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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The food assistance to refugees and asylum seekers in Osire camp has been ongoing since the first influx of Angolan refugees between 1999 and 2002, during which time some 23,000 Angolans fled into Namibia. After the cessation of active conflict in Angola, joint UNHCR/IOM repatriation efforts from 2002 to the end of 2005 facilitated the repatriation of the majority of Angolan refugees back to their homes, however, some 6,500 people currently remain in Osire. The camp population at present includes Angolans who did not choose to repatriate, as well as refugees and asylum seekers from the DRC, Burundi, and Rwanda.

The first UNHCR/WFP Joint Assessment Mission (JAM), carried out in May 2006, examined food security and protection issues in Osire camp, concluding that refugees and asylum seekers in Osire were food secure only because of the regular food assistance from WFP. The assessment also confirmed that stemming from a strict confinement policy in place, refugees and asylum seekers remain highly vulnerable with no official access to arable land, labor markets, and higher education opportunities.

A second UNHCR/WFP Joint Assessment and Evaluation Mission (JAEM) in Osire camp was held from 28th Feb - 05th Mar 2008. The mission focused on assessing food security and livelihood options for refugees and asylum seekers, evaluating the impact and effectiveness of WFP/UNHCR assistance within Osire Camp, and formulating clear recommendations concerning the future of assistance provided to Osire residents.

The JAEM was comprised of two teams: 1) a household survey team, which administered a questionnaire to 250 households and conducted anthropometric measurements of children under 5 years of age, and 2) an assessment team that reviewed secondary data and conducted focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Prior to the camp level assessment, information-sharing meetings were held with the Permanent Secretaries in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration (MHAI) and Ministry of Health and Social Services (MOHSS), the Commissioner for Refugees, and the Osire Camp Administrator. Meetings were also held in Otjiwarongo with the Otjozondjupa regional governor, local police, and the regional directorates of Agriculture, Education and Health.

Main Recommendations:

- **WFP/UNHCR to plan to extend assistance to refugees and asylum seekers until the end of 2009.** Despite the positive steps taken by the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) in taking ownership and responsibility for refugees, particularly in the major sectors of education and health care, the remaining number of refugees requiring protection and food assistance is unlikely to change in the next two to three years, especially for Angolans who are waiting for national elections to take place before considering definitive repatriation (presidential elections expected in 2009).

- **WFP to adopt individualized ration cards and consider ration reductions for certain segments of the camp population.** WFP has been providing a monthly food ration through general food distributions to meet the beneficiaries’ full daily nutritional requirement of 2,100 kcals on the basis that beneficiaries have neither access to the labor market nor enough land for cultivation. The mission brought some evidence of existing, although limited, coping strategies and income generating activities which provide some groups of Osire residents with alternative sources of income/food. The Highly Food Secure households, which comprise 29% of the camp population, may well be able to support itself in the absence of food aid. In addition, there is a large mobile segment of the population, with high food security status and income earning capacity, whose family members benefit from extra food rations while these mobile individuals are not present in the camp. Given the scarce resourcing situation, the mission recommends that those resources which are available are channeled towards the “real” residents of the camp. Moving away from the current family distribution card to individual ration cards could pave the way for more effective commodity procurement and program implementation.
• **Additional agricultural/livelihood support is needed to improve self-reliance in Osire.** Opportunities for income generation and self-reliance, both inside and outside of Osire camp are constrained by a number of factors. In the agricultural sector the climate and condition of the soil in the region make large-scale crop production extremely difficult. Only serious agricultural inputs (improved crop variety, drought resistant crops, agro-forestry, irrigation, intensive training etc.) could guarantee a minimum productivity for the land surrounding the camp. For refugees and asylum seekers not involved in agriculture, lack of vocational training, restrictions on movement, and strict requirements for obtaining a work permit in Namibia seriously constrain income generation possibilities. In order to improve self-reliance in Osire camp, additional technical support that could benefit the neighboring communities as well should be provided together with adequate investment and equipment provisions. FAO and/or UNDP may be interested in providing this type of support.

• **Discussions with the Namibian government concerning the taking-over of service provision in Osire and identification of durable solutions for the camp population should continue.** The Namibian government has taken positive steps in assuming responsibility for education and health provision within Osire camp. Negotiations are ongoing concerning possibilities for alternative status or local integration for sections of the camp population.
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BACKGROUND FOR THE ASSESSMENT

The process of identifying durable solutions for the Osire population has been slow. Only small numbers of refugees have voluntarily repatriated or have been resettled in recent years. Therefore, efforts to formulate durable solutions for the remaining refugee and asylum seeker caseload are now focused on exploring options for local integration. As a first step, UNHCR conducted a large-scale re-registration and verification exercise of all persons of concern in Namibia in 2007. The re-registration exercise paved the way for the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHAI) to issue identity documents to all recognized refugees aged six years and above and to issue certificates to all asylum seekers from the age of six. The identity documents are seen as a major step towards local integration; those refugees and asylum seekers possessing documents are able to use them as valid forms of identification in Namibia. Documents have allowed Osire residents to register themselves at educational institutions, as well as open bank accounts in Namibia.

Further to the local integration initiative, a household expenditure and income survey was conducted by the Namibia Economic Policy and Research Unit (NEPRU) in 2007 to capture the skills, education levels, experience, and coping mechanisms of registered refugees and asylum seekers in Namibia. It is hoped that some individuals who are found to be self-reliant might qualify for local integration and be granted an alternative status (other than refugee).

Both UNHCR and WFP would like to see durable solutions in place for the refugees and asylum seekers in Namibia. UNHCR will be going through a progressive rationalization of its presence in Namibia, along with a gradual reduction in administrative budgets and staff. WFP has planned assistance for Osire residents through December 2008, but is finding it increasingly difficult to secure funding for the protracted refugee situation in Osire. UNHCR is already engaged with the MHAI and various line ministries in preparing a Cabinet Memorandum, in which the GRN is strongly urged to take over the full responsibility of the refugee operations in Namibia. The transfer of responsibility for refugees in Namibia from the UN to the GRN will likely be a gradual process.

As such, UNHCR and WFP have come together for the second round of the JAEM survey, in order to better understand the situation in Osire and plan for future assistance.

OBJECTIVES

This JAEM specifically assessed, reviewed and evaluated the aspects of the operations listed below and made clear strategic recommendations for future support by all concerned agencies. There was a clear focus on:

i) Assessment of the current food security and livelihood of the Angolan refugees and non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees;

ii) Evaluation of the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, as well as efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the ongoing delivery of both WFP food assistance under PRRO10543.0 and UNHCR protection, care and maintenance of refugees under 2008-14161-200 and any other assistance provided to the Angolan refugees and non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees;

iii) Provision of clear recommendations on ways to improve future delivery of both food and non food assistance with a view to support the identification of durable solutions for the chronic caseload.
METHODOLOGY

Data collection: The JAEM was comprised of two teams:

1) A household survey team, which administered a questionnaire to 247 households and conducted anthropometric measurement of children 6-59 months and women aged 15-49 years.

Using systematic random sampling, a first sample of 300 households was drawn from the list of registered beneficiaries of food assistance, a list that is maintained by UNHCR. However, since a large number of households in this sample could not be found, the sample was extended, always using the method of systematic random sampling. The original sample size for the assessment was set at 250 out of 1,348 households, of which 247 household interviews were actually carried out. In addition, the team collected anthropometric measurements for 182 mothers and 202 children.

Data was collected through use of a structured household questionnaire that included a module on health and nutritional status of women and children (see Appendix 2). The household survey was designed to provide empirical data on the food security and vulnerability status of refugees and to assess the nutritional status of women aged 15-49 years and children between 6-59 months. The data was collected by a team of 14 enumerators supervised by a senior nutritionist and 2 data analysts from UNHCR and WFP.

Hand-held Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), provided by the WFP Regional Bureau in South Africa, were used to collect and enter survey data electronically. SECA electronic weighing scales and height boards were used to collect anthropometric data.

2) An assessment team that reviewed secondary data, conducted focus group discussions, and held interviews with key informants.

A secondary data package was distributed to and reviewed by each of the JAEM mission members prior to the start of the assessment. The package included reports and statistics from all stakeholders: previous nutrition surveys, self-reliance studies, agreements between UNHCR/WFP and its implementing partner, project documents, and reports from Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA), the implementing partner of UNHCR/WFP.

Prior to the camp level assessment, information-sharing meetings were held with the Permanent Secretaries in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration, Ministry of Health and Social Services, the Commissioner for Refugees, and the Osire Camp Administrator. Meetings were also held in Otjiwarongo with the Otjozondjupa regional Governor, local police, and the regional directorates of Agriculture, Education and Health. For details, see appendix 6 for the complete list of people met.

During the Osire assessment, the team conducted focus group discussions with the following key informants and representatives of the camp households: Africa Humanitarian Action, the Refugee Committee, Religious Leaders, Health Staff, teachers, people involved in Income Generating Activities, and a representative of the local farmers association. The focus groups discussions explored camp resident views on service provision (care, protection, and food aid) and general livelihood conditions in the camp. Refugees and asylum seekers were also asked about their perceptions concerning possible return to countries of origin and the overall feasibility of durable solutions.

Finally, the mission visited and evaluated health, water, and sanitation facilities, households, schools, income generating activities, surrounding fields, gardens, camp markets, and storage facilities, employing visual techniques such as transect walks and verbal techniques such as ranking and scoring.

The field work lasted 4 days following 2 days of the enumerator’s team training.

Data Analysis: The household survey data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the child nutrition data, Epi-Info was used to calculate z-scores used in the analysis.
During the data collection, the JAEM household survey and assessment teams met nightly to discuss and exchange impressions as a continuous quality check of the qualitative data collected during the day.

**Limitations:** In total, some 460 households were visited by the quantitative team during the four days of data collection, of which 240 were actually found and interviewed. The challenge of finding households that actually resided in the camp and in which at least one adult member was home resulted in significant delays of the work of enumerators in the field. Furthermore, many of the households registered in the camp consist of only one adult member. Many of these “households” were never found as the individuals were outside the camp for work or other reasons.

In addition, for the households that were found, the quantitative data presented in this report reflects the perceptions of the people interviewed and the interpretation of the question by the interviewer. Given the limited time allocated for training, the language barrier between enumerator and interviewee, and the possibility that respondents are not completely honest about various aspects of their lives (e.g. expenditures), we expect an unpredictable bias in some of the figures reported here.

The quantitative analysis presented in this report is often stratified by country of origin. However, the sampling method was done for the entire population of the camp. Therefore, caution is required when interpreting the numerical data in the analysis, as it reflects overall trends rather than exact measures.

The malnutrition rates in the camp of the 140 children that were measured are not likely to be representative of all children in the camps as the teams had difficulties in ensuring that the children reached the measuring site after the household interviews. Therefore they will only be used for the food security and nutrition analytical linkages.
PART I – BASIC FACTS

a) Refugee numbers and demography

Figure 1 shows the breakdown of the Osire camp population (official UNHCR data Oct 07). It shows that the two main nationalities in the camp are Angolan (75%) and Congolese (19%). The rest of the refugees come mainly from the Great Lakes region, of which Burundi (3%) and Rwanda (2%) are the two largest groups. The households surveyed by the mission reflected this population distribution.

The main camp population is composed of Angolans who fled into Namibia during the prolonged civil war in Angola. When the war intensified at the end of the 1990’s, some 23,000 Angolans fled into Namibia, prompting the government to designate Osire camp in central Namibia as place of asylum. In December 1999, the Office of the Prime Minister of the Government of Namibia made an official appeal to WFP for the provision of food to Angolan refugees. WFP approved Emergency Operation 6206.00 to assist 7,500 beneficiaries with 751 Mt of food assistance on 10 January 2000. Following the death of UNITA leader Jonas Savimbi in February 2002 and the resulting peace developments in Angola, new arrivals to Osire camp reduced significantly.

Given the more peaceful situation in Angola, in September 2002, UNHCR signed a Tripartite Agreement with the governments of Namibia and Angola to voluntarily repatriate Angolan refugees during 2003-2004. Returning refugees were provided with a return package in Angola under WFP Angola PRRO 10054.1. Two transit camps for arriving/returning refugees were established in Kassava and Okakwa in northern Namibia. The voluntary repatriation program was extended by UNHCR until December 2005, by which time there was a residual caseload of some 4,666 Angolan refugees and 1,540 non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees, totaling some 6,200.

Since the formal end of the repatriation program in 2005 there continues to be a small number of refugees that returns informally to Angola. However, the current caseload is unlikely to reduce significantly until parliamentary and presidential elections are held in Angola or some decision concerning the refugee status of Angolans in Namibia is taken by the GRN. At the same time, the camp has continued to receive a small number of refugees and asylum seekers from the Great Lakes region.

Figure 2 illustrates the household arrival pattern (first arrival) of the various nationalities in the camp. 23% of the Angolan households arrived before the last round of political violence in 1999, while the rest arrived between this date and Savimbi’s death. For the Congolese and other Great Lakes refugees, however, nearly half arrived after 2003.

In February 2007, a re-registration and socio-economic profiling exercise of the beneficiaries took place in Osire camp. Using biometric data collected during the re-registration exercise, special refugee ID cards are being issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration. So far, over 3,000 refugee ID cards have been issued and this activity is ongoing. All asylum-seekers who have

---

1The JAEM survey team conducted interviews in households with the following origins: Angola (67%), DRC (24%), Rwanda (4%), Burundi (4%), and other (1%).
registered with the GRN and UNHCR up to June 2007 have already been issued asylum-seeker certificates, which are valid for a period of six months and are renewable. This exercise is widely seen as a positive step taken by GRN in its efforts to identify durable solutions such as local integration for refugees.

The re-registration and verification exercise revealed that there are over 600 persons residing in the camp who are not registered either with the GRN or UNHCR, representing around 10% of the total camp population. In order to document their residence and profile, these people were registered as Not Of Concern (NOT) with the intention of considering their situation afterwards. Because they are not recognized by the GRN as refugees or asylum seekers, Not of Concern individuals living in Osire camp do not qualify for food or non-food assistance, but do access the social, educational, and health services provided in Osire. Most this population is composed of Angolans who arrived in Namibia after 2003, at which time the GRN was no longer granting Angolans *prima facie* refugee status. Lacking any other means of subsistence, most of them benefit from sharing food and NFIs given to the registered population, which may reduce the intended impact of aid.

Figures 3 show the basic demographic data for the camp using official UNHCR statistics. Notably, there are significantly more males of adult age in the camp as a number of the households in the camp consist of single males or males only. The data collected during the JAEM household survey reveals a comparable demographic pattern, although the sampled households also hosted considerably more boys than girls of age 5-17. The most recent, December 2007, feeding figure from general food distribution in Osire indicated that the camp population comprises 6,422 refugees and asylum seekers.

![Figure 3: Camp demographics by age groups](image)

b) General context

In April 2006, the first UNHCR/WFP joint assessment mission (JAM) was conducted in Osire camp. The report concluded that refugees and asylum seekers at Osire camp are food secure only due to the regular food assistance from WFP and that in the event of termination of food assistance, refugees and asylum seekers’ nutritional status will deteriorate in a matter of months. These findings were reconfirmed during the UNHCR Participatory Assessments – part of the Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) process, held in September 2006 and again in September 2007. Many participants attributed their dependency on aid to the restrictions on freedom of movement.

One of the key recommendations of the 2006 UNHCR/WFP JAM was that both UNHCR and WFP plan for the continuation of protection, care and maintenance and food assistance respectively. Despite plans to move from care and maintenance to a more assertive search for durable solutions, progress in indentifying durable solutions has been slow. Any reduction in food and non food support would see a rapid deterioration in health, water, sanitation and other key physical and material protection areas.

