Presentation of Joint Food Security Assessment Analysis

Main Findings

Kyiv, 12 September, 2017
Cluster discussions since February on the need for a Food Security Assessment (FSA)

8 different cluster partners (and KIIS) undertook the first joint FSCLC assessment in Ukraine.

Planning and design of the FSA led by the Cluster FSA Technical Working Group:

- sample design and sampling;
- design of the questionnaire and accompanying tools;
- selection and training of enumerators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>ACF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARITAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DORCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP Field Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WFP / KIIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>WFP / KIIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEN & HOW?
- Data Collection & Data Analysis

HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEWS:
2,687 households surveyed
→ GCA – 778 face-to-face household (HH) interviews in June 2017 (ACF, ADRA, CARITAS, DORCAS, FAO, NRC, PIN, WFP / KIIS)
→ NGCA – 1,909 interviews through phone carried out in May-June, 2017 (WFP / KIIS)

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS:
→ 7 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)
→ 32 Key Informants Interviews (KIIs) undertaken during July, 2017

DATA ANALYSIS:
✓ Data analysis completed by the FSA Analytical Technical Working Group:
  ▪ Caritas Head of M&E
  ▪ REACH Assessment Officer,
  ▪ WFP VAM Officer,
  ▪ FSLC IMO and
  ▪ KIIS analytical expert

REPORT WRITING:
✓ Report prepared by FSLC team with consultations with FSA partners and other analytical TWG members.
HOW DID WE REACH OUR RESULTS?
- Food Security Assessment Methodology:

- Joint FSA use WFP's household-level food security classification (CARI Approach).

- Report and PPT → to compare results, we refer to findings from February 2017 analysis of the 2016 REACH IAVA (GCA) and MSNA (NGCA).

FSA Findings are comparable with the analysis of REACH 2016 data

→ The same questionnaire on food security indicators was used for REACH IAVA and MSNA.

→ The CARI methodology was also used for the analysis the 2016 IAVA (GCA) & MSNA (NGCA).
WHAT ARE THE KEY FINDINGS?
- Overall Increase of Food Insecurity in GCA & NGCA

Donetska & Luhanska GCA severely and moderately food insecure:
→ 15% in Donetska GCA (up from 6%)
→ 14% in Luhanska GCA (up from 10%).

Donetska & Luhanska NGCA:
→ 26% (up from 13%) severely and moderately food insecure
→ 5.2% (up from 1.7%) severely food insecure.
WHAT ARE THE KEY FINDINGS?
- Overall Increase of Food Insecurity & Link with Livelihoods

- Poor and borderline levels of food consumption have increased.

- Application of Negative Coping Strategies has increased in NGCA while in GCA it remains at a stable level.

- Food Expenditure has reduced overall, mainly to reflect the increased cost of utilities, which has negatively impacted food consumption.

- The FSA indicates a direct link between food insecurity and unemployment.

- Vulnerable groups:
  - Single headed HHs with children
  - Elders (60+) living alone
  - Households with no active employment
  - Female-headed HHs

- Overall number of food insecure / “People in Need” has increased.
WHAT ARE THE COMPONENTS OF THE FOOD SECURITY ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS?

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

WFP CARI
Covers Food Security

Livelihoods Section in Questionnaire (links with food security)

Triangulation of secondary data → SSSU, other humanitarian assessments, 3W, field observations etc
FOOD CONSUMPTION SCORE:
- Looking at Dietary Quality & Frequency of Consumption

**Share of General Population with poor and borderline levels of food consumption**
- 17.8% (up from 7.3%) in GCA
- 20.8% (up from 15.2%) in NGCA.

**High proportion of HHs with poor levels of food consumption**
- 5.1% in GCA
- 7.6% in NGCA.
% of HHs with poor and borderline levels of food consumption

**GCA:**
- 21% of female-headed HHs (up from 13%)
- 14% of male-headed HHs (up from 4%).

**NGCA:**
- 25% of female-headed HHs (up from 19%)
- 15% of male-headed HHs (up from 9%).

---

**Food Consumption Score:**
- **Vulnerable Groups: Female Headed HHs**

---

### Food Consumption % – Male vs Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>GCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*acceptable, borderline, poor*
FOOD CONSUMPTION SCORE:
- Vulnerable Groups: Elders (60+)

% of HHs with poor and borderline levels of food consumption

GCA:
- 25% of HHs headed by Elderly (up from 18%)

