

**UNHCR-WFP**  
**JOINT ASSESSMENT MISSION**  
with  
**The Department of State for the Interior**  
And  
**NGOs**  
in  
**THE GAMBIA**



Firewood is one of the most common source of cash for rural refugees in The Gambia © DDY

**November 10- December 04 2009**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This JAM was co-led by UNHCR (Dr Dieudonné YIWEZA, Senior Regional Health, HIV and Nutrition Officer, UNHCR Regional Representation Dakar) and WFP (Mr. Lucas RIEGGER, Emergency Preparedness Officer, WFP Dakar and Ms. Angie LEE, Programme Officer, WFP Rome).

We want to thank the Country Offices of WFP (Mr. Malcolm DUTHIE, Country Director and Mr. Patrick TEIXEIRA, Head of Programme) and UNHCR (Mr. Sekou K. SAHO, Head of Office and Mr. Ilunga Sylvain, Senior Livelihood Expert) for their commitments and facilitation during the exercise.

Our gratitude goes to the Government of The Gambia (Ministry of interior and Immigration, the Gambian Refugee Board and the Governor's Office, Western Region) and to all team members from the Gambia Red Cross Society, GAFNA, Concern Universal. Last but not least, we extend our gratitude to the refugee as well as host communities in The Gambia were available to meet the JAM members.

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

EU:	European Union
FFW:	Food for work
FGD:	focus group discussion
GAFNA:	Gambia Food and Nutrition Association
GFD:	General food distribution
GMD:	Gambian Dalasi (Gambian currency. 1USD=25 DL)
GNIC:	The Gambia National Insurance Company
GRCS:	Gambia Red Cross Society
GID:	Gambia Immigration Department.
IGA:	Income generating activities
IP:	Implementing Partner
JAM:	Joint assessment mission
MFDC:	Movement of Democratic Forces of Casamance
MRC:	Medical Research Council
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding.
MFDC:	Movement of Democratic Forces of Casamance .
NaNA:	National Nutrition agency
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organisation
OAU:	Organization of African Unity.
PLWA:	People Living With AIDS.
PHC:	Primary Health Care
RVTH:	Royal Victoria Teaching Hospital.
SGBV:	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
STD:	Sexually Transmitted Diseases
TB:	Tuberculosis.
UK:	United Kingdom
UN:	United Nations
UNAIDS:	United Nations Joint Programme on AIDS
UNICEF:	United Nations International Children's Fund
UNHCR:	United Nations High Commission for refugees
USA:	United States of America
VDC:	Village development committee
VHW:	Village Health Worker
VCT:	Voluntary Counselling and Testing
WFP:	World Food Program
WHO:	World Health Organisation

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Acknowledgements:	2
List of acronyms:	3
Table of content:	4
Executive summary:	5
Methodology:	9
<b>Part1: Situation overview:</b>	<b>11</b>
A) General Context:	11
<b>Part2: Findings and recommendations:</b>	<b>12</b>
B) Refugee number, location and legal status:	12
C) Nutrition, Health, water and education:	14
D) Food security:	17
E) Self-reliance:	20
F) Partnerships and coordination:	23
G) Options and final recommendations:	23
<b>Part 3: Annexes</b>	
A.1. Action taken on previous recommendations:	25
A.2. Draft joint plan of action (JAP):	27
A.3. TOR JAM 2009:	31
A.4. JAM questionnaires:	36
A.5. References and list of key informants:	41

## a) Executive summary

1. A Joint UNHCR/WFP Assessment Mission (JAM) was conducted to re-assess the food security and self reliance situation of Senegalese refugees in The Gambia to determine the need and level of support beyond December 2009 when the current operation providing food assistance to the refugees will come to an end. The assessment took place almost a year after it was recommended by the previous JAM to change the focus of assistance from food support to livelihood support.
2. The specific objectives of this JAM were, inter alia: i) to review the implementation of the food and non-food assistance strategies that have been used since the last JAM; ii) to determine the number of refugees who are currently registered, have returned to Senegal or will remain in The Gambia beyond December 2009; iii) to assess the current food and future food and non-food needs of refugees with a view towards a 'durable solution' by December 2010; and iv) identify possibilities to collaborate with the Government of The Gambia and partners to devise a sustainable phase out strategy.
3. The findings of this JAM are based on an extensive review of secondary data in reports compiled by WFP, UNHCR and other partners as well as information gathered through key informant meetings in Banjul and analysis of data collected in the field. The mission team visited 11 villages in Foni Districts that were randomly selected and conducted focus group discussions and household interviews with both refugees and hosts. A separate focus group discussion was arranged in Fagi-Kunda to better understand the situation of Senegalese refugees living in urban areas. The results from the analysis of field data cannot be extrapolated to the entire refugee population in the absence of a representative sample<sup>1</sup>. Nonetheless, the findings were conclusive enough to suggest an overall trend that was supported by triangulation with other data sources.
4. The main mission findings and recommendations are as follows:
5. **Location and numbers** – The number of refugees on the registration database often does not match the actual number of refugees living in the respective villages. For instance, the mission team was able to verify only 40 refugee households in Ballen as compared to a total of 274 registered households in the database. In other villages like Buniadu, there were hardly any or no refugees at all to be found. It is possible that this movement of refugees is temporary and fluid in nature (e.g. move to Kombos and nearby urban areas for the feast preparations and wage employment) but there are other accounts of refugees having gone back to the Casamance and returning to The Gambia for the food distribution. Unfortunately, this JAM was not able to draw any definite conclusion on this question and **recommends a follow up inquiry into the identification of refugees' current location and numbers and subsequent updating of the refugee database as an utmost priority.**

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, unless noted otherwise, the findings relate to refugees and hosts in the Foni Districts where the JAM undertook the field visits.

6. **Food security** – There is no sign of deterioration in the food security situation of refugees since the last JAM. Production estimates for the upcoming harvest are well above last year and the 5 year average and expected to cater for over 50% of domestic food needs of rural farmers. At the household level, expected harvest is above average and better than last year with food stocks estimated to last up to 4 months for refugees and 5 months for hosts respectively. Regular sharing of resources including food, seeds and tools between refugees and hosts is common practice and there is no significant difference in the dietary intake and meal frequency between the two groups.
7. **Food security (cont.)** – Refugees are more likely to be food insecure than hosts due to the uncertainty about having guaranteed access to land on a continuing basis, poor soil fertility and lack of farming tools and implements, all of which deny them the possibility of proper reinvestment and asset building. However, both refugees and host groups were identified to resort to similar coping strategies (e.g. more sales of farming produce and firewood collection). **It is therefore recommended to strengthen the current livelihoods support strategy for improved self-reliance of refugees. In particular, the provision of agricultural tools and implements, which was already recommended by the previous JAM but has not been realized yet, should be given priority. Further, the JAM recommends a gradual phase-out of general food distribution with a reasonable timeframe and special consideration towards vulnerable groups<sup>2</sup>.**
8. **Self-reliance** – There are positive signs of refugees having achieved a certain degree of self-reliance since the last JAM. Notwithstanding the fact that the most common income generating activity is firewood and/or charcoal collection, the range of additional income sources has widened including soap making, tie and dye, petty business, sale of cash crops, wages and remittances. Efforts are underway to further improve the coverage and reach-out of micro-finance services to rural areas. In the meantime, a series of vocational trainings have been carried out but often did not directly result in income generating activities. **It is therefore recommended to strengthen the linkage between vocational training and income generating activities by means of developing a proper integration package (e.g. facilitate access to Micro Finance Institutions for those who have received vocational training on small business and entrepreneurship).**
9. **Development projects (including Food For Work)** – It was not clear to determine the status of existing development projects in different villages. The mission team did not find any ongoing development projects in the villages visited. At the same time, there were accounts of duplication of assistance by different partners in the same village(s) without coordination in advance. Food For Work (FFW) schemes are found to be generally appreciated by both refugees and hosts, despite the fact that certain types of activity (forestation) proved to be more effective than other types (communal farming and road rehabilitation). It is too early to gauge the true impact of these development projects on the livelihoods of refugees and hosts; however,

---

<sup>2</sup> The vulnerability criteria should consider a time-bound benchmark and go beyond the general demographics (e.g. female-headed households, elderly, physically ill etc.). This can be developed in lieu of the updating of refugee database.

there are few best practice examples (e.g. Jalokoto and Bullock) that indicate potential. **It is thus recommended to draw lessons learned and exchange best practice for development projects and FFW schemes and explore ways to replicate a 'working model'.**

10. **Shelter** – The housing situation of the refugees has improved with most refugees now living in their own houses as compared to the situation assessed by the last JAM when 80% of refugee families lived under one roof with host families. There is also no clear evidence that the general living conditions of refugees are significantly different from those of hosts. Given the fact that refugees have access to land for housing and necessary support within the communities, there may be reasons why some refugees are still living with host families that are not only accounted for by their vulnerability (e.g. secondary movement to urban areas or back to Senegal). **It is recommended to carry out a verification exercise to better understand this dynamic and subsequently recommend strategy for households who cannot afford to build their own houses due to vulnerability.**
11. **Water** – With a few exceptions, drinking water is available in refugee hosting communities. However, as already stated in the previous JAM report, water for other types of domestic and non-domestic use (farming, gardening, livestock etc.) is insufficient. Further, the poor maintenance of hand pumps is a common factor that aggravates water availability and access problems. **It is critical to increase the number of water sources that meet the needs and established standards (i.e. SPHERE standards, although notwithstanding the local context) as access to water is key to the livelihood activities of both refugees and hosts who depend mostly on farming and gardening.**
12. **Health and sanitation** – Refugees have access to three hospitals in Bwiam, Sibanor and Kaffuta although it is difficult to access these for those who do not live in the nearby villages. There were also reported cases on late disbursement of revolving funds to recover medical expenses. The mission also noted that health posts/centres in the communities are often of poor quality with lack of trained staff, drugs and equipments. Other sanitation aspects were not captured through this JAM and **it is recommended to organize a comprehensive public health assessment of refugees and hosts to improve access to and quality of health care. Furthermore, the *Fourth Nutrition and Health Status Survey of Casamance Refugees in The Gambia* should be conducted as soon as possible to complement the findings of this JAM as planned.**
13. **Education** – Access to education, particularly primary schooling, is acceptable for both refugees and hosts. However, some refugee children are reported to attend school without receiving school fee support as they did not reach school –age at the time when the initial identification survey was conducted and therefore were not captured. There were reports of children crossing the border to attend schools in the Casamance which raises concerns for security (although, there haven't been incidents involving threats to children to date with the exception of an unexploded ordnance incident in 2008). **The mission recommends discussions with UNICEF and the Ministry of Education on sustainable access mechanisms to education for refugees. It is also recommended to update in the mean time the list of**

