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Executive summary

The Danish Refugee Council – Danish Demining Group has since 2009 implemented annual project cycles of a Livelihood Support project to strengthen food security and standard of living in the refugee hosting areas of West Nile and Kiryandongo.

The approach of Farmer Field Schools is adopted in the implementation of the project, where farmers are supported for a period of 1-2 years with the provision of training and agricultural inputs in the local environment. In 2012, the project targeted both national and refugee households in Arua, Koboko, Adjumani and Kiryandongo and has in addition supported environmental rehabilitation in Moyo, Yumbe and Arua Districts. The main impacts of the project in 2012 project period are as follows:

- The basis for self-reliance has been strengthened through social organization and skill building that enhances productivity level.
- Access to arable land has improved
- Food security defined by at least two meals per day is now extended to 76.9% of refugee households and 93.3% of national households.
- Improvements are reported in standard of living, for examples in the quality of shelter, school enrollment and acquisition of household items for a relevant proportion of beneficiaries
- The relationship between nationals and refugees in 3 out of 4 locations is now categorized as good.
- Energy saving equipment has been acquired in 57% of beneficiary households.

A number of challenges have been identified in relation to marketing of products, food storage, income enhancement and sustainability of group and household food production. Based on this, the report gives the following recommendations to strengthen impact in a subsequent project period:

- Increase focus on developing self-reliance
- Ensure quality and timeliness of agricultural inputs
- Improve food storage facilities
- Strengthen activity level and motivation of the beneficiaries
- Improve marketing and diversify sources of income
- Increase duration of engagement with groups
- Address bio-mass challenge in Kiryandongo
- Ensure thorough exit strategies when phasing groups out

These findings and recommendations are based on quantitative and qualitative data collection conducted in January 2013.
1. Introduction

A. DRC-DDG programme in the country

Danish Refugee Council has been present in Uganda since 1999, where operations were launched to support Sudanese refugees and the Ugandan communities hosting them in West Nile. In 2007, DRC expanded its operation to also include support to IDPs living in camps, and those returning home in Northern Uganda. DRC’s role working with IDPs has largely been provision of protection through presence and monitoring, advocacy on behalf of the population and helping the communities to rebuild their own support systems for helping the vulnerable.

Danish Demining Group launched activities in Uganda in 2008, and has been working in mine action in Northern and Western Uganda with technical, financial and logistic support to the national Mine Action Program for a 4 year period. In 2010, Armed Violence Reduction activities were launched in the northeastern region of Karamoja to support conflict management and peace building in the region.

In 2012, Danish Refugee Council and Danish Demining Group merged into one organization, working as DRC-DDG Uganda.

B. Description of the Livelihood Support Project

Immediate objectives

The overall objective of the project is to contribute to creation of sustainable livelihoods and food security in West Nile and Kiryandongo. In order to contribute to this overall objective, the intervention has the following immediate objectives:

1) Improved self-reliance among targeted refugee and national households
2) Peaceful co-existence and protection of shared environment

The project implementation has been based on the approach of Farmer Field Schools, where farmers are clustered into groups within their locality and receive training, guidance and agricultural inputs for a period of one to two years (60% of the groups in this implementation period was formed in the project period of 2011). Activities include trainings in crop agronomy, post harvest handling, Farming as a Business, group dynamics and energy conservation techniques.

The heart of the Farmer Field School approach is to create an experiential learning environment in the farmers’ normal setting, where learning activities in a group’s demonstration garden is closely linked to the household production of the individual farmers. Learning and motivation is also facilitated through exchange visits and visits of selected beneficiaries to National Agricultural Research stations and seed multiplication centers.

Farmer groups are supported by: distribution of farming tools by the time of joining a group, opening of land, construction of demonstration storage facilities and distribution of seeds and limited amounts of pesticides and fungicides. Lastly, groups are given weekly to bi-monthly extension services (needs based) where a field staff is present to give guidance and supervision.

Implementation period: April to December 2012
Donor: UNHCR
The numerical outputs for the project period are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTPUTS IN 2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups formed or re-organised</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People trained in post-harvest handling</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People trained in energy saving equipment (ToT)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth supported in vocational training (pilot activity in Adjumani)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize cribs constructed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed management committees established</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange visits carried out</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock distributed to landlords</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of land opened</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy saving stoves constructed</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree seedlings distributed to Districts for planting</td>
<td>259,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Brief description of the working context

Targeted areas, districts and communities
In the 2012 project period, the project targeted Arua, Adjumani, Koboko and Kiryandongo Districts with full intervention, and the districts of Yumbe and Moyo with distribution of tree seedlings to be planted by the District authorities under the the Post Repatriation and environmental Rehabilitation Program (PRRLP)

The following Sub-Counties were targeted with livelihood activities:
Arua District: Odupi, Rigbo and Uriama
Koboko District: Midia, Abuku, Lobula, Kuluba
Adjumani District: Ciforo, Ofua, Adropi, Dzaipi
Kiryandongo District: Bweyale, Kiryandongo, Kigumba, Masindi Port, Mutunda

Number and characteristics of beneficiaries
The total number of direct beneficiaries in the project period is 1552 individuals which comprise 782 refugees and 803 nationals, with 57% female beneficiaries. 392 are targeted in Arua, 319 in Koboko, 428 in Adjumani and 446 in Kiryandongo. As this project aims to improve livelihood and food security at household level, household members are included as indirect beneficiaries. Based on the estimation of average household sizes of 7 people, the number of indirect beneficiaries is approximately 9,300 individuals.

Socio-economic characteristic of the area
The targeted areas in West Nile and Kiryandongo have a long history as refugee hosting area and by the beginning of 2012 targeted Districts hosted 15,388 refugees from South Sudan, DR Congo, Kenya, Central African Republic and Rwanda. Settlements are located in Adjumani, Arua and Kiryandongo, while Koboko is now facing rehabilitation of the environment after hosting transit camps for a long period.

In the places where settlements were established, natural resources and agricultural land have been used intensely which has challenged livelihoods due to soil exhaustion, environmental degradation of the area and increased loss of tree cover which is among the root causes of the negative changes in rain pattern in the region.

The population relies on agriculture as its main source of livelihood, and majority of farmers work as independent subsistence farmers growing a limited number of crops. Capacity among the population to engage in sufficient agricultural production is inadequate whereby production levels in many households do not meet basic needs for food or income. Furthermore, the region is characterized by high unemployment and difficult access to income generating activities.
There are important differences in land fertility and rain pattern across the different districts, which in a context of agricultural livelihood impacts directly on standard of living of the population. The rain patterns are challenging and differ from one district to the other, which makes agriculture and application of recommended practices difficult in some locations.

Among the targeted refugee beneficiaries, those who have been in Uganda for less than 5 years are eligible for food support from WFP, and hence the household food security varies depending on their eligibility to receive assistance from WFP. Most refugee beneficiaries are people who recently have or soon will be weaned off from this food support and therefore are in a period of transition; hence, their food security and livelihood solely relies on their own ability to produce food and generate income.

