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1 Terms

AAH-U  Action Africa Help - Uganda
ANC   Antenatal Clinic
AWD   Acute Watery Diarrhoea
CSB+  Corn Soya Blend Plus
CT    Cash Transfer
CTD   Conventional travel document
DRC   Democratic Republic of Congo
EDP   Extended Delivery Point
EVI   Extremely Vulnerable Individual
FBM   Food Basket Monitoring
FCS   Food Consumption Score
FDP   Final Distribution Point
FGD   Focus Group Discussion
FMCC  Food Management Committee
FSSA  Food Security and Nutrition Assessment
GAM   Global Acute Malnutrition
GFD   General Food Distribution
GoU   Government of Uganda
HC    Health Centre
HH    Household
HIV   Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HQ    Head Quarters
IBFAN International Baby Food Action Network - Uganda
ID    Identity
IGA   Income Generating Activity
IPs   Implementing Partners
IYCF  Infant and Young Child Feeding
JAM   Joint Assessment Mission
Keal  Kilocalorie(s)
LC    Local Council
LUCYA Land Use and Crop Yield Assessment
MAM   Moderate Acute Malnutrition
MANP  Micronutrient Powder
MoH   Ministry of Health
MT    Metric Tonnes
MUAC  Mid-Upper Arm Circumference
NGO   Non-Governmental Organisation
OPM   Office of the Prime Minister
OTC   Outpatient Therapeutic Care
PDM   Post-Distribution Monitoring
PoC   Persons of Concern
PRRO  Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation
PSN   Persons with Specific Needs
PTA   Parent Teacher Association
RAB   Refugee Appeals Board
RC    Reception Centre
RDO   Regional District Office
REC   Refugee Eligibility Committee
RSD   Refugee Status Determination
RWC   Refugee Welfare Committee
SAM   Severe Acute Malnutrition
SFC   Supplementary Feeding Centre
SFP   Supplementary Feeding Programme
SGBV  Sexual and Gender Based Violence
STI   Sexually Transmitted Diseases
SW    Southwest
TC    Transit Centre
TFC   Therapeutic Feeding Centre
UGX   Ugandan Shillings
UNHCR The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNRA  Uganda National Roads Authority
VHT   Village Health Team
VSLA  Village Savings and Loans Associations
WASH  Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP   World Food Programme
WHO   World Health Organisation
WN    West Nile
2 Executive Summary

As of 30 June 2014, Uganda currently hosts 392,088 refugees and asylum seekers. The majority of refugees and asylum seekers’ country of origin are the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (46.2% - 181,240) and the Republic of South Sudan (36.4% - 142,769). Uganda has been experiencing major simultaneous emergencies from DRC since 2011 and South Sudan since February 2012. The restoration of security in North Kivu and Province Orientale of DRC has resulted in limited spontaneous repatriation of the Congolese refugees. However, the situation in South Sudan remains fragile and the potential for future influx due to resumed conflict and food insecurity in parts of South Sudan.

The Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) was conducted by the Office of the Prime Minister’s Refugees Department (OPM), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and World Food Programme (WFP) from 4-14 June 2014. The 2014 JAM aims to enhance knowledge and insight into food security, nutrition, and access to basic needs and essential services in the refugee settlements. The JAM field missions visited 8 refugee settlements of Rhino Camp, Lobule (Koboko), Adjumani, Kiryandongo, Kyangwali, Oruchinga, Nakivale, Rwamwanja and Kyaka II including refugee hosting area of the above settlements. The JAM utilized a mix of quantitative (e.g. Food Security and Nutrition Assessments) and qualitative (e.g. focus group discussions) methods.

Recommendations from the JAM will be used to draft the Joint Plan of Action with OPM, WFP and UNHCR working together on the plan.

Key Findings and Recommendations

Targeting for food assistance

- Provision of 100% of the kilocalorie requirement to the Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) and new arrivals (0 – 3 years in Uganda) as per the 2011 JAM recommended ration schedule remains a fitting response to their vulnerability and should be maintained. However, in the absence of regular/standardised EVI verification, some vulnerable individuals may not be accessing the food assistance they require hence:
  - A standardised and regular system of EVI verification of refugees is recommended to ensure inclusion of eligible households.
- The food ration schedule outlined in the 2011 JAM sets expectations of food assistance. However, more information is needed to draw a clear correlation between food security status, length of stay, and the role of the ration, land allocation and income generation in promoting food self-sustainability among refugees. It is therefore recommended that:
  - The current ration schedule is maintained until review can be conducted on the impact of the ration schedule on food security, in a manner that ensures sustainable food security beyond the first 3 years in the settlements,
  - Holding off the ration reduction in Rwamwanja until evidence above is established to guide ration reduction modality, and
  - OPM, WFP and UNHCR to explore the option of compensating for milling costs and come up with a suitable way forward. This includes assessment of past interventions to understand what needs to be done differently, especially by WFP.

Nutrition

- Despite continued food assistance and nutritional support, Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates across the settlements have increased since the 2011 JAM, with higher GAM rates in West Nile compared with Southwest in 2013. In order to tackle the problem of malnutrition, there is need to:
  - Expedite the introduction of targeted supplementary feeding in West Nile to manage the moderately malnourished for both children and pregnant and lactating mother,
- Introduce blanket supplementary feeding among the 6-23 months. Enrol HIV positive and tuberculosis patients on medication in the supplementary feeding programme.
  - Anaemia rates are slowly declining, but remain a public health concern. Overall rates among refugees is 48.1%. The new South Sudanese caseloads have anaemia rates as high as 71.9%. Anaemia is partly linked to poor diet diversification, high prevalence of malaria, and worm infestations. Diet diversification in the settlements depends on knowledge, attitude, and cultural perceptions of a diversified diet, limited capacity for own food production, and lack of income to purchase food items from local markets. Therefore, the JAM recommends:
    - OPM, UNHCR, WFP to institute a multi-sector anaemia prevention and treatment programme which is participatory and inclusive from a community perspective to be sustainable,
    - Ensure provision of iron/folic acid tablets to pregnant and lactating women and the blanket supplementary feeding recommended above among the 6-23 months and pregnant and lactating women to address high anaemia levels,
    - Conduct a micronutrient study looking into the prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies, including causes of anaemia, and institute remedial measures.

**Health/WASH**

- Malaria and acute respiratory tract infections remain the leading causes of morbidity and mortality in the settlements. Refugees and host community have access to health centers in either the refugee settlement or the host community. When medicines and health services are constrained, refugees may seek private alternatives. Therefore, the OPM through the Ministry of Health and UNHCR need to ensure that:
  - OPM, Ministry of Health, and UNHCR to ensure settlement health center have adequate supplies, especially malaria medication and rapid diagnostic tests for malaria,
  - Refugees are included in the mass distribution and sensitization for longer-lasting, insecticide treated bed nets,
  - UNHCR and partners to review and harmonize health staff salaries scale, and
- While major improvements have been made with regards to access to water in the settlement since the 2011, the recent influx of refugees from DRC and South Sudan has considerably impacted the access to water per capita. Sanitation facilities at food distribution points were found to be lacking. Therefore, the JAM recommends;
  - WFP and UNHCR to ensure settlement FDPs have water and sanitation facilities.
- There is need to construct additional FDPs where these are lacking (especially in Kyaka2 and Rwamwanja )

**Livelihoods**

- Currently, livelihood programming has a strong focus on providing for short-term households food security primarily in refugee settlements. Efforts have been made to upgrade Uganda’s livelihood programme to better address both the new arrivals and protracted refugee caseloads. With a broader scope and increased scale, local economic development, value chain upgrading, and other long-term development approaches will be increasingly practiced. It is recommended to:
  - Continue to deliver seeds, tools, and agriculture extension services to support short-term food security,
  - Support an upgraded agriculture package in post-harvest handling and storage at the household level to further enhance food security, and at the same time, work towards collective bulking, storage and marketing at the community-level to enhance sales of surplus agriculture commodities,
  - Promote non-farm income generating activities (IGAs) to increase and diversify household incomes. Non-farm IGAs can partially address limited land availability and youth employment and empowerment, and
- Ensure communities are given opportunity and guided to choose, actively co-lead and co-manage their solutions from planning and implementation, to monitoring and reporting progress against targets on a multi-year strategy.

**Environment**

- The environment in refugee settlements and outlying areas is heavily impacted by refugee hosting. Deforestation is a product of firewood and shelter material collection, and clearing land for habitation and farming. The depletion of natural resources continues to cause friction between refugees and host community. To mitigate environment degradation, several initiatives have been implemented and JAM recommend their continuation and upgrade:
  - Fuel-efficient stoves have been distributed or constructed at household level to reduce firewood consumption,
  - Reforestation and afforestation have projects created green zones and buffer areas,
  - Individual and community-owned woodlots in the host community have been support to create jobs while also providing a sustainable resource for shelter and fuel wood.

**Food distribution**

- The Family Size Food Distribution system is working well and should be maintained. Recommendations for the food distribution system include:
  - Standardizing scooping tools and scale to be made available for refugees,
  - Clustering family sizes for ease of distribution needs to be avoided to ensure that each household is provided food based on actual number of persons in the household, and
  - Functional complaints’ desk should be present at all distributions to enable a timely response to refugee food distribution issues.

**Registration**

- The registration process in Uganda was acceptable and clear. Recommendations for registration include:
  - Maintain food assistance to asylum seekers throughout the refugee status determination (RSD) and appeals process,
  - OPM should review arable land allocation and food security for the Rwandese Refugees (1994-1998 caseload),
  - Periodic use of fingerprint biometrics to verify food beneficiaries in conjunction with monthly use of household attestation letter and Identification (ID) cards, and
  - OPM and UNHCR to expedite the issuance of ID cards to all refugees above the age of 16 years.

3 **Introduction**

Uganda is currently hosting over 392,000 refugees and asylum seekers, the majority of whom reside in refugee settlements provided by the Government of Uganda. Thanks to Uganda’s generous asylum policy, refugees from neighbouring countries continue to access the territory and the asylum procedure. At present, 47% of all refugees in Uganda are from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and 37% are from the Republic of South Sudan (see Graph 1 below for breakdown by nationality). Congolese and South Sudanese fleeing to Uganda are granted prima facie refugee status. Other nationalities are granted refugee status through an Eligibility process.

