees irrespective of camp, do not have any access to credit mainly due to lack of credit institutions/facilities in the proximity of the refugee camps, lack of assets needed for collateral and lack of longer term status.

Credit is more likely to be received mainly from friends and relatives (ranging from 10% in Napere to 27% in Makpandu), these sources of credit are typically insignificant, unreliable and not enough to start a significant investment, but enough to solve household needs and consumption.



Table 10: Source of credit

Credit sources				
	Relatives/ friends	NGOs/ Charities	Local lender	No source
<b>Lasu</b>	14.5%	.6%	.6%	84.4%
<b>Makpandu</b>	27.2%	1.0%	1.0%	70.9%
<b>Napere</b>	10.0%	2.2%	2.2%	85.6%

Some 18% of the refugee population indicated demand for loans to help households meet the daily expenses including purchase of food. About 18% reported that they have settled previous debts.

#### 4.6 Food consumption

Overall, 59% reported inadequate (poor and borderline) food consumption levels. There are variations across counties, with Makpandu seemingly reporting better food consumption levels than the other two refugee camps (48% better off compared to 41% for Napere and 33% for Lasu respectively). Food consumption patterns are relatively better among host communities than within refugee communities. The main variation is generally reported in the both poor and borderline food consumption levels than among the acceptable food category. Compared to only 6% of households in Lasu, 43% and 30% in Napere and Makpandu respectively report poor food consumption levels. Likewise, 53% of households in Lasu, 24% and 22% in Napere and Makpandu respectively report borderline food consumption.

Figure 9: Food Consumption of refugees in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere





Figure 10: Dietary Diversity in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere refugee camps



Dietary diversity is very poor in the three locations. Less than 5% of refugees have acceptable dietary diversity (Figure 10). Napere reported the highest level of low dietary diversity at 63% followed by Makpandu at about 61% and Lasu at 44%. Dietary diversity is lower in women-headed households compared to male-headed households. Table 11 shows that about 57% of female-headed households have low dietary diversity, compared to 52% of male-headed households.

Table 11: Comparison of FCS and HDDS between Male and Female headed households

	Food Consumption Score categories			Dietary Diversity categories		
	Poor	Border line	Acceptable	Low HDDS	Medium HDDS	High HDDS
Male	22.2%	37.2%	40.6%	52.2%	45.1%	2.0%
Female	24.6%	34.7%	40.7%	56.8%	37.3%	5.1%

## 4.7 Coping strategies

During the lean season, which extends from April to July and other catastrophic periods due to crop loss and low yields caused by locust outbreak, heavy wind, and climate change, the commonly practiced livelihoods and consumption coping mechanisms used by refugee and host community households to access food are:

- a. working as casual labourers, borrowing, restricting consumption by adults to give priority to children;
- b. brewing and selling of alcohol;
- c. reducing meal portions;
- d. hunting wild animals;
- e. harvesting wild yam;
- f. collection of wild fruits;
- g. consumption or selling of seeds preserved for cultivation; and
- h. using assets such as mobile phone as collateral especially for the youth.

## 5 Challenges

Qualitative assessment indicated that host communities and refugees co-exist relatively peacefully. Despite this, refugees report a myriad of challenges, which inhibit their development and self-reliance endeavours. Among these challenges include limited income-generating opportunities, limited land for cultivation of crops, lack of agricultural inputs, restricted movement beyond the camps in some cases, limited ability to viably participate in local market operations, and lack of access to financial services. These challenges are summarized as below:

### 5.1 Limitations in agricultural activities

Agriculture should ideally be the mainstay of the refugees. However, the average farm sizes and even land available to the refugees is still small to accommodate sustainable production. Although the government has allocated land to both Makpandu and Lasu refugees, they are still not able access the land due to lack of road linkage in the case of Lasu and a perception of infertility for the land in Makpandu. The refugees report lack of infrastructure to connect them to the allocated farm land and even when they produce, market facilities are equally lacking. Refugees also report inadequate incentives such as proper access to functional markets, loan facilities to increase production, ensuring proper pricing etc. to encourage them to farm. Shortage of agricultural tools and other inputs, lack of extension services and inadequate storage facilities are also some of the pertinent challenges reported.

### 5.2 Inefficient labour market

A large proportion of households depend on casual work mainly in the agriculture sector, reported as the second most important source of income for the refugees. However, agriculture is a seasonal activity. Thus, during the off-peak agricultural activities, typically coinciding with part of the lean season (April-July), casual labour opportunities are diminished. The situation is worsened by the fact that refugees have restricted movements in some camps and are therefore unable to venture far off from the camps in search of job opportunities. This restricts them to depend entirely on the limited opportunities availed by the local communities, of which they also compete at a disadvantaged position with the hosts.

### 5.3 Limited ability for asset-building

Refugees are unable to save and invest due to limited income opportunities. Notably, the refugees do have organized savings groups such as Savings and Loan Associations (SLA), but these financial savings

schemes cannot support them with enough capital to build assets due to the limited savings opportunities. Consequently, refugees have extremely limited asset base, making them vulnerable to shocks. As a result, they remain within a poverty cycle and are not able to become more resilient.