**Changes in overall context:** The GRN, through the Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration, is responsible for refugee assistance in the country, including the granting of refugee status and for the provision of shelter and related assistance. The GRN has ratified the UN Convention of 1951 and the 1967 Protocol related to the status of refugees. It has, however, made a reservation to Article 26 on the freedom of movement, which up to date remains in force. Asylum seekers and refugees do not have freedom of movement within Namibia, and can be arrested, detained, and prosecuted if found outside of the camp without a valid permit. However, during 2007, authorities became more lax about
enforcing these movement restrictions. In addition, permits were issued more frequently and for longer periods of time.

While the GRN has not signed on to the 1969 OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugees in Africa, it has incorporated the provisions of this Convention in the Namibian Refugees (Recognition and Control) Act No. 2, dated 1999. Since 2003, Angolan refugees are no longer given prima facie refugee status in Namibia, while non-Angolans are considered as asylum seekers until the Namibian Government decides on their requests on a case-by-case basis.

The GRN has the primary responsibility for the protection and care of refugees and asylum-seekers in Namibia. Recently they have taken over some responsibility for the educational and health sectors at the camp. UNHCR, together with its partners, is assisting the GRN by providing refugees and asylum seekers with documentation, education, community development services, quality health services, tools and training services for small scale crop production and income generating projects, non-food items such as shelter materials, tools required to build pit latrines, kitchen utensils, sanitary materials for girls and women, blankets, mattresses, jerry cans, paraffin, and soap.

The current WFP assistance is based on the Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) 10543.0 “Assistance to refugees and asylum seekers residing in camp in Namibia”. It originally covered the period 01 January 2007 – 30 December 2007 for an average caseload of 6,000 refugees and asylum seekers residing in the camp. In view of the slow progress towards identifying durable solutions and the positive donor response, the project was extended through to the end of 2008 – Budget Revision (BR) 01.

In July 2007, a nutritional survey was carried out by Ministry of Health and Social Services (MOHSS) and AHA. The main findings show that malnourishment levels in the camp are moderate and that additional education of mothers is required.

In July 2007, a sample survey on skills, livelihoods and coping mechanisms of refugees and asylum-seekers was carried out by NEPRU (Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit) on behalf of UNHCR. The full report is yet to be submitted by NEPRU. However, one of the main findings was that there are some refugees with skills required to fill the gap in the Namibian labor market.

**Economic situation / opportunities in local area:** Namibia is classified as a lower middle income country by the World Bank, with economic activity concentrated in the mining sector. Although Namibia has a high per capita GDP relative to the region, there is an extremely high level of income inequality; 25% of Namibians had an annual income of less than $1600 per capita, according to the 2003/2004 Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey. In addition, the country has an unemployment rate of over 37%, a statistic that makes integration of unskilled refugees into the local population very difficult.

Namibia is one of the largest but least densely populated countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Namibia is also the driest country in the region, with only 34% of the country receiving on average more than 400mm of rain, which is considered the minimum for reliable rain fed crop production. Although more than half of the population depends on subsistence agriculture for its livelihood, due to the significant variations in rainfall from year to year and the poor conditions for agriculture, Namibia normally imports at least 60% of its cereal requirements. In drought years, food shortages are a major problem in rural areas. The main agricultural activities in the country are livestock rearing and rain-fed and irrigated crop production. Generally water availability is the greatest constraint to both livestock and rain-fed and irrigated agriculture. In addition, Namibia’s poor soils, with low clay content, limited water holding capacity, and deficiencies in micronutrients such as manganese, iron, and zinc also place major limitations on agricultural activity. Only about 1% of the land surface of Namibia is considered to have medium to high potential for rain-fed and irrigated crop production and the bulk of this occurs within the communal areas in the north-east of the country.

---

Land tenure is a significant political issue in Namibia. There are three broad categories of land tenure. Approximately 44% of the country is so-called "commercial" farmland with freehold tenure, 41% is allocated to communal areas, and the remaining 15% is state land including conservation areas. The communal areas are situated mainly in contiguous blocks in the north of the country, while the commercial (freehold) areas occupy most of the centre and the south of the country, including the Otjozondjupa region where Osire camp is located. Not only do commercial farmers own more land than communal farmers, they also have freehold titles to 74% of the potential arable land (Pankhurst, 1996). Because of the scarcity of land for Namibians, it is unlikely that refugees who wish to work in the agriculture sector will be able or eligible to do so.

The Namibian economy has a modern market sector, which produces most of the country's wealth, and a traditional subsistence sector. Although the majority of the population engages in subsistence agriculture and herding, Namibia has more than 200,000 skilled workers, as well as a small professional and managerial class. However, the Namibian economy remains integrated with the economy of South Africa, and the bulk of Namibia's imports originate there.

**Relations with host community:** Relations with the host community are important where local integration is considered as one of the durable solutions. The nearest large settlement to Osire camp is Otjiwarongo, a town situated 140 km away. Unlike other refugee camps in the Southern African region, private commercial farms surround Osire camp. Thus, there is little interaction with the local community, except for the school children who attend the refugee school and the farm workers who attend the clinic.

When the population of Osire camp was at its peak, there were several issues with refugees and asylum seekers trespassing on surrounding commercial farms, to collect firewood and also to gather Devil's Claw, a tuber which could be exported to Europe for significant profit. However, both the decrease in the camp population and the reduction in the market price for Devil’s Claw have greatly reduced the incidence of trespassing, and tensions appear to be low at the moment between the farming community and the camp population. Firewood collection and rarer incidence of illegal hunting on farms surrounding Osire still remain contentious issues. The desertification impact of wood collection around the camp location is obvious.

The discussions held with the president of the Commercial Farmer Association of the neighborhood shows the limited information being shared with the local community regarding the camp's 'rule' and policy environment.

A recent study conducted by NEPRU on the skills/ livelihoods and coping mechanisms of Refugees and asylum seekers in Osire revealed that many are interested in the prospects for local integration – 82% of the respondents said they wanted to stay in Namibia.
PART 2 – FOOD AVAILABILITY AND AGRICULTURE

a) Osire neighborhood

Osire refugee camp is located in Otjozondjupa region, and is surrounded by private commercial livestock farms. The land in the Osire area has a low potential for crop cultivation. Poor water-holding capacity, poor organic matter content, low nutrient content in the soil, excessive heat, as well as low and erratic rainfall make crop farming in the area prone to risk and uncertainty.

Consistent with the commercial agricultural activities which dominate in the region, the government agricultural technical support system is also structured around livestock development, as evidenced by the large staff base of livestock extension specialists relative to their crop science counterparts in the region.

b) Farming system in Osire camp

Despite the poor farming conditions, around half of the camp households reported to be cultivating at least one crop during the last agricultural season. This includes small-scale vegetable gardening, which is the most common agricultural activity, most likely because water used for consumption in the camp is also available for home gardens. Apart from gardening, which residents from all nationalities were engaged in, it appears that only Angolans have an interest in large scale crop production. There is land available in Osire for field farming activities – in previous years refugees have unofficially used land behind the camp for fields, and in 2007 the GRN for the first time granted permission for residents to use a 300 hectare area adjacent to the camp for farming activities. Of Angolan households engaged in farming, 40% report an average cultivated area of about ½ a hectare.

c) Crop cultivation activities

Over 40% of all households have small kitchen gardens in which they grow local vegetables for sale and own consumption. The most common vegetable grown is cabbage (kovich). Other vegetables include a local variety of rape, pumpkins, onions, cabbages and other indigenous vegetables. Households without gardens cited lack of water (56%), no land available (47%) and no money to buy seeds (27%) as reasons for not growing any vegetables.

AHA has a demonstration garden where vegetables are grown using irrigation. Varieties under cultivation include tomatoes, eggplants, green pepper, spinach, onion, squashes, maize, amaranthus, sweet potatoes and okra. Also in this garden are lemon, fig, and mulberry trees, and about 2,700 seedlings and a tree nursery for neem and acacia species. A number of refugee volunteers manage the garden under the supervision of the AHA technical staff.

Transect walks around the camp revealed a variety of field crops under cultivation. Households surveyed reported that the main crops being cultivated in Osire are beans (23%), maize (11%) and wheat/pearl millet (10%), which is a local variety of Mahangu. Other crops include local squashes, sweet potatoes, cassava, Irish potatoes, peppers, and pigeon peas. However, the quantities harvested of these crops are marginal; food production plays a minimal role in the total food availability in the camp.

Seeds used for gardening and crop production are informally sourced within the camp or kept from a previous harvest. However, to improve seed availability and access, AHA has procured small amounts of seeds for distribution to refugees involved in farming during the 2007/08 farming season. Seeds sampled by the mission were generally of a poor quality, perhaps contributing to the low harvest yields. Improved seed varieties for cultivation in low rainfall/poor soil conditions are available in Namibia, however at significant cost.

---

4 Households that engaged in agricultural production reported harvesting on average 80kg of beans, 50kg of millet, and 16kg of maize last season.
Three major challenges preventing households from producing more food were limited water supply (47%), limited access to land (42%), and the lack of inputs (29%). Given the difficult challenges that face farmers in Osire, if agriculture is to be pursued as a significant livelihood option for refugees, AHA/UNHCR would need to develop a comprehensive agricultural programme based on low input farming systems. The focus should be to improve soils, creating a micro-climate conducive to plant growth and thereafter identify improved and heat stress resistant crop varieties. However, these investments will only be meaningful once the refugees are certain about land ownership and the GRN position on their status in the long term.

d) Livestock production activities

Livestock production by residents of Osire is very limited. About 15% of households own poultry, while the other livestock types (goats) are mainly owned by the camp officials. Household interviews revealed that the major constraints upon livestock activities in Osire are lack of money to buy livestock (70%), lack of space to construct livestock housing (29%), and no access to grazing lands (26%). Given that local commercial farmers require 20 hectares per head of cattle, cattle raising is not a realistic livelihood option for the residents of Osire camp.

The mission noted a large number of goats roaming throughout the camp, which mostly belong to camp officials. These goats pose a serious threat to fields, gardens, and aforestation programs within Osire.

e) Aforestation and agroforestry activities

The area around Osire is significantly deforested, as a result of the years of a highly concentrated population living in the area. Firewood is an important supplement to the paraffin distributed by UNHCR for many households, and firewood collection in farms surrounding Osire remains an issue. AHA has a program in place to address the deforestation of the camp site, in order to provide the camp with shade and windbreaks. With the assistance of the Ministry of Agriculture, AHA has distributed over 2000 tree seedlings, however many of the seedlings were destroyed by goats or inattention. At the time of the JAM survey, the AHA nursery had over 2500 seedlings of the neem and acacia trees, with plans to plant these seedlings throughout the camp.
PART 3 - HOUSEHOLD FOOD SECURITY & SELF-RELIANCE

a) Food assistance

Food assistance for refugees and asylum seekers residing in Osire camp is provided by WFP with AHA as the cooperating partner overseeing the warehouse and food distributions. A WFP staff member is present at the camp during food distributions to monitor the distribution and conduct post-distribution monitoring and analysis. The food assistance consists of monthly distribution of a full food basket providing 2100 kcal per person per day, as illustrated in the table below. The ration is adequate although the energy supplied by protein, at 13.8%, is slightly higher than the 10-12% recommended contribution whereas fat is slightly less at 16.1% contribution compared to the 17% recommendation.

Food is also distributed after the general distribution to new arrivals and absentees, with the quantities prorated based upon the number of weeks until the next food distribution. If food is not collected on a ration card for a period of more than three months, the ration card is inactivated, although the card may be reactivated on a case-by-case basis.

Table 1: Monthly WFP/AHA food rations and nutritional value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Monthly Ration (kilograms)</th>
<th>Ration/Person/ Day (grams)</th>
<th>Kilocalories</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Fat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize Meal</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Oil</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Soy Blend</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>562g</strong></td>
<td><strong>2104</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Ration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WFP also supports a supplementary feeding program run through AHA, providing beans, CSB and vegetable oil for 14 moderately malnourished children per month (100g CSB, 30g beans, 15g veg oil). The general hospital kitchen provides additional food items for a lunch meal for these children. Children are sent to the supplementary feeding center based upon the recommendations of health promoters who circulate throughout the camp. The number of children attending the supplementary feeding center each month fluctuates, but has not risen above 14. Children admitted to the supplementary feeding center generally have underlying health problems, such as tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, diarrhea, or parasitic worms.

98% of households surveyed during the assessment mission reported that they had received the WFP food ration for the past three months, and that the ration received had been complete (consisting of all 6 items in the food basket). When households were asked about their usage of the items in the food basket, it appears that not all items are consumed equally. Households reported using (on average) 95% or greater of the oil, CSB, salt, and sugar distributed, but only 88% of the pulses distributed and 86% of the maize. These findings correlate with the market visits, which revealed that the most commonly sold items in the food basket are cereals and pulses, while most households consume the full amount of the other commodities. This finding is perhaps related to the high absentee rate in the camp – if households are collecting a ration for more people than are actually resident in the household, maize and pulses, which are distributed in the largest quantities, are likely the commodities to remain unused.

---

5 The actual amount of all commodities consumed is likely lower than reported in the survey, as selling of the food ration is technically not allowed, so refugees might be reluctant to admit to such activities.
b) Food supply

**Pipeline:** As of mid February 2008, the pipeline for PRRO10543 was secure until July 2008, when the operation will experience shortfalls of maize meal and beans. The sugar and oil pipelines are secure until October 2008, and the CSB pipeline will fall short in December 2008, before the stated end of the operation at the close of December. However, the pipeline is calculated based on a planning figure of 6000 refugees, and the actual feeding figure for December 2007 (latest available) was 6422 refugees and asylum seekers. Any additional rise in the camp population will affect the pipeline status.

**Food Procurement:** Maize meal and salt are purchased and processed locally in Namibia. CSB and pulses are purchased and milled regionally (South Africa). Sugar procurement has been approximately 50% regional and 50% international, and oil purchase international, due to the lower prices of these commodities on the international market.

c) Non-Food Assistance

Non-food items (NFIs) are purchased by UNHCR and distributed through AHA as the cooperating partner. Consumable NFIs are distributed on a monthly basis following the general food distribution; these commodities include 4L of paraffin per person per month, 250g of soap per person per month, and sanitary pads for women. Non-consumable items such as mattresses, blankets, stoves, utensils, and building materials are purchased yearly and distributed to new arrivals and as needed to camp residents. When asked which consumable NFIs Osire residents most urgently needed more of, cooking fuel (48%), education supplies (26%) and health supplies (10%) were the most common answers. For non-consumable NFIs, Osire residents reported they needed most urgently building materials (31%), mattresses (25%), and stoves (14%).

In the focus group discussions, it appeared that many residents of Osire felt that the paraffin supplied was not enough to provide for all of their monthly needs. Firewood is widely used in the camp as an alternative to cooking with paraffin; however, the procurement of firewood is contentious because camp residents go illegally to surrounding commercial farms to collect it. The issue of illegal firewood collection seems to have been more controversial when the camp population was much larger, however the practice continues, and there have been complaints from local farmers, as well as reports of assault on refugees and asylum seekers when they are caught collecting. In a meeting with the head of the local farmers association, the suggestion was made that farmers might be willing to collect firewood on their own farms and sell it to UNHCR or camp residents for a small fee. This option should be further explored.

A need for additional building materials was also noted during the focus group discussions. Many households who have been living in Osire camp for a long period of time now want to expand houses due to increased household size. AHA’s head of shelter section estimated that over 200 families need to expand their houses to alleviate overcrowding. Follow-up is needed on the availability of building supplies so that these expansions can take place. The shortage of stoves was also noted during focus group discussions. UNCHR/AHA has been recently purchasing an extra quantity of paraffin stoves to distribute to camp residents, as many of the older stoves are no longer functional. As of the JAEM, all residents who arrived in the camp prior to 2000 had been given a new paraffin stove in 2007.

d) Access to Market

At present, the Government has an encampment policy and refugees require a permit to leave Osire camp. Free access to the local market is difficult because of legal restrictions, which the GRN mainly attributes to the high unemployment rate in Namibia, of around 37%. The rules for refugee movement are expected to be relaxed under the local integration legal framework, for which UNHCR has commissioned a study by the Legal Assistance Centre to explore legal options and restrictions in relation to local integration of refugees.