**Changes to the working context since start of operation**

In Arua District a group of beneficiaries has undergone relocation from Imvepi to Rhino Camp. These beneficiaries report that their agricultural activities in the second season of 2012 were affected by late allocation of plots of land in the new location and that they needed to spend time on constructing houses at the time when they should have been preparing fields and planting.
2. Methodology

A. Data collection methods
The assessment of this Livelihood Support project seeks to document changes within the areas of agricultural production, livelihood, environmental protection and self-reliance among the project target group. As this project has strengthening of agricultural production at its centre, the report emphasizes assessment of both outcomes and impact. This seeks to reflect the conditionality of successful agricultural outcomes prior to realization of aspirations of creating impact on the livelihood and self-reliance of the beneficiary households.

To assess this, a combination of methods has been applied. In the course of the implementation of the project, yield assessment has been applied to assess agricultural outcomes, field observations have served as a means of verification of the agricultural and post-harvest practices applied at both group and individual level and seasonal monitoring data of production activities and group performance has been recorded. Immediately after the completion of the project period, an end-line survey has been conducted in January 2013 in the four districts of Arua, Koboko, Adjumani and Kiryandongo. The survey included collection of 380 household questionnaires and interviews with beneficiaries and community leaders.

Data collection has been coordinated by project field staff together with the M&E Officer, and survey interviews have been conducted by teams of external enumerators with multi-linguistic skills that reflect the varying languages spoken by nationals and refugees in the different locations. Working with a refugee target group implies a high level of linguistic diversity among the respondents, and for that reason the original English questionnaire has been translated into Lugbara, colloquial Arabic, Madi and Kiswahili. Furthermore, translation into Kakwa and Acholi was made on the spot to ensure representation of all language groups in the sample.

It has been a premise for the study, that it is the first in-depth assessment of the project to be carried out – as part of a strengthened focus on impact monitoring within the DRC-DDG. The tools for data collection have been developed in the final stage of the implementation period, and have been designed to compensate for the absence of a baseline study. This means that the findings about change presented in this report, in most cases are based on the perceptions of change expressed by respondents at the time of the end-line assessment. This leaves a larger margin for subjectivity that otherwise pursued by the DRC-DDG, and for that reason careful triangulation with the findings of field observations and monitoring data has been conducted in the process of data analysis.

B. Sampling and characteristics of respondents
The sample size for the end-line study has been calculated based on the number of beneficiary households. The sample size reflects a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of +/- 4.3.

In total, 380 household respondents have been interviewed for the questionnaire-based survey, which means that 24% of the targeted households have been consulted in the study.

The majority of respondents are indirect beneficiaries (household members of farmers), as the survey seeks to assess impact at household level. The survey has, however, in some instances included direct beneficiaries as respondents.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are the following: 44.6% are male, whereby the remaining 55.4% of females represent that women are slightly overrepresented in the sample. 54.1% of interviewed households are nationals, who thereby are overrepresented by 4% point in comparison with national households’ proportion of beneficiaries. The average age is 34.2 years, which reflects the population well. Beneficiaries who have been part of the project for 2 years comprise 74.6% of the sample and are therefore overrepresented in comparison with those who have been part of the project for two years by 14.6% point.

C. Data handling and analysis
Monitoring data of field observations has been recorded on monitoring forms in the course of the project implementation, and has been kept in files in the field offices. The survey data has been collected on paper questionnaires and thereafter entered into an SPSS-database for statistical analysis.
Records of interviews have been coded according to the project indicators, and stored in this form in an office file in Kampala.

In the statistical data analysis it has been emphasized to look into both general trends of the project and findings when data is disaggregated based on respondent’s varying locations, status as nationals or refugees and the duration of the household’s involvement in the project in their location. Also, interpretation of the statistical findings have been closely linked to the field observations records and monitoring data, as the absence of baseline data has inflicted a strengthened emphasis on data triangulation.

D. Challenges with data collection

Linguistic diversity made FGDs difficult
During the data collection it was a challenge to conduct focus group discussions in the highly multi-lingual areas so it imposed a choice between either isolating language groups and only include a limited number of the groups who are part of the project, or to make an attempt to conduct focus group discussions with interpretation for the different language groups represented. Neither of the options was found conducive to the data collection process because of the risk of bias that was implied by either only including few language groups, or by the hindrances for data collection that was found when participants in a focus group could not discuss dynamically with each other. For that reason the method of focus groups was converted into interviews with community leaders, farmer group leaders and a limited number of focus group discussions.

Interference of change in WFP food distribution
The timing of the end-line assessment in January 2013 was planned according to the harvesting season, whereby it was expected that at this time it would be possible to measure relevant outcomes and in some cases impact of the agricultural performance of the second agricultural season of 2012. This intention has, however, been spurred by the fact that a relevant number of target refugees – particularly in Arua District – from 1st of January 2013 no longer has been eligible for WFP’s food distribution as they have had refugee status in Uganda for more than 5 years. This incident underlines the relevance of the livelihood support project, but it has also complicated the assessment of food security since a relevant proportion of the households’ situation has changed in the period between the end of the 2012 project cycle and the time of the assessment from January 14th to 19th 2013.

As such, a proportion of the measurements about food security are liable to be affected by selected household’s new situation where less food is available from the 1st of January 2013, than has been the case for 2012. For this reason, the food security data will be disaggregated according to districts and the yield assessments that documents the increase in food production is utilized as a key means of triangulation in relation to food security.

Sampling to reflect many different parameters
As reflected in the demographic descriptions of the sample presented above, this project has a wide range of parameters that needs to be taken into account in sampling. This sample has not been fully successful in securing representativeness on all the parameters and in effect, the findings are based on a small over-representation of views of women, nationals, beneficiaries in Adjumani and Konyandongo and beneficiaries who have been part of the project for two years.

During data collection the beneficiaries categorized as ‘Persons with Special Needs’ have not been separated from other beneficiaries, whereby their responses are incorporated in the general findings but no separate data analysis has been conducted for this group.

While this would be subject for improvement in a subsequent assessment, it is not found to critically challenge validity of the data that this report is based on.
3. Findings

Immediate objective 1: Improved self reliance and livelihood among targeted refugee and national households

Indicator I: Agricultural production

This project utilizes agricultural activities as the means of improvement of household livelihood. Due to this, it is relevant to start with an assessment of the results and outcomes of the agricultural activities as impact on livelihood and self reliance would be dependent on the success in the agricultural production. For this reason, the assessment initially looks into achievements and challenges that are part of the process of food production, which would likely impact the findings under the following indicators of livelihood, food security and ability to meet basic needs.

Land opening

As indicated in the previous overview of outcomes, 369 acres of land has been opened under the livelihood support project. During the interviews with beneficiaries, it was indicated that the majority of the farming land that the farmers were working on is additional to what farmers otherwise would open themselves, and as such it appears that the project has achieved to increase access to arable land that would otherwise not have been utilized.

