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Objective of Analysis

Provide an overview of the overall impact of conflict on Luhanska and Donetska oblasts, over time, to show:

→ Food Security Trends
  
  *food consumption, food security index, food prices, food expenditure, vulnerability groups, livelihood coping strategies*

→ Socio-economic Trends
  
  *macro-economic indictors, demography, business/enterprise, labor force, poverty, household (HH) income and expenditure*
Data used for Analysis & Methodology:

**Food Security Analysis:**

- We have used the all relevant studies, reports and data available from 2015-2018
- Most recent data → NGCA: REACH October 2017 & GCA: REACH February 2018
- We have based the analysis on WFP's household-level food security classification (CARI Approach) → also used when analysing previous studies / data

**Socio-economic Analysis:**

- We have used secondary data from the State Statistics Service of Ukraine (SSSU), Pension Fund of Ukraine, MoSP, Institute for Demography and Social Studies.
- For the Pre-conflict data → we are looking at GCA and NGCA combined
- But after 2014 → only GCA data is available
Main Findings – Food Security Trends

- Continued food insecurity trends
- Correlation between food insecurity, vulnerability and socio-economic trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCA Food Insecurity:</th>
<th>NGCA Food Insecurity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.7% in February 2018 (15% in June 2017)</td>
<td>17.4% in October 2017 (26% in June 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7% severely food insecure (0.9% in June 2017)</td>
<td>3.2% severely food insecure (5.2% in June 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of winter on food security</td>
<td>Seasonal reduction of food prices, which plays a key role in food access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUT</strong> confirmed trend of increased food insecurity for vulnerable groups over time (2016-2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Findings – Food Security

Positive Impact in GCA of Pension Reform (October 2017):
- 90% reported increase of pension
- Food insecurity from 21% in June 2017 to 18% in February 2018 – despite the seasonal impact of winter.

GCA Food Insecurity and Unemployment – New Key Vulnerable Group in 2018:
- In February 2018, food insecurity 26% (11% in June 2016) for households with the head of household aged 40-60

Inadequate Food Consumption:

**NGCA**
- Recent positive trend (seasonal factor / reduction of food price) but same level as 2016

**GCA**
- Increased level
- Elders (60+) still high (22%)
- BUT higher for HHs headed by people aged 40-60 at 27.4%

Negative Coping Strategies:

**GCA** - 78% (highest level since April 2016)
**NGCA** - 71% (87% in June 2017 where food prices were high)
Main Findings – Socio Economic Situation (GCA)

Real Salary
- Increased in 2017
- **BUT** when compared to 2013 → still 22% lower in Donetska & 33% lower in Luhanska

Real Cash Income
- Continued to decrease in 2016
  (*Ukraine average increased*)

Poverty Levels:
- Trend of growing poverty *stabilised* in 2016
- **BUT** depth of the poverty slightly increased → level of most vulnerable people remained or worsened since 2015

Household Expenditure:
- Growing faster than total income

Consumer & Food Prices:
- Vast increases for both food and utilities

Demography Trends - 2015-2017:
- Number of elderly (aged 65+) increased by 8% in Donetska & by 11% in Luhanska
- Increased burden on the able-bodied population
- Economic active population decreased by 2%
Main Findings – Socio Economic Situation (GCA)

**Unemployment:**
- 2015-2017 continuing to grow (15% in Donetska and 17.4% Luhanska in September 2017)

**Trend of enterprise closures:**
- Bigger impact on large and medium-sized businesses compared to small and micro businesses

**Salary Arrears:**
- Luhanska / Donetska - 43% of total salary arrears in Ukraine
Socio-economic indicators

Several food security findings are found to be closely linked with the trends of the socio-economic indicators.