**refugee households who are eligible for educational support and also explore ways to provide support for access to secondary and tertiary schooling.**

14. In conclusion, the JAM duly notes that the shift from food support to livelihoods support has been appropriate and the focus on the latter should be maintained. Given the increased degrees of food security and self-reliance attained by refugees despite the reduction in food distribution over the last few years, the JAM **recommends a complete phase out of food assistance by mid-2010 for the non-vulnerable refugee population**, contingent to the following conditions:

- a. Continue with the current food assistance (50% GFD and 50% FFW) for the initial transition period during which the refugee database should be updated (see paragraph hereunder).
- b. Update refugee database – by means of a rigorous population survey if necessary – to provide a clear picture on the number, location and vulnerability criteria of refugees.
- c. Upon updating of refugee database, there will be two target groups:
  - i. the non-vulnerable refugee population will be assisted through FFW/FFT schemes only during the remaining months until complete phase-out by June 2010<sup>3</sup>; and
  - ii. the vulnerable refugee population will be assisted with a full ration of 2,100 Kcal at least until the next harvest season (September – October 2010) and beyond if necessary and given priority consideration for the aforementioned integration package with regard to IGA and other self-reliance opportunities.
- d. Partners should continue their efforts in providing enhanced livelihoods support to refugees across different sectors and also invite other development partners including World Bank, ILO, FAO, UNDP etc. and consulting donors with development agenda for future collaboration. Examples of partners in-country who may be engaged are: the IFAD-funded Rural Finance Project (for access to micro-credit and skills training) and other relevant government agencies such as the Department of Water Resources.
- e. Meanwhile all current partners should work towards an improved coordination and partnership mechanism by engaging in regular dialogue at the strategic management level and fully committing to field monitoring responsibilities (i.e. systematic documentation and compilation of progress reports with clear outputs and outcomes).

---

<sup>3</sup> The findings of the JAM regarding food availability (bumper harvest and household food stocks up to 4 months) and increased degree of self-reliance support the assumption that the non-vulnerable population will be less subject to deterioration in food security compared to last year.



## **b) Methodology**

As per the ToRs, information was collected by the JAM through a combination of:

- i) review of secondary data including progress reports, assessment reports, project documents, previous nutrition surveys, self-reliance and livelihoods study, and other reports compiled by WFP, UNHCR and partners;
- ii) meetings with national, regional and local authorities, implementing partners and other organizations working with refugees in food and livelihoods related programmes in addition to UNHCR and WFP staff; and
- iii) data collection in the field through visits of sites where refugees are located.

In particular, data collection in the field was organized as follows:

### *Planning*

Data collection in the field comprised of focus group discussion with refugees and hosts communities respectively complemented by household visits for individual interviews (with head of household). Structured questionnaires were used for both the focus group discussion and individual household interview.

Twelve out of a total of 56 refugee hosting villages located in the Kombo East and Foni Districts were randomly selected. In each village, it was planned to conduct two focus group discussions and six household interviews (three refugee households and three host households with each household belonging to different wealth groups, i.e. very poor/poor/better off).

### *Implementation*

Two out of the 12 selected villages were excluded from the data collection because there were either no or hardly any refugee households to be found (contrary to the number of households indicated on the refugee database). The assessment team decided to replace one village with another nearby village with a bigger refugee population. Also, instead of visiting an additional village to recuperate the total number of villages visited in the rural areas as per original planning, the assessment team chose to visit an urban area near Banjul to gain a better understanding of the urban refugees.

### *Limitations*

In four villages, only one focus group discussion was conducted involving both refugees and hosts either due to time constraints or insufficient number of households available in each group for a separate discussion. The presence of the host community in the wider group discussion may have influenced the answers of the refugee community (and vice versa). Also, the identification of individual households belonging to different wealth groups was challenging as more than often the village representatives (“alkalo”) could not make a clear distinction. By contrast, the distinction was feasible for the refugee group with the help of the refugee representative (Village Development Committee or Activity Coordinator) and food aid monitors who were part of the assessment team. Therefore, the wealth group analysis was only done for the refugee group.

In the end, a total of 19 focus group discussions (18 in rural areas and one in urban area) and 64 household interviews (33 refugee households and 31 host households) were conducted. It should be noted that the results from the analysis of field data – particularly from household interviews – cannot be extrapolated to the entire refugee population in the absence of a representative sample. Nonetheless, the findings were conclusive enough to suggest an overall trend which was supported by triangulation with other data sources.

*Summary of data collection in the field*

Village	# FGD	# HH (Refugees)	# HH (Host)	Comments
Jalokoto	1	3	3	Time constraint
Janack	2	3	3	
Ballen	2	3	3	
Gikess/Bita	2	3	3	FGD also with Bita as Gikess is sub-village of Bita
Kandonku	x	X	X	No refugee households
Karunor	1	3	3	Time constraint
Kappa	2	3	3	
Buniadu	2	3	3	
Kaimu Karanai	1	3	3	No refugee FGD; but 3 out of a total of 4 available refugee households interviewed
Arangallen	2	2	2	Poor data quality
Omoroto	x	X	X	Not enough refugee households
Bulock	1	3	3	
Bwiam	2	4	3	
Fagi Kunda	1	X	X	Urban refugees
TOTAL	18	33	31	

## PART 1 – SITUATION OVERVIEW

### A) General context

The insurgency in Senegal's southern region, known as the CASAMANCE, began in 1982. It is characterized by sporadic waves of conflict within the Movement of Democratic Forces of Casamance (MFDC) rebel groups and between these groups and the Government of Senegal's armed forces. This conflict has resulted in refugees fleeing into The Gambia for the past 20 years, but with the majority returning home when tensions decreased.

Since August 2006, intermittent fighting between the Senegalese Army and at least one of the MFDC groups, and conflicts between rebel groups are prevalent in the area bordering the Western Division of The Gambia, in particular the western and central areas of the FONIS.

Senegalese families were welcomed and housed by Gambian host families, who share a common JOLA ethnicity and are often members of the same extended families. Refugees arrived carrying very few of their assets, settled in 56 scattered villages and have been sharing shelter and food with their host families, who are predominantly farmers.

In response to the refugee influx, WFP launched a four-month Emergency Operation following **the first** Joint UNHCR/WFP Assessment Mission (JAM) conducted in mid-September 2006, which confirmed the urgent food needs for both refugees and host families. The operation aimed at providing full daily rations to the refugees from October 2006 and food assistance to host families through Food For Work for Community Asset Development during the lean or hungry season (May-September 2007).

The continuing sporadic fighting in the Casamance region and in the areas in the immediate vicinity of The Gambian border rendered the area very unstable and tense and the refugees continued to consider it too unsafe and unstable to go back to their original villages.

**A second** JAM conducted in February 2008 concluded that the return of the refugees to their regions of origin could not be planned at this stage because of the prevailing security situation in Casamance and WFP recommended that the EMOP (Emergency Operation) be extended for a period of six months from September 2008 to end March 2009. UNHCR recommended a one year extension of the EMOP i.e. until end of August 2009. WFP also recommended to reduce the ration as of January 2009, after the harvest when food availability and access is at its highest (given improved conditions for the refugees). The 2008 JAM also recommended that WFP and UNHCR undertake an in-depth food security and self-reliance assessment in December 2008 in order to determine the level of self-reliance among all refugees to determine the plans for future support.

**A third** Joint Qualitative Rapid Assessment Mission was conducted end December 2008. The mission recommended a change of focus of assistance from food support to livelihood support. Full rations were recommended for vulnerable households only. Reduction in rations was adopted for valid heads of households who were urged to complement their entitlement by participating in community asset development programmes through Food-For-Work schemes. The mission further recommended the active contributions of the Government and all humanitarian actors in the provision of an integrated support package consisting of agricultural inputs, Food-For-Work, construction materials and technical support.

Clear commitments and timely implementation of this integrated package was seen as an essential requirement towards creating an environment that would enable refugees to attain self-reliance.

Following the December 2008 JAM, it was agreed that in order to determine whether the support to improve the livelihood situation of refugees would be extended beyond December 2009, a **fourth** JAM would be conducted in October 2009.

Refugees derive their subsistence through a mix of food and non-food support from WFP, UNHCR, The Gambia Red Cross Society and various NGOs, primarily, as well as various income earning activities including firewood collection and farming. Sending the adult male household members to seek employment in the urban and peri-urban areas (known as the Kombos) is also a coping strategy for refugee and host families alike, especially in the dry season, from January to June.

## PART 2 – FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### B) REFUGEE NUMBERS, LOCATION AND LEGAL STATUS

In August 2006, following intensified hostilities between the Senegalese army and rebel groups in the Casamance region; some 6,500 refugees fled into The Gambia and sought refuge in 56 villages of Kombo East and Foni Districts. The number of refugees increased to 7,290 after a supplementary registration exercise was conducted by UNHCR in November 2007 in order to pick up the scattered families that missed the initial registration. Further refugee movement to urban areas has brought the number of refugees being assisted to 7,000. While the conflict has been long standing, it has escalated with the involvement of the Senegalese army more permanently deployed along the border and with increased fighting between rebel factions.

