





BENEFICIARY HOUSEHOLD BASELINE REPORT

Household Economy Analysis (HEA) and Baseline assessment for the building resilience through Social Safety Nets in South-Central Somalia Project

Revised Jan.15, 2017

For

SOMALIA RESILIENCE ACTION CONSORTIUM (STREAM)

[FORMERLY SOCIAL SAFETY NETS CONSORTIUM (SSNP) CONSORTIUM]



Presented by: KasmoDev Development Consulting **Kenya:** The Mirage, Tower 1, #5, Chiromo Road Info@kasmodev.com

Somalia: Omar Hashi Building, Suite 413 26 June Raod Hargeisa, Somaliland

Contents

2. EXECU	JTIVE SUMMARY	3
3. BACK	GROUND	5
3.1. Intr	oduction	5
3.2. Ob	jective and scope	6
4. METH	ODOLOGY	6
4.1. Sar	npling Design	6
4.2. De	velopment of the survey questionnaire and training of enumerators	7
4.3. Dat	a entry, cleaning and analysis	8
5. ASSES	SMENT FINDINGS	9
5.1. Ho	usehold baseline survey findings	9
5.1.1.	Beneficiary general information	9
5.1.2.	Income sources	10
5.1.3.	Livelihood assets	13
5.1.4.	Livestock assets	14
5.1.5.	Material Assets (Productive and other assets)	14
5.1.6.	Household Expenditure	15
5.1.7.	Household food consumption and coping strategies	
5.1.8.	Food sources	19
5.1.9.	Humanitarian assistance	20
5.1.10.	Farming	20
5.1.11.	Trainings	20
5.2. Qu	alitative baseline survey results	21
5.2.1.	Summary of the Key informant Interviews	21
5.2.2.	Summary of the Focus group discussions	
5.2.3.	Challenges/Gaps met by the communities when pursuing their livelihoods	
5.2.4.	How best to address the challenges	23
5.2.5.	Suggested other livelihoods opportunities by the Communities	
5.2.6.	Community's prior involvements in CFW program	
5.2.7.	Major Challenges faced by the communities in CFW programs	
5.2.8.	Most common Disasters	
5.3. Ma	rket information-(Secondary Review)	
5.3.1.	Cereal prices	
5.3.2.	Daily labor wage	
5.3.3.	Household food purchasing power	
5.3.4.	Market integration	29
5.4. For	a Security Situation - Recent Trends	
5.5. Nu	tritional Situation	
b. ANNE	XES (attached)	

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A household level baseline survey was conducted as required by the STREAM Consortium, among the 5000 beneficiary households selected by the Consortium, using criteria provided in the first stage of the assessment - the HEA assessment. The baseline analysis provides information against which to periodically monitor any changes in the beneficiary households' strategies after the start of the interventions of the STREAM Consortium Project. Information collected was, among others used to compute the food consumption score, and coping strategies index, asset holding, and other socio-economic characteristics and household strategies of the beneficiary households. Using the appropriate sampling procedure and focusing on the Poor/Very Poor livelihood zones within the villages of focus, a representative sample was identified in order to collect the baseline information.

The assessment followed accepted procedures and methodologies and established baseline values and information on key parameters as defined in the log frame of the STREAM Consortium. Parameters assessed included: household description, food consumption an sources, coping strategies, asset types/levels, income sources and livelihood strategies/diversification, and others. Information available from HEA Analysis and from other secondary sources (such as FSNAU) was also presented, if relevant, either inside baseline report or referenced. At the start of the assessment, the STREAM Consortium made available information that was a useful starting point, including: the target Regions, Districts, village and livelihood type of the household; names of 5000 target beneficiaries and their age and next of kin, as well telephone numbers and other related information.

Based on a questionnaire that was discussed and agreed with the STREAM Consortium lead persons, baseline data/values were established. Some of these information and data are presented here:

- a. **Sources of Income:** On average between 30 to 63 % of households in Afmadow, Dobley and Kismayo mentioned casual labour as their main source of income. In addition, over 30% of beneficiaries in Afmadow and Dobley mentioned Selfemployment (bush product sales) as one of their main sources of income.
- b. **Assets ownership:** On average, more than 40% of households in Afmadow, Dhobley and Kismayo were categorized as asset poor. Kismayo reported the poorest livestock asset ownership among the three districts. The most commonly owned material asset is mobile phones, owned by over 80 % of households in all the three districts.
- c. **Household expenses:** All respondents regardless of the districts mentioned food as one of their main expenditure items. Majority of households stated that over nearly 70 % or more of their income is spent on food.
- d. **Household food consumption and coping strategies:** More than 70 % of households, in all the three districts have acceptable food consumption based on Food Consumption Score (FCS) indicator. FCS of more than 20 % of households in Dobley and Kismayo indicated poor to borderline consumption. High coping strategy index (CSI) (33-56) was reported in the three districts.

- e. **Food sources:** Purchase was the mostly mentioned food source in the three districts.
- f. **Farming**: is not a major livelihoods system in all the three districts, about 5-19% of household reported practicing crop farming in Dhobley and Afmadow. While none reported doing farming in Kismayo.

A number of key informant interviews and focus group discussions were also held among men and women participants. Among other aspects, these groups confirmed community assets and how these are managed, and engagement of communities in development and humanitarian programs, knowledge of community members about DRR related activities, etc.

The assessment also reviewed secondary data and provides information on integrated food security phase classification (IPC), a brief market analysis and a mention of available nutrition information.

Finally, the baseline data/information obtained from the survey has been prepared and summarized in a table for ease of reference and to guide end-line surveys.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

The Building Resilience through Social Safety Nets in South-Central Somalia Program is implemented by the STREAM Consortium comprising of ADESO and ACTED (the latter working in partnership with the local NGO, SADO). The program is a long term intervention which will provide predictable market-based support which has the potential to help households manage their own coping mechanisms and livelihood opportunities, minimizing the negative impacts of shock events. It aims at reducing the vulnerability of communities in Lower Juba to acute and chronic food insecurity.