A highly positive attitude exists amongst the beneficiaries towards mechanical assistance to opening of the land. However, several farmer groups in each of the project locations raise issues of land opening being conducted too late whereby all subsequent steps of preparation, planting and harvesting suffer from being done off-season – and thereby causing less yield than would otherwise have been possible. In cases of delay in land opening, there appears to be a dynamic interplay between the availability of a tractor in a given district and the timely preparation done by the farmers themselves in the form of clearance of trees and bush. Farmers express challenges in achieving the land clearance due to lack of axes, while project staffs furthermore direct attention to challenges in planning to ensure land clearance in time.

Activity level and motivation

In the quantitative data obtained in the household survey there are significant differences in responses regarding engagement in agricultural activity at household level when the figures are disaggregated between nationals and refugees, and also across the different districts.

In all locations, 96.4% of nationals indicate to engage in food production, whereas the number for refugees is 88.4%. Respondents in Arua and Adjumani Districts account for the largest proportion of households – respectively 13.1% and 10.8% - who indicate not to be active in agricultural production at household level. This should be seen in the light that Arua and Adjumani Districts among project locations are the areas with the poorest soil qualities and with the biggest challenges in relation to extended dry spells and unreliable rain pattern. Based on this data, it is likely that these external factors influence the motivation to engage in farming activities, and in a subsequent phase of the project it could be relevant to investigate how the project could stimulate increase in activity in these regions.

In relation to the activity level indicated in the household survey, a tendency observed in the qualitative data should be highlighted. In the interviews and focus groups conducted, there is a clear trend of people stressing that the mode of work in the Farmer Groups is conducive to an increase in agricultural activity. Statements include, that “Formerly we used to work individually. We now share experiences and have a learning process [and] the hard-working are role models” and “When you are alone there is some kind of laziness that develops. But for being a group, a day is scheduled and you don’t want to lose that day unless when you are very sick”\(^1\). Furthermore, it appears to serve as a key incentive for joining a Farmer Group that is enables an individual to access support structures and loans in a way that is not possible on your own. This is illustrated by Farmer Group leader in Adjumani, stating that “If you are not in a group,

\(^1\) Both quotes are from Focus Group Discussions in Arua
and a beneficiary in Arua stressing that “before being in the group, there was no access to farming tools. There was an interest in farming, but not until becoming part of the group was it possible to produce in the home as well”.

As such, it seems likely that the project has contributed to an increase in the activity level both in the form of more people engaging in farming activities, and people who were already active becoming more active. This, however, seems to correspond, with important differences across the different project locations, with differences in the fertility of the land.

**Access to farming inputs**

The distribution of seeds and farming tools has been highlighted by all interviewed beneficiaries as enabling for their agricultural productivity. While willingness to recover seeds for subsequent planting is emerging after the establishment of 12 seed management committees, there is a widespread attitude amongst the farmers of seeing both seeds and farming tools as something that needs to be continuously provided to uphold activity level. Furthermore, it is also clear that that there is a a potential to increase production by activating people who currently are non-productive due to having no access to farming tools. For instance, there were reports of households where 8 out of 12 adult household members did not take part in household production for this reason.

These findings point at a need to strengthen the culture of self-reliance and to strategize on how the full potential for household production can be realized.

**Agricultural and post-harvest practices**

In field observations, beneficiary interviews and focus group discussions it has been observed that the target groups have responded well to the knowledge on modern agricultural and storing practices. The recommended agricultural practices that were highlighted to have been applied at household level after people have joined the Farmer Groups include, early preparation of fields (in order to utilize natural maneuver and saturate the soil), planting in rows (rather than broadcasting), weeding, seed-multiplication, awareness about seed recovery and knowledge about field layout that enables increased yield and avoiding cross-pollination. In different groups, varying strategies have been applied to spread the use of these practices. In some groups, members “…take the knowledge home and grow the crops as you have been taught”. In others “There is rotation in the agricultural work whereby in everyone’s fields the modern practices are applied”.

An important pre-condition to the project’s potential impact in contributing to increased dietary variety is whether it has been successful in facilitating and stimulating a more diverse agricultural production. On this matter, it is observed in the quantitative data that there are diverging trends in the responses given. In the data, it is indicated that among nationals 54.3% produce more varied types of food than they did 12 months earlier. However, 26.5% of nationals state that they produce the same variety and 18.5% indicate that they produce less varied types of food crops. This means that the positive finding of more than half indicating an increased variety should be seen in combination with almost one fifth indicating a decrease in the variety.

Among refugees, there are almost equal proportions of responses in the three categories of increase, decrease and no change comparing to 12 months earlier. As such, the positive change of 30.6% of household respondents stating to be growing more varied types of food is leveled out by 31.7% stating to experience a decrease in the variety and 37.4% indicating no change.

When the responses are disaggregated to district level, it is seen that Kiryandongo and Koboko beneficiaries account for the majority of respondents that indicate increase in the variety, which reflects that soil in these locations can better accommodate new types of crops. For subsequent project cycles it could – based on an evaluation of technical viability - be considered if more can be done to introduce new types of crops in Arua and Adjumani.

The qualitative evaluation of the introduction of new types of crops in Koboko and Kiryandondo districts shows significant differences in the levels of success. In Kiryandongo, beneficiaries expressed great satisfaction with the introduction of rice and vegetables, which has been very successful both as a source of

---
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improved household diet and income. The depth of the success is indicated by beneficiaries stressing to have learnt how to produce seeds for a new type of crop in order to be able to sustain its production. In Koboko, an attempt to introduce Irish potatoes has resulted in failure for the majority of Farmer Groups either in the process of growing them or in the storage phase due to lack of knowledge on the importance of heaping and storage in a dark place. This has highlighted the importance of conducting in-depth training of farmers prior to the introduction of new types of enterprises is highlighted.

In the 2012 project period, 983 people have been trained in recommended post-harvest handling practices. Among the beneficiaries interviewed, there appears to be a strong awareness about the importance of proper storage. At the same time, access to proper storage facilities is highlighted as a challenge in several of the consulted groups. For instance, a focus group discussion in Koboko District says: "The challenge now is post harvest storing, as we have no access to a collection centre. Rats, chickens, weasels and termites are the biggest threats to the crops when stored in the home". Access to storage facilities is related to income generation and food security in absence of proper storage, people are more prone to sell the produce off immediately after harvest, because they do not want to take the risk of waiting. In doing so, the produce is sold in a low-price season which leads to farmers receiving less value for the crops compared to if it had been stored and sold later on during the high demand season. This also impacts negatively on household’s food security as selling crops immediately after the harvest results in no food reserve for the lean season. This seems to predominantly impact the refugee households’ food security due to selling of produce intended for consumption, and impact on the national’s household with impact on income due to seasonal cost.

