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Executive Summary

The primary objective of CHS is to determine the impact of food assistance on targeted households and to monitor food insecurity and livelihood trends of vulnerable groups. The first round of CHS in four refugee camps in North Western Tanzania took place in December 2008 and provided baseline information for subsequent CHS rounds. This second round took place in May 2010 and only covered Nyarugusu camp as the other three camps surveyed in 2008 have been closed. A total of 320 household interviews were conducted.

Some highlights of the survey include:

- The majority of the households in Nyarugusu hailed mainly from DRC (98%) with a small percentage from Burundi and Rwanda.

- Although over half of the boys and girls of school-going age are attending school, irregular attendance was found to be high but overall school dropout was low and showed improvement from 2008.

- Almost all the households (97%) reported drinking water from improved sources.

- Almost half of the sampled households have access to land for cultivation, and which is mostly less than 0.5 acres.

- Support from outside the camp, in terms of money, clothing, food and agricultural input was found to be insignificant although it has increased in comparison to 2008.

- Household food security, as measured by the food consumption score, was relatively good with most households having acceptable consumption. However, there was also an increase in households with poor consumption compared to 2008 mainly due to households from Lugufu camp. In addition, reliance on food assistance is high, with about three-quarters of food consumed coming from assistance.

- The sampled households mainly relied on food assistance, fishing, casual labour, food crop production/sales, and food aid sales for their livelihoods. Mean contribution of food assistance, petty trade, skilled labour and salaries decreased between December 2008 and June 2010 while the contribution for the other activities has increased though by small percentages¹.

- Nearly half of the sampled households were found to be asset very poor. This increase in ‘asset very poor category’ is significantly (p < 0.005) higher among households that were relocated to Nyarugusu from Lugufu camp.

- Food is readily available at the market, with the most common being sweet potatoes, pulses, maize and beans.

- Reducing the number of meals eaten per day and limiting portion sizes at meal times were cited as the most commonly employed coping strategies. However, number of households reporting this has reduced in comparison to 2008.

- A large proportion of the sampled households are encountering difficulties in meals preparations, main problems being scarcity of firewood, insufficient amounts of food and lack of kitchen utensils.

- More than half of the sampled households were not aware of the food distribution committees in the camp.

¹ Note that these percentage changes are not statistically significant
• The main problems encountered during food distribution were cited as underweight bags and congestion at sheds/shelters and uneven distribution and absence of ration information and inaccurate weighing scales.

• Overall, the duration of the 14 days ration provided was found to be 9 days a decline from 11 days reported in 2008. Further investigations to understand why are recommended.

• At the time of the survey, refugees reported they were provided with Unimix in place of CSB and they were not familiar with this food item and thus most of them were preparing it as maize meal. It’s therefore recommended that more sensitization takes place when a new item is introduced into the food basket.

• Most households are highly dependent on food and other assistance and although they are far from being self-reliant, there has been improvement in their participation in different economic activities. The recommendation is to continue the food assistance at the current levels while also enabling them to access more livelihood activities.
1.0 Background

In 1993, approximately 250,000 Burundian refugees fled to Kigoma and Kagera regions in Tanzania following an attempted coup in Burundi. Another significant influx of refugees from Rwanda and Burundi followed in 1994 after the Rwandan and Burundian Presidents were killed in an airplane crash. In 1996 large numbers of Congolese refugees arrived in Kigoma following civil strife in the DRC, formerly known as Zaire.

In June 2006, the Governments of Tanzania and Burundi and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) launched the promotion phase of Burundian repatriation following improved security to enable safe and dignified return. The Government was planning to officially close several camps in 2008. Although, the repatriation activity was not as per Government and UNHCR estimates most of the camps have been closed leaving only Nyarugusu camps that hosts about 60,000 refugees.

