



Caucasus Conflict

Emergency Food Security Assessment

IDP Survey Results

IRA Survey Results



WFP Georgia

September 2008

List of Abbreviations

CHF	Cooperative Housing Foundation International
CSI	Coping Strategy Index
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
EFSA	Emergency Food Security Assessment
EU	European Union
FAI	Food Access Index
FCS	Food Consumption Score
FSC	Food Security Classification
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IRA	Initial Rapid Assessment
Ha	Hectares
MERLIN	Medical Emergency Relief International
WFP	World Food Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
USD	United States Dollar



Table of Contents

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
2.0 BACKGROUND	6
3.0 METHODOLOGY	8
4.0 FOOD SECURITY	12
4.1 IDPs.....	12
4.2 Buffer Zone.....	18
4.2.1 SECTOR: Food Security.....	19
4.2.2 NON-FOOD SECTORS	24
4.3 South Shida Kartli.....	29
5.0 MARKETS	30
6.0 FOOD SECURITY MONITORING SYSTEM	31
7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	32

ANNEX: Survey Questionnaires



MAPS

- Map 1: Shida Kartli
- Map 2: South Ossetia
- Map 3: Buffer Zone

TABLES

- Table 3.1: Food Consumption Score
- Table 3.2 Coping Strategy
- Table 3.3 Food Access
- Table 3.4 Indicator Matrix
- Table 3.5 Food Security Groups
- Table 3.6 FS Groups by Weight
- Table 4.1: Pre Conflict Account of Assets and Crops Grown
- Table 4.2: Education Level
- Table 4.3: Relocation Preferences
- Table 4.4: Preferred Livelihood
- Table 4.5: Assistance Required
- Table 4.6: Land size preferred for agriculture
- Table 4.7: Cash Assistance
- Table 4.8: Vulnerable Groups
- Table 4.9: Dominant Livelihoods
- Table 4.10: Villages reporting losses
- Table 4.11: Coping Mechanism
- Table 4.12: Greatest Needs Identified by Villagers
- Table 4.13: Food Access Index
- Table 4.14: Coping Mechanism Index
- Table 4.15: Access and Coping Mechanism Matrix
- Table 4.16: Food Security Classification of Villages
- Table 4.17: List of Villages by Food Security Classification
- Table 4.18: Number of Food Insecure
- Table 4.19: Ethnic Composition
- Table 4.20: Main Protection Concerns
- Table 4.21: Households with access to clean drinking water
- Table 4.22: Primary Drinking Water Source
- Table 4.23: Access to Sanitary Facilities
- Table 4.24: Access to hygiene supplies
- Table 4.25: Main health concerns
- Table 4.26: Supply of medicine and medical equipment
- Table 4.27: Health Facilities
- Table 4.28: Education
- Table 4.29: Greatest Needs Identified by Villages
- Table 6.1: Food Security Monitoring Indicators for Buffer Zone
- Table 6.2: Food Security Monitoring Indicators for IDPs



1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

War of August 2008 left many villages abandoned and thousands of IDPs concentrated in urban areas. In September, WFP fielded an Emergency Food Security Assessment Mission to assess implications of the war on household food security. The mission collected information from the affected villages and IDPs through household interviews and focus group discussions. Two surveys, one for the villages and the other for IDPs were conducted.

Villages are suffering from a poor season where the wheat crop was harvested late and yields were down, tomato harvest, an important source of cash for small farmers, could not be marketed, and the region's main source of livelihood, horticulture, is suffering from water shortages. With headwaters in South Ossetia, massive diversions have left orchards in a poor state. Food security of subsistence farmers in the *Buffer Zone* is threatened by lack of irrigation water. Viable sources of irrigation water must be studied and funded to ensure food security of the region. Seed stocks are depleted and should be provided to ensure planting for next season. Milk production is very low on account of poor cattle breed and limited pastureland. Improvements in cattle breed and grazing lands would improve overall food security. Improved access to markets through better information and cold chain facilities would improve livelihoods of small farmers. Insecurity has resulted in shops being unable to stock and sell basic food commodities. Villagers in the Buffer Zone have exhausted their resilience and without assistance, will not be able to provide food over the winter season. According to results from the village survey, villagers clearly identified security, food, irrigation water and fuel for winter heating as their greatest needs.

IDPs from South Ossetia and the Buffer Zone remain in collective centres uncertain of their future. Villagers fled with little or no assets and remain totally dependent on government and non-government aid. Immediate deployment of food aid has satisfied short term food needs preventing malnourishment but long term sustainable solutions are required. IDPs have lost their livelihoods and rely on government allowances and aid. Over half prefer relocation to cities. Relocating would involve provision of land, equipment, training and cash. Recent massive cash pledges are anticipated to improve the future job market. Generous long term scholarships for IDP youth would act as a safety net and better prepare them for the future job market.

The government has prepared a strategy for internally displaced people. Implementation of this strategy is essential to the food security of these people. Food security of IDPs relies on the success of establishing viable livelihoods. In villages, restoration of security is of paramount importance. Provision of food over the short term and supply of irrigation water are important for the food security of villages in the Buffer Zone. These aims are achievable through political will and establishing of food security as a national priority.



2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Georgia

Georgia is a country of 69,700 square kilometres and a population of 3.8 million. It borders Turkey to the south, the Russian Federation to its north and the Black sea to its west. Independence in 1991 was immediately followed by wars in Abkhazia and South Ossetia resulting in large numbers of internally displaced persons (IDPs). Prior to independence, industry and agriculture was integrated with the Soviet Republics. Post independence de-industrialization and wars resulted in complete economic collapse by the mid 1990s. Industrial reforms over the last few years have made enormous stride (GDP \$1.6 billion in 2007¹) but unemployment is high (25%), there is still 25% of the population living below the poverty line and agriculture employs about 55% of the population. Agriculture is, therefore, the main economic safety net for the majority of the population, although the sector provides only about 9% of GDP. On average, food accounts for 75% of a household's annual expenditure². Daily Energy Supply of the extremely poor households is 1,893 kcal which is less than the standard requirement of 2100 kcal per person per day. Wheat flour accounts for 50% of total food consumption. Reliance on markets for food purchases is very high. Excluding wheat growing areas, well above 50% of food is purchased. International markets are accessed through the Black Sea port of Poti in the west and land routes with Turkey in the south. The war of August 2008 has resulted in huge amounts of financial pledges for reconstruction and revival of the economy. The effects of these investments, if ever realized, should be felt in the next two to five years but the unemployment rates in the interim period will remain high.

2.2 Shida Kartli and the Buffer Zone

The Shida Kartli region is located north west of the capital Tbilisi and was the scene of the August war. The Region spreads over 5,700 square kilometers with a population of 314 thousand. Gori city is the capital. According to the WFP baseline assessment of 2004, agriculture in this area is predominantly horticulture and the overall food insecurity level is classified as 'low'. According to figures from the Ministry of Agriculture, average annual production in thousands of tonnes is: fruits (170), vegetables (150), wheat (45), maize (25), potato (20) and beans (5). Before the 2005 trade embargo, the main market for produce of Shida Kartli was neighbouring Russia. South Ossetia forms the northern part of Shida Kartli while the southern part consists of four Rayons: Gori, Kareli, Kaspi and Khashuri. The major highway (M27) traversing west to east connects Gori to western towns of Kareli and Khashuri and the eastern town of Kaspi. Areas south of the M27 were relatively less affected by war and farmers were able to return to their villages within two weeks. The capital of South Ossetia is Tshkinvali with Kornisi and Java its main towns. Further north is the border of the Russian Federation. The Buffer Zone is an area of nebulous boundary lying south of South Ossetia and north of the M27. The actual boundary depending on ever changing access controlled by Russian military

¹ Georgia Human Development Report, UNDP 2008

² Baseline Household Food Economy Assessment, WFP 2004



check points. In practical terms, and for purposes of this assessment, the buffer zone consists of villages where the local population is either unable or unwilling to return due to insecurity.

2.3 Emergency

War broke out in August 2008. Though the actual combat spanned only a couple of days, looting and insurgency occurred before and after the combat period. About 120 thousand people were displaced, mostly to the cities of Tbilisi and Gori. A damage assessment by the EU using satellite imagery estimated 1981 buildings were damaged. About 93% were residential buildings with 87% of damage located in South Ossetia. There were also reports of unexploded ordinance and mines. Halo Trust conducted a survey and identified potential threat areas. Villagers south of the M27 have mostly returned to their farms. Most IDPs from South Ossetia and the Buffer Zone remain at Community Centres mainly in Tbilisi and Gori. They were unable to carry assets and arrived at the centres totally dependent on food and non-food aid.