NGCA:
- 32% of HHs headed by Elderly (up from 23%)

Food Consumption %, (60+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borderline</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borderline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Food consumption levels:
  - acceptable
  - borderline
  - poor
% of HHs with low/poor dietary diversity

GCA:
- 14% (up from 3%) of HHs were found to have low/poor dietary diversity

NGCA
- 20% of HHs (an increase from 12%) were found to have a low/poor diet diversity
**Overall reduction in diet diversity**

**GCA:**
- 32% of HHs did not eat any fruit in the past 7 days (up from 13%).

**NGCA:**
- 42% of HHs did not eat any fruit in the past 7 days (up from 24%).
For the first time since March 2015, a negative trend of poor and borderline of food consumption.

Situation remains unchanged with higher percentage of poor and borderline HHs than in GCA.
**FOOD CONSUMPTION SCORE: Seasonality**

*Winterisation Link: Needs peak in January-February*

**Clear trend of higher unmet food needs during winter months:**

→ Affected HHs Peak in January-February: 20-23%

→ In November-December and again in March-April: 10% (still high)

“Were there months, in the past 12 months, in which you did not have enough food to meet your family's needs?”
**FOOD EXPENDITURE**

*Proportion of HH budget spent on food*

**Food Expenditure Levels Reduced:**

- **Food Expenditure** average in Donbas has decreased
- 47% in GCA (down from 53%)
- 59% in NGCA (down from 64%)

**Share of Food Expenditure in HH Spending Budget in July 2017 in GCA & NGCA, %**

- **Food Expenditure Levels Reduced**
  - GCA: 53% (2016), 47% (2017)
  - NGCA: 64% (2016), 59% (2017)

**Share of food expenditure, %**

- 2016: GCA 53%, NGCA 64%
- 2017: GCA 47%, NGCA 59%
Reduction of expenditure for food and medicines to pay utilities during the last 12 months
→ 58% in GCA
→ 45% in NGCA

- Those who **reduced expenditure on food & medicines** to pay for utilities
  → twice as high **inadequate food consumption levels**
  (compared to those who did not have to reduce their food and medicine expenditure)
  → in NGCA (15% compared to 28%)
  → in GCA (9% compared to 24%)
**LIVELIHOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES**

**Negative Coping Strategies**
- 87% in NGCA (up from 40%),
- GCA 53% are applying negative coping strategies (down from 55%).

**Most common coping strategy**

**Crisis Coping Strategies:**
HHs found to have **reduced health expenditures**:
- 61% (46% before) of HHs in NGCA
- 31% (35% before) of HHs in GCA
**LIVELIHOOD-BASED COPING STRATEGIES**

*Significant Increase of Negative Coping Strategies in NGCA*

- Nearly 14% of HHs: “entire HH had moved from place of origin in search of work (up from 3%)”

- Almost 10% of HHs using degrading sources of income, illegal work or high risk jobs (up from 2%).

![Negative Applied Coping Strategies in NGCA](chart.png)
LIVELIHOODS: - Direct Link between Food Insecurity & Unemployment

- In GCA, the food insecurity levels of HHs where no one is working is 21% (compared to 8% in HHs with one or more employed).

- In Luhanska NGCA, 32% of HHs, where no one is working, are food insecure (compared to 20% in HHs with one or more employed) whereas in Donetska NGCA this figure is 45% (compared to 22%).

**% of Households Moderately or Severely Food Insecure & hh employment status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lugansk</th>
<th>Donetsk</th>
<th>Lugansk</th>
<th>Donetsk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nobody in household employed</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one employee in household</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GCA | NGCA
WHAT ARE THE KEY FINDINGS?
- Overall Increase of Food Insecurity

Donetska & Luhanska GCA severely and moderately food insecure:
→ 15% in Donetska GCA (up from 6%)
→ 14% in Luhanska GCA (up from 10%).

Donetska & Luhanska NGCA:
→ 28% in Donetska NGCA (up from 12%)
→ 23% in Luhanska NGCA (up from 14%).
WHAT ARE THE KEY FINDINGS?

- Overall Increase of **SEVERE** Food Insecurity in **GCA & NGCA**

Percentage of Severely Food Insecure in GCA and NGCA

Severe food insecurity levels across GCA:
→ 0.9% (up from 0.4%)

Severe food insecurity levels across NGCA:
→ 5.2% (up from 1.7%)
WHAT ARE THE KEY FINDINGS?
- Overall Increase of Food Insecurity in NGCA

- Overall Moderate and Severe food insecurity levels in Donetska and Luhanska NGCA: 26% (up from 13%)
WHO ARE THE KEY VULNERABLE GROUPS?