3.1 **Population**

Since the last JAM in 2011, the refugee population has changed significantly. The creation of South Sudan and stability in Rwanda enabled thousands of refugees to repatriate from Uganda. However, since July 2011, Southwest Uganda has been experiencing a protracted influx of new arrivals from the
Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) as a result of rebel groups in the east of the country, with Congolese refugees mostly settling in South Western Uganda settlements.

Refugees by Country of Origin (Progres 31 May 2014)

In 2011, 87,000² Congolese refugees resided in Uganda that population has more than double to 181,240 in June 2014.³ With the deteriorating situation in Jonglei State, the small scale influx started to Uganda since February 2012, however, the December 2013 events in South Sudan have resulted in significant forced displacement. As of April 2014, 96,983 South Sudanese refugees have sought refuge in Uganda with a total of 142,000 residing in Uganda by June 2014.⁴ The South Sudanese caseload has been settled in Adjumani, Rhino Camp, and Kiryandongo (see Table 1 below for a breakdown of refugee numbers by settlement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Number of refugees</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjumani</td>
<td>89,095</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryandongo</td>
<td>29,848</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhino Camp</td>
<td>17,453</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koboko</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyumanzi TC</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceca RC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Nile total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakivale</td>
<td>68,529</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwamwanja</td>
<td>54,315</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyangwali</td>
<td>40,155</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyaka II</td>
<td>22,734</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oruchinga</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South west total</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>48%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala/urban refugees</td>
<td>56,964</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - Refugee numbers by settlement – Source: UNHCR Population Statistics, 1st July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Recommended WFP food ration – Southwest</th>
<th>Recommended WFP food ration – West Nile</th>
<th>Effective date for new ration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVIs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New arrivals (0-3 years)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees in Uganda 4-5 years</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees in Uganda 5 years or more</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>July 2012 for Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 2013 for West Nile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Food Ration Schedule for General Food Distribution – Source: 2011 JAM

Note: It is important to note that refugees are not automatically off-assistance after 5 years. Various other indicators and parameters are first taken into consideration; for example, current health status, agricultural productivity, livelihood options, security of the area etc.

Refugees on 100% food ration receive a basket equivalent to 2,100 Kcal per day. Maize forms the bulk of the caloric intake of the GFD with Maize meal being provided to Extremely Vulnerable Individuals (EVIs) and new arrivals.

Food Ration Per Refugee Caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>General Food Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVIs and New Caseload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% ration (grams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize Grain</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize Meal</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB +</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein Contribution</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Contribution</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Food rations per refugee caseload – Source: WFP

Over the past 2 years, there had been some inconsistencies in the food pipeline with ration reductions experienced at various intervals. Following an unprecedented influx of refugees from DRC and South Sudan, WFP was forced to cut rations by 50% for all old caseload refugees in Uganda in order to prioritise the new caseload. In 2013, funding-related impacts occurred resulting in food ration reductions. The old caseload was provided with 50% of cereal entitlement for 3 months.

The most significant ration reduction was in January and February 2014, however, from March 2014, the pipeline has been healthy, consistent and restored to full ration for each category again.

Refugees continue to flow into Uganda in search of asylum. For the South Sudanese refugees, the current 2014 planning figure is 150,000 by end of 2014 to arrive in country. Given the current political and security situations in South Sudan, UNHCR, WFP, and OPM are also planning on a
contingency planning figures of 300,000 asylum seekers and refugees by the end of 2014, with a ‘worst case’ scenario of 450,000.

4 Joint Assessment Mission Overview

4.1 Objectives

In accordance with the global memorandum of understanding between the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and World Food Programme (WFP), Joint Assessment Missions (JAM) are carried out every two years to assess the condition of refugees and refugee hosting population in order to make recommendations for programme adjustment. While the main focus of the assessment is food security and livelihoods, other key areas impacting on the lives of refugees in the settlements of Uganda are also covered during the JAM.

The 2014 JAM aims to provide technical analysis of activities since the 2011 JAM in order to provide OPM, UNHCR, and WFP with recommendations on planned support. The 2011 JAM raised a series of recommendations that have formed the basis of post-JAM programming for the organizations involved, most notably the change in food ration schedule. The 2014 JAM narrowed its focus to food security and increased livelihood.

4.2 Methodology

The JAM is largely based on secondary data review complemented by an extension field mission. The JAM undertook an exhaustive desk review, a one-day training in Kampala for the JAM core team on 26th May, during which an overview of the JAM process and data collection tools was held. Two team of experts from OPM, UNHCR, and WFP were formed to conduct field missions to Southwest and West Nile.

Information was collected through participatory data collection tools, including key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Fieldwork took place across the nine refugee settlements in Uganda from 4th to 14th June 2014 and included:

- The JAM field missions visited 8 refugee settlements of Rhino Camp, Lobule (Koboko), Kiryandongo, Kyangwali, Oruchinga, Nakivale, Rwamwanja and Kyaka II and the refugee hosting area of Adjumani. These field missions went to reception centres, schools, health centres, WASH facilities, markets, warehouses, food distribution points, youth centres, and livelihood projects,
- Interviews with local district government, settlement authorities, and refugee and host community leaders,
- Interviews with teachers, health practitioners, and specialists from the water sector and traders,
- Focus group discussions with refugees on food assistance and coping strategies, coexistence with host community, quality of life, environment, livelihood opportunities,
- Market and settlement infrastructure visits,
- Interviews with NGO representatives and partners, and
- Observation and transect walks throughout the settlements.

Topics discussed and questions posed were based loosely on checklists that were developed at Kampala level and further refined at field level by the teams (see Annex 3). Checklists served as prompts to key issues for discussion and were not intended to be a strict questionnaire. Daily debriefs were held in the field to share information collected each day, to begin the triangulation and validation process of the information gathered and to share with refugee leaders and representatives.
and field staff the results of the time in their respective locations. In each location, translators from the refugee community accompanied the teams.

Five thematic groups were formed to cover the following areas of data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAM Thematic Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security, livelihoods, targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and coping strategies from the refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics, warehousing, roads,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure, NFI and markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, nutrition, WASH and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, domestic energy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agriculture/livestock, shelter and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination, verification, durable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions, policy, contingency planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and new arrivals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial findings and recommendations from the JAM were presented to the core team in Kampala on 19th June 2014, where issues were further discussed and refined ahead of the report writing process.

The JAM report brings together the main findings from across the settlements that came out of the interviews and observations, as well as information from secondary data sources that relate to the issues raised during the JAM.

5 Food Security

This section covers issue relating to the food security of refugee households in the settlements, including issues of food access, availability and use, as well as touching upon issues identified during the JAM as impacting on household food security.

**Sector Overview – Food Security**

**Key findings:**
- Food assistance is provided to 279,548 of refugees (April 2014)*
- Food security decreased from 65.7% in 2011 to 45.2% in 2013*
- Households “had access to and were able to cultivate land” experienced a drop from 71.7% in 2011 to 62.7% in 2013*
- Food rations are bartered and sold for households needing to diversify diets, purchase household items, and meet critical health and education expenditures
- The biggest obstacles to food security are pipeline breaks, lack of access to land for agriculture production, and income generating activities

*FSNA

**Sector Overview - Food Assistance Targeting**

**Key Findings**
- The EVIs and new arrivals are getting food assistance at 100%.
- Food assistance for longer-term refugees can be reviewed with the right support (e.g. access to land, livelihood support), and
- In some instances, beneficiaries and partners were not clear regarding PSNs and EVIs selection for identification criteria.

**Recommendations**
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR to conduct further settlement-specific analysis relevant to food ration schedule,
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR-Partners need to sensitize refugees on EVIs and PSNs criteria, and
- Refugee Welfare Committees should be more involved in identifying and reporting potential
5.1 Food Access

Depending on the length of stay in the settlements in Uganda and the settlement in which they reside, refugees have access to between 100% and 0% WFP food ration. Those on 100% general food ration receive at least 2,100 kcal in the form of dry food (refer to Table 3 above for the commodity breakdown).

EVIs and new arrivals (0-3 years in Uganda) are often the most vulnerable to food insecurity in the settlements. These groups have limited access to food because of their recent arrival, health status, age, mobility, number of dependents etc. and are dependent on food assistance, core relief items, and other assistance provided by OPM, WFP, UNHCR and partners. Proportional piling exercises conducted at field level suggest that the WFP ration is the main source of food for refugees still on food assistance. The provision of 100% ration to these groups is a fitting response to their vulnerability.

EVIs receive 100% ration as they lack the productive capacity to support themselves and their family and lack the social safety net to assist them. The JAM noted that Persons with Specific Needs (PSNs) and EVI verification is conducted annually, but there are no mechanisms in between to incorporate or remove those whose circumstances have changed. In the absence of regular, standardised checks, vulnerable individuals who should qualify for greater assistance may not be captured. Conversely, there may be individuals on the EVI list who ought not to be. The definitions and qualifications of EVI and PSN should be made clearer to refugees to prevent misunderstanding.

**Recommendation:**

There is need for UNHCR, WFP and OPM to continue to conduct an annual EVI verification and, in between verifications, a mechanism to include or remove persons from the EVI list. Refugee welfare committees (RWCs) should have a stronger role in the identification of potential EVIs. RWCs have intimate knowledge of refugees living in their location.

In principle, refugees in Uganda have access to land for residence and farming. The 2013 FSNA notes that 82% of households use their land for agriculture and 17.3% of food consumed was own production. Refugees grow a variety of crops, including maize, beans, rice, sorghum, millet, sweet potatoes, cassava, groundnuts, beans, cowpeas, and sesame seed. In Southwest, a limited number of refugees have matoke plants, despite a ban on refugees growing perennial crops. The 2013 FSNA indicates that 29.7% of refugees own livestock. Refugees who have limited or no access to land, or non-farm income generating activities (IGAs) are seriously impacted when there are delays or reduction in their food ration (food pipeline break). For those refugees on reduced or no ration, the greatest threats to food security are lack of access to land and lack of access to income generating sources. Case in point, the Rwandese Refugees from the 1994-1998 caseload no longer have access to land for cultivation should have their arable land allocation and food security reviewed.