The camp consolidation exercise implemented between 2007 and 2009 saw six camps (Lugufu, Muyovozi, Kanembwa, Mkugwa Mtabilu II and Lukole camps closed down. Mtabila I and Mtabila II camps in Kasulu were merged into Mtabila camp while Lugufu camp was consolidated into Nyarugusu camp. Mtabila camp, although physically existing, was declared officially closed by the government in June 2009; as such this survey only took place in Nyarugusu camp. However, basic services including food, water and health services continue to be provided on humanitarian grounds in Mtabila camp.

The WFP Community and Household Surveillance monitoring system (CHS), was developed for use in several southern African countries in 2003. It has also been implemented as an outcome monitoring system for programmes providing a household ration through targeted food assistance interventions. The CHS approach has also been applied to enhance Joint Assessment Missions (JAMs) in several countries and was then introduced in North Western Tanzania in 2008 after consultation with the WFP Tanzania CO and partners.

The main objectives of the CHS is to monitor food aid outcomes, determine the impact of food aid on targeted households and to monitor food insecurity and livelihood trends of vulnerable groups. CHS has value as a management tool and has proved to be a useful tool in informing operational decisions with respect to the food aid interventions by addressing the following questions:

- Are intended outcomes being achieved?
- Is food assistance reaching intended beneficiaries?
- What is the contribution of food assistance to the households’ diet, food security and livelihoods?
- Is food assistance preventing depletion of human and productive assets?

The CHS, is also supposed to provide baseline information for subsequent rounds and allow the analysis of trends for key food security indicators in the future with the results feeding into the annual JAM and incorporating aspects of any other data collection activities.

As stated earlier the first round of CHS took place in December 2008 and covered four camps. This second round only covers one camp of Nyarugusu following closure of the other three camps. Worth noting is that the majority of the refugees in Nyarugusu camp are Congolese.

1.1 Methodology, Training and Data Collection

A two stage sample design was adopted for the survey. The first stage was the selection of villages (Primary sampling units). And this was done using Simple random sampling. The second stage involved the selection of household from the selected villages. The household were the ultimate sampling units. The Frame from which
both the villages and the household were selected was provided by UNHCR from their camp population database.

The CHS questionnaire (household) was used to collect information for food security indicators such as, household demographics, livelihood strategies, agriculture production, cereal stocks and sources, income and expenditure, asset wealth, food consumption, and coping strategies. This was done through household interviews with household heads. Data was collected electronically using Personal Digital Assistants which are hand-held devices used to save time and reduce errors during data collection and analysis.

A total of 16 enumerators were trained for two days as most of them had received prior training on the use of PDAs. The second day was used for field testing from which minor changes were made to the tool. Data collection took place over a period of three days and a total of 320 household questionnaires were collected.

1.2 Limitations of the Study

All possible steps were taken to ensure that the results accurately represent the food security context and situation in the camps. However, some limitations must be acknowledged.

- Inaccurate recall and quantitative estimates may affect the validity of the findings. The enumerators were trained to facilitate such recall and to collect accurate data.

- It is also possible that expectations for ulterior benefits influenced the results. However, it was explained to respondents that no ulterior benefits were to be expected and that the questionnaires were anonymous.

- The questionnaires were developed in English and administered in Swahili. Careful training was conducted to reduce individual variations on how enumerators interpreted the questionnaire and understood the questions.
2.0 Household Characteristics

**Household size**
The average household size of the sample was 6 persons, which is slightly lower than previous survey round of 2008 which was 7 persons. Most households had an adult male and adult female, plus children 6-17 years of age. In addition, around three-quarters of the households also had young children while only around 10% of households had elderly members (60+ years).

**Household Head and Marital Status**
Of the sampled households, about 43% were headed by women, higher than what was reported in 2008 at 36%. There was no information on elderly or child-headed households collected. About 17% of the household heads were widowed while 62% were married. Over 6% of households interviewed indicated that they were living apart from their spouses although not divorced and this is higher than the 3% reported in 2008. More than 90% of the male heads were literate compared to 84% in 2008. However, for 2010, less than 50% of the female heads indicated they were literate.

