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Executive summary

This report is a baseline survey for emergency livelihood through Cash for Work project targeting 2250, (75% women and 25% youth), 70% refugees and 30% host community beneficiaries implemented by Living Earth Uganda in partnership with UNDP, funded by central emergency response fund. The project is being implemented in Imvepi refugee settlement, covering zone 2 and 3 of refugee settlement and 4 parishes of Odupi sub county host communities in Arua and Palorinya refugee settlement zone 3 East and West of the settlement and 3 parishes of Itula sub county host communities in Moyo district. It details the background and purpose of the survey, the methodology employed, the findings and discussion, conclusions and recommendations. The overall project objective is to provide emergency livelihood support to 2,250 refugees and hosting community members in target areas.

The methodology; The PDM/evaluation survey was a cross-sectional that used mixed research approaches involving quantitative and qualitative methods. The survey adopted a 4 way mixed approach method of household interviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and observations to collect data

The findings shows a few socio-demographic characteristics to describe the target population in Arua and Moyo districts and results indicates that majority (59.5% and 77.3%) of the respondents were females for Arua and Moyo respectively while only 40.5% and 22.7% were for males in the two study areas. The households total monthly income indicated over eighty six (86.2% and 81.5%) percent for Arua and Moyo respectively earns less than 50,000 Uganda shillings per monthly and is possibly because majority of respondents were refugees with limited or no activities to generate income for the households. The most prominent major source of income by the respondents were Assistance from UN bodies and development partners (NGOs) as well as work/employment in both of the two districts however close to sixty (59.2%) percent were getting assistance from UN bodies and development partners (NGOs) similar to thirty four (34%) of the same in Moyo. When it came to subsistence work/small business sixty six (66%) percent were for Moyo compared to 29.6% for Arua. It was reported that on average across the two districts, seventy four (74%) percent of the households do not belong to any VSLA and over eighty six (86.9%) in Arua don’t belong to VSLA whereas it is sixty one (61%) percent of the households in Moyo district. They said that in refugee camps and host communities there is lack of what to save since there are limited income generating activities where they could earn money and save.

On cross cutting advocacy, only 19.9% of the respondents didn’t know about Causes of HIV/AIDS in Arua district. While in Moyo, it is over fifty seven (57.9%) percent of the respondents an evidence of HIV and AIDS high risk of transmission. Gender issues, there was evidence of close to twenty seven (26.6%) of the respondents experiencing gender based violence in their homes in Arua and in Moyo close to sixty five (64.7%) percent of the respondents had not experienced GBV in their homes compared to 35.3% of the respondents who had experienced gender based violence in their homes. The results indicate that 44.5% in Arua have been sensitized and only 11.5% of the respondents in Moyo. The respondents suggested the mitigating measures that includes, creating awareness in the community, empowering justice committees within the refugee settlement and host communities. First Aid results indicated that only 16% of the respondents had been trained about First Aid compared to 84% of the respondents that have not been sensitized about First Aid. In Moyo only 19.6% had been trained in Arua compared to 80.4% who indicated that they had not been trained on First Aid.

Lastly, the environmental challenges affecting the community results shows over eighty four (84.4%) percent of respondents in Arua compared to 67.5% in Moyo are affected by environmental challenges. They suggested tree planting along the roads, creating green belts within the settlement, conducting awareness campaign to community members, engaging the host community and encourage them to plant trees, promote distribution of free seedlings to people willing people interested to plant trees, enforce total burning of bricks in refugee settlement and host community. It was observed that in less than three years, the cost of firewood will be more than the cost of food due to failure to plan for tree planting.
1.0 Introduction
This report is a baseline survey for Emergency livelihood support project through cash for work to 2,250 vulnerable households in Arua and Moyo Districts, West Nile sub-region, an emergency livelihoods improvement support to refugees and host communities of Palorinya refugee settlement and Itula Sub-county, Moyo district and Imvepi refugee settlement and Odupi Sub County, Arua district. The five (5) months project is implemented by Living Earth Uganda in partnership with UNDP with funding from UN Central Emergency Response Fund. The project targets 2,250 beneficiaries, 75% female and 25% youth males, covering 70% refugees and 30% host communities. The study was conducted to establish and document benchmarks on socio-economic characteristic of the targeted beneficiaries on household income; livelihood/food security, savings, HIV/AIDS, gender, first aid and environment issues. This report is structured into four sections. These are Introduction and Background; Methodology; Findings; and Conclusions and Recommendations.