For example:

- Food consumption and food insecurity levels, which are linked to food and utility prices;
- Food insecurity levels, which links to the income and expenditure levels;
- The emergence of new key vulnerability group (heads of HHs aged 40-60), which is linked with unemployment levels;
- Improved food security of HHs headed by pensioners, which is linked with pension reform;
# Food Security in Ukraine Context

## Four Dimensions / Pillars of Food Security:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical AVAILABILITY of food</th>
<th>Food availability addresses the “supply side” of food security and is determined by the level of food production, stock levels and net trade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic and physical ACCESS to food</td>
<td>An adequate supply of food at the national or international level does not in itself guarantee household level food security. Concerns about insufficient food access have resulted in a greater policy focus on incomes, expenditure, markets and prices in achieving food security objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food UTILIZATION</td>
<td>Utilization is commonly understood as the way the body makes the most of various nutrients in the food. Sufficient energy and nutrient intake by individuals is the result of good care and feeding practices, food preparation, diversity of the diet and intra-household distribution of food. Combined with good biological utilization of food consumed, this determines the nutritional status of individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABILITY of the other three dimensions over time</td>
<td>Even if your food intake is adequate today, you are still considered to be food insecure if you have inadequate access to food on a periodic basis, risking a deterioration of your nutritional status. Adverse weather conditions, political instability, or economic factors (unemployment, rising food prices) may have an impact on your food security status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis needed to understand the overall trends

Key Findings

- Food & Utilities Prices
- Food Security
- GDP/GRP, industry, agriculture
- Business activity
- Foreign economic activity
- Labour market
- Demography & Population
- Household income & expenditure
- Poverty & Social vulnerability

Analysis

Analysis needed to understand the overall trends
The Analysis shows the Impact of Conflict on the Following Areas:

**Macro-economic indicators**
(GRP, Export/Import, Industry production, Agricultural production, Capital Investments)

**Business Statistics including “Person-entrepreneurs”**
(Number of units, turnover and number of employees)

**Labor Force**
(Economic active population, employment, unemployment, salary)

**Households socio-economic profile**
(Poverty, income, expenditure, pensions, social protection indicators, prices)

**Food Security**
(Food consumption, food expenditure, livelihood coping strategies, food prices)
**Gross Regional Product:**
- After two years of significant negative trends for all main macroeconomic indicators, in 2016 compare 2015, the Gross Regional Product increased by 2% in Donetska and 25% in Luhanska.

**Industry Production:**
- **BUT** industry production in 2017 decreased by 11% in Donetska and 31% in Luhanska (economic blockade), which could have negative impact on the Gross Regional Product in 2017.
In 2016 → index of agricultural production increased by 19% in Luhanska and 8% in Donetska oblast (compared to 2015)

In 2017 → it increased in Donetska by 2% and in Luhanska decreased by 2% (compared to 2016)

- **Donetska oblast** → positive trend in export and import for the period of 2015-2017

- **Luhanska oblast** → continued decline in export as well as import (bigger impact of conflict on the oblast’s enterprises, markets etc.)
Business Statistics including “Person-entrepreneurs”

Employees

Legal unit/enterprise

Person-entrepreneurs

Non-profit and other organizations (govt, ngo etc)

Business

Large

Medium

Small

Micro
From 2015-2016, the trend of enterprise closures continued

- worst for large and medium-sized businesses compared to small and micro business.
- # of large and medium sized active enterprise reduced from 912 (2015) to 590 (2016) in Donetska and from 248 (2015) to 223 (2016) in Luhanska

**Trend of enterprise closures**

- impact on number of employed people.
- Between 2015-2016 in Donetska: number of people employed by active enterprises reduced from 410,000 to 314,000
- In Luhanska the number reduced from 112,000 to 104,000 people (closure of large and medium enterprises).
From 2015-2016 → number of “person-entrepreneurs” in Donetska decreased from 57,587 in 2015 to 53,211 BUT the number of employees working for or as “person-entrepreneurs” slightly increased from 78,400 (2015) to 79,000 (2016).

The share of employed people as/on the person-entrepreneurs units compared to enterprises increased from 19% (2015) to 25% (2016) in Donetska, and from 22% (2015) to 26% (2016) in Luhanska.
Between 2015-2017

- number of population of “children ages 0-14 years” decreased by 5% in Donetska and 7% in Luhanska oblast.
- number of elderly aged 65+ increased by 8% in Donetska oblast and 11% in Luhanska oblast.

