Main Findings

- The overall food security situation within the covered locations in February 2011 shows that rural camps are more food insecure compared to urban camps. The stable food security situation in urban camps is mainly attributed to more income opportunities, regular food distribution and a smaller price increase for essential commodities in the urban markets.

- Data collection was carried out in mid-February 2011, which is considered to be the post-harvest season. Food consumption score has slightly decreased among IDPs compared to November 2010. Nevertheless, the majority of households have an acceptable food consumption score.

- Only 13 out of the planned 21 sentinel sites have been reached due to insecurity and movement restriction. This has resulted in less than planned numbers of households being interviewed for mixed and resident communities, hence only Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) group is represented in the report.

- During the first quarter of 2011, prices of cereals (millet and sorghum) in Nyala market were stable compared to prices recorded during the same period last year. However, the terms of trade (ToT) between the price of a medium size goat and a 90-kg bag of sorghum is in favor of livestock owners.

- The price of the minimum healthy food basket has significantly increased to 1.59 SDG/per capita compared to November 2010, when the price was 1.27 SDG. This increase in prices is due to the increase in the price of essential food items such as cereals, sugar and oil. This has negatively affected the purchasing power of IDPs. It was indicated that 66 percent of the interviewed IDP households were unable to cover the cost of one food basket.

- The proportion of households spending more than 65 percent of their income on food has increased in the five rural locations covered in February 2011.

- There is a slight decrease in the percentage of children (6-23 months) who consume more than four food groups compared to November 2010. However, compared to August 2010, the situation has reportedly improved.
1. FOOD SECURITY

The food security situation for IDPs has deteriorated compared to November 2010. There is a shift in the proportion of households from the food secure category to the severely and moderately food insecure category. This shift is attributed to the increase in the cost of the minimum healthy food basket, resulting in a lower purchasing power and people’s inability to meet basic household food requirements.

Over 40 percent of interviewed households are female-headed households, however, there is no significant difference in terms of food security status when comparing to male-headed households. The significant difference in the food security situation is whether the households are recipients of food assistance. Thus, 41 percent of the households who have not received food assistance are classified as severely food insecure compared to 13 percent of households receiving food assistance.

The food security situation by location indicates a deterioration in the situation of IDPs in camps in Nyala (Otash), Sharia (AU), Gereida (Um Baloula) and Duma. Meanwhile, in rural areas the deterioration is observed among Muhajeria residents and Selea mixed community.

A significant deterioration in the food security situation is observed in Selea and Umbaloula camp in Gereida compared to previous rounds.

*The food security indicator consists of the following: market situation and cost of minimum healthy food basket; income sources; expenditure; and food consumption.*
**Income Sources**

The main incomes sources for the IDP communities are similar across the FSMS rounds. This is mainly due to less diversified income activities available for the IDPs, particularly in the big settlements. Domestic labour, pottering and construction labour are among the typical IDP activities, and various forms of wage labour is the most important income source for 40 percent of the IDP households. IDPs in the rural areas are depending entirely on agricultural wage labour following the various types of agricultural season.

Small business represents the second most important income source for the IDPs, with more than a quarter of the households relying on this as their main income source. Income from firewood/charcoal collection and sale has slightly increased from 10 percent to 12 percent, as this source is one of the important activities in the dry season.

It is of significance to indicate that income from crops sale is still the most important income source for six percent of the households, indicating that some of the IDPs managed to cultivate last season.

Moreover, the household’s income contribution from donation (remittances and gifts) has increased in February 2011 compared to November 2010 and to same time last year.

The median absolute income per location describes a deteriorating situation related to income per capita in rural areas (Selea, AU and Duma) compared to urban settlements (Otash camp in Nyala and Al Neim IDP camps in El Daein). The income deterioration is due to less diversified income opportunities in rural areas. Statistically significant deterioration has been observed in both Gerida camps (Um Baloula and Dar El Salam).