**Local Market:** The household surveys revealed that about 30% of the food consumed by camp residents in the week prior to the JAM mission was from purchase. The market in Osire is small, although refugees can purchase basic supplies. During the official missions to the market little food aid
was being openly sold, although anecdotal evidence suggests that food assistance, particularly maize meal and beans, are sold informally in other settings. Some food aid is also being cheaply sold to local farm workers.

Despite restrictions on movement, the number of cars and minibuses in the camp indicates fairly large scale movement of people and goods to the closest markets in Otjiwarongo and Windhoek. However, transport costs are significant. The JAM mission noted that local authorities in Otjiwarongo appeared positive about the impact refugees have had on the town economy.

e) Skills, Income generating and employment opportunities

Opportunities for informal income generation are widely accessible in the camp, and the data collected indicates that about 80% of the households have at least one income source. However, both the focus group discussions and the household survey data indicate that there are limited opportunities for formal income generation or employment, both within and outside of Osire Camp. Only 17% of the households (mainly those who are highly educated) report wage labor/employment as an income source. Refugees and asylum seekers face considerable constraints in seeking formal employment opportunities. Only 3% of households reported having a family member involved in service provision within the camp, and 16% of households reported having a family member working outside of Osire camp. Within Osire, formal employment is generally limited to the positions offered by the cooperating partners (AHA, MOE, UNHCR). Outside of Osire, it is necessary to obtain a work permit to be legally employed in Namibia, and such a permit cannot be obtained except in cases where the refugee or asylum seeker possesses unique skills which cannot be found within the Namibian population. Furthermore, the remoteness of the camp from major trading centers makes it difficult for camp residents to participate in the Namibian economy. Although some residents of Osire obtain employment outside of the camp without a work permit, these opportunities are likely restricted to lower paying wage or casual labor activities, and unless they are regularized, these positions cannot be part of a durable solution.

While formal employment opportunities for refugees and asylum seekers are limited, informal income generating opportunities both within and outside Osire camp appear to be major livelihood sources for much of the population. The most common informal income sources were business/trade within the camp (22% of households) and casual labor (14% of households). Remittances are also a key income source for many camp residents – 14% of households reported remittances as an income source. While trade within the camp is healthy, based upon focus group interviews and market visits, the majority of trade appears to be small-scale, for example selling of produce from home gardens. Such activities contribute to the food security of households but cannot be considered as sustainable livelihoods in the absence of food aid and other supports.

A number of nearby farms do hire camp residents as laborers, but given that the majority of farms surrounding Osire camp are livestock producing, the demand for labor is relatively low with little opportunity for scaling up. Another major income activity at Osire is centered on transportation. Because of its relative isolation, there is considerable demand for transportation from the camp both to Windhoek and to Otjiwarongo. Transect walks revealed a number of minibuses present in the camp, and focus group discussions illustrated the importance such vehicles play in sustaining livelihoods and supplying the camp with goods purchased elsewhere in Namibia.

There are a number of small enterprises operating within Osire camp. The majority of these businesses are privately funded, although AHA does have a small income generating activities project which provides loans for groups of residents to start businesses. This year is the first year for these income generating activities, and they have met with mixed success. Many of these funded projects have gone into competition against previously established businesses within the camp, and profits for the majority of IGA start-ups have been extremely limited. Although these projects may be improved by better business management training and support, it does not appear that the activities can be expanded to a level where they will improve livelihoods for more than a few people within the camp. However, the nature of the IGA businesses is revealing; projects included a movie theatre, bike rental, gym, ice cream and fish sales, and soft drink sales. The presence of a market for such enterprises demonstrates that there is some amount of excess cash available amongst the Osire resident population.
Refugees and asylum seekers with income sources find it difficult to access financial services such as banks and savings programs. Camp residents reported that it is not possible to open a bank account without a refugee ID card (which asylum seekers do not possess). There is no bank or ATM in Osire at present; however Standard Bank is considering installing an ATM near the police station. Initial reports indicate that there is a demand for access to cash within Osire camp.

When asked about potential income sources for the future, the income source most often named as ‘most interesting’ was business/trade within the camp, followed by wage labor/employee. Unfortunately, it appears that such opportunities, especially within Osire camp, are extremely limited due to the isolation and small size of the settlement.

Furthermore, employment is severely limited by the education level of many of the camp residents. Educational level of adults is closely linked to the ability to generate income. Refugees with education beyond secondary school had 1-2 income sources, formal employment being the main one. By contrast, for the households with no education only 55% had an income source, with remittances being the most important one. Table 2 shows educational level of the HH head by origin and in total, which shows that there are wide discrepancies among the nationalities. 27% of Congolese, but only 2% of Angolans have completed some form of higher education. Overall, only 50% of the adults in Osire are educated beyond the primary school level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Level of education of HH head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While adults within the camp who are not highly educated may not have opportunities to obtain employment or integrate into the Namibian economy, over 50% of the camp population is under the age of 18. Educating this sector of the population, providing them with skills that can be used in Namibia or elsewhere may be the best way to encourage durable solutions for the camp population.
f) Food Security

From the above sections it is clear both that many refugees and asylum seekers in Osire have income and livelihood sources, and also that many depend heavily on the food and non-food assistance provided by WFP and UNHCR. It is important next to understand which segments of the population are most food insecure, remaining dependent on food aid, and which are most self-reliant, and can manage without food aid. Once this analysis is done it will be possible to further identify characteristics of each of these populations within the camp in order to formulate better, more targeted assistance.

There are several ways to measure food insecurity; the ultimate goal of this analysis is to understand the situation in the camp by constructing a food security indicator which takes into account several different aspects of vulnerability and self reliance in order to predict how households might fare with reduced or no assistance. The food security indicator will incorporate a food consumption score (FCS), based upon dietary diversity, food frequency, and nutrition, as well as a food access score (FAS) based upon household food sources, skill levels, per capita expenditure, and asset ownership. The combination of a household’s food consumption at present and its food access (ability to access food in the future) will serve as a measure for overall food security.

**Food Consumption:** Figure 4 shows the results of a food consumption analysis for Osire camp, also comparing the results to the 2006 UNHCR/WFP JAM, in addition to a similar survey done for a segment of the Namibian population (WFP CHS 2007). Households are classified as having poor, borderline, or acceptable consumption, based upon their responses concerning normal consumption habits. As one would expect in a camp environment where all refugees are provided with a full ration worth 2,100 kcal, almost all households fall into the acceptable consumption group. Only 2% fall into the poor consumption group, while 8% attain a borderline consumption. The rest, 90%, have acceptable consumption. The results are similar, or even slightly better than the 2006 JAM, where the percentage of the population with acceptable consumption was 86%.

Compared to the community household survey (CHS), conducted on Namibians living in the North of the country, the refugees achieve a significantly better consumption score. Only 71% of the CHS population has acceptable consumption. Although this comparison should only be treated as indicative, it does suggest that the situation in Osire camp is considerably better than in the north of Namibia, where the majority of the Namibian population is concentrated.

When examining food consumption scores for different nationalities in the camp, some small variations were identified, although overall food consumption in all groups is very good. Angolans have slightly worse consumption than Congolese and refugees of other origins. 11% of the Angolans, 7% of the Congolese, and 5% of other refugees have either poor or borderline consumption.

Table 3 illustrates the differences in average weekly consumption frequencies for the two main food consumption groups, those with borderline or acceptable consumption. Differences are found in the consumption of vegetables, fish and meat, other cereals, sugar, beans, and CSB. This can be explained by analyzing how households access food, which is in essence mainly through food aid (75%), supplemented by purchases (15%) for those that can afford. All consumption groups purchase some

---

6 WFP has adopted the Food Consumption Score methodology to measure dietary diversity, food frequency, and relative nutritional importance of foods consumed. This indicator has proven to be a strong proxy for food intake and present food security. See appendix 3 for a detailed explanation of the construction of the FCS.

7 In May 2007, WFP conducted the Community and Household Surveillance (CHS) to monitor the effects of WFP food aid programmes in Namibia, covering the six districts of Oshana, Caprivi, Kavango, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshikoto. Although the results are not statistically representative for Namibian population, they still provide an indicative basis for comparison.
Table 3: Average weekly consumption of different food items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Borderline consumption</th>
<th>Acceptable consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main staples</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cereals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 20) (n = 223)

While the FCS presented above gives an indication of a household’s present level and quality of food consumption, it does not address what ability that household might have to access food in the future, should the situation in the camp change. For the moment, the main food access strategy in the camp is food aid, while the key complementary activity is market purchase. Vegetable gardens also play a role on a smaller scale, but that is an activity that most people can engage in and is not an important discriminator of a household’s ability to access food. The following food access analysis will therefore concentrate on household capacity to earn income. The answers on income sources from the household survey are most probably underreported, as many income earning strategies are informal or illegal, the food access analysis will rather incorporate a variety of indicators which relate to income generating ability.

Figure 5 shows the results of the food access analysis for Osire camp, broken down by household nationality. The graph illustrates that 46% of Congolese but only 25% of Angolans households have a good ability to access food. About 30% of all nationality groups are classified as having poor access to food, meaning that their ability to acquire food for themselves in the absence of food aid is severely limited.

Coping strategies: Normally, an analysis of food security would include an evaluation of coping strategies, the responses used by households to manage food shortages. However, because refugees and asylum seekers are provided with a full monthly food ration by WFP, and over 98% of households surveyed have indicated that they receive the ration every month, there is no need for the camp population to engage in coping. Therefore, coping strategies will not be used as a part of the food security classification for the Osire population.

---

8 The absence of serious coping in Osire is further confirmed by analyzing the data collected at the household level and calculating the standard Coping Strategies Index (CSI). The CSI is a simple index which numerically expresses how well a household is currently coping. A higher score reflects higher household stress. The average CSI in the camp is 22, which is considerably better than the national average.
Food Security: After having determined both households’ food consumption levels and food access levels, it is possible to construct a composite indicator, combining FCS and FAS, to distinguish Osire households by their overall level of food security: both their level of food consumption at present and their ability to access food in the future.

Figure 6 shows a cross tabulation of households’ own ability to access food versus current food consumption that is highly supported by food aid.

**Figure 6: Cross tabulation of food access and food consumption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security Category</th>
<th>Food Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Food Secure</td>
<td>Poor 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td>Poor 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td>Poor 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Food Insecure</td>
<td>Poor 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households were classified into food security levels with the following categories:

- **Highly Food Secure households** are those with good acceptable consumption and good food access;
- **Food Secure households** are those that have acceptable consumption and average food access, or borderline consumption and good access;
- **Moderately Food Insecure households** or those with acceptable consumption and poor access, or borderline consumption and average access;
- **Severely Food Insecure households** are all those that have poor food consumption, in addition to households from the borderline group that have poor food access;

The Highly Food Secure group, with acceptable consumption and good food access, constitutes 29% of the camp population, while 38% of the camp population falls into the largest group, the Food Secure. The households which make up these two groups have almost entirely acceptable consumption and average food access. 27% of households in Osire are Moderately Food Insecure, mainly with acceptable consumption and poor food access. A further 6% of households are currently Severely Food Insecure, even though they receive the regular food and non-food aid package.

**Characteristics of food security groups:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Food Security by Country of Origin</th>
<th>Angolans</th>
<th>Congolese</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Food Secure</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Food Insecure</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 166) (n = 59) (n = 22)

than the average CSI calculated in the Namibian CHS of 28 (CHS May 2007). To contextualise this information, households in Swaziland and Lesotho, which were affected by droughts in 2007, have an average CSI of 40 and 60 respectively.

9 See Appendix 5 for a flowchart depicting the process of assigning households to a food security group based upon their Food Consumption Score and Food Access Score.
The tables on the following pages explore in-depth the profiles of the four food security groups, explaining demographics, household circumstances, main income sources and expenditures, assets, and food consumption patterns, for characteristic households of each group. The following narrative will summarize these characteristics.

**Severely Food Insecure (400 people):** The Severely Food Insecure households have all poor consumption or borderline consumption with poor food access. They are almost all of Angolan origin (80%), the median household size is 4, which is smaller than the average in the camp overall (5). 30% of these households include a chronically ill member, twice as high as the camp average, which explains the higher percentage of household members who are dependents (60%). 65% of Severely Food Insecure household heads live without a partner, far higher than the average in the camp of about 40%. 30% of the households have only male members. All of the households arrived after 1999/2000, while 15% are new arrivals¹⁰, twice as high as the camp average. Educational status is very poor; only 7% of the adults in these households have finished secondary school. The main income sources for the Severely Food Insecure group are firewood collection and remittances. Per capita monthly expenditure is less than N$10 for almost all of these households, and food expenditures represent half of the total expenditure, much higher than the camp average of 27% expenditure on food. In addition, medical expenses are as high as 13% of the total monthly expenditure. Although health facilities in the camp are free, the number of chronically ill household members in this group might explain why these households report medical expenditures. The group is also very asset poor, none have a TV and only 7% a radio.

This group relies entirely on food aid, and would have to engage in severe negative coping mechanisms in order to manage their food shortages without assistance.

**Moderately Food Insecure (1800 people):** The Moderately Food Insecure households have mostly acceptable food consumption but poor food access, meaning that they would be vulnerable to deteriorating levels of food security should the food assistance cease. 50% of household heads in this group live without a partner, and almost 40% of household heads are female, the highest percentage among all food security groups. The level of education for the Moderately Food Insecure food security group is very low; only 6% of the adults have finished secondary school. The main income sources for this group are casual labor, (mainly on surrounding farms), and business within the camp. Moderately Food Insecure households are the only group that has virtually no access to land. Although half of the camp households overall have vegetable gardens, only 25% of this group has such gardens. They are very asset poor – only 4% own a TV and 10% a radio. Food expenditure is the main portion of total expenditure, which in total is less than N$10 per capita per month. However, the Moderately Food Insecure households have a much more diverse expenditure pattern than the Severely Food Insecure households; they report buying fuel with 10% of their money, and transport with 11%. In addition, debt repayments represent 8%.

Thanks to the food and non-food assistance this group is able to eat well, but they rely heavily on food aid to maintain their livelihoods. They would not be able to rely on their own ability to access food without assistance, and would probably engage in negative coping strategies to maintain their consumption at an acceptable level.