As clashes in the border area continued, any discussion of repatriation of the refugees was precluded.

**Table 1. List of Villages, Number of Households and Refugees**

Village Name	No. of Households	No. of Refugees	Village Name	No. of Households	No. of Refugees
Bajakarr	22	168	Janack	25	213
Luluchor	10	48	Tampato	2	20
Kappa	38	254	Kabokorr	3	16
Karunorr	25	182	Kanuma	2	11
Baipah	6	47	Janaguel	2	23
Balen	47	282	Jakoi Bintang	1	2
Kafuta	3	45	Manena	8	48
Omorto	8	29	Upat	40	485
Kafuta Tumbung	11	58	Batabutu Kantora	16	118
Penyem	2	16	Arangellen	33	258
Ndemban	6	26	Sitta	1	12
Kanjabina	40	243	Denilo	13	91
Ndemban Jola	41	290	Jako	1	4
Bulock	100	945	Kambong Madina	5	58

Village Name	No. of Households	No. of Refugees		Village Name	No. of Households	No. of Refugees
Somita	7	49		Bugingha	14	59
Jalokoto	25	165		Bwiam Kurunlie	5	37
Gikess	10	67		Karor	3	11
Bitta	18	153		Kambong	3	13
Batendeng Kajara	4	17		Bwiam	24	174
Kandonku	4	30		Bwiam Ginia	1	12
Jakoi Paima	0	0		Baleyu	3	17
Kaimu Karannai	4	45		Kaling	4	18
Kaimu Bintang	9	59		Jibanack	2	4
Bunyadu	17	162		Funtang	10	70
Seaul	28	130		Kampant	4	24
Kusamai	68	504		Karania	3	15
Sibanor	25	166		Gikess Dando	12	46
Kamosor	4	9		Kayanga	3	5
Tamba Kunda	22	186		Monon	4	32
Jilanfar	8	66		Buluntu	16	104
Kanilai	1	11		Dobong	10	74
Kayanga	10	63		Kantiba	1	5
Jifanga	93	826		Jagil	14	26
Batendeng	2	11		Grand Total	958	7290

Source: WFP, Food Distribution List, February 2008

The total number of households in each community was not always clear; although in lieu of the Food For Work (FFW) schemes, the Village Development Committee/Activity Coordinator (VDC) is supposed to have the most up to date figure.

In January 2008, there were 7,290 refugees (or 834 families) in the region; in October 2008, only 6,410 showed up for food collection.

During the current JAM, interviewees were reluctant to indicate who (among the registered households) are not actually living in the area:

- In Ballen, 274 households are registered in the database and the team only encountered 40 refugee HH heads as  $\frac{3}{4}$  of them went to Serakunda.
- In Buniadu, it was difficult to find any refugees at all.

While there is sufficient evidence of secondary movements of refugees (many refugees do not live in areas where they are registered), it was not easy to estimate the percentage of family (members) who returned home to CASAMANCE or moved to *KOMBOS*. As community members are very well aware of the fact that the presence in the community is linked to access to food distribution and other assistance, most of them do not disclose during focus group discussion (FGD) the number of those families who have returned back to CASAMANCE or are living outside the primary sites (i.e. place of registration). It is possible that refugees who have returned to CASAMANCE or are living in other places come to the primary sites just to collect food rations <sup>4</sup>

Possible reasons for movement include, inter alia, movement to Kombos for feast preparation (Tobaski) and children going to school in Casamance where there is no need to pay fees (there were also reports of Gambian children going to Casamance for schooling).

<sup>4</sup> In fact, secondary movement inside the country of asylum does not affect the refugees status and access to available assistance.

During the January 2008 JAM, most refugees intended to stay and settle in The Gambia. In the meantime, UNHCR and the Government of The Gambia have been working towards the establishment of a Refugees Act “to make better provision of the management of refugee affairs in The Gambia by establishing the Gambia Commission for Refugees and for matters connected therewith”.

This Refugee Bill granting the refugees the same rights as the local Gambians in terms of access to different services (but necessarily nullifying their refugee status) was passed by the Assembly and has been enacted by the President of the National Assembly on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2008.

During this JAM’s key informant meetings, an official from The Government of The Gambia stated refugees *could stay*. It is necessary to confirm the government’s official position on refugee settlement and/or integration option.

➔ **Recommendations:**

- Update basic household demographics as the current data is 2-3 years old and the numbers on the registration list/database do not reflect the actual numbers on the ground.
- Follow up with UNHCR Country Office and the Regional Bureau in Dakar on re-registration/verifications options.
- Ensure VDC/Activity Coordinators keep an up-to-date record of and regularly report on the number of refugee households that participate in FFW schemes, which will help track the number of present vs. absent refugees.
- Follow up UNHCR and WFP’s current position on assisting villages close to the border (established rules call for a minimum distance of 50 km)
- Confirm the government’s position on refugees settlement and/or integration option.

## **C) NUTRITIONAL AND HEALTH SITUATION; ACCESS TO WATER AND EDUCATION**

### **C.1. NUTRITION:**

Two initial health and nutrition surveys were conducted in June and November 2007, as recommended by the first JAM in 2006.

The third survey took place in November 2008 just after the rainy season (lean season).

This JAM mission did not fully assess the nutrition and health status of the Casamance refugees as a comprehensive health and nutrition survey by NaNA was planned to be conducted in parallel but was eventually delayed. The information presented in the following section draws upon the most recent survey conducted for WFP by NaNA (National Nutrition Agency) in **November 2008**:

- All children were or have been breastfed with more than 80% exclusively breastfed.
- The median duration of breastfeeding was 24 months.
- The addition of food (eggs, oil, milk and fish) was almost insignificant.
- Primary source of drinking water was from protected sources while 27.8% of respondents had their water from unprotected wells.
- 70.9% of children were vaccinated against measles. Vitamin A was given to 53.6% of children while 27.6% have been de-wormed.

- Weight-for-Height: compared to the November 2007 figure of 6.3%, the proportion of wasting in children aged 0-59 months is about the same at 6.1%.<sup>5</sup>

The November 2008 Health and Nutrition survey concluded that *“food aid and other interventions for the refugee population appear to be contributing positively to the well-being of the refugees. Therefore, the food aid and other interventions such as vaccinations, vitamin A supplementation and de-worming should be continued”*.

This JAM noted that the overall nutritional and health situation for the refugees was adequate and no alarming trends of deterioration have been detected through over the time period of the three surveys.

**→ Recommendation:**

- Conduct the fourth Health and Nutrition survey by NaNA should take place the soonest in order to confirm and complement the qualitative findings of this JAM.

## **C.2. HEALTH**

Access to health care is perceived to be good for refugees and bad for 50% of host community. UNHCR has an agreement with 3 hospital where refugees with an identity card (ID) can be treated “for free” [i.e. UNHCR pays the medical bills at the end of the month]. The selected hospitals (Sulayman Junkung Jammeh hospital in Bwiam, WEC Clinic in Sibanor and Kaffuta Health Center in Kaffuta) are located at least 6 km away from the areas where most refugees are located. In order to reach these hospitals, refugees have to pay transport (approximately 50-70 Dalasis= USD 2-2.5), which is not always easy for some families. When they cannot afford to pay transport, refugees in few communities – e.g. Bullock and Kappa – have access to clinics (or health posts) near their communities. In these clinics, they pay 5-25 Dalasis for consultation and drugs. This is the same for the local Gambians as well.

**The quality of services in these village health posts** is substandard due to lack of drugs, materials, equipments and trained staff as identified during this short JAM. Refugees prefer to go to hospitals as they can see a doctor or a trained nurse and laboratory test can be performed, which is not possible in village clinics. The most common diseases according to both refugee and host population are malaria, respiratory infection and diarrhea. High blood pressure was mentioned as a common health condition.

In two communities, refugees and host communities revealed that they first go to a traditional healer when they are sick and then go to the village clinic if there are no signs of improvement (also in the case of malaria). No one has been refused health care at the clinic because of lack of cash.

**→ Recommendations:**

- UNHCR to organize (as planned) a comprehensive Public/Reproductive Health and HIV/AIDS assessment among refugees and host communities and make clear and practical recommendations.
- Conduct proper sensitization in terms of access to health care as some refugees are confused about which health facilities they can visit for free consultation.

## **C.3. WATER:**

---

<sup>5</sup> Wasting is an indicator of recent nutritional deficiency. The 6.1 % is still below the national average of 7% (NaNA, 2005).

All 11 villages have access to **drinking water from pumps** (two villages have both pump and well). The quality of water from the pumps was not assessed<sup>6</sup>. Of 5 pumps in JALAKOKTO, only one is functioning; 1 out of 3 wells is currently in use. Open wells are most likely not to meet the standards for drinking water and the maintenance of the hand pumps is poor in many communities (VDC/Activity Coordinator not active enough for proper maintenance). This affects access to safe drinking water. In Bullock village where a high number of refugees settlements have taken place, the issues of access to potable drinking water is a concern as other compounds are more than 500 meters away from the main water source.

When it comes to water used for other purposes, all communities mentioned having serious problems; in particular, **water for kitchen gardening was reported to be insufficient**. This affects crop production and therefore **food security** for community members.

#### → Recommendations:

- Strengthen VDC/Activity Coordinators and Water Committees to ensure establishment of strategies for **maintenance and repair of pumps**. This would develop **ownership spirit** of water sources by communities.
- After mapping of water sources in each village, install additional pumps in communities with larger number of population to meet recommended standards (500 persons per hand pump) and to ensure communities have enough water for Kitchen gardening during the dry season (which lasts 9 months).

#### C.4. EDUCATION:

Refugees' school-aged children have easy access to school; GRCS provided school fees and uniforms for the school year 2008-2009. Five out of 33 house hold perceive access to education good not good.