1.1 Background
Uganda has received an unprecedented influx of refugees since 2016 that by September 2017 the refugee population was nearly 1.35 million people. As of April 2018, a total of 1,462,886 refugees and asylum seekers are recorded in the country. Most of these refugees (1,061,892) came from South Sudan and are mainly settled in West Nile districts. Uganda has a progressive refugee protection policy, providing refugees with freedom of movement, the right to work and establish businesses, the right to documentation and access to national social services. The country pursues a non-camp settlement policy, by which refugees are allocated plots of land for shelter and agricultural production, stretching out over vast territories. However, the refugee caseload and new arrivals continues to put enormous pressure on the country’s resources, in particular on land, basic service delivery systems (including health, education, water and sanitation), the humanitarian partners’ capacity to respond to the crisis, and on the ability to maintain Uganda’s generous refugee policy. Acute needs remain in protection, food assistance, shelter, health and nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and emergency livelihoods.

To support the progressive Government policy, the UN and the World Bank developed the Refugee and host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) framework, a comprehensive strategy to
build the resilience and self-reliance of refugees as well as host communities. UNDP Emergency Response and Resilience Strategy for Refugees and Host Communities, based on the ReHoPE framework and in line with Uganda’s second National Development Plan and the Settlement Transformative Agenda, seeks to strengthen the resilience of refugees, host community members, district local government and relevant national institutions to cope with and recover from the impact of the large influx of refugees. The aim is to provide emergency support, while investing in existing national and local systems to ensure they can adequately serve both host and refugee communities.

1.2 Project Description
In 2018 UNDP received a CERF (Central Emergency Response Fund) grant to respond to life-saving livelihood needs of refugees and host communities. Through the CERF allocation, UNDP targeted to support 2,250 vulnerable households in Imvepi zone 2 and 3 refugee settlement and host communities covering 4 parishes of Odupi sub county in Arua and Palorinya, zone 3 East and West refugee settlement and 3 parishes of Ubbi, Parolinnya and Legu, Ttula sub county in Moyo districts, to provide non-farming livelihood support through cash for work. The two settlements were recognised as the most underserved in terms of livelihood support, among all settlements hosting South Sudanese refugees. The refugee population in Imvepi settlement has reached a total of 128,249 refugees, while Palorinya settlement currently hosts 163,322 refugees. Living Earth Uganda implemented the emergency livelihood through cash for work project. This project was for a period of 5 months, implemented between July and December, 2018. In this project, each beneficiary completed 30 days of cash for work activities in the period of 4 months, resulting in an average of 7.5 days worked per month, at the rate of US$ 4 per day in Arua and US$ 5 in Moyo district. The cash transfers were undertaken through mobile money to ensure the safety and transparency of the cash transfers because of minimising the physical movement of cash. Over the course of the project, each beneficiary received Uganda shillings 450,000 in Arua and 600,000 in Moyo district.

1.3 Overall project Objective:
To provide emergency livelihood support to 2,250 refugees and hosting community members in Palorinya refugee settlement and host communities of 3 parishes of Ttula sub county, Moyo
district, and Imvepi refugee settlement and host communities of Odupi sub county, Arua district, through cash for work activities.

1.4 Objectives of the Baseline Survey
The main objective of the baseline survey was to collect benchmark information regarding the status of household incomes, food security, savings, gender, HIV/AIDS, KAP on First Aid and environment concerns in the study areas of Moyo and Arua districts. The baseline survey sought to achieve the following specific objectives;

- Establish the socio-economic status of the program’s target beneficiaries.
- Undertake KAP survey on household’s incomes, VSLA, Livelihood/food security, gender, HIV/AIDS, First Aid and Environmental issues.
- Make recommendations for the project focus.
2.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overall Study Design

The survey was conducted as a cross-sectional study, employing a participatory approach utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. Qualitative and quantitative data was collected from both primary and secondary data sources. Quantitative methodology was used to determine baseline values, especially the socio-economic attributes of the sample population and levels of knowledge, attitudes and practices. The qualitative methods were employed to gain deeper understanding and explanations of the perceptions of the people, opinions and recommendations of stakeholders in relation to food security, household income, gender, HIV/AIDS, environment among others.