**Chronically ill, Disabled or Orphaned Members**
In total, 13% of the sampled households reported having a chronically ill member (ill for 3+ months), compared to 7% reported in 2008. Female headed households were more likely to have a chronically ill member (11%) than those headed by men (8%). In addition, 11% of the households had a physically disabled member which is still a rise from 9% reported in 2008. There was no difference between male and female headed households.

In total, 20% of the sampled households were hosting orphans. Female-headed households were much more likely to be hosting orphans (16%) than those headed by men (14%).

**Dependency**
The percentage of dependents\(^2\) was significantly \(p < 0.001\) higher in households headed by women (62%) compared to male headed households (56%). Overall, the dependency ratio was at 58% which has not changed from 2008.

**Economically Active Persons**
Overall, 75% of the adults (18-59) were found to be engaged in economic activities, 19% of children aged 6-17 years were economically active and only 16% of elderly (60 years and above). In 2008, Nyarugusu had the

---

\(^2\) Percentage of effective dependents is the number of persons < 18 years or 60 or more years plus those of working age (18-59) who are chronically ill, divided by the total number of household members.
highest percentage of economically active children aged 6-17 years at 11%, compared to other camps and as shown above, this has increased further.

**School Enrolment and Attendance**

Overall, 56% of the boys and 54% of the girls aged 6-13 years were reported to be enrolled in school. As shown in the graph, enrolment has gone down in Nyarugusu as compared to 2008 especially for boys.

Regarding attendance, the level of boys and girls attending school regularly was at 57% and 54% respectively; and this is a decline from what was reported in 2008.

On the other hand, level of drop out has reduced from 9% in 2008 to 7% in 2010.

**Source of Drinking Water**

Over 97% of the households were found to be drinking water from improved water sources (piped into dwelling yard or plot, public tap/neighbouring house, borehole with pump), with no differences from 2008 average time spent on fetching water was reported as 17 minutes.

**Sanitation**

Most households (71%) used traditional family pit latrine for their sanitation purposes. However, this has reduced compared to 90% reported in 2008; similarly, percentage of households using the shared traditional pit latrine has increased from 10% in 2008 to 25% in 2010. This could be attributed to households from Lugufu that did not have their latrines already in place.

**Source of Lighting**

Kerosene and oil lamp is the main source of lighting used by 54% of the households. In addition, there has been an increase in households using electricity (including solar and torches) from 3% in 2008 to 25% in 2010. Firewood was cited by 11% of the households while only 9% reported no lighting at all. Female headed households were less likely to use an oil lamp (14% vs. 24%) and more likely to use firewood (16% vs. 8%) than households headed by men. This pattern is similar to what was reported in 2008.

**Source of cooking fuel**

Of the sampled households, wood was the mentioned as the main source of cooking fuel by 98% of the households. Only 1% of the households mentioned charcoal as a cooking source while other sources such as kerosene, and gas were hardly used at all.
3.0 Household Circumstances

Country of origin
Of the sampled households, 98% originated from DRC, with the rest from Burundi (1%) with only 0.6 households coming from Rwanda. This is not very different from what was reported in 2008 with 96% of the households from DRC.

Change of Camp
Over the last 15 years, 57% percent indicated having changed camps once, and about 35% have changed camps twice. Only 8% of the sampled households indicated having changed the camps three times.

Main reasons for moving to current camp were:
- Protection/security reasons, cited by 57% of the households, much lower than the 68% reported in 2008;
- Last camp being closed by 42% of the households compared to 20% in 2008.

Plans to repatriate to Country of Origin
Overall, only 9% of the sampled households indicated they planned to repatriate. Over 90% are not planning to repatriate, which is 10% higher than what was reported in 2008. Of the households planning to repatriate, 26% indicated they would do so in 2011 and 18% in 2012.