Reasons for children not attending school include distance, lack of nursery and lack of money (especially for secondary schools which require fees for entrance exams).

Some children who were not captured initially because they did not reach school age at the time when UNHCR/GRCS was conducting the identification exercise but are in the meantime at school do not receive any support.

Some refugee children go to Casamance everyday to attend school there and come back in the evening, as families prefer their children to study in French so they can attend French high schools (*lycee*) and also schools are free of charge. It was reported that combatants do not attack children crossing to and from Casamance.

#### → Recommendations

- Proactively engage in discussions with UNICEF and the Ministry of Education on sustainable access mechanisms to education for refugees for the coming school years.
- In the meantime, UNHCR should update the list of refugee households who are eligible for educational support especially for secondary and tertiary schooling, taking into account language issues for refugee children.

#### C.5. VOCATIONAL TRAINING

---

<sup>6</sup> However, diarrhea and skin disease have been mentioned as common in two out of 11 communities. This might not be related to the quality of water but rather to the overall hygienic conditions. This JAM was not able to determine the real cause behind the incidence of diarrhea and skin disease.



Vocational trainings have been organized mostly for refugee women and include marketing, soap making, tie & dye and tailoring. Host communities have not benefited much from any vocational training. Soap making and tie and dye are the most appreciated trainings as they provide “quick” cash income. Tailoring was also mentioned as an important skill especially during the period before the *Tobaski* feast.

In Bullock, more than 225 refugee women and men were trained on soap making and are currently producing their own products and selling them to customers in the local community and in the urban centers. The proceeds collected from the sales (around 100 USD) are deposited in one of the Microfinance Institution (MFI) at the area.

In some refugee settlements or clusters, there were already centers dedicated to skills development<sup>7</sup>.

An agricultural extension worker organized seed distribution and training on seed multiplication, provision of fertilizer and herbicide, training on farming techniques at Janack for 30 farmers identified in 6 refugee communities in Foni in August 2009. In July 2009, tree planting (5000 seedlings per community) for six communities with 50 participants – refugees and hosts – was organized. An adult literacy programme was conducted in July 2009 in six villages mainly targeting women. Modules include health, personal hygiene, community action plan, soap making & tie-dye. In addition, the following trainings were conducted:

- Three day workshop on entrepreneurship and micro finance for rural refugees – 50 participants from 18 villages in the three districts of Foni Berefet, Bintang Karani and Kansala;
- Three day training on tie & dye for urban refugees (30 participants); and
- Vocational skills training on hairdressing, cookery and tailoring for 15 females in rural areas<sup>8</sup>.

#### ➔ Recommendations:

- Conduct training in welding procedures to help communities to repair and maintain agricultural tools.
- Link vocational training attendees to self-reliance activities through access to Microfinance and other IGA (Income generating activities) opportunities

## D) FOOD SECURITY

### D.1. Food access (Household food security)

#### *Food sources*

At the time of the previous JAM (Dec-08), a high percentage of refugee households reported to depend almost entirely on food aid for their daily meals. Most refugees cultivated some land but harvest was found to be generally poor with grains barely lasting two months. On the contrary, this JAM found that the expected harvest at household level is above

<sup>7</sup> Local integration and livelihoods support strategy – GAFNA (Oct-09)

<sup>8</sup> 2009 Concern Universal’s interim report on DDR intervention program targeting refugee host communities in The Gambia

average/acceptable. Better-off refugee households (seven out of a total of 33) indicated food stocks will last 4 months whereby poor and very poor refugee households indicated a range of 1.5 – 2.5 months. By comparison, host households indicated production will last up to 5 months.

#### *Access to land*

Refugees do not have difficulties accessing land (12 out of a total of 33 households indicated there is sufficient land) apart from a few exceptions in Bwiam, Sibanor and Bullock due to crowding and proximity to the urban areas. Poor soil quality and lack of assurance/guarantee for continuous land usage in the following seasons together with the late arrival and poor quality of seeds, insufficient water for irrigation, and lack of tools and implements are major limiting factors for expansion of cultivated areas.

#### *Food preferences*

Household production of millet, maize and coos is mostly allocated for self consumption. Focus group discussion results revealed that on average the number of daily meals is two and animal protein intake is three times per week for both refugee and host households.

#### *Market access*

Both hosts and refugees continue to resort to largely subsistence farming but as opposed to the previous JAM, there is evidence of sales of produce. For instance, 25% of refugee households and 34% of host households respectively indicated to profit from groundnut production sales and some households reported to sell cassava as well. Host households, having access to better quality land, usually have more diverse products to sell including pepper, onion and tomato.

The latest livelihoods support reports by UNHCR and partners (GAFNA) released in April and October 2009 respectively indicated that mechanisms for refugees to access the market outlets in the Fonis and in urban centers are well in place. In particular, the new market in Bwiam is expected to serve as the main access point for marketing refugee products.

#### *Economic resources*

The previous JAM noted that 70-80% of refugee families own hardly any assets and that there is almost no additional income. Only sources of external income reported were mud brick making and firewood sale as well as remittances by adults and adolescents working in pre-urban areas around Bangui. This JAM also noted that the most common additional income source for refugees if any is firewood sales but at the same time, the range of sources has diversified to include sales of agricultural produce, wage employment and remittances. For instance, out of 33 refugee households, 22 indicated to resort to sale of kitchen garden produce and 15 indicated to resort to wage employment (including as a shepherd, mechanic, tailor, mason etc.) or remittances.

#### *Livelihoods and coping mechanism*

Most interviewed refugees are farmers even those refugees who were formerly engaging in other livelihood activities in Casamance and those who travel to Kombos/urban areas for skilled wage employment (e.g. tailors, carpenters, blacksmiths etc.) remain in the rural areas during the rainy season to engage in farming. Regular sharing of resources between hosts and refugees in terms of food, seeds, tools and implements continues to take place and there are indications of a strong interdependent social network between the two groups. However, refugees can only use the tools and implements once hosts are finished using

them which often results in refugees not being able to cultivate in time according to the usual crop cycle.

Focus group discussion and household interviews revealed that hosts are equally concerned about the likely negative impact the discontinuation of food aid will have on their own livelihoods. At the same time, 44 out of a total of 64 households (refugees and hosts alike) responded that in such an event, they will cope by relying more on farming. This in itself is an indication of self-reliance attained by both communities since the previous JAM.

## **D.2. Food availability**

### *Pipeline and logistics*

Due to lack of timely contributions the project experienced considerable pipeline breaks in 2009. The breaks started in June 2009 and the project had to borrow food from the WFP's Development project to meet its obligations. Contributions were however received and programmed in June 2009 and the commodities (rice, CSB, oil and peas) arrived in September/October 2009. Upon repayment of the loans to the development project, the balances of food commodities were only able to meet 26 percent of the requirements for November and December 2009. Consequently, rations for General Food Distribution had to be reduced by 50% and the FFW activities cancelled.

As at end of December 2009 the stock balances were rice: 3.90, peas: 1.46, CSB: 7.08, oil: 10.38 and salt: 3.89 totaling 26.71 Mt. The total food requirement for the three-month recommended extension period is 332.67 mt. Given the lead time for international procurement of food commodities and the absence of confirmed contributions, the project will be not be in a position to honour its obligation in January 2010.

### *Rations and targeting*

Following the recommendations by the previous JAM (Dec-08), full ration was provided to the most vulnerable households only and a ration cut of 30% (in terms of kilocalorie) for the rest of the beneficiaries of General Food Distribution (GFD). This came into effect in January 2009. The most vulnerable households that received full ration included the elderly, the ill, physically disabled, widows with children, etc. As of July 2009, 50% of the total tonnage was transferred to Food For Work (FFW) schemes and full ration was restituted for all GFD beneficiaries.

FFW schemes were also extended to the members of host communities whereby the number of participating hosts was consistently higher than that of refugees in most of the villages for which reliable data on participation levels is available (30 communities). Globally, the level of participation in FFW amounts to 975 members from host and 865 from refugee families. On average, 1 out of 10 members of the refugee population participate in FFW and 2 out of 10 refugees are considered vulnerable.

As of November 2009, all beneficiaries of General Food Distribution received half a ration due to shortage in the pipeline

The standard monthly ration with 2,100 kcal per day consisted of Rice 400grms, Peas 65grms, CSB 65grms, Vegetable Oil 25ml, and Salt 5 grms per person.

### *Production*

According to the Joint Pre-Harvest Assessment Mission (CILSS/FAO/FEWS/WFP/Gov't) of the 2009-2010 cropping season, production estimates for the upcoming harvest are well above last year and 5 year average with cereal grain production 10.5% higher than last year and 27.8% higher than the 5 year average. Also, food production in 2009 is expected to cater for over 50% of domestic food needs of rural farmers and the prospects for food supplies are expected to be greater than last year even with the worst case scenario.

There were heavy rains during the period of August –September, and large scale floods negatively affected those with limited coping mechanism, limiting their food self sufficiency to two to three months. However, there was little impact felt in the Foniis regarding the floods and the significant drop in lowland tidal and swamp production will be compensated more than enough by the upland rice production, which is 58.3% higher than last year.

**Given all of the above, the JAM concluded that there is no sign of deterioration in refugees' food security since the previous JAM. Although refugees are more likely to be food insecure than hosts, given the latter has comparative advantage with regard to access to better quality land and additional income sources, the difference in the level of food security between the two groups is not too evident. In fact, food insecurity faced by worse off refugee households is not attributable to their refugee status but rather to structural issues such as poverty and economic conditions which affect host households as well.**

#### → Recommendations:

- Strengthen livelihoods support strategy for improved self reliance (e.g. provision of non food items such as fertilizers and other farming tools and implements and technical support for increased productivity and better marketization of refugees' produce).
- Devise phase-out of food assistance with reasonable timeframe and special consideration towards vulnerable groups.

