

ANNEX 2: METHODOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTS FOR THE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT

OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the mission was to conduct a food security and nutritional vulnerability assessment in the West Bank and Gaza, using a participatory qualitative methodology. In light of the recent studies on poverty and nutrition, the assessment focused on food security/insecurity and vulnerability, addressing the extent and the causes of food insecurity. It identified the people, households and groups that were food insecure and at risk of becoming food insecure in the near future, by providing a picture of where the food insecure groups were located geographically and how physical location shaped their food insecurity. Finally, the assessment sought to find the coping mechanisms and the extent to which these were exhausted.

A literature review revealed that there was information available on levels of poverty and vulnerability among the general population based largely on measurements of income and consumption. Much of the information in the current literature includes descriptions on the coping mechanisms used by households for survival. Factors considered include the contribution of public sector wages, traditional mutual help practices, casual employment in the private sector and in settlements, external social assistance to the poorest and peoples' savings. These studies predicted that these household coping mechanisms were about to break down. However, the literature review revealed that little was known about *who* constituted the most vulnerable groups and *how* vulnerability profiles were changing during the second *Intifada*. Furthermore, these studies made few links with food security and failed to show which groups could no longer rely on their coping mechanisms. Based on these identified information gaps, this assessment aimed to: 1) identify specific vulnerable groups; 2) assess the extent to which their coping mechanisms had broken down or were exhausted; and, 3) find the coping mechanisms, if any, still available to the Palestinians.

ASSESSMENT CONCEPTS

i. Livelihoods

The assessment adopted a livelihoods approach to food insecurity. The term 'livelihood' embraces a wider conception of work than employment alone and incorporates the household and the diverse strategies employed by its members to mobilise available resources and opportunities including: income-generating work, subsistence production, savings accumulation and spending, changing patterns of consumption, investment in children's education, and labour and asset pooling arrangements. For the purposes of this assessment, *livelihood* comprises the capabilities, assets (including material, human and social resources) and activities required for earning a means of living.

ii. Social networks

Conventional conceptualisations of livelihoods look at how access to material and human resources explains people's ability to seize opportunities. This assessment also paid attention to the manner in which social resources contribute towards livelihoods. The assessment held that it was crucial to understand the way social networks and household relations shaped people's ability to turn material and human resources into strategies for achieving food security. Social networks are seen as important because they play a welfare role in obtaining resources and acted as a buffer protecting households against external shocks.

The assessment was interested in the extent to which exclusion from social networks shaped vulnerability. For example, it asked which households could not turn to others for food when they are hungry. Further, was it the case that the recently unemployed who have relied on income from employment in Israel found it difficult to turn to others for help because they were accustomed to having high economic and/or social status in the community? While, by contrast, were the longer-term poor more integrated into networks of support with food assistance channels open to them? Or did the new poor still have access to influential networks that helped them while general impoverishment meant that the community turned its back on the longer-term poor? This assessment also sought to establish the importance of access to credit for achieving food security, the extent to which it continued to operate and which groups had access to it. The assessment addressed inclusion and exclusion from support networks and the overall deterioration of social networks due to prolonged hardship.

iii. Household

The household was of particular relevance because its internal relations shaped its ability to compensate for economic decline. For the purposes of this assessment, the household was understood to encompass a variety of forms and functions. Resources flowing into the household from those residing beyond its physical boundaries, such as family members living abroad and humanitarian aid agencies were important. Differences between households in terms of members' gender, age, income, education, social networks and access to government/PA and international aid provision affected household members' food security.

The assessment adopted a gender approach to the household which holds that power relations within it according to gender and generation mean that it cannot be treated as a unified whole. This provided a good starting point to analyse the link between households' internal dynamics and the construction of livelihoods. It suggested that changes in the conditions under which individuals form a household affect their decision-making power. This point was important because men in many cases no longer played the main breadwinner role and women increasingly shouldered the burden of household survival, both of which can throw into flux the basis of the household's power relations. The assessment addressed whether household adjustment strategies such as increasing the number of workers per household and increasing the number of household members, together with the modification of consumption patterns cushioned the blow of the falling rate of incomes. The assessment also addressed the negative impacts of closure, including the breakdown of household relations, and considered how food problems in the home triggered violence and conflict between parents and children and husbands and wives.

iv. Food security

Food security was defined as the condition in which a population has physical, social and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food over a given period to meet dietary needs and preferences for an active and healthy life. The three main components to food security were:

a) *Food availability*

A measure of the food that is, and will be, physically available in the relevant vicinity of a population during the given consumption period through a combination of domestic (national) production, stocks and trade. For example, the assessment considered whether farmers are able to grow crops and get them to markets, whether merchants could supply shops and whether shopkeepers could sell the range of foods that they have done in the past.

b) *Food access*

A measure of the population's ability to acquire available food. Access is physical, such as whether people can reach food. For example, to what extent did closure and curfew prevent people from buying food in shops and tending their fields. Access is also economic, that is, shaped by the extent to which people can afford to buy food. Lastly, access is social, that is, shaped by social status.

c) *Utilisation*

A measure of whether a population will be able to derive sufficient nutrition during the given consumption period from available and accessible food to meet its dietary needs. This assessment paid attention to patterns of food distribution within the household and sought to understand whether some people were more food insecure in the household than others and how household type influenced the food insecurity of its different members. For example, what happened to food allocation when a nuclear household expanded to become an extended household? Did everyone get equally less food or did some members reduce their consumption while others not?

v. **Vulnerability**

This refers to the risk of food shortage and vulnerability to such risk, generally and per specific social groups. A distinction was made between a constant state of vulnerability and temporary/transitory vulnerability. This assessment aimed to provide a dynamic view of vulnerability considering the risk that households face in their day-to-day decision-making and their capacity to respond effectively over time. This dynamic perspective helps understand how well households cope in their daily quest for survival, an element that formed an integral part of the assessment. It allows us to examine those characterised in this assessment as the 'middle group' (understood as those households that were under threat of food insecurity), their coping mechanisms and capacity to escape food insecurity. Changes to their food security status depended on the impact of socio-economic changes either increasing or decreasing the risk factor.