#### **5.4 Dependency and destruction of natural resources**

Selling of charcoal, firewood, poles and even grass are some of the most common income activities undertaken by refugees. However, refugees typically cut trees for construction, charcoal and even firewood without replanting to replace the depleted forests. There have also been reports of refugees cutting conserved species like the teak for charcoal. These practices are environmentally destructive and contribute to the changing climate. Furthermore, the destruction of forests has led to some tensions between refugees and hosts, with the latter accusing the former of encroachment and destruction of forests.

#### **5.5 Limited market activities**

Market structures are available in refugee camps. However, the markets are generally depressed, characterised by few numbers of traders, lack of capital for the traders, limited supply of commodities, low purchasing power, etc. Furthermore, trading is dominated by the host communities. Recently, relocation of one market from refugee areas to host communities in Makpandu has negatively impacted refugee livelihoods, especially due to lack of convenient transportation of commodities.

There are few refugee residents receiving stable income sources that can support market operations, primarily those who work with humanitarian agencies and the few local residents that work for the local authorities. Traders acutely lack startup capital and are therefore unable to expand their businesses. Furthermore, markets lack adequate storage facilities and refugees have limited means of transport to get their products to major urban centres.

#### **5.6 Lack of and limited access to financial services**

Nearly all refugees report inability to have bank accounts. This is due to lack of financial institutions within the camps, lack of proper documents to facilitate opening of bank accounts in places where they exist and limited disposable income to be banked. Access to financial services has potential to increase refugees' choices of diversifying livelihoods activities to become self-reliant. Bank accounts and other financial services are important to promote savings. Loans/microfinance will help capacitate households to grow their existing livelihoods options. However, microfinance organizations are not penetrating in the refugee camps.

## **6 Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **6.1 Conclusion**

Over a decade of co-existence of host and refugee communities in Lasu, Makpandu and Napere camps has developed a coherent way of living. Since there are similarities in terms of ethnicity and culture, the refugees residing in these camps have opportunities to be well integrated and self-reliant. The conducted study provided a snapshot of the willingness of the community to be engaged in economic activities. All refugees receive food assistance, and experience limitations around livelihoods that prevent them from becoming self-reliant.

Considering the existing governmental policies, a positive attitude towards refugees is anticipated through strengthening of advocacy. With proper integration through land right establishment, access to basic services and mindset changes, there is potential to increase the aggregate productivity of both host and refugees.

To enable the communities to be self-reliant, a holistic approach is required. A significant role is required from government to show the willingness to integrate the refugee community and to leverage resources. Development agencies including UN and NGOs are required to plan for long-term activities to help refugees achieve self-reliance.

Based on the findings of this report, cross cutting and camp-specific programmatic recommendations are presented in following sections.

## 6.2 Cross-cutting recommendations

Cross-cutting recommendations include:

- a. advocating for enforcing refugee acts and nationality act in all three camps through regular consultation with government and civil society;
- b. ensuring work force development, focusing on agriculture, through trainings, specific targeting and proper technology;
- c. introducing asset building activities like Food for Asset (FFA) light and FFA activities to substitute general food distribution; and
- d. targeting very poor and vulnerable households and determining a timeframe for continuing general food distribution;
- e. Provided that other recommended activities are systematically and effectively implemented, WFP might continue to provide General Food Distribution (GFD) for at least two agricultural seasons, while livelihoods options are implemented to develop refugees' resilience to shock, and to gradually withdraw provision of free handouts including GFD. However, vulnerable households, disabled, chronically ill and child headed households would continue to receive on-going humanitarian assistance. Future actions regarding these groups would be taken based on a household survey to be conducted specifically targeting these groups to determine the progress and status of their welfare.

## 6.3 Camp-specific recommendations

### 6.3.1 Napere

Recommendations for Napere camp include the following:

- a. Based on the low income levels of the refugee population, UNHCR/WFP joint initiative should introduce cash grants to refugees with entrepreneurial ideas interested in small business opportunities. The grants should be relatively flexible packages that allow households to invest in small businesses such as purchase and rearing of poultry, or starting small tea shops.
- b. An effective intervention would be to support the promotion of sustainable market-oriented agricultural production and productivity through the expansion and facilitation of cultivation of vegetable crops (okra, onions, and tomatoes) and food crops (e.g. cassava, rice, beans, and sorghum) within the camp settlement as well as in the host community.
- c. The capacities and capabilities of refugees and host communities should be built and enhanced through the promotion and support to:
  - i. training in natural resource management;
  - ii. training in post-harvest techniques and practices;
  - iii. training in business development skills and small business management;
  - iv. training in formation and development of self-help groups including cooperatives;
  - v. training in improved crop production and soil management; and
  - vi. training in transformation, processing, and preservation of goods into finished/higher value products which could fetch higher market price.

