

# PART 3: TRAINER'S GUIDE

The trainer's guide is the third of four parts contained in this module. It is NOT a training course. This guide provides guidance on how to design a training course by giving tips and examples of tools that the trainer can use and adapt to meet training needs. The trainer's guide should only be used by experienced trainers to help develop a training course that meets the needs of a specific audience. The trainer's guide is linked to the technical information found in Part 2 of the module.

This module is about the different types of livelihood interventions that can be employed in emergencies. It includes a brief description of the livelihoods framework, criteria for selecting appropriate livelihoods interventions and descriptions of the main implementation steps involved. Module 9 explains how to conduct assessments to determine the need for and type of livelihood intervention that may be necessary.

It is unlikely that you will be asked to train participants to carry out specific interventions as this would require several days training for each intervention. In the absence of guidelines or international consensus it would be best to help participants to understand implementation steps and challenges through case studies based on agencies' previous experiences. It will also be important to help participants to understand that each context must be analysed in order to select appropriate interventions. Both practitioners and senior managers will need to be briefed on the practicalities of the steps involved in implementing interventions. Practitioners will need greater detail and time to consider and apply these steps in different contexts.

### Navigating your way around the guide

The trainer's guide is divided into six sections.

1. **Tips for trainers** provide pointers on how to prepare for and organize a training course.
2. **Learning objectives** set out examples of learning objectives for this module that can be adapted for a particular participant group.
3. **Testing knowledge** contains an example of a questionnaire that can be used to test participants' knowledge of EFSA either at the start or at the end of a training course.
4. **Classroom exercises** provide examples of practical exercises that can be done in a classroom context by participants individually or in groups.
5. **Case studies** contain examples of case studies (one from Africa and one from another continent) that can be used to get participants to think by using real-life scenarios.
6. **Field-based exercises** outline ideas for field visits that may be conducted during a longer training course.

# CONTENTS

## 1. Tips for trainers

## 2. Learning objectives

## 3. Testing knowledge

**Exercise 1:** What do you know about livelihoods programming?

**Handout 1a:** What do you know about livelihoods programming?: Questionnaire

**Handout 1b:** What do you know about livelihoods programming?: Questionnaire answers

## 4. Classroom exercises

**Exercise 2:** Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework

**Handout 2a:** Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework in Columbia 1997

**Handout 2b:** Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework in Columbia 1997: Model answers

**Exercise 3:** Classifying livelihoods interventions

**Handout 3a:** Classifying livelihoods interventions

**Handout 3b:** Classifying livelihoods interventions: Model answers

**Exercise 4:** Identifying steps in a destocking programme

**Handout 4a:** Identifying steps in a destocking programme

**Handout 4b:** Destocking in Kenya – two case studies

## 5. Case studies

**Exercise 5:** Analysing needs assessment to inform intervention

**Handout 5a:** Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya

**Handout 5b:** Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya: Model answers

**Exercise 6:** Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka

**Handout 6a:** Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka

**Handout 6b:** Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka: Model answer

## 6. Field-based exercises

**Exercise 7:** Direct observation of a livelihoods programme in an emergency

**Handout 7a:** Description of livelihoods programme being visited

**Handout 7b:** Checklist for focus group discussion with implementers

**Handout 7c:** Checklist for focus group discussion with beneficiaries

**Handout 7d:** Questionnaire for key informants

# 1. Tips for trainers

## Step 1: Do the reading!

- Read Part 2 of this module.
- Familiarise yourself with the technical terms from the glossary.
- Read through the following key documents (see full references and how to access them in Part 4 of this module):
  - Jaspars, S. (2006). *From food crisis to fair trade: Livelihoods analysis, protection and support in emergencies*. ENN Special Supplement Series, No. 3. ENN.
  - Livestock Emergency Network. (2007). *Integrated Livelihood Assessment Guidelines: A tool kit for rapid analysis and response to the impact of disasters on the livelihoods of people*.
  - ICRC & IFRC. (2007). *Guidelines for cash transfer programming*. ICRC and IFRC.

## Step 2: Know your audience!

- Find out about your participants in advance of the training:
  - How many participants will there be?
  - Do any of the participants already have experience of livelihoods programming and where?
  - Could participants with experience of livelihoods programming be involved in the sessions by preparing a case study or contribute through describing their practical experience?
  - Ensure that the participants have been introduced to each other, are aware of each others background and current work situation and they have expressed their personal expectations for the teaching period.

## Step 3: Design the training!

- Decide how long the training will be and what activities can be covered within the available time. In general, the following guide can be used:
  - A **90-minute** classroom-based training can provide a basic overview of livelihoods programming in emergencies.
  - A **half-day** classroom-based training can provide an overview of livelihoods programming and include some practical exercise.
  - A **one-day** classroom-based training can provide a more in-depth understanding of livelihoods programming and include a number of practical exercises and/or one case study.
  - A **three to eight-day** classroom plus field-based training can provide a full training in order to carry out an actual livelihoods programme in a particular context. This would include case studies and field practical exercises.
- Identify appropriate learning objectives. This will depend on your participants, their level of understanding and experience, how they want to use the training in their future work, and the aim and length of the training.
- Decide exactly which points to cover based on the learning objectives that you have identified.
- Divide the training into manageable sections. One session should generally not last longer than an hour.
- Ensure the training is a good combination of activities, e.g., mix PowerPoint presentations in plenary with more active participation through classroom-based exercises, mix individual work with group work.

**Step 4: Get prepared!**

- Prepare PowerPoint presentations with notes (if they are going to be used) in advance and do a trial run. Time yourself! Recommended PowerPoint presentations can be prepared from Part 2 of this module.
- Prepare exercises and case studies. These can be based on the examples given in this trainer's guide but should be adapted to be suitable for the particular training context.
- Plan sessions that can benefit from an interactive approach, especially if they can be mixed with a more 'top-down' teaching/training.
- Prepare a 'kit' of materials for each participant. These should be given out at the start of the training and should include:
  - Timetable showing break times (coffee and lunch) and individual sessions
  - Parts 1 and 2 of this module
  - Pens and paper

**REMEMBER**

People remember 20% of what they are told, 40% of what they are told and read, and 80% of what they find out for themselves.

People learn differently. They learn from what they read, what they hear, what they see, what they discuss with others and what they explain to others. A good training is therefore one that offers a variety of learning methods which suit the variety of individuals in any group. Such variety will also help reinforce messages and ideas so that they are more likely to be learned.

## 2. Learning objectives

Below are examples of learning objectives for a session on nutrition IEC. Trainers may wish to develop alternative learning objectives that are appropriate to their particular participant group. The number of learning objectives should be limited; up to five per day of training is appropriate. Each exercise should be related to at least one of the learning objectives.

### Examples of learning objectives

At the end of the training, participants will:

- Understand the connection between livelihoods and nutrition and how emergencies impact nutrition through affecting livelihoods.
- Understand the livelihoods framework.
- Understand the range of livelihoods interventions that can be applied in emergencies and their respective objectives.
- Have knowledge of advantages and disadvantages of specific interventions.
- Be able to identify and apply criteria for selecting appropriate livelihood intervention in emergencies.
- Be able to analyse contexts with a view to decide on appropriateness of specific interventions.
- Have a clear understanding of the potential role of food aid in livelihoods programming.
- Have knowledge of general steps and the practicalities of implementing livelihoods interventions.
- Have knowledge of practical issues that may arise during implementation of specific interventions.
- Understand main challenges with regard to implementing large-scale livelihoods interventions during emergencies.