3.0 METHODOLOGY

The objective of this Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) was to determine the food security status and identify needs, if any, for external assistance. The study area consisted of south Shida Kartli and the IDPs originating from these areas. A secondary literature review included WFP's baseline studies on Household Food Economy. The National Strategy for Internally Displaced Persons, the quarterly food security bulletins and reports such as Georgia Human Development Report were also consulted. The rapid assessment mission spanned from 30 August to 15 September and conducted an assessment of the rural areas and IDPs in community centres. At the time of this assessment, access to South Ossetia from Georgian territory was not possible. In the Buffer Zone, the mission was able to conduct transect line surveys, household interviews and focus group discussions. Villages in the buffer zone³ and Kareli district (Bebnisi) south of the M27 were visited where household interviews and focus group discussions were held. Interviews were also conducted in Community Centres of Tbilisi and the Tented Camp at Gori. Discussions were also held with UN staff and NGOs working in the conflict zone. Assessments of the World Bank and EU were consulted as were village assessments of the NGOs, CHF and MERLIN. To collect statistically significant empirical data, two rapid surveys were launched. The methodology adopted for these surveys is documented below:

3.1 IDP Survey

The objective of the IDP Survey was to analyze the IDP community in terms of demographics, food security and livelihoods, assets and relocation options. The study group was IDPs originating from either South Ossetia or the Buffer Zone⁴. Data was collected by a team of WFP enumerators over the period 10-12 September 2008. The study area covered IDP centres in Tbilisi. There are IDPs in Gori and other parts of the country. However, for expediency, it was decided to concentrate the study in Tbilisi where over 70% of the IDPs reside. A purposive sampling methodology was selected. Centres were randomly selected proportionate to their populations. Within centres, IDPs were randomly selected. IDPs not coming from either of the two designated areas of South Ossetia and the Buffer Zone were not included. The sample consists of 96 households originating from South Ossetia and 103 households originating from the Buffer Zone. The Questionnaire covered demographics, pre-conflict status, current status, education level, relocation/livelihood preferences and relocation assistance. The instrument was tested and modified in light of test results. WFP enumerators were trained on administering the questionnaire. An *Access* database with a data entry interface and query forms was created for data capture and analysis. The data were cleaned and analyzed. For a complete description of the survey instrument, see Annex.

Survey limitations:

³ Kvarkheti, Breti, Dirbi, Mejriskhevi, Pkhvenisi

⁴ Villages beyond South Ossetia boundary and North of Gori inaccessible due to insecurity.



- Only IDPs in Tbilisi were considered in the survey. IDPs from south Shida Kartli and those living with host families were excluded from the study.
- Although the sample size is statistically significant for the results generated, more cross-sectional analysis such as livelihood preferences against education backgrounds would require a larger sample.
- The survey collects preferences at a certain cross section of time. As IDPs spend more time in urban centres, their preference for urban living may change.

3.2 IRA Survey

A joint UN/NGO⁵ was undertaken to collect village level information in the Buffer Zone. A single multi-sector questionnaire was designed. Enumerators were trained. The survey collected village level information on population, shelter, household food security, social protection, water and sanitation, health, education and relief assistance. Due to security, some villages could not be surveyed. The final database covers 60 villages. In each village, a key informants' group was assembled. The group was composed of village authorities, community leaders, local health staff, religious leaders, local community based organizations and teachers. Group composition took into account the need for a balanced representation of women, men, vulnerable groups and ethnic diversity. A database was setup at WFP where the data entry, data cleaning and analysis were conducted. For a complete description of the survey instrument, see Annex.

Survey Limitations:

- Some villages were inaccessible due to security. However, about 80% population has been covered by the 60 villages surveyed.
- The figures on displaced populations, number of damaged houses and losses in harvest are estimates agreed upon by the focus group members. Although these are key informants and live in the villages, their responses are estimates and not based on actual counts.
- Drinking water quality data represents perceptions. Water quality was not tested.

3.3 Food Security Calculations

3.3.1 Food Consumption Score

The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a data collection method applied by WFP in rapid assessments. The process records the food groups consumed over a 7 day recall period. A standard weight based on the nutrition levels of each food group has been derived (Table 3.1). Applied at the household level, the FCS is indicative of the household's dietary diversity.

Table 3.1: Food Consumption Score

Food Group	Food Items	Weight
------------	------------	--------

⁵ OCHA, UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, UNHCR, CARE International, DRC, World Vision, Mercy Corps, Oxfam and NRC.



Cereals and Tubers	Wheat, maize, pasta, rice	2
Pulses	Beans, peas, nuts	3
Vegetables	Vegetables and leaves	1
Fruits	Fruits and fruit products	1
Meat and Fish	Beef, goat, sheep, pig, poultry, eggs, fish	4
Milk	Dairy and dairy products	4
Sugar	Sugar, honey	0.5
Oil	Oil, butter	0.5

$$FCS = a_{cereal}x_{cereal} + a_{pulse}x_{pulse} + a_{veg}x_{veg} + a_{fruit}x_{fruit} + a_{animal}x_{animal} + a_{milk}x_{milk} + a_{sugar}x_{sugar} + a_{oil}x_{oil}$$

a_i = weight of food group

x_i = number of days per week

3.3.2 Coping Strategy Index

Table 3.2 Coping Strategy

Coping Strategy	Percentage of households		
	Low: <25	Moderate: 25-74	High: >75
CS ₁ : Reduce food intake			
CS ₂ : Eat unhealthy/less preferred food			
CS ₃ : Increase borrowing for food			
CS ₄ : Sell productive assets for food			
CS ₅ : Sell household assets for food			
CS ₆ : Consume seed reserved for planting			

$$CSI_{high} = \text{if}(CS_i = \text{HIGH})$$

$$CSI_{moderate} = \text{if}(CS_i = \text{MODERATE and } CS_i \nlessgtr \text{ HIGH})$$

$$CSI_{low} = \text{if}(CS_i = \text{LOW and } CS_i \nlessgtr \text{ MODERATE and } CS_i \nlessgtr \text{ HIGH})$$

Where i = CS₁ or CS₂ or CS₃ or CS₄ or CS₅ or CS₆

3.3.3 Food Access Index

Table 3.3 Food Access

Food Access	Percentage of households		
	Low: <25	Moderate: 25-74	High: >75
FA ₁ : Lose household Stock			
FA ₂ : Lose livestock			
FA ₃ : Lose their harvest			
FA ₄ : Lose tractors			

$$FAI_{high} = \text{if}(FA_i = \text{HIGH})$$

$$FAI_{moderate} = \text{if}(FA_i = \text{MODERATE and } FA_i \nlessgtr \text{ HIGH})$$



$$FAI_{low} = \text{if}(FA_i = \text{LOW and } FA_i \diamond \text{ MODERATE and } FA_i \diamond \text{ HIGH})$$

Where $i = FA_1$ or FA_2 or FA_3 or FA_4

3.3.4 Food Security Groups

Table 3.4 Indicator Matrix

Access/Coping Strategy	High	Moderate	Low
High			
Moderate			
Low			

Table 3.5 Food Security Groups

Food Security Groups	
Highly food insecure	
Moderately food insecure	
Low food secure	

3.3.5 Number of Food Insecure

$$\text{FoodInsecure}_{village} = \text{FoodSecurity}_{Group} \times \text{FoodSecurity}_{Weight} * \text{Population}_{village} / 100$$

Where

Table 3.6 FS Groups by Weight

Food Security _{Group}	FoodSecurity _{Weight}
Highly food insecure	75
Moderately food insecure	50
Low food insecure	25



4.0 FOOD SECURITY

4.1 IDPs

Survey Results: Internally Displaced Persons

At peak, the number of displaced people was estimated at 127 thousand. By mid September, most had returned. The two groups unable to return are those originating from South Ossetia and those from the Buffer Zone. These numbers are estimated at 55 thousand. The majority of IDPs are housed in collective centres in the urban areas of Tbilisi and Gori⁶. These IDPs are suffering from the trauma caused by war, life in crowded temporary shelters and uncertainty over their future. They fled without any assets and are totally dependent upon aid for food, clothing and shelter. Able-bodied men were often left to tend the farms resulting in some IDP families consisting only of women, children, elders and disabled. UNHCR has erected a tented camp in Gori housing two thousand people. The WFP is providing food aid to all the IDPs in centres and at the Gori camp. Food rations consist of wheat, pasta, sugar, oil, beans and salt. Intake is calculated as equivalent to 2100 kcal per person per day.

The urban job market is terrible especially for people with rural skill sets. Sources for income should be created for these families to create and sustain livelihoods. The economic boost anticipated as a result of recent monetary pledges should realize into highly skilled job in the next two to five years. In order to support these families during this transition, and to prepare them for those future opportunities, long term (1 to 3 years) generous scholarships should be provided to the IDP youth. Exemptions from competing with regular candidates should also be regulated. Some persons are unable to claim disability allowance due to loss of papers in the war. Registration of such people should be facilitated through regulation. These recommendations are in line with the priorities stipulated in the National Strategy for IDPs.

4.1.1 Demographics

The average IDP family size living in centres is 5. About 38% of households have child(ren) less than 5 years old and a staggering 71% have elderly member(s) i.e. 60 years old or more. The male to female ratio amongst the IDPs is almost 1:1 with slightly more men than women though there are more women than men in the 18-59 age group. Some families have left selected family members back in villages though those numbers are low. Most households (77%) are male headed and only 23% female headed. There is no significant difference between demographics of households from South Ossetia compared to households from the Buffer Zone except that there are more families with a disabled member from South Ossetia (23%) than those from the Buffer Zone (20%).

4.1.2 Pre Conflict Situation

⁶ A few have made private arrangements such as living with relatives.



LIVELIHOODS: Statistics were collected on the main source of pre-conflict livelihoods. Before the war, about 78% of South Ossetia⁷ IDPs and 91% from Buffer Zone relied on agriculture as their main source of livelihood. Unskilled labour contributed negligibly to the household incomes with only 1% amongst South Ossetia IDPs and 5% amongst Buffer Zone families. South Ossetia featured slightly more skilled labour with 6% of households relying on it as their main source of livelihood compared to only 3% in the Buffer Zone. Services were the main income source of 15% households in South Ossetia.