- d. A joint initiative through CRA should undertake advocacy with government to facilitate provision of additional productive and accessible farmland so as to engage more refugees in agriculture

### 6.3.2 Lasu

Recommendations for Lasu camp include the following:

- a. UNHCR/WFP should consider supporting the construction of feeder roads linking farm land to the refugee camps as well as the markets through the most feasible and cost-effective approach, using local design and materials.
- b. Humanitarian agencies, in collaboration with government should have long-term initiatives to promote trade through creating market linkages for both refugees and host farmers through such avenues like local procurement to support on-going humanitarian operations like school feeding. The WFP Purchase for Progress (P4P)<sup>4</sup> initiative should be expanded to cover refugees while also exploring linkages to private sector.
- c. UNHCR should advocate with the government through policy discussions on how to ease the restricted movements of refugees in those areas where this practice is implemented, especially in search of work opportunities outside their camp domiciles. The refugee camp management committees should collaborate with CRA to ensure that policies to facilitate movements are legislated.

### 6.3.3 Makpandu

Recommendations for Makpandu camp include the following:

- a. In collaboration with FAO and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Cooperatives, UNHCR/WFP should promote employment through asset-building activities such as Food for Asset and Cash and Voucher<sup>5</sup> projects, which will in turn stimulate generation of household incomes in both short-term and medium to long-term period.
- b. Agencies should consider linking the teak concessionary deforestation projects to the labor-intensive cash-for-work projects involving both refugees and host communities.
- c. Support programmes should aim to promote and strengthen co-existence with local administration/authorities and communities through awareness campaigns on the rights and responsibilities of refugees and the host communities.
- d. Agencies should support vocational and technical skills training schemes through on-job skills enhancements, internships or apprenticeship placement options for youths from refugee and host communities. Public-private sector initiatives intended at providing job opportunities to the local youth who are graduating from training projects should be prioritized.
- e. Overall, agriculture production is mainly subsistence and not targeted at commercial objectives. There is need to modernize agricultural production systems through introduction of hand-drawn motorized machines or even include the refugees in the government mechanization scheme as well as high yielding and disease resistant seeds to increase productivity and improve livelihoods in a sustainable manner.
- f. UNHCR/WFP should collaborate with FAO to bring on board organizations involved in agriculture and food security projects such as the FARM project and Action Africa Help

---

<sup>4</sup> P4P is a WFP initiative called Purchase for Progress which offers local procurement of staple commodities (grains, pulses etc.) from smallholder farmers. See link [www.wfp.org/purchase-progress](http://www.wfp.org/purchase-progress)

<sup>5</sup> Cash and vouchers are electronic written authorizations exchangeable for cash or representing a credit against future expenditures

International (AAHI) to extend their agro-processing programmes to refugees in protracted settlements and adjacent host communities in Central and Western Equatoria states.

- g. Partnership should be built with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Cooperatives to extend extension services to refugee farmers to support agricultural production and ensure orderly and maximum utilization of farmland.

## 6.4 Agency specific recommendations

### 6.4.1 UNHCR

Recommendations for UNHCR include:

- a. continuous advocacy and networking with government on policies that promote favorable conditions for refugees to participate in self-reliance and livelihoods opportunities;
- b. strengthening of advocacy through Commission for Refugee Affairs, local and county authorities for additional provision of land for increased agricultural activities;
- c. support for the creation and opening of access corridors for increased access of refugees to agricultural lands and markets; and
- d. support for the improved and innovative agriculture and food security schemes that incorporates refugees and host communities.

### 6.4.2 WFP

Recommendations for WFP include:

- a. support for community assets creations such as feeder roads construction through Food For Assets or Cash For Assets projects;
- b. support for nutritional projects such as promotion of kitchen garden for women-headed households using cash-based intervention;
- c. support for the provision of high valued fruit seedlings, crop seeds and tools; and
- d. support for vocational and technical skills training for youth and income generating activities for refugee and host community women.

### 6.4.3 FAO

Recommendations for FAO include:

- a. support for the provision of agricultural livelihoods kits such as seeds and tools to refugees and host communities;
- b. support for training to improve production practices and new crop technologies;
- c. support for increased commercial production and value chain development of selected crops; and
- d. support the creation of market linkages.

## 6.5 Long-term strategic recommendations

Long-term, strategic recommendations include:

- a. Shift from general food distributions to other types of food assistances such as conditional food transfer/food assistance, food for assets activities etc.
- b. Introduction of targeted agriculture activities at household level to achieve nourished generation for the households who own limited areas within households.
- c. Introduction of modern agriculture technologies to enhance productivity among both host and refugees, mainstreamed in the whole agricultural value chain.
- d. Provision of trainings and establish business development services such as commodity storage, transportation, packaging solution, preservation, information services, aggregate marketing etc. to maximize local economic activities.

- e. Development of local self-help groups for women and men separately to foster gender-sensitivity in providing solutions to the problems affecting refugees and to provide entry points for community based savings and loan programmes.
- f. Enhancement of partnerships with government, local organizations, international organizations and private sector to address infrastructural challenges.
- g. Advocacy for refugee inclusiveness in local economy enabling strong farmer groups, developing entrepreneurship, government policies on employment opportunities and developing smallholders.