## 3. Testing knowledge

This section contains one exercise which is an example of a questionnaire that can be used to test participants' knowledge of livelihoods programming in emergencies either at the start or at the end of a training session. The questionnaire can be adapted by the trainer to include questions relevant to the specific participant group.

### Exercise 1: What do you know about livelihoods programming?

#### What is the learning objective?

- To test participants' knowledge about livelihoods programming in emergencies

#### When should this exercise be done?

- *Either* at the start of a training session to establish knowledge level
- *Or* at the end of a training session to check how much participants have learned

#### How long should the exercise take?

- 25 minutes

#### What materials are needed?

- **Handout 1a:** What do you know about livelihoods programming?: Questionnaire
- **Handout 1b:** What do you know about livelihoods programming?: Questionnaire answers

#### What does the trainer need to prepare?

- Familiarise yourself with the questionnaire questions and answers.
- Add your own questions and answers based on your knowledge of the participants and their knowledge base.

#### Instructions

**Step 1:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 1a.

**Step 2:** Give participants 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire working alone.

**Step 3:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 1b.

**Step 4:** Give participants five minutes to mark their own questionnaires and clarify the answers where necessary.

#### Discussion points

- ➔ Criteria for selecting appropriate interventions are not meant to be used inflexibly. This is still a cutting edge area of programming with few guidelines in the public domain. Furthermore, there has been little if any empirical study to determine when, why and how different interventions may be more appropriate or cost-effective in one context compared to another.

## Handout 1a: What do you know about livelihoods programming in emergencies?: Questionnaire

*Time for completion: 20 minutes*

*Answer all the questions*

*For questions 2 to 8, add up the number of correct answers.*

1. Select two livelihoods indicators that could be categorized under each of the following elements of the livelihoods framework:
  - i) Vulnerability
  - ii) Livelihood strategies
  - iii) Assets
  - iv) Policies, institutions and processes
  - v) Livelihood outcomes
- a) Vulnerability
  - i) Drought proneness
  - ii) High levels of stunting
  - iii) High levels of HIV in the area
- b) Livelihood strategies
  - i) Petty trading.
  - ii) Agro-pastoralism
  - iii) Selling off key livestock
- c) Assets
  - i) Education
  - ii) Membership of a large extended family
  - iii) Large families with many children.
- d) Policies, institutions and processes
  - i) Land holding size.
  - ii) Land tenure system.
  - iii) Subsidies on main staple crop.
- e) Livelihood outcomes
  - i) Nutritional status
  - ii) Prevalence of HIV
  - iii) Crude mortality rates (CMR)

2. Under what circumstances should food aid be used to support livelihoods in emergencies?
  
3. How would you decide whether it was best to implement a cash, voucher or micro-finance initiative in an emergency?
  
4. What questions would you need to answer before implementing a seed intervention?
  
5. What are the potential advantages of a seeds fair over a more traditional seeds distribution?
  
6. What questions would you need to answer before implementing a livestock restocking programme?
  
7. What are the potential benefits of a de-stocking programme?
  
8. Identify ways in which HIV can be mainstreamed into emergency livelihoods intervention.



## Handout 1b: What do you know about livelihood programming in emergencies?: Questionnaire answers

1. a) Vulnerability
    - i) **Drought proneness. Correct.**
    - ii) High levels of stunting. Incorrect. This is a livelihood outcome and not a vulnerability factor
    - iii) **High levels of HIV in the area. Correct. HIV can undermine capacity to work and ability to sustain livelihoods.**
  - b) Livelihood strategies
    - i) **Petty trading. Correct, although this is likely to be only one component of a livelihood.**
    - ii) **Agro-pastoralism. Correct.**
    - iii) Selling off key livestock. Incorrect. It is likely that this activity is non-sustainable and only carried out in situations of stress.
  - c) Assets
    - i) **Education. Correct. This is a human asset that can enhance livelihoods.**
    - ii) **Membership of a large extended family. Correct. This is likely to lead to lead to greater livelihood opportunities and support in times of hardship.**
    - iii) Large families with many children. Incorrect. If the family has a large dependency ratio then, e.g., few adults to support the family, then livelihoods will be stretched.
  - d) Policies, institutions and processes
    - i) Land holding size. Incorrect. This is a physical asset
    - ii) **Land tenure system. Correct. The system will determine people's access and capacity to exploit land.**
    - iii) **Subsidies on main staple crop. Correct.**
  - e) Livelihood outcomes
    - i) **Nutritional status. Correct. Nutrition is frequently a direct outcome of livelihood success**
    - ii) Prevalence of HIV: Incorrect. HIV infection cuts across all income and livelihood classes.
    - iii) **Crude mortality rates (CMR). Correct. Mortality rates tend to be highest in areas where populations are poor and livelihoods are constrained.**
2. Under what circumstances should food aid be used to support livelihoods in emergencies?
- **People cut off from normal sources of food**
  - **Lack of food availability**
  - **Alternative ways of increasing access to food would take too long**
  - **Acute emergency, large scale and possibly involving displacement**
  - **Readily available food aid resources**

3. How would you decide whether it was best to implement a cash, voucher or micro-finance initiative in an emergency?
  - **Weigh a number of factors and seeing 'how many boxes ticked'.**
  - **Cash transfers are appropriate during the early stages of emergency or rehabilitation and when food is available, markets function, there is a low risk of inflationary pressure, and when there is a benefit to provide a choice for beneficiaries and to quickly meet basic needs.**
  - **Vouchers are appropriate when: functioning markets, food availability commodities can be bought in by traders, want to support traders and promote purchase of certain local products, post-acute phase of disaster, worried about inflation and easy to monitor. (May need regular adjustment if inflation occurring, risk of forgery)**
  - **Micro-finance appropriate when: Functioning markets and banks, Stable economy (no hyper-inflation). Skilled workforce, recovery stage of emergency, relatively secure context and home based population. Programme can be sustainable and have good management capacity.**
  
4. What questions would you need to answer before implementing a seed intervention?
  - **What crops and crops varieties do farmers plant, and how are these used?**
  - **Availability of land**
  - **What are the main feature of the cropping system, i.e. what ecologies do the crops occupy, what is the cropping calendar for the different crops, and crop types and who (i.e. men or women) is responsible for various agricultural tasks?**
  - **For each crop, do farmers normally save the seed from the previous harvest? How is seed saved and what are the main constraints?**
  - **If seed is not saved, how do farmers normally acquire the seed for the different crops (where, through what means, from whom?)?**
  - **Have farmers lost their seed or been forced to eat it?**
  - **Has the disaster disrupted marketing of local crops or exchange of seed between farmers?**
  - **Has the disaster affected the quality of seed produced by farmers or the quality of seed available from markets?**
  