METHODOLOGY DESIGN

The assessment adopted a qualitative, participatory approach. At the same time, because of its large size and comprehensive coverage of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, it sought to quantify the findings.

The assessment involved collaboration between FAO, WFP, UNRWA, UNDP, CARE, Al Quds and John Hopkins Universities, which are working on food security issues in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. These organisations contributed staff and office space and provided logistical support (cars, computers).

INSTRUMENTS UTILIZED

The assessment used a combination of semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. The questionnaires and focus group discussion outlines used are found below. Interviews with traders, farmers and fisher folk provided information about the production and supply of food and its availability to the local population. Focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with women and children provided information on vulnerability and food insecurity. These tools were chosen because of their suitability for eliciting information from the assessment's sample population (see

below). The assumption behind the choice of women and children was that women were most knowledgeable about the management of household resources and the utilisation of food within the household. Children were selected because it was believed that they would talk more openly about the distribution of food within the household.

The pair-wise ranking exercise used for conducting the key informant interviews allowed us to map geographically where food insecure people were located, and their percentage in the overall population of each cluster. This exercise is discussed in detail in the methodology section of chapter V in the main report.

The potential weaknesses of interviews and focus groups included biases in the sample and on the part of the fieldworkers. The quality of interviews was ensured by training of fieldworkers on participatory research techniques; assessing the credibility of people questioned and the sources through which they are identified; examining the nature of the sample, and cross-checking the information collected during the fieldwork monitoring process and during the data processing and cleaning. Making the methodology, reasoning and assumptions explicit and the data available for re-examination further reduced possible biases.

IDENTIFYING RESPONDENTS FOR FOCUS GROUPS AND INTERVIEWS

The respondents were not a random sample, but carefully chosen for the kinds of vulnerability they illustrated. Focus groups were conducted with the following groups:

1. *Chronic poor* (women only, including female headed households, widows, households with chronically sick or disabled members, households without a breadwinner);
2. *New poor* (women only, including recently unemployed and households where the main income earner has lost their income in the last two years);
3. *Households that have lost assets* (women only and including for example, assets lost due to bypass roads, the construction and expansion of settlements, the wall separating the West Bank from Israel, demolitions);
4. *Elderly* (women and men);
5. *Children*, comprising two groups: 8-12 years (girls and boys) and 13-16 years (girls and boys in separate groups if mixed groups were inappropriate).
6. *Control group* for comparing the coping strategies of the vulnerable groups with a more randomly selected group. This control group was selected among those “living on account” through shops’ credit lists (women only). After conducting a trade/food supply semi-structured interview with a food shopkeeper, fieldworkers asked the shopkeeper whether he was willing to put together a focus group from the shop’s credit list of both clients to whom he extended and no longer extended credit due to repayment arrears.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with women from vulnerable households and included Bedouin women.

Semi-structured interviews about the production and supply of food were conducted with farmers, fishers and traders. The decision to collect information on food availability was the result of discussions between the Gaza socio-economist and the FAO agro-economist.

Fieldwork was conducted in all of the West Bank and Gaza Strip districts. In each district, the assessment covered urban, camp and rural/remote locations. The rural/remote locations selected fitted one or more of the following criteria: proximity to settlements, the wall, restricted military zones or a border and the

harsh imposition of closure over time. When more than one rural location was selected in a district, the locations varied in their proximity to the district capital.

SAMPLE SIZE

About 240 focus group discussions, 950 semi-structured interviews and 80 key informant interviews were collected in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. A minimum of 59 semi-structured interviews, 15 focus group discussions and five key informant interviews were collected in each district. In each district, about eleven focus groups, with three per location type (camp, urban, rural) consisted of the chronic poor, new poor and the shops' credit lists. A minimum of one focus group per district was collected from the elderly, those who have lost assets and the two groups of children. The semi-structured interviews were also collected evenly between camp, urban areas and rural areas. A small proportion of interviews were conducted with Bedouin households.

PAIR-WISE RANKING WITH KEY INFORMANTS

The pair-wise ranking exercise was chosen as the tool for conducting the key informant interviews. This tool allowed for the comparison of sub-districts against one another, in order to identify the location of the food insecure and their percentage of the sub-district population, and also allowed the team to validate the findings from the focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

Key informants in most of the districts included *Zakat* committees, UNRWA, PARC, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Social Affairs, ICRC, CRS, Ard-ElAtfal (Hebron) and the Palestinian Youth Union (Ramallah), and were required to know about the whole district in order to compare levels of food insecurity in each sub-district against every other sub-district. Provided with a map of the district, divided into between four and eight sub-districts, the informants were given a definition of food security. The interviewer made sure it was understood and explained that when comparing sub-districts, the informant should assume that those who receive food aid are food insecure.