*Annex 1: Characteristics of the three wealth categories based on community perception*

Wealth grouping	Characteristics
Better-Off	Cultivate 3 feddans, own 2 motorcycles and 3 bicycles, a radio, DVD, own livestock (goats 7, chicken 10, ducks 10), incentive worker, owns private grinding mill
Middle (Average)	Cultivate 1-2 feddans, own 1 motorcycle, petty trader, technicians (tailors, carpenters, masons etc.), own livestock (goats 2-3, chicken and ducks more than 5)
Poor	Cultivates less than 1 feddan, sell casual labour, do not own livestock, chronically ill, person with disability

## Annex 2: HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT

### Introduction to household members:

- “My name is \_\_\_\_\_. We are here to collect information about the living conditions of people in the camp/settlement. Your household was selected to be part of this survey. I would like to speak to you (and your spouse/partner).”
- “The researchers will keep your responses confidential. You do not need to use your full name in the interview. Your full name will not be written down anywhere to ensure confidentiality.”
- “We hope that the research will benefit refugees by assisting us to understand better the needs of the people to improve the situation in the future.”
- “You will not receive any direct benefit if you join this study, your participation is voluntary.”
- “Do you have any questions for me? You may ask questions about this study at any time.”

COMPLETE BEFORE THE INTERVIEW		COMPLETE UPON DATA ENTRY	
Date	__   __   __  /  __   __   __  / 2015	__   __   __  /  __   __   __  / 2015	
Interviewer name		Team Number:  __   __   __	
Supervisor Name:		Data clerk name:	
Block/Location Name:		Questionnaire number:	__   __   __   __   __   __
Household Number	__   __		
Time of interview		Start:  __   __   __  :  __   __   __	End:  __   __   __  :  __   __   __
Team Code			
Signature of supervisor/team leader			

1. DEMOGRAPHICS						
1.1	What is the sex of the respondent?	1	Male	2	Female	
1.2	What is the sex of the household head?	1	Male	2	Female	
1.3	What is the age of the household head?	1=( < 17 yrs)	2=(18-60yrs)	3=( > 60 yrs)		
1.4	How many people currently live in your household?	Children under 5 years  __	5 to 17 years  __	18 to 60 years  __	Above 60 years  __	Total  __
1.5	Is there a member of your household who is --	<b>1.5.1=Person with disability</b> 1= Yes      0=No		<b>1.5.2=Chronically ill</b> 1= Yes      0=No		
1.6	What kind of accommodation do you have at the moment?	1	Own house	3	Temporary shelter	
		2	Hosted by someone	4	Other, specify	
1.7	Please indicate the major material of the roof, floor and walls of the main house? <b>(based on observation – Don't ask)</b>	Roof 1 = Thatch, 2 = Iron sheets, 3 = Tiles,	Floor 1= Dirt/ Mud/ sand, 2 = Wood, 3 = Concrete,	Walls 1 = Concrete/ fired brick,		
1	Roof					



grants, 8 = subsidies, 9 = Storage, 10 = livestock services, 99 = others	8 = not applicable			
3.1.1   _____	3.1.2   _____	3.1.3   _____	3.1.4   _____	3.1.5   _____
3.2.1   _____	3.2.2   _____	3.2.3   _____	3.2.4   _____	3.2.5   _____
3.3.1   _____	3.3.2   _____	3.3.3   _____	3.3.4   _____	3.3.5   _____
3.4.1   _____	3.4.2   _____	3.4.3   _____	3.4.4   _____	3.4.5   _____
3.5.1   _____	3.5.2   _____	3.5.3   _____	3.5.4   _____	3.5.5   _____
3.6.1   _____	3.6.2   _____	3.6.3   _____	3.6.4   _____	3.6.5   _____
3.7.1   _____	3.7.2   _____	3.7.3   _____	3.7.4   _____	3.7.5   _____

<b>4.0</b>	<b>AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION</b>	
4.1.1.	Do you have access to farmland?	1=Yes 0=No (skip to Q5)
4.1.2	What size of land do you have access to in feddans?	_____   Feddans
4.2	During the 1 <sup>st</sup> season of 2014, how much land did your HH cultivate/use for agriculture (whether rented, owned or borrowed)?	_____   Feddans
4.3	During 2 <sup>nd</sup> Season, how much land did your HH use for agriculture (including owned, rented and borrowed)	_____   Feddans
4.4	With which source of draught power did you cultivate most land during the last 12 months?	1=Tractor 2=Donkeys 3=Cattle 4= Other 5=Not applicable
4.5	5 During season 1, did you pay any labor based on the task (for example, ploughing or transporting crops from the field to your house)? (if Yes, go to 4.7)	1 =Yes 0= No 99 = Do not know
4.6	Considering cash and the value of in-kind payment, how much did you pay for all these tasks?	_____   SSP

<b>5. LIVESTOCK</b>	
5.1 During last 12 months, did your HH raise any livestock, either for sale or for your own consumption?	1 = yes, 0 = No