5. What are the potential advantages of a seeds fair over a more traditional seeds distribution?
  - **Farmers can buy the variety and quality that they prefer, rather than receiving a single kit of seed which is the same for everyone.**
  - **Seed is adapted to local agro-climatic conditions, which does not necessarily apply to imported seeds.**
  - **Farmers exchange experiences, information and seed among themselves and with seed sellers.**
  - **Emergency funds are invested in the local economy and in the affected area, whereas with direct seed distribution funds are invested outside the area.**
  - **There is a contribution to revitalizing local seed production and trade.**
  - **Both local and certified seed is distributed, whereas in direct distributions only certified seed is distributed.**

6. What questions would you need to answer before implementing a livestock restocking programme?
  - **Is the area already over-stocked or over-grazed?**
  - **Are there other opportunities for getting food or income?**
  - **Which one of the species has an added value for the vulnerable?**
  - **Is it a suitable environment for the species?**
  - **Do the beneficiaries have prior knowledge of livestock management?**
  - **Is the species culturally and religiously acceptable to the beneficiaries?**
  - **Is local knowledge on husbandry and back-up available?**
  - **Is there enough food, water and shelter to support the herd?**
  - **Is it profitable to keep a herd?**
  - **Are its products/benefits consumable locally?**
  
7. What are the potential benefits of a destocking programme?
  - **It provides cash that can be used to cover immediate needs.**
  - **Livestock numbers are reduced, leaving more grazing for the other breeding animals.**
  - **It creates employment amongst the very poor, for slaughtering, meat preparation, guarding, etc.**
  - **Meat is available for poor and vulnerable.**
  
8. Identify ways in which HIV can be mainstreamed into emergency livelihoods intervention.
  - **Providing appropriate rations for the sick, e.g., CSB**
  - **Targeting PLWHA or ensuring that community based targeting does not discriminate the stigmatized**
  - **Training of relief staff re-sexual exploitation**
  - **Work geared to chronically sick in FFW or CFW**
  - **Using gatherings like GFD and fairs to link with HIV groups to make presentations/dramas, etc.**
  - **Addressing water and sanitation issues through interventions, e.g., soap, hygiene facilities**

## 4. Classroom exercises

This section provides examples of practical exercises that can be carried out in a classroom context by participants individually or in groups. Practical exercises are useful between plenary sessions, where the trainer has done most of the talking, as they provide an opportunity for participants to engage actively in the session. The choice of classroom exercises will depend upon the learning objectives and the time available. Trainers should adapt the exercises presented in this section to make them appropriate to the particular participant group. Ideally, trainers should use case examples with which they are familiar.

### Exercise 2: Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework

#### What is the learning objective?

- To understand the livelihoods framework

#### When should this exercise be done?

- After the livelihoods framework has been introduced

#### How long should the exercise take?

- 25 minutes

#### What materials are needed?

- **Handout 2a:** Identifying the elements of the livelihoods framework in Columbia 1997
- **Handout 2b:** Identifying the elements of the livelihood framework in Columbia 1997: Model answer

#### What does the trainer need to prepare?

- Prepare a case study for an area that is familiar to the participants based on the template Handout 2a.

#### Instructions

**Step 1:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 2a.

**Step 2:** Give participants 15 minutes to read the case study and complete the table.

**Step 3:** Allow 10 minutes of discussion in plenary.

#### Discussion points for feedback in plenary

- ➔ Try to tease out livelihoods elements for each group.
- ➔ Try to break elements down further, e.g., assets into physical, human, natural resources, etc.
- ➔ Not all elements of framework are described, e.g., outcomes.
- ➔ Identify groups who appear most vulnerable.

## Handout 2a: Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework in Columbia 1997

*Time for completion: 15 minutes*

*Answer the question below.*

*In the brief case study below, what elements of the livelihood framework can you identify?*

### Background

In 1997 heavy bombing and fighting between left-wing guerrillas, government troops and militia in Uraba, Columbia led to the mass displacement of over 10,000 civilians. At first they congregated mainly in three camps. A year later, displaced people were housed in 16 provisional camps. These were divided into five different groups depending on their location and settlement type.

### River homeland

IDP settlements appear along the Atrato River several hours walk from the displaced persons' original homes and farms. They live here for safety reasons but are able to farm their own land. The river provides an escape route and allows agencies to deliver food. The area is far upriver and isolated from market towns.

### River camp

Intermediary camps appear along the river about a two-day walk from the displaced persons' original farms. Sites are chosen to allow IDPs to fish. Some still farm their own land and others exploit river trading.

### Rural homeland

IDP camps are located about 300 kilometres from original farms. Settled in traditional logging and fishing areas and have no access to farmland. While there is no significant insecurity, hostility from resident population restricts IDPs to land allocated to them. Access to the nearest town is only by boat two hours away.

### Urban camp

IDPs in the city of Turbo are camped in the football stadium or in peripheral slums. There is no access to land and IDPs are dependent on daily labour and charity.

At the time of an assessment in 1999 most of the displaced had been living in the camps for almost two years, waiting for the government to declare it safe for them to return to their home areas. Over 80 per cent were originally subsistence farmers, with smallholdings of between 2 to 10 hectares. The remainder were largely engaged in trade and logging before they were displaced lived along the area's river. Heavy rains immediately prior to the assessment led to large-scale flooding along the Atrato River, seriously affecting about half of the provisional camps. This led to migration of some displaced people to the city of Turbo. Others returned to their home area before the official return date.

**Handout 2b: Identifying elements of the livelihoods framework in Columbia 1997:  
Model answer**

Vulnerability context	Bombing, fighting, displacement, lack of access to farming land and employment opportunities, distance from markets, hostility from resident populations, flooding
Assets	Farmland for some, fishing skills and fish resources, trading and logging skills, food aid
Policies, institutions and processes	Settlement of displaced in IDP sites
Livelihood strategies	Farming, trading and logging, fishing, food aid
Livelihood outcomes	Loss of dignity for those unable to pursue normal livelihood activities

**Exercise 3: Classifying livelihoods interventions****What is the learning objective?**

- To understand the range of livelihoods interventions that can be applied in emergencies and their respective objectives

**When should this exercise be done?**

- After the main types of livelihoods interventions have been introduced

**How long should the exercise take?**

- This should be open-ended, allowing participants to recall experiences. Allow for a maximum of 30 minutes but be prepared to run for only 10 minutes if there are few participants contributing experiences.

**What materials are needed?**

- **Handout 3a:** Classifying livelihoods interventions
- **Handout 3b:** Classifying livelihoods interventions: Model answers
- Flip charts to record participant contributions

**What does the trainer need to prepare?**

- In the event that no participant (or only one or two) has any direct experiences then be prepared to talk about at least two experiences of your own and ask participants to classify these.

**Instructions**

**Step 1:** Determine whether some participants have direct or indirect experience of livelihood interventions

**Step 2:** Organize small groups of five with one key informant in each group and give each group a copy of Handout 3a.

**Step 3:** Ask groups to discuss experiences of interventions and attempt to classify these with regard to type of intervention and whether these fall under livelihoods protection, rehabilitation or promotion. Also comment on objectives and effectiveness of interventions.