The ADESO and ACTED-SADO Social safety nets programme under the STREAM Consortium aims to provide a sustainable opportunity for resilience building for communities chronically affected by food insecurity and humanitarian crises in Lower Juba. Targeted communities will benefit through the delivery of predictable and regular cash transfers to vulnerable households, alongside investment in diverse livelihood bases and the provision of support and community led preparedness, early warning and timely response systems. Resilience will be strengthened not only at the household level directly, but through implementing improvements to systems and policies in terms of early warning and disaster preparedness.

The program will reach 5,000 households with regular cash transfers and livelihood support, and the overall communities - an estimated 18,000 households, will benefit from improved access to early warning messaging, disaster risk reduction and a scale-up of cash transfers in the event of a shock or disaster event. The project will support a body of research on Social Safety Net Programming, enabling service providers to continue to deliver better designed Safety Net interventions into the future.

The target locations for the project include three districts of Lower Juba region, namely Kismayo, Afmadow and Dobley, where ADESO and ACTED-SADO have a strong presence. The STREAM Consortium will aim to implement a similar approach in other locations, in particular in Burhakaba, with complementary funding sources.

The STREAM Consortium sought to get a good understanding of the livelihoods and household economies and strategies of the target populations to enable them develop and establish a social safety nets program that will build/strengthen the resilience of the target communities and households, so that these communities can better cope with and quickly recover from the hazards that frequently threaten their livelihoods and food security. This is because a comprehensive understanding of socio-economic context is essential to the success of any resilience-building program.

It is with this background that KasmoDev Ltd was contracted to conduct two studies: (i) a livelihoods analysis using the HEA framework, which would provide an understanding of the livelihoods and vulnerability context of the selected livelihood groups in Lower Juba Region. This understanding would also provide the basis for the selection of the STREAM beneficiaries, and (ii) a baseline f the baseline assessment that focuses on the targeted beneficiary households in the project areas of Kismayo, Afmadow and Dobley districts. The baseline assessment provides an understanding of the livelihood assets and strategies,

the nature and size of their livelihood deficits (resulting from their chronic food insecurity), and other relevant information. The findings of this assessment provide information that serves as benchmark against the impact to be measured at the end of the project. Moreover, the results also help to determine the size and duration of any support such as cash transfers, under the STREAM program, that will be required for the targeted households in order to build their livelihood assets to an extent that will enable them to graduate from their chronic food insecurity state.

This report is presented in three parts. The first part gives the scope and context in which beneficiary baseline assessment was designed and undertaken. This section presents the coverage and aims of the project. The second part presents the methodology of the study, covering data collection, analysis and presentation by target districts. These include the sampling design, training of interviewers, collection of data, data cleaning and analysis. The final part of the report presents the main findings of the exercise. Tables that summarizes all the beneficiary baseline survey data are presented in the Annex.

2.2 Objective and scope

STREAM Consortium provided the objectives for the beneficiary household baseline survey:

a) To develop a basis against which project impact can be measured in future. The baseline is meant to provide background data that will be used by the consortium to measure or assess the changes generated by the implementation of the program. It is because of this that the baseline survey was conducted at the early stages before the start of main program activities.

b) To increase the understanding of the specific contexts within which the program will be implemented. Through assessment of various indicators, the survey gives an up-to-date and relevant information about the beneficiaries thereby improving the stakeholders' knowledge of the situation they plan to affect.

The assessment was conducted among 5,000 beneficiary households and their communities in three districts in Lower Juba, namely: Dhobley, Afmadow and Kismayo.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sampling Design

The research team had decided that the assessment would need to be representative at area level. This was considered an acceptable compromise between the need for accurate and detailed information and, on the other hand, the time and other resources available for the exercise. In line with this decision, the baseline provides a statistically representative profile of the beneficiary communities in Lower Juba region.

The baseline sampling design has been developed to have the following sampling attributes:

- a. Confidence level of 95%
- b. A margin of error of plus or minus 5%.

c. degree of variability (P) of 50%

Guided by other resilience baseline researches and statistical articles reviewed, a margin error of plus or minus 6% was arrived at.

To get the sample size needed for the baseline survey, proportions sample calculation formula (Cochran 1963) is used. Using established sample size calculation formula and correcting for finite population for proportions, a total sample size of 356 beneficiaries was arrived at.

Populations being beneficiaries with all the contacts' details available, non-responsiveness was not expected and therefore research experts did not the need to have additional sampling units to account for potential non-responsiveness.

The population size varied among the 3 targeted beneficiary livelihoods. In order to ensure that every household/beneficiary in each of these livelihoods had an equal chance of participating in giving information in this survey, the baseline design proportionately divided the sample size among the three livelihoods (SO18:Pastoral-Afmadow, SO11: Pastoral-Dhobley and SO19: Kismayu urban). According to this, the livelihoods with a larger beneficiary set selected received sampling units than smaller ones.

Livelihoods	Baseline HH sample size	Total population	Proportion
SO18: Pastoral-Afmadow	107	1500	30%
SO11: Pastoral-Dhobley	107	1500	30%
SO19: Kismayo urban	142	2000	40%
Total	356	5000	100%

The table below further provides the final sample size for each targeted livelihood

Within each livelihood, the beneficiaries to be interviewed were selected using the systematic random sampling method.

In addition to the household questionnaires, focus group discussions (FGD) and key informant interviews (KII) were also conducted. KIIs and FGDs were used to get information at a more aggregate level – on community level issues such as DRR, community level indicators, etc. The KII and FGD questions were captured in the baseline assessment tool. As much as possible, the team ensured that FGD interviews included up to 6 members and did separate interviews for men and women. Additional FGDs were discontinued as soon as a consistent set of answers were obtained from the different FGDs, as further FGDs would add little additional value. Additionally KIIs would be used to complete the picture being obtained from FGDs and household questionnaires.

3.2. Development of the survey questionnaire and training of enumerators

An elaborate draft of questionnaire was developed by KasmoDev based on the study ToR and log frame from the client. An advance version was shared with the client and a revised one is included in the Annex. The reviewed questionnaire was then pretested to give useful feedback for the finalization of the survey tool.