Of the households not planning to repatriate, 81% cited security related problems while 40% reported protection problems as shown in table below. Others reported land problems at home (21%) and never been to country of origin (5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not Repatriating</th>
<th>Land Problem at home</th>
<th>Security Related problems</th>
<th>Protection Related problems</th>
<th>Never been to country of origin</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2008</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2010</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Livelihood Activities

In order to better understand the relative importance of different livelihood sources, households were asked to estimate the contribution of each source to the total household income. The table below shows mean change in relative contribution of different livelihoods to households’ income between 2008 and 2010. It shows that the mean contribution of food assistance, petty trade, skilled labour and salaries decreased between December 2008 and June 2010 while the contribution for the other activities has increased though by small percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contribution to Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Assistance</td>
<td>Majority of the interviewed households are in this category. They are dependant on food assistance for their livelihood (67%). However, this has reduced by about 9% between 2008 and 2010. This could be attributed to the start of the harvest season implying increased contribution from other activities such as increased labour opportunities as well as food crop production.</td>
<td>77% Round 2008 67% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/Livestock Production</td>
<td>The contribution of fishing and livestock production (including poultry) has increased between 2008 and 2010. This could be attributed to households from Lugufu camps that were reliant on fishing from the lake. As reported in the 2007 Qualitative study, fishing in Lake Tanganyika was one of the main livelihoods for households in Lugufu I and II.</td>
<td>1% Round 2008 3% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Labour</td>
<td>Reliance on casual labour has increased by 2% between the two reporting periods. This could be due to the start of the harvest season implying increased demand for labour for agricultural activities.</td>
<td>4% Round 2008 6% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Crop Production</td>
<td>Contribution of food crop production has increased by about 3% between the two reporting period. As indicated above, this was the start of the harvest season hence could be why contribution of food crop production has increased.</td>
<td>2% Round 2008 5% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid Sales</td>
<td>Though not high, contribution of food aid sales has increased between 2008 and 2010. This could be associated with loss of livelihoods for households that were moved from Lugufu camp to Nyarugusu hence have to start over.</td>
<td>2% Round 2008 3% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>In addition to food assistance, these households have shown an increased reliance on gifts. Households with an average 20% of their livelihood generated from gifts they receive.</td>
<td>1% Round 2008 3% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>Households indicated an increased reliance on small business between 2008 and 2010. This could also be attributed to new traders who joined the camp from Lugufu.</td>
<td>3% Round 2008 5% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Trade</td>
<td>There has been no change in the contribution of petty trade to households’ income between 2008 and 2010.</td>
<td>3% Round 2008 3% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Labour</td>
<td>Contribution of skilled labour has also decreased between the two reporting periods.</td>
<td>4% Round 2008 3% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>There has been no change in the contribution of salaries to household income.</td>
<td>2% Round 2008 2% Round 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This is not a comprehensive livelihood analysis, which includes, but it is not limited to, economic activities. The main goal is to identify and group households based on a common set of economic activities, their relative importance for risk analysis and how this has changed over the different reporting periods.

4 Note that these percentage changes are not statistically significant.
External Support and Debt

The sampled households were asked if they had received any support in form of money, clothes, food, agricultural input from friends and relatives outside the camp for the last 6 months. Similar to 2008, 40% of households indicated they had received money support and 20% had received support in form of food. There is an increase in households that received support in form of clothing from 21% in 2008 to 40% in 2010. However, most households reported that this support was not regular.

Overall, 18% of the sampled households indicated they had borrowed money, mostly from money lenders which has reduced compared to 36% that was reported in 2008. The main reason given for borrowing was to purchase food. In addition, households were also asked if they had borrowed food before their last distribution; 60% reported that they had and the majority (93%) indicated that they had borrowed cereals, 63% borrowed pulses and 54% borrowed oil. This indicates that over 50% of the population rely on borrowing food to meet the following food distribution cycle. It was gathered during the assessment that churches also play an important role in lending from the stocks they gather after refugee’s food contribution during each food distribution week.
5.0 Agriculture

Access to agricultural land

Overall, 46% of the sampled households reported having access to land for cultivation, an increase from 27% reported in 2008. Female and male headed households had equal access to agricultural land. It should be noted that by law refugees are only allowed to access land within a 4km radius of the camp. The majority of households (84%) had access to less than 0.5 acres and 15% accessed 0.5-1acre. Households that owned land but were not cultivating reported that lack of seeds (47%) and illness in the household were the main reasons for not cultivating. This is however different from 2008 where the major reason for not cultivating was planned fallow (64%).