5.2	<i>What type of livestock has your HH owned in last 12 months?</i>	<i>How many do you have now?</i>	<i>How many did you buy in last 12 months?</i>	<i>How many did you consume in last 12 months?</i>	<i>How many did you sell/ barter in last 12 months?</i>	<i>What was the total amount received from sale of animals?</i>	<i>Considering cash and the value of inkind payment, how much did you spend on feed for these animals during the past 12 months?</i>	<i>Considering cash and the value of inkind payment, how much did you spend on other costs for these animals such as veterinary supplies, taxes, and hired labor during the past 12 months?</i>
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
1								
2								
3								
4								

Codes: 1= Poultry, 2 = Cattle, 3 = small ruminants (Goats and Sheep), 4 = Others

<b>SECTION 6 – INCOME/LIVELIHOOD SOURCES AND ACCESS TO CREDIT</b>	
6.1	How many household members are contributing or have contributed to the household's income in the past three months?
	_____
What are the main income sources of the household for the last 3 months in order of importance?	
Use proportional piling or divide the pie method to estimate relative contribution from each income source to total household income (both cash and in-kind).	

	Income source (Rank activity)	Code (Use codes on the right)	Total income (cash/ in-kind) contribution from this activity (%)	<b>99 = No source</b> <b>01 = Food crop production (including home gardening)</b> <b>02 = Cash crop production</b> <b>03 = Fishing</b> <b>04 = Hunting/gathering</b> <b>05 = Petty trade/street vending</b> <b>06 = Unskilled/casual labour ("contract")</b> <b>07 = Skilled labour/handicraft</b> <b>08 = Regular salary from employer</b> <b>09 = Shop-owner, commerce/trade</b> <b>10 = Charcoal production</b> <b>11 = Rubber tapping</b> <b>12 = Palm oil production</b> <b>13 = Rents</b> <b>14 = Support from abroad</b> <b>15 = Support from within South Sudan</b> <b>16 = Pension</b> <b>17 = Other, specify _____</b>
6.2-	Main income activity	_ _	_ _ _	
6.3-	Second income activity	_ _	_ _ _	
6.4-	Third income activity	_ _	_ _ _	
	<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>100%</b>	

Please complete the following table one activity at the time, using the codes below

6.5-	Do you have access to loan/credit money?	Circle all that apply	1	YES – Relatives / friends
			2	YES – Charities / NGOs
			3	YES – Local lender (e.g. shop)
			4	YES – chamas/social club
			5	YES - Bank
			6	YES – Co-operatives
			7	NO – No access to credit
6.6a	Do you or anybody in your HH take currently have a loan or debt?		1 = YES	0 = NO → Skip to 6.7
6.6b	If yes to 6.6a above, what was the main reason for debts or credit?	1	To buy food	
		2	To cover health expenses	
		3	To pay school, education costs	
		4	To pay other loans	
		5	To pay fines/tax	
		6	To buy clothes, shoes	
		7	To buy/rent land/ house construction	

		<b>8</b>	To pay for ceremonies/donations
		<b>9</b>	Transportation
		<b>10</b>	Other reason (specify) _____
		<b>99</b>	No loan taken out
<b>6.7-</b>	Do you sometimes purchase food on credit or borrow money to purchase food?	<b>1= YES</b>	<b>0= NO → Skip to Section 7</b>
<b>6.8-</b>	If yes, in the <b>last 7 days</b> how many days did you buy food on credit or borrowed money to buy food?  <b>(Indicate the number of days in the last 7 days)</b>	Number of days:   _____	
<b>SECTION 7 – HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURES (CASH &amp; CREDIT)</b>			

In the Past <b>MONTH</b> , how much money have you spent on each of the following items or service? <i>Use the following table, write 0 if no expenditure.</i>		<b>A - Spent during the last month (cash or credit, or both)</b> 1 = YES 2 = NO (if no, go to next item)	<b>B – Estimated Expenditure in Cash during the last month (SSP)</b>	<b>C – Estimated Expenditure in Credit during the last month (SSP)</b>
<b>7.1 -</b>	Cereals (e.g. maize, sorghum rice, bread, wheat flour)	__		
<b>7.2 -</b>	Roots and Tubers (e.g. cassava, yams, potatoes)	__		
<b>7.3 -</b>	Lentils and legumes (beans, peas and lentils)	__		
<b>7.4 -</b>	Green leafy vegetables (e.g. cassava leaves, potato greens, water green, pumpkin leaves)	__		
<b>7.5 -</b>	Other vegetables (e.g. onion, pepper, eggplant, , cabbage)	__		
<b>7.6 -</b>	Fruits e.g. plum, oranges, pumpkins, pawpaw etc	__		
<b>7.7 -</b>	Milk and milk products e.g. cheese, butter, milk	__		
<b>7.8 -</b>	Meat (e.g. bush meat, chicken, cow, sheep)	__		
<b>7.9</b>	Fish and sea food e.g. crab, snail, salmon etc	__		
<b>7.10</b>	Eggs	__		
<b>7.11</b>	Oils and fat e.g. coconut oil, vegetable oil, etc	__		
<b>7.12</b>	Nuts and seeds e.g. ground pea, sesame etc	__		
<b>7.13</b>	Sweets (e.g. sugar and other sweets)	__		