5.2 Food Utilisation and Consumption

Food ration are consumed by the household, as well as a form of currency in the settlements. Ration sales are almost always due to households needing to meet critical health and education expenses, soap, milling costs and shelter repair, as well as to acquire diversified and preferred foods. Domestic expenditure breaks down as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic expenditure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food expenditure</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the sale of the ration reduces the kilocalories available at the household level, additional diversified food purchases and own crop production adds to the kcals available to the household.

5.2.1 Dietary Diversity

| Education | 26.1% |
| Construction/House repairs | 22.4% |
| Soap/Household items | 18.6% |

Table 5 – Domestic expenditure break down

Sector Overview - Dietary Diversity

Key Findings
- Monotonous food rations,
- Lack of income, rather than lack of availability, to purchase food items from local markets,
- Limited capacity for own food production (seeds, livestock, poultry and land), and
- Knowledge, attitude, and perceptions for a diversified diet.

Recommendations
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR to strengthen livelihoods in the following areas:
  - agriculture to enhance own food production (e.g. demonstration sites, agriculture inputs, intensive farming on small plots, drought resistant crops)
  - non-farm income generating opportunities to buy diversified foods in the market
- Depending the results of the ongoing pilot, OPM-WFP-UNHCR to investigate possibility of expanding cash for food (currently in Adjumani, Rhino Camp, Kiryandongo) to catalyze dietary diversity
- Nutrition education to improve knowledge and attitudes for a balanced and nutritious diet

Poor dietary diversity, which is linked to under-nutrition (e.g. anaemia, micronutrient deficiency), is a result of weak dietary practices and limited access to other fresh food stuff. The lack of income to purchase food, rather than the lack of availability of fresh foods in market, is the major challenge for refugees to access diversified diets. Markets in close proximity settlements have majority of the commodities refugees require. Compounding limited dietary diversity is the limited diversity of food production at the household level. Limited types of crops grown, livestock, and land, negatively impact household’s own production. More sensitization, increase number of demonstration plots, and higher quality training can build knowledge, attitudes and practices among refugees for the need for a diversified diet.

The monotony of the food ration was raised several times during the JAM, with recipients complaining of lack of choice. In line with the WFP’s Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) and UNHCR’s operational guidance for Cash-Based Interventions (CBIs) in displacement settings, UNHCR and WFP has introduced a project to provide cash as an alternative to the food ration. CBI is one mechanism that may allow for increased dietary diversification. CBIs in Uganda commenced in May 2014. If the PDM reports and FSNA indicate a positive effect on household food security (e.g. food diversification, improved nutrition indicators) then WFP and UNHCR should consider expanding the CBIs programme to other settlements.

5.2.2 Food Consumption Score (FCS)

Based on food consumed in the household over a 7-day period, food consumption score (FCS) is used as a measure of household food security based on proxy indicators of adequacy and diversity. In November 2013, 54.2% of households across all settlements had “acceptable” food consumption.
When the overall 2014 and 2011 FCS are compared, the FCS has declined. The 2011 FCS overall “acceptable” was noted at 65.7%, “borderline” 24.2%, and 10.0% poor. Several factors that may have contributed to this FCS decline according to focus group discussions include:

- The steady but large influx of Congolese refugees since 2011,
- Ration cuts due to funding shortfall and food pipeline breaks,
- The gradual reduction in soil fertility leading to reduced crop yields, and
- The reduction in land available for farming as a result of the influx.

(Source: Focus Group Discussions during JAM field mission)

When comparing refugees’ FCS and the length of stay, there has been a gradual decline in food security status between 2011 and 2013 across three consumption groups. A rise in the proportion of households in the poor category across all lengths of stay, and a corresponding decline in the proportion of households in the acceptable category across all lengths of stay.

Graph 2- Proportion of households, by timing of arrival in Uganda, by food consumption category.

### 5.3 Milling

**Sector Overview - Milling**

**Key Findings**

- WFP does not cover maize grain milling cost,
- Part of the food rations are sold to pay for milling service,
- Households are receiving less than 2100 kcal due to milling costs, and
- Limited number of mills result in high milling costs.

**Recommendations**

- WFP should maintain maize meal for EVIs and new arrivals,
- In case there is a commodity replacement to maize grain, WFP should explore the option of compensating for milling costs to EVIs and new arrivals, and
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR to discuss milling issue and come up with a suitable way forward. This includes assessment of past interventions to understand what needs to be done differently, especially by the relevant technical agency (e.g. WFP).

With the exception of EVIs who should receive maize meal, refugees eligible for food assistance receive whole grain maize. Maize grain requires milling prior to cooking. An additional 10gms of maize per day account for the grain lost in the milling process, but no compensation is provided for the cost incurred in milling. The logic is that those who have stayed in country ought to have developed livelihoods to cover incidental costs. The majority of households indicated that a portion of
ration is sold or bartered to pay for milling costs, which reduces the total amount of food for the household.

Milling costs quoted during the JAM ranged from between 100 to 300 UGX per kg. Furthermore, there is a limited number of hammer mills in the settlements leading to a monopoly of pricing. The time and transportation costs needed to reach milling facilities make it difficult and costly for refugees to utilize this service.

If WFP is unable to guarantee EVIs and new arrivals with maize meal, they should be compensated for the cost of milling. WFP and partners are currently exploring how best to make available additional milling capacity. While several milling initiatives have been implemented and handed over to the community groups, many of these projects have failed to become sustainable. The majority of mills visited during the JAM were privately owned.

5.4 Coping strategies

The most common coping strategy used by refugee households during times of food scarcity is to reduce the number of meals and the quantity cooked. Negative coping strategies become more prevalent when household food stocks run low towards the end of the ration cycle. This echoes FSNA findings, where 48.7% and 47.6% of households reported reducing number of meals and sizes of portions on a 7-day recall period, respectively. Other coping strategies reported during the JAM include the collection of wild foods (e.g. greens and fruits), doing casual work for the host community and borrowing from relatives and friends.

6 Nutrition and Health

6.1 Nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview – Nutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anaemia rates are high among:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Children 6-59 months – 48.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Non-pregnant women 15-39 years – 23.3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall GAM rates (2013 - 4.7%, 2012 - 3.6%) are within acceptable levels *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Low GAM rate Adjumani 9.6% and Rhino Camp 7.6% (Pre-December 2013 influx), however high GAM rates (19.6%) in West Nile after the influx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Overall prevalence of stunting 24%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highest stunting Kyaka II (38.4%), Nakivale (37.9%), Oruchinga (34.8%), and Rwamwanja (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor dietary diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of supplementary feeding programme for moderately malnourished children, HIV, and TB patients in West Nile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recommendations** |
| • WFP-UNHCR to step up intervention in anaemia prevention |
|   o Provision of CSB++ (fortified) for children, 6-23 months |
|   o UNHCR to step up and continue to provide iron folic acid tablets for pregnant mothers |
|   o Other interventions (e.g. mosquito net) |
| • WFP and UNHCR to conduct a micro-nutrient study to understand the causes of anaemia among refugees |
In December 2013, global acute malnutrition (GAM) rates across the settlements ranged from 2.4% in Oruchinga to unacceptably high rates of 9.7% in Adjumani. When compared with the 2011 JAM when GAM rates were within the ‘acceptable’ range, this indicates a downward trend.

In March 2014, an additional food security and nutrition assessment was conducted for the new South Sudanese refugees in West Nile settlements. The assessment noted that the new South Sudanese refugees had higher GAM and severe acute malnutrition (SAM) rates than the old caseload, with GAMs of 24.1%, 20.1% and 15.2% in Kiryandongo, Adjumani and Arua respectively, and SAMs in the emergency threshold in Kiryandongo and Adjumani (see Graph 4 below for GAM and SAM new caseload breakdown). The West Nile pre-influx GAM rates are higher than in the Southwest.

**Southwest** - Targeted supplementary feeding programme (SFP) to address moderate acute malnourishment (MAM) among children under 5-years of age and pregnant and lactating women continues to be implemented by WFP in Southwest settlements. In part, SFP is assisting to lower GAM and SAM rates. Focus group discussion noted that the CSB provision was helping the nutritional status of children. Although GAM rates are generally acceptable, given the high rates of stunting and high rates of anaemia among children and mothers, the JAM recommends maintaining the targeted SFP for nutritional rehabilitation of the malnourished cases. In part, Southwest’s GAM rates are lower as the regions predominately hosts Congolese refugees who traditional diet has greater dietary diversity than in West Nile, which mainly hosts South Sudanese.

**West Nile** - A child is acutely malnourished when his or her weight drops to such a low level that they are at risk of dying. This is a major public health concern and continues to be one of the primarily feature of humanitarian emergencies, particularly in refugees. In West Nile, it is mostly affecting children aged 6 to 59 months old, and pregnant and lactating women. GAM rates are significantly higher than in Southwest. In West Nile, GAM has exceeded the 10% alert threshold while in the South West Settlements, it is acceptable across all settlements at below 5%. To address this issue, the introduction of 1) targeted supplementary feeding programme for children 6-59 months, pregnant and lactating mothers and 2) blanket supplementary feeding among the 6-23 month is recommended while for pregnant and lactating women, and HIV positive patient on antiretroviral therapy and tuberculosis patients on medication should be explored.

High rates of anaemia among children 6-59 months were noted with concern during the JAM 2014 mission. Nutrition surveys conducted between 2011 and 2013 found anaemia rates higher than the
WHO critical rates (greater than 40%) among children. Even though anaemia has declined from 54.4% in 2009 to 48.1% in 2013, this issue remains a severe public health issue.

Anaemia is strongly linked to poor diet diversification and high rates of malaria. However, causes of under-nutrition and anaemia are multifactorial. A micro-nutrient study could help to better define its root causes and define appropriate interventions. Based on the outcomes of the study, interventions in the form of nutrition and dietary education should be explored by WFP and UNHCR to address high anaemia levels.21

The following types of nutrition interventions are being implemented to address anaemia and malnutrition:

- Monthly general food distribution with inclusion of fortified corn soy blend (CSB+) and vegetable cooking oil,
- Promotion of dietary diversity, particularly iron rich vegetables, through household gardening,
- Nutrition and dietary education,
- Education on infant and young child feeding (IYCF), including the promotion of exclusive breastfeeding for 0-6 months, followed by complementary feeding and continued breastfeeding for 1 and 2 years,
- Screening for micronutrient deficiencies, especially anaemia,
- Management of SAM, MAM and anaemia,
- Vitamin A supplementation at 6 months intervals among children below 5 years
- Immunization as per national expanded programme for immunization protocols
- Surveillance systems through village health teams and community health workers, and
- Distribution of long-lasting insecticide treated nets, deworming, iron and folic acid tablets and Ferro-B syrup.