**Step 4:** Groups present back to plenary to discuss these classifications and record consensus on the flip chart.

**Step 5:** Give Handout 3b to everyone in plenary and allow discussion to determine whether classification revisions are necessary.

**Discussion points for feedback in plenary**

- ➔ Some interventions are most appropriate at specific stages of an emergency and for specific contexts.
- ➔ Recognize the importance clarity over programme objectives and setting realizable objectives.
- ➔ Recognize the importance of evaluating attainment of programme objectives and the difficulties involved.
- ➔ Distinguishing between income, market and production support is not straightforward.

### **Handout 3a: Classifying livelihoods interventions**

*Time for completion: 60 minutes*

*Working in groups of five, discuss emergency livelihoods interventions that you have seen or been aware of and classify these interventions under broad headings of food aid, income support, market support and production support. Identify objectives of these programmes, whether/how these were evaluated and programme effectiveness/outcomes.*

*Once listed on a flip chart, categorize the following: interventions under livelihood protection, rehabilitation, and promotion.*

*Present findings back to plenary for discussion.*



### Handout 3b: Classifying livelihoods interventions: Model answers

*Working in groups of five, discuss emergency livelihoods interventions that you have seen or been aware of and classify these interventions under broad headings of food aid, income support, market support and production support. Identify objectives of these programmes, whether/how these were evaluated and programme effectiveness/outcomes.*

*Once listed on a flip chart, categorize the following: interventions under livelihood provision, protection, and promotion.*

*Present findings back to plenary for discussion.*

Examples of livelihood provision, protection, and promotion are below.

Livelihood provision: providing basic needs such as food in the acute phase of a disaster, where these needs cannot be met because of a loss of livelihoods, e.g. food for landless labourers who have lost employment as a result of floods in agricultural areas.

Livelihood protection: reducing the risk of sale of livestock as a negative coping strategy by pastoralists or agro-pastoralists during periods of drought by providing food aid or subsidizing the price of key staple foods

Livelihood promotion: helping households diversify livelihood activities, e.g., bee-keeping, training in handcrafts, promoting cash crop farming, etc.

**Exercise 4: Identifying the steps in a de-stocking programme****What is the learning objective?**

- To have knowledge of general steps and the practicalities of implementing livelihoods interventions

**When should this exercise be done?**

- Once the session on production support interventions has been completed

**How long should the exercise take?**

- 35 to 45 minutes

**What materials are needed?**

- **Handout 4a:** Identifying steps in a destocking programme
- **Handout 4b:** Destocking in Kenya – two case studies
- Flip charts

**What does the trainer need to prepare?**

- Familiarise yourself with Handout 4a.
- Identify whether any participants have direct or indirect experience of destocking programmes. If so, use them as facilitators/resource people in groups.

**Instructions**

**Step 1:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 4a and present main points.

**Step 2:** Divide participants into groups of five and distribute Handout 4b.

**Step 3:** Give groups 30 minutes to read the case studies and identify generic steps of destocking programmes and record on a flip chart.

**Step 4:** Select one group to provide feedback to plenary.

**Step 5:** Ask plenary to fill in any gaps.

**Discussion points for feedback in plenary**

- ➔ There were a number of problems and challenges encountered which suggest steps that could or should have been taken.
- ➔ Programmes may by definition not involve poorest, e.g., if have livestock may not be that poor.
- ➔ Achieving scale and high coverage may pose considerable management challenges.

## Handout 4a: Identifying steps in a destocking programme

*Time for completion: 45 to 60 minutes*

### Introduction to destocking (trainer to review before participants read the case studies):

Destocking involves buying (or exchanging) livestock for immediate slaughter with the meat distributed dry or fresh. Destocking can be implemented by communities, women's groups, private sector trader or directly by NGO officers. The main aim of destocking is to provide a value to animals that would otherwise die. Destocking has become one of the most widely used emergency interventions in pastoralist areas. Generally cattle, sheep and goats are the main species targeted.

### The advantages of destocking include:

- It provides cash which can be used to cover immediate needs.
- Livestock numbers are reduced, leaving more grazing for the other breeding animals.
- It creates employment amongst the very poor, for slaughtering, meat preparation, guarding, etc.

Local NGOs can often implement destocking at less expense and more effectively than international NGOs. In fact, village destocking committees or women's groups can be responsible for the actual implementation. The NGO need only do the verification.

Typical objectives include:

- To reduce the number of animals becoming unmarketable
- To provide some cash for beneficiaries
- To enable investment in credit facilities
- To distribute meat as a relief ration

## Handout 4b: Destocking in Kenya – two case studies

Source: Jaspars, S. (2006): From food crisis to fair trade. Livelihoods analysis, protection and support in emergencies. ENN Special Supplement Series No. 3.

### Background

The drought in 1999-2001 was one of the most severe in recent history in Kenya. Nearly 3 million pastoralists and agro-pastoralists were considered at risk. As a direct result of the drought, an estimated 2 million sheep and goats, over 900,000 cattle and 14,000 camels worth some 6 billion Kenyan Shillings (US\$80 million) were lost. This threatened the pastoralists' future livelihoods, as many dropped out of their traditional production systems and settled near food distribution centres.

Food aid was one of the first responses to the crisis, but there was also an unprecedented level of livestock interventions in pastoralist areas. By September 2001, there were 21 livestock projects in the country, including destocking, livestock transport subsidies, animal health, livestock feed, restocking and cross-border harmonization and peace initiatives to allow access to pasture in Uganda. The destocking supported the purchase of nearly 40,000 sheep and goats, 200 camels, and 6000 cattle. This case study focuses on the destocking programmes of Oxfam in Wajir and of CARE in Garrissa, and outlines some of the general lessons learned.

### Case study I: CARE in Garrissa

CARE planned to destock 1126 cattle, and the actual number was 850 cattle and 250 sheep and goats. The project had four objectives:

1. To reduce the number of animals becoming unmarketable
2. To provide some cash for beneficiaries
3. To enable investment in credit facilities
4. To distribute meat as a relief ration

The intervention targeted nearly all the relief centres in southern Garissa. The objectives of the programme were discussed with relief committees, including their responsibilities in identifying beneficiaries and fixing dates for purchasing stock. The committees were also responsible for giving hides and skins to women's groups.

Each beneficiary centre was allocated 25 head of cattle and 50 shoats. CARE staff witnessed the slaughter of cattle, but the distribution of meat was left to relief committees. Supervision was minimal because of a lack of staff and vehicles for the area covered. Because of security problems associated with transporting cash, payment to beneficiaries was through vouchers. These were put into the name of a trusted community member, who could cash the voucher at the CARE office. Sometimes the vouchers were exchanged by traders who could then come to the CARE office to cash them. CARE estimated that 45 per cent of stocks were purchased from people targeted for relief, and the remainder from better-off members of the community who had stock to dispose of.

In addition to providing income for those who sold stock, the income from sales of skins and hides enabled women's groups to start small businesses, and some 60 MT of fresh meat was distributed to 1943 households. The main strength of the programme was its wide coverage, despite security problems in Garrissa. However, the project had high overhead and operations costs. The intervention also lacked sufficient local knowledge, as the allocation of equal numbers of livestock to be destocked per centre ignored the variation in needy people.