2.2 Study Areas

The study area comprised of Palorinya refugee settlement and Itula Sub-county in Moyo district and Imvepi refugee settlement, and Odupi Sub County, Arua district where cash for work project is being implemented.

2.3 Sample Determination and Selection

The respondents covered through household survey were sampled on the basis of the household population size of the targeted beneficiaries and overall the project targets 2,250 households from Palorinya refugee settlement and three (3) parishes of host communities of Itula sub-counties, Moyo and Imvepi refugee settlement and in four (4) parishes of host communities of Odupi Sub-county in Arua district. Given the importance of ensuring scientific representation of the sample so as to derive accurate results, the sample selection procedure hinged in the Raosoft\textsuperscript{1} sampling technique. The following questions guided the sampling technique that we used:

\textsuperscript{1}More detail about this technique can be accessed from http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html
What is our population?

How accurate do we need to be?

How big a sample do we need?

How responsive will people be?

Raosoft was our preferred choice of sampling for this study because it takes care of the above concerns which are critical in social surveys.

The sample size was thus determined with the following equation:

Equation: 

\[
 n = \frac{Z^2 pq}{d^2}
\]

Where:

- \( n \) refers to the desired sample size when the entire survey population is greater than 2500.
- \( Z \) is the standard normal deviate usually set at 1.96 which corresponds to the 95% confidence level.
- \( p \) is the proportion of characteristic of interest in the population and in this case it is the host communities and refugee settlement beneficiaries of the project; 50% is normally used because it is the recommended measure if there is lack of reasonable estimate.
- \( q = 1.0 - p \)
- \( d \) is the degree of accuracy desired; in this context set at 0.05.

The sample size of 334 respondents (Rs) was obtained by substituting in the above formula as indicated below:

\[
 n = \frac{Z^2 pq}{d^2}
\]

Substituting in the figures in the equation 

\[
 n = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.5(1.0 - 0.5)}{0.05^2}
\]

Note that 0.5 is used for the value of “p” because we do not empirically know the proportion of the population that is using RET.
\[ n = \frac{1.96^2 \times 0.25}{0.00025} = 334 \text{ households} \]

This number was scaled up by 10% to derive 368 households to cater for non-responses and also to reduce the margin of error. The reason is to have a valid and reliable respondents’ distribution.

The total sample size was proportionately distributed by district, by sub-county and by host community and refugee settlement based on the target beneficiary size.

### 2.4 Data Collection Techniques

The methods of data collection included:

1. Review of key project documents;
2. Focus group discussions with the direct project beneficiaries;
3. Household surveys with individual beneficiaries;
4. Observation of aspects such as farming practices, hygiene and sanitation

### 2.5 Data Collection Tools

The following data collection tools were used in the baseline survey:

- Household interview questionnaire
- Key informant interview guide for Project staff;
- Focus group discussions guide for project beneficiaries

#### 2.5.1 Instrument Pre-testing

All the data collection tools were pilot-tested in mini-survey on 20 non-sampled project beneficiaries in participating sub counties to ensure their validity and reliability. The content validity was analyzed by computation of the content validity index (CVI). The instrument was considered suitable if the CVI was 0.70 or higher. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The necessary changes were made to the data collection tools after the pilot.
2.5.2 Qualitative methods
Respondents for the key informant interviews were purposively selected. In-depth interviews using pre-determined checklists were conducted for key informant interviews. Key Informant interviews were conducted up to saturation point. The study team used a key informant interview guide to capture data on challenges faced by the beneficiaries, sustainability issues for the project. Key informants also had the opportunity to recommend areas and strategies for the project.

Group interviews were conducted using pre-determined checklists of questions on relevant topics with Local leaders up to saturation point. Observation of aspects such as household conditions of the beneficiaries was used for data collection.

Quantitative methods
The quantitative methods were used to assess the project benchmarks against which midterm and end of project evaluations will measure the project performance. The project objectives were used as a guide to ensure that all the benchmarks were captured quantitatively. A household assessment survey tool was used to capture data on the benchmarks and the challenges faced by the beneficiaries.