6.2 Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview - Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Within settlements, refugee and host community have equal access to free primary healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malaria is the leading cause of morbidity and mortality, followed by acute respiratory infections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health Centers suffer from limited quantities of medicines available at health centers. As UNHCR planned medical stock is for refugee population and the stock provided by the Ministry of Health are insufficient for the local population that accesses the Centre. As such, the combined stock is insufficient for both refugee and host communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delay in delivery of medical supplies by UNHCR due to changes in procurement policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient staffing levels: daily clinician-patient consultation levels are above the 1:50 standard, the range extends to over 1:170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient accommodation and salary and benefit gap between Government and NGO staff resulting in high staff turn-over from NGO to Government. The failure to retain quality staff is impacting health delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community participation in health through the Village Health Team strategy is working well, but requires additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menstrual kits are delivered late and are of poor quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Recommendations** |
| • Mass distribution and sensitization on longer-lasting, insecticide treated bed nets (LLIN) in line with the government’s action and strategy. |
| • OPM, Ministry of Health, and UNHCR to ensure settlement health center have adequate supplies, especially in respect to malaria medication and testing kits |
| • UNHCR and partners to review and harmonize health staff salaries scale |
Refugees and host communities have equal access to comprehensive and integrated free primary healthcare. Promotive, preventing and curative health services are provided in line with the Ministry of Health (MoH) guidelines and protocols. These services include curative and preventive services for common morbidities, maternal and child health, HIV/AIDS and STIs, mental health and psychosocial services, laboratory and referrals. In West Nile, health service provision had been handed over to the local district government prior to the refugee influx. In Southwest, health remains under UNHCR and its implementing partners.

Malaria, acute respiratory infections and diarrhea remain the leading causes of morbidity among refugees in the settlements (58.7% of the consultation are due to malaria, 19.3% due to diarrhea). Peaks in incidence rates have been linked with seasonal changes (see Graph 4 below for morbidity trends in West Nile).

**Morbidity Trends - Five Leading Causes of Morbidity in West Nile**

![Morbidity Trends](image)

**Graph 4 - Morbidity trends for the 5 leading causes of morbidity in West Nile**

**Health Centers**

The health centers provide a critical service to the refugee hosting area. Refugee and host community have access to refugee settlements’ health centers. However, there are gaps in the health centers that limit the delivery of health services. These gaps include:

- Limited quantities of medicines available at refugee settlements’ health centers, due to:
  - UNHCR planned stock is based on only refugee population, but on average 36% of health refugee health center consultations are from the host community. Additional support to the Ministry of Health by partners is needed to increase the supply of medical stocks in the host communities’ health centers, and
  - Delay in delivery of medical supplies by UNHCR due to procurement policies.
- Insufficient accommodation and salary and benefit gap between Government and NGO staff resulting in high staff turn-over from NGO to Government. The failure to retain quality staff is impacting service delivery.

**Village Health Team**
Village Health Teams (VHTs) strategy is working well, and the communities’ participation in health is active and effective. However, motivation packages should be harmonized across the settlements, and more non-monetary incentives should be deployed.

**Long-lasting insecticidal nets**

Long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLIN) are distributed by UNHCR to refugees after registration. LLIN utilization is irregular with an average of 41.8% coverage across the country, and range from a high 88.3% in Rhino Camp to low 14.8% in Oruchinga. There is a need to strengthen sensitisation campaigns (e.g. hang up campaigns) to ensure proper utilization of LLIN, and make periodic evaluation on when LLIN have been exhausted and should be resupplied. The JAM noted that LLIN can be better aligned to the government standard of 1 between 2 persons.

## 7 Livelihoods, Self-Reliance, and Local Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview – Livelihoods, Self-Reliance, and Local Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings Agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Southwest – land is gazetted and owned by government in the form of refugee settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o West Nile – land is limited and is privately owned by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inconsistent and limited land availability for refugees (See section 7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenges to agricultural production:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Poor soil fertility, land degradation, overgrazing and climatic changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limited livelihood options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limited agriculture support (e.g. extension workers, agriculture inputs, market information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Limited post-harvest facilities and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lack of access to credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-farm Income Generating Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need to address youth unemployment and underemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are livelihood interventions, but many are small scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited vocational skills training opportunities for refugees and host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited start-up capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualifications from country of origin recognized, but not equated to Ugandan standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Illiteracy and language barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure community are given opportunity and guided to choose, actively co-lead and co-manage their solutions from planning and implementation, to monitoring and reporting progress against targets on a multi-year strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNHCR and partners to clearly articulate how it will empower the community to take ownership, leadership and manage these opportunities to achieve food and nutrition security and to sustain gains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For households with less than the 50 m x 100 m standard (due to heavy refugee hosting), OPM to continue to seek additional land for full land allotment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support refugees-host communities informal land arrangements to expand the amount of arable land available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Continued OPM support to formal land access to government gazetted-land and community owned-land for short-term food security, while at the same time continuing to explore local
Recommendations under Agriculture

Recommendations on land
- OPM to lead plot/land audit in each settlement to determine refugee access to land (a major factor for own food production capacity)
- Promote refugee-host community cohesion to enhance economic opportunity
- Refugees need to be clearly informed of the specific terms of land use and allocation by OPM
- Measure agriculture production through reintroduced Land Use and Crop Yield Assessments or similar tool
- Enhance agriculture production and productivity within existing plots through:
  - Increasing the number and capacity of agriculture extension services
  - Promotion of best farming practices
  - Increasing access to agriculture inputs
  - Increase on-farm income generation:
    - Provide households with diversified livelihood options
    - Encourage construction of post-harvest storage at household and community level
  - Promotion of farmers groups and cooperatives
- Enhance market price information to individual, farmer groups, and cooperatives

Recommendations Non-farm Income Generating Activities

- Increase non-farm income generating activities through:
  - Skills building: Vocational skills training, and functional literacy training
  - Access to finance: Promotion of savings and credit schemes
  - Windle Trust to spearhead translation and equation of education certificates
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR to lobby donors for longer-term funding to facilitate a more development-oriented livelihoods framework
  - OPM-UNHCR to explore universal secondary education opportunities for refugee children
  - Scholarships for technical and vocational education and training, secondary and tertiary education

7.1 Government of Uganda Livelihood and Self-Reliance Policy

The GoU is supportive of livelihoods and self-reliance for refugees and has provided an enabling environment for this to be feasible within its legal and policy framework. Through the Bill of Rights of the 1995 Constitution, Refugee Act 2006 and its 2010 Refugee Regulations, the GoU incorporates elements of economic and social rights of refugees. These policies enable refugees with the right to work, freedom of movement, and access to agriculture land in settlements.

These rights are to a greater extent commensurate with those accorded to legal aliens with regards to freedom of movement, ownership of moveable and immovable property, transfer of assets, leases, engagement in commerce, trade and industry in conformity with the applicable laws in Uganda. Refugees have the right to practice their profession provided their qualifications are recognized by the competent authorities in Uganda and they have the right to access employment opportunities and engage in gainful employment. The Refugee Regulations 2010 expressly exempt refugees from having to pay fees required of foreign nationals working in Uganda. Refugees are accorded the same treatment as nationals with regards to primary education and recognition of foreign certificates, diplomas and degrees and the remission of fees and charges.

There is a need to build on the above favourable environment and ensure that a future solutions in food security and nutrition to be genuinely participatory and inclusive from a community perspective.
to be sustainable. Community would need to be given opportunity and guided to choose, actively co-lead and co-manage their solutions from planning and implementation, to monitoring and reporting progress against targets on a multi-year strategy.

Recommendations:
- Ensure community are given opportunity and guided to choose, actively co-lead and co-manage their solutions from planning and implementation, to monitoring and reporting progress against targets on a multi-year strategy.
- UNHCR and other partners to clearly articulate how it will empower the community to take ownership, leadership and manage these opportunities to achieve food and nutrition security and to sustain gains.

7.2 Access to Land

In line with the GoU’s commitment for refugee self-reliance, refugees are hosted in settlements not camps. In the settlement setting, refugees have access to arable land for cultivation. Own crop production is a critical factor that contributes directly to households food consumption and sold to traders to generate income for other food not available in the WFP food rations, non-food items, and services.

OPM’s official size of land allocation is 50 m x 100 m per household for both residential and agriculture cultivation. Refugees’ own agriculture production is intended to contribute towards their self-reliance. In areas, where land availability is impacted, the OPM provides the residential allocation first with the intent of providing agriculture land at a later date. The large influx of refugees during the 2012 Congolese Emergency and 2013 South Sudanese Emergency has meant that some households have reduced land allocations. For example, for the old caseload (before mid-December 2013), the plot size distributed was 50*50 sq metres for residential area and 50*50 sq metres for arable land. For new caseload (after mid December 2013 and so far), plot size distributed is 20*30 sq metres for residential area and 50*50 sq metres for arable land. The location of arable land towards the residential land vary from one village to the other, the furthest land is 2km while other plots are just next to the residential areas.

Additionally, agriculture production and productivity is not equal across the settlements. The agriculture productivity of the refugee settlements are impacted by rainfall and soil fertility. Southwest and West Nile Settlements are drought prone, and many settlements (e.g. Oruchinga, Nakivale, Kyangwali) have been under constant habitation for over 50 years. As refugees’ own crop production is an important part for both household consumption and sold as a cash crop, settlements will need to undertake a land use and crop yield assessment to quantifying household’s production towards self-reliance.

Recommendations:
- For households with less than the 50 m x 100 m standard (due to heavy refugee hosting), OPM to continue to seek additional land for full land allotment.
- Support refugees-host communities informal land arrangements to expand the amount of arable land available. This recommendation is in line with the 2011 JAM and 2014 FSNA recommendations.
- Continued OPM support to formal land access to government gazetted-land and community owned-land for short-term food security, while at the same time continuing to explore local integration and other innovative solutions for the protracted caseload. This recommendation is in line with the 2011 JAM.