7.14	Salt	_		
7.15	Chicken soup	_		
7.16	Tea/coffee	_		
7.17	Alcohol and tobacco	_		
7.18	Soap /soap powder / detergents	_		
7.19	Transport	_		
7.20	Lighting (e.g. Firewood/charcoal/electricity/candle)	_		
7.21	Kerosene/gasoline	_		
7.22	Water	_		
7.23	Communications e.g. phone cards/phone bill	_		
In the Past <b>6 MONTHS</b> (semester), how much money have you spent on each of the following items or service (both cash and on credit)?				
		(SSP)		(SSP)
7.24	Agricultural tools		7.31 - Celebrations, social events, funerals, weddings	
7.25	Seeds for agriculture		7.32 - Fines / Taxes	
7.26	Fishing tools		7.33 - Repayment of debts (e.g. <b>rabita club</b> )	
7.27	Hiring labour (including )		7.34 - Construction, house repair	
7.28	Medical expenses, health care		7.35 - Other social <b>Societies</b>	
7.29	Education: school fee, uniform, copy books		7.36 - Savings (e.g. <b>merry-go rounds</b> )	
7.30	Clothing, shoes (except for school uniform)		7.37 - Other long term expenditures, (specify_____)	

8. FOOD CONSUMPTION		
	A. Adults	B. Children below 5 years
7.1 Yesterday, how many meals were eaten by:	_	_
Focus on food consumed by the household	7.2 Over the last 7 days, how many days did you consume the following foods?	7.3 What was the main source of the food in the past 7 days?
A. Sorghum	_	_
B. Maize	_	_
C. Cassava	_	_
D. Other cereals and tubers (root crops, potatoes millet, rice, bread, wheat)	_	_
E. Pulses (groundnuts, legumes, beans, lentils, peas, sesame)	_	_
G. Vegetables including wild vegetables and leaves	_	_
H. Fruits including wild fruits	_	_

I. Meat, and poultry (including bush meat, and both red and white meat)	____	____
J. Eggs	____	____
K. Fish	____	____
L. Milk, cheese, yogurt	____	____
M. Sugar, honey, sweets	____	____
N. Oil, fats	____	____
<b>FOOD SOURCE CODES</b>		
1= Own crop/garden production	4= Market/shop purchase	7 = Hunting
2= Work for food	5= Borrowing/debts	8 = Fishing
3= Gifts from neighbors/relatives	6= Food aid	9 = Gathering

### 9 HOUSEHOLD ASSETS

9.1 How many of each of the following assets that are in working order does a member of your household own? (If an asset is not owned or belongs to a non-household member, write 0)

	a		a
1	Chair (excluding traditional stools and benches)	15	Hand mill
2	Table	16	Bicycle
3	Bed	17	Harrow/ Plough
4	TV/ Satellite dish/ DVD	18	Sewing machine
5	Radio	19	Hammer mill
6	Fishing Nets	20	Mobile phones/ landline
7	Boats	21	Maize thresher
8	Axe	22	Silos/ Storage
9	Machete/ Knife	23	Vehicles (boda, car)
10	Backpack sprayer	24	Stove (electric, gas)
11	Hoe	25	Fridge
12	Ox cart	26	Water pump/ treadle pump
13	Tractor	27	
14	Generator	28	

### 10. ACCESS TO SERVICES/ AMENITIES

10.1 What is the main source of drinking water for your family? (If "Piped into dwelling", go to question 10.5)		1 = Piped into dwelling, yard or plot, 2 = Public tap/ neighboring house, 3 = Well/ Spring, 4 = Pond, Lake, River or Stream, 5 = Tanker, 6 = Borehole, 7 = Rainwater, 8 = Other
10.2 On a typical day, what is the total number of trips all members of your household make to fetch water for household use?		
10.3 Including waiting time, about how much time does one trip to fetch water for HH consumption usually take?	Hours:	
	Minutes:	
10.4 What type of toilet facility does your household use?		1 = Flush/pour flush, 2 = Ventilated Improved Pit latrine (VIP), 3 = Pit latrine, (unimproved), 4 = None (bush or field)
10.5 What type of cooking fuel does your HH use?		1 = Charcoal, 2 = Firewood, 3 = Kerosene/paraffin, 4 = Gas cylinder, 5= Electricity, 6 = Other
10.6 What type of lighting fuel does your household use?		1 = Kerosene/paraffin, 2 = Generator/ Car battery, 3 = Candles/ firewood, 4 = Solar panel, 5= Electrical Network, 6= Torch, 7 = Other