¹⁰ New arrivals are defined as those arriving 2006 and later.
### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Severe Food Insecure (400 people)</th>
<th>Moderately Food Insecure (1800 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly Angolans (80%)</td>
<td>Origins representative of camp population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller households than camp average, median size is 4</td>
<td>HH size larger than Severe Food Insecure group, but smaller than the other groups – median size 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average age of HH head (34) younger than camp overall (38)</td>
<td>50% live without a partner: 25% never married, 13% divorced and 13% are widow(er)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65% live without a partner, the large majority of these have never married</td>
<td>37% are HHs headed by females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% take care of a Chronically Ill household member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% of the households have only male members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer households host orphans than the other groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Circumstances</td>
<td>All arrived in Osire after 1999, 15% are new arrivals</td>
<td>Only 20% of the HHs have members living outside the camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 20% have members living outside the camp</td>
<td>For those that live outside, the main reason is work (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 7% of the HHs have adults who have finished secondary school</td>
<td>Only 6% of the HHs have adults who have finished secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change place of residence often – 43% have moved in the last 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main income sources</td>
<td>No income source (50%)</td>
<td>No income source (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of firewood (15%)</td>
<td>Casual labor (13%), many report leaving the camp to work on surrounding farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remittances (15%)</td>
<td>Business within the camp (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure pattern</td>
<td>Per capita total expenditure is less than N$10 on average per month</td>
<td>Per capita total expenditure is less than N$10 on average per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food represents about half of total expenditures, illustrating the poor food access of this food security group</td>
<td>Food expenditure as share of the total is 37%, confirming the stronger food access of this group compared to the Severely Food Insecure group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing represents the second largest portion of expenditure (27%)</td>
<td>Clothing represents a smaller part of the total (14%) than for the Severely Food Insecure, reflecting higher average expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical expenses are high (13%) compared to other groups, explained by the number of chronically ill members in this group.</td>
<td>More of the total is devoted to transport (11%) than for the Severely Food Insecure group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The group has little money available for transport, and spends only 5% on this item</td>
<td>This group also supplements their fuel supply from UNHCR with fuel purchases, 10% of the total expenditure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8% goes to debt repayment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td>Asset poor, none have a TV and only 7% a radio</td>
<td>Asset poor, 4% own a TV and only 10% a radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food consumption and use</td>
<td>Practically no source of protein to complement food rations</td>
<td>Practically no source of protein to complement food rations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited consumption of vegetables (twice a week)</td>
<td>Vegetable consumption three times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very limited consumption of sugar (once a week)</td>
<td>Sugar consumption four times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gifts and production supplement food aid</td>
<td>Gifts and production supplement food aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This group reports the highest amount of food aid sales</td>
<td>This group barters some of the food aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issues</td>
<td>15% report using bush as a main toilet facility</td>
<td>Only 25% have a vegetable garden, mainly due lack of water, suitable land, and seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The NFIs that are needed most are mattresses and education supplies. The latter probably refers to support for older children.</td>
<td>Households have practically no access to agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% use firewood as a main fuel source for cooking</td>
<td>30% use firewood as a main fuel source for cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% leave the camp regularly, mainly for casual labor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

**Food secure (2400 people)**

- Most Angolans fall into this food security group
- Median HH size is 5
- 65% of HH heads have a partner
- 35% of HHs are headed by females

**Highly Food Secure (1900 people)**

- Most Congolese fall into this food security group
- The largest HHs in the camp, median size is 5
- Almost 80% of HH heads have a partner
- Only 15% of HHs are headed by females

**Demographics**

- 40% of the households have members living outside the camp, probably related to business activities that are performed within the camp
- For those HH members who live outside Osire, the main reasons are school (71%) and work (32%)
- 60% of the household heads have finished secondary school

**Household Circumstances**

- Per capita total expenditure is N$70 per month
- Transport is the biggest expense for this group, making up 34% of the total expenditure. This reflects the group’s involvement in trade as an income source.
- Food represents only 31% monthly expenditure. HHs in this group devote a small share of expenditure to schooling, reflecting an ability to send children to school after grade 12.
- Compared to the lower food security groups, these HHs have a much more diverse expenditure pattern, with expenditures on 11 different items, compared to only 6 for the Severely Food Insecure group.

**Main income sources**

- Business within the camp (23%)
- Wage labor or formal employment (16%)
- Casual labor (16%)

**Expenses**

- Per capita total expenditure is N$320 per month
- Transport is the biggest expense for this group, but represents only 21% of total expenditure
- Food is only one-fifth of total expenditure, which illustrates that the children who go to school after grade 12 mainly come from this group.
- Households from this group have a very diverse and balanced expenditure pattern, with significant expenditures on almost all items.

**Assets**

- Asset medium: 17% own a TV, 20% a radio, 55% a cell phone
- Asset rich, almost 50% own a TV, 70% a radio and practically everyone owns a cell phone

**Food consumption and use**

- Eat meat and fish twice a week
- Vegetable consumption almost every day
- Sugar consumption almost every day
- Purchase is the main supplemental source of food (12% of the food)
- Barter some of the food

**Other issues**

- 60% leave the camp regularly, mainly for shopping or social reasons
- 80% leave the camp regularly, mainly for shopping
Food Secure (2400 people): The Food Secure households in Osire have almost entirely an acceptable consumption level with an average food access score, but food aid still represents 78% of their total food consumed. The Food Secure have larger households than the Severely Food Insecure or Moderately Food Insecure groups, with a median household size of 5. 65% are married or live with a partner, which is much higher than for the previously discussed groups. 20% of household heads in this group have finished secondary school. The main income sources for the Food Secure households are business within the camp (23%) and wage labor (16%). In addition, 40% of households have members living outside of the camp, mainly for work and school. This is likely related to the business activities these individuals perform within the camp, which is supported by the fact that transport costs are the main expenditure (34%) for this group and that 60% report leaving the camp regularly, mainly for shopping. They are able to supplement their diet with regular purchases of meat and fish, and are the first group to report schooling expenses, which reflects their ability to send children above grade 12 outside the camp for school. They are much wealthier than the less food secure households. 17% of households in this group own a TV, 20% a radio and 55% a cell phone. Per capita monthly expenditure is on average N$70.

The Food Secure households experience a certain degree of self-reliance, and could be able to cope without assistance. However, since they only have average food access, food aid is still their main livelihood strategy, which is why only 20% of the food consumed by this group comes from sources other than food aid. Without food assistance, they cannot be expected to maintain their livelihoods without other types of livelihood support.

Highly Food Secure (1900 people): The Highly Food Secure households all have an acceptable consumption supported by a good ability to access food on their own. They have the largest households in the camp (median of 5) and 75% are married or living with a partner, which is much higher than the other food security groups. 85% of these households are headed by males, while all the other groups have at least 30% female headed households. The main income source for the Highly Food Secure group is wage labor, which is reported by about 40% of these households, while 26% of the households do business. The educational level is much higher than any other group, with 60% of the household heads having finished secondary school. 50% have members living outside the camp; for these, the main reason is schooling, reported by over 70%. This explains why schooling accounts for as much as 13% of total expenditure, which shows these households have a significantly better ability to provide their children with higher education. The group spends on average N$320 per capita per month, with a much diversified expenditure pattern that includes all categories which were asked about during the household survey. Food expenditures account only for 20% of the total monthly expenditure for this group, but they are still able to purchase meat and fish 4 times a week. In total, almost 40% of the food consumed by Highly Food Secure households comes from the market. The group is very asset rich, and 50% own a TV, 70% a radio and nearly all own a cell phone. The group is also highly mobile; 80% leave the camp regularly, mainly for shopping.

There is strong evidence that the Highly Food Secure households are self-reliant, and would easily manage without assistance. Given their educational status, this is also the group that by far has the best chance of locally integrating in the Namibian context. One of the most straight-forward ways of identifying these households is by their asset wealth; For example, 70% of all the TVs in the camp are owned by this group, while the rest are owned by the Food Secure group.

g) Conclusions

Highly skilled members of the refugee and asylum seeker population have generally managed to develop successful livelihood strategies and support themselves, both inside and outside of Osire camp. These food secure households would be able to maintain acceptable food consumption levels in the absence of food aid.

Although it is clear that there are many refugees who have the means to support themselves independently in the absence of food aid and other inputs, the majority of the Osire population does not have the skills or inputs necessary to do so at this time. Only 50% of household heads have completed more than junior secondary school. This shows that there are still a high number of
unskilled workers in all camp populations, whose opportunities for employment within Namibia (with a 37% unemployment rate of its own) are extremely restricted. The 36% of households classified as either Moderately Food Insecure or Severely Food Insecure would not be able to cope at present in an environment where food aid and other inputs are not provided.

Mobility is very well correlated with food security status. The more food secure households are, the more often they leave the camp and the more often they have members living outside the camp, therefore these households are in the best position to continue to support themselves in the absence of a camp situation. Currently households receive rations through a family ration card, and only one member of the household need be present for the household to receive the entire ration. A possible individualization of the ration cards would mostly affect the mobile households. Members traveling and living outside would no longer be able to receive food without being physically present.
PART 4 – HEALTH AND NUTRITION

a) General Information

The health and nutrition results of the Joint Assessment and Evaluation Mission are based on the logical analysis of the nutrition analytical conceptual framework. This report is based on the understanding of the interrelationships of some the causes of malnutrition with focus on some of the causes that relate to Health, Care and Food Security aspects in the camp. The primary source of information was is both primary and secondary data collected using a structured health and nutrition questionnaire which focussed on child caring and feeding practices, health seeking behaviour practices and intervention services provided among them the supplementary feeding programme and child survival programmes such as immunizations and the Vitamin A supplementation programme.

Services in the camp are provided by implementing partners of which Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA) Namibia is the main partner of the Government of the Republic of Namibia through the Ministry of Health and Social Services. AHA also provides the health and nutrition services in the camp. The health facility is appropriately located in the camp and is in easy proximity by all refugees.

The results highlighted in the health and nutrition section are based on 247 households that were interviewed and had 140 children that were eligible from a total of 95 households of the entire JEAM. There is need to indicate that the numbers were relatively small and the results should be interpreted with caution and in their right and meaningful context.

b) Morbidity in children and women

Results obtained through an interview with the health facility doctor indicated that the most common illnesses for children less than five years of age were diarrhoea and acute respiratory infections (ARI). Results from the data collected indicated that 20% of children had diarrhoea, 20% had fever and 8.6% had suffered from Acute Respiratory Infection in the last 2 weeks prior to the JAEM. This result is similar to previous findings (JAM 2006). Mother’s illness did not appear significant, except for fevers, possibly associated with Malaria.

c) Diarrhoea, Fever and ARI – Children 6-59 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Diarrhoea</th>
<th>Fever</th>
<th>ARI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-23 months</td>
<td>29.8%*</td>
<td>29.8%*</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-59 months</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of arrival of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1998</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-present</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/caretaker Fever</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/caretaker Diarrhoea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Nutritional status of children and women

Anthropometric data was collected on all children aged 6-59 months and mothers within the reproductive age group of 15-49 years. To accommodate eligible children who were being looked after by elderly grandmothers/caregivers outside this age bracket, for the purpose of this JAEM, the age bracket was extended to 55 years.

Although primary data was collected to indicate malnutrition rates in the camp among 140 children, no conclusions could be made due to high non response and absence rate. Therefore result will only be used for the food security and nutrition analytical linkages.

Instead, findings from the nutrition survey conducted by AHA in July 2007 are presented. The result showed that for children 6-59 months the prevalence of wasting was 5.3% (95% CI = 3.7–6.9), underweight was 12.7% (10.3-15.0) and stunting 21.7% (18.8-24.6). This result shows a slightly lower but similar prevalence when compared to rural Namibia (DNH2006: CHS 2007).

The graph below shows the prevalence of malnutrition by age group. All forms follow the expected distribution by age group with the exception of stunting which should increase again in the children 35 months and older. There may have been some problems with age estimation in these older children. However, the graphs indicate that the critical age group is at 12-17 months when children are most often being weaned.

Further analysis also revealed that children from female headed households were more likely to be wasted and underweighted when compared to children from male headed households.

Maternal malnutrition was low. In total 93 women were weighed less than 10% (7.5%) were undernourished (BMI < 18.5 kg/m²) and 36.6% were overweight or obese (BMI > 25.0 kg/m²). All of the women who were undernourished were from Angola who also had the lowest percentage of women who were overweight or obese.

Education did not appear to affect maternal malnutrition among the sampled women. Indeed, further analysis showed a relationship between body-mass index (BMI) and education with the mean BMI increasing with education: 27% of women with no education were overweight or obese, followed by 35% with incomplete primary, 37% who completed primary and 50% with secondary education or higher.

f) Child feeding practices

Breastfeeding is universal in the camp, with 96% of the children having been breastfed out of which 28% were still being breastfed. This was very comparable as it met the standards (95% and above) of universal practices of child survival strategies. The graph below shows breastfeeding by age group and sex indicates that breastfeeding continues
until child reaches two years of age. Boys appear to be breastfed a bit longer than girls. It also appears that Angolan children are breastfed a bit longer than others.

**g) Nutritional Deficiencies**

All refugees receive a food ration calculated to meet their optimal daily requirement, by international standards. However, when food consumption categories are considered, the ration only covers cereal, legume and oil. Although variety is limited the diet still contributes to micronutrients through the fortified mealie meal as well as through the Vitamin A supplementation.

Vitamin A supplementation is associated with reducing frequency of illnesses among children. In all, only 47% of the children had reportedly received a vitamin A capsule in the previous months – 49% of children 6-23 months and 46% of the older children despite the supplementation programs which is in place. However, when investigating by country of origin, 36% of the children with Angolan parents had received the supplements as compared to 85% of other children. By year of arrival, 75% of children whose parents had arrived since 2005 had received vitamin A supplements as compared to 56% who arrived between 2001 and 2004 and even less from the earlier arrivals. The differences could be attributed to recall, language problems and/or confusion with the Polio drops.

**i) Existing Interventions**

The camp has a very well structured functional health system through which the implementation of two vital child survival programmes are channelled through. These are the supplementary feeding for the moderately malnourished children and the Vitamin A programme for children aged 6-59 months.

At the time of conducting the JAEM, only 8 children were admitted to the supplementary feeding programme with moderate malnutrition. Malnourished children were kept in the programme until they reached at least 90% of their weight for age and kept for at least 2 weeks after that before discharging them.

The main aim of targeted supplementary feeding programmes is to prevent the moderately malnourished from becoming severely malnourished. However, the team observed that the ration provided to malnourished did not differ from that of in-patients. In addition, the admission and discharge criteria should be defined on the basis of weight and height measurements, following international standard. According to the WFP standard, the anthropometric criteria for admission and discharge for therapeutic and supplementary feeding programmes are as follows: 70% of median of weight for height or -3 Z scores for Therapeutic Feeding Programmes (TFC) and 70-80% for Supplementary Feeding Programmes (SFP) or -3 to -2 Z scores. If individuals have oedema, no matter what weight they are, they should be admitted to the TFP. Children are discharged from TFP when they reach 80% weight-for-height over 2 consecutive weightings (weightings usually take place weekly). If there is no SFP to which they can be referred, discharge should be delayed until they have reached 85% or 1.5 Z score (if children live a long way from the feeding centre, discharge should be delayed until they reach 90%). Children are discharged from SFPs if they reach > 85% weight for height during two to four consecutive weeks. A proper monitoring of wasting (instead of stunting) is therefore required. Overall the mission recommends that AHA provides additional technical support to its Health and Social workers in charge of running this component of the programme.

The interview also reviewed that there was no appropriate response to severe cases as there was no therapeutic feeding programme in place for severe cases. The health facility had never stocked F75 or F100. Only one child was at the time admitted with severe malnutrition and cause was associated and compounded by HIV factors.

**j) Linkages with Food Security**

When comparing linkages between child nutritional status and food security from the data collected, an interesting relationship comes up. However, this has to be treated with great care as the sample is quite low for some of the food security groups.

Still, as an indicative comparison to link nutrition and food security, the data can still tell us a lot. Table 8 illustrates this: for both underweight and stunting (no wasting reported in the data collected) there is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Security Group</th>
<th>Underweight</th>
<th>Stunting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severely Food Insecure</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Food Insecure</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Secure</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Off</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a lower prevalence among the children in the households with better food security status. This analysis tends to validate the correctness of the food security analysis.

Analysis also showed a relationship between women’s nutritional status and household food security. The median food consumption score increases with women’s body size while the coping strategies index decreases, indicating that reduced stress on the household is reflected in increased body size of women.

In terms of vulnerability, women from female headed households are much less likely to be overweight or obese and more likely to be undernourished.