7.3 Assistance to Agriculture and Non-farm Income Generating Activities
Economies in refugee settlements are dominated by the agriculture sector. In Rwamwanja, “Farming own plot (for selling)” and “farm workers (works on another’s plot for money)” accounts for a combined 87.4% of primary livelihood activity. The remaining 12.6% of primary livelihood activity are composed of 23 non-farm income-generating activities (IGAs). As a result, developing sector specific intervention for high-density sectors (e.g. agriculture) is feasible, while the non-farm IGAs are diffuse (i.e. many activities, few people per activity) and requires the support of a business-enabling environment.

7.3.1 Agriculture

Crop Cultivation

In the emergency, agriculture is aimed at improving immediate household food security. The agriculture support focus on crop production for household consumption is conducted as a means to supplement WFP food rations. Households with more acceptable FCS in 2013 tended to be those households consuming a higher proportion from own production. The aim is to provide all households with seed and agriculture implements (e.g. hoes, machetes) for at least two seasons. In the DRC emergency, 2 rounds of 15kg seed and agriculture implements were provided to all households. In the 2013 South Sudanese Emergency, 1 round of 15kg seed and agriculture implements were provided to all households and seed for the second harvest season is being planned.

In normal care and maintenance, the crop cultivation is utilized for both household consumption and for sale of agriculture surplus to generate income. In this phase, efforts are focused at household plot (individual) and bulk production (groups). The emphasis shifts from kitchen gardens for vegetable production towards household plot (individual) and bulk production (groups) for maize and bean production. Maize and beans, while eaten by the household, are sold as a cash crop to Ugandan traders. Smallholder farmers are price takers having limited negotiations power to influencing pricing. Farmers need household-level storage for food security and satellite collection points (SCPs) to collectively bulk and market grain. SCPs have the potential to enhance the terms of trade with brokers and traders, while also serving as a nexus for VLSAs formation, access to equipment (e.g. threshing equipment), and training (e.g. agronomic practice, post-harvest handling).

Refugees’ weak post-harvest handling capacity negatively impacts household food security and income generation. Due to a lack of knowledge, equipment and household storage, refugee sell their maize and bean grains generally within the 30 days of harvest. Beyond this period, the grain is at risk for partial or complete loss due to weevil and pest infestation. Refugees, being risk adverse, opt to sell their grain to avoid a catastrophic loss to their household. As such, it was noted that household storage is needed.

Refugee households are given land (a major productive asset in rural economies) by the Government as a means for assisting refugees’ move towards self-reliance. However, limited agriculture land, diminishing land fertility, and environmental and climatic shocks (e.g. droughts, pest outbreak) adversely impact household food security. To improve household resilience to shocks and increase overall household income, the diversification of household income is needed.

Key findings and recommendations:

- Post-harvest handling of maize and beans is critically weak and is impacting food security and income generation. Main lines of intervention may include:
  - Provide household-level storage to enhance household food security. Without proper storage, within one month, weevils will eat the grain leading to total loss of the food.
  - Establish community-level bulk, storage, and marketing to enhance income generation. Community-level facilities allow for the safe storage of grain (e.g. fumigate pests) to allow prices to normalize after the harvest’s price trough and
enhance grain quality (e.g. better cleaning, processing) which may yield a better price in the market.

- **Refugee have limited access to market prices.** Through farmers groups, SCPs, and other structures build a mechanism for market price information dissemination.

- **Engage private sector to provide forward contracts to crops.** Forward contracts, if properly utilized, can provide refugee with much needed consumption income during the lean season. Forward contracts may also set a price floor to encourage farmers to grow in demand crops.

- **Land is limited.** Improved agronomic practice training can be provided to improved yields.

- **Poor soil fertility is impacting production.** Intense, continuous farming, and monocropping over time is resulting in lower yields. Agronomic practice should be trained to ensure sustainable use of land.

- **A high percentage of refugee lack agricultural or livestock inputs.** The 2013 FSNA noted 44.3% of refugees interviewed “indicated not having access to agricultural or livestock inputs.” There is limited resources to grant agricultural inputs provision. Most often, agriculture inputs are provided within the emergency phase. The engagement of private sector offer agriculture and livestock inputs closer to the settlements are needed.

- **Seeds and agriculture implements require timely delivery.** At times, multi-sector implementing partners will procure time sensitive seed and tool inputs with other supplies for WASH and other sector resulting in delays. Procurement inefficiencies means the delivery of agriculture inputs misses the start of the planting season.

- **Limited knowledge of agriculture production capacity at settlement-level.** Land use and crop yield assessments (LUCYA) were previously carried out by WFP, UNHCR and partners. When the South Sudanese caseload voluntarily repatriated, the LUCYA phased out. Improve knowledge and insight into the agriculture productivity, as impacted by local factors (e.g. land allocation, soil fertility, agriculture extension services, environmental impact), is needed.

### 7.4 Non-Farm Income Generation Activities

Within the refugee settlement, incomes from agriculture will be constrained due to the limited land allotment. For refugees to move towards self-reliance, non-farm income generating activities (IGAs) will be needed.

The support to non-farm income generating activities is important as:

- households rely on non-farm IGAs to supplement income from crop cultivation,
- diversified households incomes serves as a risk mitigation mechanism,
- refugees may not come from an agriculture background and lack the skill set, and
- refugees may desire alternative livelihood opportunities other than agriculture.

The creation of non-farm employment opportunities are particularly important for refugee youth who have limited educational opportunities beyond primary education and interest for farming. Many youth farm by necessity, not by choice. The youth seek to invest in skills that they may use within Uganda and, when the peace returns, in their country of origin. Many youth have been educated in their former countries and have skills that could be utilized if they have access to capital and other business development services.

Key findings and recommendations:

- **Weak business and financial literacy among beneficiaries.** Foundation courses in basic business and finance should be provided to both agriculture and non-farm IGA beneficiaries.

- **Limited technical and vocational education and training (TVET) providers in the refugee settlement.** The strengthening of TVET providers in the host communities to ensure sustainable delivery of service during and beyond the period of refugee hosting.
• **Limited access to start-up capital.** Village savings and loan associations (VLSAs), savings and credit cooperative (SACCOs), and other community-owned financial institutions should be strongly supported. Microfinance institutions should be encouraged to deliver in refugee settlements and nearby host communities.

• **Limited wage employment opportunities in both refugee and host communities.** Support existing businesses to expand, and strongly encourage entrepreneurship for self-employment.

• **Educational qualifications are not recognised by employers.** Expand translation and equation services for foreign certificates, diplomas and degrees to be translated to English, and continue advocacy for recognition of qualifications under the Refugee Regulations 2010.

• **Illiteracy and language barriers limit business.** Continue to support functional literacy training, and basic business skills.

• **Standardized monitoring system is required based on delivery rather than results** To better measure the agriculture and non-farm IGAs interventions, a standardized results-based management tools is needed across all the settlements. A harmonized monitoring and evaluation will allow for the more strategic planning, implementation, and monitoring of countrywide self-reliance programming.

8 WASH

8.1 Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview – Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High population to borehole ratio in some refugee villages,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water quality including high iron and fluoride content in some boreholes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor water storage at household and community levels, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to find alternatives to water trucking, especially in the South Sudan emergency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct a hydrological study to plan and drill functional boreholes in West Nile,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water quality monitoring to capture physio-chemical and bacteriological metrics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNHCR to provide improved hand pumps, and ensure spares stocked,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore feasibility of replicating the Rwamwanja’s solar-powered motorization boreholes in all locations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduce water purification technology at wells where hard water is a problem, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore anti-theft mechanism for WASH and water purification equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water facilities in the settlements are utilized by both refugee and host communities. In December 2013, 79.1% of refugees across Uganda were relying on tube well or borehole water as their main source, 4.2% relied on unprotected dug wells, 3.6% on piped water, and 3.2% on public taps, standpipes and surface water.³²

While major improvements have been made with regards to access to water since the 2011 JAM,³³ the South Sudanese and Congolese Emergencies has considerably resulted in a high population to borehole ratio. Access and availability to water is poor in some areas due to:

• High population to borehole ratio,

• Water quality including high iron and fluoride content,

• Poor water storage at household and community levels, and

• Need to find alternatives to water trucking.

The below table indicates the litres per person per day in each settlement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Litres Per Person Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uganda Joint Assessment Mission
Water quality was raised as an issue in some of the settlements. For example, Kiryandongo noted high turbidity and iron content, and in Nakivale and Oruchinga boreholes have high mineral content, such as calcium, magnesium, iron, fluoride and manganese. While water hardness may be a nuisance to users, according to the WHO (World Health Organization) it poses no health risks.

The JAM found household level water storage lacking, due to insufficient storage containers. At the institutional level, water storage is weak. In the West Nile, many schools and health centers do not use rainwater harvesting. However, the majority of institutions in Southwest have rainwater harvesting infrastructure. The JAM fielded complaints regarding the durability of PVC water tanks in high temperature environments and recommended galvanised special iron sheets for water tanks in settlements high temperature settlements.

### 8.2 Sanitation and Hygiene

#### Sector Overview – Sanitation and Hygiene

**Key Findings**
- Latrine coverage and utilization in the refugee settlements has remained below the recommended UNHCR standards, and
- Need to further integrate service delivery with local district development plans

**Recommendations**
- Conduct sensitization of communities on the importance of proper hygiene, and
- OPM-WFP-UNHCR find innovative ways for soap to be made available (e.g. soap product at settlement).

Latrine coverage and utilization in the refugee settlements has remained below the recommended UNHCR standards. Household latrine coverage across settlements is noted at 70.2%.