2.6 Data Management
The collected data was cross-checked for consistency and validity. The tools were checked every end of day to see if they were fully filled and call back suggested and implemented. The data collection tools had been developed with coded questions. This was followed by the data entry process whereby double data entry was done with the aid of the SPSS computer package.

Data cleaning was also done by crosschecking for any errors in data entry in the two data entry sheets with the aid of data analysis outputs. Computer data cleaning; editing and immediate storage with back-up copies was done on a daily basis. A random sample of the original completed questionnaires was compared with the computer print out to assess the accuracy of the entered data. Frequency distributions of all variables were generated. All the raw data forms were put in coded box files and securely kept to avoid losing them during the course of the survey.
2.7 Quantitative Data Analysis
Quantitative data analysis was carried out with the aid of SPSS computer software package. Outcomes were expressed as proportions and percentages. Simple proportions were generated as appropriate to describe the data. Data was then summarized and presented as tables, graphs, and pie charts in this report.

Qualitative Data Analysis
The investigators cross-checked all data received for completeness, validity, consistency and accuracy. Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data on the basis of emerging themes and sub-themes in line with the survey objectives. Participants’ responses were coded and typed in Microsoft Word 2007, and later proof-read. The data was then transferred to Nvivo Statistical package to aid analysis.

This qualitative data was analyzed by formulating tentative themes and sub-themes, which were continuously analyzed before, during and after data collection. Descriptive summaries and quotes were used. Trend analyses of the key informant interviews and Focus group discussions were useful for identifying the major issues for each of the study themes and sub-themes. This also facilitated comparisons and contrasts of participants’ views within and among the different sites.

2.8 Data Quality Control
The operations and quality assurance technical expert directly supervised the data collection, data entry and analysis. The research assistants underwent 1-day training in proper data collection techniques before they set out to work. They were instructed on how to administer all the data collection tools as well as on responsible conduct of research, with emphasis on research ethics. An extensive discussion of the questionnaires was done during training on question-by-question basis.

The questionnaires were also pre-tested on 20 individuals and accordingly modified to incorporate the changes. At the end of each data collection day, a de-briefing meeting was held between the data collectors and the consultants to discuss and resolve challenges that had been encountered during the data collection process.
2.9 Limitations of the survey
Consequently, a few (10%) of project beneficiaries who were interviewed did not complete all the questions- leading to termination of the interview.

2.10 Ethical Considerations
Before data collection began, due care was taken to ensure that informed consent was obtained from all respondents. The informed consent included explanations about the purpose and objectives of the survey, the benefits and risks that could accrue from the survey; the rights of the respondents, and reassurance on confidentiality. An opportunity was availed to each respondent to ask questions and / or seek further clarification.

Respondents were free to refuse to participate in the study and this did not affect their right to benefit from the project interventions or their relationship with the project staff. This survey had no explicit risks to the respondents, but its findings could inform processes for improving the project in case of replication or extension.

Unique identification numbers instead of names were indicated on the data collection tools. Confidentiality and integrity of all respondents was observed throughout the course of the survey. Key informants were not directly linked to the comments made during the project survey so as to give them freedom to express their views frankly and freely. They were interviewed in secluded places while in the field to ensure privacy and confidentiality. All data records were kept in box files for safety and confidentiality during data collection and analysis.

2.11 Baseline Findings

Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents
The study considered a few socio-demographic characteristics to describe the target population. The characteristics included age structure, gender, marital status, Household size and main sources of income.
Gender of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of respondents</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey sought to know the sex of respondents for both Arua and Moyo districts and results indicates that majority (59.5% and 77.3%) of the respondents were females for Arua and Moyo respectively while only 40.5% and 22.7% were for males in the two study areas as indicated above. More percentage of females than male counterparts was due to the fact that the project targeted 75% of women.

Marital status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey asked to know the marital status of respondents and findings indicates over seventy seven and slightly less than seventy percent (77.6% and 68.6%) for Arua and Moyo were married as shown in the table above. The rest were single, widowed and separated as shown in the table above.

Households Total monthly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50,000</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110,000-150,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160,000-200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study team sought to know households total monthly income and the results indicates that over eighty six (86.2% and 81.5%) percent for Arua and Moyo respectively earns less than 50,000 Uganda shillings per monthly and is possibly because majority of respondents were refugees with limited or no activities to generate income for the households. The rest of the distribution of total monthly income is shown in the table above.