**k) HIV and AIDS**

No HIV/AIDS prevalence estimates are available for Osire camp. Testing is however available at the health facility in the camp, and health workers reported that 10% of those tested for HIV/AIDS at Osire were positive, while Ministry of Health reports indicate that 61% of individuals tested region-wide were HIV positive. It is important to note that the statistic presented here is not HIV prevalence – individuals who choose to be tested for HIV are a self-selected group who often have reasons already to suspect that they are HIV positive.

ARV treatment, offered by the government of Namibia, is available in Osire, and currently there are 35 individuals in Osire on treatment. AHA coordinates a home based care program for patients requiring Home Based Care. Infected individuals receive supplementary food rations of dry fish, meat, and vegetables from AHA/UNHCR. There is also an active HIV/AIDS task force in Osire, comprising of members from the refugee community, AHA, the police, MHAI, and the Ministry of Education.

AHA has conducted sensitization campaigns in the past to inform the community of the issues surrounding HIV and AIDS, however, health workers reported that there is a very high level of stigma against people living with HIV and AIDS in the camp. It is recommended that sensitization campaigns continue to be held regularly, in the hopes of reducing levels of stigma. In particular, clergy within the camp should be targeted, as there were reports that pastors in the camp are encouraging HIV positive individuals to seek alternative treatments such as fasting, which can be seriously detrimental to an AIDS patient.
PART 5 – OTHER COMMUNITY SERVICES AND PROTECTION

a) Water and Sanitation

Water: Water in the camp is mainly supplied by two large reservoirs. Water from these reservoirs is chlorinated and tested regularly, and then pumped to communal taps distributed throughout the camp. The school and health centers at Osire are supplied by separate water tanks. In addition there are several boreholes and pumps throughout the camp, however at present only a few of these boreholes are functional. Parts are not available to fix the pumps at present. Because rainfall levels are generally so low in Osire, rainfall contributes a negligible amount to the overall water supply.

Generally there is enough water in the reservoirs to cover necessary household usage, however, camp residents expressed concerns that especially during dry times, the levels in the water tanks drop and water pressure can be low. Gardening and larger scale farming activities are severely limited by the amount of water available in the camp.

No incidence of waterborne diseases was reported in the camp in the past year, indicating that the quality of the water supply is good.

UNHCR has been exploring options to increase the water supply in the camp, but many of these options require significant investment and installation of permanent infrastructure. Plans currently under discussion include installing another reservoir or implementing a grey water usage system for gardening and agricultural use. However, as it is unknown at this time how permanent Osire will be as a place of residence for refugees and asylum seekers, it therefore appears premature to make costly decisions about increasing the water supply.

Sanitation: The sanitation situation in Osire camp is good. Almost all residents in Osire use pit latrines, distributed throughout the camp. At present there are approximately 480 latrines in Osire, which is more than the recommended minimum standard of 1 latrine per 20 people. There is a pilot flush toilet program, with one set of toilets installed in one residential block, although it is still undermined whether use of flush toilets is cost-effective, and whether it will stress the already limited water supply in the camp. A pilot program to purchase chemicals for dissolving waste in pit latrines, increasing lifespan, is currently also being implemented, with positive feedback.

Rubbish disposal pits are scattered throughout the camp, and transect walks revealed that rubbish disposal is not a big issue in Osire camp.

b) Shelter

Each household lives on a plot, with an average dwelling space of $\geq 45 \text{ m}^2$ per person and a small area for a kitchen garden. The land space in Osire camp is sufficient to accommodate all refugees and asylum seekers in Namibia.

There is a new arrival center at Osire, where new arrivals can live for up to three months while preparing a dwelling. A shelter team, run by AHA, assists new arrivals and other needy households with the provision of building materials. In 2007, of the 376 new arrivals, 287 joined relatives in the camp while 89 were sheltered at the new arrival center and subsequently constructed houses in the camp. In addition to its responsibilities for new arrivals, in 2007 the shelter team also assisted single parents and all vulnerable with house reconstruction, as several houses collapsed during heavy rainfall or due to poorly made bricks.

c) Education

The JAEM observed a notable high standard of performance at the refugee school. In 2007 Osire junior secondary school recorded a grade 10 pass rate of 63%, far higher than the national average of 46%. However, a significant issue in the camp is that there is not a senior secondary school. Pupils who wish to continue their education after grade 10 must go elsewhere, either on scholarship or through any family funds. During the past years, only a few students have received scholarships and study permits.
from the GRN to complete grades 11 and 12 outside the camp. The limited number of scholarships is evidently hampering education, which restricts the possibilities that refugees have for successful local integration or repatriation. It is not within UNHCR’s mandate to provide secondary education to refugees. However, UNHCR continues to engage in searches for private and local funding to provide a full secondary school education to as many Osire children as possible.

The NEPRU survey found that 56% of refugees and asylum seekers have about the same level of secondary education as Namibians. It is only older Angolans who have little or no formal education.

Unsurprisingly, education featured very strongly in expenditure. Although school in the camp is free, school expenditure beyond grade 10 is a significant portion of the total money spent in the camp. This illustrates that when the money is available, parents are eager to see their children complete education.

However, according to the NEPRU survey, after grade 12, there is a big difference in percentages of women who have tertiary education – 44.4% females vs. 67.3% for men.

d) Social services

The Social Services and Community Development unit provides social counseling and care to all refugees in the camp with special care provided to women, children, the mentally challenged, albinos, unaccompanied minors, people infected with and affected by HIV/AIDS, widows and aged people, orphans, and the physically challenged. The unit also promotes gender and youth activities such as cultural workshops and social activities, fights against sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), and provides psychosocial support for survivors who are now resident in the camp.

The NEPRU survey found that 56% of refugees and asylum seekers have about the same level of secondary education as Namibians. It is only older Angolans who have little or no formal education.

However, according to the NEPRU survey, after grade 12, there is a big difference in percentages of women who have tertiary education – 44.4% females vs. 67.3% for men.

The NEPRU survey found that 56% of refugees and asylum seekers have about the same level of secondary education as Namibians. It is only older Angolans who have little or no formal education.

Unsurprisingly, education featured very strongly in expenditure. Although school in the camp is free, school expenditure beyond grade 10 is a significant portion of the total money spent in the camp. This illustrates that when the money is available, parents are eager to see their children complete education.

However, according to the NEPRU survey, after grade 12, there is a big difference in percentages of women who have tertiary education – 44.4% females vs. 67.3% for men.

d) Social services

The Social Services and Community Development unit provides social counseling and care to all refugees in the camp with special care provided to women, children, the mentally challenged, albinos, unaccompanied minors, people infected with and affected by HIV/AIDS, widows and aged people, orphans, and the physically challenged. The unit also promotes gender and youth activities such as cultural workshops and social activities, fights against sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), and provides psychosocial support for survivors who are now resident in the camp.

The social services unit presided over participatory assessments conducted with both adults and children during 2007. The findings of these assessments have been used to design better programs which address the real needs of the refugee population, based upon age, gender, and diversity. Beneficiary based consultations on SGBV were conducted in the camp on September 2007.

The social services unit also carried out a registration of people with special needs, and an assessment of their needs was done to provide better care and support.

e) Gender and protection concerns

In 2007 a comprehensive Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for registration was developed and agreed upon by UNHCR and the Namibian government. The SOP establishes guidelines for ensuring fairness and efficiency in the registration of refugees and asylum-seekers, verifying their information, personal data, updating the existing data, and collecting additional information for protection, care, maintenance, and durable solutions purposes.

In accordance with the High Commissioner for Refugees’ five commitments to refugee women, UNHCR and the GRN continue to conduct individual registration of refugees and asylum seekers. Individual identity documentation is issued to all persons of six years and above – both male and female. The individual registration process is also used as a tool to identify persons with special needs including single women, unaccompanied or separated children, older persons, and people with disabilities who are referred to social services unit for further support and care.

There is a forty (40%) representation of women in the camp management and sixty-four percent (64%) representation of women in the general food distribution.
PART 6 - PARTNERSHIPS, PLANNING AND OTHER ISSUES

a) Co-ordination arrangements

Monthly coordination meetings are regularly taking place at camp level with all the stakeholders. Participants are encouraged to share findings and recommendations with their respective offices in Windhoek. This would also encourage the ongoing discussions between WFP, UNHCR and GRN.

The last JAM recommends the introduction of at least quarterly coordination meetings in Windhoek at the Permanent Secretary level with heads of agencies from UNHCR and WFP. These meetings have not yet occurred. Close coordination and regular information sharing are critical for the identification and promotion of durable solutions. This JAM again recommends the introduction of these quarterly meetings.

At the camp level, the refugees’ representatives have not been convincing in their ability to bring common priority issues to the attention of the team. Leadership remains an issue and dissemination of information among this very mobile population is challenging.

At another level, the discussion held with the head of the local Commercial Farmers Association shows that very limited information is being shared between the camp administration and the local community regarding the camp’s ‘rule’ and policy environment. Ignorance and speculation add to the already highly stigmatized situation. Relations between the camp population and the local population might be significantly improved with proper communication and dissemination of information regarding the situation in Osire camp.

b) Camp demographics and expected evolution

As of December 2007, the total refugee and asylum seeker population of concern to UNHCR in Namibia comprised 7,730 individuals. This group included 6,525 refugees (84% of the population) and 1,205 asylum seekers (16% of the population). The majority, notably 6,380 persons, reside in the Osire refugee camp. This is in line with the provisions of the Refugee Act, which requires all refugees and asylum-seekers to reside in Osire. The 1,350 people not residing in Osire live mainly in Windhoek or in the north along the border with Angola. Most of these persons have spontaneously settled along the borders and are residing legally, while a smaller number are living outside of the camp illegally.

There is a considerable backlog of asylum seeker cases awaiting status determination. Although the Namibia Refugees, Recognition, and Control Act, No 19 of 1999 specifies that the Committee considering asylum seeker cases should consider written applications for asylum within 30 days, this has not usually been the case. Asylum seekers are allowed to remain in Namibia, and receive the same treatment and access to services as refugees in Osire, however, asylum seekers claim that the delay in their status determination has prevented them from applying for bank accounts, obtaining refugee travel documents, qualifying for resettlement, etc. UNHCR has made many efforts to assist the government to address the backlog (800+) of asylum seeker cases by sponsoring retreats and providing information to the Committee. It is hoped that in the next several cases, the backlog of cases will have gone through at least an initial status determination, and the the appeals process will be addressed for rejected cases.

c) Registration and ration card control

In February 2007, a re-registration and socio-economic profiling exercise of the beneficiaries took place in Osire camp, as described above in the ‘background section’. The most significant finding of the re-registration exercise was the existence of over 600 individuals living illegally in the camp. This population is mostly Angolans who arrived in Namibia after 2003 and who do not qualify for food or material assistance from UNHCR/WFP. At present these individuals have been designated as ‘not of concern’ and have been allowed to reside in the camp with no decision yet taken on their status in Namibia.
A number of ration card exchange exercises have taken place over the years with the most recent held in August 2007. Despite major improvements following the re-registration and verification exercise, determining the precise number of refugees and asylum seekers resident in the camp, and the elimination of duplicate ration cards remains an issue to be watched, for effective commodity procurement and program implementation.

Beneficiaries targeted to receive WFP food assistance must be either permanently resident in Osire camp, or have a student permit issued by MHAi. In families jointly headed by both a man and woman, the woman is registered to receive the family food entitlement and she should directly collect the food each month at the distribution point.

The survey team faced difficulties in finding randomly selected people among the Food Distribution list (list of permanent refugees or asylum seeker resident in the camp). In total, some 460 households were visited by the quantitative team during the four days of data collection, of which 240 were actually found and interviewed. About 16% of the 460 selected households were not to be found because they were outside the camp, while 22% could not at all be located. In this latter case, refugee leaders and households in the block in which they are reported to be living (UNHCR database) were not able to find them or reported that they did not know anyone by that name. In total, this means that as many as 40% of the households might not have had any member in the camp during the time of the survey.

Using the data from the UNHCR database, some simple analysis was done on this group to see what characterizes these highly mobile refugees. As many as 60% are households of one single male, and the average household size is 2.6, compared to 5.4 in the sampled households. Only 50% of these household originate from Angola, compared to almost 70% for the sampled households.

In addition to the households which could not be found at all, many surveyed households had members living or travelling outside the camp, while others are left behind to take care of the home and collect the food assistance. For example, the survey teams found many households consisted, at the time of the survey, of only school-age children. Furthermore, a number of households were confirmed to be in the camp, but not in the block they are registered in.

The population of Osire is very mobile and there is strong evidence to support that many of the people registered on the Food Distribution List are in fact not permanent residents of the camp.
PART 7 – RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Resolution of the “Not of Concern” caseload

Over 600 ‘persons not of concern’ are currently residing in Osire camp. These individuals are dependent upon the food aid received by family or household members who are legitimate members of the refugee and asylum seeker community. Although these individuals have been tacitly allowed to continue living in Osire, accessing health, education and other services provided within the camp, there has been no official GRN decision on their status or the legality of their situation. The GRN should, as soon as possible, resolve the status of the ‘not of concern’ caseload, determining whether these individuals should be allowed to stay in Osire or not, and whether they qualify for assistance as refugees.

2. WFP/UNHCR Namibia should, in the short term, plan to extend its food and protection assistance to refugees and asylum seekers until the end of 2009

Despite the positive steps taken by the GRN in assuming ownership and responsibility for refugee care, especially in the education and health care sectors, the remaining number of refugees requiring protection and food (notably the 33% of the population considered Moderately or Severely Food Insecure) is unlikely to change in the next two to three years, especially for Angolans who are waiting for national elections to take place before considering definitive repatriation and external support (presidential election expected in 2009). Therefore, WFP and UNHCR should plan to extend assistance in some form until such time as durable solutions for the refugees residing in Osire camp are identified; at least until the end of 2009.

3. Individualization of the ration card

A number of ration card exchange exercises have taken place over the years with the most recent held in August 2007. Despite major improvements following the re-registration and verification exercise, determining the precise number of refugees and asylum seekers residing in the camp, and the elimination of duplicate ration cards remains an issue to carefully monitor.

Currently households receive rations through a family ration card, and only one member of the household need be present at the food distribution to receive the entire ration. A possible individualization of the ration cards would mostly affect mobile households. Members traveling and living outside would no longer be able to receive food without being physically present. There is strong evidence from the preceding analysis that mobility and ability to incur transport costs is closely related to food security, thereby supporting such individualization from a food security perspective. The food secure households will easily be able to manage some cuts.

Moving away from the current family distribution card to individual cards could pave the way for effective commodity procurement and program implementation.

Furthermore, the individualization will probably make the beneficiary numbers drop, although the extent is difficult to predict. However, this could have some important implications for UNHCR and WFP programming. The joint WFP/UNHCR MoU from 1997 stipulates that it is UNHCR’s responsibility to provide food assistance if it involves refugees and the refugee number is below 5000, which might very well happen in Osire.

4. Scope For Ration Adjustment

WFP has been providing a monthly food ration through general food distributions to meet the beneficiaries’ daily nutritional requirement of 2,100 kcfals on the basis that beneficiaries have neither access to the labor market nor enough land for cultivation.
However, 38% of Osire population is considered Food Secure and 29% considered Highly Food Secure. The Food Secure households experience a certain degree of self-reliance, and could be able to cope without assistance, but since they only have average access to food, food aid is still their main livelihood strategy. Without food assistance, they cannot be expected to maintain their livelihoods without other types of livelihood support.

The Highly Food Secure households are classified as having a good ability to access food on their own, which is supported by analysis of their expenditure patterns, income sources, and demographics. There is strong evidence to show that these households are self-reliant, and would easily manage without assistance. Given their educational status, this is also the group that by far has the best chance of locally integrating in the Namibian context.