The key informant was given nine pre-defined response options to code food insecurity in each sub-district: namely that the percentage of food insecure in area-1 as compared to area-2 is: "very much higher", "much higher", "higher", "slightly higher", "the same or similar", "slightly lower", "lower", "much lower", or "very much lower". Interviews proceeded until all possible combinations (area pairs) within a district were compared. Key informants were also asked to compare the percentage of food insecure for each area. The data for both groups (i.e. the food insecure and the food secure) later allowed estimates to be produced for a third group - those understood as being in the 'middle' with regard to food security status. These answers were keyed into the computer during the interview. After the comparisons were made, the consistency of the answers was checked on the spot through an IDRISI application. If inconsistent, the respondent was given the opportunity to amend his/her answers. If still inconsistent, the interview was disregarded. This application calculated the weights and showed which sub-districts were identified as the most food secure and insecure. The informant was then asked to estimate the percentages of food insecure and food secure in the highest ranking and lowest ranking sub-districts and overall in the district.

The percentages of food insecure in each sub-district was computed and presented on a map in GIS format. Finally, percentages of food insecure were calculated against the population of each sub-district (based on the 2003 projections of the 1997 population census), resulting in numbers of the food insecure, food secure and at-risk per sub-district. The results of this pair-wise exercise are available on request.

METHODOLOGY IMPLEMENTATION

In order to conduct the fieldwork, the two SocioEconomists divided responsibility for the West Bank and Gaza Strip between them. Roles were divided in this way because it facilitated logistics and because there were differences in West Bank and Gaza Strip profiles of vulnerability and coping mechanisms. WFP Programme staff provided support for the design, mapping, implementation and analysis of the interviews with key informants.

The Gaza Strip team was composed of twenty three fieldworkers and included 8 volunteers and 6 UNRWA staff, initially assisted by a UNDP transferred staff to act as the Participatory Rural Assessment Coordinator. The team consisted of: Helene Lalonde (SocioEconomist), E'timad Muhanna (PRA Coordinator Gaza), Lionel Brisson (Director Gaza operations), Sam Rose (Assistant to the Director Gaza), Maroua Abu-Dagga, Anas Yousef Musallam (FAO Food Monitors, Gaza Strip); Amir Yasin, Tahany Hertani, Wafa Zaqout, Rafeek El-Madhoun (WFP Food Monitors, Gaza Strip); Faraj Mubarak, Mohammed Aydi, Mohammed Qawash, Mohammed Abu Qamar, Akram Mashni, Jamal Nabaheen (UNRWA Social Workers Gaza Strip); Ayman Al Hour, Shahdia Abu Shaweesh, Iman Al Bayouk, Radwan Okal, Belal Al Hamida, Luay Al Amassi, Hamida AL Tahrwi, and Osama Al Kurdi (Gaza StripVolunteers). The Gaza Strip, comprising five districts was split into three areas (area 1: North governerate and Gaza city; area 2: Deir El Balah (Middle Area); area 3 the South – Khan Younis and Rafah). During the assessment period, when the task was to enter the data, complete closures occurred within the Gaza strip, resulting in a lack of mobility, even for UN personnel between the three areas.

The West Bank team consisted of 22 fieldworkers, a PRA Coordinator and SocioEconomist: Francine Pickup (FAO SocioEconomist); Zakariya Odeh (PRA Coordinator from UNDP); fieldwork team leaders from WFP: Khaled Suleiman, Ashraf Saadi Ali, Isra Muzaffar, Mike Smeir, Majdi Dana and FAO: Abed Yassin. Fieldworkers came from UNRWA: Mahmoud Stiti, Suhair Sawalha, Amal Balawneh, Nidal Fahmawi, Sameera Shalabi, Fouzan Awad, Rania Zaben, Tamam Tanji, Falasteen Dabie, Najat Qasem, Aisha Khader, Dalia Al-Ayyoubi, Alia Salah, Marwan Abu Haikal, Amani Sarahneh and FAO: Lubna Tammam, Mohammed Odeh, Haya Abassi. Francine Pickup from FAO and Marc Regnault de la Mothe, Tareq Abu El Haj, Pascale LeFrancois, Ashraf Al-Saadi, Majdi Dana, Isra Muzaffar, Mike Smeir, Khaled Suleiman from WFP were involved in the pair-wise ranking. The mapping was carried out by Tareq Abu El Haj from WFP. Radwan Qasrawi (Al Quds University) was responsible for the data processing.

The West Bank comprising eleven districts was divided into four areas, with each area comprising between two and three districts. Each area has between five and seven local fieldworkers who lived locally (area 1: Hebron and Bethlehem; area 2: Jerusalem, Jericho, Ramallah; area 3: Nablus, Qalqilia, Salfit; area 4: Jenin, Tulkarm and Tubas). The division of the West Bank into area teams was intended to minimize the need to travel long distances which is problematic with movement restrictions. Fieldworkers were assigned responsibility for specific districts in which they lived where possible. Where this was not possible, they were assigned a car or arrangements were made for overnight stay due to difficulties reaching home in the evenings. Each area was assigned a team leader and assistant who were responsible for budgets, arranging team meetings, preparing workplans and applying for security clearance in advance for all travel. They were selected on the basis of their experience working as food monitors and their English language, necessary for entering data into the database. Each area was assigned one car donated to the mission by UNRWA and WFP.

FIELDWORK TRAINING

The fieldworkers included UNRWA social workers, WFP and FAO Food Monitors, as well as a number of volunteers. The Gaza group training developed, field tested and refined the survey instruments. The West Bank group was trained over two days (*See below Report of West Bank training in Jericho, Jericho training outline and PRA training session outline*). The fieldworker training workshops sought to familiarise the fieldworkers with the assessment objectives, concepts and tools, arrange the logistics for undertaking fieldwork with 24 fieldworkers from three different organisations and develop workplans and to encourage fieldworkers to start operating as teams.

WFP Food Monitors were selected as team leaders of the four West Bank teams. Together with their assistants, they attended one day training for input of data training for into database using Microsoft Access 2000 and a follow-up training one week later to discuss problems encountered.