AGRICULTURE: Almost all IDPs owned agricultural land prior to the conflict. Only 3% did not own land but they cultivated leased land. Land sizes, however, varied considerably. On average land sizes were larger in the Buffer Zone. The majority of IDPs from South Ossetia (57%) cultivated land of less than one hectare while the majority of Buffer Zone households (55%) cultivated between one and two hectares of land with only 38% having less than one hectare. Similarly, about 3% owned more than two hectares of land compared to none in South Ossetia. All IDPs had access to irrigation. In addition to irrigation, about 17% of households from South Ossetia and 21% of Buffer Zone farmers also practiced rainfed agriculture. Ownership of orchards was very high. About three quarter families owned cows and little less than half had tractors (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Pre Conflict Account of Assets and Crops Grown

	Pre Conflict	Percentage of Households	
		South Ossetia	Buffer Zone
Assets	Orchards	94	96
	Cows	79	68
	Tractors	44	47
Crops	Cereals	73	72
	Horticulture	96	95
	Vegetables for Sale	55	63
	Kitchen gardens	90	88

4.1.3 Current Status

IDPs fled their villages at short notice and could not liquidate or carry assets with them. Consequently, their current assets are minimal. Only 20% of those from South Ossetia and 25% from the Buffer Zone have cars. Possession of jewellery is extremely low at 2% (South Ossetia) and 10% (Buffer Zone). About 77% of IDPs report having less than 100⁸ lari in savings. About 10% claim savings in the range of 100 to 500 lari and less than 2% report savings above 1000 lari. Debt amongst the IDPs is high. About 60% of IDPs from South Ossetia and 49% of Buffer Zone IDPs report being in debt. Whereas 13% of South Ossetia IDPs claim their debt to be in the range of 100 to 500 lari, 17% of IDPs from the buffer Zone are in the same debt range. Debts of higher than 1000 lari are less prevalent amongst South Ossetia IDPs (7%) than Buffer Zone (21%). Further studies may be commissioned to understand this difference and the use of the borrowed monies.

⁷ The term refers to geographic origin not ethnicity.

⁸ 1.4 lari = 1 USD



With little non-productive assets available for liquidation and insignificant levels of savings, their main sources of securing food are earned income and assistance. Yet only 4% have regular incomes and 2% receive a casual income. About 29% of IDPs receive government allowance and only 10% receive remittances. A staggering 57% of IDPs have no income source whatsoever.

All IDPs receive food aid and 97% have received non-food aid. Shared cooking facilities are available in most of the Community Centres. Some IDPs have also received gas powered stoves for cooking. Consequently, 72% of IDPs report having access to cooking stoves but only 29% have access to fuel for cooking. This means the 13 lari required to refill a gas stove is unaffordable by over two thirds of the recipients. About 67% IDPs have access to clean drinking water⁹ and 79% have access to a functioning sanitary facility (toilet)¹⁰. However, only 13% describe supplies for personal hygiene (soap, sanitary cloth/napkin) as adequate. Medical referral is free of charge though cost of medicines must be borne by the patient. More than half the IDPs have used medical services since their displacement. A quarter of families have children less than five years old. Of these families, 47% report illness amongst their children. Since living in camps (August), about 28% reported children suffering from diarrhoea, 26% from fever and 6% suffering from respiratory illness.

4.1.4 Food Consumption

The WFP is providing food aid to all the IDPs in centres. Food rations consist of wheat, pasta, sugar, oil, beans and salt. Intake is calculated as equivalent to 2100 kcal per person per day. The Food Consumption Score is a method WFP uses to capture dietary diversity. A score less than 21 reflects poor food consumption. A score between 21 and 35 is considered adequate and above 35 is good. The average food consumption score of IDPs in the Tbilisi centres is 28. This adequate score is mainly a result of direct food aid. However, the consumption of essential food items not provided in aid is very low. To secure a balanced diet over longer periods of time, diversity is necessary. The survey asked families the number of days in a week they consume certain food categories not provided in the food package. Not a single IDP family consumes meat more than twice a week. Only 6% of IDPs consume vegetables more than twice a week. Dairy is consumed even less. On average, only 2% IDPs consume dairy more than twice a week. On average, only 3% IDPs consume fruit more than twice a week. There is a slight difference in diets between South Ossetia IDPs and Buffer Zone IDPs where the former prefer vegetables over fruits. However, the actual quantities and frequency of meat, vegetables, dairy and fruit consumption of IDPs are poor.

4.1.5 Relocation

The sensitive issue of relocation was captured during the survey. Enumerators were trained and instructed on how to approach this issue. Pre-survey tests confirmed the

⁹ 20 litres per person per day

¹⁰ Toilet facilities vary across centres.



obvious that IDPs' first preference is to return to their origins. However, the issue of relocation was presented as an element of planning in the event that such an option needed implementation. It was made clear, no decision on the issue has been made and this survey is merely tabulating personal preferences of displaced people.

EDUCATION: In order to understand the viability of settlement in new areas, information on the education levels of household heads and their spouses was collected. About 74% of IDPs have secondary education. Another 30% have a diploma/technical training and a quarter (26%) have a university education. These high levels indicate flexibility in acquiring skills in the case of relocation. There was little difference in education levels between IDPs from the two study areas (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: Education Level

Education Level	Percentage of Households	
	South Ossetia	Buffer Zone
Secondary	61	67
Diploma	19	13
University	19	17

RELOCATION PREFERENCE: More than half the IDPs prefer relocation to urban areas. Whereas 43% of South Ossetia IDPs preferred rural resettlement, only a third of Buffer Zone IDPs chose this category. The number of undecided was much higher amongst Buffer Zone families (Table 4.3). This is reflective of the prevalent uncertainty.

Table 4.3: Relocation Preferences

Relocation Preference	Percentage of Households	
	South Ossetia	Buffer Zone
Relocation to urban areas	53	52
Relocation to rural areas	43	33
Either (urban or rural)	0	3
Do not know	4	12

PREFERRED LIVELIHOOD: Only a third of IDPs indicated farming as a preferred livelihood. Large sections of household preferences spanned over labour, small businesses and services (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4: Preferred Livelihood

Preferred Livelihood	Percentage of Households	
	South Ossetia	Buffer Zone
Farming	34	34
Unskilled labour	11	16
Skilled labour	16	13
Small business	13	14
Services	15	13
Other	10	10

In connection to their preferences, the respondents were asked what assistance they would require in realizing these livelihoods. They were asked to identify assets (land,



equipment, cash) and training they deemed important to ensure success in their chosen livelihood. About 34% listed land as a requirement. Only 14% mentioned training and 45% required equipment (Table 4.5). The list of trainings varies with the major categories being: operating computers, starting a small business, driving, nursing and courses for carpenters, electricians and teachers. The list of equipment consists mainly of tractors and other agricultural tools, cars for taxis, tools for carpentry and bakery equipment. A staggering 76% listed cash as a requirement. Table 4.6 lists land sizes preferred by households who selected agriculture as their preferred livelihood.

Table 4.5: Assistance Required

Assistance Type	Percentage of Households
Land	34
Training	14
Equipment	45
Cash	76

Table 4.6: Land size preferred for agriculture

Preferred land size	Percentage of Households ¹¹
Less than 0.5 hectares	10
0.5 ha	15
1 ha	46
2 ha	21
More than 2 ha	7

Although a large section of the IDPs mentioned their need for cash, the actual amounts stipulated were low. A third of the IDPs considered cash amounts less than 1500 lari. More than half considered cash amounts below 3000 lari and only 9% mentioned cash worth more than 10,000 lari would be required (Table 4.7). It must be noted, these cash figures were often listed in addition to land, equipment and training requirements.

Table 4.7: Cash Assistance

Cash Amounts Preferred	Approx. \$ Equivalent	Percentage of Households
Less than 1500 lari	1100	34
1500-3000 lari	1100-2200	30
3000-5000 lari	2200-3600	20
5000-10000 lari	3600-7100	7
More than 10000 lari	7100	9

4.1.6 Vulnerable Groups

All IDPs are vulnerable due to loss of access to livelihoods. However, to advance the study, certain traditional vulnerable groups were quantified. Female headed households, families with child(ren) below the age of 5 years, families with elder(s) at the age of 60 or above and families with one or more members suffering from disability are considered vulnerable. About a quarter of IDP families are female headed and over two thirds have children (Table 4.8). A high proportion (71%), of families have elderly members and

¹¹ Only those households requiring land



22% of families have member(s) with disability. It must be noted many families have multiple vulnerabilities. As food aid is distributed according to family size ensuring the same amount per person, food consumption scores of each group reveal negligible difference from the mean. However, families with children have a marginally higher score suggesting adults are providing more for their children.

Table 4.8: Vulnerable Groups

Vulnerable Group	Percentage of Households	FCS
Female Headed	24	27
With child(ren) less than 5 years old	38	29
With elderly (60 or above)	71	27
With disability	22	27

All 55,000 IDPs are food insecure and will remain food insecure until their livelihoods are restored.



4.2 Buffer Zone

Survey Results: Initial Rapid Assessment of Buffer Zone

The whole of Shida Kartli region, and the Buffer Zone within it, is an agriculture based economy. Even households with no land depend on farm labour as a source of income. Produce from these farms provides food security for the villagers. Horticulture is the main source of livelihood for 35% of villages, crop farming for another 35% and livestock accounts for the livelihood of a quarter of villages in the Buffer Zone. Agriculture in the Buffer Zone has been plagued by the 2005 Russian embargo on imports. However, some alternative markets have been found and there is some indirect trade with the north via Azerbaijan. Some of the fruits are now transported to markets in Ukraine. In spite of these alternatives, stable markets for fruits must be secured. Lack of cold storage hampers marketability for products from the region and should be considered as a priority in support of livelihoods and food security. The cold frost in early Spring this year also had negative effects on fruit production. However, the withholding of irrigation waters originating in South Ossetia is the major cause of negative impact on horticulture production. Although diversion of water has been experienced repeatedly in recent years, preceding 2008, the war of this year exasperated the situation through large scale diversions. Stable sources of irrigation water are essential to sustain production in this area. Alternative surface water sources, water storage, groundwater availability and rainwater potential should be studied and funded.