## Case study II: Oxfam in Wajir

Oxfam funded a local NGO, ALDEF, to destock 950 cattle/camels and 7500 shoats. The actual number purchased was 194 camels, 95 cattle, and 9963 shoats. The target beneficiaries were mainly the peri-urban poor close to Wajir town, high school students, hospital patients and orphans. Few rural beneficiaries were incorporated in the proposals. The project covered seven peri-urban areas and seven sparsely populated rural areas.

Communities were involved in the selection of beneficiaries. The intervention targeted vulnerable households, and lists of planned beneficiaries were read out in public. People unhappy with the list, could appeal to a livestock off-take committee. A new committee was established oversee the destocking, but also to curb the power of the relief committee. The committee was also responsible for: receiving livestock and distributing this to eligible families for meat, overseeing the slaughtering process, collecting skins and hides, and liaising with ALDEF. The communities identified trustworthy contractors. This included members of the women's groups who were already supported by an ALDEF micro-credit programme.

Contractors were instructed on the type of animal to buy, e.g., those that were too weak to survive the drought (generally male animals), females with udder defects, old or barren stock and animals with a history of abortion. Agreement was reached between ALDEF and the contractors on the number and types of animals each had to supply. The contractors then sold the animals to ALDEF at a fixed price and purchased animals were handed over to the committee.

Meat was distributed regularly to beneficiaries, two shoats between eight families per week for the duration of the programme (two months). Livestock were distributed at the rate of 2 bulls/camels per week per school, 6 goats/week to hospitals, 3 goats/week to TB clinics, and several goats and one bull/week each for six orphanages. Slaughtering took place twice a week in all operational sites.

One of the key strengths of the programme was its planning and community involvement. Trust was placed in the management capacity of communities, the urban poor were targeted, and strong support was given to women's groups. Weaknesses included limited geographical coverage, and profits for the contractors meant lost income for pastoralists.

## 5. Case studies

Two case studies, one from Kenya and one from Sri Lanka, are presented in this section. Case studies are useful for getting participants to think through real-life scenarios. They also provide an opportunity for participants to work in a group and develop their analytical and decision-making skills. Trainers should develop their own case studies which are contextually appropriate to the particular participant group. Ideally, trainers should use scenarios with which they are familiar.

### Exercise 5: Analysing needs assessments to inform intervention

#### What are the learning objectives?

- Be able to identify and apply criteria for selecting appropriate livelihoods intervention in emergencies
- Be able to analyse contexts with a view to decide on appropriateness of specific interventions

#### When should this exercise be done?

- After criteria for implementation of specific interventions has been covered and as part of a longer in-depth training

#### How long should the exercise take?

- 90 minutes

#### What materials are needed?

- **Handout 5a:** Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya
- **Handout 5b:** Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya: Model answers

#### What does the trainer need to prepare?

- Prepare a case study from a context familiar to the participants based on the template Handouts 5a and 5b. If using the handouts below, read the case study carefully and formulate a model answer. The model answer in Handout 5b is not meant to be the definitive answer but a summary of main recommendations.

#### Instructions

**Step 1:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 5a.

**Step 2:** Divide the participants into groups of (maximum) five people.

**Step 3:** Give the groups 30 minutes to answer the questions and prepare a presentation

**Step 4:** Give each group five minutes for feedback in plenary

**Step 5:** Distribute Handout 5b and talk through recommendations

#### Discussion points for feedback in plenary

- ➔ Not all needs assessments are able to provide such detailed livelihoods zoning.
- ➔ There are different impacts of the shock affecting each livelihood zone.
- ➔ Levels of wasting are very high but there are no quantitative baseline data for comparison in the needs assessment.

## Handout 5a: Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya

### Background

In the northeast district of Kenya, Wajir experienced prolonged drought at the end of the millennium. In May 2000, the Government of Kenya (GoK), WFP and NGOs estimated that 256,000 people in Wajir were affected, although as the drought worsened estimates increased to 300,000. A number of assessments and nutrition surveys were conducted over the next two years. The drought-monitoring programme of the Arid Land Resource Management Programme had been collecting data for a number of years in the region prior to this. The livelihoods systems in the area had been described in 1998 by Oxfam and WFP through a livelihoods zoning exercise.

Zone	Area	Livelihood
A	North	Cattle, camels, agriculture, border trade with Ethiopia
B	Northeast	Camels, cattle, gum Arabic, border trade with Somalia
C	West and south	Cattle, goats, camels, farming, border trade with Garissa
D	Areas around towns	Sheep, goats, petty trade
E	Wajir town and 'bullas' (peri-urban settlements)	Petty trade, casual labour, dependence on relatives

### Assessment findings

By the end of 2000, pasture in western Wajir was seriously depleted or non-existent. The women and children of livestock owners congregated close to boreholes with their weak livestock. The lack of pasture has forced the migration of livestock to Ethiopia and Somalia, where rainfall was better.

By October 2002 the condition of livestock was poor in all parts of Wajir. Prices dropped sharply. Many animals were in too poor a state to be sold. High mortality rates were reported for cattle and sheep in west Wajir and milk production drastically declined. Insecurity in northern Wajir meant that crop production could not be assessed. Rainfall was better in this area than in the rest of Wajir, but anecdotal evidence indicated that farmers were unable to plant because of insecurity. This also restricted movement to grazing areas.

Price of maize in markets remained fairly stable until mid-2000 when it began to fall with the start of the food distribution in June. Emergency interventions began following the government's declaration of an emergency in May 2000. WFP and GoK food distributions were meant to provide a ration of maize, pulses and oil, with UNICEF and Oxfam providing blended food for all under-fives. However, quantities of food were not always available, with oil rations most compromised. The complete recommended ration was only available once. In addition, the total beneficiary population was estimated at 256,000 but Oxfam distributed rations to 298,000 registered beneficiaries, thereby diluting the ration.

In Zone A, the impact of inter-clan conflict on access to food was much greater than that of the drought. Milk and meat production were affected by the limited grazing because of insecurity and sales were difficult because the main market was inaccessible. Crops had not been planted.

In Zone B, camels had not been producing milk and animals were not being sold due to their poor condition and were not slaughtered once relief began.

In Zone C, mortality among sheep and cattle had increased and animals were too weak to sell. People were trying to keep cattle alive by staying closer to boreholes but this meant that they lacked pasture. Burden animals were becoming too weak to transport water to settlements reducing food intake because water was insufficient to cook two or three meals a day.

In Zone D, where petty trading is important, demand for goods declined and so did milk production. Wealthier relatives had less to give as they were also severely affected by the drought.

In Zone E, income from labour and trade declined as did gifts from relatives.

### Severity of food insecurity

The drought significantly reduced their main food sources for all livelihood groups. Those in west Wajir were worst affected, as cattle had started dying. Few alternative sources of food or income were available apart from food aid and slaughtering livestock. However, by late 2000 lack of pasture meant that livestock were dying for want of food. Nutritional surveillance data confirmed a worsening situation. In August 2000 prevalence of acute wasting in central Wajir was 22.5 per cent including 5 per cent SAM. Under-five mortality was 5.43/10,000/day in July. This was a significant increase compared to an earlier survey in December 1999. This increase was attributed to disease and inadequate access to health care, as well as food insecurity. In September a survey in west Wajir found 21.6 per cent wasting including 5.8 per cent SAM. Under-five mortality was 7.1/10,000/day.