ORGANISATION OF THE FIELDWORK

Data collection in the West Bank and Gaza Strip was monitored by regular field visits on the part of the PRA coordinators and the socio-economists. Meetings were also arranged for the feedback and analysis of the data collected on a weekly basis. In the West Bank, area teams submitted weekly work plans which also acted as applications for security clearance necessary for travel in the West Bank. In the West Bank, district-level teams met on a daily basis and area teams met twice per week. In addition, weekly reports were submitted by the team leader for each West Bank area. These reports contained the fieldworkers' views and analysis and were intended to retain the richness of the qualitative data. The weekly reports contained information on work achieved, main findings, stories and problems experienced. Information was sought on food insecurity; vulnerability profiles, intra-household distribution of food and coping mechanisms.

Due to movement restrictions within the West Bank, arranging meetings for the entire West Bank team was problematic and time consuming. However, the team did hold three weekly meetings in Zababdeh (Jenin District), and two meetings in Jericho. During these meetings, logistical, administrative and methodological problems were discussed, issues related to team dynamics were resolved, findings were shared and unanswered questions identified.

PROBLEMS IN CONDUCTING FIELDWORK UNDER CLOSURES

Both in the West Bank and Gaza, closures and curfews significantly hampered the fieldwork process. In Gaza, a number of incidents hampered the smooth running of the assessment. The first and test focus group with women was cancelled in the Nuseirat because of a military incursion in the area. On another occasion, going to the enclave village of Al Mawasi in the Khan Yunis district, soldiers at the checkpoint held up the UN vehicles for some time. At the time the WFP staff was carrying high energy biscuits for distribution to health centers, so the staff was forced to unload and reload all of the boxes as well as other gear and put the objects through a metal detector. In another incident, the house where the team was holding an interview was in proximity to an incident which resulted in a group of people nearby being shot at. In the Brazil area (a housing project for refugees) in the district of Rafah, the team was near the Border at the Jamai' Club where they were conducting a focus group and interviews, when shooting started in a nearby area.

In the West Bank, fieldworkers in Hebron, Jenin and Tulkarm were particularly badly affected by closure, experiencing up to five consecutive days under curfew on a number of occasions when they were unable to

leave their homes. This also had negative repercussions on the other area team members' work. For example, the team leader responsible for the Northern area and living in Jenin was often at home under curfew, during which he sometimes did not have an internet connection. Tanks would park below his apartment and leave their engines running all night. In Hebron, when curfew was not imposed strictly, fieldworkers continued their data collection despite being concerned about returning home afterwards. Many of the team meetings in Hebron could not take place because of curfew.

Fieldworkers suffered from delays at checkpoints which disrupted appointments and impacted on their performance. The Bethlehem team continually experienced problems getting to and from meetings in Hebron, and were often forced to take longer alternative roads because the soldiers at checkpoints did not accept the UN ID Card as an official document. On many occasions, soldiers at checkpoints prevented fieldworkers continuing their journey to their fieldwork site.

Fieldworkers in the West Bank experienced attacks by settlers. In one incident, a settler threw a rock from a settler bus near Daniel settlement at one fieldwork team in a UNRWA car nearly causing an accident. The Nablus team leader's UN car was attacked on the way to his village by a group of settler youths. One Jenin team member was shot at by soldiers while travelling in a taxi from his village to the office in Zababdeh.

Due to movement restriction, fieldworkers, as far as possible, developed contingency plans – activities that could be completed from their homes, alternative fieldwork destinations, locating computers and a car in a second location so that other fieldworkers could continue to work. It is a testament to the fieldworkers' commitment in the West Bank and Gaza that they conducted their fieldwork in a professional manner in spite of the daily problems of curfew and movement restrictions.

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND AMENDMENTS TO TOOLS

The importance of diversifying the channels by which focus group and interview respondents were identified was recognised during the early stages of fieldwork. By relying heavily on UNRWA, MoSA and *zakat* hardship lists, there was a danger that only those already perceived as vulnerable and eligible for food assistance would be identified. As a result, fieldworkers also identified respondents through women's unions, family associations, children's associations, centres for the disabled, local and international NGOs, CBOs, local councils, trade unions and clinics. In Gaza, the Palestinian NGO, Ard El Insan, provided lists of households who had members diagnosed by health centres as being malnourished and such households were included in a separate group for interview.

Fieldwork monitoring also revealed the need to spend a greater length of time explaining the assessment objectives to respondents. For example, during the focus group discussions in Shoukba village in Ramallah district, the children mentioned that their families received aid from ICRC, political parties, the *zakat* committee and benefactors. However, after conducting individual interviews and focus groups, women denied receiving such aid. This example brought up in a West Bank team meeting led to a wider discussion of the problem that people sometimes provided false information in the expectation of receiving food aid. Fieldworkers found it very difficult to convince respondents that the mission would not provide food aid. In the same way, some fieldworkers faced problems arranging the focus groups identified through the shop credit lists. In several villages, shopkeepers arranged the participation of their friends and relatives in the focus groups in the hope that they would receive assistance. Various strategies were identified in the meeting to alleviate this problem. One was for fieldworkers not to introduce themselves as WFP Food Monitors and UNRWA Social Workers but as researchers for an FAO mission. Fieldworkers would visit the fieldwork location well in advance to make contacts with local organisations and build a rapport with the local

community. Fieldworkers spent time explaining to respondents the objectives of the research. A document was drafted explaining the origins, goals and outcomes of the mission as an aid to help fieldworkers explain what they were doing to respondents. A letter addressed to local organisations and respondents was drafted and translated into Arabic explaining the mission.