Farmers fleeing on account of the insecurity caused by war (and armed looters) has left farms unattended. Some families left behind one or two members but their ability to tend the farms is limited. There was the fear of unexploded ordinance and mines. Whether actual or perceived, this threat restricted farm access. Consequently, yield from the wheat crop is much reduced. About 40% of villages reported loss of their harvest. In a quarter of villages, the majority of farmers have completely lost their harvest. The tomato harvest could not be marketed. Looting of tractors (and to a lesser extent livestock), has affected long term production prospects. Ten percent of villages have lost all their tractors to looting. Ten percent of villages have reported incidences of livestock loss. Village shops are not stocking essential food items due to fear of looting, transporters' refusal to deliver and low local farm production. There are reports of families consuming seed for food thus seriously compromising planting for next season.

African Swine Fever of 2007 and Avian Flue of 2006 left swine and poultry stocks depleted. Though poultry stocks have risen in 2007, only a few households own pigs. Milk production from cows is very low (around 2 to 5 litres) due to poor breed and poor pastureland. Although there are no significant reports of malnutrition yet, dietary diversity of foods is extremely limited. Diets consist chiefly of wheat bread, onion, tomato and cucumber. The latter two will be unaffordable during winter. Consumption levels of meat and chicken are unacceptably low. Whereas there are no reports of malnutrition, the coping strategies of these subsistence farmers are stretched and with no food stocks in storage, without assistance, households will be left with inadequate food levels over the winter. Reducing food intake has been reported in 68% of villages. A



quarter of villages have resorted to eating unhealthy food and selling of productive assets. In 27% of villages, farmers have consumed seed reserved for next season's planting. Winter heating is a major issue facing farmers. Wood is the main source of fuel for cooking and heating.

Based on the Initial Rapid Assessment of Buffer Zone villages, there are 22 villages classified as being highly food insecure, 20 villages are moderately food insecure and only 18 have low food insecurity. This corresponds to 3,870 highly food insecure households, about 1,440 moderately food insecure households and 3,980 households with low food insecurity.

4.2.1 SECTOR: Food Security

The IRA survey was a joint UN/NGO¹² effort conducted during September 2008 covering 61 villages of the Buffer Zone. One village report was rejected due to poor data collection. The following analysis is based on data from 60 villages. These 60 villages represent about 80% of the population. The survey is a good representation of the Buffer Zone. There were about 23,700 households in the 60 villages prior to the conflict. Displacements due to war and subsequent return of the IDPs resulted in the current population around 17,000 households. The total number of reported dead, injured and missing persons is 295 and the number of vulnerable households (unaccompanied elderly/minors, disabled, pregnant/lactating women, female headed) is about 1,500.

The predominant¹³ livelihood of the villages is crop farming (35% of villages) and horticulture (35% of villages). Livestock is the predominant livelihood of a quarter of the villages (Table 4.9). The remaining villages reported small business/cottage industry and urban employment as their main source of livelihood. Two villages (adjacent to Gori town) reported urban employment as their main source of livelihood. Remittances and government allowances/subsidies are not a dominant source of livelihood in any village.

Table 4.9: Dominant Livelihoods

Main livelihood : (above 50% of village population)	% of villages
Crop farming	35
Horticulture	35
Livestock	25

War, displacement and looting resulted in losses of produce and productive assets. In order to better understand food availability and access, the survey asked about losses in household food stocks, livestock, harvest and tractors. The ability to sustain food supplies over winter was a key concern. Respondents were asked to report on current levels of household food stocks. About 16% of villages reported loss of household food stocks and 10% reported loss of livestock (Table 4.10). However, the major concern was for losses of the current harvest. Over 40% of villages reported loss of their harvest (maize, wheat,

¹² OCHA, UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, UNHCR, CARE International, DRC, World Vision, Mercy Corps, Oxfam and NRC.

¹³ Above 50% of households in the village



tomato and fruits). In about 40% of villages more than half their populations reported complete loss of their harvest. In about a quarter of villages (27%) more than 75% of their populations reported the complete loss of harvest. In 60% of the villages over 75% of their populations reported a partial loss of harvest. Seventeen percent of villages reported the loss of some tractors and 10% of villages lost all their tractors.

Table 4.10: Villages reporting losses

Category	% of villages
Loss of food stocks	16
Loss of livestock	10
Loss of harvest	40
Loss of tractors	17

In order to better understand stress in meeting food needs, the survey asked about the coping mechanisms adopted by the villagers. About 68% of villages have reduced their food intake (Table 4.11). About 27% of villages report eating less preferred foods. Alarming, 27% of villages have consumed seed reserves that would have otherwise been used for planting the next crop. A quarter of villages have reported selling of productive assets. There are reports of cows being sold at low prices. Twelve percent reported sale of household assets. It must be noted, these subsistence farmers have few household assets for disposal. The proportion of populations within each village adopting these measures is high. In 40% of villages, above three quarters of their entire population have resorted to reducing their food intake. Similarly, in 12% of villages, more than three quarters of their population have consumed seeds leaving none for next season's planting.

Table 4.11: Coping Mechanism

Coping Strategy	% of Villages	% of Villages where more than 75% have adopted this coping strategy
Reduce food intake	68	40
Eat unhealthy food	27	7
Sell productive asset (cows, farm machinery)	25	5
Sell household asset	12	0
Consumption of reserved seed	27	12

The role of retail markets and food prices were studied as part of this survey. Only half the villages reported having access to markets. Among these shops, only two thirds are stocked with basic food commodities. Therefore a large section of the overall population does not have access to food for purchase. This is a serious availability limitation compounded by the approaching winter and heavy losses in household food stocks. Considering low purchasing power resulting from low harvests, the ability of households to meet their food needs is seriously compromised. Data on prices offers encouragement since a third of villages reported no change in prices of basic food commodities, only 22% reported slight increases and around half (47%) experienced nominal decrease in food prices.



Each village was asked to list in order of priority their greatest needs. The majority of villages listed security¹⁴, food, irrigation water and winter heating as their greatest needs (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12: Greatest Needs Identified by Villagers

Greatest Needs	Number of Villages: Priority		
	First	Second	Third
Security	24	4	3
Food	12	9	19
Irrigation water	7	11	2
Winter heating	5	13	9

Food Security Classification

To classify the villages in terms of food security, and to calculate the overall number of food insecure, two indices were generated: Food Access Index (Table 4.13) and Coping Strategy Index (Table 4.14). The composite of these indices (Table 4.15) was applied to reach the final Food Insecurity Classification. For details on how these were derived, see methodology section of this report.

Table 4.13: Food Access Index

Food Access	Number of villages		
	Low: <25 ¹⁵	Moderate: 25-74	High: >75
Loss of household Stock	3	6	3
Loss of livestock	4	1	0
Loss of harvest	0	8	16
Loss of tractors	1	3	6

Table 4.14: Coping Mechanism Index

Coping Strategy	Number of Villages		
	Low: <25 ¹⁶	Moderate: 25-74	High: >75
Reduce food intake	1	16	24
Eat unhealthy/less preferred food	5	7	4
Increase borrowing for food	0	1	1
Sell productive assets for food	1	11	3
Sell household assets for food	2	5	0
Consume seed reserved for planting	2	7	7

Table 4.15: Access and Coping Mechanism Matrix

Access/Coping Strategy	High	Moderate	Low
High	9	8	2
Moderate	5	4	0
Low	14	9	9

¹⁴ Security refers to the presence of armed military, militia or looters disrupting normal life.

¹⁵ Percentage of households having lost the entire asset

¹⁶ Percentage of households in village



There are 22 villages with high food insecurity, 20 villages with moderate food insecurity and 18 villages with low food insecurity (Table 4.16). Village names and their classification are listed in Table 4.17. There are 3,870 highly food insecure households, 1,440 moderately food insecure households and 3,980 households with low food insecurity (Table 4.18).

Table 4.16: Food Security Classification of Villages

Food Security Groups	
Highly food insecure	22
Moderately food insecure	20
Low food insecure	18

Table 4.17: List of Villages by Food Security Classification

FSC	Village	District	Number of food insecure	
			Households	Persons
High	Dzevera	Gori	240	816
High	Karaleti	Gori	680	2312
High	Kintsvisi	Gori	300	1020
High	Didi gari jvari	Gori	180	612
High	Patara garejvari	Gori	340	1156
High	Shurtuli	Gori	70	238
High	Karbi	Gori	190	646
High	Merekhi	Gori	150	510
High	Kordi	Gori	120	408
High	Arbo	Gori	60	204
High	Ditsi	Gori	230	782
High	Koshka	Gori	70	238
High	Terevisi	Gori	50	170
High	Tirdznisi	Gori	230	782
High	Tsitsagiant kari	Gori	60	204
High	Akhalubani	Gori	210	714
High	Kirbali	Gori	110	374
High	Djariasheni	Gori	70	238
High	Mumlaantkari	Gori	50	170
High	Tkviavi	Gori	270	918
High	Abisi	Kareli	60	204
High	Zemo nikozi	Gori	120	408
Moderate	Arashenda	Gori	70	238
Moderate	Satemo	Gori	40	136
Moderate	Sakasheti	Gori	80	272
Moderate	Gugutiantkari	Gori	10	34
Moderate	Megrevisi	Gori	10	34
Moderate	Brotsleti	Gori	20	68
Moderate	Adzvi	Gori	40	136
Moderate	Kvakhreti	Gori	40	136
Moderate	Kheltubani	Gori	290	986
Moderate	Rekha	Gori	110	374