11. COPING STRATEGIES				
1 1 . 1	In the past 7 days were there times when your household did not have enough food or money to buy food?  If the answer is "No" go to question 6.3	1	Yes	0 No
1 1 2	<u>ONLY If yes to 5.2</u>  Has your household done any of the listed things, and how frequent were they done in the past 7 days:	<b>FREQUENCY</b> Over the last <b>7 days</b> , how many days did you use any of the following strategies?  If not used, mark 0		
	A Rely on less preferred and less expensive food	__		
	B Borrow food, or rely on help from friends or relatives	__		
	C Limit portion size at meals	__		
	D Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat	__		
	E Reduce number of meals eaten in a day	__		
	F Skip entire days without eating	__		
	G Collect any <b>unusual</b> amounts of types of wild foods for this season	__		
	Has your household done any of the listed things in the past 30 days: <b>READ OUT STRATEGIES ADOPTED</b>	1=Yes 2=No because I did not face a shortage of food 3= No because I have already sold off those assets or have engage in this activity and cannot continue to do it.		
	H Sell more animals <b>than usual</b>	__		
	I Sent household members to eat elsewhere	__		
1 1 3	J Spent saving	__		
	K Consume seed stocks held for the next season	__		
	L Sold productive assets or means of transport e.g. sewing machines, wheel barrows, etc	__		
	M Reduced expenses on health and education	__		
	N Entire household migrated	__		
	O Begged	__		
	P Sold last female animals	__		
1 1	If you report unusual high sale of livestock, do you have enough animals to continue this elevated rate of sale?	1 = Yes	0 =No	__
1	For how long do you expect this to unusual high sale of livestock to continue?	__  Months		

## Annex 3: CHECKLIST FOR HOST COMMUNITY /REFUGEE COMMUNITY FGDs

### Wealth Ranking

- In any community there are differences in wealth. This depends on what people own or have access to in those households. We would like you to help us understand this community by first describing how you would classify the households in this community by wealth. If you could divide the community in wealth groups how many would you have? Could you describe why would you divide the refugees/host community into these groups? What do you look at to differentiate between different households? Feddan? Area of land harvested etc.
- Get percentages for each category of households.

### Livelihoods activities calendar (labor issues, income sources, production, and consumption)

**Services vicinity map**-on a map draw where the different physical infrastructures are within this community. Potential list is hospitals, schools, markets, roads, storage facilities, access to information.

### Access and control over assets

- Which are the 3 most important livelihood **activities** for the “average” household in the community (e.g. farming, fishing, livestock rearing, trading, agro processing, transport, remittances, labor, and formal employment?) Specific for women and men in this group.
- Which are the 3 most important livelihood **activities** for the “poorer” household in the community (e.g. farming, trading, agro processing, transport, remittances, labor, and formal employment?) Specific for women and men in this group
- Are there any livelihood activities which only men do and only women do?

Taking the “average” household in this community, what would be their **main assets**?

- Natural? (Access to farmland, water, forest). For each asset who has control? Men or women?
- Social? (belonging to organizations, groups, support from extended family or some community organizations, remittances) Who participates? Men or women?
- Physical? (Type of house, vehicles, road access, equipment, livestock, seeds). For each asset who has control? Men or women?
- Human (household size and composition, labour power in the household, knowledge, access to education and health facilities, nutrition status skills within the household). For each asset who has control? Men or women?
- Financial (savings, number of livestock, income sources, credit). For each asset who has control? Men or women?

### Farming

- Crops grown
- Area planted (area in feddans)

- Type of seed (and fertilizer if applicable)
- Rainfall situation
- Quantity of harvest this year
- Land tenure status (ownership, rental, share arrangements etc.)
- Specific roles of women and men in crop production activities (sowing, weeding)
- Challenges in crop production for women and men
- Crop production and seasonality
- Hazards (flooding, shortage of rain, pest/disease outbreaks, etc)

### **Livestock**

- How many HH own livestock? Which type, what is each type used for (e.g. Draught power, milk, meat, sales)
- Specific roles of women, men, boys and girls in livestock production activities
- Challenges in livestock production for women and men
- How many HH sell livestock as a regular source of income? Which ones? How many per year? What is the average price? Where did they sell them? Who did you sell them to?
- How were the animals fed?
- What is your current livestock holding? Have you lost any animals? Do you have access to fodder?
- Are there HH which are sometimes able to buy livestock? In which season? Where do they buy the livestock from?

### **Fishing**

- Fish harvested (types).
- Equipment used.
- Catch: amount and types of fish throughout the year.
- Specific fishing roles of women and men in fishing activities
- Challenges in fishing for women and men
- How do they use the fish (consume at HH, sell etc)?
- How is fish stock like?
- Do you have access to the fish markets; what is the price of fish per kg?
- How much income do you make from fish sales in a week? Do you make this income every week or it varies in some weeks? How much?

### **Casual labour**

- How many HH engage in casual labour work which household member are more involved?
- Where do they do this work (do they migrate), who employs them?
- Which months of the year was the work available, and how much are they paid?

### **Formal employment**

- How many household have members formally employed, if so what job are they doing?
- Where do they work, do they go and come back every day, or migrate?