**Expenditure**

An average of 67 percent of the monthly income of the sampled households is spent on food items in February 2011, which exceeds the World Bank threshold of 65 percent. The percentage increased from 60 percent in November 2010, which can be attributed to the increase in food basket prices.

Households’ expenditure on food items has remained similar to November 2010; however, the purchasing power among IDP households in February 2011 has deteriorated compared to the last three months and to same time last year. IDPs are considered to be most affected, and 66 percent of IDP households cannot afford the cost of one food basket (1.59 SDG/person/day).

Cereal, sugar, vegetable oil and dry vegetables are among the items where prices increased considerably. The increase in food items prices has resulted in a 25 percent increment in food basket prices from November 2010 to February 2011. Thus, the proportion of households’ expenditure on non-food items have decreased for some items, such as education (eight percent to six percent) and transportation (three percent to one percent) compared to November 2010.
Food Consumption

The food consumption score by community type show that the IDPs generally have an acceptable food consumption score throughout the rounds. Nevertheless, the proportion of households with an acceptable food consumption score has decreased by eight percent from November 2010 to February 2011. The shift in the households’ food consumption classification reveals that the same portion of households who had an acceptable food consumption score in November 2010 now have a borderline food consumption score. There is a clear positive correlation between households with an acceptable food consumption score and food assistance. Among the households in the acceptable food consumption group, 74 percent receive food aid regularly. Of the households who have not received food assistance, only 38 percent are in the acceptable food consumption group. Furthermore, of the households who received food assistance, only five percent are in the poor food consumption group. For the group who have not received any food assistance, 18 percent are in the poor food consumption group.

The average food consumption score at location level reveals that nearly all locations have an acceptable food consumption score, except AU camp in Shaeria which has a borderline consumption score. Statistically significant deterioration in the food consumption scores compared to the last three months is observed in Otash camp in Nyala and Selea mixed community (rural location).

2. Coping Strategy Index

Within the residential groups, more than 70 percent of the IDP households did not use any negative coping strategies in February 2011. This confirms that the post harvest period is a less stressful period compared to the rest of year.

There is a statistical correlation between coping and food consumption, indicating that when households are not engaging in any negative coping they have a higher food consumption score.
3. Mid Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC)

Mid Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) was measured on 288 IDP children in the age between 6 and 59 months. There is an increase in the proportion of children with a MUAC score corresponding to severe malnutrition (<115mm) compared to November 2010, and four percent of these children need curative care. Within the other community groups (mixed (46) and residents (73)) the proportion of children who are severely malnourished has increased from zero percent for both mixed and residents community to two percent and 10 percent respectively. MUAC for children was introduced in November 2010; therefore seasonal comparison is not possible.
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### DEMOGRAPHICS

- 325 households were interviewed.
- 42.4% are female headed households.
- 7 persons is average household size.

### Residential status of sampled households:
- 79 percent IDPs in camps
- 5.5 percent IDPs outside camps
- 7.4 percent residents
- 6.5 percent returnees

4. Child Health and Dietary Diversity

Dietary diversity groups among infants and young children (6-23 months), have deteriorated in February 2011 compared to November 2010, but improved compared to August 2010.

The proportion of children who consume food from less than four food groups has increased to 68 percent from 64 percent in November 2010, which means that a large proportion of the children do not receive enough nutrients required for growth. This deterioration could be attributed to poor health care practices and poor environmental hygiene.
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5. Food Assistance

The proportion of households in IDP camps that receive food assistance in this round is 94 percent and remains stable compared to previous rounds. Among the food assistance recipients, 26 percent of IDPs reported to have sold or exchanged parts of their cereal, oil and pulses which is a higher proportion compared to November 2010 (14 percent). The main reasons for selling food assistance are to meet milling costs (81 percent), purchase other food items (65 percent), education (29 percent), firewood/fuel (26 percent) and medicine (15 percent).