Moderate	Kveshi	Gori	70	238
Moderate	Dirbi	Kareli	320	1088
Moderate	Satsikhuri	Kareli	40	136
Moderate	Abano	Kareli	30	102
Moderate	Didi khurvaleti	Gori	50	170
Moderate	Patara khurvaleti	Gori	30	102
Moderate	Kvemo nikozi	Gori	20	68
Moderate	Kvemo khviti	Gori	90	306
Moderate	Pkhvenisi	Gori	10	34
Moderate	Kelktseuli	Gori	70	238
Low	Variani	Gori	270	918
Low	Akhaldaba	Gori	270	918
Low	Kere	Gori	100	340
Low	Berbuki	Gori	170	578
Low	Akhrisi	Gori	140	476
Low	Zerti	Gori	440	1496
Low	Mejvriskhevi	Gori	650	2210
Low	Sveneti	Gori	280	952
Low	Tortiza	Gori	100	340
Low	Kvemo artsevi	Gori	20	68
Low	Plavi	Gori	150	510
Low	Breti	Kareli	250	850
Low	Aradeti	Kareli	90	306
Low	Tsveri	Kareli	140	476
Low	Sagolasheni	Kareli	100	340
Low	Tsitelubani	Gori	130	442
Low	Zemo khviti	Gori	130	442
Low	Shindisi	Gori	550	1870

Table 4.18: Number of Food Insecure

Classification	Households	Persons
High Food Insecurity	3,870	14,700
Moderate Food Insecurity	1,440	5,470
Low Food Insecurity	3,980	15,120
Total	9,290	35,290



Survey Results: Initial Rapid Assessment (Continued)

4.2.2 NON-FOOD SECTORS

Population

The overall pre-conflict number of households in the 60 surveyed villages of the Buffer Zone was 23,700¹⁷. Present number of households is 17,000. The estimated number dead/injured/missing is 295 and the number of vulnerable households is 1,500. The number of ethnic Ossetian families was only 7% of the pre conflict population (Table 4.19).

Table 4.19: Ethnic Composition

Ethnic Group	Number of households	
	Pre conflict	Present
Georgian	21,900	15,560
Ossetian	1,600	1,300
Others	200	140
Total	23,700	17,000

SECTOR: Protection

Villages were asked to list their protection concerns. Based on the number of villages that identified these, the main concern was presence of armed forces, exposure to UXOs/landmines and victims of trauma (Table 4.20). Risks to children, such as separation or loss of parents and trafficking were not identified as issues of importance.

Table 4.20: Main Protection Concerns

Main Concern	# of villages
Presence of armed forces	36
Exposure to UXO/Landmines	23
Trauma victims	20
Discrimination/ethnic tensions	4
Prevalence of small arms	3
Missing persons	1
Communities have not remained intact	1
Separated/unaccompanied children	-
Children who lost both parents	-
Risk of trafficking	-
Other protection concerns	15

The majority population of the Buffer Zone is ethnic Georgian. However, more than half the villages (60%) had minor ethnic Ossetian populations and 13% of villages had some families of neither Georgian nor Ossetian ethnicity. As a result of displacement from conflict, currently only 47% of villages have ethnic Ossetian enclaves and only 8% of

¹⁷ Population numbers are estimated by village focus groups.



villages have non-Georgian and non-Ossetian groups. Regarding IDPs from previous conflicts (1992) the whole Buffer Zone had only 13 such families.

SECTOR: Water and Sanitation

The majority of Buffer Zone population has access to clean drinking water (Table 4.21). This agrees with the fact that only two villages listed drinking water as their top priority. The main sources of drinking water are piped water, well/spring and water supplied through electric pumps (Table 4.22). Only six villages had their primary water source damaged or destroyed and only two villages had contamination of their primary water source. Based on perception, 62% of villages have adequate drinking water quality while 58% have adequate quantity.

Table 4.21: Households with access to clean drinking water

Percentage of Households	# of villages
0-24%	10
24-49%	6
50-74%	1
75-100%	31

Table 4.22: Primary Drinking Water Source

WASH Primary Water Source	Number of villages							
	Condition				Quality		Quantity	
	working	damaged	contaminated	destroyed	Adequate	Inadequate	Adequate	Inadequate
Piped water	13	2	1	2	12	6	11	8
Electric pump	11	1	-	-	8	3	9	3
Well/spring	13	-	1	-	17	6	15	6
other	-	1	0	-	0	1	0	1
Total	37	4	2	2	37	16	35	18

The survey collected information on sanitary facilities and supplies. This information is based on answers provided by the respondents. More than three quarters of villages have access to functioning sanitation facilities (Table 4.23). However, of those that answered, 60% considered status of personal hygiene supplies as inadequate (Table 4.24).

Table 4.23: Access to Sanitary Facilities

WASH Pop with access to functioning sanitary facilities	Number of villages
0-24%	5
25-49%	4
50-74%	5
75-100%	46

Table 4.24: Access to hygiene supplies

WASH: Status of personal hygiene supplies	# of villages
Adequate	19
Inadequate	28

**SECTOR: Nutrition**

The survey collected information on foods given to infants and whether there has been any change since the conflict. The most common food for infants before and after the conflict is breastfeeding. However, there have been reports by mothers suffering from trauma having to change to baby food from breastfeeding. Consequently, more infants are on formula than before. Cow's milk, milk powder and commercial baby food are also fed to infants.

SECTOR: Health

The survey collected information on health concerns. The interview asked the village group to identify their main health concerns and to report severity on a scale from low to high. Psychological trauma was listed as the main health concern (Table 4.25). The interview also asked about availability of medicines and medical equipment. Amongst the villages that responded, 76% considered availability of medicines as inadequate and 68% considered supply of medical equipment as inadequate (Table 4.26). Damage to clinics was minimal (Table 4.27). However, a large number of ambulatory clinics and private clinics are not open and over two thirds of ambulatory clinics do not have adequate staff.

Table 4.25: Main health concerns

HEALTH: Main health concerns and severity				
	# of villages: severity			
	none	low	medium	high
Psychological trauma	7	2	23	30
Physical trauma	3	15	4	2
Dehydration	4	6	2	-
Diarrhea	1	6	2	2
Fever	2	9	1	-
Cough and fever (ARI)	2	8	2	2

Table 4.26: Supply of medicine and medical equipment

HEALTH: Availability of medical supplies		# of villages
Medicine	Adequate	10
	Inadequate	33
Equipment	Adequate	12
	Inadequate	26

Table 4.27: Health Facilities

HEALTH: Type of facility	Number of villages					
	damaged		open		Adequate staff	
	yes	no	yes	no	yes	No
Ambulatory clinic	1	40	23	37	20	40
Private clinic	1	59	2	58	1	59

SECTOR: Education



The survey asked about the status of schools. Although the survey was conducted during summer vacations, the villagers were asked if classes are anticipated to resume as normal. One third of villages confirmed classes would resume as normal and two thirds responded with a negative (Table 4.28). The status of basic school and education materials was also recorded. School materials refer to black board, teaching material etc. Educational material refers to text books, pencils, book bags, notebooks etc About 57% of villages reported that basic school materials and educational materials were not affected by war. About 30% of villages complained of insufficient teaching staff.

Table 4.28: Education

EDUCATION		
	Response	# of villages
Are classes being taught	Yes	20
	No	40
Have basic school materials been affected	Not affected	34
	Partially lost	11
	Mostly lost	5
Have educational materials been affected	Not affected	35
	Partially lost	9
	Mostly lost	4
Are there sufficient teachers	Yes	42
	no	18

SECTOR: Relief

Villagers were asked if their village had received relief assistance. Fifty villages had received assistance and only 10 villages had not received any assistance.

Village Priorities

Each village was asked to list in order of priority their greatest needs. The majority of villages listed security, food, irrigation water and winter heating as their greatest needs (Table 4.29). Security refers to the presence of armed military, militia or looters disrupting normal life. Need for food includes food for children and infants. Many farms rely on irrigation water originating from South Ossetia. Diversion of these waters has threatened current horticulture harvest in the short term and the health of fruit trees in the long term. These priorities were followed in lesser degree by the need for credit, shelter and tractors. Only two villages identified drinking water as a first priority. Agricultural inputs were the first priority of only one village though a total of 7 villages identified it as one of the 3 priority areas. Health care was also cited by only one village as their top priority and a total of 13 villages considered it amongst their top 3 priorities. Clearance of UXOs concerned only one village. Sanitation was a concern (third priority) for only 3 villages.

Table 4.29: Greatest Needs Identified by Villages

Greatest Needs	Number of Villages: Priority
-----------------------	-------------------------------------



	First	Second	Third
Security	24	4	3
Food	12	9	19
Irrigation water	7	11	2
Winter heating	5	13	9
Credit	4	6	1
Shelter	4	2	6
Tractors	2	-	2
Drinking water	2	8	3
Ag inputs (mainly seed)	1	2	4
Health care	1	4	8
Fuel	-	3	-
Infrastructure	-	3	-
Electricity	-	1	-
UXO Clearance	-	1	-
Sanitation	-	-	3



4.3 South Shida Kartli

This area was relatively less affected by the war. Most farmers returned to their villages within two weeks of fleeing and could attend to their farms. Sources of surface water do not originate in South Ossetia and irrigation water is plentiful. There is an abundance of deep wells pumping ground water. Access to markets through the M27 highway is good. Damage to buildings was mainly restricted to shattered glass. For cooking and heating, villages have access to gas through the national pipeline. The area is considered to have returned to normal. Malnutrition is not a threat and external assistance is not required.