### *What interventions would you have recommended?*



## **Handout 5b: Case study I: Needs assessment and recommended interventions in Wajir, Kenya: Model answers**

### ***What interventions would you have recommended?***

What the agencies recommended:

- Increase food aid from 80 per cent of population to 95 per cent.
- Continue blended-food distribution due to lack of milk therefore under fives need something.
- Distribute fodder for 7,000 animals for two months. Beneficiaries were to receive feed through registration at water points and 'bullas'.
- Extension of livestock off-take project was also recommended. Each pastoralist family would be able to sell 2 large animals or 10 goats or sheep.

**Exercise 6: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka****What are the learning objectives?**

- To be able to identify and apply criteria for selecting appropriate livelihood intervention in emergencies
- To be able to analyse contexts with a view to decide on appropriateness of specific interventions

**When should this exercise be done?**

- After income transfer programmes have been covered

**How long should the exercise take?**

- 150 to 180 minutes

**What materials are needed?**

- **Handout 6a:** Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka
- **Handout 6b:** Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka: Model answers

**What does the trainer need to prepare?**

- Read the case study and model answer carefully. The model answer in Handout 5b is not meant to be the definitive answer. It is a summary of main lessons extracted by the programme evaluators.

**Instructions**

**Step 1:** Give each participant a copy of Handout 5a.

**Step 2:** Divide the participants into groups of (Maximum) five people.

**Step 3:** Give the groups 90 minutes to read the case study and extract key lessons and then prepare a presentation of their findings.

**Step 4:** Give each group five minutes for feedback in plenary.

**Step 5:** Distribute Handout 5b and talk through the findings of the original evaluation in light of the findings of the working groups.

**Discussion points for feedback in plenary**

- ➔ Cash transfers are still relatively cutting edge in terms of programming in emergencies.
- ➔ It is important to monitor programme performance and outcome.
- ➔ Cash programmes can be cost-effective but context is also important.
- ➔ There are certain context specific factors which favour one type of cash approach over another.

## Handout 6a: Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka

*Time for completion: 3 to 4 hours*

### Background

In 2006, WFP, Oxfam and the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) implemented a cash-transfer pilot project (CTPP) in Sri Lanka in the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami. The key objective was to compare the impact of cash and food transfers on beneficiary households' food and livelihood security and on the local economy. A wider objective was to learn how best to determine the feasibility and appropriateness of cash-based programmes in emergency food security assessments. The role of WFP was to supply the resources necessary for the implementation of the pilot. Oxfam provided technical implementation expertise and IFPRI undertook project impact analysis.

### Background to the project

The eastern, northern, and southern coastlines of Sri Lanka suffered heavily from the tsunami in 2004, with at least 38,000 deaths, approximately 5,000 people missing, and 500,000 people displaced. Many of the worst-affected areas on the east coast were fully or partially under the control of the Tamil Independence Movement (LTTE), and had been subjected to years of conflict and, in some areas, frequent displacement. World Bank-led assessments indicated damages of around \$1.5 billion. Resulting unemployment was substantial, with estimates of 1 million job losses.

WFP started emergency food distribution within days after the tsunami struck. Initially this consisted mainly of imported food, as it was prior to the harvest and local prices were not internationally competitive at that time. However, following predictions of a good Maha rice harvest, the Government of Sri Lanka discouraged rice importation. Furthermore, various NGOs (such as Oxfam, Save the Children UK, and the British Red Cross) raised concerns that import-based food aid, especially rice, would distort local markets and made strong arguments for cash-based interventions.

WFP Sri Lanka undertook a series of emergency needs assessments (ENAs), which considered the scale of the response from organizations and the Government of Sri Lanka, and the ability of households to re-establish their livelihoods. The last ENA assessment in May 2005 advised that there should be a reduction in food assistance from 900,000 to 350,000 people, e.g., a shift to a more targeted intervention (Vulnerable Group Feeding [VGF] programme) starting mid-August 2005, following the completion of the general food distribution. Based on a feasibility assessment, a pilot cash-transfer project (CTPP) was proposed as part of the VGF response. An additional WFP study in May 2005 identified key issues in assessing the appropriateness of cash transfers and the feasibility of such interventions in Sri Lanka, and provided inputs into the design of the CTPP.

Delays in the completion of the general food distribution, due to setbacks with the local procurement of rice, supported the case for a three-month VGF programme, in which 12,000 out of 312,000 beneficiaries received cash in lieu of a full food ration between October and November 2005 and January 2006.<sup>1</sup>

The same household targeting mechanisms were used for cash and food beneficiaries. These included:

- Families whose houses were completely damaged/destroyed by the tsunami
- Families from partially damaged/destroyed households in the buffer zone<sup>2</sup>
- Families in the buffer zone with no damage to their houses but who had lost their main livelihoods
- Families considered as destitute

The amount of cash disbursed was equal to the local market value of the WFP food ration, taking into consideration average seasonal market price fluctuations in the area. The total transfer value amounted to 150 Sri Lankan rupees per beneficiary per week, or US\$1.50.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The food ration (per person per day) included 400g of cereals (rice/wheat flour), 60g lentils, 20g oil, 20g sugar, and 40g corn soy blend, providing some 2000 kcal per day.

<sup>2</sup> A zone defined by the government, up to 200 metres from the sea, where rebuilding houses is prohibited for safety reasons.

<sup>3</sup> The exchange rate end of 2005 was US\$1 = Rs.100.

The cash was distributed on a fortnightly basis to targeted households from randomly selected communities in three districts of Sri Lanka (Batticaloa in the east, Galle and Hambantota in the south).<sup>4</sup> The Samhurdhi community bank network, normally used for social welfare payments, community-based savings schemes, and, more recently, large-scale government tsunami cash payments, provided a cash-delivery mechanism.

WFP transcribed the cash-beneficiary household head's name, identity card number, and household size (provided by local government officials) onto coupons that indicated the amount due per person, total household entitlement and a calendar for indicating cash collection days. All coupons were 'signed-off' by the officials, with any unclaimed cards returned to WFP. The cash was redeemable at banks on presentation of the coupon and an identification card. Failure to redeem cash within the collection period, spanning three consecutive days, would result in non-payment.

For the food-beneficiary households, the food-delivery mechanism was not modified for this pilot. Local officials submitted lists of targeted household names to WFP, and in return received an appropriate number of blank coupons for completion. On receipt of the coupon at the distribution point, households received allocated food. Forms indicating receipt of food would normally be signed, as would coupons. When there were inadequate amounts of all or some foods for distribution, households would be informed. As there were no fixed days for collection, beneficiaries were not penalized for non-attendance.

### Key findings

Communities in the more densely populated and less conflict-affected south of the island had very good market and bank access. This resulted in less time spent collecting cash and accessing markets, and as market prices were stable, the 'value' of the cash transfer did not depreciate. There were no restrictions or limitations on consumer and trader movements or products sold in the area. Almost all cash-receiving households in this area preferred receiving cash to food.