→ **30%** of female headed HHs in NGCA and **17%** in GCA are food insecure.

→ **12%** of male headed HHs in GCA and **22%** in NGCA are food insecure.

→ **Elders (60+)** are the most vulnerable group with up to **35%** food insecure in NGCA and **21%** in GCA.

---

**FSI, % of HHs food insecure (male & female headed HHs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male GCA</th>
<th>Female GCA</th>
<th>Male NGCA</th>
<th>Female NGCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FSI, % of HHs food insecure (by age of headed HHs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to 40</th>
<th>40-60</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- red: severely food insecure
- yellow: moderately food insecure
SUMMARY: What are the Main Factors Explaining Food Insecurity in GCA?

- **Food consumption score**: 17.8% (from 7.3%)
  - 24% compared to 9%

- **Share of food expenditure**: 47% (from 53%)

- **Livelihood coping strategy**: 51% (from 53%)
  - 21% compared to 8%

**WFP CARI**

- **Food Security Index**: 15% (from 7%)

**Livelihoods Section in Questionnaire** (links with food security)
SUMMARY: What are the Main Factors Explaining Food Insecurity in NGCA?

Food consumption score: 20.8% (up from 15.2%)
Share of food expenditure: 59% (from 64%)
Livelihood coping strategy: 87% (from 40%)

WFP CARI

Food Security Index: 26% (from 13%)

In Luhanska 32% (compared to 20%); Donetska 45% (compared to 22%)

Livelihoods Section in Questionnaire (links with food security)
Based on FSA analysis, the overall number of food insecure people in Donbas is estimated to be up to 1.2 million.

**GCA**
- Up to **410,000** people severely and moderately food insecure
- Of these, up to **26,000** people are severely food insecure.

**NGCA**
- Up to **800,000** people severely and moderately food insecure
- Of these, up to **150,000** people severely food insecure.

- Across all areas, the most vulnerable groups remain:
  - Single headed HHs with children
  - Elders (60+) living alone
  - Households with no active employment
  - Female-headed HHs
POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO THE CHANGE IN SITUATION:

**Increased Consumer Prices:**
Consumer prices has seen a rapid increase — between June 2016 and June 2017, consumer prices had increased by **15.6%** (especially utility prices which alone increased by 29.2%).

**Increased Food Prices:**
In May 2017, the value of the WFP monitored food basket in NGCA reached its the highest level (at 1066 UAH per person per month) since the beginning of the conflict.

Food prices in GCA, according the WFP monitored food basket, between December 2016 and June 2017, increased by **20.5%** from UAH 702 in December to UAH 846 in June 2017.

- **High unemployment rate:**
  - **GCA:** During the first quarter of 2017, unemployment has increased to **18.3%** in Luhanska GCA March (up from 16.9% in Dec 2016) and to **15.6%** Donetska GCA (up from 14.6%).
  - This is the highest increase in the unemployment rate since 2008.
  - Employment data is unavailability for NGCA, however FSA indicates increased levels of unemployment.
POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTING FACTORS:

**Salary Status:**
Average salaries since the beginning of 2017 has increased however, the “real salaries” (ratio between salaries and consumer prices index) stay almost at the same level.

In addition, the amount of salary arrears in GCA is growing – in June GCA made up 41% of total salary arrears in all of Ukraine.

**Reduction of humanitarian assistance:**
- Between February and March, food assistance declined by 89%.
- 500,000 beneficiaries average per month in early 2017 → between the months of March-June, only 69,600 beneficiaries in average per month across Donbas received some type of food assistance – in NGCA alone, the monthly average was only 25,800.

**Social Benefits:**
In a context of increased prices, social payments for the most vulnerable groups have stayed almost on the same level – this means that the income of the majority of pensioners fall below the actual minimum subsistence level.

**Blockade and nationalization:**
After March 2017, the blockade and “nationalization” of numerous businesses and mines in NGCA, is expected to have led to a large number of people losing jobs and income.
THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?
The Summary Report of the Joint Food Security Assessment will be available here:

http://fscluster.org/ukraine

The next regular Kyiv meeting will depend on the timing of the field meetings and potential HRP process and will therefore likely be:

First week of October