5.0 MARKETS

5.1 Buffer Zone

Access to markets is a priority for small farmers. Absence of commodity price information and lack of means to deliver their produce to major centres results in low incomes. Establishment of cold chain facilities would increase incomes and the overall household food security of small farmers. The road network is adequate with most farms within a few kilometres of paved roads and even the farthest farm is within 30 kilometres of Gori and 90 kilometres of Tbilisi. However, village shops in the Buffer Zone are not stocking essential food items due to:

- fear of looting
- transporters' refusal to deliver
- low local farm production and
- low local demand.

Insecurity is the underlying cause for each of these factors. Markets are not capable of stocking and supplying essential foods over the winter. With poor harvests and poor markets in the Buffer Zone the food security of villages over winter will be compromised and requires external assistance. Food prices have not escalated since the war. A food commodity price monitoring system is in place for major cities. This should be extended to the Buffer Zone by collecting prices in Mejriskhevi and Breti villages. Prices should be collected on a periodic basis.

5.2 IDPs

Located in the capital city, these IDPs have access to retail and wholesale markets which stock their food preferences at all times and seasons. However, at present, many IDPs do not have access to cooking (stove and fuel). Cash instead of in-kind interventions should be considered once these limitations are overcome. The number of IDPs compared to the overall city population is low yet considerable. Where possible, local purchases of food should be made to ensure beneficiary preferences and cooking/consumption practices.



6.0 FOOD SECURITY MONITORING SYSTEM

A system is required to monitor change in the food security situation of villages in the Buffer Zone and of IDPs in community centres. The system should have a household food consumption component, a markets component and an early warning component.

6.1 Buffer Zone

Availability and retail prices of basic food commodities (wheat, pasta, oil, sugar) should be collected at two villages, Mejvriskhevi and Breti, on a fortnightly basis (Table 6.1). Return of villagers and access to villages should be catalogued.

Table 6.1: Food Security Monitoring Indicators for Buffer Zone

Indicators	Detection
Food availability	Presence of food stocks in village shops
Access to food for purchase	Periodic change in price of food
Physical Access	List of villages inaccessible
Returnees	Villages where all IDPs have returned

6.2 IDPs

Using a sub-sample of the IDPs surveyed, household food consumption, income levels and number of returnees should be monitored (Table 6.2). Retail prices of basic food prices should be collected on a fortnightly basis from two markets in Tbilisi.

Table 6.2: Food Security Monitoring Indicators for IDPs

Indicators	Detection
Access to food for purchase	Periodic change in price of food
Incomes	Number of IDPs with regular incomes
Returnees	Number of IDPs returning to villages



7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Conclusions

7.1.1 Buffer Zone

- Security, food and shelter are the greatest needs identified by villagers
- Without assistance, households will not be able to access adequate food over winter
- Majority of the population has resorted to consuming less food
- In some villages, productive assets have been sold to meet food needs
- Most farmers have lost this season's harvest
- Some villages have lost all their tractors
- In some villages, seeds reserved for next planting have been consumed as food
- Inputs of seed are required to support next season's planting
- Disruption of irrigation water is a major threat to long term food security
- Dairy production is very low due to lack of pasturelands and poor breeds
- There has been no significant change in prices of basic food commodities
- A majority of the population does not have access to markets for purchase of basic foods
- Winter heating is unaffordable for the majority

7.1.2 IDPs

- All IDPs are dependent on food assistance to meet their food needs
- Prevalence of vulnerable groups, especially elderly, amongst IDPs is very high
- A majority of IDPs were subsistence farmers before their displacement
- IDPs have negligible assets and savings and a majority are in debt
- Over half of the IDPs have no income source at all
- Fuel for cooking is unaffordable
- Supplies for personal hygiene are inadequate
- About half the families with children suffer from illness
- Consumption of milk, vegetables, dairy and fruits is low
- Most IDPs prefer resettlement to urban areas
- Potential for learning new skills and trades is high though interest in training is low
- A third require land and about half require equipment
- Most land preferences are between 1 and 2 hectares
- The cash component the majority requires is less than 5000 lari per household
- Equipment requirements include tractors and tools for urban trades
- Trainings include: starting small businesses, driving, nursing and short technical courses



7.2 Recommendations

7.2.1 Buffer Zone

- Restore security
- Continue food/cash assistance over winter
- Rebuild damaged houses and buildings
- Initiate and maintain a food security monitoring system
- Provide seed and fodder immediately
- Provide fuel for winter heating
- Initiate programmes to improve grazing and cow breeds
- Study and fund viable interventions to secure irrigation water

7.2.2 IDPs

- Continue food/cash assistance over winter
- Initiate and maintain a food security monitoring system
- Initiate long term scholarships
- Initiate vocational training
- Expedite formalities for receipt of government allowances
- Provide access to cooking fuel
- Improve access to water and sanitation
- Provide supplies for personal hygiene
- Incorporate beneficiary preferences into relocation plans



ANNEX



IDP
Assessment Sheet Questionnaire #: _____

Date _____ Enumerator name _____ Cell Number _____

Region _____ District _____ City/Village _____ Centre Name _____

DEMOGRAPHICS

Respondent	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of Household	<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Spouse	<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female		
Household Size and Age (years)		Less than 5	5-17	18-59	60 and above
In Centre	Male				
	Female				
In South Ossetia or Buffer Zone	Male				
	Female				
Is any household member disabled? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes					

PRE-CONFLICT STATUS

Location	<input type="checkbox"/> South Ossetia	<input type="checkbox"/> Buffer Zone	Village _____	District _____
Livelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> unskilled labour <input type="checkbox"/> skilled labour <input type="checkbox"/> services			
Land size/type	<input type="checkbox"/> do not own land <input type="checkbox"/> less than 1 ha <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 <input type="checkbox"/> more <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigated <input type="checkbox"/> Rainfed			
Assets	<input type="checkbox"/> orchard	<input type="checkbox"/> cows	<input type="checkbox"/> tractor	
Crops grown	<input type="checkbox"/> cereals <input type="checkbox"/> horticulture <input type="checkbox"/> vegetables <input type="checkbox"/> kitchen garden			

CURRENT STATUS

Assets	<input type="checkbox"/> Car	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewelry
Income Source	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Casual Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Govt allowance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Remittance <input type="checkbox"/> other specify _____ <input type="checkbox"/> None	
Savings	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 100 <input type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input type="checkbox"/> 500-1000 <input type="checkbox"/> above 1000 lari	
Debt	<input type="checkbox"/> no debt <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 100 <input type="checkbox"/> 100-500 <input type="checkbox"/> 500-1000 <input type="checkbox"/> above 1000 lari	
Type of assistance being received <input type="checkbox"/> food <input type="checkbox"/> non-food <input type="checkbox"/> health care		
Access to stove <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Access to fuel for cooking <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Access to clean drinking water (20 litres/person/day) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Access to functioning sanitary facility <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Personal hygiene supplies (soap, sanitary cloth/napkin) availability <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate		
Has any child under 5 years old recently suffered from any of the following?		
<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Diarrhea <input type="checkbox"/> Fever <input type="checkbox"/> Respiratory illness		

Over the last seven days, how many days did your household consume the following food?															
Food Group	Food Items							Number of Days (Circle one)							
Cereals and Tubers	Wheat, maize, barley, rice, pasta, potato							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pulses	Beans, lentils, peas, any types of nuts							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vegetables	Vegetables							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fruits	Fruits and fruit products							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meat and Fish	Beef, pig, goat, sheep, poultry, eggs, fish							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Diary	Milk, yoghurt, cheese or other dairy products							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sugar	Sugar and sugar products							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Oil	Oil, fats, butter							0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7



Questionnaire # _____

EDUCATION LEVEL: check highest education level achieved

Level	Household head	Spouse
Secondary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diploma (subject)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
University (subject)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

RELOCATION: In case of permanent relocation, where would you prefer?

Prefer Relocation to	<input type="checkbox"/> urban	<input type="checkbox"/> rural	<input type="checkbox"/> either	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not know
Why	_____			
Where: District	_____	Region	_____	
Why	_____			

LIVELIHOOD: What livelihood would you prefer to adopt after relocation?

Livelihood	Household head	Spouse
<input type="checkbox"/> Farming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Unskilled labour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Small business specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Services specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other specify _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ASSISTANCE: What assistance would be required to realize this livelihood?

Assistance	Cost (lari)
<input type="checkbox"/> Land (Ha) _____ Type <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigated <input type="checkbox"/> Rainfed	
<input type="checkbox"/> Training, specify type _____ and duration <input type="checkbox"/> day <input type="checkbox"/> week <input type="checkbox"/> month <input type="checkbox"/> 6 months <input type="checkbox"/> 1 year <input type="checkbox"/> 2 years <input type="checkbox"/> don't know	
<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment, specify type _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Cash, specify use _____	

Notes

If both are present, try to interview both head of household and spouse together

DEMOGRAPHICS: age in years

Disability in entire household including members living in origin

PRE-CONFLICT:

- Use map to identify South Ossetia villages
- Inaccessible villages beyond South Ossetia boundary and North of Gori.
- Livelihood: Select one, to indicate the main source of livelihood
-
- Land size refers to agriculture land (crops plus horticulture). Land size includes house, crop land, horticulture, commercial vegetables and kitchen garden



- f. A person working on leased land may select ‘do not own land’ and also indicate land size and land type. Land type response may be both i.e. The respondent has both irrigated and rainfed crops.
- g. Assets: multiple checkmarks are possible. Large farm machinery is mainly tractors. the tractor field may also be ticked if the respondent has large farm machinery such as a truck.
- h. Crops grown may have multiple selections

CURRENT STATUS

- a. Assets: multiple checkmarks are possible.
- b. Income source: multiple checkmarks are possible except if NONE is checked.
- c. Savings: Only one selection is possible. In case of no savings, select *Less than 100*.
- d. Debt: Select either *no debt* or one of the other options
- e. Type of assistance: multiple selection is possible. Even if non-food item such as blankets were received as one-time only, this should be checked. Health care means free access to doctor and medicine.
- f. Access to clean drinking water: tap water in Tbilisi is clean.
- g. Sanitary facility means toilet

DIETARY DIVERSITY AND FOOD CONSUMPTION SCORE

- a. Apply training rules to filling this table. This records household (not individual) recall.