Mostly, the land accessed by the farming households was free (not rented) as indicated by 70% of the households. Similar to 2008, over 29% of households in Nyarugusu rent land for farming. Of the households with access to land, 89% indicated having cultivated this agricultural season which is slightly lower than 93% reported in 2008

For the farming households the main crops cultivated were: Sweet potatoes by 57% of the households, followed by, Maize (44%) down from 66% in 2008, beans (37%) an increase from 25%, vegetables (28%) which reduced from 50%, green bananas (11%) and cassava (10%) which remained the same. On average, households obtained approximately Tshs 7,000 from the sale of their crops which is slightly higher than Tsh 5,000 that was reported in 2008. It is possible that prices of several items may have gone up hence explaining increased income although most households reported growing less.

Availability of Food Commodities in the Market

The graph below shows the availability of different food items in the market, as reported by the households during the interview. Vegetables, maize, sweet potatoes were the most common food item found in the markets. As shown below, there is an increased availability of most commodities compared to 2008 especially for potatoes and rice. The 2008 survey took place at the peak of the high food prices crisis hence could explain low availability of rice at that time. And for the other food items, increased availability could be credited to the harvest season.

![Common Commodities in the Market](image-url)
6.0 Asset Wealth and Livestock Ownership

Asset wealth

Asset wealth was determined by counting the number of different types of assets a household owned and then creating categories of: ‘very poor’ (0-2 assets), ‘poor’ (3-4 assets), ‘medium’ (5-9 assets), and ‘rich’ (10 or more assets). In total for 2010, 41% of the households were ‘asset very poor’ - owning 0-2 different types of assets. Another 25% were ‘asset poor’, 29% were ‘asset medium’ and only 5% were ‘asset rich’. As the chart below shows, there has been an increase in households that are ‘asset very poor’ and consequently a decline in the other asset wealth groups. This increase in ‘asset very poor category’ is significantly \((p < 0.005)\) higher among households that were relocated to Nyarugusu from Lugufu camp.

For 2010, female headed households were more likely to be ‘asset very poor’ (40% vs 21%) compared to households headed by men. The majority of male-headed households were asset ‘medium’ (38%) which is similar to what was reported in 2008.

Comparing livelihood groups by asset wealth showed that asset rich households were only found in households relying on small business (6%), gifts (13%), and skilled labour (18%) and fishing (10%). Households relying on salaries had the highest proportion of ‘asset medium’ category. In addition, proportion of households in the asset ‘very poor’ category increased across all livelihoods between 2008 and 2010.

Livestock Ownership

About half of the households owned livestock—51% slightly lower compared to 57% reported in 2008. Only about 1% of the households owned cattle less than 2% reported in 2008. In addition, 16% owned sheep or goats, and largest percentage 48% owning poultry.

Sampled households were also asked if they had sold any assets or animals in the last three months, and only 5% indicated that they had. Of those that sold, the majority reported that the reason they sold was to buy food and pay for other daily expenditure with in the household.
7.0 Household Food Consumption

Number of Meals

On average, the number of meals eaten per day was two, with no significant differences by age group (children-6-17 years, and adults). There also no significant differences between 2008 and 2010.

Difficulties with Meal Preparation

A 70% majority of the sampled households encountered difficulties in meals preparations compared to only 51% in 2008. As indicated in the chart, the three main difficulties encountered in 2010 included: fuel wood (27%), insufficient amount of food (21%) and lack of kitchen utensils (19%) As shown below, fewer households reported difficulties of fuel wood and insufficient amount of food between the two reporting periods.

Dietary Diversity and Food Frequency

Research has shown that dietary diversity\(^5\) and frequency are a good proxy measure of food consumption and food security at household level. Food consumption data was collected and analyzed using the standard WFP methodology. Using a 7-day recall period, information was collected on the variety and frequency of different foods and food groups to calculate a weighted food consumption score. Weights were based on the nutritional density of the foods.