Share of elderly people up:
- 19.2% (17.5% in 2015) in Donetska
- 19.2 (17.3 in 2015) in Luhanska

Share of able-bodied people down:
- 69.5% to 68.2% in Donetska
- 70.3% to 69.1% in Luhanska
Between 2015 and January-September 2017:
→ number of the economic active population reduced by 1.6% in Luhanska and 1.7% in Donetska oblast.

Between 2015-2017 - number of unemployed people increased:
→ by 2.6% in Donetska (124,500 as per Jan-Sep 2017)
→ by 2.7% in Luhansk (57,900 as per Jan-Sep 2017).
2015-2017 - growing unemployment level.

*September 2017:*
→ 15% in Donetska
→ 17.4% in Luhanska

2015-2017 - overall number of employed people reduced:
→ by 3% in Donetska
→ by 4% in Luhanska oblast
Compared to 2015, real salary increased:
→ Donetska by 4% in 2016
→ Luhanska by 18%

In 2017, real salary continued growing:
→ by 11% in Donetska
→ By 2% in Luhanska compared to 2016.

Average nominal salary level increases:
→ Donetska by 56% (7,764 UAH) in 2017 when compared to 2015
→ Luhanska by 71% (5,862 UAH)
2013 – 2017: ratio of average salary level to the actual minimum subsistence level decreased

→ from 3.37 to 2.64 (22% less) in Donetska
→ from 3 to 1.99 (33% less) in Luhanska
→ average in Ukraine from 2.99 to 2.42 (18% less).

January 2018 Arrears:
→ 453 million UAH in Donetska
→ 557 million UAH in Luhanska
Household level

- Total income/total resources
  - Cash income
  - Non-cash income

- Total expenditure/total resources
  - Cash expenditure
  - Non cash expenditure

- Poverty
Total household income in 2016
- Up by 17% in Donetska
- Up by 25% in Luhanska.

BUT cash income remained at the same level in Donetska and increased by 15% in Luhanska oblast.

2013-2016
Share of total of self-produced and consumed products by household:
- Up from 0.9% to 2.7% in Donetska
- Up from 1.6% to 5.6% in Luhanska

Share of Non-cash income (subsidies for utilities)
- Up from 0.4% to 5.4% in Donetska
- Up from 1% to 5.9% in Luhanska
2016:
Real cash income per person
→ Continued reduction to 19% in
Donetska
→ Continued reduction to 26% in
Luhanska
→ Average across Ukraine increased by
0.8%

2017 (first 3 quarters): Cash income per household
→ Up by 21% in Donetska oblast
→ Up by 35% in Luhanska oblast
(22% in average across all of Ukraine compare to 2016)
2013-2016:

**Total expenditure** increased by 25% in Donetska & by 30% in Luhanska

&

**Cash expenditure** increased by 17% in both Luhanska and Donetska
Household level – Dynamics

INCOME VS EXPENDITURE VS PRICES
IN DONETSKA OBLAST (Compared to 2013)

2013:
→ total income in Donetska was 14% higher than total expenditure
→ total income in Luhanska was 24% higher than total expenditure

2016:
→ total expenditure growing faster than total household income (mainly due to food and utilities)
→ differences decreased to 7% in Donetska & 20% in Luhanska

INCOME VS EXPENDITURE VS PRICES IN LUHANSKA OBLAST (Compared to 2013)
2013-2015:
→ increasing poverty levels
2016:
→ trend stabilized (Donetska level decreased from 66% to 59% & Luhanska level, from 74% to 71%) *(due to non-cash expenditure etc.)*

**BUT**
→ the depth of the poverty increased by 1.1% in Donetska and 0.8% in Luhanska
→ most vulnerable people remained at the same level of poverty as in 2015 (or have seen poverty worsen).
In 2016, total disbursement on social protection in Ukraine increased by 20% compared to 2013.