**Major sources of income for the households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major source of income</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance from UN bodies and NGOs</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/employment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From friends and family members outside the settlement/parish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative copying mechanisms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most prominent major source of income by the respondents were Assistance from UN bodies and development partners (NGOs) as well as work/employment in both of the two districts however close to sixty (59.2%) percent were getting assistance from UN bodies and development partners (NGOs) similar to thirty four (34%) of the same in Moyo. When it came to subsistence work/small business sixty six (66%) percent were for Moyo compared to 29.6% for Arua. It is high in Moyo, this may be because of regular fishing on river Nile which is not in Arua and an evidence that the beneficiaries depend on hand outs from donors with no alternative income for self reliance. The details are shown in table above.
2.12 Food security

The survey considered two issues that included how many times household members ate in a day and the results are presented in table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of meals</th>
<th>Arua Frequency</th>
<th>Arua Percent</th>
<th>Moyo Frequency</th>
<th>Moyo Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One meal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two meals</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three meals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey wanted to know the number of meals households eat per day and were asked on how many meals did the household members eat including breakfast, lunch and dinner and the results indicates that majority (87% and 43%) of the households eat two meals a day followed by one meal a day while the least was three meals a day. The results reflects that majority of the respondents cannot afford three meals per day. The rest of the distribution per times of meals is shown in table above. During the cross sectional survey, it was observed that part of the Imvepi refugee settlement is situated on rocky terrain, this has contributed somewhat to the lower proportion of refugees households engaged in agricultural activities and their reduced capacity to act as sellers in the local market. Most refugees practice back yard gardening for growing vegetables for consumption on their small piece of land of fifty by fifty which is not enough to sustain a homestead.

“Food security is a major challenge, most especially to refugees who depend on food distribution rations, majority of them have just arrived, lost their little property which they had at home, it is difficult to find the jobs within the settlement to work and generate the income, no start up capital to do small business to enable us meet the basic subsistence essential needs like buying clothes, extra food and other provision needs that are required in the family and not provided by the UNHCR”, William Bakata, the chairman RWC 11, Zone 11.
“The refugees are limited with collateral to borrow, and start up small business as much as there is a big purchasing market most especially for household basic needs, There is a need to equip the refugees with skills to learn how to support themselves, how to generate income, and start small businesses” Dennis Mbaguta, camp commandant, OPM.

It was observed that among the beneficiaries, none of them was involved in any income generating activities, and practicing subsistence agricultural farming to supplement food rations received from UNHCR and other partners. This was attributed to the nature of terrain they were allocated, and lack of capital to start small business to generate income to support their families.

The survey team also asked respondents on how they cope with lack of food or money to buy it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping mechanism</th>
<th>Arua N</th>
<th>Arua Percent</th>
<th>Moyo N</th>
<th>Moyo Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrow food</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow money</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rely on less preferred food</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of meals a day</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit proportion size and meal time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell HH assets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell food rations to buy preferred food</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from the baseline survey indicates that a large number of households cope up with borrowing food while others cope up by reducing the number of meals a day. It was reported that whenever the refugees wanted to change the diet, they sold the rations received from UNHCR and other development partners and buy food of their choices. The details of the cope up mechanism by the households are indicated in the table above.
2.13 VSLA Issues

It is costly for microfinance organizations to reach the rural poor, and as a consequence the vast majority of them lack access to formal financial services. Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs) attempt to overcome the difficulties of offering credit to the rural poor by creating groups of people who can pool their savings in order to have a source of lending funds. Researchers in Uganda are assessing the impact of VSLAs on access to financial services, income, food security, and education.

Although during the last decades microfinance institutions have provided millions of people access to financial services, provision of access in rural areas remains a major challenge. It is costly for microfinance organizations to reach the rural poor, and as a consequence the great majority of them lack any access to formal financial services. Traditional community methods of saving, such as the rotating savings and credit associations called ROSCAs, can provide an opportunity to save.

Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs) attempt to overcome the difficulties of offering credit to the rural poor by building on a ROSCA model to create groups of people who can pool their savings in order to have a source of lending funds. Members make savings contributions to the pool, and can also borrow from it. As a self-sustainable and self-replicating mechanism, VSLAs have the potential to bring access to more remote areas.

