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Presentation of results

- Main findings on baseline food, income, and expenditure for IDP and host community
- Comparison between e-voucher and actual food expenditure
- Outcome analysis: survival and livelihoods protection thresholds
- Limitations of HEA data

Discussion on use of HEA results

- Targeting
- Food basket and transfer value
- Monitoring
HEA methodology overview

Key points to remember going forward

• Livelihoods-based framework for analysing the way households gain access to the things they need to survive and prosper

  **HEA is about quantifying access to food and income**

• Understanding how households live normally will enable us to understand and quantify how they will be impacted by a shock or hazard

• HEA defines a **livelihood zone** (a geographical area in which a population have similar access to markets, and similar levels and types of income-generating activities)

  **NB:** The results of this HEA are valid only for the livelihood zone in which the HEA was conducted (Maiduguri Lower and Intermediate Urban areas)

• Within the livelihood zone, 8 communities were visited for both community representative and household representative interviews. The quantification of livelihood strategies shown below was derived from the group household representative interviews
Urban HEA in brief
Overview of objectives and zoning

Objective
• To understand how the most vulnerable households in urban Maiduguri are living and gaining access to food and income
• To understand and quantify coping strategies
• To compare between displaced and host community livelihoods

Urban Zoning
• Periurban
• Lower urban
• Intermediate urban
• Urban centre

Maiduguri Lower and Intermediate Urban Livelihood Zone
Locations visited during fieldwork

LGAs
- Jere
- MMC

Communities
- Shagari Lowcost
- Madinatu
- Kusheri
- Jiddari Polo
- Galtimari/Fori
- Kawarmaila
- Modusulumri
- Dala Lawanti
- Shuwari II
Wealth Breakdown
Disaggregation of the host and IDP populations into locally-defined socioeconomic groups
### IDP wealth characteristics

Key characteristics that distinguish between different wealth groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Household size and cultivated</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Productive assets</th>
<th>Income-generating activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
<td>6 (5-7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand hoe, cutlass, cellphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water vendors, cap-making,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>domestic work, agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>labour, begging, petty trade,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>firewood sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>8 (7-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand hoe, cutlass, cellphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>construction labour, carpentry,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural labour, petty trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td>9 (8-10)</td>
<td>0.5 Ha (0-1)</td>
<td>1-2 goats; 0-1 sheep</td>
<td>hand hoes, cutlass, cell phone, cart, rickshaw, wheelbarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small traders, kekenapepe drivers, taxi drivers, small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Better Off</strong></td>
<td>11 (9-15)</td>
<td>1 Ha (0-2)</td>
<td>2-3 goats, 1-2 sheep</td>
<td>hand hoes, cutlass, cell phone, cart, rickshaw, wheelbarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>government salaries, small business owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Host community wealth characteristics

Key characteristics that distinguish between different wealth groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Land Cultivated</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Productive assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>8(6-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand hoe, cuttlass, cellphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9(7-11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 hen</td>
<td>hand hoe, cuttlass, cellphone, bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>11(8-12)</td>
<td>2(0-5)</td>
<td>2cattle, 3goats, 4sheep, 6hen</td>
<td>hand hoe, cuttlass, cellphone, carts, wheelbarrow, rickshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Off</td>
<td>18(15-21)</td>
<td>5(1-10)</td>
<td>3cattle, 4goats, 7sheep, 16hen</td>
<td>hand hoe, cuttlass, cellphone, carts, wheelbarrow, rickshaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IDP key points

• Majority are displaced from Bama, Gwoza, Konduga LGAs
• Key determinants of wealth = social, financial and physical capital from community of origin
• Better off and middle households are engaged in government work and small business, respectively
• Poor households earn 60% of income from casual employment
• Very poor households earn 41% from self-employment
• E-vouchers and cash assistance contribute 30% to very poor IDP household income, and 24% of poor IDP household income
• Most common very poor household size is 7, most common poor household size is 8
• Very poor IDPs tend to be living in thatch huts, poor IDPs tend to be living in tents or renting
• Very poor IDPs tend not to send their children to school
Host community key points

- Very poor and poor households depend largely on labour as their main source of income.
- Little or no agricultural activity within the host communities as farmlands are located outskirt of town and currently inaccessible due to frequent attacks on farmers.
- The presence of the displaced population has further reduced access to local labour and as well increased the price of staple food and house rent.
- Major source of income for the poor and very poor households within the host community is casual labour, with the poor and very poor getting 77% and 59% respectively from this source.
- Peculiar to the very poor household income generating activity is domestic labour which contributes 26% to their annual cash income.
- Better off and middle households are engaged in large and medium scale business, as well as government work.
- Poor households earn 20% of income from self-employment
- Very poor households earn 29% from self-employment
Total Annual Income (for the reference year)
The reference year used was March 2016-February 2017

Total IDP Cash Income during reference year

Total Host Cash Income during reference year
Comparative analysis of livelihood strategies