**BUT** ratio of the total disbursement on social protection to gross domestic product (GDP) decreased from 23.7% in 2013 to 18.2% in 2016.

**European system of integrated social protection statistics (ESSPROS):**

- ‘sickness/health care’ from 4.2% (2013) to 2.9% (2016)
- ‘old age’ from 14.3% to 10.3%,
- ‘family/children’ from 2.6% to 1.7%
- ‘housing’ from 0.4% to 1.9% (subsidies provided for utilities)
Household level – Pension Reform (Oct. 2017)

**NUMBER OF PENSIONERS RECEIVING PENSION**
(THOUSANDS)

- **Donetsk**
  - 2013: 1,371
  - 2014: 1,360
  - 2015: 717
  - 2016: 710
  - 2017: 309

- **Luhansk**
  - 2013: 717
  - 2014: 710
  - 2015: 809
  - 2016: 979
  - 2017: 861

**AVERAGE PENSION SIZE (UAH)**

- **Donetsk**
  - 2013: 1,430
  - 2014: 1,667
  - 2015: 1,725
  - 2016: 1,530
  - 2017: 1,657
  - 2018: 1,785

- **Luhansk**
  - 2013: 717
  - 2014: 1,487
  - 2015: 1,725
  - 2016: 1,959
  - 2017: 1,964
  - 2018: 2,985

Reduction of number of pensioners receiving a pension from the Ukrainian Pension Fund:

- **Donetska oblast** decreased from 1,371,000 (2013) to 861,000s (1 January 2017).
- **In Luhanska oblast**, decreased from 717,000 (2013) to 385,000 (1 January 2017)

**Between January 2017 - January 2018:**

- **Pensions increased by 56% in Donetska & by 52% in Luhanska (Ukrainian average 39%).**
- **BUT** 79% of all pensioners in Ukraine received pensions below 3,000 UAH (below AMSL of 3,128 UAH).
FOOD SECURITY ANALYSIS

- Food Consumptions Score
- Diet Diversity Score
- Food Expenditure
- Livelihoods Based Coping Strategies
- Food Insecurity
- Food Price Monitoring in GCA and NGCA
1. WFP Food Security Update on Ukraine (March 2015),
2. WFP Food Security Assessment (November 2015),
3. WFP Food Security Update (June 2016)
4. REACH Inter Agency Vulnerability Assessment (IAVA) (September 2016),
5. REACH Multi Sector Needs Assessment (MSNA I) (October 2016),
6. Joint FSLC Food Security Assessment (September, 2017 – data collection in June),
7. REACH Area Based Assessment (June 2017),
8. REACH Trend Analysis Data (September 2017),
9. REACH Multi Sector Needs Assessment Data (MSNA II) (October, 2017)
10. REACH Winter Assessment Data (data collection in February, 2018)
What Are The Components Of The Food Security Analysis?

- Food consumption score
- Share of food expenditure
- Livelihood coping strategy

WFP CARI
Covers Food Security

Food Security Index

Food Price Monitoring

SOCIO ECONOMIC SITUATION
Poor and borderline levels of food consumption has increased to 20.9% in February 2018 (17.8% in June 2017).

For vulnerable groups, it remains high at 29%.

27.4% of HHs headed by people aged 40-60.

Elders (60+) 22% with inadequate consumption

Food Consumption Score – in GCA
Consumption & Seasonality: Consumption levels of vegetables and fruits show a clear seasonal correlation with higher levels in the summer/autumn period and lower levels in the winter/spring period. → due to cropping season, increased availability and as a result of higher and lower prices.

Consumption & Prices: Consumption levels of dairy products, eggs and meat/fish decreased. Cereals and grains, roots and tubers, oil and fat increased. → Due to constant increasing prices.
Share of HHs spending less than 50% on food increased → a positive trend.

**BUT** - reduced food expenditure must be understood in context of rising expenditure shares for utilities and heating, which increased to 23% (compared to 20% in June 2016).