The other area that was considered during the survey was Village Savings and loans Associations (VSLA) and the survey team sought to know whether households interviewed belong to any of the VSLA group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you belong to any VSLA group</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above table on average across the two districts seventy four (74%) percent of the households do not belong to any VSLA and over eighty six (86.9%) in Arua don’t belong to VSLA while sixty one (61%) percent of the households in Moyo district don’t belong in VSLA. They said that in refugee camps there is lack of what to save since there are limited income generating activities where they could earn money and save. Whereas in host communities, the beneficiaries targeted were the most vulnerable households. During the interview with Community development officer, Itula sub county, Moyo district, he recognized the need to create the awareness of the community to join the VSLA, carry out refresher training and train new members to enable them understand the dynamics of VSLAs, power of saving, and how to borrow the savings to start up business and supplement their business income.

Community-based trainers present the model to villagers at public meetings. Those interested in participating are invited to form groups averaging about twenty and receive training. These groups, comprised mostly of women, meet on a regular basis, as decided by members, to make savings contributions to a common pool. At each meeting, members can request a loan from the group to be repaid with interest. This lending feature makes the VSLA a type of Accumulating Savings and Credit Association (ASCA) providing a group-based source of both credit and savings accumulation. CARE’s VSLA model also introduces an emergency fund, allowing members to borrow money for urgent expenses without having to sell productive assets or cut essential expenses such as meals.

2.14 HIV/AIDS Issues

The global community has allocated increased funding for healthcare systems in the developing world, especially HIV/AIDS care systems. The Ministry of Health and development partners in many countries have become a stronger advocate for the healthcare needs of people in all sectors of society including refugees.

The survey team sought to know whether the respondents know the causes of HIV/AIDS and results indicated that over eighty five (85.1%) percent of the respondents know about HIV/AIDS while only 19.9% of the respondents don’t know about Causes of HIV/AIDS in Arua district.

While in Moyo over fifty seven (57.9%) percent of the respondents don’t know the causes of HIV/AIDS while 42.1% know about the causes of HIV/AIDS Awareness in on the causes of
HIV/AIDS is high compared to Moyo district and emphasis needs to be considered more in Moyo than Arua.

When they were asked about the causes of HIV and AIDS transmission in the community, they mentioned high level of poverty, vulnerability of women and girls, ignorance about the use of preventive measures like PMTCT, like use of condom, abstinence, lack of HIV and AIDS awareness, idleness among adolescence youth, failure to seek health services and others.

This was supported during the interview with key informants, Andrew, community development officer, OPM, incharge of zone 111, Imvepi refugee settlement, he said “conflict and displacement make women and children, particularly girls, proportionately vulnerable to the risk of HIV. Women and girls are also subject to sexual violence and exploitation in refugee settings. As refugees struggle to meet their basic needs such as food, water and shelter, women and girls are often forced to exchange sexual services for money, food or protection. Children living without parental support, whether due to separation from or death of family members, are also particularly vulnerable to sexual and physical violence and exploitation.

During the focus group discussion with the Local leaders in zone 111 East, Palorinya refugee settlement, they suggested the mitigation measures that includes; strengthen the capacity of refugee community leaders and community based organizations in refugee setting and host communities, including those of people living with HIV and AIDS, to advocate for their rights. Increase communication and cooperation between refugee and host communities and their representatives, including community leaders, women’s groups and student groups on issues related to HIV and AIDS. Sensitize communities on challenges of stigma and discrimination against affected persons and advocate necessary legal and policy reforms to ensure that their human rights are respected and fulfilled. Increase networking and information exchange between refugee groups and organizations working on behalf of refugees and between refugees and policy makers. Introduce house to house support to persons affected with HIV and AIDS.
2.15 Gender
Violence Against Women is a global phenomenon that cuts across boundaries of age, socioeconomic status, education and geography. The lack of women’s empowerment is a critical form of inequality. While there are many barriers to empowerment, violence against women and girls (VAW) is both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality. The issues considered under gender was knowledge on gender based violence in a home, experience of cases of gender based violence in the community, government response, sensitization about gender based violence and who is the most responsible for gender based violence in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study team sought to know whether respondents have ever experienced gender based violence in their homes and results indicated that over seventy three (73.4%) percent of respondents in Arua hadn’t experienced gender based violence in their homes while only close to twenty seven(26.6%) of the respondents had experienced gender based violence in their homes. Likewise in Moyo close to sixty five (64.7%) percent of the respondents had not experienced GBV in their homes compared to 35.3% of the respondents who had experienced gender based violence in their homes as indicated in the table above.