In the more poverty-stricken LTTE-controlled east, access to banks and markets was inferior. At the time of project planning, the availability of public transport and traders within the target area led to the assumption that market access was adequate and that traders would respond to any increase in demand induced by the cash transfer.

However, an unforeseeable deterioration in security within the area resulted in more vigorous controls at roadside government checkpoints. Traders were restricted in the amount and types of produce allowed into the area, and consequently food prices increased and the actual value of the cash transfer eroded proportionately. Further, movement control and higher transportation costs also imposed higher transaction costs for consumers purchasing food. For these reasons, all households in this area indicated preference for food rather than cash transfers.

Overall, when households did receive cash, they diversified their diet. They spent more on dairy products, meat, packaged foods, and non-food essentials, such as clothing and footwear, and they bought cereals with a higher market value than the ones supplied by WFP. These increased expenditures were financed by reductions in the consumption of key staples.

For both household groups (cash-receiving and food-receiving), calorie consumption declined over the project period, partly because important Hindu and Muslim festivities took place during the baseline survey. In this period households would have incurred additional festival-related costs and in the instance of Muslim households, there would have been changes both in types of food consumed and consumption patterns. In the poorer, more remote and conflict-ridden communities in the east, the decline in per capita daily calorie intake was significantly steeper for cash-receiving households (a decline of 535 calories) than for food-receiving households (a decline of 290 calories) suggesting that cash transfers there had a net negative effect on household calorie intake. This was partly due to the higher level of unmet non-staple and non-food needs of the poorer households in this area and also due to higher liquidity afforded by cash (cash gave households the opportunity to purchase goods that would otherwise have required them to save up over a period of time). Also, as already mentioned, transaction costs imposed due to remoteness and conflict in the area had the effect of eroding the value of cash transfers relative to food transfers.

---

<sup>4</sup> As ethnic diversity in cash recipient households was desired, careful district selection was required.

The decrease in food intake could also have been due to the fact that there remained some scope for reduction in the consumption of staples without compromising basic calorie intake: even at the end of the cash distribution, average per capita daily calorie intake was slightly above 2100 for both cash-receiving and food-receiving households.

Although cash-receiving households cited investment in home improvement and businesses as priorities, there was no significant difference in actual expenditure in these areas between cash-receiving and food-receiving households. This could perhaps be attributed to both having knowledge of government/NGO plans to rebuild houses, and expectations that NGO livelihood projects would continue in the future.

Another possible explanation could be that the amount of cash was insufficient for the purchase of livelihood assets or investment in small-scale business. The cash transfer was calculated on the basis of the value of the food ration rather than the value of the basic livelihood assets that needed to be rebuilt.

In the east, the impact evaluation also found that cash beneficiaries reduced their engagement in casual labour over the implementation period. However, further understanding of household motivation to seek casual labour during this period is required before a definitive conclusion is made on the effects of cash transfer on work-related decisions.

The Samhurdhi banks were suitable partners for distributing cash because of previous experience in large-scale cash distributions, their extensive geographical coverage and their knowledge of the targeted communities. Bank staff members were paid according to the number of days worked. They were also trained, and, most importantly, they were involved in the design of the disbursement system and coupons. They were efficient, had low logistical costs and accounted for all the cash transferred from the WFP bank account. Nearly all cash beneficiaries involved in monitoring the process expressed satisfaction with the banks' services. In contrast, over one third of food beneficiaries were dissatisfied with the food distribution system, many reporting long queues. Spoiled food and under-scooping were also reported by a small percentage of beneficiaries. Food-related logistical costs were significantly higher and, unlike cash, a percentage is expected to be lost.

Cost-effectiveness compares expenditure (costs) and outcomes (effects) associated with an action. Cost-efficiency relates to the cost of delivering the transfer (transportation, administration, delivery costs) compared to the value generated.

The cash disbursement system was more cost-efficient (5 per cent less expensive) than the food system in all geographical areas. This cost-efficiency calculation considered the costs to WFP of providing cash and food assistance (calculated as a cost per beneficiary), and the value of the cash and food assistance to the beneficiaries. Expenses related to logistics included external and local transportation, handling and storage, but not WFP human resources. The lower cost of delivering cash were largely due to the existence of a well-functioning bank network compared to the relatively high-costs of moving food. It is likely that when staff costs are considered, the cost-efficiency of cash will be more pronounced. However, this should not be taken as a valid statement on cost-efficiency in other contexts, where delivering cash might be more expensive due to factors such as insecurity and a lack of financial infrastructure.

The cost-effectiveness of food was higher in the east in areas where security was deteriorating, where markets and banks were difficult to access, and where market prices were prone to higher fluctuations. Conversely, the cash transfer system was more cost-effective in areas with integrated and competitive markets, better bank access and lower market-price fluctuation. Neither food nor cash transfers reflected beneficiary transportation costs,<sup>5</sup> nor did cash transfers take into account price fluctuations. Both are cost elements that affect cost-efficiency and effectiveness calculations.

At the project planning stage, there were reservations that replacing food with cash would have a negative impact on food-security and decision-making. It was feared that the male member of the household would control the cash entitlement and would be more likely to purchase items such as alcohol.

---

<sup>5</sup> Transport costs were significant for food beneficiaries, as the majority received a single bulk delivery of 12 weeks of food rations.

The results show that these assumptions were unfounded. The level of joint decision-making between husbands and wives was slightly higher in cash-receiving households compared to food-receiving households. Alcohol consumption, although increasing marginally in both household types over the implementation period, increased less for cash-receiving households.

In households with a high level of female control,<sup>6</sup> there was a slightly higher expenditure on diverse food items and packaged goods, and a reduction in the purchase of alcoholic beverages compared to other households.

The pilot project findings are similar to those of projects elsewhere; for example, in the Horn of Africa (Kenya, Somaliland, Uganda) and Asia (Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bangladesh).<sup>7</sup> These projects also found that a large proportion of cash was spent on basic food and non-food items, particularly when small amounts of money were received on a frequent basis. Other studies showed that expenditure on livelihood assets was more likely to result from projects of longer duration, where larger amounts of cash are disbursed and where cash is a complement to food aid (rather than replacing food aid).

***What are the main lessons that can be learned from these programmes?***

---

<sup>6</sup> These are households in which the women control the money to purchase food from the market.

<sup>7</sup> Jaspars, S. *From Food Crisis to Fair Trade – Livelihoods analysis, protection and support in emergencies*, ENN Special Supplement No. 3., 2006. See ODI website for additional publications on cash programming <[www.odi.org.uk/](http://www.odi.org.uk/)>.