Households were then classified as having either ‘poor’, ‘borderline’ or ‘acceptable’ consumption based on the analysis of the data. Over 86% of the sampled households had acceptable consumption, which is lower than 98% reported in 2008. Households showing borderline consumption also increased from 2% to 8% and those with poor diet at 6% up from 0% in 2008. This increase in ‘poor and borderline consumption’ is significantly (p< 0.005) higher among households that were relocated to Nyarugusu from Lugufu camp which explains why the situation has declined since 2008. Following the closure of Lugufu camp, the refugees were moved to Nyarugusu which means some of them may have lost their minimal livelihood which could probably explain decline in consumption patterns.

\(^5\) Dietary diversity is defined as the number of individual foods or food groups consumed over a given period of time.
Households with ‘borderline’ consumption reported eating the equivalent of cereals and pulses 5 days a week plus vegetables and oils about 2 days a week. Those with ‘poor’ consumption managed to eat the equivalent of only cereals and pulses two days in week. Discussions with the households as well as analysis indicated that CSB consumption has reduced across all households. For the last distribution, they were provided with Unimix in the absence of CSB and most were not familiar with the product. It was also further disclosed that most households prepared the unimix as maize meal.

The chart below shows the average number of days key food groups were consumed in a week. Number of days each of the foods is consumed has reduced for all food items especially for the poor consumption category. Analysis by livelihood groups showed that consumption patterns between the two reporting periods have declined for households relying on all livelihood activities with the exception of food aid sales. All livelihood activities showed an increase in percentage households in the poor and borderline consumption category.

Food Sources
Households were also asked the name the main source of the foods consumed in the previous week, by food item. The most common source was food assistance (82%) up from 74% in 2008, followed by purchase (10%) and own production (6%). Though small, the increase in reliance on own production could be attributed to the ongoing harvest season and hence resulting in less reliance on purchase.
Overall the average household total monthly expenditure amounted to TZ Shs 14,000 and average per-capita of TZ Shs 2,300. Of the total expenditure, TZ Shs. 7,800 (52%) was used to purchase food items that are inclusive of those provided in the food basket. As shown in the graph below, highest food expenditure is on Cereals (20%) and meats (11%).

Comparing expenditure patterns by asset wealth groups, it was found that the ‘very poor’ had the highest percentage food expenditure at 60% followed by the ‘asset medium’ at 55% and then the ‘asset poor at 51%. The ‘asset rich’ wealth group was found to have higher non food expenditure (55%) than their food expenditure (45%). Worth noting that in absolute terms, the asset medium had the highest food expenditure across all asset wealth groups.

Analyzing expenditure patterns by livelihood groups showed that households relying on fishing/livestock production had the highest percentage food expenditure at 63% while those relying on skilled labour had the least at 35%. All other groups had similar expenditure patterns.

As shown in the chart above, highest non food expenditure for the refugees was on clothing (13%), soap (11%) and fuel (9%)
9.0 Coping Strategies Index

The coping strategy Index (CSI) measures the frequency and severity of a number of common household coping strategies for addressing shortfalls in food supply and combines the information into a single CSI score. With the CSI, a lower score implies reduced stress on the household ability to meet its food needs and thus, relatively better food security. Overall, households reported an improvement in stress levels with a decreased in their coping strategies index from 36 in 2008 to 22 in 2010. The 2010 survey took place during the harvest season implying more labour opportunities which was shown in the livelihood activities and thus more income available. This all means improved access for the refuges which possibly explains the reduced stress shown by the lower CSI. In addition, there was an increase in reliance on own production as a food source.