The data collection was conducted through pen and paper method after a thorough training was given to experienced field enumerators. The collection process took approximately one week.

There was continuous monitoring of data collection process by supervisors to ensure that the information obtained is of high quality.

3.3. Data entry, cleaning and analysis

The questionnaire was programmed in **EPI-INFO 7** which was then be used for data entry. Data entry will be done in Nairobi by experienced and trained data clerks. This took approximately two days. After the data entry process, data cleaning was undertaken to identify and eliminate any "outliers" or extreme values of a variable that were very distant from other observations. The statistical software **SPSS** was used for data cleaning and analysis.

Data analysis was done separately for each livelihood group because of their heterogeneity (less so among the two pastoral groups). Frequency tables and descriptive statistics were generated for each variable collected in the baseline survey in order to establish the baseline values. Additionally, cross-tabulation and any other analysis for selected variables as appropriate, to give a better understand dynamics and interactions were generated.

4. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

This section presents the baseline study results. The first part gives the findings obtained from the household survey of representative beneficiary households. This is followed by a presentation of the findings from the Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and Key Informants Interviews (KII). The final part presents data/information from secondary sources which is relevant for the baseline study; these information are obtained mainly from FSNAU and FEWS NET sources. All the collected baseline data and FGD/KII information are summarized by district and presented in an accompanying Annex.

4.1. Household baseline survey findings

4.1.1. Beneficiary general information

Beneficiary livelihood group reported - Regardless of the district, on average, the STREAM beneficiary households have 8 members. The majority of the respondents considered themselves as urban poor with the highest value (75%) recorded in Kismayo district, followed by Dobley (53%) and Afmadow (44%), mainly because they lived in/around these main towns. A good proportion of beneficiaries in Afmadow (36%) and Dobley (32%) also considered themselves as pastoralists. The remaining proportion (25%) in Kismayo considered themselves as Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs): This is as presented in the figure1 below:



Prevalence of Orphans and chronically sick persons - More than 40% in Kismayo, 37% in Dobley and 24% in Afmadow reported existence of at least male and female orphans in their households. Additionally, when they were asked about the number of chronically sick persons in the household; 25% in Kismayo, 16% in Dobley and 18% in Afmadow reported at least one case of chronically sick person in the household.

A high percentage of prevalence of orphans and chronically sick persons in Kismayo and Dobley would contribute to increased vulnerability to food insecurity in these districts. The beneficiaries in these two districts also had a higher proportion of internally displaced persons compared to Afmadow – meaning that they have suffered relatively more conflict.

4.1.2. Income sources



The survey teams also collected information on ownership of livelihood assets and income

sources. Households reported "yes" if they owned an income source and "no" if they did not have that income source, and the frequency table was graphed (Figure 2). Casual labour and self-employment (sale of bush products) emerged the mostly mentioned main sources of income among the beneficiaries. On average over 60% in Kismayo, 48% in Afmadow and over 30% in Dobley mentioned casual labour as one of their main sources of income. Moreover, over 30% of beneficiaries in Afmadow and Dobley mentioned Selfemployment (bush product sales) as one of their main sources of income. Overall, Afmadow reported highest income diversification compared to Dobley and Kismayo.

Among those who mentioned casual labour as one of their main income sources, porterage and house construction were the most commonly mentioned kinds of casual labour. Working on the construction of water catchments was also a casual labour type that was significantly reported in Afmadow. (Figure 3). The findings are consistent with what would be expected to be the main income sources among the urban poor.

The income source data was further analysed to determine income diversification of households. Household income sources was categorized into (i) Households with one income source only, (ii) households with two income sources only and (iii) households reporting three income sources or more.

The combined results (for the three livelihoods; n=356), show that the majority of households (58%) reported having only one income source, and 29% reported having two income sources only, while only 13% of households reported having three or more income sources (Table 1). The most common income source is casual labor, followed by self

employment (collection of bush products) followed by gifts/zakaat, humanitarian assistance (the latter mainly among the Kismayo Urban) and livestock sales.

The disaggregated data (by the three livelihood zones) on income diversification is also provided below (Table 1) and the results are similar to that of the combined data and shows that there are more households in Afmadow with more than one income source, followed by Dhobley, with Kismayo Urban households showing the least diversification. An increase in the percentage of households with "two" and "three or more" income sources will show improved income diversification.

 Table 1: Income Diversity - No. of income sources reported by households in the V.Poor category

District /Livelihood Area	One income source	Two income sources	Three or more income sources	Note
Dhobley (rural); n=106	88%	10%	2%	Very poor income diversification – nearly all have only one source
Afmadow (rural); n=106	16%	48%	36%	Relatively better diversification with majority h/holds with 'two' sources
Kismayo (Urban); n=144	68%	28%	4%	Weak diversification – mostly one source; about 30% have two sources
Combined (n=356)	58%	29%	13%	Overall – weak income source diversification with 87% households with either only 'one' or 'two' income sources

The Household Baseline survey analysis also yielded data on amount of household incomes but the number of households reporting income amounts was small/insignificant. However, the HEA analysis for the Very Poor Wealth Group category provides estimates of baseline income amounts, as given below:.

Income sources of the Very Poor households - from the HEA baseline study:

Table 2: Income Sources of the Very Poor Wealth Groups – from the HEA Baseline Analysis

Income Source	Afmadow Amount (SOSH)	Dhobley Amount: (SOSH)	Kismayo Amount (SOSH)
livestock product sales	1,980,000	4440000	0
livestock sales	6,987,500	5000000	0
Employment (e.g. labor) + remittances	9,360,000	6720000	5,700,000
self-employment (e.g. firewood)	5040000	3600000	17,040,000
petty trade or safety nets	0	0	0

other (gifts, wild food sales, fishing, etc	750000	1500000	15,300,000
Total Annual Income	24,117,500	21,260,000	38,040,000
Average monthly Income (Avg. for all: \$100/month)	2,009,792 (about USD. 85)	1,771,667 (about USD.75)	3,170,000 (about USD.135)

The findings of HEA baseline studies for the three livelihoods zones (SO18: Juba Cattle pastoralist, SO11: Southern Inland (Camel) pastoralist and SO19: Kismayo urban) are quite consistent on the observations from the household baseline study especially in terms of what the main income sources are and estimated amounts. From the HEA analysis, in Afmadow, Dhobley and Kismayo, the very poor wealth groups obtain about SOSH. 24million (about \$1000), SOSH 21million (about \$950) and SOSH.31million (about \$1580) respectively annually (Table 2 above). Consistent with the Household Baseline study, the biggest income source for the very poor is self employment and casual labor, which make up over 50% in all livelihood groups, and particularly so among Kismayo Urban (who obtain no income from livestock, unlike in the rural areas where livestock income is between 20-30% among V.poor wealth groups).