A stronger focus on storage facilities in subsequent project cycles would help to ensure that agricultural outcomes make desired impact on the food security. This was well reflected by a Farmer Group leader’s experience in Adjumani District: "Before, food produced in one year would never reach the next year. Learning how to handle it, how to conserve it, makes it easier to store food up to next year".

Social impact
In addition to the reported changes in the project indicators, a number of examples of spill-over to social impact have been seen in selected locations. The examples mentioned here are not general trends, but indications of the projects potential capacity to feed into a wider social development. Firstly, in Koboko District the introduction of new agricultural practices like planting in rows is reported to have affected the division of work and cooperation between men and women, as the method requires cooperation, and encourages participation of all household members equally. Furthermore, a Farmer Group leader in another Koboko Group reports that "There has become interest from women to join the group, as they see that the women who are part of the project benefit".

In Kiryandongo the project supports groups previously founded as women groups, whereby there is a strong involvement of women in the project. Consequently, in this location the project has contributed significantly to women’s economic empowerment. "In many homes you see the woman contributing more than the man to family development, and therefore they also take part in decision making", the project officer in this location reports.

In Adjumani, a Farmer Group leader indicates increased capacity to take social responsibility by the members of the group: "We have become able to assist vulnerable groups, like disabled people who are included in the group and receive the same share even though they do not have the full work strength". And the most general example relates to supporting each other in times of crisis, e.g. sickness or death in a family, where the Farmer Groups seems to have installed a new support network for the members.

Indicator II: Food security

Amount of food available
In the survey of the food situation in targeted households, a divide is seen between refugees and nationals. Among nationals, 93.3% of national households state being food secure by the definition of at least 2 meals per day. Among refugees, the trend is lower with 76.8% of households having at least 2 meals per day. This leaves a significant proportion (22.7%) of refugee households that live on 1 meal per day. When the data is disaggregated to district level, it is observed that the food level is generally lower in Arua, where 3.6% of both nationals and refugees live on only one meal per day.
These figures should be interpreted in conjunction with the data regarding access of all household members to the available food. Here, 31.7% of refugee household respondents express that there is a shortage of food, whereby not all household members have access to food. Among nationals, the equivalent figure is 13.9%. Amongst the targeted districts, this trend is relatively higher in Arua, and lower in Adjumani.

There seems to be strong dissatisfaction with the amount of food available in the households. Amongst the refugees a strong tendency is observed with 69.4% indicating dissatisfaction, whereas 46.1% of the respondent nationals indicated dissatisfaction.

When looking at respondent’s estimation of changes in the number of meals in the household in the past 12 months, diverging tendencies are found as there are high proportions of responses in each of the categories of decrease, increase and no change. The trend of increase is twice as strong among nationals compared with refugees, with 42.7% of nationals stating increase in number of meals, while only 21% refugees reporting to have increased number of meals. This coincides with significant proportions of 31% of nationals and 22.6% of refugees who indicate to have experienced a decrease in the number of meals. This shows that refugees have registered a decrease of 10%, whereas for nationals it is a net increase of 22.1%. The highest decrease is found in Arua, and the highest increase in Koboko.

These findings should be seen in the context of data collection being done shortly after changes in the WFP food distribution for the beneficiaries who by January 2013 have been in Uganda for 5 years. Due to this, an unknown proportion of respondents – particularly in Arua – are likely to have been affected by this, and consequently their answers could to some extent reflect the change in food situation due to this change in food allowance.

**Dietary diversity**

In the household survey, respondents were asked to estimate how many days in one month different types of food are included in the meals. The response shows that the main menu comprises of carbohydrates, vegetables and beans/peas, with fairly rare access to meat, fish and poultry.

![Dietary diversity chart](image)

When asked about changes in types of food eaten, 37.1% of both nationals and refugees report to be eating less varied types of food today than 12 months earlier. However, 37% of refugees state to have the same dietary diversity as one year before. Increased dietary diversity is strongest among nationals, where 41.2% indicate an increase, while the figure for refugees is 23.6%. It appears that the project has had a differing impact on food variety with some beneficiaries experiencing a positive change and other experiencing a negative change. Arua stands out as the location where most respondents indicate a decrease, and Kiryandongo as the place with the highest proportion of increase.

---

4 Rice, millet, sorghum, posho, cassava, sweet potatoes
Period of food security
To gauge the food security periods, households were asked to estimate for how long the stored food has lasted in the agricultural seasons they have been part of the project. The responses indicate that the vast majority of refugees live on stored food for a period between 1 and 4 months, which would be insufficient to cater for their food needs up to the following harvest.

Table 1: Estimates of how long time stored food last – divided by nationals/refugees

Furthermore, there seems to be important variance in the region. Arua district again seems to be most vulnerable in terms of having short periods of food security from the farmer's own products.

Table 2: Estimates of how long time stored food last – divided by Districts

Proper storage facilities is great significance to income and food security, because it affects the vulnerability of the families are to selling their produce immediately after the harvest. This has been highlighted earlier on in this report. In the qualitative data it has been observed that access to reasonable storage facilities challenges refugees more so than it does the nationals. The data shows that refugees have a strong tendency to sell off produce immediately after harvest. Therefore, a strengthened emphasis on construction of storage facilities aimed at refugees in general and nationals living in distant locations appears to be of relevance in a subsequent project period.

Following the finding that it is difficult to sustain a food access until the next harvest from own produce; the ability of the household to buy supplementary food becomes relevant. Here data shows that refugees buy food slightly more often compared to the nationals. This, in the qualitative data analysis seems to be re-
lated to a stronger dependency on food beyond what they produce themselves. However, neither nationals nor refugees have a strong trend of buying supplementary food with only 7.2% and 10% respectively stating that they buy food ‘often’ or ‘always’. When asked about changes in the ability to buy food, there is a strong trend for both groups towards a decrease in the ability with 60.1% among nationals and 55.2% among refugees stating to be able to buy less food than they were 12 months earlier. For the same period, 13.5% of nationals report to have experienced increased ability to buy supplementary food, and 17.5% of refugees report so.

**Indicator III: Livelihood and income generation**

**Marketing of agricultural produce**

The project intended to strengthen the target group’s livelihood situation by inducing more agribusiness activities. In the qualitative assessment there appears to be a general trend of awareness towards basic income-enhancing strategies like selling when prices peak. However, there seems to be three different degrees of impact.

The first category covers those who have become aware, but have not managed to engage in strategic selling, and continues to sell individually and immediately after harvest. This is partly explained above with reference to the challenge of storage, and another reason being lack of access to information about current market prices which makes farmers vulnerable to exploitation. Furthermore, far distances to a market and low level of coordination in a group in facilitating contact to bulk buyers seems also to prompt early selling of crops.

For this group – mostly characterized by refugees and beneficiaries in distant locations – the situation could be improved in a subsequent phase by improved storage facilities, education on obtaining information about market prices through Sub-County Farmers Forum’s radio broadcasting and linking to buyers who can facilitate transport.