The mission therefore identifies a scope for adjusting the ration to the real needs of these four Food Security Groups, for example by cutting food rations for the Highly Food Secure group (29% of the camp population). The mission also recognizes the challenges posed by such a targeting measure and understands the questions raised by the practicalities trade off. The characteristics of the Highly Food Secure group that should be in priority cut off food assistance, especially their mobility, lead the mission to recommend at first an individualization of the ration card that would need to be followed by further monitoring of the impact of such a measure.

5. **Revision of the current Supplementary Feeding Programme protocols**

The supplementary feeding program aims at improving the nutrition and health status of acutely malnourished children below age five and PLWHA (People Living With HIV/AIDS).

AHA’s social workers are responsible for identifying children under five that may need special nutritional care. The child is referred to a doctor at the camp health center, and is subsequently introduced to the supplementary feeding program if necessary. Progress is closely monitored by the nurse in charge. All newly admitted, severely malnourished children should receive (i) medical treatment to reduce mortality risk and (ii) a carefully introduced sustenance level diet that prevents nutritional deterioration and allows normalization of metabolic function. Therapeutic milk, in the form of WHO F75 starter formula, is considered to be the most effective diet for the first phase of treatment. This formula is not available at the clinic and the medical team expressed a need for additional training in the treatment of malnutrition. AHA/MOHSS should follow up to ensure that the correct standard protocol for treating malnutrition is in place and adhered to in Osire camp. In addition, clear anthropometric criteria should be used for admission to the supplementary feeding center with regular follow up of the effectiveness of the supplementary ration.

6. **Additional technical support**

Opportunities for income generation and self-reliance, both inside and outside of Osire camp are constrained by a number of factors. In the agricultural sector the climate and condition of the soil in the region make large-scale crop production extremely difficult. Only serious agricultural inputs (improved crop variety, drought resistant crops, agro-forestry, irrigation, intensive training etc.) could guarantee a minimum productivity for the land surrounding the camp. For refugees and asylum seekers not involved in agriculture, lack of vocational training, restrictions on movement and strict requirements surrounding obtaining a work permit in Namibia seriously constrain income generation possibilities. In order to improve self-reliance in Osire camp, additional technical support that could benefit the neighboring communities as well should be provided together with adequate investment and equipment provisions. FAO and/or UNDP may be interested in providing this type of support.

Regarding the water, the GRN must pronounce on the future of Osire as a refugee settlement in Namibia before UNHCR can make permanent, costly investments towards improving the camp water supply.

Firewood collection remains an issue of contention between Osire residents and the surrounding community. Options for UNHCR or camp residents themselves to purchase firewood from local
farmers at low prices (perhaps employing refugees to collect the wood) should be pursued through the local farmers association.

Many households expressed a need to expand as their families have increased over time. Additional support and building materials are needed from the Shelter team to ease overcrowding of houses in the camp.

While the HIV/AIDS task force is active within the camp, there still is a very high level of stigma for HIV/AIDS affected individuals. Awareness raising campaigns and educational trainings should continue in Osire, particularly for camp leaders, such as the heads of religious organizations.

The goats which belong to the camp administrator and the local police are destroying kitchen gardens and tree planting efforts in Osire. These goats should be penned and properly looked after.

Despite indications that some segments of the Osire camp population are wealthy enough to need banking services, there is no ATM yet in Osire. UNHCR should continue discussions with local banks to install an ATM in Osire, to ease the flow of cash and promote increased trade and investment.

7. **Promote continued legal refugee mobility**

Mobility is very well correlated with food security status. The more often refugees and asylum seekers leave the camp or have household members living outside of Osire, the more food secure their households are. Therefore, all efforts should be made to continue to promote refugee mobility by granting passes to leave the camp regularly and for significant periods of time, within the scope of the law.

8. **Scholarships for grade 11, 12 and above**

Because many older refugees have very limited skills, and because 50% of the camp population is under the age of 18, an emphasis should be placed on education the youth in the camp as highly as is possible in order to increase the possibilities of successful local integration or repatriation efforts. Sponsorships for secondary and tertiary education should be a priority – although this not within the UNHCR mandate which focuses on primary education.

9. **Coordination meeting and information sharing**

Quarterly coordination meetings in Windhoek at the Permanent Secretary level with heads of agencies from UNHCR and WFP are essential to efficiently implement the overall program. Continuous discussions with government to take over and/or consider possibilities for alternative status or local integration should be continued.

Continuous effort in training refugees’ and asylum seekers’ leaders is also required.

The mission also suggests that some field based staff from UNHCR and AHA attend the regular farmer’s association meetings to bridge the gap with the sometimes hostile hosting community.
FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Despite the challenges facing the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN), such as recurrent droughts, high national unemployment rates and one of the highest HIV/AIDS prevalence rates in the world, the GRN and UNHCR have engaged in promising dialogue regarding durable solutions, including local integration and voluntary repatriation. UNHCR continues to discuss increased ownership and responsibility for refugee protection, care, and maintenance with the GRN. Currently the major sectors such as education and health care are gradually being taken over by the Regional Directorates of Education and Health.

In the current setting, the 6,422 refugees and asylum seekers residing in Osire camp have relatively few prospects of self sufficiency. The dry, sandy soil of the camps limits agriculture and only a few refugees and asylum seekers have government permission to work elsewhere. They need permission to leave the refugee camp, located nearly 1.5 hours drive from the first town and market place in Otjiwarongo, and a 3 hour drive from Windhoek. The refugees’ restricted access to employment and markets, together with the requirement for specific skills, seem to be the main impediments for many to become involved officially in more profitable trading activities.

However, highly skilled members of the refugee and asylum seeker population have generally managed to develop successful livelihood strategies and support themselves, both inside and outside of Osire camp. Some 67% of the assessed population in the camp proved to be Food Secure or Highly Food Secure, experience a certain degree of self-reliance, and will be able to cope without assistance if sufficient livelihood support is provided. Mobility and ability to incur transport costs is closely related to food security. The more food secure households are, the more often they leave the camp and the more often they have members living outside the camp.

Nearly a tier of Osire population (27%) is considered Moderately Food Insecure. Thanks to the assistance this group is able to eat well, but relies heavily on food aid to maintain livelihoods. This group would not be able to rely on its own ability to access food without assistance, and would probably engage in negative coping strategies to maintain consumption at an average level.

A fourth group representing only 6% of the entire population is considered Severely Food Insecure. This group relies entirely on food aid, and would have to engage in severe negative coping mechanisms in order to manage food shortages without assistance. With limited education, financial assets and income sources, this group, which is 80% Angolan, consists mainly of young households or households hosting chronically ill members.

While many of the adults living in Osire may not have skills which will enable them to find sustainable employment in Namibia or elsewhere, over 50% of the camp population is under the age of 18. While still in school, these children have an opportunity to learn skills which they can use to support their families in the future, without further aid from WFP and UNCHR. The focus for income generation and employment activities in the future should be on educating and training the youth in the camp to eventually become self-sufficient. All efforts should be made to ensure that the younger generation of students and skilled workers can achieve their studies.

In the short term, food remains vital for the Moderately Food Insecure and Severely Food Insecure caseload residing in Osire Camp. On the longer term, without re-thinking the settlement location and the legal framework for the refugees, local integration opportunities are very limited. Direct transfer will be continuously necessary to support the population that is not ready to benefit from the repatriation program.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Household questionnaire

Team number: |__| 1-7 (1 digit only)
Enumerator number: |__|__| 01-19 (2 digits)
Block number: |__|__| 01-19 (2 digits)
Day of interview: |__| 1-4 (1 digit)
Interview number: |__|__| 01-19 (2 digits)
Household key (from above fields) |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|

Guidance for introducing yourself and the purpose of the interview:

- My name is _____ and I am doing some survey work for WFP and UNHCR.
- Your household has been selected by chance from all households in the area for this interview. The purpose of this interview is to obtain information on the effects of the WFP and UNHCR programs in the cmap. It helps us understand whether we are implementing our program properly and whether our intended objectives are met.
- The survey is voluntary and the information that you give will be confidential. The information will be used to prepare reports, but neither your, nor any other names, will be mentioned in any reports. There will be no way to identify that you gave this information.
- Could you please spare some time (around 40 minutes) for the interview?

**NB to enumerator:** DO NOT suggest in any way that household entitlements could depend on the outcome of the interview, as this will prejudice the answers.

Respondent should be household head or spouse of household head.
Section A: Household Demographics

A1 Name of Respondent (for record only): _______________________________

A2 Sex of Head of Household
\[1 = \text{Male} \quad 2 = \text{Female}\]

A3 Age of Head of Household
\[\text{Age in years: } [____] \]

A4 Marital status of Head of household.
\[1 = \text{Married (and living together)} \quad 2 = \text{Partner, not married} \quad 3 = \text{Divorced} \quad 4 = \text{Living apart, not divorced} \quad 5 = \text{Widow or widower} \quad 6 = \text{Never married}\]

A5 Can the Head/Spouse read a simple message in any language?
\[1 = \text{Yes} \quad 2 = \text{No} \quad 3 = \text{No spouse}\]

A6 Total Number of People Living in the Household
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6-17</th>
<th>18-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
<td>[____]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A7 What is the level of education of the household members?
For 3rd and 4th member – only if applicable
\[\text{Household head} \quad \text{Spouse} \quad \text{3rd adult member} \quad \text{4th adult member}\]

Codes for A6
\[1 = \text{Nothing} \quad 2 = \text{Lower primary (Grade 1-4)} \quad 3 = \text{Upper primary (Grade 5-7)} \quad 4 = \text{Junior Secondary (Grade 8-10)} \quad 5 = \text{Senior Secondary (Grade 11-12)} \quad 6 = \text{Higher education (University, college etc)}\]

A8 How many orphans (below the age of 18) are living in your household? [____]

A9 How many members of your HH are living outside the camp? IF 0, skip A10 [____]

A10 What are the three main reasons they are living outside the camp?
A. [____] B. [____] C. [____]
\[1 = \text{School} \quad 2 = \text{Work} \quad 3 = \text{Health} \quad 88 = \text{Other (specify)} \quad 98 = \text{No more reason}\]

A11 How many of your household members have been chronically ill and unable to work for at least 3 of the last 12 months? [____]

A12 Has your household received the new ration card from 2007? I = Yes 2 = No

B. Household Circumstances

B1 What is your country of origin?
\[1 = \text{Angola} \quad 2 = \text{DRC} \quad 3 = \text{Rwanda} \quad 4 = \text{Burundi} \quad 88 = \text{Other, specify}: \]

B2 When do you plan to return to your country of origin?
\[1 = \text{Never} \quad 2 = \text{Next 6 months} \quad 3 = \text{Next 6-12 months} \quad 4 = \text{Next 1-2 years} \quad 6 = \text{Don’t know}\]

B3 What are the three main reasons that prevent you from returning to your place of origin?
A. [____] B. [____] C. [____]
\[1 = \text{Insecurity/Political instability (including elections)} \quad 2 = \text{No land to cultivate in place of origin} \quad 3 = \text{Cannot find work/earn enough money there} \quad 4 = \text{Roads/bridges/infrastructure destroyed} \quad 88 = \text{Other reasons (specify)} \quad 98 = \text{No more reasons}\]

B4 How many times did you change your place of living in the past 3 years? [____]

B5 In which year did your household move to this current camp? Year [____]

B6 What is primary source of drinking water for your household?
\[1 = \text{Piped into dwelling, yard or plot} \quad 2 = \text{Public tap/neighbor house} \quad 3 = \text{Borehole with pump} \quad 4 = \text{Rain water}\]

B7 What kind of toilet facility does your household use?
\[1 = \text{Flush latrine} \quad 2 = \text{Traditional pit latrine} \quad 3 = \text{Open pit} \quad 4 = \text{None/bush/open space}\]
### B8
What is the primary source of lighting for this house?

1 = Solar electricity  
2 = Paraffin/Kerosene lamp  
3 = Candle  
4 = Firewood  
5 = Generator  
6 = Oil lamp  
7 = None

### B9
What is the primary source of cooking fuel for this household?

1 = Solar electricity  
2 = Wood  
3 = Charcoal  
4 = Gas  
5 = Kerosene/Paraffin  
6 = Dung

### B10
Are all of your children that are eligible for grade 10 and below attending school regularly?

A. Males:  
1 = Yes, 2 = No  
3 = No such children in HH

B. Females:  
1 = Yes, 2 = No  
3 = No such children in HH

### B11
If the males are not attending regularly, list the 3 main reasons:

A. |__|  B. |__|  C. |__|  D. Other:

1 = Illness  
2 = Has to work for food or money  
3 = Incapable of continuing  
4 = Help with HH work  
5 = Care for HH member  
6 = Could not obtain permit  
7 = Not interested in school  
8 = Hunger  
9 = Expensive/no money  
10 = Pregnancy  
11 = Marriage  
98 = Other (specify)

### B12
Are all of your children that are eligible for grade 11 and 12 attending school regularly?

A. Males:  
1 = Yes, 2 = No  
B. Females:  
1 = Yes, 2 = No

### B13
If the males are not attending regularly, list the 3 main reasons:

A. |__|  B. |__|  C. |__|  D. Other:

1 = Illness  
2 = Has to work for food or money  
3 = Incapable of continuing  
4 = Help with HH work  
5 = Care for HH member  
6 = Could not obtain permit  
7 = Not interested in school  
8 = Hunger  
9 = Expensive/no money  
10 = Pregnancy  
11 = Marriage  
98 = Other (specify)

### B14
Are you receiving any school bursaries for your children?  
Enter number of children receiving bursaries

A. Grade 1-10  
B. Grade 11-12

### Section C. Household expenditures (not business-related expenditures) and debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, tools, seeds, fertilizers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals (maize, millet, sorghum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relishes (e.g. legumes, veg, meat, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condiments (salt, pepper, spice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing, shoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking/lighting fuel (Charcoal, kerosene etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene articles - Soap, sanitary supplies etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt repayment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring of labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C2
During the past 3 months, did you or any member of your HH borrow money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No (skip to Section D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### C3
What was the primary reason for borrowing?

- 1 = to buy food
- 2 = pay for health care
- 3 = pay for funeral
- 4 = pay for social event
- 5 = buy agricultural inputs
- 6 = pay for education
- 7 = to start a business
- 8 = Other (specify)

### C4
From whom did you borrow? (primary source)

- 1 = friend/relative
- 2 = money lender
- 3 = bank/formal lending institution
- 4 = informal savings group
- 8 = Other (specify)

### D. Household income and agricultural production

#### D1.
During the past year, what were your household’s most important sources of income? (use activity code, up to 3 activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income source codes (for above):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = Remittance (external)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = Trade with other towns/countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 = Casual labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 = Brewhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 = Wage labour/employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 = Begging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 = No more sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D2.
Using proportional piles or ‘divide the pie’ methods, please estimate the relative contribution to total income of each source (%)

#### D3.
Does this income source mainly related to activities performed within or outside the camp? 1 = within 2 = outside

#### D4.
Please indicate the three activities you would like to do in the future to earn more income (existing or new activities). Use the income source codes above.

#### D5.
Please indicate the primary support you would need to develop these activities. See codes above

#### D6.
How many members of your household are involved in formal employment?

### D7
Excluding vegetable gardening, how much land DID you cultivate LAST season (Nov 06 – Oct 07)? Imagine the plot as being rectangular in (steps X steps), indicate the number of steps

### D8
Do you have a vegetable garden?

### D9
By order of importance, what are the main crops cultivated by your household last year (November 2006 to October 2007)? Enter code for up to 3 main crops from list below, including crops from both vegetable gardening and other land.