The most commonly reported strategy was reducing number of meals eaten in a day reported by 77% of the respondents. This has however, reduced from 85% that reported it in 2008. Other frequently reported strategies that have shown an improvement from 2008 are limit portion sizes from 78% to 68% and restrict adult consumption from 61% to 34%. Although most have reported a decrease, it should be noted that there has been an increase in a number of strategies. As shown in the chart below, the increase was reported in borrowing food/money from 50% to 59% in 2010. Migration of household members, sending household members to beg or eat elsewhere, migration and illegal activities also showed an increase in percentage households reporting them between 2008 and 2010. Analysis by livelihood groups shows reducing levels of stress across all groups except for those relying on small business whose coping index increased slightly from 32 in 2008 to 33 in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Round 2008</th>
<th>Round 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of meals eaten in a day?</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit portion size at mealtimes?</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow food or money from neighbours, friends, or relatives?</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict consumption of adults in order for small children to eat?</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase food on credit?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip entire days without eating?</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange your labour for food (work for food)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell high value, preferred foods to purchase larger quantity of less expensive foods</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send household members to eat elsewhere?</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send household members to beg?</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell Household Assets or the NFI’s the household owns</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have some members of the household migrate elsewhere or repatriate</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in prostitution or theft of food (illegal activities)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.0 Post Distribution Monitoring

Post Distribution Monitoring is a systematic investigation that monitors the perception that both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have of a WFP operation. Information is collected at the household level after a food distribution to assess access to use and satisfaction with the food aid. It provides information on leading indicators, i.e. gives an indication as to whether food assistance is likely to lead to the desired outcomes. Feedback on beneficiary perceptions informs management decisions on design of rations, distribution modalities and targeting of beneficiaries.

Duration Cereal Ration Lasted

The ration provided is designed to last for 14 days. However, according to the findings, average days the rations last have reduced this year compared to what was reported in 2008. The maize and bean ration given lasted for 9 days, down from 11 days reported in 2008. Vegetables oil lasted 7 days less than 9 days reported in 2008, while salt also lasted for only 5 days compared to 9 days reported in 2008. CSB only lasted 5 days compared to 7 days reported in the previous survey. Salt ration was reduced from 10mg to 5mg in January 2010 based on revised PRRO figures. It’s still not clear why a 14 day ration provided to refugees only lasts 9 days hence further investigations are needed to understand this. This could also be attributed to poor budgeting of food at household level due availability of alternative sources of food following harvesting season.

Sale of Food Assistance

Overall, 76% of the sampled households reported having not sold their ration which is much better than 41% reported in 2008 where Nyarugusu had the highest percentage of households that had sold their ration. For those that sold food, the main reason for selling the ration follows the 2008 trend and was given as: need other food items (19%), need other non-food items (13%) and no other source of money by 13% of the households. As indicated in the chart below, reasons for households selling food aid has reduced between 2008 and 2010.

Distance to the Food Distribution Point

On average majority of the beneficiary households took close to one hour to arrive at the distribution point (36 minutes) which is close to what was reported in 2008. However, this was in contrast to the amount of time spent to actually receive food at the distribution point, which according to most of the households, took more than five hours, with the recipient leaving the house in the morning and only getting the ration late in the evening. It’s worth noting that refugee caseload increased following merger with Lugufu hence could be a factor in the length of time at the distribution point.
Gender of the Ration Recipient

Across the camp, most of the women (77%) were more likely to be the recipients of the ration which is not different from what was reported in 2008. Proportion of male and female child receiving food was very low, on average at only 6 percent although it has increased from 4 percent reported in 2008.

A total of 33% of the sampled households were of the opinion that both women and men should collect the ration, which has gone down from 44% reported in 2008. About 57% felt that only the woman should collect the ration, while 10% felt that the men should be the one to collect. Preference for women to collect the ration has increased by 12%. However, when asked whether issuing the ration card in the name of the woman would have the impact of improving their decision-making power at the household level, 61% of the households felt that this would not make any significant impact although this has increased compared to 29% reported in the previous survey.

Satisfaction with the Distribution Process

Overall, 41% of the sampled households indicated having received information regarding the ration size, which is a decline from 53% reported in the previous survey. The source of information showed a decline in all sources apart from neighbours which increased from 29% to 36%. As shown in the chart on the right, most of the information is received from camp leaders (41%), food committee (47%) and Notice boards (52%).

Only 70% of the sampled households were aware of their entitlements, and this has declined from 76% reported in the 2008 survey.