In terms of the conducting of the focus groups, fieldworkers were encouraged to find ways to avoid consensus forming too quickly by developing their facilitation skills and preventing domination of the group by one or a few participants. Fieldworkers found it difficult to get old people and children to talk. With children aged 8-12 years, drawing was often an effective way of breaking the ice.

At the onset of the fieldwork, traders and farmers were asked the vulnerability questionnaire in addition to a questionnaire about production and supply of food. However, the respondents, particularly in the West Bank, complained that the interview took too long (about two hours). In addition, for some of the better-off farmers and traders in the West Bank it was inappropriate to ask the vulnerability questionnaire. The decision was taken in the West Bank to split the questionnaires related to production and supply of food from those about vulnerability. Mindful of the fact that some farmers were vulnerable, they continued to figure in the vulnerable interviews.

Fieldworkers faced difficulty asking for information on intra-household distribution of food. Respondents often said that they all ate at once from the same plate. Some fieldworkers felt uncomfortable asking, what they perceived as, offensive questions about the unequal distribution of food. However, fieldworkers were encouraged to probe further in a more indirect manner. For example, they asked which household members ate which pieces of meat. Women who said that men got preference because they worked were asked what happened when the husband lost his work. In focus groups, lead-in questions were asked about who bought food, who decided how much was spent and who ate when. Fieldworkers were asked to collect additional information about pregnant and lactating women and to distinguish between children over and under the age of five. Fieldworkers asked whether children went to other households to eat and whether households cooked extra food to give friends, neighbours and relatives. They tried to identify differences in patterns of food allocation by household type.

The monitoring revealed that respondents stressed the importance of reducing expenditure and living on account as coping mechanisms and minimised the role of income generation. While levels of formal unemployment are very high, fieldworkers were encouraged to be cautious about dismissing the role of income generation. They probed about informal income earnings, piecemeal work, petty trade activities (especially those engaged by women that may have gone unrecognised) and remittances.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PAIR-WISE RANKING EXERCISE

Pair-wise ranking was pilot tested in Hebron, a large district with many rural areas and in Northern Gaza district, mostly urban and densely populated. Following the pilot, it was decided to add several qualitative questions in order to give informants the opportunity to explain the reasons why they ranked the sub-districts the way they did. Key informants were asked to describe the particular conditions in the most food secure and food insecure districts. The piloting revealed informants' estimations of the percentage of food secure and insecure in the best and worst sub-districts did not add up to 100 percent. It was decided to collect information on the 'middle group' that were neither food secure or insecure, but under threat of becoming food insecure. Informants were asked which households/kinds of people were in this group and at risk of falling into food insecurity if current conditions persisted or worsened. Collecting information on this group allowed for a better understanding of the people likely to face food insecurity in the near future. In

addition, informants were asked whether there were vulnerable groups who were being excluded from current social services or food aid.

One problem was that some key informants overestimated food insecurity. However, fact that the ranking rather than the informants' percentage estimations formed the basis of analysis mitigated this bias. A further problem was that UNRWA informants often did not know about food security outside the camps.

Obtaining accurate maps was time-consuming. The districts of Gaza and the West Bank do not have clearly delineated sub-districts. The maps showed settlements, separation barrier and water sources but it would have been useful to have indicated other features, such as roads. It is strongly suggested in the future to link the pair-wise ranking methodology with a strong GIS mapping capacity at the onset of the assessment, in order to:

- facilitate issuing of district maps in a timely fashion;
- Give the key informants the possibility of recognizing geographical features, villages and roads that are included in and characterise each sub-district;
- Able to estimate the population of each cluster.

DATA PROCESSING

Inputted data was sent by the fieldworkers to the database at Al Quds twice per week. Data inputting was a time consuming process that the team leaders prioritised for the second half of the research period. The database was used for the analysis of the semi-structured interviews. For the processing of the focus group discussions, area teams together with the socio-economist and PRA Coordinator, produced summary reports of the main characteristics of each vulnerable group, their coping mechanisms, extent to which they were exhausted and geographical specificities of their vulnerability.

General skeleton, semi-structured interviews

General Information

Name: _____

Male Female

Refugee Status: Yes No

Location name: _____

Camp Urban Rural

Household composition: wife(s), husband, children (ages and sex), mother, father, extended family members, others.

relationship	Age	Education

Since the *Intifada* has your household become larger as a means to support others?

Short Term _____

Long Term _____

What was your main occupation prior to the *Intifada* _____

What is it now? _____

Why has it changed? _____

Assets:

House: No. of rooms _____ owned _____ rent _____

Land: Number of dunums _____

Livestock: sheep _____ goats _____ cattle _____

Poultry: hens _____ rabbits _____ pigeons _____

Ducks _____ Geese _____

Transportation: Do you own a vehicle _____ (kind)

Cart _____

Do you have a home garden? Before *Intifada* _____ Now _____

If not, do you have access to land to start one: Yes No

After feeding the household is there a surplus? What is done with it?

Sold : Yes No

Exchanged: Yes No

Gifts Yes No

What type of cooking fuel is used? _____

Source of water in household use.

Before:

Rain Well River Tank Pipe Other (specify) _____

After:

Rain Well River Tank Pipe Other (specify) _____

Household Food Intake Matrix (in kg)

(Per month)	Bought	Produced	Bartered	Food assistance	Gifts	% change from pre- <i>Intifada</i>
Meat						
Chicken						
Fish						
Bread						
Rice						
Vegetables						
Pulses						
Fruit						
Dairy						
Eggs						
Olive Oil						
Cooking Oil						
Wheatflour						

If there is not enough food which members eat differently in terms of quality and quantity?