In Afmadow 39% (Sosh 9,360,000) of their annual income from Labour. The second most important income comes from livestock sales contributing about 29% (Sosh 6,987,500) while self- employments in the form of bush products and firewood contributed 21% (Sosh 5,040,000). Other important source of income for the very poor wealth group in Afmadow is livestock product sales (milk) that contributes about 8% (Sosh 1,980,000) followed by gifts (3%) mainly from relatives and friends. However, the latter is not visible in the current finding (Beneficiaries Household Baseline) due to aspects related to seasonality. The households baseline was done at the peak of *Jilaal* season when most of the cattle have migrated out or dried up hence the very poor and the poor who have low livestock herd sizes will have no or little access to milk.

In Dobley, the very poor wealth group receive 32% (Sosh 6,700,000) of their annual income from Labour. The second most important income comes from livestock sales contributing about 24% (Sosh 5,000,000) and an additional 21% (4,400,000) while self-employments in the form of bush products and firewood contributed 17% (Sosh 3,600,000) and the remainder 7% (Sosh 1500,000) is obtained through gifts mainly from relatives and friends. In Kismayo urban significant 45% (Sosh 17,000,000) level of income is obtained



from Self-employments including firewood/charcoal and other types of self-employments like petty trades while another 40% (15,000,000) is obtained through fish sales and the remainder is achieved bycasual labour.

Even though some of the reviewed secondary data on Somalia underscored the significance of remittances in the country, the surveyed group does not have remittances as an important income source. This could be because of two reasons (i) perhaps the surveyed group is among the poorest and are less likely to have relatives outside of Somalia, or (ii) respondents may have understated their remittance incomes; this latter reason is corroborated by other past research findings, which indicated that beneficiaries may fear reduced chances of getting assistance if they report higher income levels.

From the income data, it is clear that income insecurity (low and undiversified income sources) remains a major concern which limits the capacity of households to cater for their basic needs and invest in education as well as pursuing other economic activities.

4.1.3. Livelihood assets

Asset ownership is an important indicator of wealth and is a useful proxy for characterizing the livelihood security of households. In this baseline survey, households were asked to indicate their ownership with regard to a number of the main assets that are common in the Region. Based on their responses, households were classified into one of three asset ownership categories, namely:

- a) "Asset poor" households having 0 to 4 different types of assets²
- b) "Asset medium" households having 5 to 9 different types of assets
- c) "Asset rich" households having 10 or more different types of assets

The majority of beneficiaries in all Dhobley and Kismayo districts were assessed to be "asset poor" with the highest asset poverty being in Kismayo (95%) followed by Dhobley (67%). Target beneficiaries in Afmadow were mainly 'asset medium', meaning they are relatively better off in terms of asset diversity than those in Kismayo and Dhobley. Overall target beneficiaries are considered as having a low asset diversity and low asset levels. Asset creation would be an appropriate target for the safety nets programme.

² The terms 'Asset poor', 'Asset medium' and 'Asset rich' are used by some UN Agencies in Somalia (FAO, WFP...) to measure asset diversity among households. This study adopted the standard tools and approaches used by these groups.



4.1.4. Livestock assets

Because livestock assets are very fundamental as a measure of wealth among Somali households, livestock asset ownership was also assessed. Most of the selected STREAM Consortium beneficiaries (over 60%) in all three districts did not own any livestock. Sheep and goats were owned by more than 40 % of sampled households in Dobley and Afmadow, followed by cattle (32% in Dobley and 45% in Afmadow). As expected the beneficiaries in Kismayo reported very low ownership of livestock asset with only 11 % reported having Sheep/goats ownership.

4.1.5. Material Assets (Productive and other assets)

The study also assessed ownership relating to 'other' assets. Table 3 (below) presents the proportion of households that own various material assets listed in decreasing order of frequency of ownership. Households generally have very low productive assets. The most commonly owned material asset is mobile phones, owned by over 80 % of households in all the three districts. Only a small proportion of households own radios (36 % in Afmadow, 23 % in Kismayo and only 11 % in Dobley); this may mean that radios broadcasts may not be the most appropriate medium for public information among this beneficiary type. One recommendation would be to help improve access to key productive assets.

	Dobley		Afmadow		Kismayo	
Asset	Number of	Percentage	Number of	Percentage	Number of	Percentage
Mobile phones	95	89%	107	100%	134	94%
House	64	60%	80	75%	27	19%
Residential	51	48%	80	75%	23	16%
Donkey cart	15	14%	9	8%	3	2%
Radio	12	11%	38	36%	32	23%
Wheelbarrows	11	10%	31	29%	17	12%
productive land	6	6%	22	21%	2	1%
Skilled work	5	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Farming tools	4	4%	20	19%	1	1%
Motorbikes	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%
Jewelry	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%

Table 23: Productive and other assets

4.1.6. Household Expenditure

Households were also asked to name their household's main expenditure items/categories, eliciting a "yes" or "no" answer. The survey also determined how many households reported expenditure on up to 10 expenditure items and an 'Other' category. An end-line survey will determine that there is an increase in expenditure categories and therefore an improvement in the income situation, if there are more households reporting an more expenditure categories than the baseline number. In all the surveyed districts, all respondents indicated food as the main household expenditure item (both in terms of absolute budget expenditure and percentage), as shown in Figure 5. This is followed by water and other bills, and education. When households were asked whether they had sold animals in the last one year prior to the interview date to meet household expenditure needs, more than 20% in Dobley and Afmadow reported 'Yes' (Figure 6). Money obtained from the animal sales was used to buy food, pay loan and cater for medical expenses. In addition to this when beneficiaries were asked to provide what proportion of their household incomes/earnings were used on food, non-food items, debt payment and saving in the last three months, irrespective of district, majority stated that over nearly 70 % or (Figure more of their income is spent on food 7).