#### A. Main crop

- 5 = Beans

#### B. Second crop

- 9 = Tobacco

#### C. Third crop

- 13 = Irish Potatoes
| 1 = Maize | 6 = Sweet Potatoes | 10 = Sugar Cane | 88 = Other |
| 2 = Sorghum | 7 = Vegetables (e.g. spinach, tomatoes, cabbage) | 11 = Pumpkins | 98 = No other crop |
| 3 = Millet | 8 = Pulses/Legumes | 12 = paprika/peppers |
| 4 = Wheat (Mahaingu) | |

### D10
How many kg (shelled) of these main crops did you harvest last season? (ask for bags and convert to kg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop 1</th>
<th>kg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop 2</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop 3</td>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D11
If you do not have a vegetable garden, what are the three main reasons?

A. [ ]
B. [ ]
C. [ ]

D11a.
If you do not have a vegetable garden, what are the three main reasons?

1 = No money for seeds
2 = No land
3 = Lack of water
4 = Don’t need a garden
5 = No one to take care of it
6 = No access to tools
88 = Other

### D10b.
Crop 2: [ ] kg

### D10c.
Crop 3: [ ] kg

### D12
What are the three main reasons that prevent you from producing more food for your household?

A. [ ]
B. [ ]
C. [ ]

1 = Limited access to land
2 = Poor quality of land
3 = Land is too far away
4 = Lack of agricultural inputs
5 = Lack of knowledge
6 = Conflict with local community
7 = No access to exit permits
8 = Health reasons
9 = Lack of transportation means
10 = Do not want to work
11 = No market to sell produce
88 = Other (specify)

### E. Household assets and livestock

#### E1
How many of the following assets are owned by you or any member of your household? If a specific asset is not owned, enter ‘0’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-productive Assets</th>
<th>Productive &amp; Transport Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chair</td>
<td>6. Axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Table</td>
<td>7. Sickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TV</td>
<td>9. Mortar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Radio</td>
<td>10. Hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mobile phones</td>
<td>11. Ox Cart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Harrow</td>
<td>15. Plough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E2
How many of the following animals do your household own?

1. Draught cattle [ ]
2. Cattle [ ]
3. Donkeys/Horses [ ]
4. Sheep/goats [ ]
5. Pigs [ ]
6. Poultry [ ]

#### E3
What are the three main constraints that you face in raising livestock and animal production?

A. [ ]
B. [ ]
C. [ ]

1 = No money to buy livestock
2 = No access to grazing land
3 = Not allowed
4 = No money to hire labour (Shepard etc)
5 = No space to shelter animals
6 = Too far to grazing land
7 = Conflict with local community
8 = Lack of knowledge
9 = Lack of inputs (fodder etc)
10 = No market to sell produce
11 = Not enough security (animals will be stolen)
88 = Other (specify)
F. Food Consumption

Please fill out the table below, one food item at a time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of days (0 to 7)</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Seasonality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maize, maize porridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other cereal (rice, sorghum, millet, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Roots and Tubers (cassava, potatoes, sweet potatoes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sugar or sugar products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beans and peas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Groundnuts and cashew nuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vegetables (including relish and leaves)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fruits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Beef, goat, or other red meat and pork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Poultry and eggs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Oils/fats/butter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Milk/yogurt/other dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CSB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source codes for F2:
1 = From own production
2 = Hunting, trapping
4 = Purchase
5 = Borrowed
6 = Exchange labour for food
7 = Gift
8 = Food aid
9 = Barter
88 = Other

Source codes for F3:
1 : Jan - March
2: Apr - June
3 = Jul - Sept
4 = Oct- Dec
5 = Continuous

G. Coping strategies

In the past 30 days, how frequently did your household resort to using one or more of the following strategies in order to have access to food?

CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER PER STRATEGY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1</th>
<th>Skip entire days without eating?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G2</th>
<th>Limit portion size at mealtimes!</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Reduce number of meals eaten per day?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G4</th>
<th>Borrow food or rely on help from friends or relatives?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G5</th>
<th>Rely on less expensive or less preferred foods?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G6</th>
<th>Purchase/borrow food on credit?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G7</th>
<th>Gather unusual types or amounts of wild food / hunt?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G8</th>
<th>Harvest immature crops (e.g. green maize)?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G9</th>
<th>Send household members to eat elsewhere?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G10</th>
<th>Send household members to beg?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G11</th>
<th>Reduce adult consumption so children can eat?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G12</th>
<th>Rely on casual labour for food?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom (1-3 days/month)</th>
<th>Sometimes (1-2 days/week)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days a week)</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### H. Food assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H1</th>
<th>Did your household receive food aid at any time during the last 3 months?</th>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>When in the past 3 months did your HH receive food ration? (Ask for each individual month, circle all that apply)</td>
<td>1 = January 2008</td>
<td>2 = December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>If you have not received a food ration during any of these 3 months, what is the main reason? GO TO SECTION I AFTER THIS QUESTION</td>
<td>1 = Absent during distribution</td>
<td>2 = Am not registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>What was the sex of the recipient who went and collected your most recent food ration?</td>
<td>1 = Male</td>
<td>2 = Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>When did you receive your most recent food ration? (Specify exact date in January)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>What commodities did you receive in your most recent household ration? (Circle all that apply)</td>
<td>1 = Cereals</td>
<td>2 = Pulses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>What quantities remain of the commodities you received in your most recent household ration? (kg, litres etc)</td>
<td>1 = Cereals</td>
<td>2 = Pulses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Usage of commodities

**LAST MONTH:** For each of the commodities, please indicate how they were used (consumed, sold, bartered, or given away), by using the proportional piling method to estimate a percentage for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H8</th>
<th></th>
<th>A. During the last month, what percentage did you consume</th>
<th>B. During the last month, what percentage did you sell?</th>
<th>C. During the last month, what percentage did you barter away?</th>
<th>D. During the last month, what percentage did you give away?</th>
<th>E. During the last month, what percentage was spent on other use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Cereals</td>
<td>2 = Pulses</td>
<td>3 = Oil</td>
<td>4 = CSB</td>
<td>5 = Sugar</td>
<td>6 = Salt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Non-Food assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I1</th>
<th>What “consumable” NFIs has your household received during the last 3 months? (Circle all that apply)</th>
<th>1 = Soap</th>
<th>2 = Sanitary supplies</th>
<th>3 = Cooking fuel (paraffin/kerosene)</th>
<th>4 = Health supplies</th>
<th>5 = Condoms</th>
<th>6 = Education supplies</th>
<th>88 = other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>What “non-consumable” NFIs has your household received during the last 6 months? (Circle all that apply)</td>
<td>1 = Mattress</td>
<td>2 = Blanket</td>
<td>3 = Plastic sheeting</td>
<td>4 = Tent</td>
<td>5 = Building materials</td>
<td>6 = Kitchen set</td>
<td>7 = Jerrycan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>What is your main source for the following NFIs?</td>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>Sanitary supplies</td>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes for H3:** 1 = UNHCR/AHA distribution, 2 = Government, 3 = NGOs, 4 = Church organization, 5 = Market purchase, 6 = Barter for it, 7 = collect from fields, 8 = Gifts, 9 = Health center 88 = Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I4</th>
<th>Which NFI is the one you most urgently need more of?</th>
<th>Consumables</th>
<th>Non-consumables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codes for I4:** Same as in I1 and I2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I5</th>
<th>What are the three main constraints faced by your household in acquiring enough firewood?</th>
<th>1 = Scarcity in the fields</th>
<th>2 = Don't exist in the camp</th>
<th>3 = Too expensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>4 = Too far to go and collect</td>
<td>5 = No exit permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = Illegal to collect firewood</td>
<td>88=Other (specify)</td>
<td>6 = Security reasons when collecting firewood</td>
<td>98 = No more constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J1</th>
<th>How often do members of your household leave the camp?</th>
<th>1= Daily</th>
<th>2= Every week</th>
<th>3= Every month</th>
<th>4= Only occasionally</th>
<th>5 = Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J2</th>
<th>What are the three main reasons that make members of the household leave the camp?</th>
<th>1 = To collect firewood</th>
<th>2 = Casual labour on surrounding farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>3 = For formal employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = To sell agricultural produce</td>
<td>6 = To work on land outside camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = Trade with other areas</td>
<td>8 = To sell animal/livestock production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 = For social reasons</td>
<td>10 = Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 = Other (specify)</td>
<td>98 = No more reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J3</th>
<th>What are the three main reasons that prevent you from leaving the camp more often?</th>
<th>1 = Issuance of permits</th>
<th>2= Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>3 = No need to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 = Other (Specify)</td>
<td>98 = Nothing/No more reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Nutrition and health questionnaire

Maternal Health and Nutrition

Mother's name________________

• How old are you? [__|__|] (Note: must be between 15 and 49 years old)

• What is the highest level of education you have attained?
  1 = None  2 = Primary, incomplete  3 = Primary, complete  4 = Secondary or higher

• Are you currently pregnant or breastfeeding? (circle one)
  1 = pregnant  2 = breastfeeding  3 = neither  4 = both  5 = don’t know

• How many times have you been pregnant? [__|__|]

• How many living children have you given birth to? [__|__|]

• How old were you with your first live birth? [__|__|]

• In the past 2 weeks have you been ill with:
  o Diarrhoea? YES………………1  NO………………2
  o Fever? YES………………1  NO………………2

• Do you wash your hands after visiting the toilet?
  o YES………………1  NO………………2

• If yes, what do you use to wash your hands?
  1 = water only  2 = ash & water  3 = washing soap & water  4 = nothing

Mother's weight (in kilograms) [__|__|.|__|]

Mother's height (in centimetres) [__|__|.|__|.|__|.|__]|
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Child’s name ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Date of birth (check birth record if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Child’s age in months (this is for verification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Child gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>When you were pregnant with [NAME], did you see anyone for antenatal care for this pregnancy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If YES, whom did you see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECORD ALL PERSONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>When you were pregnant with [NAME] were you given an injection in the arm to prevent the baby from getting convulsions after birth? <em>(anti-tetanus shot – an injection at the top of the arm or shoulder)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>When [NAME] was born, was he/she: Very large, Larger than normal, Normal, Smaller than normal, or Very small?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>Was [NAME] ever breastfed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>Is [NAME] still being breastfed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>ONLY if 6 - 24 months</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Since this time yesterday, did [NAME] receive any of the following? <em>(circle all that apply)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>Has [NAME] ever received a vitamin A capsule <em>(supplement)</em> in the past 6 months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Has [NAME] been ill with a fever at any time in the past 2 weeks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>Has [NAME] been ill with a cough at any time in the past 2 weeks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | When [NAME] had the cough, did he/she breathe faster than usual with short, rapid breaths? | Yes…………………1  
No…………………2  
Don’t know………9 |
| 15 | Has [NAME] been ill with diarrhoea in the past 2 weeks?                  | Yes…………………1  
No…………………2  
Don’t know………9 |
|    | (Diarrhoea: perceived by mother as 3 or more loose stools per day or one large watery stool or blood in stool) |                         |
| 16 | Has (NAME) ever visited the supplementary feeding center?                | Yes…………………1  
No…………………2 |
| 17 | For how long?                                                            | Less than on month…..1  
One month………2  
1-2 months……3  
More than two months….4  
Don’t know…..9 |
| 18 | In the 6 months following the stay at the supplementary feeding center, was the child readmitted? | Yes…………………1  
No…………………2 |
| 19 | Child weight – Enter weight in kilograms, with one decimal place.        |                         |
| 20 | Child height/length (in centimetres, with 1 decimal place)               |                         |
Appendix 3: Food Consumption Score

**Definition:** The frequency weighted diet diversity score or “Food consumption score” is a score calculated using the frequency of consumption of different food groups consumed by a household during the 7 days before the survey.

**Data collection module:**

I. See attached household questionnaire (section F. Food Consumption)

**Calculation steps:**

II. Using the data collected from the household questionnaire, group all the food items into specific food groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD ITEMS (examples)</th>
<th>Food groups (definitive)</th>
<th>Weight (definitive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maize, maize porridge, rice, sorghum, millet pasta, bread and other cereals</td>
<td>Main staples</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cassava, potatoes and sweet potatoes, other tubers, plantains</td>
<td>Pulses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Beans, peas, groundnuts and cashew nuts</td>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Vegetables, leaves</td>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fruits</td>
<td>Meat and fish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Beef, goat, poultry, pork, eggs and fish</td>
<td>Milk and other diary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Milk, yogurt and other dairy</td>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sugar and sugar products, honey</td>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oils, fats and butter</td>
<td>Oil</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Spices, tea, coffee, salt, fish power, small amounts of milk for tea.</td>
<td>Condiments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Corn Soya Blend</td>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Sum all the values for each of the food groups, and multiply the value obtained for each food group by its weight (see weights in table above).

IV. Sum the weighed food group scores together, thus creating the food consumption score (FCS).

V. Using the appropriate thresholds (see below), group the food consumption scores into categories.

Once the food consumption score is calculated, the context-specific thresholds are determined based on the knowledge of the consumption behavior in each country. In Southern Africa, WFP has used the following thresholds through 4 years of data collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FCS Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-21 Poor consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5-35 Borderline consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 35 Acceptable consumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, a household with a score below 21 is categorized as having poor consumption, between 21.5 and 35 as borderline, and above 35 as acceptable. For more information, validation of the indicator as a proxy of food security, and discussion of these thresholds, please refer to the Food Consumption Score Technical Guidance Sheet, WFP Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Branch (January 2008).
Appendix 4: Food Access Score

The food access score was a combination of the following four measures. For each measure, every household surveyed was rated as having poor, average, or good access.

I. Purchase as a source of food:
The first food access indicator is the percentage of food sourced from the market. 65% of households do purchase food, and over 30% purchase more than 20% of their food in the market, with Congolese households purchasing slightly more than Angolans. Hence, we chose to classify households with no market purchased food as having poor access, those that purchase between 0 and 20% of their food in market as having average access, and those that purchase more than 20% of total food consumed as having good access.

II. Human skills:
Education is an important part of a household’s social capital, is closely linked to food security, and is an important proxy indicator of the ability to access food. In addition, education is a critical factor distinguishing the livelihood strategy options of the poor from those who are better off (see table X). HHs with nothing/primary education were classified as having poor access, upper primary/junior secondary as average, and good access as having finished at least senior secondary school.

III. Monthly per capita total expenditure:
Expenditures are normally underreported, and logical thresholds are therefore difficult to establish. Instead of deriving complicated thresholds, the upper third of the population in terms of monthly per capita total expenditure were categorized as good, the lower third as poor and the rest average. Analysis of mean per capita expenditure by household country of origin show that Congolese, on average, spend about twice as much as Angolans. However, expenditure figures are highly influenced by a small number of households with very high costs, especially for schooling and clothing.

IV. Assets ownership:
Given the limited role of agriculture in Osire camp, productive assets do not play an important role in determining food access. The ownership of non-productive assets is however closely related to income generation ability and therefore non-productive assets are important indicators of a household’s socio-economic status. Many refugees own cell phones (55%), radios (30%), and TVs (20%). Households that own 4 or more of the assets listed in the survey were classified as having good access, 2-3 assets as medium, and 0-1 assets as poor.

Creating a consolidated access indicator:
The four access indicators listed above were validated through a statistical analysis that confirmed their significant correlation with the FCS. The access indicators were then consolidated into one overall access indicator, which combines the previous classifications for education, food purchasing ability, monthly per capita expenditure, and asset wealth. As explained above, each household was rated as having good, average, or poor access to each of the four single access indicators. These ratings were then converted to scores (poor = 1, average = 2, and good = 3) and the four scores summed in one total score that ranges from a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 12 for each household. Logical cut-offs were then chosen to divide this score into one consolidated classification of poor (4-6), average (7-9) and good (10-12) overall access to food. In this way, a household will always be classified in the category which it indicates the most number of times. In addition, a household that scores poor twice and medium twice on the single indicators is classified as having poor food access (score of 6), while household that scores twice medium and twice good is classified as having good food access (score of 10).