## **E) SELF-RELIANCE**

### **E.1. EMPLOYEMENT OPPORTUNITIES & IGA**

The January 2008 JAM's recommendations included agricultural extension to improve cultivation practices and identify other income generating projects outside of agriculture through reactivation of existing professional skills within refugee community (i.e. use existing survey data and/or conduct special survey to identify craftsmen and focus on them) None of these recommendations has been implemented.

Employment market is already completely saturated in The Gambia for Nationals; it is very hard for refugees to get remunerated employment.

Firewood collection, tie & dye and soap making are one of the most common sources of income. As depletion of firewood is increasing, people start going to Casamance collect firewood (Karunor) which expose them to land mine and abduction risks.

Garden produce are difficult to sell (not because of access to market but due to poor quality of produce).

On Micro-Credit, some refugees have heard about micro-credits but they do not have access to it. Reasons include lack of fund to open an account, lack of clear information on the process

In Foni-Western regions, there are six Micro Finance Institutions (MIFs). Refugees in Bullock already started saving but interest rates for loan and savings range from 5-10% and 20-24%.

In Kappa, host community women have access to credit but do not want to include refugees because they are mobile.

During January – December 2009, cash grants were given to a total of 115: 78 urban (23 female) and 37 rural (12 female) Senegalese refugees. Total of 385,500 Dalasis (around 14277.78 USD) was disbursed (flat rate per person unknown). In the rural areas, cash grants were given to the old, the handicapped and female HH heads.

**→ Recommendations:**

- Develop a proper integration package/mechanism which will ensure vocational training is followed by income generating opportunities
- Continue with ongoing roll-out of MFI services and expand to rural areas.
- Map out existing development projects to ensure efforts by different partners are complementary.

**E.2. FOOD FOR WORK (FFW)**

The number of FFW beneficiaries indicates that participation is skewed toward host households; 913 host participants vs. 478 refugee participants.

Data on FFW scheme output is not straightforward: in certain cases, village members do not even know the size of agricultural land devoted to FFW and village coordinators do not understand the extent to which communities have invested their own resources (e.g. expenditures) in the communal farms.

As at October 2009, a total of 122 activities in 37 communities have been implemented including i) communal farming; ii) afforestation; iii) road reconstruction and rehabilitation. Participating communities showed different levels (or lack of) creativity, self-initiative, self reliance and quality of work in terms of output and record keeping. There were a few exceptions (e.g. village coordinator of Jalokoto with initiative and long-term planning).

In almost all cases, it is too early at this stage to gauge the impact of agricultural or income generating activities on lowering the refugee households' dependence on food aid; however best practice examples (e.g. in Jalokoto) reveals potential for effective self-reliance and livelihoods support.

**→ Recommendations:**

- Develop an incentive mechanism (offering cattle or fertilizer) to encourage this practice.
- Include construction of wells as an additional activity within the FFW scheme to address water need.
- GRCS should use the FFW tracking matrix for future monitoring visits.

### **E.3. SHELTER/HOUSING**

In the January 2008 JAM, **80%** of refugee families were still living under the roof of hosts and building of housing was ranked as a top priority.

Since then, WFP monitoring missions observed that out of 264 households at least 147 have or are planning to settle in their own houses in the near future. Compared to last year,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of refugees seem to have their own houses generally good conditions (all with corrugated sheets and spacious).<sup>9</sup>

In few communities (i.e. BULOCK, JALOKOTO, KAPPA, KARUNOR, etc.) some refugees are *still* hosted by a national. It is not clear if those refugees choose not to own their own houses due to other reasons (e.g. potential returnees or having moved to other areas and returning to the communities only to receive assistance) or if they are in need of assistance in terms of housing.

In general, both refugee and host communities have almost the same living conditions, the poorest and most vulnerable groups being the widows or female headed house holds and the elderly.

#### **→ Recommendation:**

- Carry out a verification exercise to better understand the dynamics of Ref households not having their own houses<sup>10</sup>.
- Implement the recommendation from the previous JAM regarding provision of building materials according to need.

### **E.4. VULNERABLE GROUPS & GENDER CONCERNS**

It is estimated that the refugee population of women is about 35%, men is about 55% and the rest are children and vulnerable groups. The vulnerable in this context include people who are sick, pregnant, disable, children, elderly, and female and child head of HH, extremely poor and helpless people<sup>11</sup>.

The JAM noted that some communities were not able to identify who are the most vulnerable among themselves and those who might still need food aid if the GFD was to be stopped. Currently, there is no clear vulnerability criteria in place.

#### **→ Recommendation:**

- Develop a clear vulnerability criteria which is time bound (taking into account that vulnerability is not a permanent status).
- Target identified vulnerable households for vocational training and linkage with IGA/MFIs for self-reliance.

---

<sup>9</sup> Statement by JAM member who participated in the previous JAM as well.

<sup>10</sup> However, those who left might come just for to attend the registration/verification exercise.

<sup>11</sup> Local integration and livelihoods support strategy, GAFNA – October 2009.

### **E.5. URBAN REFUGEES (in Fagi-Kunda)**

According to UNCHR records, there are approximately 600 registered Senegalese refugees from Casamance staying in the urban area; most of which are pre-2006 Senegalese refugees who have been in The Gambia for more than 10 years

The Focus Group Discussion results revealed that the majority engages in farming and all have their own houses. The JAM noted that the 18-50 age group was not present, indicating there are household members who are engaged in some type of wage employment or income generating activities. A women's group in the community reported to have received vocational training and was also proactive in seeking support from GAFNA for credit (cash for individual petty business was made available).

#### **→ Recommendations;**

- Map dynamics of refugees' secondary movement (from rural to urban and/or back to Casamance) including their number and livelihood activities.

## **F) PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION**

The JAM noted that the food assistance activities lack good coordination, strategic mutual planning and organization, clear-cut division of labor and lack of commitment towards joint ownership of project's objectives. For example, the provision of seasonal seedlings and working tools was not timely enough for seasonal schedule. Also, feedback from Implementing Partners on progress to FFW commitments is irregular or mostly missing making long term planning and implementation impossible.

#### **→ Recommendations:**

- Convene regular coordination meetings at strategic managerial level with all partners.
- In lieu of strengthened livelihood support, engage with more development partners including World Bank, ILO, FAO, etc.
- Implement field monitoring through joint monitoring visits.
- UNHCR to revise its strategy and make a comparative study to consider direct implantation option given financial and implementation/monitoring constraints faced by both country office and Implementing Partners.
- Systematic documentation and information sharing (e.g. FFW tracking sheets, progress reports with clear outputs and outcomes).

## **G) OPTIONS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

In conclusion, the JAM duly notes that the shift from food support to livelihoods support has been appropriate and the focus on the latter should be maintained. Given the increased degrees of food security and self-reliance attained by refugees despite the reduction in food distribution over the last few years, the JAM **recommends a complete phase out of food assistance by mid-2010 for the non-vulnerable refugee population**, contingent to the following conditions:

- a. Continue with the current food assistance (50% GFD and 50% FFW) for the initial transition period during which the refugee database should be updated (see paragraph hereunder).

- b. Update refugee database – by means of a rigorous population survey if necessary – to provide a clear picture on the number, location and vulnerability criteria of refugees.
- c. Upon updating of refugee database, there will be two target groups:
  - i. the non-vulnerable refugee population will be assisted through FFW/FFT schemes only during the remaining months until complete phase-out by June 2010; and
  - ii. the vulnerable refugee population will be assisted with a full ration of 2,100 Kcal at least until the next harvest season (September – October 2010) and beyond if necessary and given priority consideration for the aforementioned integration package with regard to IGA and other self-reliance opportunities.
- d. Partners should continue their efforts in providing enhanced livelihoods support to refugees across different sectors and also invite other development partners including World Bank, ILO, FAO etc. and consulting donors with development agenda for future collaboration. Examples of partners in-country who may be engaged are: the IFAD-funded Rural Finance Project (for access to micro-credit and skills training) and other relevant government agencies such as the Department of Water Resources.
- e. Meanwhile all current partners should work towards an improved coordination and partnership mechanism by engaging in regular dialogue at the strategic management level and fully committing to field monitoring responsibilities (i.e. systematic documentation and compilation of progress reports with clear outputs and outcomes).



## PART 3: ANNEXES

### A.1. ACTION TAKEN ON PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS (Progress up to Nov. 09):

Type of Action	Recommendations	Action Needed	Agencies Responsible	Timing (2009)	Progress up to date (as at Nov-09)
<b>Mobilization of resources, commitments, agreements</b>	All components of the integrated support package need to be implemented. Participating agencies need to make binding commitments early in the year.	Consultations between participating agencies at Banjul and Dakar levels, Budgetary allocations, mobilization of external resources if required, agreements to be signed.	HCR WFP FAO GRCS	January	Consultations took place. Not all partners have made binding agreement. commitments to the integrated support package.  Field level Agreement (FLA) was signed between WFP and GRCS for the implementation of Food for Work activities.
	Stakeholders to share their plans of action with committed resources for better more efficient planning in terms of intervention.	Stakeholders commitments to be clear to enable the identification of gaps and possible solutions.	HCR WFP GRCS CU GAFNA	January	Tools could not be provided by UNHCR
<b>Local integration</b>	The option of integration needs to be further discussed in order to offer more guarantees for permanent settlement in The Gambia.	HCR to pursue its high level discussions with the GoG in order to ensure the act is implemented.	GoG HCR	January-December	The Refugee Act has been passed by the National Assembly which guarantees refugees the same rights as the Gambians. A more formalized announcement by the GoG on refugees' right of permanent settlement is outstanding.
	Training and access to micro-credit be provided to refugees in order to enhance their source of livelihood.	HCR to provide training and discuss with credit organizations on possibilities of its access for refugees considering collateral for payment.	HCR GAFNA GRCS		Vocational training on soap making and tie & dye was conducted by GRCS and WR Community Development, while GAFNA conducted training on micro-credit management.
<b>Information campaign</b>	Information is to be provided to all refugees on reasons for ration cuts and	Information campaign with meetings to be held in all villages with refugee	HCR WFP GRCS	January-February	Partially achieved with a more systematic approach (quality and frequency) on information dissemination needed.