---

## Handout 6b: Case study II: Comparing cash and food transfer programmes in Sri Lanka: Model answers

### *What are the main lessons that can be learnt from these programmes?*

- The appropriateness of cash depends on a secure environment where markets are functioning.
- Cash beneficiaries diversified their diet and bought non-food items.
- There has been little apparent impact on livelihoods.
- Working through local banks was effective.
- Cash was more cost-efficient, but cost-effectiveness depends on context.
- Fears that cash expenditure would lead to adverse social impact and gender inequity in resource decision-making were not realized.
- In areas where markets were functioning and accessible, cash transfer was more cost-effective and preferred by beneficiaries.
- In areas where markets were less functional or accessible, food assistance was more cost-effective and preferred by beneficiaries.
- The appropriateness of cash programming depends on market access and functioning (whether they are competitive and integrated) and security.
- Food aid is more appropriate in contexts where markets are not working well, where security conditions impose higher market transaction costs for consumers, and in situations of high and unpredictable inflation.
- Opportunities exist for using both interventions in parallel or in a phased approach depending on seasonal and contextual changes over time and space. This is especially relevant to emergencies, where market access could be a limiting factor.
- In the immediate aftermath of a shock, food intervention may be more appropriate. Cash-based interventions may be gradually introduced as markets recover and could potentially be used as an exit strategy.
- When project objectives include livelihood recovery, protection or support, analysis should include the identification of livelihood groups and the seasonality of their activities. The size of the transfer needs to be based on the value of assets that need to be rebuilt, which in turn should determine the scale and duration of the project.
- Analysis of both cost-effectiveness and cost-efficiency of interventions should be standard practice in food and cash interventions in order to get a wider body of evidence on the relative costs and impact of these two approaches.

## 6. Field based exercises

The section outlines ideas for exercises that can be carried out as part of a field visit. Field visits require a lot of preparation. An organization that is actively involved in programming or nutrition surveillance has to be identified to 'host' the visit. This could be a government agency, an international NGO or a United Nations agency. The agency needs to identify an area that can be easily and safely visited by participants. Permission has to be sought from all the relevant authorities and care taken not to disrupt or take time away from programming activities. Despite these caveats, field based learning is probably the best way of providing information that participants will remember.

### Exercise 7: Direct observation of a livelihoods programme in an emergency

#### What is the learning objective?

- To provide an opportunity to 'observe' a real intervention

#### When should this exercise be done?

- As part of an in-depth course and after a session on the relevant livelihoods intervention being observed

#### How long should the exercise take?

- 1 day (excluding travel) over a 3-day period

#### What materials are needed?

- **Handout 7a:** Description of livelihoods programme being visited
- **Handout 7b:** Checklist for focus group discussion with implementers
- **Handout 7c:** Checklist for focus group discussion with beneficiaries
- **Handout 7d:** Questionnaire for key informants

#### What does the trainer need to prepare?

- Prior to the exercise, prepare a briefing paper for participants about the programme being visited. On day 1 of the exercise, work with the participants to develop their checklists and questions. The field visit takes place on day 2. Identify a suitable organization and area for the field visit and organize all logistics (transport, fuel, meals, etc.) for the visit. It is essential that the trainer visits the field site in advance of the visit in order to set up focus groups and identify key informants, and potential problems. Discussion should take place back on day 3.



**Exercise 7: Direct observation of a livelihoods programme in an emergency** (continued)**Instructions**

**Step 1:** Provide each participant with your briefing paper on the intervention.

**Step 2:** Divide participants into three groups (two groups for focus groups with implementers and beneficiaries and one group for key informant interviews).

**Step 3:** On day 1, groups work together to develop checklists and questionnaires.

**Step 4:** On day 2, groups complete focus group discussions and key informant interviews at the field site.

**Step 5:** On day 3, groups return to the classroom to discuss and present their findings.

**Discussion points for feedback in plenary**

- ➔ What were the challenges for programme implementers and what lessons were learned?
- ➔ What were beneficiary views on programme implementation – what did they feel worked well and what were the areas that needed strengthening?
- ➔ How were issues around HIV, gender, and the elderly mainstreamed into the intervention?
- ➔ Were views of implementers, beneficiaries and key informants in accord?
- ➔ Overall, how would trainees assess the outcome and effectiveness of the intervention and what criteria were they using to make this assessment?
- ➔ Would some other type of intervention been more appropriate in the context?

## Handout 7a: Description of livelihoods programme being visited

*Time for completion: 3 days*

*Three groups are needed for this exercise. Each group will carry out a set of interviews either in focus group or key informant settings on day 2 of the exercise. Test a different EFSA tool for these interviews. On day 1 in the classroom, each group will prepare checklists or questionnaires for discussions and interviews. On day 2, each group will visit the field to carry out focus group discussions or key informant interviews. On day 3 groups will return to class to prepare and discuss findings.*

Note to trainer: Handout 7a should provide a description of the intervention, when and why it was implemented and project data on delivery and performance.

## Handout 7b: Checklist for focus group discussion with implementers

*The group conducting the focus group discussion with those implementing the project should develop a checklist of questions covering the following areas:*

- Why was the project implemented?
- What were the criteria for implementation?
- Who were the priority target groups?
- What consultation took place with beneficiaries?
- What alternatives were considered?
- Did implementing agencies and beneficiaries have prior experience of this type of intervention?
- How was the programme planned?
- What were the challenges in implementation?
- What lessons were learned?
- What monitoring and evaluation took place and what did this reveal?
- How was the programme modified in light of monitoring and evaluation?
- What is the overall view on success of project?

*Focus group discussions should take no more than 90 minutes.*

*Develop a recording sheet which allows points to be recorded.*

*Decide how your group will organize the focus group discussion. For example, will one person ask questions while the others take notes? Will several people ask questions?*

*Write down your observations (good and bad) of the process. Was it easy to get people to talk? Did a few individuals dominate the discussion? Were you able to cover all the areas you needed to in the time available? Were there any sensitive areas which you were unable to cover?*

## Handout 7c: Checklist for focus group discussion with recipients and non-recipients

*The group conducting the focus group discussion with beneficiaries should develop a checklist covering the following areas:*

- Were you consulted and if so how, with regard to project design and implementations?
- What was your involvement in implementation?
- Did the intervention target the most vulnerable or most appropriate group?
- How useful was the intervention?
- What were eligibility criteria and were these fair?
- What were the main challenges for the programme?
- What improvements were made during the programme?
- Was it possible to voice complaints and how were these dealt with?
- If this programme was to be implemented again, what changes would you recommend?

*Focus group discussions should take no more than 90 minutes.*

*Develop a recording sheet which allows points to be recorded.*

*Decide how your group will organize the focus group discussion. For example, will one person ask questions while the others take notes? Will several people ask questions?*

*Write down your observations (good and bad) of the process. Was it easy to get people to talk? Did a few individuals dominate the discussion? Were you able to cover all the areas you needed to in the time available? Were there any sensitive areas which you were unable to cover?*

## Handout 7d: Questionnaire for key informants

*Questions should address the following:*

- What is your position/role in the community?
- How were you involved in programme design and implementation?
- Were you happy with the way the programme was implemented, e.g., eligibility criteria, process of consultation, accountability of implementing agency?
- How did the programme perform?
- Was this the most appropriate intervention given the nature of the emergency?
- How could the programme have been strengthened?
- What have you learned about implementation if this programme was to be implemented in the future?

*Key informant interviews should take no more than 40 minutes.*

*Aim to triangulate answers, e.g., ask the same question in different ways at different points of the interview and see if you get the same answer.*

*Record whether certain questions were difficult, appeared sensitive or elicited confused answers.*

*Record whether the interview was observed by other members of the community and whether they tried to answer questions or in your view inhibited the key informant in any way.*