---

11 In this survey, non-productive assets asked for included chair, table, bed, radio, cell phone and TV.
Appendix 5: Food Security classification framework: Flowchart depicting the process of assigning households to a food security group based upon their Food Consumption Score and Food Access Score.
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Appendix 7: Terms of Reference

I) Background:

1. As a result of the prolonged civil war in Angola, some 23,000 Angolans fled to Namibia during the period of 1999 to 2002. However, new arrivals reduced significantly in 2002 mainly due to peace developments in Angola after the death of UNITA leader in February 2002.

2. The Office of the Prime Minister of the Government of Namibia made an official appeal to WFP for the provision of food to Angolan refugees in December 1999. WFP approved Emergency Operation 6206.00 to assist 7,500 beneficiaries with 751 Mt of food assistance on 10 January 2000. Refugees were based in Osire camp designated by the Government in central Namibia.

3. As the numbers of refugees increased, the total tonnage was revised upward to 951 Mt in June 2000 and then again to 1,399 Mt under Emergency Operation 6206.01 to assist an average of 14,000 beneficiaries for the period 01 August 2000 to 31 January 2001. Following further increases in numbers, in January 2002 WFP approved Emergency Operation 10145.0 to distribute 5,006 Mt of food to 23,000 beneficiaries for the period of Jan – December 2002 which was then extended until 30 April 2003. EMOP 10145.1 was then approved to continue the operation from 01 May 2003 to 30 April 2004 for some 16,000 beneficiaries, a number which took into account the planned voluntary repatriation programme.

4. In addition, there was and still is a continuing influx of small numbers of refugees from DRC, Rwanda, Burundi, and other countries due to the unfavourable political and humanitarian situations in their respective countries.

5. In September 2002, UNHCR signed a Tripartite Agreement with the governments of Namibia and Angola to voluntarily repatriate the Angolan refugees in 2003 and 2004 with a view to repatriate about 7,000 persons in 2003 and those remaining in 2004. Returning refugees were provided with a return package in Angola under WFP Angola PRRO 10054.1. A transit camp for arriving/returning refugees was established in Kassava in northern Namibia.

6. The voluntary repatriation programme with assisted returns for Angolan refugees was extended by UNHCR until December 2005 by which time there was a residual caseload of some 4,666 Angolan refugees and 1,540 non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees totalling some 6,206 registered as resident in Osire.

7. Nevertheless, despite a significant number of refugees also returning informally, over 4,000 Angolans did not take this option; at the same time, the camp continued to receive a small number of refugees and asylum seekers from the Great Lakes region. The organized repatriation programme effectively came to an end in December 2005.

8. The remaining registered camp-based population, as of end -2006, was approximately 6,500, including Angolan and non-Angolan refugees and asylum seekers of whom some 6,000 were receiving food assistance. As the numbers dwindled, the Kassava transit centre was closed in 2005 and is not being used at the moment. All refugees who were residing there have repatriated.

9. WFP carried out a number of budget revisions to the EMOP 10145.1, extending assistance to the remaining caseload of about 6,000 beneficiaries through to the end of 2006.

10. In April 2006, the first UNHCR/WFP joint assessment mission (JAM) was conducted in Osire camp. The report concluded that refugees and asylum seekers at Osire camp are food secure only due to the regular food assistance from WFP and that in the event of termination of food assistance, refugees and asylum seekers’ nutritional status will deteriorate in a matter of months. WFP provides food rations through monthly food distributions and a supplementary feeding programme to moderately malnourished and chronically ill children below five. The assessment also confirmed that, stemming from a strict confinement policy in place, refugees and asylum seekers remain highly vulnerable, with no official access to arable land and limited access to labour markets, while students have also only limited access to education (grades 11 and 12) outside the camp due to financial constraints and difficulties in obtaining study permits on time. These findings were confirmed during the UNHCR Participatory Assessments – part of the Age, Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) process, held in September 2006 and again in September 2007. Many participants made the lack of freedom of movement responsible for their dependency on aid.

11. One of the key recommendations of the 2006 UNHCR/WFP joint assessment mission was that both UNHCR and WFP plan for the continuation of protection, care and maintenance and food assistance respectively. Despite plans to move from care and maintenance to a more assertive search for durable solutions, this cannot happen overnight and any reduction in food and non food support would see a rapid deterioration in health, water, sanitation and other key physical and material protection areas.

II) Current Situation

12. The Government of Namibia, through the Ministry of Home Affairs, is responsible for refugee assistance in the country, including the granting of refugee status, and for the provision of shelter and related assistance. The Government of Namibia has ratified the UN Convention of 1951 and the 1967 Protocol related to the status of refugees. It has, however, made a reservation to Article 26 on the freedom of movement, which up to date remains in force. While the GRN has not signed on to the 1969 OAU Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugees in Africa, it has incorporated the provisions of this Convention in the Namibian Refugees (Recognition and Control) Act No. 2, dated 1999. Since 2003, Angolan refugees are no longer given prono facie refugee status in Namibia, while non-Angolans are considered as asylum seekers until the Namibian Government decides on their requests on a case-by-case basis.

13. The Government of Namibia provides land in Osire for a refugee camp settlement, including small-sized kitchen gardens which are by far insufficient to meet the refugees’ basic daily nutritional needs. It is compulsory for refugees to reside in the camp and the extreme difficulty in obtaining a permit to work outside substantially limits the economic integration of the refugee population into the Namibian economy. Lack of funds for refugee scholarships limits their education beyond primary and junior secondary levels. Opportunities for increasing the self-reliance of the refugees are limited.
14. At present, the Government has an encampment policy and refugees require a permit to leave the Osire camp. Self-reliance initiatives are being encouraged and a few refugees (about 20 business groups comprising some 50 persons) have been given micro-project loans. Free access to the local market is slow though because of trade/legal restrictions, which the GRN mainly attributes to the high unemployment rate of around 38%. The rules are expected to be relaxed under the local integration legal framework, for which UNHCR has commissioned a study by the Legal Assistance Centre to explore legal options and restrictions in relation to local integration of refugees. However, the majority of refugees are still totally dependent on food and non-food assistance from UNHCR and WFP.

15. The GRN has the primary responsibility for the protection and care of refugees and asylum-seekers in Namibia. UNHCR, together with its partners, is assisting the GRN by providing refugees and asylum seekers with non-food items, such as shelter materials, tools required to build pit latrines, kitchen utensils, sanitary materials for girls and women, blankets, mattresses, jelly cans, paraffin and soap.

16. Current WFP assistance is based on a Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) 10543.0 “Assistance to refugees and asylum seekers residing in camp in Namibia” (see Annex II) originally covering the period 01 January 2007 – 30 December 2007 for an average caseload of 6,000 refugees and asylum seekers residing in the camp. In view of the slow progress in identifying durable solutions and the positive donor response, the project was extended through to the end of 2008 – Budget Revision (BR) 0.

17. In February 2007, a re-registration and socio-economic profiling exercise of the beneficiaries took place in the Osire camp including collection of biometric data. Special refugee ID cards are being issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs and Immigration, using biometric data collected. So far, over 3,000 refugee ID cards have been issued and this activity is ongoing. All asylum-seekers who have registered with the GRN and UNHCR up to June 2007 have already been issued asylum-seeker certificates, which are valid for a period of six months and are renewable. This exercise is widely seen as a positive step taken by GRN in its efforts to identify durable solutions such as local integration for the refugees.

18. The registration exercise revealed that there are over 600 persons residing in the camp who are not registered with either the GRN or UNHCR, representing around 10% of the total camp population. In order to record their number and profile, these people were registered as Not Of Concern (NOT) with the intention of considering their situation afterwards on a case-by-case basis. Most of them are Angolans who have arrived after the GRN had stopped registering them in 2003. Lacking any other means of subsistence, most of them benefit from sharing food and NFIs given to the registered population, which may reduce intended impact.

19. A number of ration card exchange exercises have taken place over the years with the most recent held in August 2007. Despite major improvements following the registration and verification exercise, determining the precise number of refugees and asylum seekers resident in the camps, and the elimination of duplicate ration cards remains an issue to be on the lookout for effective commodity procurement and programme implementation.

20. In July 2007, a nutritional survey was carried out by Ministry of Health and Social Services (MOHSS) and AHA. The main findings show that malnourishment levels are moderate and that additional education of mothers is required.

21. In July 2007, a sample survey on skills, livelihoods and coping mechanisms of refugees and asylum-seekers was carried out by NEPRU (Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit) on behalf of UNHCR. The full report is yet to be submitted by NEPRU. However, one of the main findings was that there are some refugees with skills required to fill the gap in the Namibian labour market.

22. The most recent, September 2007 feeding figure was 6,140 refugees and asylum seekers.

III) Objectives

23. This JAEM will specifically assess, review and evaluate the aspects of the operation/s listed below and make clear strategic recommendations for future support by all concerned agencies. There will be a clear focus on: i) assessment of the current food security and livelihood of the Angolan refugees and non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees; ii) evaluation of the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, as well as efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the ongoing delivery of both WFP food assistance under PRRO10543.0 and UNHCR protection, care and maintenance of refugees under 08/AB/NAM/CM/200 and any other assistance provided to the Angolan refugees and non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees; iii) provision of clear recommendations on ways to improve future delivery of both food and non-food assistance with a view to support the identification of durable solutions for the chronic caseload.

III i. Assessment of the current food security and livelihood of the Angolan refugees and non-Angolan asylum seekers/refugees resident in Osire camp, at the household level taking into account the state of and existing links between relevant factors such as:

24. Land availability and cultivation opportunities; food availability; access to markets, income-generating and employment opportunities, and existing levels of reliance on external aid (food and non-food).

25. Food assistance being provided through WFP general and selective feeding programmes including coverage, with a view to better understand major factors related to infant and young child feeding as well as pregnant and lactating women.

26. Non-food assistance to refugees in terms of availability of water and sanitation, cooking utensils, soap, fuel and other non-food items.

27. Health and nutrition indicators including malnutrition and mortality rates, as well as major causes of morbidity and mortality among the refugees.

28. Food and nutritional support being provided to people living with HIV/AIDS, including support given to HIV positive pregnant women, as well as other chronically ill people.
29. The extent to which women are involved in income-generating activities and their involvement in the management of food and non-food support at the planning, distribution, collection and household levels.

30. The education programme and its overall impact in the refugee camp. Gender parity and reason for low enrolment of girls, if it is the case.

31. The co-ordination arrangements in place for the general management of the operation and the distribution of food and non-food items between UN agencies, NGO partners, GRN, the Refugee Committee, both at the camp and Windhoek level.

32. Number of refugees and asylum seekers registered as resident in Osire camp, the reliability and efficiency of the beneficiary re-registration, socio-economic profiling, ration card exchange, refugee status determination exercises and the processing of the asylum seekers claims that have been carried out in recent years, and estimate the projected caseload in need of food assistance in 2008 and beyond, taking into account future potential for; self-sufficiency among certain groups; any plans for organized voluntary repatriation; spontaneous resettlement; and local integration.

III ii. Evaluation of the ongoing delivery of both WFP food assistance under the PRRO 10543.0 and UNHCR non-food assistance under project 08/AB/NAM/CM/200 (Protection, Care & Maintenance of Refugees in Namibia), using the following criteria as well as examples of key issues and questions to be used:

33. Relevance (the extent to which the objectives of the operation are consistent with beneficiaries’ needs, country needs, organisational priorities, and partners’ and donors’ policies).

34. Preparation and design (the process by which the operation was identified and formulated; and the logic and completeness of the resulting design).

35. Adequacy (the adequacy of inputs in relation to the carrying out of the activities, including an assessment of the food basket).

36. Timeliness (the timeliness with which inputs are converted into outputs and outputs are converted into outcomes).

37. Efficiency (how cost-efficiently inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into outputs).

38. Effectiveness (the extent to which the operation’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance).

39. Outcome (the medium-term results of operation’s outputs).

40. Impact (positive and negative intended or unintended long-term results produced by the prolonged assistance, either directly or indirectly).

41. Sustainability (the continuation of benefits from the operation in the event that major assistance would be completed).

42. Coverage and targeting (the appropriateness of operation-level targeting of objectives to the local situation), the objectives’ compliance with WFP/UNHCRs’ targeting objectives at the policy level, and the extent to which the planned coverage has been achieved.

43. Partnerships and coordination (the appropriateness of the partnerships that have been established with governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and agencies; the effectiveness with which those partnerships have been managed to support the achievement of objectives).

III iii. Provision of clear recommendations on ways to improve future delivery of both food and non-food assistance with a view to support the identification of durable solutions for the chronic caseload:

44. Informed by findings and conclusions from Sections III. i. and III. ii., the mission report should outline to the relevant stakeholders recommendations on how to improve performance vis-à-vis the objectives raised in section III. ii., thus informing the managers how best to direct the ongoing (but not limited to) WFP and UNHCR future intervention/s, with the key objective to improve the refugee food security and livelihoods assessed in Section III i.

45. Review the strategic approach, the efforts made so far as well future plans by all relevant stakeholders towards the identification of durable solutions for the caseload of refugees / asylum seekers resident in refugee camp, and provide recommendations for improvement.

46. The mission recommendations described in paragraph nr. 43 - 44 should be relevant, realistic, time-bound, innovative and helpful and should add value to the existing knowledge base that exists in the country.

IV) Methodology

Qualitative Methods:

47. Desk Reviews and Data Analysis: The mission will undertake a desk review of relevant programme documents, particularly project logical framework, surveys and reports as well as tabulate data including those collected by the mission itself.

48. Consultations:

48.1. Timeline: During the initial meetings with key informants and focus groups, a timeline of important events will be created, to help reconstruct events and explore the perceptions of different stakeholders regarding the sequence and importance of those events.

48.2. Key Informants: Data will be collected from interviews/meetings with key informants in WFP/UNHCR sub-offices, NGO partners, refugees including their leaders, Government Officials from the MHAI and other ministries and key donors and embassies.

48.3. Group Interviews, Focus Group Interviews: The mission will conduct discussions with a community group and representative gender and age subgroups (male, female, children and other vulnerable subgroups).

48.4. Other RRA/PRA techniques - Visual techniques, such as mapping, ranking and scoring, and verbal techniques, such as transect walks will also be applied.
49. **Observations/Inspections**: The mission will visit health, water and sanitation facilities, households, schools, income generating activities, and local markets in the camp. The mission will inspect extended delivery points (EDP), final distribution points (FDP) and storage facilities of food and non-food items, and where possible, the mission will also observe food and non-food distributions.

**Quantitative Methods:**

50. **Household Survey/Interviews**: Household interviews will be conducted collecting data including health and anthropometric (nutritional) data using questionnaires in a representative sample of respondents.

**IV) Outputs**

51. **Briefing** session outlining key findings (drawn from the draft executive summary of the report) to WFP, UNHCR, the GRN, key donors and other relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, before departure from the country, where applicable.

52. **JAEM mission report** presenting technically adequate analysis and relevant recommendations vis-à-vis the objectives outlined in section III, finalized within one month upon completing the mission.

53. The JAEM mission report must be evidence based, showing clearly how the evaluation team applied the methods and how the findings were arrived at. Findings must always be triangulated, i.e. supported by several different sources (e.g. key informant, beneficiary and direct observation). The report should contain a well-written, one-page Executive Summary, concisely and briefly outlining the background of the JAEM, current refugees state of affairs, main findings and recommendations of the mission.

**V) Itinerary (*** needs fleshing out)**

Day 1 – Arrive Windhoek, briefings WFP / UNHCR
Day 2 – Briefings with MHAI, Embassies, other key donors
Day 3 – Assessment Osire
Day 4 – Assessment Osire
Day 5 – Return Windhoek, debriefing, report preparation
Day 6 – Brief Govt / Donors, report writing
Day 7 – Report writing (1st draft report submitted), depart Windhoek