#### Toilet Facilities by Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Not sharing (%)</th>
<th>Shared 2HH (%)</th>
<th>Communal (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nakivale</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oruchinga</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyaka</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwamwanja</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryandongo</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhino Camp</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjumani</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7 – Sharing of Toilet Facilities by households, November 2013*

By April and May 2014, the latrine to person ratio for all useable household latrines was as follows:
Less than 50% of the household latrines are compliant with UNHCR minimum recommended design standards for household latrines which is; a latrine pit depth of 3-4 metres, a cleanable latrine floor slab, and a privacy superstructure. The JAM recommends that context be taken into consideration when standards are drawn up and appropriate materials should be provided, where they are not locally available, to ensure correct use and durability of latrines. The current material support provided by UNHCR/partners includes a plastic/concrete latrine floor slab of 79 cm x 59 cm x 2 cm; four (4) treated poles of 2m length and 18-25 cm diameter to support the slab; and a 6m long eucalyptus pole of 12 – 15cm diameter for the superstructure. This assumes availability of other local construction materials to use alongside the eucalyptus pole, to put up a superstructure which can provide adequate privacy. However this is not always the case as evidenced by the variable superstructures observed during the JAM assessment mission including mud and wattle, plants forming a ‘live’ fence, polythene papers, pieces of plastic sheeting, blankets and other pieces of cloth.

UNHCR minimum design standard for a household latrine does not include a roof and this is particularly a challenge during the rainy season as the latrine floors become wet and messy, which condition then becomes a deterrent to users.

The JAM therefore recommends that UNHCR reviews the sanitation kit contents, subject to availability of funding, to include a piece of plastic sheeting to cater for the walling and roof of the household latrines.

Household latrines and refuse pits were observed in the settlements, although not all households had observed the recommended 6 metres between the home and the latrine and refuse pit. Plot sizes should be ample to accommodate for the distance. It is therefore recommended that sensitisation on why the distance is important be strengthened.

Soap and other basic sanitary supplies are essential for health and hygiene. According to the 2013 FSNA, an average 18.6% of refugee household income is spent on soap and household items. As such, OPM-WFP-UNHCR should find innovative ways for soap to be made available (e.g. soap production at settlement). UNHCR should continue to sensitize the communities on the importance of proper hygiene. Women and girls of reproductive age are provided with sanitary material package in all UNHCR Uganda operations. The focus group discussions noted the irregularity of sanitary kit distributions and the poor quality of the menstruation pads and it was agreed that UNCHR would look into this issue with the current supplier as well as explore appropriate alternatives.

9 Education

While universal primary education (UPE) provides for refugees and nationals free tuition, uniforms, school supplies, and other associate costs places a financial burden on the household. The 2013 FSNA indicates refugees spend 26.1% of their expendable income on education, school fees, uniforms, and other associated costs. Education costs are second only to spending on food expenditure (65.7%). With limited income, refugees sell and barter their food rations to purchase non-food items, and pay for other basic needs and essential services (e.g. education, health).
Schools were generally found to be without adequate water provision, including rainwater harvesting. Provision of safe and clean water for drinking in schools is essential, as well as sufficient water for hand washing and cleaning hygiene and sanitation facilities.

In the schools visited during the mission, the number of latrines was insufficient. In some instances, male and female students share the same facilities, and teachers were using toilets for disabled children. The latrines also had no or insufficient hand-washing facilities. School children interviewed during the JAM reported hunger to impede afternoon school attendance. Children mentioned they go home during lunch breaks to find food is not ready or not available and that, due to hunger, they decide not to come back to attend the afternoon sessions. Compounding the issue of hunger is the distance some children walk to attend school. There is no formal school-feeding programme in Uganda. Teachers and school children interviewed emphasised on the need to provide some kind of food in schools so as to increase attendance and retention of children.

10 Food and Core Relief Items Distribution, Warehousing, Logistics and Roads

10.1 Food distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview - Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the application of the Family Size Distribution System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Mixing of family sizes under the Family Size Distribution System, leading to some cases of under-entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Lack of complaints desk and inability to resolve issues (poor representation of all partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Non-standardized scooping noted in some settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Weak Food Management Committees in West Nile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Due to supply shortages, incomplete core relief item kits are distributed until stocks arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some donated relief items brought during the emergency were below standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Family Size Group Distribution system should continue and be strengthened by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>WFP to standardize scooping sets at food group and implementing partner level</strong> as well as consider providing scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>UNHCR, WFP and OPM to jointly ensure complaint desks with relevant focal persons at each food distribution point</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>Ensure annual training of Food Management Committees on food management practices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NFIs gaps to be addressed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>UNHCR to reexamine its procurement plan to ensure timely delivery of NFIs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <strong>UNHCR to strengthen follow-up on households who are receiving incomplete or missing relief items so that the household can be adequately provisioned</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major influxes and funding impacts have resulted in reduced food rations. In 2013, funding-related impacts occurred resulting in food ration reductions. The old caseload was provided with 50% of cereal entitlement for 3 months. In January and February 2014, Uganda experienced major simultaneous emergencies from DRC and South Sudan as well. In order to ensure full food ration allocation for new arrivals, GFD were reduced by 50% for refugees arrived prior to October 2013. Since March 2014, the food pipeline has been fully functioning and refugees are receiving the full food ration allocation.
Family Size Distribution System

The Family Size Distribution System (also known as the Semi-Malawian System) is used for food distribution in Uganda, whereby refugees are grouped into groups of 30 people who are all entitled to the same family size ration. In theory, the system works well as beneficiaries are present to see the dividing of the food. However, the JAM team noted several complaints from refugees about under entitlement due to the mixing of family sizes under this system, especially in the smaller distribution clusters where refugees use their own utensils for scooping.

Scooping Instruments

In addition, the team noted that there were no standardised scooping instruments across the settlements. The implementing partner and refugees were using different scoop sizes, which is leading to under-entitlements. To prevent any further under entitlements, it is recommended that standardised scoops to be provided for refugees to facilitate the sharing of food. It was note that mixing of family sizes is done when there is an odd-number left at the end of the distribution, and therefore not consistent across all family size groupings. It is recommended that partners maintain the family size approach and avoid mixing family sizes. Where a standard cluster of 30 refugees cannot be reached partners should allow clusters of less than 30 refugees and corresponding food pile.

Complaint desks

Refugees can lodge their distribution-related issues to the complaints desk. These desks are staffed by WFP, UNHCR, OPM and implementing partner representative at each distribution. Understaffing at field level has resulted in limited and inconsistent staffing at the complaints desks.

On-Off Loading Food

The JAM noted problems with off-loading of food from the vehicles arriving at the FDP, which is the responsibility of refugees. Refugees were not mobilised or were reluctant to off-load vehicles transporting food. Mobilising refugees and ensuring that they are aware of their responsibilities is part of the work of the food management committees (FMCs). There is need for intensified mobilisation and sensitisation of refugees on their roles and responsibilities to avoid delays at the FDP and to put back unclaimed or left over balance of food on the truck after distribution.

Monitoring Distributions

The food distribution system is monitored monthly by the Food Basket Monitoring (FBM) and Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) reports. The 2014 JAM notes that, despite the 2011 recommendation for WFP to share these reports with partners working at settlement level, this is not being done. Periodic meetings to review the findings and recommendations of the FBM and PDM reports would encourage sharing the documents and provide a platform to resolve operational issues raised through these reports.

10.2 Core Relief Item Distribution

Core relief items (CRI) (refer to Annex 5 for complete list of CRIs distributed by UNHCR) are distributed based on family size. Refugees noted that family composition (e.g. gender, age) should also be taken into account. It was noted, some families forced to have their teenage children of mixed genders sharing beds due to insufficient blankets. As with food rations, refugees often resort to selling CRIs to supplement other household needs.

The CRI kits provided to refugees are standardised in all emergency operations. When there are CRI shortages, partial kits maybe given or non-standard items (e.g. collapsible jerry cans) provided as a
temporary substitute. When missing CRIs are stocked, UNHCR and partners provide these missing items to the household. The need to follow-up to complete missing items in the package is one of the gaps noted by the JAM. It should also be noted that items like plastic sheets, mosquito nets, sleeping mats, and blankets fall under UNHCR’s international procurement. A protracted procurement process and limited procurement flexibility impacts CRI delivery.

As a result of bottlenecks in the supply chain, beneficiaries interviewed are losing track of knowledge of their entitlements, owing largely to not receiving CRIs as scheduled or receiving incomplete packages. Greater sensitization is necessary to ensure that refugees are aware of their entitlements.

10.3 Roads, Warehouse and Logistics Infrastructure

Access and feeder roads to and within refugee settlements are in a variety of states from very poor to good. Annex 6 provides an overview of the critical sections of road the JAM team recommends are prioritised for Improvement. The Uganda National Roads Authority (UNRA) is responsible for government roads leading up to the settlement. The local district governments at times also maintain roads. UNHCR is responsible for roads within the settlements.

Periodic maintenance of the roads, including spot improvement and culvert installation, is being carried out although with limited funding. In some cases, communities were mobilised to carry out maintenance, but with limited response. As noted by the 2013 AGDM for Kyaka II, communities were reluctant to carry out road maintenance due to lack of tools and the belief, on the part of nationals, that road construction and maintenance is the responsibility of UNHCR. Improved community mobilisation should be promoted to facilitate periodic road maintenance.

Of all the settlements, only Rwamwanja had sanitary facilities and shelter at FDPs. Latrines ensure good hygiene, while shelters protect food from exposure to the sun and rain. WFP and OPM should review options for shelter and latrines at FDPs, bearing in mind that caretakers will need to be identified and potentially remunerated in order to keep the public latrines clean. In tandem, local solutions should be explored with refugees, as labour is abundant.

Other issues raised during the JAM with regards to warehousing included:

- Various warehouse repairs,
- Lack of guard posts,
- Lack of security lighting, and
- Lack of protective wear for casual labourers at the EDPs.

In addition, some CRIs had been in storage for an extended period. The turnover of CRIs is needed to make room for new stock. These issues were also highlighted in the 2011 JAM and remain to be addressed.

11 Environment and Shelter

11.1 Environment

Refugee hosting places a strong demand on the environment. The collection of wood for fuel and shelter, and clearing of land for residence construction, farming crops and grazing livestock heavily taxes the land. The need to develop initiatives to restore areas impacted by refugee hosting is important to maintaining a peaceful coexistence between refugees and host community.