EUCATION LEVEL

- a. This captures formal schooling irrespective of current occupation or skill level.
- b. Under subject list main subject only

Brief the respondent with sensitivity. Although their return to origin is the best option, the following questions are in the event that permanent relocation to other areas must be considered.

RELOCATION

- a. Select one of the 4 options
- b. Under WHY capture main reason

LIVELIHOOD

Select not more than one for household head and not more than one for spouse.

ASSISTANCE

- a. It is possible the respondent wants some irrigated and some rainfed land.
- b. Do not suggest training duration even if the respondent’s time estimate seems wrong.
- c. Leave Cost section n blank if respondent is unable to estimate cost.



Initial Rapid Assessment - VILLAGE LEVEL, GEORGIA
Final Version

This assessment form should be used in close coordination and review with key members of the community (example: the village authorities, community leaders, local health staff, religious leaders, local community based organizations) and take into consideration the need for a balanced representation of women, men and vulnerable groups. Some of the indicators have been **highlighted and underlined** to emphasize their importance. Due to challenges in the field if assessment teams cannot collect answers for all questions then it is suggested to focus on these highlighted key indicators. The security of all participants must be taken into consideration when conducting the assessment.

1. Assessment Team Information

Name of team leader/ organization		Contact Details	
Date of assessment:			
Name of team members	Organization	Phone number	
1)			
2)			
3)			

2. Sample Village/Community

Village Name	Community (Sub-district)	District
P-code*	Latitude (Y)*	Longitude (X)*
Name of Community Leader:		Phone Number:

3. Population data (Village/Settlement level)

3.1 Population of village Prior to conflict

Total number of Families	Male %	Female %	Children < 1 year old

3.2 Peak displacement during the conflict (expressed as a percentage of total population):

3.3 Current population of village

Current number of Families	Male %	Female %	Children < 1 year old

3.4 Due to conflict number of persons:

	TOTAL	Male	Female	Children < 1 year old
Dead:				
Injured:				
Missing				

3.5 Vulnerable groups

Number of persons	Unaccompanied elderly			Unaccompanied minors			Severely Ill / Disabled			Pregnant / Lactating Women	Female headed households
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female		

4. Shelter – possible significant revision

*Optional: Provide P-code if available. If GPS is not available the latitude and longitude are optional.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broken windows, door locks and hinges, roof tiles/sheets - Cut-off from electricity, water - CAN BE REPAIRED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Up to 30% roof damage - Light shelling or bullet impact on walls - Partial fire damage - CAN BE REPAIRED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over 30% roof damage - Severe Fire damage - Need for replacement of floors - Doors and Windows destroyed - All piping, wiring destroyed - CAN BE REPAIRED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Destroyed - Needs reconstruction - CANNOT BE REPAIRED 			
4.1 Damage to family houses (See category guide above)	Total Houses in village	Category 1 (undamaged/unfinished)	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Category 5

4.2 damage to apartment buildings	Total Number	Category 1 (undamaged/unfinished)	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Category 5
Number of BUILDINGS						
Number of individual APARTMENT units						
4.3 Damage to community buildings	WAREHOUSE None / Category	SCHOOL None / Category	CHURCH None / Category	SHOPS None / Category	BAKERY None / Category	HEALTH FAC. None / Category

Note: Circle "None" if no such building exists within the village.

4.4 Was there any new damage after 22 August : Yes / No

4.5 ELECTRICITY Working? Yes / No / Intermittent If intermittent, approx. hours working per day

5. Household food security						
5.1 What percentage of households that lost their household food stocks?				<u>Completely (%)</u>	<u>Partially (%)</u>	
5.2 What percentage of households lost livestock				<u>Completely (%)</u>	<u>Partially (%)</u>	
5.3 What percentage of households may lose their harvest?				<u>Completely (%)</u>	<u>Partially (%)</u>	
5.4 Number of tractors in the village:				<u>Before the conflict</u>	<u>Now</u>	
5.5 Check the main livelihoods of this community?	Circle % of community that this is main livelihood. Have most families resumed livelihood? Y/N					
<input type="checkbox"/> Crop farming1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Horticulture (fruit trees)1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Livestock1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Government allowances1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Remittances1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Small business1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Cottage industry1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Commute to city/town for employment1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%.....	Yes	No



5.6 Price of main commodities?		Unit	Now	Before crisis
Wheat flour		Kg.	_____	_____
Oil		liter	_____	_____
Sugar		kg.	_____	_____
Bread		loaf	_____	_____
Other (Specify) _____		_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	_____	_____

5.7 As a result of the emergency are any of the following coping strategies practiced in the community?

<input type="checkbox"/> Reduce food intake	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Eating unhealthy food / less preferred foods/quality.....	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase in borrowing for consumption purposes	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Sale of productive assets (tractor, milk producing cow, land...) ...	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Sale of household assets	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumption of seed reserved for future planting	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
<input type="checkbox"/> Others (Specify)	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%

5.8 Are markets accessible? Yes No **If Yes, are markets stocked with basic food commodities?** Yes No

6. Protection

6.1 What are the major protection concerns (select all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gender Based Violence or risk of (violence against women (rape, kidnapping, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of Armed Groups
<input type="checkbox"/> Prevalence of small arms
<input type="checkbox"/> Exposure to UXOs/Landmines
<input type="checkbox"/> Traumatized Children / Adults
<input type="checkbox"/> Discrimination/ ethnic tensions | <input type="checkbox"/> Missing persons
<input type="checkbox"/> Separated/Unaccompanied Children
<input type="checkbox"/> Children who have lost both parents: _____ # children
<input type="checkbox"/> Risk of Trafficking
<input type="checkbox"/> Communities have not remained intact
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
|---|---|

(Protection continued) If yes to any of above please provide details on extent and location(s) of problem:

6.2 Ethnic composition of village

a) Before the recent conflict: Georgian _____ % Ossetian _____ % Other: _____ %
b) Presently: Georgian _____ % Ossetian _____ % Other: _____ %

6.3 Is there an IDP caseload from previous conflict living in the community? Yes No

If Yes, please indicate the approximate number of IDP families from previous caseload: _____

7. WASH

7.1 Water Supply

Number of households that HAVE clean drinking water available (20 litres /person/day):

0-24% 25-49% 50-74% 75-99% 100%

Check the primary water source:	Check its current condition:	Perceived Drinking Water...	
		QUALITY	QUANTITY
<input type="checkbox"/> Piped water system	<input type="checkbox"/> Working	Adequate / Inadequate	Adequate / Inadequate
<input type="checkbox"/> Electric pump	<input type="checkbox"/> Damaged (Repair required for minimum supply)	Adequate / Inadequate	Adequate / Inadequate
<input type="checkbox"/> Well/Spring	<input type="checkbox"/> Contaminated	Adequate / Inadequate	Adequate / Inadequate
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Destroyed	Adequate / Inadequate	Adequate / Inadequate

Alternate water source available? Yes No, If yes, type/location/water clear or turbid

7.2 Sanitary facilities

Pop. With access to functioning sanitary facilities/toilets: 0-24% 25-49% 50-74% 75-100%



Adequate personal hygiene supplies available (soap, sanitary cloth/napkins)	Adequate / Inadequate
---	-----------------------

8 Nutrition (If possible ask mothers with infants in the village)

8.1 What foods are fed to infants under 1 year of age (most common first)?

Now: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 	Before conflict: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
---	---

8.2 Is there indication of decreased/interrupted breastfeeding? Yes / No

- If so, what are the reasons?
- What is replacing breastfeeding?

8.3 Have there been any donations of infant formula or commercial baby foods or bottles or teats?

- If yes, source of donation(s) if known:

9. Health

9.1 Main health concerns and severity

(Prevalence: 0 = none; 1 = low; 2 = medium ; 3 = high)

	Prevalence	(H) Other specify:	Prevalence	9.2 Availability of medical supplies
(A) Psychological Trauma	_____	_____	_____	Medicines: <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate Equipment: <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate Specify needs: _____ _____
(B) Physical Trauma /Injuries	_____	_____	_____	
(C) Dehydration	_____	_____	_____	
(D) Diarrhea	_____	_____	_____	
(E) Fever	_____	_____	_____	
(F) Cough and Fever (ARI)	_____	_____	_____	

9.3 Distance to nearest health facility (pre-conflict): _____ kilometers

9.4 Functioning of the health facility nearest to village:

Type of facility:	Damaged		Open		Adequate staff	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Ambulatory clinic						
Private clinic						

If local health facilities are inaccessible for village/community please explain why:

10. Education

10.1 How many children attended the school before the conflict: _____

Are classes being taught and attended in the community: Yes (will resume on time) No

10.2 Have basic SCHOOL materials been affected? (Black boards / Teaching materials, books, etc.)

- 0 Not affected
- 1 Partially lost
- 2 Mostly lost



10.3 Have EDUCATIONAL materials of the children been affected? (Text books, pencils, book bags, note books etc.)

0 Not affected

1 Partially lost

2 Mostly lost

10.4 Are their sufficient TEACHERS in the school to maintain a regular schooling process? Yes No



11. Relief effort/assistance			
11.1 Has the community received any assistance?		Yes	No
If Yes, who is providing what?			
	Organization	Item provided	Quantity
1			
2			
3			
If No, are there any current plans to provide assistance?			
1			
2			
3			
11.2 What do the community members identify as their greatest need:			
1			
2			
3			



Additional comment on finding in village:

A large empty rectangular box with a black border, intended for providing additional comments on findings in a village.