	Quality Meat, chicken, fish and Vegetables (better / same / worse)	Quantity Overall (more / same / less)
Husband / wife(ves)		
Boys / girls		
Hh permanent member / hh newcomer		
Old man / rest of the hh		
Parents / children		

Are all of these foods available locally? Yes No Which are not available? When?

Can you afford these foods on a regular basis? Yes No

Identify those you do not purchase.

Have you faced problems in reaching your usual food supplies (outlets)

Yes No If yes, frequency.

Coping Strategies

General:

Strategy	Ranking (1 - 5 in which order used)
Living off savings	
Sale of Assets	
Reduced expenditures	
Income Earning Activities	
Household Adjustment Strategies	

Specific:

Strategy	Strategy Use (Y / N)	Exhausted (Y / N)
Living off savings		
Borrowing/Living on Account		
From store/shop		
From creditors (banks, credit union)		
From family		
From neighbour		

From benefactor		
From water provider		
From electricity company		
From heating and fuel supplier		
Sale of Assets		
Jewellery		
Household appliances		
Tools (equipment for work)		
Cars or other vehicle		
Land		
Reduced expenditures		
Food quality		
Food quantity		
Making foods at home		
Reducing social activities		
Clothing		
Reduced health expenses		
Reduced education spending		
Pocket money for children		
Children dropping out of school		
Household maintenance		
Income earning activities		
Selling good made at home (food)		
Selling good made at home (products)		
Renting part of the family home		
Women working (where they did not before)		
Children working		
Taking part-time/seasonal employment		
Return to the land/agriculture		
Home gardens		
Begging		
Household Adjustment Strategies		
Moving to extended family		
Early marriage		
Postponement of marriage		
Living with family-husband's family		
Internal Migration		

Extent of debt

Strategy	How much do you owe?	Can you still borrow from these sources?	For How long can you count on this source?
Borrowing/Living on Account			
From store/shop			
From creditors (banks, credit union)			
From family			
From neighbour			
From benefactor			
From water provider			
From electricity company			
From heating and fuel supplier			
Savings Groups			

Why? (explain levels of credit)

Reliance on Formal Institutions

Source	Form of Assistance*	Frequency	When do you expect next to receive from these sources in the future
Ministry of Agriculture			
PARC			
Other NGOs			
MOSA			
Cooperatives			
UNWRA			
ICRC			
Others:			

*Forms of assistance: extension services (advice), credit, inputs, marketing)

Community level Networks

	Forms of Assistance*	Frequency	Quality
Zakat			
Charities			
CBOs**			
Political parties			
Relatives			
Friends			
Neighbours			
Benefactors			
Labour union			

*financial assistance (loans, gifts), food, key information and advice, employment assistance, accommodation, transportation, education, others.

** CBO – Community Based Organization

Home grown solutions

Hope. On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your feeling/hope for the future? _____

Are there any positive impacts of current situation (e.g. more cohesive community, family, more equal distribution of goods, new skills acquisitions from taking on new jobs, etc.)

Are there any negative community impacts (increasing conflict in the community, increased household conflict/violence,

What can local agencies do to help – municipality, government ministries, NGOs, etc.

Arabic

الهيكل العام General skeleton المقابلات شبه المنظمة Semi-structured interviews

General Information

الاسم: _____ Name:

Male ذكر Female أنثى

Refugee Status هل أنت لاجئ؟: Yes نعم No لا

Location name: _____ الموقع / اسم المنطقة:

Camp مخيم لاجئين Urban منطقة حضرية Rural منطقة ريفية

Household composition: wife(s), husband, children (ages and sex), mother, father, extended family members, others.

، الأم، الأب، أعضاء الأسرة الممتدة، آخرون (الجنس والعمر)، الزوج، الأطفال (الزوجات) الزوجة: تركيبة الأسرة

Relationship نوع العلاقة	العمر age	الحالة التعليمية Education

Since the *Intifada* has your household becomes larger as a means to support others?

(لمساعدة آخرين كالأخت أو الابنة المطلقة مثلا) منذ بداية الانتفاضة، هل ازداد حجم الأسرة؟

Short Term على المدى القصير _____

Long Term على المدى الطويل _____

What was your main occupation prior to the *Intifada*?

ما هي المهنة الرئيسية قبل بداية الانتفاضة _____

What is it now? المهنة الآن? _____

Why has it changed لماذا هذا التغيير _____

Assets: المقتنيات أو الممتلكات

House المنزل: No. of rooms عدد الغرف _____ owned ملك _____ rent إيجار _____

Land الأرض: Number of dunums عدد الدونومات _____

Livestock الثروة الحيوانية: sheep أغنام _____ goats ماعز _____ cattle أبقار _____

Poultry الدواجن: hens دجاج _____ rabbits أرانب _____ pigeons حمام _____

Ducks بط _____ Geese أوز _____

Transportation : Do you own a vehicle (kind) هل لديك سيارة _____

Cart كارة _____

Do you have a home garden? هل لديك حديقة منزلية?

Before Intifada قبل الانتفاضة _____ Now الآن _____

If not, do you have access to land to start one? إذا كان الجواب لا، هل يمكنك الحصول على أرض لعمل حديقة منزلية?

Yes نعم No لا

After feeding the household is there a surplus? بعد الاكتفاء المنزلي، هل هناك فائض من الحديقة المنزلية?

Sold للبيع: Yes No

Exchanged للتبادل: Yes No

Gifts للإهداء: Yes No

What type of cooking fuel is used? نوع الوقود المستخدم للطبخ _____

Source of water in household use. مصدر المياه المخصصة للاستخدام المنزلي.