Food Distribution Committees

A total of 48% of the households did not know about the food distribution committees in the camp and this is a drop from 52% reported in 2008. As shown in the table, assisting with ration calculation was the main assistance provided by the food distribution committees (81%). Other assistance provided were cited as: solving distribution problems (56%), that has seen a decline since 2008, assisting with ration information dissemination (47%), solving ration cards problems (35%), and controlling ration thefts (33%). Thirteen percent of the sampled households thought that the food distribution committees did not offer any assistance during food distributions showing an improvement from what was reported in 2008.
Perception of Problems Encountered During the Food Distribution

Overall, five main problems cited were; underweight bags by 41% of the households, uneven distribution and absence of ration information (35%), inadequate notice (27%), cheating by group leaders (29%), congestion at the sharing sheds/shelters (25%) and inaccurate weighing scales (30%) As shown in the table below, households reporting problems encountered have reduced compared to the previous survey in 2008 with the exception of uneven distribution/absence of ration information which was already reflected in less assistance provided by the food committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived problems during distribution</th>
<th>Round -2008</th>
<th>Round 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution group size</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food packaging too big/heavy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion at sharing sheds or shelters</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of sharing shelters</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/lack of crowd control measures</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overburdening of women, esp. pregnant and lactating</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneven distribution and absence of ration info</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance of Food distribution sites from houses</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of or inadequate scoops/Notice</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate weighing scales</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underweight bags</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating by group leaders</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation by group leaders</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Problem</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Food Assistance

Households were asked how they had used each of their items in the last distribution ration. For all items, (maize, beans, oil, CSB, and salt) over 90% used for consumption which is an improvement from 85% in 2008. For all the food items, only about 3% was sold and another 3% exchanged. There are no major differences across the different food items.
11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

This section will provide summary conclusions and recommendations by the three pillars of food security: food availability, food access and food utilisation.

Availability

It is evident from the findings that the sampled households are relying mostly on food assistance as their main source of food with very little from purchase and own production. Between 2008 and 2010, reliance on food aid, own production and gifts has increased. Although 2010 shows an increased contribution from some livelihood activities, they are still very limited and lack diversity and they have limited access to agricultural activities, due to their refugee status. This therefore calls for a well secured pipeline to ensure consistency of receipt of food assistance.

Access

The results indicate strongly that food assistance is having a positive impact in improving household food consumption and improving households ability to cope with the deteriorating situation, thus the consistency of food distributions to the beneficiary households needs to be maintained for this objective to be achieved. Nonetheless, it should be noted that there has been a decline in households with acceptable consumption patterns from 98% in 2008 to 86% in 2010. Diversity is still heavily dependant on the provided food basket and this has also shown a decline between the two reporting periods.

Post distribution Monitoring

• There is an indication of exchange and use of food to pay debts, which is a major concern and needs further investigation.

• The high level of women receiving food assistance has continued to increase since 2008 and should be maintained

• Although problems encountered at distribution have shown a great improvement, there are still problems with underweight bags and uneven distribution/absence of ration information.

• Households reported a decline in assistance from the food committees compared to 2008.

• Households reported that the provided 14-day ration only lasts 9 days which is a decline from 2008.

Recommendations

• Most households are highly dependent on food and other assistance and although they are far from being self-reliant, there has been improvement in their participation is different economic activities. The recommendation is to continue the food assistance at the current levels while also enabling the refugees to access more livelihood activities.

• Educational opportunities should be reviewed in light of the declining levels of enrolment and attendance for children 6-13 years of age.

• Refugees reported they were provided with Unimix in place of CSB and they were not familiar with this food item and thus most of them were preparing it as maize meal. It’s therefore recommended that more sensitization takes place when a new item is introduced into the food basket.

• Further investigations are needed to understand why a 14-Day ration provided to refugees only lasts 9 days.

• WFP in collaboration with UNHCR and relevant cooperating partners should review the food distribution system with the aim of reducing time spent collecting food at the distribution centres.