Cooking Fuel
Cooking fuel is not provided to refugees. As a result, refugees collect firewood within the settlement and in the host community for their household’s own use and sale. Firewood is the fuel of choice as it can be gathered free of charge in the surrounding areas. At times, there is friction when refugees come to host community lands for firewood collection or charcoal production. In the absence of sufficient cooking fuel, a recent survey reported that 52% of households undercook food for an average of 2.2 times per week and 44% reported skipping meals for 0.9 times per week. In addition, 10% of households surveyed said they sell 28% their family’s food ration in order to buy cooking fuel. Refugees spent 7.8% of household income on fuel (e.g. wood, paraffin, etc.).

Save 80 and Lorena fuel-efficient stoves have been promoted to reduce firewood consumption. Greater sensitization is needed in order to increase utilization of stoves. Adjumani, 67.4%, and Oruchinga, 65.8%, noted the highest utilization of deployed of stoves. In addition to fuel efficient hardware, the need to promote fuel efficient cooking habits is needed. Using properly dried firewood, soaking beans prior to cooking, and other techniques can reduce fuel wood consumption. More community environmental workers, local district government, and other field-level personnel should be trained in fuel efficient cooking technologies (e.g. stoves, fuel briquettes) and techniques (e.g. cooking techniques), and trained at a higher quality.

Fuel efficient stoves and techniques will reduce timber needs, but never eliminate them. As such, environmental reforestation and afforestation projects remain an important activity in the larger environmental plan. In the past, tree seedlings were distributed to the refugee and host community, but had limited follow up support. Extended-term support in nurturing, pesticides, and other maintenance can increase the survival rate of seedlings. Wood lots in the host community and settlements for fuel wood and construct timber production is needed as well as planting along the lake shore belt to protect the water edges.

Livestock Impact

Households that have brought livestock from their country of origin or acquired them in Uganda graze animals within the settlement. Large livestock (e.g. cows, goats) in large quantity may results in overgrazing. Moreover, when the plot size is small, there is greater potential for disputes and conflict when animals have eaten neighbours’ crops. Joint refugee and host community projects should be encouraged to support livelihoods in both communities, enhance refugee-host community cohesion, and obtain greater grazing land access for refugees in host community lands. Poultry (e.g. chicken, guinea fowl, ducks), rabbits, guinea and other small animals should be encouraged. These small animals have a relatively low environmental footprint, and are in high demand by both the refugee and host communities.

11.2 Shelter

The shelter sector cuts across the environment sector. The refugees’ need for timber and grass to construct a shelter upon the arrival places both an environmental burden and an economic opportunity for the wider refugee hosting area. Refugees (family size 1-5) are provided with the following upon arrival (refer also to Annex 5):

- Plastic sheet/tarpaulin,
- Poles (eucalyptus),
- Rope,
- Pangas,
- Slashers,
- Hoes, and
- Sickles.

1 2013 FSNA
Anything additional for construction needs to be sourced in and around the settlements. In the absence of Natural Resource Management planning, the unregulated harvesting of timber and grasses permanently depletes the environment and sourcing shelter material freely is becoming a problem for refugees, who must generally sell and barter to get sufficient supplies.

In Southwest settlements, refugees reported spending between UGX100,000-150,000 to construct their shelters, excluding the initial support by UNHCR. In order to be able to meet these needs, the sale of food rations and UNHCR tarpaulins was observed. According to the FSNA from 2013, 22.4% of refugee spending is on construction or house repairs; this is third only to food and education expenses.

Refugees in Uganda have the right to roof their homes with iron sheeting, on the understanding that it can be carried with them back to their country of origin. Refugees may not construct shelters with fired bricks as these mark permanence and cannot be uprooted back to country of origin. The suggestion to consider roofing PSN shelters with iron sheeting was raised by refugees in Kiryandongo as a cost-effective and longer-term solution to shelter.

UNHCR and partners support People with Specific Needs (PSNs) with shelter construction in all the settlements; however funds are lacking to support all PSNs that require shelter construction assistance. Communities interviewed felt the assistance was minimal and targeted too few of the many vulnerable community members. Local solutions to shelter construction should be explored, where labour is abundant in the refugee and host communities and where support networks for vulnerable people already exist.

12 Registration, Policy, Durable Solutions, Security, and Coordination and Contingency Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Overview – Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The JAM noted that the registration process was generally acceptable,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since 2009, the old Rwandese caseload have not been allocated land for cultivation, although they are still on 50% ration due to being in Southwest, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asylum seekers are not receiving food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of arable land allocation and food security for the Rwandese refugees (1994-1998 caseload),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agencies to factor in health staff accommodation options prior to starting operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNHCR-OPM to expedite identification cards to all refugees above 16 years old,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Periodic use of finger print biometrics to verify food beneficiaries in conjunction with monthly use of household attestation letter other forms of identification, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain food assistance to asylum seekers who have not exhausted the refugee status determination (RSD) procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.1 Registration
The JAM noted that the registration process in Uganda was generally acceptable and clear. OPM leads the registration process with UNHCR in support. Registration occurs at reception centres along the major points of entry, refugee settlements, and in Kampala. The process involves collection of basic bio data, biometric data (photo and fingerprints) collection, medical and nutrition screening and interviews to screen individuals and families for any specific requirements and credibility. UNHCR is responsible for identifying persons with specific needs (PSNs). Registration data is stored in the ProGres database.

The registration process results in household attestation and food ration cards for refugees in the settlement. For refugees in Kampala, ID cards are issued within reasonable time frame, while for refugees above the age of 16 years old in the settlement, ID cards are issued during verification exercises. So far, IDs were issues in 2012 and 2013 to Kyaka II, Oruchinga, part of Nakivale, Kiryandongo and Kyangwali settlements. However, the new Congolese and South Sudanese refugees are yet to be covered.

From reception center, refugees are transferred to the refugee settlement where they are given a shelter kit, CRI kit, and food rations. There are cases where refugee travel directly to the settlement, thereby skipping the registration process. If refugees skip the registration process, they may not be properly entered into the ProGres database, which produces logs for food ration distribution and land allocation. Wherever possible, wishes to be located near to relatives or friends are catered for. However, PSNs are given priority to land plots near services (e.g. health centres). Increase sensitization is needed to inform refugees on the importance of the registration process.

**Refugee Eligibility Committee**

The Congolese and South Sudanese refugees fleeing violence are granted refugee status on a *prima facie* basis (group determination). Refugee Eligibility Committee (REC) determines other asylum seekers on a case by case basis. In all cases, following registration, all asylum seekers in the settlements receive basic CRIs as Transit Centre residents (see Annex 5 for complete kit) an asylum seeker’s certificate, as applicable, valid for a 90-day period, and a 100% general food ration from WFP. The REC and the Refugee Appeals Board (RAB) are mobile and move throughout the country to address asylum cases. Asylum seekers who apply for refugee status or are in the process of appeal following a first instance rejection for refugee status, may spend several months in order that they exhaust the asylum procedure.

**Refugee Appeals Board**

Asylum seekers who have had their case rejected by REC have the right to appeal within the following 30 days. UNHCR and partners can provide assistance pending the appeal process. When all asylum appeals have been exhausted, an asylum seeker is phased off the food log and land no longer can be accessed. The Refugee Appeal Board (RAB) hears appeals from rejected asylum seekers and makes a determination on whether the case should again be reviewed by the REC or the REC decision should be upheld. The JAM noted that this process was even more irregular than the REC. There have been two RAB sessions in Southwest and none in the West Nile. The RAB was created in 2011 and has been functional since 2012.

**Verification**

UNHCR, WFP, OPM and partners carry out annual PSN and EVI verification of refugees. Verification is done at the household level. General verification exercises to ascertain the presence of the refugee household and to update bio-data takes place every second year in a given settlement. Between 2012 and 2013, general verification exercises were carried out in all settlements.
12.2 Policy

Uganda’s refugee policies provide for economic and social rights of refugees. Refugees have the right to work, freedom of movement, and access to agriculture land in settlements. These policies enable refugees to live a more dignified life in the country of asylum.

The government provide refugees with equal access as nationals to universal primary education, health centers, and other social services. For secondary education and tertiary institutions, fees may apply for both refugees and nationals. However, refugees reported they are charged fees as international students in tertiary institutions. This is an issue of misinformation and OPM has pledged to share the refugee education policy with concerned institutions so that the anomaly is corrected.

12.3 Durable solutions

Voluntary Repatriation

Stability in DRC is resulting in some refugees to voluntarily return spontaneously. Following the Tripartite Meeting between the governments of Uganda, DRC and UNHCR in May 2014, it was agreed that UNHCR will start to assist those who opt for spontaneous return through provision of safe transport. A return intention survey exercise is planned in the settlements to determine the number of refugees wishing to spontaneous returns to DRC. In light of South Sudan’s on going conflict and food insecurity, voluntary return to South Sudan in the immediate future is unlikely.

Resettlement

Resettlement places are extremely limited and resettlement needs in Uganda continue to vastly outnumber the number of places made available by resettlement countries. In 2014, UNHCR expects to submit approximately 4,270 refugees from Uganda to resettlement countries. The majority of these refugees originate from the DRC and will be submitted to the USA, in the framework of a multi-year sub-regional approach to enhance durable solutions for this population. UNHCR estimates that 2,143 refugees will depart from Uganda to resettlement countries in 2014.

Local integration

Local integration is currently not a legal option in Uganda. However, the JAM noted several cases of self-integration in Southwest Uganda and West Nile, especially among the Rwandan and South Sudanese communities, respectively, who are long-term refugees.

12.4 Security

The majority of conflicts discussed during the JAM were resource-based: predominantly land, water and fuel/shelter wood. Encroachment of land, either by nationals onto refugee land or vice versa, has caused disputes – refugees interviewed felt they had little ability to do anything about it. Similarly, illegal wood and crop harvesting by refugees was discussed during the JAM and the host communities interviewed did not fully understand the complaint mechanism or felt they could do little. The mechanisms for disputes from the Refugee Welfare Committee or Local Council 1 need to be revised to become more efficient.

The need for better engagement with the host communities was raised during the JAM, with the aim of quelling any inter-communal tensions. Programming in settlements should also stand to benefit
surrounding host communities on a 70:30 refugee: host basis. Harmonising plans and programming in line with District Development Plans is one way of reducing inter-communal tensions, as well as improving partnerships with Districts and local communities.