This high share of income spent on food items is a clear indicator of the fragility of beneficiaries' livelihoods and the inadequacy of their earnings to meet essential household wants. In this regard, increase in food prices and decrease in income due to fluctuating environmental/security conditions may lead to the inability of households to access enough quantity and quality of food to meet their nutritional requirements.

Months of inadequate food access - Despite the high expenditure on food, there are months when the poorest households did not have enough food. Nearly 77%, 84% and 96% of the respondent in Dobley, Afmadow and Kismayo respectively reported not having adequate food starting from the mid of Jilaal (end of Feb and March) to the early months of Gu seasons (April) and the mid of Hagaa season to the early phase of Deyr. This is a critical period to the pastoralist and peri urban who mainly rely on livestock products either through own production or even purchase. Expenditure on livestock inputs increase during this time and income from livestock drastically decline owing to the poor condition of the livestock. Trade activities equally decline hence labour opportunities is affected given the low investments and trade activities. The urban communities in Kismayo mentioned Hagaa (June – August) as the main period when their access to food is inadequate mainly due to the effects of Moonsoon (high seas tides that practically make sea transport difficult for dhows). Port operations for both imports and export is affected resulting in low trade activities and subsequent decline in labour opportunities for poor urban households. Additionally the prices of staple imported commodities increases resulting in increased expenditure on food. The HEA analysis showed that it is the jilaal (Jan/Feb - Apr) and Hagaa (Jun – Aug) seasons that households face the largest food deficits (refer to: The STREAM Consortium's Livelihoods Baseline Analysis of Lower Juba Livelihoods using the HEA Analysis; Executive Summary section)

4.1.7. Household food consumption and coping strategies

Food Consumption Score:

The food consumption score (FCS) was computed based on standard UN-WFP approach. The FCS is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency, and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. It uses a 7-day recall of weighted food groups consumed by households. A detailed FCS definition and computation approach is presented in the WFP presentation found on: http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp196627.pdf

More than 70 % of households, regardless of district have acceptable food consumption based on Food Consumption Score (FCS) indicator (Figure 8). However, the FCS of more than 20 % of beneficiary households in Dobley and Kismayo indicate poor to borderline consumption. It is important to note that the FCS helps assess the status of a household's food consumption only with reference to the 7 days previous to the data collection. It does not capture seasonal variations or the nutritional deficit of a household. Also, it does not provide insights on how food consumption is distributed within the household. Due to its limitations, the FCS is a useful tool in the analysis of household food consumption when it is coupled with other relevant measurements (BRCiS, 2014). It is because of this that other indicators such as Household dietary diversity score and coping strategy index (CSI) were calculated.

Coping Strategies

The coping strategies Index (CSI) was computed using common coping strategies used by a number of humanitarian and development agencies in Somalia, including FAO and WFP. Coping strategies are considered very severe, severe, moderate, and least severe, depending

on the effect that these strategies have on the household's longer term food security³ (Table below). In this study, the following coping strategies were included to compute the CSI.

Coping Strategy	Nature of CS
Shift to less preferred (low quality, less expensive) foods?	Least Severe
Limit the portion/quantity consumed in a meal	
Take fewer numbers of meals in a day	
Borrow food on credit from the shop/market	
Borrow food on credit from another household	Moderate
Restrict consumption of adults in order for small children to eat	
Rely on food donations from relatives	
Seek or rely on food aid from humanitarian agencies	
Send household members to eat elsewhere	Severe
Beg for food (Tuugsi/dawarsi/baryootan/shaxaad)?	
Skip entire days without eating	
Consume spoilt or left-over foods	
Rely on food donations from the clan/community	

³ Maxwell D and Caldwell R, The Coping Strategies Index: Field Methods Manual, Second Edition 2008

According to survey results, household dietary diversity indicated that the majority of beneficiary households in the three districts consume more than four food groups. High coping strategy index (CSI) was reported in all the three districts with the highest (56) being reported in Dobley followed by Kismayo (35) and then Afmadow (33). A high CSI score indicates more frequent engagement in more severe coping mechanisms to access food. Severe coping strategies were reported to be employed more in Dhobley (25%) and Kismayo (23%) compared to Afmadow (21%).



4.1.8. Food sources

Cereals and milk being some of the important foods in Somalia, this survey put an emphasis on establishing the main sources of these two foods. Most interviewed beneficiaries' households (over 80% on average in all the three districts) reported purchase as their main source of both cereals and milk: a condition that makes a big portion of the population vulnerable to fluctuations of market prices. It was noted from the results that own production can be considered as a secondary source of milk in Dobley as close to half the respondents (43%) mentioned it as their main source (Figure 9&10).



4.1.9. Humanitarian assistance

Beneficiary households were also asked whether or not they had received cash assistance in the last three months prior to the interview date. Only 13% reported having received cash assistance with the highest value (39%) recorded in Afmadow district (Figure 11).



All who received cash assistance mentioned international NGO (specifically ADESO and ARC) as the source. A high proportion of cash received was used to buy food while some proportion was spent on non-food items.

4.1.10. Farming Farming is a rare practice among the beneficiaries. The few households who reported engaging in crop farming are mainly from Afmadow, planting mainly maize; none reported doing farming in Kismayo and only 5% reporting it in Dobley. On average, 4 bags of 50Kgs of maize and approximately 2 bags of 50Kgs of sorghum are produced by crop farmers.

4.1.11. Trainings

On average, only 6% of the total respondents reported having attended livelihood training with hardly any (1%) reporting having received disaster preparedness training, a clear indication of lack of trainings that would have a valuable economic impact in the three districts. Solving some of the beneficiary problems would revolve around giving support to small enterprises; training in vocational and business skills as well as agricultural and pastoral skills and provision of key inputs to farmers and pastoralists. Moreover, mechanism or procedures through which beneficiaries can report concerns or grievances for projects implemented should be put in place as majority of the respondents reported not being aware of such mechanisms and procedures.