Guidance Note to accompany the Initial Rapid Assessment

The Guidance Note has been prepared with the assistance of CARE International in the Caucasus. It aims to inform the assessment team on how to approach each question of the IRA and fill in the IRA form. The security of all participants must be taken into consideration when conducting the assessment. If there are any threats to personal security the assessment team should stop conducting the assessments immediately.

GENERAL: SECTIONS/QUESTIONS THAT MUST BE ANSWERED ARE MARKED WITH: *

Section 1 * Assessment Team Information	
Question	Key data issues and recording
Name of Team Leader / Organisation	Last name, first name. Abbreviation of the organisation is sufficient. Provide contact details of the team leader (i.e. daytime phone number and e-mail address) next to the Box "Contact Details".
Date of assessment:	Enter in the format <i>dd/mm/yyyy</i>
Name of team members	Last name, first name. Abbreviation of the organisation is sufficient. Add mobile phone # or landline, as appropriate. If more than three members on the team, add additional information on the back of the page.

Section 2 * Sample Village/Community	
Question	Key data issues and recording
Village Name	Enter Village name in Latin in CAPITAL letters
Community	or municipality. Enter name in CAPITAL letters
District	Enter name in CAPITAL letters
Latitude/Longitude	GPS reading in the <u>centre of the village</u> (Optional)
Name of Community Leader	Enter surname, first name, title. If the community leader is unavailable, identify an <u>alternative representative or key community member</u> in the village who can answer the questions in his/her official capacity (example: local health staff, religious leaders, local community based organisations, etc.)
Phone Number:	Try to obtain both his/her landline and mobile phone number, divide numbers with comma or semicolon

Section 3 Population Data (Village/Settlement level)	
Question	Key data issues and recording
3.1*	Enter the total number of Families (not persons!) that lived in the village prior to the conflict in the first column. Include the ESTIMATED total number of male/female as a PERCENTAGE of the total number. Include the number of children younger than 1 year.
3.2	Enter the peak number of families that were displaced during the conflict (even if some of them have returned already) as a percentage of the number under 3.1



3.3	3.1 Enter number of families CURRENTLY living (i.e. regularly staying over night) in the village. Include the ESTIMATED number of male/female as a PERCENTAGE of the total number. If known, include the number of children younger than 1 year.
3.4	Do not write anything in the space behind the question itself, only complete the table below. The total figures must equal the numbers of male plus the numbers of female victims. The number of children younger than 1 year must also be included in the total and male /female, respectively.
3.5	<u>Unaccompanied elderly</u> : Persons older than 60-65 years of age who are separated from their family or previous care giver; <u>unaccompanied minors</u> : are children under 18 years of age who are separated from both parents, or previous/legal customary primary care giver; <u>severely ill/disabled</u> : persons forced to stay in bed, etc.

Section 4 Shelter	
Question	Key data issues and recording
	<p>This section covers damages on three types of buildings: Family houses under question 4.1, Apartments under question 4.2 and community buildings, under question 4.3. All of these buildings can be categorised in five (5) different damage categories, illustrated on page 2 of the IRA Template. Damage Category 1 is NOT illustrated, as it means that NO damages occurred. This applies also for houses that are unfinished.</p> <p>In general, try also to get your own visual impression on the level of damages. You are encouraged to take photos. Please also make photos of areas that are UNDAMAGED, as the pictorial records should describe the overall situation as good as possible. Leave a note on the questionnaire if photos are available and how they can be accessed (e-mail address).</p>
4.1	First enter the total number of FAMILY houses in the village. For the damage assessment, most probably no exact figures are available (except Category 5, which is usually counted). Enter percentages that are given by the focal points.
4.2	This question is about apartment buildings. A building qualifies as an "apartment building" when it has more than three housing units. In the first row under this question, note down the total number of apartment BUILDINGS, and the respective damage levels in percent. In the second row, note down the exact or estimated number of housing units (=apartments). Please note that the percentage of damage for buildings and housing units.
4.3	This question is about community buildings. If there are more than one building in the same category, describe the situation of the building in the WORST condition.
4.4	Circle the right answer. (If there was looting, burning, etc... after 22 August)
4.5	Circle the right answer, and add the number of hours with access to electricity in numbers.

Section 5 Household food security	
Question	Key data issues and recording
5.1	"Household food stock" describes all food items regularly stored in the household. It is not limited to stocks in corn. Stocks of proteins is held of nuts,



	dry fish, smoked meat, etc. Enter percentage of families that lost all their household food stocks (“completely”) and percentage of families that lost part of their household food stocks (“partially”).
5.2	“Livestock” includes cattle and other animals, such as swine, poultry, sheep, goats, horses, etc. Enter percentage of families that lost all livestock (“completely”) and percentage of families that lost part of their livestock (“partially”).
5.3	Enter percentage of families that expect to lose all of their harvest (“completely”), and percentage of families that expect to lose part of their harvest (“partially”).
5.4	Tractors and other agricultural machinery.
5.5	This section consists of three different sections: First tick the boxes (multiple choice possible) on the left to mark the main livelihoods (usually one to three), then try to gauge the percentage of the community with that livelihood – circle the appropriate range (1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75-100%). In a third step, circle “yes” or “no”, if most families have resumed their livelihoods in these areas.
5.6	Add commodities that are not listed if mentioned by the primary source as important (for example fire wood, etc.) Try to enter real prices in Georgian Lari (GEL) only. If you want to use another currency, please indicate the currency clearly. The price difference can also be described in %.
5.7	First mark the relevant (and only the relevant) strategies by ticking the box on the left side. Multiple choices are possible. In a second step. Circle the appropriate range of households that are practicing these strategies (1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75-100%).
5.8	Tick the boxes next to yes and no as appropriate. Please note that there are two questions to be answered.



Section 6 Protection	
Question	Key data issues and recording
6.1	Tick the boxes next to yes and no as appropriate. Multiple choices are possible.
6.2	Enter the estimated percentages as appropriate. PLEASE NOTE: There is a text box on the next page of the template where you can should free text if any of the boxes were ticked WHEN this happened and the details of the extent.
6.3	IDPs displaced from previous conflict that were resettled in the community. If yes, indicate number of families that have been resettled in the community.

Section 7 WASH	
Question	Key data issues and recording
7.1	This question consists of SIX different sections. First tick the box next to the estimated percentage of families with regular (20 l /day) access to drinking water. Only one choice is possible. Then mark the PRIMARY water source (only ONE choice possible!) and tick also the condition on the scale from Working to Destroyed. Then circle “adequate” or “inadequate” on the PERCEIVED (guessed) Quality as well as Quality of DRINKING water (not irrigation water). Finally, mark Yes or No, if an alternate water source is available. If YES, enter text on a) type and b) location, and c) if the water is clear or turbid.
7.2	Tick the box next to the estimated percentage of families with access to functioning toilets etc. Then tick the boxes “adequate” or “inadequate” in regards to access to hygienic items.

Section 8 Nutrition	
Question	Key data issues and recording
	Gather a small group of women to answer both the questions under this section as well as under section 9. If this is not possible, write a quick note, skip the questions.
8.1	Please note that this question does only need to be answered if there are children under 1 year old in this village. If yes, indicate what these children have been fed before the crisis, and then, in a second column, what they are fed today.
8.2	Answer the question “Is there indication of decreased/interrupted breastfeeding?” by writing “YES” or “NO”. On the next two questions (“If so, what are the reasons?” – “What is replacing breastfeeding?”) please write a short answer on the backside of the page
8.3	Tick the Yes or No box as appropriate. If you ticked “YES”, provide a note if the source of the donation (name of the organisation)

Section 9 Health	
Question	Key data issues and recording
9.1	Try to identify the prevalence of EACH concern by rating them as 0=none; 1=low; 2=medium; or 3=high. Do NOT leave blanks. You can add other



	concerns and rate them accordingly.
9.2	Tick the respective boxes regarding availability of medicine and medical equipment. Add text on special needs as required. If you need more space, write on the backside of the page and make a note on that.
9.3	Enter the distance to the next health facility in kilometres into the box.
9.4	Tick the fields with a cross as required. If the local health facilities are inaccessible for the village/community please write a short sentence to explain why.



Section 10 Education	
Question	Key data issues and recording
10.1	Enter number of children.
10.2	Tick the yes/no boxes as appropriate.
10.3	Tick only ONE box.
10.4	Tick only ONE box.
10.5	Tick the yes/no boxes as appropriate.

Section 11 Relief Efforts/Assistance	
Question	Key data issues and recording
11.1	Circle yes or no as required. If the answer is YES, fill out the table below by listing the name(s) of the organisations, the item(s) they provided as well as the quantities. If the answer is NO, fill in the same type of information on plans if KNOWN by the village (NOT by the enumerators!)
11.2	Enter the THREE Most important items in priority order.