The second category is where the initiation of the Farmer Groups has led to more and increasingly coordinated agribusiness activities. A Farmer Group leader in Adjumani explains that “the group stores the bulk production until prices go up in February-March, and this process of planning is new”.

The practice is further illustrated in an interview in Koboko: “When we have enough [produce], one representative from the group is responsible for facilitating the contact with a buyer. This practice is new; before it was an individual issue to go to the market”. In most cases, this applies to groups that have been successful in increasing the amount of food produced to the extent where the bulk production serves as surplus food that is strategized as a livelihood enterprise, and managed accordingly by facilitation of joint contact with a buyer.

The beneficiaries who fall into the third category are similar to the organized groups selling their products during the high price season in characteristic, but are often located closer to a market location. These groups have easy access to transport and sell produce under favorable conditions as an individual, as illustrated by a beneficiary living in walking distance from a trading centre in Koboko: “When prices are up we sell. We go to the open market, everyone goes individually when have learned that prices are high”. This group achieves similar benefits of the ones who sell in bulk, but due to their location the incentive to coordinated selling is reduced.

**Income**

In the household survey, respondents were asked about their average monthly income in the past 6 months, and were furthermore requested to estimate their monthly income prior to their involvement in the project. As this measurement is based on memory, there is some uncertainty related to the estimation of income changes. The data, however can be used to conclude that while only marginal changes are represented among refugee households, 10% of the nationals indicate to an increase in households earning of more than UGX 50,000 per month. Table 3 and 4 below indicates to project making positive effect to the incomes of the nationals.
Indicator IV: Ability to meet basic needs

In this assessment ‘ability to meet basic needs’ has been operationalized into a number of parameters that are instrumental in daily life and development. Access to medical care, clothing, school enrolment and acquisition of household items serve as the backbone to the assessment. It is generally observed that improvements related to this indicator have taken place in the project period.

The respondents evaluation of their clothing situation, 69% indicate as it being either ‘fair’ or ‘good’ and 22% as it being bad. There are very few responses of ‘very good’, but 9% of refugees state that the clothing situation is ‘very bad’. The majority indicate to have an acceptable clothing situation while ¼ of household respondents indicate a dissatisfying situation.

As a second indicator of ability to meet the basic needs the beneficiaries were asked to indicate if there have been changes in the quality of their shelter in the past 12 months, In Adjumani, Koboko and Kiryandongo districts, 43% of all respondents indicate to have experienced improvement in their shelter. Arua stands out where only 27% indicate to have experienced improvement, and at the same time 37.8% indicate that the situation has worsened in the period. In Arua, this is likely to relate to the relocation of refugees from Imvepi, whereby a group of beneficiaries had to leave the shelters they had developed over
years and construct a new one from the scratch. In Koboko, 14.1% indicate a worsened shelter situation and the figure for Adjumani and Kiryandongo is 20%. There are varying findings in relation to the shelter, however, for this parameter a positive trend is found to be dominant in Adjumani, Koboko and Kiryandongo.

The ability to take children to school was also investigated. More precisely, assessment was done to gauge to what extent children in school going age in a household are enrolled for primary or secondary education. The data showed that 86% of the households reported having children in school going age. The analysis of how many of these are able to enroll in the school shows a significant differences across the four districts as indicated in the table 5 below

Table 5: District distribution of ability to enroll children in school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Percent of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjumani</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koboko</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryandongo</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjumani stands out as the location where most households are able to take all children to school. This is also reflected in the interviews conducted in Adjumani, where a general trend exists of people who would like to send their children to school as one of the Farmer Group leader emphasizes: “More children are sent to school. Today, it is very difficult to find a child at home”. This positive trend is also found in Koboko, where it was commonly stated that “The extra food produced is used to facilitate school fees and the things you cannot manufacture”. In three of the Districts, the proportion of households which are not able to take children to school is below 10%. Arua, however, stands out with 26% who are not able.

When the figures are disaggregated to the distribution between national and refugee households, the data shows that nationals have a significantly stronger ability to take all children in a household to school than refugees have, while there is only 4% point’s different in the overall proportions of households where either some or all children are school attending.

Table 6: Distribution of ability to enroll children in school divided by nationals and refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>National households</th>
<th>Refugee households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the children</td>
<td>Some of the children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjumani</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In locations where food production does not reach the level of surplus food production, a qualitative difference is observed in the source of income households turn to in order to facilitate needs like school fees and medical care, as these households are prone to selling food intended for consumption or to sell off household items. As such, when households and Farmer Groups are not successful in raising the productivity level to surplus production, catering for basic needs can be at the expense of food security.

The findings regarding improvements in access to medical care follows the same trend; where the food production has reached a level of surplus production, it is converted into income that better enables households to cater for their medical needs. In the qualitative data, this form of impact has mostly been found in Koboko and Adjumani.

The last measurement of changes in beneficiaries’ ability to meet basic needs relates to household items. Here it is found that a wide range of items have been acquired in the course of 2012, as indicated in table 7 below. When comparing to the list of household items possessed in table 8, it is seen that while 35% of refugee households own a radio by the end of 2012, 26% indicate to have acquired it within the past 12 months. For mattresses, 27% indicate to own, and 21% state to have acquired it in 2012. This trend of a large proportion indicating that the asset has been acquired within the project period is also valid for mobile phones, lamps, bed sheets and mosquito nets which can be seen in the details in the table below.

Table 7: Overview of household items acquired in 2012

Table 8: Overview of household items owned by the end of 2012

One limitation in this data is that it only measures the acquisition and possession of a type of item, and not the numerical details of how many has been purchased or how many is owned. Therefore, qualitative differences in e.g. number of items owned across national and refugee households is not reflected in the tables. However, in the qualitative data it is found that there are important numerical differences in e.g. number cooking pots where – even thought in the table is indicated to be almost equally possessed by nationals and refugees – a national household often has 4-6 while a refugee household often has 1-2.
Overall for this indicator in the data suggests that important improvements have taken place in the project period, with the strongest trend being in Koboko, Adjumani and Kiryandongo which are also the locations where beneficiaries have been most successful in producing surplus food. In Arua, factors like relocation of selected groups has impacted negatively on their shelter situation and school enrollment figures are low in comparison with other districts. However, in terms of household items acquired and possessed Arua ranks higher than e.g. Adjumani which indirectly indicates the presence of economic activities that it has not been possible to capture in the available data.

Immediate objective 2: Peaceful co-existence and protection of shared environment

Indicator I: Perception of relationship between refugees and nationals

In the household survey respondents were asked to rate how they perceive the relationship between nationals and refugees. As Koboko no longer hosts refugees, this presentation of findings focuses on the three other districts where there are active settlements. In Arua and Adjumani, a significant majority of respectively 76.5% nationals and 64% refugees indicate that the relationship is good, and 22.2% and 34.3% state that it is acceptable with some minor problems. These data suggest that co-existence in these locations is not a major challenge. In these locations, most respondents indicate that the relationship has remained the same over the past 12 months, while 30.6% in Adjumani and 35.3% in Arua state that it is improved and respectively 6.9% of nationals and 12.7% of refugees express that it has worsened. There are also a small noticeable groups of beneficiaries which indicate deviation from the overall positive trend.