Before: قبل الانتفاضة:

Rain مطر Well بئر ماء River نهر Tank خزان Pipe خط بلدية Other (specify) غير ذلك (حدد) _____

After: بعد الانتفاضة:

Rain مطر Well بئر ماء River نهر Tank خزان Pipe خط بلدية Other (specify) غير ذلك (حدد) _____

Food Intake Matrix مصفوفة استهلاك الغذاء

(Per month) شهريا	Bought شراء	Produced إنتاج	Bartered مقايضة	Food assistance مساعدات غذائية	Gifts هدايا	% change from pre- Intifada نسبة التغير عن قبل الانتفاضة
Meat لحوم حمراء						
Chicken دجاج						
Fish سمك						
Bread خبز						
Rice أرز						
Vegetables خضروات						
Pulses بقوليات						
Fruit فواكه						
Dairy ألبان وأجبان						
Eggs بيض						
Olive Oil زيت زيتون						
Cooking Oil زيت طبخ						
Wheat flour طحين						

Based on the normal dietary needs of the different household members If there is not enough food which members eat differently in terms of quality and quantity?

على أساس الاحتياجات الغذائية الاعتيادية لأفراد الأسرة، هل هناك غذاء غير كافي لأفراد الأسرة كما أو نوعاً؟

	Quality Meat, chicken, fish and Vegetables (better / same / worse) لحوم، دجاج، سمك، :النوعية خضروات (أسوأ /متساوين /أفضل)	Quantity Overall الكمية
Husband الزوج		
Wife(ves)الزوجة/ الزوجات		
Girls البنات		
Boys الأبناء		
Old men الرجال الكبار		
Old women النساء الكبار		
Household newcomer نزلاء		

Are all of these foods available locally? Yes No Which are not available? When?

لا ؟ أيها غير متوفر؟ ومتى؟ نعم هل كل هذه الأنواع متوفرة في السوق المحلي؟

Can you afford these foods on a regular basis? Yes No identify those you do not purchase.

حدد أي الأنواع التي لا تشتريها . نعم هل يمكنك توفير هذه الأنواع بصورة منتظمة،

Have you faced problems in reaching your usual food supplies (outlets)?

Yes No If yes, frequency.

لا نعم هل واجهت مشاكل في الوصول إلى مصادر التموين الغذائي المعتادة لديك؟
، كم مرة؟ (لا) إذا كان الجواب

Coping Strategies: آليات التكيف

General: العامة

Strategy الآلية	Ranking (in which order used) الترتيب حسب أولوية الاستخدام	Exhausted هل تم استنفاد هذا المصدر؟
Living off savings السحب من المدخرات		
Sale of Assets بيع المقتنيات		
Reduced expenditures تقليل المصروفات		
Income Earning Activities أنشطة مدرة للدخل		
Household Adjustment Strategies آليات تكيف منزلية		

بالتحديد: Specific:

Strategy الآلية	Ranking (in which order used) الترتيب حسب أولوية الاستخدام	Exhausted هل تم استنفاد هذا المصدر؟
Living off savings السحب من المدخرات		
Borrowing/Living on Account الاستدانة أو الشراء على الحساب		
From store/shop من محل أو مخزن		
From creditors (banks, credit union) من بنك		
From family من العائلة		
From neighbour من الجيران		
From benefactor من فاعل خير		
From water provider من مزود المياه		
From electricity company من شركة الكهرباء		
From heating and fuel supplier من شركة الغاز		
Sale of Assets بيع المقتنيات		
Jewellery مجوهرات		
Household appliances أغراض منزلية		
Tools (equipment for work) أدوات وعدة عمل		
Cars or other vehicle سيارة أو مركبة		
Land أرض		
Reduced expenditures تقليل المصروفات		
Food quality نوعية الغذاء		
Food quantity كمية الغذاء		
Making foods at home تصنيع الغذاء منزلياً		
Reducing social activities التقليل من أنشطة اجتماعية		
Clothing ملابس		
Reduced health expenses تقليل النفقات الصحية		
Reduced education spending تقليل نفقات التعليم		
Pocket money for children مصروف جيب الأطفال		
Children dropping out of school ترك الدراسة		
Household maintenance أعمال صيانة منزلية		
Income earning activities أنشطة مدرة للدخل		
Selling good made at home (food) بيع غذاء تصنيع منزلي		
Selling good made at home (products) بيع منتجات صنع منزلي		
Renting part of the family home تأجير جزء من المنزل		
Women working (where they did not before) عمل المرأة (حيث لم يكن ممكناً من قبل)		
Children working عمل الأطفال		
Taking part-time/seasonal employment عمل بوظيفة جزئي أو مؤقت		
Return to the land/agriculture العودة إلى الأرض والزراعة		

Home gardens عمل حدائق منزلية للبيع والإنتاج		
Begging التسول		
Household Adjustment Strategies آليات تكيف منزلية		
Moving to extended family الانتقال إلى الأسرة الممتدة		
Early marriage الزواج المبكر		
Postponement of marriage تأخير الزواج		
Living with family-husband's family السكن مع عائلة الزوج أو الزوجة		
Internal Migration الهجرة الداخلية		

Extent of debt

Strategy الآلية	How much do you owe? بكم أنت مدين؟	Can you still borrow from these sources? هل ما زال بإمكانك الدين من هذا المصدر	For How long can you count on this source? إلى متى يمكنك الاعتماد على هذا المصدر؟
Borrowing/Living on Account الديون			
From store/shop من محل أو مخزن			
From creditors (banks, credit union) من بنك			
From family من العائلة			
From neighbour من الجيران			
From benefactor من فاعل خير			
From water provider من مزود المياه			
From electricity company من شركة الكهرباء			
From heating and fuel supplier من مزود الغاز			
Savings Groups من جمعيات شهرية			