In reality, low income causes households to **reduce their food expenditure** as well as other expenditures to pay for utilities → negative impact on their food consumption.
Application of (negative) coping strategies due to lack of money to buy food has increased.

In 2018, such strategies are applied by 78% of households – the highest level since science April 2016.

Emergency coping strategies has increased up to 19% - highest level since April 2016.

Nearly 4% of the HHs interviewed indicated that entire HH had moved from place of in and almost 16% of HHs are using degrading sources of income, illegal work or high risk jobs → affecting future productivity and more difficult to reverse
Moderate and severe food insecurity at 18.7% in February 2018 (15% in June 2017)
1.7% severely food insecure (0.9% in June 2017)
Impact of winter on food security

Confirmed trend of increased food insecurity for vulnerable groups over time (2016-2018)
Reinforced by high level of poverty caused by low incomes & rapid rise in food prices and utilities over the last three years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARI</th>
<th>Household Group Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food secure</strong></td>
<td>Able to meet essential food and non-food needs without depletion of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginally food secure</strong></td>
<td>Has minimally adequate food consumption, but unable to afford some essential non-food expenditures without depletion of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately food insecure</strong></td>
<td>Has food consumption gaps, OR, Marginally able to meet minimum food needs only with accelerated depletion of livelihood assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Severely food insecure</strong></td>
<td>Has large food consumption gaps, OR, Has extreme loss of livelihood assets that will lead to large food consumption gaps, OR worse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Food Insecurity – in GCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MODERATELY FOOD INSECURE COMPARED TO MARGINALLY FOOD SECURE</th>
<th>SEVERELY FOOD INSECURE COMPARED TO MARGINALLY FOOD SECURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH income</td>
<td>26% less than marginally food secure</td>
<td>54% less than marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>2% less than marginally food secure</td>
<td>56% less than marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of food expenditure</strong></td>
<td>45% compare to 50% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>85% compare to 50% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of health expenditure</strong></td>
<td>the share of health expenditure is 15% compare 9% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>the share of health expenditure is 5% compare 9% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>34% HH has a member with vulnerability compare to 27% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>37% HH has a member with vulnerability compare to 27% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of utilities</strong></td>
<td>22% the share of utilities and heating compared to 23% share of utilities and heating of marginally food secure</td>
<td>4% the share of utilities and heating compared to 23% share of utilities and heating of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Consumption Scores</td>
<td>71% has borderline FCS compare to 6% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>60% has borderline FCS compare to 6% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% has poor FCS compare to 0% of marginally</td>
<td>40% has poor FCS compare to 0% of marginally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Coping Strategies</td>
<td>92% applying negative coping strategies compare to 89% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>100% applying negative coping strategies compare to 89% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35% applying emergency coping strategy compare to 20% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>88% applying emergency coping strategy compare to 20% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Pension Increase on Food Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARI</th>
<th>No increase</th>
<th>&lt; 500 UAH</th>
<th>500-1000 UAH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food secure</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginally food secure</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately food insecure</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely food insecure</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of pension reform (October 2017):
positive impact on households headed by pensioners.

- 90% reported increase of pension
- Food insecurity from 21% in June 2017 to 18% in February 2018 – despite the seasonal impact of winter.

Vulnerable HHs:

- 24% food are food insecure → clear correlation between vulnerability and food insecurity levels
- The majority of vulnerable households → reduce on other expenses, making choices between medicine, heating and their children’s education to ensure basic daily food intake.
GCA Food Insecurity – New Key Vulnerable Group:

- GCA Food Insecurity and Unemployment – New Key Vulnerable Group:
  - The REACH winter assessment data confirms the trend identified in 2017, directly linking food security and unemployment.
  - In February 2018, food insecurity increased from to 26% (compared to 11% in June 2016) for households with the head of household aged 40-60.
  - This mainly a reflection of a high proportion of unemployed people as a head of household within this group.
  - For households with unemployed head overall, the level of food insecurity 37%.
**Food Insecurity – in NGCA**

**NGCA Food Consumption:**
- Recent positive trend (seasonal factor / reduction of food price) but same level as 2016
- In October, 2017, poor and borderline levels FCS was found to be 16% (21% in June 2017) **BUT** - increased from October 2016 where it was 15%.