In this respect, Kiryandongo is handled separately due to a manifestation of a different trend. Here the relationship between nationals and refugees is seems a bit strained with 10% stating that it is characterized by conflicts and a much larger proportion of 45.6% stating that it is acceptable with some minor problems, while 44.4% indicate that it is good. This suggests that co-existence in Kiryandongo faces a higher extent of difficulties. The preliminary findings from field observations indicate that troublesome relations here could be related to the addition of IDPs in Kiryandongo who were displaced due to land slides in Bududa. There have been reports of refugees accusing IDPs of stealing produce from their fields and there was at least one report of a case of a violent clash.

It is, however, very interesting that Kiryandongo at the same time is the location where most respondents – 43.7% - indicate that the relationship has improved in the past 12 months. Hence it seems that Kiryandongo has had a worse starting point than other districts, which indicates to that the program have had the biggest impact here. However, also there are diverging trends in Kiryandongo, as 16.1% of respondents state that the relationship has worsened while 40.2% express that it has stayed the same. It seems likely, that people have rated the relationship differently according to their involvement in the before mentioned conflict.

When data across all the districts are analyzed separately for nationals and refugees, nationals generally rank the relationship positively, while 30%refugees state that the relationship has minor but acceptable problems. More refugees indicate improved relationship (41.1%) against lesser number of nationals (29.2%) indicating having experienced no changes. Hence, it appeas that most impact is seen among beneficiaries with the worst starting point which indicates to a qualitative change whereby the worst cases have been most responsive.

In general, it is therefore likely that the relationship between nationals and refugees has improved in the three refugee hosting locations during the period of the project, but that a minority of beneficiaries in the same period has had the opposite experience. This difficult relationship is prevalent in Kiryandongo, but also valid in some other locations. For this reason it is recommended that further investigation should be conducted on the challenges that beneficiaries face in the daily co-existence in a subsequent project period.

When looking separately at the attitude of landlords, there seems to be a general willingness to support Farmer Groups with allocation of land – often with landlords becoming a member of the farmer group. The issue of compensation of landlords for refugees settling on their land remains a contested issue between
landlords and OPM, and in this context the token of appreciation given under the Livelihood Support Project in the form of livestock is not in all cases received well, since the handing out can be confused with compensation which it would have too low value for. During focus group discussions in Arua they received. Because of this, the message of appreciation has not come across for the landlords in question. To address both of these issues, it is recommended that information sharing about the process of distribution of livestock is strengthened to eliminate misunderstandings that challenge achievement of the purpose of distribution.

Indicator II: Consumption of natural resources

In order to mitigate the environmental impact of the use of firewood as an energy source the project has emphasised training in construction and usage of energy saving stoves. In the project period, 810 stoves have been constructed which is reflected in the household survey where 57% of both national and refugee households state to own an energy saving stove. A pilot test of the impact of the use of energy saving stoves in comparison with 3-stone fireplaces indicate a 50% decrease in the amount of fuel wood used. According to available statistics from 2010, a household (without an energy saving stove) in average uses 13-15 kilos of firewood per day. This means that in a scenario where the household that has an energy saving stove would use it as the only instrument of food preparation. Hence, it would be likely that the amount of firewood consumed is reduced with 5.67 tons per day across the region. This illustration indicates to the potential of the spread of energy saving stoves in the region. However, there are no documented evidence or records of the regularity of the usage of the stoves in these places.

However, household respondents evaluation of changes in accessibility of firewood has been documented. Here, data suggests that in Adjumani, Arua and Koboko, it has become easier to access firewood, whereas in Kiryandongo accessibility is severely aggravating with 72.7% of households indicating that this access has become more difficult. In Arua 19.1% indicate to difficulties accessing firewood whereas, in Adjumani it is 31% and in Koboko 24.7%.

The difficulty stated in Kiryandongo is furthermore reflected in the indications of the longer time spent on collecting firewood in a household in a week. In Kiryandongo this is four times more than in Arua and Koboko, and twice the time spent in Adjumani. Reports from the field staff in Kiryandongo also points to severe challenges in the location due to a very low biomass in the area and strong competition over the available tree cover with nationals and other institutions in the area.

Table 9: Weekly time spent on collecting firewood divided by Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjumani</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koboko</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryandongo</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this it is recommended that tree planting activities are extended to include Kiryandongo in a subsequent project period. Furthermore, to realize the potential mitigating effect of installation of energy saving stoves it is recommended that training activities are extended to cover maintenance of stove and sensitization on replacement of stoves by the end of their life span. Lastly, it would also be valuable to extend staff monitoring to include follow up on usage and maintenance of stoves.
4. Conclusions

A. Progress towards objectives
The main achievements documented in this assessment indicate to the strengthening of the foundation for beneficiaries to engage in agricultural livelihood activities to sustain themselves.

The survey indicates that the project has created an increased access to arable land. Additionally, a social structure has been initiated whereby the enhancement in the activity level of farmers in agricultural production has been initiated due to strengthened motivation, organisation and the formation of an environment for learning and sharing of experiences. This social organisation helps facilitate the individual's access to support structures and qualifies them for external support.

Increased knowledge and application of modern agricultural practices is evident and a high level of information about post harvest handling practices have been acquired by the farmers. The application of the latter, however, is found to be constrained by access to proper storage facilities.

A number of examples of social impact of the project have been identified. These include increased social cooperation, changes in distribution of labour between men and women, and the establishment of new community support structures to protect individuals in crisis situations.

In relation to food security, it is evident that 93.3% of national households and 76.8% of refugee households now have access to at least 2 meals per day. The intervention, however, still leaves room for improvement in food security, as challenges remain in ensuring that food security is spread out to a higher proportion of targeted refugees. It is important also to ensure sufficiency of food that enables all household members to access the available meals and in securing food reserves to live on from one season to another. This need is most common in Arua, which may be because this district has been most severely affected by a host of external factors such as delays in rain, relocations of refugees that disrupted agricultural activities and the changes following people disqualifying for continued food support from WFP.

It is also observed that there is increased awareness about marketing and agribusiness activities. Enabling factors for the success of such enterprises are: if groups and households have been able to produce surplus food, have access to safe storage facilities, are well coordinated in group activities, are linked to the information systems of market prices, and if they are within an accessible distance to bulk buyers or markets.

A small increase has also been observed in the income of national beneficiaries, while changes for refugees are more visible in acquisition of household items. Meanwhile, increase in children's school enrollment for refugees, however, still remains low in absolute terms. A trend of improvement of shelter is seen in the three locations that have not been affected by relocation in the project period. In general, changes in livelihood seems to be correlated with the ability to produce surplus food by the beneficiary households.