- Very poor and poor IDPs are earning 30% less than their host counterparts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total reference year annual per household income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor (HH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (HH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- E-vouchers constitute 30% of very poor IDP annual income, and 24% of poor IDP annual income
- E-vouchers constitute approximately 10% of host community annual income (both very poor and poor)
- Very poor IDPs are engaging in less formal income-generating activities, that contribute to the more precarious nature of their livelihood security
Food Needs
Total food consumed converted into kilocalories, compared to threshold of 2100 kcal per person per day

- Children begging
- Gifts from Better Off
- Other (mixed)
- Beans
- Wheat flour
- Sorghum
- Millet
- Maize flour
- Maize grain
- Rice

Percentage of total food needs met (IDPs)

Percentage of total food needs met (hosts)
Total Annual Expenditure
All expenditure items depicted as percentage of total annual expenditure

Breakdown of total expenditure (IDPs)
Breakdown of Total Expenditure (hosts)
SCI e-vouchers compared with monthly food expenditure
IDP households

- Total annual food expenditure (staple and non-staple) for IDP households was divided by twelve to determine approximate monthly spending
- This monthly amount is compared with the monthly e-voucher transfer value given by SCI to targeted households
- SCI e-voucher covers 96% of very poor IDP monthly food, and 66% of poor IDP monthly food
Comparing e-vouchers with total expenditure

Host community households

- Total annual food expenditure (staple and non-staple) for host households was divided by twelve to determine approximate monthly spending.
- This monthly amount is compared with the monthly e-voucher transfer value given by SCI to targeted households.
- SCI e-voucher covers 69% of very poor host monthly food, and 51% of poor host monthly food.
Survival and livelihoods protection thresholds and deficits
Comparing very poor and poor IDPs (the wealth groups facing deficits)

Very poor IDPs
Survival deficit: 15%
Livelihoods protection deficit: 1%

Poor IDPs
Survival deficit: 2%
Livelihoods protection deficit: 2%
Limitations of the HEA data

- HEA outcome analysis data identifies total cash and food requirements to meet household kcal gap, not the total funding gap needed for a response.
- HEA can inform the setting of transfer amounts, but food basket composition must incorporate nutritional assessments of individual goods, prices, and availability.
- The items included in the HEA survival basket to calculate the survival deficit are: maize grain, beans, salt, and oil.
  * This likely differs from food baskets created by different NGOs.
- HEA baseline includes income earned from negative coping strategies. OA does not. Thus, the fact that a HH does not face a survival deficit does not imply that they are not vulnerable; it demonstrates the extent to which they are relying on unsustainable strategies to cope with shock. All response analysis must factor this in.
- This HEA did not assess middle and better off households. However, wealth group characteristics identified during HH interviews can be used to improve targeting within communities.
- Seasonality was not considered in the OA, but seasonal price fluctuations must be considered to determine transfer value.
• Targeting the most vulnerable households

**Key wealth breakdown characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Household size and cultivated</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Productive assets</th>
<th>Income-generating activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>6 (5-7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand hoe, cutlass, cellphone, water vendors, cap-making, domestic work, agricultural labour, begging, petty trade, firewood sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8 (7-10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>hand hoe, cutlass, cellphone, construction labour, carpentry, agricultural labour, petty trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>9 (8-10)</td>
<td>0.5 Ha (0-1)</td>
<td>1-2 goats; 0-1 sheep</td>
<td>hand hoes, cutlass, cellphone, cart, rickshaw, wheelbarrow, small traders, kekenapepe drivers, taxi drivers, small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Off</td>
<td>11 (9-15)</td>
<td>1 Ha (0-2)</td>
<td>2-3 goats, 1-2 sheep</td>
<td>hand hoes, cutlass, cellphone, cart, rickshaw, wheelbarrow, government salaries, small business owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food basket and transfer value

Using HEA data as an indicator, rather than a recommended value

• Look at total survival deficit and thresholds for each wealth group

  **NB: HEA survival threshold includes items in HEA survival basket**
  **(maize grain, beans, oil, salt)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDP households – annual per household thresholds in Nigerian Naira</th>
<th>Host community households – annual per household thresholds in Nigerian Naira</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>332,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH protection</td>
<td>336,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>444,509</td>
<td>503,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH protection</td>
<td>494,188</td>
<td>574,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The above values are based on the household size for each wealth group. For this reason, they should be taken as indicative values, rather than set values
**Monitoring**

Key items in IDP and host community expenditure baskets

- The items indicated in the table are key food and non-food expenditure items that were found during the HEA.
- These are items to consider for inclusion in a food (or non-food) basket, and items whose quantity and price need to be monitored as they are key to household food and livelihood security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Non-food</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staples</strong></td>
<td>IDPs: salt, soap, grinding, water (poor HH only), school (poor HH only), medicine, transport, radio batteries, phones, phone credit, sanitary items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice (local and imported), maize grain, maize flour, millet, sorghum, wheat, beans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-staples</strong></td>
<td>Hosts: tea, salt, soap, grinding, water, school, medicine, transport, rent, radio batteries, phone credit, festivals, electricity, sanitary items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yam, sweet potato, dried fish, palm oil, vegetable oil, pasta, vegetables, fruits, groundnut paste, groundnut, sugar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>