4.2. Qualitative baseline survey results

Key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions were held to assess community level vulnerability and resilience. KII's were with individuals that are very informed about the context of Lower Juba and the three respective districts where STREAM is implemented.

4.2.1. Summary of the Key informant Interviews

Key informant interview questions included the following:

1. How does the community monitor or evaluate humanitarian and resilience support by organizations?

Please describe:

2. Is there an information sharing process/mechanism on humanitarian within the community? How does it work?

3. Do you have knowledge or experience with safety nets/resilience programs in the area?

- 4. In your opinion, how effective are the safety net programs?
- 5. What is the source of water for households in this area?
- 6. What is the approximate distance of the water source from most of the households?
- 7. How big is the water source (in relation to the community size)?
- 8. Who maintains the water sources?
- 9. Have any trainings been conducted on water management?
- 10. If yes, how many people were trained and what is their composition by gender?

The summary responses to these questions are outlined below:

On local authorities engagement in projects, their evaluations and experience with safety nets programs

- Local authorities present in the areas, together with selected Village Relief Committees (VRC), or sections committees in the case of urban are approached and briefed by the implementing partners on the implementations of projects (Resilience or other project). The community members are in turn briefed/updated by the village/section relief committee on the impending project. This is when the committees, together with implementing partners and with the blessing of the local authorities then engage in the identification of beneficiaries. The process is relatively informal but the committee and the community members have the opportunity to witness or observe the implementation of projects.

Another important and relatively formal process that communities engage on is at the evaluation stage. Often this happens when the implementing partners come back and ask the communities on their perceptions on the project that ended. Communities get an opportunity to comment openly about a given project. Most of the key informants in Dobley and Afmadow districts had the experience of a safety net or a resilience programs, implemented mostly by partners like ADESO, WASDA, ARC, DRC and WRRS. Similarly communities in Kismayo equally had the opportunity to be involved one way or another in such programs implemented by agencies like ARC, DRC, and ACTED-SADO,

On issues related to social services (water sources, capacity, management and training of operators), most of the respondents reported relatively good number of permanent water sources (Boreholes) in Dobley even though there are still rural villages like *Diif* which have salty water (related to geographical) that are unfit for human consumption. Chronic water shortages are encountered mostly during dry periods when private water catchments

(Earth Dams) dry up⁴. In Afmadow, the water sources are mostly temporary, shallow wells that nearly dry up during prolonged dry period. In Dobley and Afmadow except for the major town centres, the approximate distance to the water sources ranges between 10 to 20 km during the dry season and less than a kilometre during the wet season. This is based on the fact that, they rely on their own water catchments or even communal dams during the wet seasons but seek to access permanent water sources during the dry season. In Kismayo, which is a relatively a bigger town and has low water table given its coastal locations, most of the respondents mention unprecedented access to Shallow wells (Salty

water⁵) but have difficulties in accessing fresh water for human consumption (Mostly from Bore holes) that is only found in few locations within Kismayo town such as Dalxiska and Bulla Abliko. The management committees of the water sources differ, In Dobley where most of the water source are public the water managements is mainly by community appointed committees but in Afmadow and Kismayo most of the water sources (Shallow wells- Afmadow, Shallow Wells and Boreholes in Kismayo) are owned by private individual and communities have to purchase water except for some instances of free use like the salty shallow wells of Kismayo where neighbors access free water from the shallow wells. Communities mentioned that they have not received water management trainings except for some in Dobley and Deg-Elema where water management committee have received some trainings on boreholes management. For Kismayo the communities have received some training on water treatments mostly during disease outbreak (chlorination) and boiling by Agencies like ARC, NRC, and ICRC.

4.2.2. Summary of the Focus group discussions

During the focus group discussion, the community members in both Afmadow and Dobley cited pastoralism as the major dominant livelihood type, followed by peri-urban that mainly rely on limited labour and petty trade. This is in line with the prevailing rural economic activities where there is more dependency in livestock and livestock products (though the poor/very poor wealth groups have limited livestock holding) and with limited labour opportunities available in the peri-urban settlements like Afmadow and Dobley. Major labour activities in these towns (Afmadow/Dobley) include: Porterage, constructions work and laundry work with some few opportunities for self- employments such as collections of constructions poles, firewood and charcoal sale. In Kismayo, the focus group discussion members mentioned urban dwelling and IDPs as their main livelihoods who mainly depend on casual Labour as their main source of cash income to obtain food and other essential requirements. Most common casual labor mentioned includes; construction, portage mostly in the port and even at the main Kismayo commercial market, stone collection, firewood and charcoal and donkey carts sale. They reported an average daily Labour rate of between Sosh 100,000 to 130,000 (5 to 6 USD) per day for nearly around 15 to 20 days per month, (it is not automatic to find labour opportunity every day for the whole month). An analysis of whether or not community members have received disaster preparedness and mitigation and DRR training was also conducted.

Table 4: Have you ever received any disaster preparedness and mitigation training or involved in CMDRR processes in recent years?							
Baseline survey results							
		Dhobley Afmadow Kismayo					
No	Freq	106	91	141			
1.0	%	100%	96%	99%			
Yes	freq	0	4	1			
105	%	0%	4%	1%			

Nearly all of the households have not received and are not aware of any DRR training (Table 4)

4.2.3. Challenges/Gaps met by the communities when pursuing their livelihoods

Major challenges reported by most of the focus group members in regards to their livelihoods types in Afmadow and Dobley (pastoral and peri-urban) are persistent drought, high cereal prices that drains down the available income that emanate from unregulated trade, livestock and human diseases, lack of educational facilities, lack of veterinary services, lack of adequate health services, double taxations and illegal check points(by government and insurgents), limited availability of labour opportunities, poor employment conditions including but not limited to under remuneration. Challenges reported by the urban livelihoods (Kismayo) includes unregulated trade activities leading to exorbitant prices and poor quality goods (expired foodstuff) products being sold in the markets, high taxation, low wage pay, high rental for petty business premises (shop/stalls), insecurity, high risk/threats faced by charcoal workers, human diseases (Dengue fever⁶)

insecurity, high risk/threats faced by charcoal workers, human diseases (Dengue fever⁰) and generally unhygienic conditions in the camps.