In Arua and Adjumani, there are indications of a good relationship between nationals and refugees, while it appears that Kiryandongo faces the highest level of problems and conflict. However, this conflict is still less than what was present last year indicating to the highest improvement in the relationship in Kiryandongo at the same time. According to reports from the field these tensions prevail between national IDPs and refugees, while the working relationship with original nationals is not estimated to be significantly different from other locations.

The spread of energy saving stoves to enhance environmental protection has been successful to the extent that 57% of households report to own this stove. Without records of household usage of the stoves it is not possible to draw valid conclusions on the mitigating effects of the stoves, however, it can be concluded based on the feedback of the beneficiaries, that in Arua, Koboko and Adjumani, it is reported to have become easier to access firewood. In Kiryandongo, however, the situation is critical due to scarcity of trees, whereby a need for strengthened environmental protection activities has been identified in this location.
B. Recommendations and lessons learned

The recommendations listed here centered on how the projects impact in food security and livelihood can be enhanced. In general it is found that the project could benefit from an increased focus on the creation of a spirit of self-reliance and facilitation of durable solutions for the target group.

**Recommendation 1: Enhance spirit of self-reliance**

In a context of working with refugees who have fled their normal sources of livelihood and have a year-long experience of being supported through food distribution, it is key to address challenges relating to a spirit of dependency. This particularly applies to beneficiaries in the transition phase of recently having disqualified for food support, or are about to be taken off the food log.

The study has observed that in this project period inputs like farming tools to a very little extent is replaced once they are worn out, and that an expectation of continued supply of such instruments prevails among the target group. Furthermore, it serves as an obstacle to fully utilize the potential for household productivity that many families have too few farming instruments to engage all eligible household members in the agricultural activities. Also it has been observed that the project could benefit by installing a system of strategizing group sustainability in which the support given under the project is conceptualized as initiation support rather than a continuous component of the group’s existence.

Practically, it is recommended that the following be included in the formation and re-organisation of groups in the future projects:

- Conduct a participatory needs assessment of the requirements for a group’s long term self-reliance
- Map available resources in the groups and the provisions of the project. On this occasion the frequency and time frame for different inputs should be made clear, stressing that inputs such as farming tools are part of inception support, while seed distribution will be seasonal in the period of support. This would also serve to eradicate misinformation about inequalities in distribution across different groups.
- Develop a longer term strategy (at least a three year) for how a group’s agricultural outcomes should be utilized to fulfill identified requirements for self-reliance. This could include:
  - Food security
  - Income
  - Seed multiplication and recovery
  - Investments in farming tools and inputs to uphold and expand agricultural production

  This strategy should commit groups to e.g. allocate a proportion of each season’s produce to replacement of tools and investment in more instruments.

**Recommendation 2: Ensure quality and timeliness of agricultural inputs**

When engaging in agricultural activities it is very important that inputs are distributed in time to prevent obstacles occurring when working off-season. The timely distribution and the quality of the inputs distributed should by no means be compromised as it jeopardizes not only the seasonal outcomes and impact but also the process of introducing recommended practices and the self-esteem of farmers and their ability to become self-reliant. Hence, it is recommended that inputs with no exception is distributed in time, and that the possibility of testing the quality of seeds prior to distribution in order to hold seed distributors accountable is explored.

**Recommendation 4: Improve food storage**

Limited access to storage facilities has been identified as a challenge to a full impact on food security and income situation. Knowledge of the importance of safe storage should be converted into good post harvest practices, and to achieve this it is suggested that emphasis on construction of storage facilities is enhanced. This in turn, for instance would be included in a group’s 3 year strategy to ensure installation of such facilities through re-investment of a part of the group income.

**Recommendation 2: Strengthen activity levels and motivation**

The assessment indicates that improvement in food security and livelihood depends on exogenous factors like soil quality, rain pattern and household ownership of land together with endogenous factors like activity level and practices applied. There seems to be a negative relationship between non-conducive exogenous factors and household engagement in agricultural activities. Hence, it is advisable to investigate how incentives to increase activity level could be created in locations where agricultural livelihood is difficult. Exchange visits and sharing of best practices could be instruments in this regard, and furthermore, it could
be considered to introduce other types of livelihood activities, as elaborated below.

**Recommendation 5: Improve marketing and diversify sources of income**

This report identifies a number of enabling and disabling factors for successful engagement in marketing. It is evident that marketing activities of some groups are stalled due to various challenges. Therefore it is recommended that the project should ensure that Farmer Groups are linked to the sub-county Farmer Forums and that the possibility of connecting with buyers is put in place. To ensure farmer’s access to information about market prices and agricultural news, listening to the weekly radio shows disseminating current prices and practical advice could be included in the group activities. As ownership of a radio is limited to 55% of nationals and 35% of refugees, having this group activity could also enhance equal access to information.

For diversification of sources of income, two initiatives could be suggested. Firstly, stimulation of value addition activities could be encouraged. For instance, encouraging grinding of maize or peeling rice prior to selling produce. At the time of writing, the market price for ground maize was 300% of the primary product, indicating significant potential for income improvement by selling the finished product. Secondly, introduction of other types of livelihood activities is advisable. For instance, for business-oriented beneficiaries, livelihood activities relying solely on agriculture is challenging.

**Recommendation 6: Increase duration of engagement with groups**

By the time a Farmer Groups ‘graduate’ from the Farmer Field Schools, knowledge and application of recommended practices is at a level where the group can continue successfully without needing regular supervision. In field observations, it is revealed that this knowledge acquisition and practical use develops gradually over time, and in most cases begins in the second year of intervention. In this regard, it is recommended that the project engages with Farmer Groups intensively for 2 years, followed by a 3rd year with monthly monitoring.

**Recommendation 7: Address bio-mass challenge in Kiryandongo**

This report finds that access to firewood is critically difficult in Kiryandongo, and the use of firewood is a threat to the environment. Additionally, the beneficiaries spend a large amount of time searching for firewood that could be channeled into e.g. agricultural activities if firewood was more accessible. Based on this finding, it is recommended that the tree planting activities that took place in Kiryandongo in 2011 is given continuity and implemented at a larger scale in the subsequent projects.