The study team furthermore wanted to know whether respondents had registered any case of domestic violence in their community and findings indicates that over seventy four (74.6%) percent of the respondents had not registered GBV case while 25.4% of the respondents had registered GBV case in Moyo district. As for Arua district results indicates that over sixty (60.8%) percent of the respondents had registered cases of GBV while 39.2% of the respondents had not registered cases of gender based violence which is contrary to Moyo district and is possibly due to the level of development in Arua and easy access of information more than Moyo district.

Asked to whether there was any response to address GBV by government or other agencies, it was revealed that over eighty five (85.8%) percent of the respondents that government responded while only 14.2% of respondents indicated no response by government or other agencies to GBV.
cases in Arua. On contrary over seventy eighty (78.6%) percent indicated no response to GBV while only 21.4% of respondents were affirmative for Moyo district. Asked whether the respondents whether they have ever heard about GBV in their community, Majority (73.4%) of the respondents indicated that they have never heard about GBV in their community compared to 26.6% of the respondents who have heard GBV in their community in Arua. While in Moyo over sixty eight (68.9%) percent in Moyo had heard GBV in their community while only in Moyo 31.1% of the respondents have not heard about GBV.

Respondents were asked whether they have ever been sensitized about the gender based violence and results indicates that 44.5% in Arua have been sensitized while only 11.5% of the respondents in Moyo indicated they have ever been sensitized about GBV. However the sensitization is below fifty percent in all the districts and possibly an area for intervention focus. While on the other hand majority (88.5%) percent had not received sensitization in Moyo compared to 55.5% who had not had sensitization about GBV in Arua district.

The respondents were further asked about their view on who is most responsible for GBV in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>most responsible for GBV</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Moyo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over eighty one (81.3% and 81.5%) percent for Arua and Moyo indicated that men are responsible for gender based violence in the community followed by women with a small percentage of respondents mentioning boys and girls as indicated in the table above.

During the focus group discussion with RWC 11, zone 111 West, Palorinya refugee settlement, they mentioned Domestic violence, which typically occurs when a man beats his female partner, is the most prevalent form of gender-based violence and this occurs within the families and inside the homes. Violence against women within the general community includes battering, rape, and sexual assault, forced treatments and the exploitation and commercialization of women’s bodies. It also includes denial of information sexual reproductive health, force and
coercion in choosing family planning methods and number of children to have some men, who
ambush women in the black spot, poor enforcement of the law by some of the leaders, most
especially where the leaders connive with the perpetrators to frustrate legal procedure, some of
the victims who may not be interested to pursue the legal means because of the fear of relatives
of the victims, failure to detect risk areas by the victims most especially the black spots.

The respondents suggested the mitigating measures that includes, creating awareness in the
community, empowering justice committees within the refugee settlement and host communities,
advocate for law enforcements, promote group movement for women and girls most especially
during the communal work like fire wood collection, fetching water, empower community
leaders to manage GBV issues, promote carry out of routine GBV reviews.

2.16 First Aid Services

First aid refers to the emergency or immediate care provided when a person is injured or ill until
full medical treatment is available. For minor conditions, first aid care may be enough. For
serious problems, first aid care can be continued until more advanced care becomes available.

During the baseline survey, the study team asked respondents whether they have ever been
trained or sensitized about the First Aid and they indicated that only 16% of the respondents had
been trained about First Aid compared to 84% of the respondents that have not been sensitized
about First Aid for Moyo while only 19.6% had been trained in Arua compared to 80.4% who
indicated that they had not been trained on First Aid.

During focus group discussion interview with leaders of zone 11, Imvepi refugee settlement, they
said that First Aid was facilitated to very few representatives, by the Red cross sometime back,
they acknowledged the common challenges affecting the community which require first Aid to
reduce on the fatal of incidences, this includes the common accidents with bodaboda riders,
minor injuries most especially during the construction of houses, injuries when people are in
their gardens, they said all these require first hand rescue. They observed the risk of losing a community member due to the absence of a First AID services. They said that the decision to act appropriately with first aid can mean the difference between life and death.