	offer of livelihood support package.	population			
<b>Food assistance</b>	Reduce rations to 70% except for most vulnerable households	Identify most vulnerable households; reduce reduction except for most vulnerable	WFP/GRCS	January	Done.
	Assess potential negative impact of the reduced rations	Conduct rapid assessment.	WFP/GRCS	End of March	Outstanding. Nutrition survey by NaNA to be conducted as soon as possible.
	Assessment of agric. production (standing crops).	FAO-WFP crop assessment to look into agricultural production by refugees.	FAO/WFP	August	Done ( <i>Joint Pre-Harvest Assessment Mission (CILSS/FAO/FEWS/WFP/GOVT) of the 2009-2010 cropping season – October 2009</i> ).
	Assessment of food security and general livelihood situation of refugees, including projections for 2010.	JAM to be conducted, providing recommendations for further food aid and other support.	WFP/HCR	Early October	Done ( <i>UNHCR/WFP Senegalese Refugee Food Security and Self-reliance Joint Assessment Mission – November 2009</i> ).
<b>Food for Work (for asset creation)</b>	Prepare new FFW programme for asset creation in communities (see also Water & Sanitation below)	Identify suitable infrastructure projects in communities, organize technical planning and supervision, organize FFW activities	WFP HCR GRC	February-March	Done.
	Implement FFW programme for refugees and members of host communities	FFW to last throughout the year, with good monitoring of work quality and impact on food security	WFP/GRCS	March-December	FFW schemes including communal farming, forestation and road rehabilitation implemented since August 2009. However, quality and frequency of monitoring should be strengthened for the attainment of better results.

## A.2. JOINT PLAN of ACTION (JPA)

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority High/low</b>	<b>Action Required</b>	<b>Est. cost (US\$)</b>	<b>Responsibilit y</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<b>Updating database: identification of refugees' current location and numbers</b>	Very H	explore options to expedite this process		UNHCR	By T1.10	
<b>Map the dynamics of refugees; secondary movement (from rural to urban and /back to Cassamance), including their number and livelihood strategies</b>	L	To be accounted for in the updating process		UNHCR	T1.10	
<b>Finalise / take decision and implement on Verification options</b>	Very H			UNHCR		
<b>Provision of agricultural tools and implements, including establishment of sustainable maintenance strategy of these tools</b>	Very H	Fundraising/ allocate budget		UNHCR/OP	By T2.10	
<b>Gradual phase-out of GFD with a reasonable timeframe and special consideration towards vulnerable groups</b>	L	Develop clear vulnerability criteria		WFP/UNHCR	By T3.10	
<b>Conduct vocational training for income generating activities such as carpentry, welding, masonry, food processing, among others</b>	H	Resource mobilization/ identification of partners		UNHCR/OP	T3.10	
Mapping existing development projects, especially in microfinance and self reliance activities		Engage the Rural Finance Project and other Projects in the Ministry of Agriculture		UNHCR/GAFN A	T2.10	
Link projects / initiatives from mapping exercise to refugee population	L	Sensitization sessions with project teams		UNHCR	T3.10	
<b>Draw lessons learned and exchange best practice for development projects and FFW schemes</b>	H	Organise formal session with all stakeholders		WFP/	T2.10	

Recommendation	Priority High/low	Action Required	Est. cost (US\$)	Responsibility	Time frame	Action taken
<b>Map, recommend strategy for HH without own shelter due to vulnerability</b>	L	Engage the Physical Planning Unit of the Ministry for Local Government and Lands, and Brikama Area Council		UNHCR/GAFNA	T4.10	
Mapping of water sources, check if established standards are met <b>and recommend strategy to increase the number of water sources.</b>	H	Include construction of wells in food for work activities		UNHCR and Department of Water Resources/WFP	T2.10	
Mobilise resources to implement strategies to increase water sources	H	Installation of additional pumps in open wells ; engagement of communities to ensure strategies for maintenance and repair of non-functioning pumps		UNHCR Department of Water Resources and UNCT	T2.10	
<b>Conduct a comprehensive public/reproductive health and HIC/AIDs assessment</b>	H	UNHCR Regional office to conduct mission	3000 USD	UNHCR/OP	T4.09	Done
<b>Conduct advocacy for refugees to access to health care as nationals</b>	H	Plan sensitization		UNCHR, UNCT, MOH,	T2.10	

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority High/low</b>	<b>Action Required</b>	<b>Est. cost (US\$)</b>	<b>Responsibilit y</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
		process: with regional health teams		Divisional Health teams		
Conduct 4 <sup>th</sup> round health and nutritional survey	L	WFP to engage the National Nutrition Agency (NaNA) lead the process		WFP	T4.09	
<b>Proactive discussions with UNICEF and the Ministry of Education on sustainable access to education ( including tertiary level) for refugees</b>	H	UNCHR activate, coordinate and follow: possibly co-opt into the coordination committee meetings		UNICEF/UNHCR/MOE	T4.10	
Confirm the government's position on refugees settlement and/or integration option	L	Formally communicate with the Government on this issue		UNHCR	T1.10	
Assist in implementation of government decisions on integration options	L	Guide eligibility process		UNHCR	By T3.10	
Target identified vulnerable households for vocational training and linkage with IGA/MFIs for self-reliance	H	Use vulnerability criteria		UNHCR/ Partners	By T3.10	
Convene regular coordination meetings at strategic managerial levels with all partners, co-opt other partners as necessary	H	To organize monthly meetings, partners to share information such as reports		UNHCR	Monthly	

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Priority High/low</b>	<b>Action Required</b>	<b>Est. cost (US\$)</b>	<b>Responsibilit y</b>	<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
		on activities conducted				
Conduct joint monitoring visits	L	Organize quarterly missions		UNHCR/WFP/ GAFNA/UNICE F/Governor's Office/GRCS	Quarterly	

### **A.3. Terms of Reference of the JAM 2009**

#### **Background:**

In August 2006, following intensified hostilities between the Senegalese army and rebel groups in the Casamance region; some 6,500 refugees fled into The Gambia and sought refuge in 56 villages of Kombo East and Foni Districts. The number of refugees increased to 7,290 after a supplementary registration exercise was conducted by UNHCR in November 2007 in order to pick up the scattered families that missed the initial registration. Further refugees moves to urban areas have brought the number of refugees being assisted to 7,000. While the conflict has been long standing, it has escalated with the involvement of the Senegalese army more permanently deployed along the border and with increased fighting between rebel factions.

In response to the refugee influx, WFP launched a four-month Emergency Operation following a Joint UNHCR/WFP Assessment Mission (JAM) conducted in mid-September 2006 which confirmed the urgent food needs for both refugees and host families. The operation aimed at providing full daily rations to the refugees from October 2006 and food assistance to host families through Food For work for Community Asset Development during the lean or hungry season (May-September 2007). This was done to ease additional stress on the local population as a result of hosting large numbers of refugees in their villages with whom they shared all their resources, and also through the development of community assets. The continuing sporadic fighting in the Casamance region and in the areas in the immediate vicinity of the Gambian border rendered the area very unstable and tense and the refugees continued to consider it too unsafe and unstable to go back to their original villages.

A JAM conducted in February 2008 concluded that the return of the refugees to their regions of origin could not be planned at this stage because of the prevailing security situation in Casamance and WFP recommended that the EMOP be extended for a period of six months from September 2008 to end March 2009. UNHCR recommended one year extension of the EMOP i.e. until end of August 2009. WFP also recommended to reduce the ration as of January 2009, after the harvest when food availability and access is at its highest (given improved conditions for the refugees). The 2008 JAM also recommended that WFP and UNHCR undertake an in-depth food security and self reliance assessment in December 2008 in order to determine the level of self reliance among all refugees to determine the plans for future support.

A Joint Qualitative Rapid Assessment Mission was conducted end December 2008-beginning of January 2009. The mission recommended a change of focus of assistance from food support to livelihood support. Full rations were recommended for vulnerable households only. Reduction in rations was adopted for valid heads of households who were urged to complement their entitlement by participating in community asset development programmes through food-for-work schemes. The mission further recommended the active contributions of the Government and all humanitarian actors in the provision of an integrated support package consisting of agricultural inputs, food-for-work, construction materials and technical support. Clear commitments and timely implementation of this integrated package was seen as an essential requirement towards creating an environment that would enable refugee self-reliance.

Following the December 2008 JAM, it was agreed that in order to determine whether the support to improve the livelihood situation of refugees would be extended beyond December 2009, a JAM will be conducted in October 2009.

#### **Rationale for the WFP/UNHCR Joint qualitative Assessment Mission**

UNHCR has indicated that the refugees will still need support beyond December 2009 particularly in livelihoods and self-reliance activities as the food assistance will cease at some point

and therefore has requested that WFP maintain its food assistance in 2010. The forthcoming JAM will aim to determine the level of food and other type of support that might be needed and to avoid any disruption in food assistance after December 2009 as well as to determine how refugees can attain self-reliance..

This JAM will help assess the food security/level of self-reliance situation of the refugees but also look at the non-food needs of the refugees; assess the capacity of UNHCR and WFP to meet these needs with appropriate assistance and the extent to which other UN agencies and development partners can be involved. The mission will look into other sectors; e.g. shelter, health, nutrition, water, sanitation, community services, security, education and income generating and make appropriate recommendations to improve the refugee operation in The Gambia

**Objective:**

The objective of this assessment is to provide an update on the food security/self reliance situation of the Senegalese refugees and determine the appropriate response for the next 12 months.