Refugees were asked questions about their quality of life in the settlements and what they considered their greatest threats – SGBV was almost unanimously the greatest risk for women and girls, especially when gathering firewood and water, while cultivating in isolated places and while walking to and from school.

Each settlement has a police post to keep law and order. However, the JAM noted significant challenges for the police to maintain the law, notably in terms of lacking transport, communication tools and accommodation – this should be looked into and addressed by relevant agencies and ways of addressing the issues found.

12.5 Coordination and Contingency Planning

Coordination has greatly improved since the last JAM and all locations were reported to be holding monthly interagency meetings, sector meetings and zonal meetings with refugee leaders.

As highlighted in the 2011 JAM, agencies and implementing partners have no concrete population statistics for nationals living in and around the settlements and accessing the same services as refugees. This makes it very difficult to plan how many people will use the services (i.e. how much medication to buy in, how many classrooms to provide).

The inter-agency appeal for the South Sudanese refugee influx of March 2014 had a planning figure of 100,000. Since that figure was exceeded, the operational planning figure was revised to 150,000. Given the current situation in South Sudan, UNHCR, WFP, and OPM together with all partners have also conducted a contingency planning exercise in Kampala in May 2014 where by response mechanisms were elaborated for the ‘most likely’ scenario of 300,000 South Sudanese refugees by the end of 2014, and a ‘worst case’ scenario of 450,000. The JAM, however, notes that these contingency figures are not known by all involved in the refugee response at field level and efforts should be made to ensure that all involved are aware of the different scenarios.

13 Conclusions

The analysis of secondary data and of the information collected during the JAM led to the following main conclusions:

1. EVIs and new arrivals (0-3 years in Uganda) are the most vulnerable to food insecurity and dependent on food and non-food assistance. The provision of 100% ration to these groups is a fitting response to their vulnerability and should be maintained in the coming 2-year period.
2. In the absence of regular/standardised EVI verification, some vulnerable individuals may not be accessing the food assistance they require. The JAM recommends a standardised and regular system of EVI verification of refugees.
3. JAM gathered no evidence that reduction in ration was the sole contributor to deterioration in nutrition status of refugees in West Nile with other factors also likely to have played a contributory role. The JAM recommends maintaining the current ration schedule and review it to ensure there are no negative impacts. However, in the case of Rwamwanja, where the majority of refugees currently access 100% GFD and where a reduction in ration size is soon due, the JAM recommends waiting to reduce the ration sizes until sufficient information is gathered and analysed about this reduction’s impact.
4. There is no evidence to suggest that 3 years is the correct time to start phasing households off 100% food rations. Information on what land size a household needs to be food secure, or how that changes according to family size or location, on what resources and support needs to be availed to facilitate this shift needs to be sought so WFP can draw a clear correlation between food security status, length of stay, and the role of the ration, land and income generation.

5. A downward trend was noted in malnutrition rates in the under 5’s and PLW since 2011, with marked difference between the Southwest and West Nile. Alarming GAM rates have been observed among the new South Sudanese caseload in West Nile. Consider introduction of targeted supplementary feeding programme 6-59 months age group for West Nile and the continuing targeted SFP in SW should ensure nutritional rehabilitation. The JAM recommends blanket supplementary feeding among the 6-23 months in West Nile and also recommends blanket supplementary feeding for PLW, HIV positive patients on antiretroviral therapy and tuberculosis patients on medication.

6. The exact causes of the persistent under-nutrition, and especially anaemia, among refugees remain unclear. A micronutrient study looking into prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies, including the causes of anaemia, could help to better address its root causes.

7. In a context of food insecurity, poor diet diversification and high malaria rates, which contribute to concerning rates of anaemia among children 6-59 months, and based on the outcomes of the micronutrient study, the JAM recommends exploring blanket supplementation of WHO-recommended micronutrient LNS for this target group. In addition, WFP should consider expanding the Cash Transfer programme to other settlements if evaluation indicates positive impact.

8. While improvements have been made with regards to access to water since the 2011, the recent influx of refugees from DRC and South Sudan has considerably reduced the access to water per capita. Water availability and water quality were also reported as problems in some settlements.

9. Refugee households regularly sell part of their ration to purchase medication which should be provided free of charge; this is impacting on their overall food security at the households level and risking the use of sub-standard medicines. The OPM through the Ministry of Health and UNHCR should ensure the continuous stocking of medication in health centres to prevent sales of food for this purpose.

10. Many refugees sell part of their ration to pay for milling costs, incurred as a result of receiving whole maize in the general food ration. It is imperative that WFP and partners look into sustainable ways of ensuring milling facilities, and providing maize meal to the most vulnerable in the settlements, for whom selling part of their ration is not feasible.

11. Years of intensive agriculture, denuded forests and overgrazing are having serious consequences for refugees. Compounding reduced land fertility is the reduction and inconsistent allocation of land as a result of significant population pressure, leading to some refugees having little or no land to cultivate. It is vital to strengthen the self-reliance of refugees in order to decrease their dependence on humanitarian assistance over time. Livelihood programming, especially focusing on off-farm income generation, coupled with increased access to vocational skills training facilities must be reinforced in order to reflect the needs and desires of refugees.

12. There is evidence of environment related challenges due to human activities through agriculture activities, firewood as the main source of energy and construction materials and as a result women and girls are exposed to greater risks on an effort to put food on the table and homestead shelter construction in the case of both genders.

14 Recommendations

On the basis of these main JAM 2014 conclusions, the team proposes the following main recommendations:
| Ensuring that the most vulnerable refugees are targeted and assisted | 1. The JAM recommends that food assistance to new arrivals (0-3 years) and EVIs be maintained at 100%.  
2. WFP, UNHCR and OPM need to come up with a standardised system of PSN/EVI verification of refugees and jointly decide the frequency of the exercise and sensitise the refugee community to these standards.  
3. In the absence of a clear evidence of how time positively impacts refugee household food security, the current food rations schedule approach to food assistance should be maintained and refugees should continue to be sensitised on the schedule.  
4. In Rwamwanja, where the majority of refugees should soon be phased off the 100% ration to 60%, the JAM recommends waiting to reduce the ration sizes until sufficient information is gathered and analysed about the impact of the ration schedule on refugee food security.  
5. In the meantime, WFP, UNHCR and OPM should conduct further settlement-specific analysis relevant to the food rations schedule and food security and nutrition outcomes in assessments as a review to guide the way forward.  
6. Any increase in the length of time it takes for RAB to hear appeals leaves asylum seekers vulnerable to food insecurity, as they receive neither food assistance nor land. OPM should ensure that regular RAB hearings are held/impose a rigid schedule for hearings, no matter how few asylum seekers there are per settlement. |
| Understanding micronutrient deficiencies and tackling malnutrition and anaemia | 7. Considering continued high stunting and anaemia rates in Southwest, WFP should maintain the on-going targeted SFP and provision of CSB in the GFD.  
8. Given the high rates of anaemia and malnutrition among the new caseload in West Nile, WFP should expedite the introduction of targeted supplementary feeding among the 6-59 months age group and blanket supplementary feeding among the 6-23 months age group, Supplementary feeding for PLW and HIV patients on Antiretroviral therapy and TB patients on treatment in West Nile.  
9. The JAM recommends that WFP and UNHCR conduct a micronutrient study to understand the prevalence of micronutrient deficiencies, including the causes of anaemia, and design a comprehensive strategy to prevent, control and treat micronutrient deficiencies, including anaemia, among refugees in Southwest and West Nile.  
10. If an evaluation indicates a positive effect on household food security as a result of cash transfers, WFP, UNHCR and OPM should investigate the possibility of expanding cash transfers to promote dietary diversity in settlements where they are not being implemented. |
| Preventing household level general food ration sales | 11. OPM through MoH and UNHCR to ensure HCs are continuously well stocked with essential medicines at least 3 month buffer stocks, especially in respect to malaria medication.  
12. WFP/UNHCR/OPM to discuss milling issue and come up with a suitable way forward and assessment of past interventions to understand what needs to be done differently, especially by the relevant technical agency (WFP).  
13. WFP should consistently provide maize meal to EVIs and new arrivals (years 0-3) or where feasible compensate for the losses arising from the cost of milling. |
| Understanding and strengthening refugee capacities for agricultural | 14. WFP to reintroduce the Land Use and Crop Yield Assessments (or similar) to establish the soil potential in each settlement.  
15. OPM, WFP and UNHCR to make specific review of phased-off group of refugees with the view of ensuring that they are food secure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>self-sufficiency</strong></th>
<th>16. OPM and UNHCR to consider plot verification exercise to establish exact land available to refugees across the settlements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. The JAM recommends that Rwandese refugees be allowed to cultivate again and be allocated land in order to meet some of their food needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding and strengthening refugee capacities and desires for off-farming livelihood opportunities</strong></td>
<td>18. WFP and UNHCR to further strengthen and expand livelihood options and increase income-generating opportunities at household level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. In a context of decreasing land availability and soil fertility, the JAM recommends strengthening off-farm livelihood interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. WFP and UNHCR to assess the demand for service provision and desires of refugees for income generation in the settlements and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. UNHCR and partners to provide relevant vocational skills training related to above outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. UNHCR and WFP to lobby donors for longer-term funding to facilitate a more development-oriented livelihoods framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing environmental degradation and other related concerns</strong></td>
<td>23. OPM to enforce household energy saving stove requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. UNHCR, WFP, OPM and other partners to explore ways of funding forestation projects in all refugee settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH – related Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>25. OPM to lead a hydrological study to plan and drill functional boreholes in the West Nile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. UNHCR to provide improved hand-pumps, and ensure spares are stocked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Explore the feasibility of introducing water purification technology at wells where hard water is a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Explore the feasibility of introducing anti-theft mechanisms for WASH and water purification related equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. The three lead agencies to conduct sensitization of communities on the importance of proper hygiene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Women and girls of reproductive age are provided with sanitary material package in all UNHCR Uganda operations. The focus group discussions noted the irregularity of sanitary kit distributions and the poor quality of the menstruation pads and it was agreed that UNCHR would look into this issue with the current supplier as well as explore appropriate alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above, specific JAM recommendations is provided in Annex 7.

Recommendations from the JAM will be used to draft the Joint Plan of Action with OPM, WFP and UNHCR working together on the plan.

---
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