They recommended a training of selected representatives from the community members with capacity to manage the first AID service and create awareness about the first AID contact persons with a role of scaling up and create awareness in specified area.

2.17 Environment Issues

Environmental degradation is one of the largest threats that are being looked at in the world today. The United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction characterizes environmental degradation as the lessening of the limit of the earth to meet social and environmental destinations, and needs. It was observed that in less than 3 years, the refugees and host communities are likely to experience shortage of firewood which is the most source of energy in the area, the study team observed the high level of environment destruction in both districts of Moyo and Arua.

The study team wanted to know whether respondents know of any of the environmental challenges affecting the community and over eighty-four (84.4%) percent indicated environmental challenges affecting the community in Arua while only 16.4% percent indicated that there are no serious challenges affecting the community.

In Moyo district respondents indicated that 67.5% indicated environmental challenges affecting the community compared to 32.5% who indicated that there were no serious environmental challenges affecting the community.

When members were asked the causes of environment challenges in their respective communities, they mentioned the limited awareness of the challenges affecting the environment, lack of law enforcement, political will and capacity to enforce environment degradation, refugee population pressure, poor culture of tree planting, lack of seedlings to plant, limited space for tree planting, poor farming methods, overgrazing, bush burning. It was further observed that the settlement was planned with no green belt spaces due to the big number of refugee influx, and rapid population growth among the host communities. This has resulted to cutting more trees to make way for more homes, opening up of access roads without planting trees along the opened
up roads in the refugee settlements and host communities, use of forest land for agriculture, animal grazing, harvest for fuel wood and logging are some of the other causes of deforestation.

During the focus group discussion with refugees leaders in Imvepi zone 111, they suggested tree planting along the roads, creating green belts within the settlement, conducting awareness campaign to community members, engaging the host community and encourage them to plant trees, promote distribution of free seedlings to people willing people interested to plant trees, enforce total burning of bricks in refugee settlement and host community where they go for firewood.

This was supported by the Odupi sub county chairman, Mr Awuzia, he said that “there is a need to make bye laws and enforcement of laws, purposive plan to plant trees at a commercial level, scaling up tree planting at each household level and discourage charcoal and brick burning which is a common business within the community and refugee settlement”.

2.18 Recommendations

Engaging men in the fight against all forms of GBV is crucial because statistics show that most of the cases of GBV (over 80%) are caused by men. If men are the main perpetrators, then their role in the fight against GBV is important.

Referral mechanisms for the management of SGBV also need to be strengthened to ensure that survivors receive appropriate response and care services. They should receive counselling both individually and in support groups to develop resilience and positive coping mechanisms.

Uganda together with UNHCR, in 2016 developed a 5-year SGBV Interagency Country Strategy premised on the vision of ‘a community free from SGBV’. On October 3, 2016, the UN General Assembly that Uganda had chaired for two years, made a declaration, the New York Declaration that stated among others, “We will ensure that our responses to large movements of refugees and migrants mainstream a gender perspective, promote gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls and fully respect and protect the human rights of women and girls. We will combat sexual and gender-based violence to the greatest extent possible.”
Uganda is thus obliged to take deliberate efforts to stop GBV against women and girls through among others strengthening the referral mechanism in refugee settlements, bringing services, such as, sexual and reproductive health services closer to the people and enhancing the capacities of the community protection committees in refugee settlements to prevent and respond to GBV cases. There is need for concerted efforts and an integrated approach from all stakeholders to commit to gender-responsive safeguards for all women and girls from all forms of GBV, placing gender factors at the centre of all interventions and/or services in the settlements and host communities.

Economic empowerment does not only restore the refugees’ dignity but also improves the overall economic status of households and reduces instances of economic exploitation of women and other forms of GBV. Tackling GBV requires a multisectoral approach, refugees and host communities need access to information about services, rights, laws, protection and opportunities.

Environmental degradation is one of most urgent of environmental issues. Depending upon the damage, some environments may never recover. The plants and animals that inhabited these places will be lost forever. In order to reduce any future impacts, refugee settlement planners, host community leaders, development partners, and resource managers must consider the long term effects of development on the environment. With sound planning, public awareness and community participation, future environmental degradation can be prevented.