4.2.4. How best to address the challenges

When asked how the challenges can be addressed, most of the focus group respondents were for the idea of getting improvements in the governances that will lead to improvement of security, service delivery (all sectors), improved trade regulations, quality control of goods and services and trades regulations, introduction of income generating activities to strengthen and expand business activities for the peri-urban households engaged in petty trade improve water sources and their management to combat drought, digging of more boreholes (Afmadow) and big capacity earth dams, enhanced veterinary service to improve livestock conditions, improved education infrastructure and its subsequent access.

In Kismayo which is purely an urban livelihoods, the respondents suggested the following issues in order to address the challenges they are facing in obtaining food and cash for them to live a decent life. Diversify CFW programs

- a. Improvement in trade regulations and general security
- b. Building of market centers by organizations

- c. Help expand business through Income generating activities,
- d. Establish proper waste disposal systems in the camps
- e. Job creation and public education

4.2.5. Other livelihoods opportunities suggested by the Communities

In the rural livelihoods (Dobley & Afmadow), most of the focus group discussions respondents mentioned improve/introduction of crop production to diversify communities livelihoods, strengthening trade through introduction of income generating activities (promotion of trade associations), improvement in infrastructure like roads and airstrips to ease transport and in turn improve communities livelihoods and improving communities assets acquisition like; donkey carts and livestock restocking. In the urban livelihoods (Kismayo) the focus group respondents emphasized the improvement on the fishing industry and enhancement in the marketing of their marine products and subsequent introduction of more technical short courses to help generate income for the semi-educated community members.

4.2.6. Community's prior involvements in CFW program

In all the three locations (Dobley, Afmadow and Kismayo), community members interviewed had been involved in a cash for work program. The agencies mentioned by the respondents as the major implementers of CFW program and their respective locations can be found in Table 5 (below)

Table 5: Agencies	mentioned	(by respondents)	as	implementing	CfW
interventions					
Doblary	Λf.	modory		Viamono	

Dobley	Afmadow	Kismayo
1. ADESO	1. ADESO	1. SADO
2. WASDA	2. WASDA	2. ARC
3. ARC	3. WRRS	3. DASHEG
4. SOLIDARITES	4. WARSO	4. NRC
5. DRC		5. APD
		6. KISIMA

4.2.7. Major Challenges faced by the communities in CFW programs

Community member's interviewed in all the three location had encountered nearly similar experiences with cash for work (CFW) projects. The most common challenges across the three locations are:

a. CFW excludes the most vulnerable groups among the community (elderly, sick, disabled and pregnant women). This is mostly true because it tends to target the

physically able people who can work on the accomplishments of the infrastructure being rehabilitated. This is a general weakness of the program.

- b. CFW projects involved physical efforts-Cumbersome to the extent of sustaining injuries and entails long working hours.
- c. Delayed payments even after the work is accomplished mainly on procedure/process on the side of the implementing agency.
- d. Gender inequality in terms of access to the CFW activities may sometimes amount to poor targeting hence may complicated the process of beneficiaries selection.
- e. Incentives are perceived to be sometimes lower than the actual activities of the CFW programs

On the other hand, the community members interviewed view CFW programs where payments is made through mobile money transfer and Hawala as an important activities that had supported them in the sense that,

- a. It enables the communities' access food and other essential requirements
- b. Created community infrastructure such as water catchments to improve drought resistances, road and even sometimes led to improvements to shelter
- c. Many people received life-changing training such as tailoring, electrical repairs and this changed their lives totally
- d. Enabled community members to repay their loans since they received immediate cash

However, despite the many advantages, the focus group discussion members cited some general challenges on the CFW programs and subsequently made their recommendations as below

Challenges of CFW program.

- a. Delayed payments- the communities expect to be paid quickly after completing the desired work out put.
- b. Money is wrongly paid to other people due to mistake or error in the telephone numbers. Telephone numbers of the beneficiaries need to be properly recorded and follow up should be made to ascertain if they really have received their dues.
- c. Not all beneficiaries have or can afford to have a mobile phone. It was suggested that mobile phones should be provided for the beneficiaries with genuine cases
- d. If the beneficiaries does not have mobile phone to receive his money, he /she is forced to register the telephone number of his neighbor or kins and later pay commission to them.

Recommendations

- a. Proper identification of beneficiaries-mostly their telephone numbers which they will be receiving the money with.
- b. Provision of mobile phone to the beneficiaries to avoid incidents of lost money and commission on beneficiaries money
- c. Facilitate quick payments to beneficiaries.
- d. Selection of CFW beneficiaries based on HH level

The communities members interviewed cited the existence of informal mode of complaint mechanism except for Afmadow and Dobley. ADESO's beneficiaries from Afmadow mentioned about complain systems with a private company, Shaqadoon, which has an automatic, complain and feedback system. The beneficiaries, in the event of informal complain mechanism, have to enlist the support of elders, local authorities to talk to the implementing partner about any irregularities in beneficiaries payment or even the beneficiaries directly approach the implementing partners officers and most of the time the complains are addressed. The automatic msn system of ADESO has its limitation whereby it can only be used by the semi educated/educated portion of the communities. The beneficiaries receive feedback that usually addresses or properly explain their circumstances satisfactorily.

4.2.8. Most common Disasters

Generally, the rural communities interviewed mentioned drought and its effects (lack of water) as the major disaster that affects their livelihoods. Others are; livestock and human diseases and insecurity. The urban communities in Kismayo shared in the above disasters too but additionally mentioned; lack of proper equipped medical facilities, uncontrolled import of expired food products and lack of employments. However, there are no any community disaster preparedness structures in place safe for the Pre-position of drugs, Nets and other first Aid kits by UNHCR partners.