### **Informal sector and self-employment (commerce and industry)**

- What sort of commercial or industrial activity is owned or practiced by household members.

### **Remittances**

- Do you know of any households with relatives abroad/overseas which get money or any other kind of support from them? If so, which kind of support how regular it is and how much this help impacts (paying school, paying unforeseen expenditure, cover food or food related costs)
- Where is that person working, and what are they doing?

### **Markets**

- What types of business do female and male traders do in this market? (Find out for the whole year)
- How many male and female traders are in the local market?
- What percentage of the traders is from the refugee community?
- Is there any limitation on their participation in this market?
- Who are participating in marketing activities? Men or women?
- Are there types of businesses Potential of refugees can be further involved in local economy?
- Are there some businesses where there are gaps or unfulfilled service?
- Can refugees play a role in providing those services?
- Any cultural or ethnic limitations with regards to participating in marketing activities?

### **Conflict and livelihoods (possible conflict in interest)**

- What are the existing challenges of the current livelihoods activities?
- Is there any potential for livestock conflicts as a result of livestock migrating into refugee farm lands?
- Current natural resource claims and potential for future conflicts? What is the land being used for? Is it likely that there will be any conflicts as a result of loss of access to natural resource assets like forests?
- What types of fuel do they use?
- Distances walked to collect firewood
- Who collects fire wood?
- Do fuel wood collectors have security concerns?
- Water?

### **Coping mechanisms**

- Do you know of any HH which in certain moments/times of the year are unable to access adequate food or incomes?

- When there is such a shock, what coping mechanisms do they generally employ?
- What are some of the worst coping mechanisms that people have ever used in this community?
- Are there differences in coping mechanisms used by the different gender groups i.e. men and women? Boys and girls? Vulnerable groups?

### **Food assistance**

Which households receive food assistance (per wealth category)?

How is the ration used (aim to get proportions of usage through proportional piling, per wealth category)? If sold or exchanged, for what?

During which period is food assistance most useful (if at all)?

### **Expenditures and income**

What are the main sources of income (ranked in order of importance, per wealth category)?

What are the main source of expenditure (ranked and with proportions give, per wealth category)?

When income is scarce, how do households access cash and food (per wealth category)?

Please consider seasonal variations, e.g. by making a seasonal calendar.

## Annex 4: CHECKLIST FOR KEY INFORMANTS

### Introduction to Key Informants:

- “My name is \_\_\_\_\_. We are here to collect information about the living conditions of people among refugee and host communities.
- “We would like to learn more from you as a key informant in this assessment. We hope that the research will benefit refugees by assisting us to understand better the needs of the people to improve their situation in the future.”
- “If you have any questions you are free to ask at any time in the course of our discussion? “

### Perceptions

1. How is the presence of the refugee camp viewed in this area?
2. Is there any conflict of interest between refugees and host communities? If there are, what are some of the things that have happened so show these conflicts?
3. Are there signs of peaceful co-existence between them? If yes then what are the factors contributing to it?

### Local Economy Dynamics

1. What are the key types of trades and business existing? Select five major trades in the market.
2. Who are the key participants in the market activities? What about the participation of women and men? Boys and girls?
3. To what extent are refugees participating in the market activities? Any percentage for the five major trades? Who from the refugee community is participating in the market? Is it men or women, boys or girls? In what activities are they participating?
4. Are there major gaps in the market in terms of provision of services for the five major trades (e.g. transportation, retailers, storage, information, linkages etc.)?
5. Do you think both host and refugee communities have the access to market? (E.g. access as traders, consumers etc.)
6. Are there any services that refugees can provide to improve the local economy?
7. What goods and products are of high demand but limited in supply?
8. What are the main distribution channels for such goods and product and at what time in the year?

### Infrastructure gaps and Enabling Environment

1. What are the important infrastructures existing in the local economy? (markets, roads, storage facilities, seed banks, information)
2. Are they adequate? If not, what do you think should be done?
3. What are the current policies and legislations that are needed to ensure equitable development for all communities?
4. Are there legislations that need to be developed to achieve equitable development for all sectors in this community?

### Livelihood Options

1. What are the income sources for host community? Who normally brings this income? Is it women and men? Boys and girls?
2. What are the income sources for refugee? Who normally brings this income? Is it women and men? Boys and girls?
3. Are these income sources enough for them to meet their basic needs for the whole year? (Both refugees and hosts) Seasonality of incomes (peaks and troughs).
4. What do you suggest as possible options to strengthen income sources to meet these gaps?

5. How does the host community source their food? Who normally brings this income? Is it women and men? Boys and girls? (Own production, purchase, barter, hunting, assistance etc.)
6. How do the refugees source their food? Who normally brings this income? Is it women and men? Boys and girls?
7. Are both communities using part of their food to exchange with other foods or non-food items? If Yes why? When? What percentage of food is used this way?
8. Are these food sources enough for them to meet their basic needs for the whole year? (Both refugees and hosts) Seasonality of food sources (peaks and troughs).
9. What do you suggest as the possible options to strengthen food sources to meet these gaps?