**Recommendation 8: Ensure thorough exit strategies**

This list of recommendations ends by pointing at the importance of installing exit strategies that accommodate the ambition of long-term group sustainability. The previous suggestions about developing strategies for self-reliance, linking groups to sub-county support structures and to complete the period of support with a period of monthly monitoring is of key relevance in this regard. Further to this, instrumental could be to ensure that the group has a joint bank account to hold them together and that land is allocated to them as a group rather than individually.
### Annex: Data collection tools

#### Household Questionnaire Livelihood Support Project (End-line Assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Report number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parish name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Village name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Beneficiary type (To be filled by enumerator based on list of farmer groups) | 1 = Part of the project for one year  
2 = Part of the project for two years | ... |
| 6. Sex of Respondent:                                                    | 1 = Female  
2 = Male                                                    | ... |
| 7. How old are you? (Do not interview below 14 years)                     | Write age in years in answer box                                         | ... |
| 8. What is the status of this household?                                  | 1 = National  
2 = Refugee                                                  | ... |
| 9. How many people live in this household?                                | Indicate number                                                        | ... |

#### Food security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| S1. How many meals do you have in this household pr. day?                | 1 = 1 meal pr. day  
2 = 2 meals pr. day  
3 = 3 meals pr. day  
4 = none  
5 = more                                                   | ... |
| S2. Is there food for all household members in these meals?              | 1 = Yes  
2 = No                                                   | ... |
| S3. In the past 12 months, have you experienced change in the number of meals in the household pr. day? Is the number... | 1 = Decreased  
2 = The same  
3 = Increased | ... |
| S4. Are you able to buy food besides what you produce and receive in food aid? | 1 = Never  
2 = Randy  
3 = Sometimes  
4 = Often  
5 = Always                                                   | ... |
| S5. Has your ability to buy food changed in the past 12 months? Can you today buy... | 1 = less additional food  
2 = same amount of additional food as one year ago  
3 = more additional food | ... |
| S6. In the past 12 months, has there been any change in how many different types of food you eat? Do you today eat... | 1 = Less varied types of food  
2 = Same variety as one year ago  
3 = More varied types of food | ... |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. In the past 30 days, how often have you eaten the following types of food in this household?</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A. Green vegetables  
B. Meat  
C. Fish  
D. Poultry  
E. Beans/peas  
F. Fats and oils  
G. Fresh Fruits  
H. Bread (Rice, millet, sorghum, posho, cassava, sweet potatoes) | (Indicate number of days between 1 and 30 that food has been included in menu) | ... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with the amount of food available in this household?</td>
<td>1= No 2= Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food production:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Do you produce food in this household?</td>
<td>1= No (go to P6) 2= Yes (continue to P2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Compared to one year ago, how many different types of food crops do you produce?</td>
<td>1= Fewer types of crops 2= Same types of crops 3= More types of crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Compared to one year ago, how is the amount of food produced in the household?</td>
<td>1= Much more food produced 2= More food produced 3= Same amount produced 4= Less food produced 5= Much less food produced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 In this season and the one before, how long does your stored food last after harvest?</td>
<td>1= 1-2 months 2= 3-4 months 3= 5-6 months 4= 6-8 months 5= more than 8 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 Comparing to 1 year ago, have you experienced any change in the length of stored food last? Does stored food today last as long as last year?</td>
<td>1= Much longer 2= Longer 3= The same 4= Shorter 5= Much shorter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 How much has your average monthly income been in the past 6 months?</td>
<td>1= 0-1,000 shillings 2= 1,000-5,000 shillings 3= 5,000-10,000 shillings 4= 10,000-20,000 shillings 5= 20,000-50,000 shillings 6= More than 50,000 shillings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Please think back on the time before the household became a part of the livelihood support project. Can you tell us what your averagely monthly income was at that time?</td>
<td>1= 0-1,000 shillings 2= 1,000-5,000 shillings 3= 5,000-10,000 shillings 4= 10,000-20,000 shillings 5= 20,000-50,000 shillings 6= More than 50,000 shillings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 How is the clothing situation for you and your family?</td>
<td>1= Very poor 2= Poor 3= Fair 4= Good 5= Very good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Do you have children in school going age (primary and secondary)?</td>
<td>1= No (go to P11) 2= Yes (continue to P10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 Can you afford to take your children to school?</td>
<td>1= None of the children 2= Some of the children 3= All of the children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have the following assets in your household??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: Cooking pots</td>
<td>1 = No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: Jerry cans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: Lamp</td>
<td>2 = Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: Blanket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: Mattresses for all household members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F: Bed sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G: Mosquito net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H: Livestock (goats, cattle, pigs, sheep)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: Poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J: Radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K: Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L: Mobile Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: Farming tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| P12 |   |   |
|   | Have you acquired these assets within the past 12 months? |   |
|   | A: Cooking pots | 1 = No |
|   | B: Jerry cans |   |
|   | C: Lamp | 2 = Yes |
|   | D: Blanket |   |
|   | E: Mattresses for all household members |   |
|   | F: Bed sheets |   |
|   | G: Mosquito net |   |
|   | H: Livestock (goats, cattle, pigs, sheep) |   |
|   | I: Poultry |   |
|   | J: Radio |   |
|   | K: Bicycle |   |
|   | L: Mobile Phone |   |
|   | M: Farming tools |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment and co-existence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Do you have an energy saving stove in this household?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= No</td>
<td>2= Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>In one week, how many work hours (number of persons x number of hours) is spent on collecting firewood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indicate number of work hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Since one year ago, have you experienced any change in accessibility of firewood? Is it now...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Easier to access firewood than before</td>
<td>2= The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>We would like to ask you how you experience the relationship between nationals and refugees living in this area. Please tell us which of the following statements you agree most with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Relationship between nationals and refugees is good</td>
<td>2= Relationship between refugees and nationals is acceptable with some minor problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>How would you describe the relationship between nationals and refugees today, compared to one year ago? Has it...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Stayed the same</td>
<td>2= Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Now we would like to ask you about this household's shelter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your shelter situation today, compared to one/two years ago?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Worsened</td>
<td>2= Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>What do you live in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Grass thatched hut</td>
<td>2= Hut with plastic cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Please think back on the time before your household became part of the livelihood support project. What did you live in at that time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1= Grass thatched hut</td>
<td>2= Hut with plastic cover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNHCR Livelihood Support

Focus group discussion guideline (farmers)

Intro:

Thank you very much for having come to meet us today. We come from the organization the Danish Refugee Council - Danish Demining Group that has been engaged in agricultural activities in this area. We have come to ask you questions about your daily life, and will appreciate all information you will be able to share with us on the topics we will ask you about. We will use the information to find out if the livelihood support that is given to this community is done in the best way.

Questions:

Qn 1: Please share with us what you think about the activities in the farmer group? Did they lead to any changes? Please give examples.

Qn 2: Has there been any benefits for you in being part of the farmer groups?

Qn 3: Have the practices that have been taught in the farmer schools been relevant for your own household production?

Have you applied any of the practices in your household food production? Which?

Qn 4: How much food do you produce in the farmer group?

Qn 5: How much food do you produce in your household?

Qn 6: Is there any change in how many types of crops you grow now, comparing to one year ago? If there has been any change, what has then led to it?

Qn 7: Has there since one/two years ago been a change in the amount of food you produce? If yes, what has led to that change?

Qn 8: Now we would like to ask you about post harvest losses. Can you please share with us what are the main reasons for post harvest losses in this group?

Qn 9: Have you experienced any changes in the level of post harvest losses since one/two years ago? If yes, what has led to that change?

Qn 10: Do you have a seed stock in place? If yes, how much to you stock in one season?

Qn11: Can you please tell me about the activities done by the farmer group representative in this group?

Qn 12: How is your income today, comparing with one year ago? Is there any change in how much money is earned? If there has been any change, what has then led to it?