4.3. Market information-(Secondary Review)

FSNAU and FEWS NET provide regular markets information and data from nearly all locations in Somalia. Some relevant data from the FSNAU were analyzed to understand price trends and to be able to discuss food access and the ability of markets to support and withstand big cash injections from safety net programs. The reference period used for the market analysis was April 2015 to March 2016, which was the same as the reference year used for the HEA analysis (The HEA analysis preceded this baseline analysis and it helped provide the criteria for the 5000 beneficiaries considered in this study,

Somalia is structurally a food deficit country where cereal imports (mostly comprising of rice, and wheat flour) cover over 50 % of its food requirements.

Market performance in terms of price behavior in the three districts show that prices of imported and local cereal (white maize) are stable and follow a regular seasonal pattern, despite the occasional flare- ups in insecurity and the very weak regional government.

4.3.1. Cereal prices

Figure 12: Kismayo cereal prices (Source: FSNAU)





Figure 14: Afmadow cereal prices (Source: FSNAU)



Local cereal (white maize) prices are relatively lower than the imported cereal prices across the analysis period in the three districts.

4.3.2. Daily labor wage

The figure below presents daily labour wage rate in the three districts. According to the graph, labour wages indicate stability during the reference period with Kismayo town showing the highest rates compared to both Afmadow and Dobley.



Figure 15: Daily labour wage (Source: FSNAU)

4.3.3. Household food purchasing power

Here we use terms of trade (ToT) between Daily labour wage and local cereal to measure the purchasing power of poor population. It represents the ratio of the price of the primary income good/service relative to the price of the primary expenditure good for a particular livelihood group. As the ToT rises, the relative welfare or purchasing power of the population increases; conversely, decreasing ToT indicates higher levels of vulnerability for the group of interest. In the graph below ToT between daily labour wage and local cereal (white maize) has been presented. According to figure 5, ToT in Kismayo town is higher than ToT in both Afmadow and Dobley across the analysis period which could be attributable to higher daily labour wage in Kismayo than both Afmadow and Dobley during the same period.

Figure 16: Terms of Trade (ToT) between Daily labour wage and local cereal (Source: FSNAU)



Figure 17: Local quality goat prices (SoSh)



4.3.4. Market integration

Will the social safety net transfers distort the market? Markets are important determinants of: food availability and food access and: whether or not markets can support interventions or; whether interventions can distort markets. The extent to which markets make food available and keep prices stable depends on whether markets are integrated with each other. Integrated markets mean that prices for same/similar commodities in the different markets do not behave independently. In the graphs above, price trends support the existence of a good degree of market integration between the Kismayo, Dhobley and Afmadow; Prices of essential food and non-food items appear to be moving in the same general direction in the different markets, and price differences among the three districts seem to be consistent with expected transaction costs between supplying and receiving markets. This shows that the markets do respond to supply and prices and that food commodities flow from surplus to deficit areas - and imports flow from port and border areas to other areas, with differences in prices being consistent with differences in distances/other transaction costs from surplus/ports to deficit areas.

In times of open conflict, there would naturally be temporary delays but flows resume soon after such incidents cease.

A correlation analyses were conducted, using price data (for cereals/rice and sugar) for the different districts over a number of years⁷. The correlation tests run on rice and sugar prices between the three districts show a high degree of market integration as confirmed by the positive correlation coefficient values (Figure 19 & 20).

	Afmadow	Dobley	Kismayo
Afmadow	1	0.76	0.81
Dobley		1	0.79
Kismayo			1

Figure 19: correlation coefficient of rice prices in the three district

Figure 20: C	Correlation	coefficient	of Sugar	prices	in the	three districts
-						

0			
	Afmadow	Dobley	Kismayo
Afmadow	1	0.9	0.89
Dobley		1	0.80
Kismayo			1

In conclusion, the analysis supports that market distortions as a result of the social safety nets interventions will not be a significant concern, given the ability of the markets to distribute fairly well despite the weak institutions and the frequent incidents of insecurity/conflict.

⁷ Price data sets from FSNAU were used - <u>http://www.fsnau.org/ids/exportdata/index.php)</u>.



4.4 Food Security Situation – Recent Trends

Based on the FSNAU/FEWSNET seasonal assessments findings that exclusively applies the integrated food security Phase Classification (IPC⁸) protocols, the food security situation for most of the livelihoods of lower Juba regions (rural & urban) have been fairly stable and/or improving since 2011 drought. This is the big picture analysis for the entire population (Area level), which remained at the IPC mild food insecurity phase "Stressed Phase" (IPC level 2) for most of the seasons in the last 5 years (2012-2016). However, the Poor and Very Poor wealth groups remained constrained (at household level) due to the low levels of assets that they have and the weak or inadequate social services. The poor infrastructure and chronic insecurity also increase the vulnerability to food insecurity especially among the poorer groups. However, from *Gu* 2016 (July to Dec 2016) the rural livelihoods have started to deteriorate, having significant poor populations in crisis (IPC level 3).

⁸ The **Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)** is a set of standardized tools that aims at providing a "common currency" for classifying the severity and magnitude of food insecurity. This evidence-based approach uses **international standards**, which allow comparability of situations across countries and over time. It is based on consensus-building processes to provide decision makers with a rigorous analysis of food insecurity along with objectives for response in both emergency and development contexts.

4.5. Nutritional Situation

So far there have not been any nutrition surveys carried out in the rural livelihoods of lower Juba regions due to the insecurity that made access to the rural villages very difficult. Therefore there is no current nutrition data from both the pastoral livelihood zones in L. Juba, neither did the assessment team come across even any recent/relevant MUAC data. However, for the Kismayo town/urban communities, assessments were carried out during the *Deyr* 2014/15, *Gu* 2015 and *Deyr* 2015/16 and the Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates, respectively are: 8.9%, 9.1% and 8.8%, while the IDPs in Kismayo had GAM rates of 12.5%, 12.9% and 14.5% respectively during these periods. *Source: FSNAU*) *http://fsnau.org/nutrition*

5. ANNEXES (attached)

Annex 1 – Summary Table of Baseline Data

Annex 2 – Summary of KII and FGD information