- 14% of HHs were found to have poor dietary diversity, whereas 50% have medium diet diversity.
- Compared to the same period of time one year earlier (October 2016), HHs with low dietary diversity increased from 12% whereas those with medium dietary diversity decreased from 56%.
Food Expenditure and Livelihood coping strategy - NGCA

- Food Expenditure remained steady at 55% (compared to 59% in June 2017 - though reduced from 64% in October 2016).
- Over time, the share of households that spend less than 50% on food increased, which is a positive trend.

NGCA Negative Coping Strategies:
Although down from 87% in June 2017 (where food prices were high), the number of households who applied negative coping strategies in October 2017 remained high at 71%.
Livelihood Coping Strategy - NGCA

The percentage of the “emergency coping strategies” has increased up to 16% during the observed period of time.

Nearly 10% of the HH interviewed indicated that the entire HH had moved from place of origin and almost 7% of HHs were using degrading sources of income, illegal work or high risk jobs.
NGCA Food Insecurity:
- Moderate and severe food insecurity down from 26% (June 2017) to 17.4% (October 2017)
- 3.2% are severely food insecure (5.2% in June 2017).
- Improvement in food insecurity levels – likely due to seasonal reduction of food prices
- Prices peaked in May at 1086 UAH but dropped by 19% in August
## Food Insecurity - NGCA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderately Food Insecure Compared to Marginally Food Secure</th>
<th>Severely Food Insecure Compared to Marginally Food Secure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of HH Income</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>18% less than marginally food secure</td>
<td>52% less than marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of food expenditure</td>
<td>57% compare to 58% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>80% compare to 58% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of health expenditure</td>
<td>the share of health expenditure is 17% compare 12% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>the share of health expenditure is 9% compare 12% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of utilities</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Consumption Scores</strong></td>
<td>57% has borderline FCS compare to 2% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>24% has borderline FCS compare to 2% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% has poor FCS compare to 0% of marginally</td>
<td>76% has poor FCS compare to 0% of marginally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihood Coping Strategies</strong></td>
<td>91% applying negative coping strategies compare to 84% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>100% applying negative coping strategies compare to 84% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28% applying emergency coping strategy compare to 18% of marginally food secure</td>
<td>40% applying emergency coping strategy compare to 20% of marginally food secure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall Vulnerable Groups:**

Analysis of the main indicators (food consumption score, livelihood coping strategies and food security index) of REACH winter assessment data in GCA (February 2018) and REACH MSNA-2 data in NGCA (October 2017) shows that in both GCA and NGCA the most vulnerable groups remain:

- single headed households with children
- elders (60+) (mostly those living alone),
- chronically ill and disabled,
- female-headed households
- households with no active employment – and especially households headed by people aged 40-60 (with no employment).
**COMPARISON BETWEEN GCA AND NGCA**

- Prices in NGCA were higher when compared to GCA during 2015-2017
  - **BUT** - fast price growing in GCA decreased the price gap between GCA and NGCA.
  
- Difference between GCA and NGCA food basket cost narrowed to only 7% in September 2017, from 21% in June and a full 35% in May 2017
  
- Prices in GCA grew sharply while in NGCA food prices were unstable and prone to spikes and rapid change
The Analysis shows the Impact of Conflict

Macro-economic indicators
(GRP, Export/Import, Industry production, Agricultural production, Capital Investments)

Business Statistics including “Person-entrepreneurs”
(Number of units, turnover and number of employees)

Labour Force
(Economic active population, employment, unemployment, salary)

Households socio-economic profile
(Poverty, income, expenditure, pensions, social protection indicators, prices)

Food Security
(Food consumption, food expenditure, livelihood coping strategies, food prices)