**Specific objectives:**

Based on the conclusions and recommendations of the Joint UNHCR/WFP Qualitative Rapid Assessment conduct in December 2008, the specific objectives are to:

- i) Review the implementation of the food, non-food assistance strategies that have been used since last JAM, especially the implementation of the mission recommendations and highlight lessons learned that can contribute to a more sustainable programme;
- ii) Determine the number of Senegalese refugees who a) are currently registered in The Gambia, b) have returned to Senegal, and c) will remain in The Gambia beyond December 2009;
- iii) Assess the current food security and under-nutrition situations of refugees, analyze their livelihood strategies and evaluate their capacity to complement the food assistance with other sources of food and income; re-assess their present coping strategies and alternative livelihood activities and their strategies in future, in case assistance is scaled down or halted;
- iv) Assess the current and future food and non-food needs of refugees, ensuring not only acceptable food security conditions, but also the achievement of 'durable solution' by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2010, including self-reliance, health, nutrition, water, sanitation, shelter and other non-food related issues; Food security and self-reliance of households would be analyzed through the following factors ;
  - expected refugees crop production and projections of gaps;
  - scope of existing income generating activities;
  - perspectives and development strategies of new income generating activities that may be undertaken by the refugees and aiming at addressing their basic needs (food, education and health);
  - development potential for (?) inter-community exchanges.



- v) Evaluate the strategies pursued by the Government of The Gambia and its partners (including UNHCR and WFP) for the integration of refugees. Propose a strategy for WFP and UNHCR to facilitate integration in The Gambia, while identifying possibilities to reinforce the collaboration with local partners and projects;
- vi) Liaise with the Government of The Gambia and identify possibilities to collaborate with partners to support device a sustainable phase out strategy

## **METHODOLOGY**

A joint UNHCR/WFP/Government team will conduct the joint assessment of the food security and self-reliance refugee operation review. The JAM will combine various data collection techniques, while cross-checking the information, as to ensure the validity and reliability of the data. Information will be collected by the JAM through a combination of:

- i) Reviewing and analyzing relevant reports;
- ii) Meetings with national, regional and local authorities, NGOs, and other organizations working with refugees in food and related programmes;
- iii) Meetings with UNHCR and WFP staff, as well as with representatives from the donor community;
- iv) Visits of sites where refugee are located (meetings with personnel responsible for food, health, water, sanitation and community services; meetings with refugee leaders and representatives; discussions with groups of refugees – men, women and young people/adolescents; inspection of general conditions at the sites/camps, including food and water availability and cooking arrangements; observation of food distribution operations, self-reliance activities; visits to clinics, schools and other community services and discussions with health workers, teachers and community service workers; visits to markets within the settlement and in the vicinity, and discussions with traders; and discussions with local communities...)

## **Assessment Activities**

The objective of the mission is to capture and update existing knowledge of the refugee beneficiaries and refugee operation in The Gambia in the following three generic areas: i) nutrition and food-security, ii) potential and risks for self-reliance including sectors which have direct connection with the nutrition status i.e. Shelter, Water, Sanitation, Education, income generating activities etc. iii) make recommendations on future activities. The fourth round of the health and nutrition status of refugees' survey will be conducted as a separate exercise and will be completed by in November 8<sup>th</sup> 2009. The results of the study will be analyzed by the mission.

## **Required outputs:**

The JAM report will form the basis of WFP's assistance to the Senegalese refugees and their host communities beyond December 2009, more specifically for:

The output required is a concise report summarizing the key findings of the mission, including a scenario for the evolution of future refugee and food beneficiary numbers, an estimate of food needs and related non-food needs, a proposal concerning the types of food aid interventions and operational measures to ensure an efficient and effective intervention.

A draft report including the preliminary findings will be presented to and discussed with the Government of The Gambia, representatives of main donors, UN agencies and partner NGOs. All stakeholders after the mission ends shall present its field work. Endorsement of all stakeholders and their support for the recommendations, if possible, will be sought. On the basis of the feedback provided, an aide-mémoire should be submitted to UNHCR, WFP and the other partners by 25<sup>th</sup> November 2009 and the final report submitted by 1st December 2009. The final report will be approved by UNHCR and WFP in accordance with the JAM Guidelines and the UNHCR – WFP MoU no later than 4<sup>th</sup> December 2009.

At the end of the mission in The Gambia, the JAM will summarize its key recommendations through an aide-mémoire signed by UNHCR and WFP leaders of mission and presented to the respective UNHCR and WFP Country Offices, as well as to donors, governments and representatives of other relevant UN and other organizations.

The aide-mémoire will:

- Summarize the findings and analysis, specifying any uncertainties due to data limitations;
- Highlight the relevant changes that have occurred in the general situation that will impact the refugees;
- Describe the prospects for durable solutions and the probable scenarios for the next 12 months;
- Present the pros, cons and implications of various possible measures and assistance interventions that could improve the food security and self-reliance of the refugees, contribute towards durable solutions, in the next 12 months;
- Demonstrate (where appropriate) how food aid and the manner, in which food aid is distributed, together with complementary non-food measures, can also contribute to protection and other objectives. This will include the update of the requirements for food assistance with related cost/budget estimates;
- Describe any logistic constraints and proposes measures to increase capacity and efficiency, where possible, and provides cost estimates for those measures;
- Provide, in light of all the above, recommendations for specific objectives and a strategic plan for food security and self-reliance for the next 12 months, and the corresponding actions to be taken by the government, WFP, UNHCR and other partners;

### **Programme of activities**

Activity	Period	Location
<b>Review and analysis of available reports: 10-15 November 2009</b>		
Briefing session	10 November 09	WFP/UNHCR CO
Review of reports	10-15 November 09	WFP/UNHCR CO
Meetings with relevant national, regional and local authorities, NGOs and other organizations working with the refugees in food and related programmes (self-reliance)	11-13 November 09	Various locations

Preparation of field visits	10-15 November 09	WFP/UNHCR CO
<b>Field visits: 16-19 November 2009</b>		
Visits of communities hosting refugees	16-19 November 09	Various locations
Meetings with local community leaders, health officials, public health workers, agricultural extension officers, market traders	16-19 November 09	Various locations
<b>Analysis and Reporting phase: 20 November-4 December 2009</b>		
Field mission debriefing and further consultations with stakeholders as needed	20 November 09	WFP/UNHCR CO
Analysis of information and report writing	20-23 November 09	WFP/UNHCR CO
Validation with stakeholders	24 November 09	WFP CO
Submission of Aide-Mémoire	25 November 09	
Finalization and submission of JAM report	1 December 09	
Signature of JAM report by WFP and UNHCR	4 December 09	

\*\*The dates may be adjusted depending on the conditions in the ground.

#### **The composition of the assessment team**

- Co-leader: **Dr Dieudonné T.S. YIWEZA**, Senior Regional Global Public Health and Nutrition Officer, RR Dakar, UNHCR
- Co-leader: Lucas RIEGGER, Emergency Preparedness Officer, WFP Dakar
- Co-leader: **Angie LEE**, Programme Officer (Food Security), WFP Rome
- Government: representatives from the Ministry of Interior (MoI), Ministry of Land and Local Government, Office of the Governor of the Western Region
- Other partners: GRCS, GAFNA, CONCERN UNIVERSAL, FAO
- Two refugee representatives per hosting community.
- **UNHCR:** **Sekou Saho**, Head of Office, UNHCR The Gambia  
**Sylvain Ilunga**, Senior Livelihood Expert , RR Dakar  
**Allabatu Jatta**, Local Integration & Livelihoods Assistant, UNHCR, The Gambia
- **WFP:** **Malcolm Duthie**, Country Director, The Gambia  
**Patrick Teixeira**, Head of Programme, The Gambia  
**Isatou Nasir Cham**, National Programme Officer, The Gambia

## A.4. IAM QUESTIONNAIRES

### Joint Assessment Mission – Individual/Household Questionnaire – GAMBIA – November 2009

Surveyor's name: \_\_\_\_\_ date: \_\_\_\_\_ community: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you: ☐ host family ☐ refugee family

Head of household is \_\_\_\_\_ (F/M?)

Main male income generating activity is: \_\_\_\_\_ second \_\_\_\_\_ third \_\_\_\_\_

Main female income generating activity is: \_\_\_\_\_ second \_\_\_\_\_ third \_\_\_\_\_

If HH disposes of agricultural land, it is: ☐ sufficient ☐ not sufficient

Household's productivity is lacking: ☐ tools ☐ quality seeds ☐ fertilizers

How is their general harvest : ☐ good-5 ☐ mildly good -4 ☐ acceptable-3 ☐ below average-2 ☐ bad-1  
☐ nil -0

Reasons why bad harvest? ☐ quality of soils ☐ quality of seeds ☐ inadequate rain (+/-)  
☐ pests

Quality of the seeds distributed by UNHCR (if any): ☐ good ☐ no good... any other source?: \_\_\_\_\_

Kitchen garden is used for : ☐ self-production ☐ sales ☐ both

Access to health care: ☐ ok ☐ not ok..... why?: \_\_\_\_\_

Access to education: ☐ ok ☐ not ok..... why?: \_\_\_\_\_

If access to development projects, which?: \_\_\_\_\_ if not, why: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you heard about micro-credit? If yes, why not involved into? \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

Household's income is complemented with: ☐ remittances ☐ wages ☐ firewood ☐ \_\_\_\_\_  
 ? \_\_\_\_\_

The agricultural production of the Household will suffice to rely on it exclusively up to: \_\_\_\_\_ months

Production of \_\_\_\_\_ is expected to reach \_\_\_\_\_ bags? (sales \_\_\_\_\_ % food \_\_\_\_\_ % seeds \_\_\_\_\_ %)

Production of \_\_\_\_\_ is expected to reach \_\_\_\_\_ bags? (sales \_\_\_\_\_ % food \_\_\_\_\_ % seeds \_\_\_\_\_ %)

Production of \_\_\_\_\_ is expected to reach \_\_\_\_\_ bags? (sales \_\_\_\_\_ % food \_\_\_\_\_ % seeds \_\_\_\_\_ %)

Production of \_\_\_\_\_ is expected to reach \_\_\_\_\_ bags? (sales \_\_\_\_\_ % food \_\_\_\_\_ % seeds \_\_\_\_\_ %)

They would consider that in this village, the poor families are: (use proportional piling) \_\_\_\_\_  
 %

Among them the Refs are: \_\_\_\_\_ % when the Hosts would be: \_\_\_\_\_ %

Three most common diseases:	usual coping method:	If food aid is stopped, what concern would arouse?	Priority needs?

### Joint Assessment Mission - Focus Group Discussion Questionnaire – GAMBIA – November 2009

Surveyor's name: \_\_\_\_\_ date: \_\_\_\_\_ community: \_\_\_\_\_

Total nb of households: \_\_\_\_\_ Nb of houses: \_\_\_\_\_ Nb of female-headed Households: \_\_\_\_\_ (H)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ (Ref)

Host: Widows: \_\_\_\_\_ husband gone: \_\_\_\_\_ divorced: \_\_\_\_\_ other (? \_\_\_\_\_ ): \_\_\_\_\_

Refs: Widows: \_\_\_\_\_ husband in Casamance: \_\_\_\_\_ gone: \_\_\_\_\_ divorced: \_\_\_\_\_ other (? \_\_\_\_\_ ): \_\_\_\_\_

Nb of **solid** meals per day in a host family: \_\_\_\_\_ ref: \_\_\_\_\_ how often eat fish/meat per week (host family):  
 \_\_\_\_\_ ref: \_\_\_\_\_

If they happen to eat else than WFP's input is it mostly: ☐ purchased ☐ produced ☐ bartered ☐ gift from NGO

Access to drinking **water**: ☐ well ☐ pump ☐ river ☐ tap ☐ pond ☐ far away, it comes from: well / pump / river / pond

Access to **health care (H)**: if no money, can obtain health care? Y / N..... how much costs a consultation? \_\_\_\_\_

Access to **health care (Ref)**: if no money, can obtain health care? Y / N..... how much costs a consultation? \_\_\_\_\_

Access to **education (H)**: if not going to school, why so? No money / distance / language / other:

Access to **education (Ref)**: if not going to school, why so? No money / distance / language / other:

Access to **development projects (H)**: none / micro-credit / cooperative / training / other:\_\_\_\_\_

Access to **development projects (Ref)**: none / micro-credit / cooperative / training / other:\_\_\_\_\_

**Income generating activities section:** [☐ pls tick the box would the activity be the result of a vocational training]

Host families			Refugees families	
Activities	Males	Females	Males	Females
1 <sup>st</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 <sup>nd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 <sup>rd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Farming – masonry – timber – carpenter - firewood – transport – fishing – tailor – trade – teacher – wages – other

Other considerations: *unemployment? low wages?*

**Agriculture section:** [☐ pls indicate if seeds are coming from 1-granaries, 2-GRCS, 3- barter, 4- bought, 5- other]

	Upland (Hosts): %			Lowland (Hosts): %			
Crops	For seeds	For food	For sale	Crops	For seeds	For food	For sale
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
Maize – peanuts – sorghum – millet – rice - beans – cassava – tomatoes – greens – okras – yam – eggplant – others							
Constraints:				Constraints:			
	Upland (Refs): %			Lowland (Refs): %			
Crops	For seeds	For food	For sale	Crop	For seeds	For food	For sale
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
Maize – peanuts – sorghum – millet – rice - beans – cassava – tomatoes – greens – okras – yam – eggplant – others							

Constraints:	Constraints:
--------------	--------------

Maize – groundnut – sorghum – millet – rice - beans – cassava – tomatoes – carrots – greens – okras – yam  
– bissap – eggplant – fruits – others

Other considerations:
-----------------------

[☐ pls indicate if seeds are coming from 1-granaries, 2-NGO, 3- barter, 4- bought, 5- other]

Hosts	Kitchen garden crops	Expected harvest	Constraints:
1 <sup>st</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
2 <sup>nd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3 <sup>rd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
4 <sup>th</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Rank as 5=good and 0=bad

Refs	Kitchen garden crops	Expected harvest	Constraints:
1 <sup>st</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
2 <sup>nd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3 <sup>rd</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
4 <sup>th</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Rank as 5=good and 0=bad

Other considerations:
-----------------------

**Product marketization in general is:** good ☐ no good ☐ ..... if no good, why? \_\_\_\_\_

**Food For Work activities:**

communal farming / road rehabilitation / vegetable comm. garden / wood lot / afforestation / dyke construction / pit latrine / others

which one best: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

which one best: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

which one worst: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

which one worst: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

more?: \_\_\_\_\_

Other considerations:
-----------------------

**Vocational training feed-back:**

tailoring / mud-bricks molding / carpentry / hair-dresser / ... / ... / ...  
/ ...

Which one best: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

Which one best: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

Which one worst: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

which one worst: \_\_\_\_\_ why?: \_\_\_\_\_

More?: \_\_\_\_\_ why not integrated? \_\_\_\_\_

**If no access to micro-credit, why:**

Hosts: interest rates / barred from / distance/ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Refs: interest rates / barred from / distance/ other: \_\_\_\_\_

Other considerations:

**Housing:**

% owning their own houses? (hosts) \_\_\_\_\_

% owning their own house? (refugees) \_\_\_\_\_

% households covered with corrugated sheets (host families): \_\_\_\_\_

% households covered with corrugated sheets (refugees): \_\_\_\_\_

Other considerations:

**Living standards:**

% of Households' living standard	Hosts families	Why?
(1) very poor: always in need of support		
(2) poor: occasional need of support		
(3) better-off: relative autonomy		

% of Households' living standard	Refs families	Why?
(1) very poor: always in need of support		
(2) poor: occasional need of support		
(3) better-off: relative autonomy		

Households having relatives in urban areas (%): Hosts \_\_\_\_\_ Refs \_\_\_\_\_

Three most common diseases	usual coping method	Cash would be invested in (30'000 FCFA / 1200 GMD):	If food aid is stopped, what concern would arouse?	Priority needs?
-Hosts: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> h. center <input type="checkbox"/> tr. healer <input type="checkbox"/> _____	Refs:	Refs:	Refs:
-Hosts _____	<input type="checkbox"/> h. center <input type="checkbox"/> tr. healer <input type="checkbox"/> _____			
-Hosts _____	<input type="checkbox"/> h. center <input type="checkbox"/> tr. healer <input type="checkbox"/> _____			
-Refs _____	<input type="checkbox"/> h. center <input type="checkbox"/> tr. healer <input type="checkbox"/> _____	Hosts:	Hosts	Hosts:

## A.5. REFERENCES AND LIST OF KEY INFORMANTS

### *List of Key Informants met*

Name	Designation	Institution
Malcolm Duthie	Country Director	WFP Gambia Country Office
Patrick Teixeira	Head of Programme	WFP Gambia Country Office
Sekou Saho	Head of Office	UNHCR
Mr Lamin Sanneh	Governor	Western Region, Brikama
Baboucarr Cham	Livelihood Officer	GAFNA
Alabatou Jatta	Livelihood Assistant	UNHCR
Fatou Barry Jeng	Protection Officer	UNHCR
Sylvian Ilunga	Senior Regional Livelihood Expert	UNHCR
Dello Bah	Assistant Secretary	Ministry for Local Government and Lands
Momodou A Bah	Integration/Livelihood Officer	GAFNA
Katim Nget	Programme Manager	Gambia Red Cross Society
Ebrima Ceesay	Refugee Protection Officer	Gambia Immigration Department
Albert Fox	Coordinator/Executive Secretary	GAFNA
Sering Modou Njie	Regional Disaster Coordinator, Western Region	GAFNA
Omar Sanyang	Branch Officer	GRCS, Western Region
Lamin Gassama	Site Supervisor	GRCS
Haddy Taal	Disaster Management Committee Member, Western Region	Gambia Immigration Department
Tijan Manga	Extension Officer	St Josephs Family Farm Centre
Manfried Bojang	DRR Desk Officer	St Josephs Family Farm Centre
Isatou Nasir Cham	National Programme Officer	WFP Gambia Country Office
Barra Secka	Field Assistant	WFP Gambia Country Office
Satou Barrow	Field Assistant	WFP Gambia Country Office
Jerreh Sanyang	Food for Work Coordinator	Jalokoto, Western Region
Essa Sanyang	Food for Work Coordinator	Gikess Dando, Western Region
Habibatou Jallow	Food for Work Coordinator	Agangalen, Western Region
Omar Sanyang	Food for Work Coordinator	Kandonku, Western Region
Momodou Jammeh	Food for Work Coordinator	Bwiam, Western Region
Over 280 Refugees and their Hosts in Foni, Western Region		
Urban Refugees		

### *References*



- Refugee Act, 2008, Gov't of The Gambia
- Activity report on local reintegration and livelihoods, UNHCR – April 2009
- Activity report on local reintegration and livelihoods, UNHCR – October 2009
- Joint Pre-Harvest Assessment Mission (CILSS/FAO/FEWS/WFP/GOVT) of the 2009-2010 cropping season – October 2009
- Joint Crop Assessment Mission (FAO/WFP/CONCERN UNIVERSAL/GOVT) to determine impact of heavy rains and floods on crops – October 2009
- UNHCR Summary Report on Seed Distribution to Rural refugees in the Foni 2009 farming seasons – Date unknown
- Progress Report/Medium term strategy for urban and rural refugees for the period Sep-Dec 09, UNHCR – Date unknown
- Local integration and livelihoods support strategy – GAFNA (Oct-09)
- Concern Universal's interim report on DDR intervention program targeting refugee host communities in the Gambia – August 2009
- GAFNA Progress Reports – Dates unknown
- FFW Progress Report, WFP – November 2009