Why? (Explain levels of credit) لماذا؟ فسّر اختلاف مستويات الدين

Reliance on Formal Institutions الاعتماد على مؤسسات رسمية

Source المصدر	Form of Assistance* *شكل المساعدة	Frequency التكرار	When do you expect next to receive from these sources in the future متى تتوقع الحصول على مساعدة أخرى من هذا المصدر؟
Ministry of Agriculture وزارة الزراعة			
PARC الإغاثة الزراعية			
Other NGOs مؤسسات أهلية أخرى			
MOSA وزارة الشؤون			
Cooperatives تعاونيات			
UNWRA الوكالة			
ICRC الصليب الأحمر			
Others: غير ذلك			

*Forms of assistance: extension services (advice), credit, inputs, marketing)

Community level Networks: على المستوى المجتمعي

	Forms of Assistance* *شكل المساعدة	Frequency التكرار	Quality النوعية
Zakat أموال الزكاة			
Charities جمعيات خيرية			
CBOs** مؤسسات مجتمعية قاعدية			
Political parties أحزاب سياسية			
Relatives أقارب			
Friends أصدقاء			
Neighbours جيران			
Benefactors (فاعل خير) جهات خيرية			
Labour union نقابة العمال			

*Financial assistance (loans, gifts), food, key information and advice, employment assistance, accommodation, transportation, education, others.

* غداء، نصائح وإرشادات، مساعدة في التوظيف، المساعدة في توفير سكن، مواصلات، (على شكل قروض أو هدايا) مساعدة مالية * ، تعليم، غير ذلك

** CBO – Community Based Organization** تعني مؤسسات مجتمعية قاعدية

Home grown solutions

Hope. On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your feeling/ hope for the future? _____

Are there any positive impacts of current situation (e.g. more cohesive community, family, more equal distribution of goods, new skills acquisitions from taking on new jobs, etc)?

Are there any negative community impacts (increasing conflict in the community, increased household conflict/violence)?

What can local agencies do to help – municipality, government ministries, NGOs, etc.

Farmers, semi-structured interviews

Agriculture information

Who works on the land (wife, children, extended family, agricultural labor, how many people work on the land, changes during *Intifada*)

Land geography: hills: terraces: lowland:

Source of water for crops and animals:

Rain Well River Tank Other (specify) _____

How far is the water source from the agricultural activities?

If water for agriculture (crops and animals) is paid for, has the price changed since pre-*intifada*?

Source	Price x LT (in NIS)	
	September 2000	Today

Production data:

Now

Crop	Area(dunums) No. of trees	Season Month of harvest	Household consumption %	Marketing (amounts*) and transportation from field**

* use only KG or MT – food monitor to convert.

** how is the produce collected from the farm to the first place where it is either processed or sold?

Pre-Intifada

Crop	Area(dunums) No. of trees	Season Month of harvest	Household consumption %	Marketing (amounts*) and distance from field

* use only KG or MT – food monitor to convert.

Reason for changes in production and transportation (includes inability to market, transportation to market, destruction of lands or greenhouses).

Did your agricultural income change in the last two years?

Increase Decrease No changes

Explain.

Are there any increases/decreases in production quality and quantity? Explain

Livestock: which? Numbers, grazing info., etc., changes over time, marketing and prices. ` birds, goats, sheep, cattle

Livestock	Numbers of Animals (now)	Numbers of Animals Sept 2000	Changes Numbers
Fowl (chicken, turkey, ducks, geese)			
Sheep			
Goats			
Cattle: beef			
Cattle: dairy			

Changes in inputs for farming (feed for livestock, inputs - price and availability of fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides - to land, methods of harvesting, transportation of goods from field to market, etc).

Have there been changes in the marketing channels? (through middlemen, Israeli or Palestinian, cooperatives)

Conditions during Intifada- Impact of Intifada

Proximity to settlements – safety during production cycle/harvesting.

Loss of land through Israeli measures (settlement expansion, occupation, by-pass roads, the wall, etc.)

Dunums in Sept 2000	Dunums today	Difference

Destruction of home or land, infrastructure (water, wells) by IDF or settlers.

Food trade, semi-structured interviews with vulnerable food traders

Type of activity (retail food - shop, cafe, etc. – and trade – on street and in the market)

Where do you work: from home on street in a shop at the market

Other:

If from a premises, do you rent or own it

Who works in your business / trade activity (hired workers, family)

Relationship (family, hired labour)	Part-time/full-time

Income

Has your profit in the last two years: Increased Decreased No Change

Supplies

Changes in Supplier of inputs / goods (through middlemen, Israeli or Palestinian, cooperatives)

Has there been substantial fluctuations in the price of certain supplies since the beginning of the *Intifada*?

Yes No

Which supplies have been particularly affected? Indicate increase or decrease in prices.

Supplies	Increase By %	Decrease By %

Have you had difficulty in accessing certain your usual supplies, in both the quantity and quality of the supplies. Please indicate which and frequency of difficulties.

Supplies	Quantity	Quality	Frequency of difficulties (on a monthly basis)

Have there been changes in the goods your clients purchase (types of food / quality of food / quantity / frequency)

Types of food	Quantity	Quality

Obtaining and selling goods on account

Have there been changes in customers ability to buy with cash and repay debts.

How much money is owed to you now? _____ (NIS)

How much money was normally owed to you before *Intifada*? _____ (NIS)

Has a growing credit line to your customers impacted on your repayment to suppliers?

Yes No

Has this resulted in an inability to access credit from suppliers? Yes No

Fishermen, semi-structured interviews

Do you own the boat? Yes No

Who works on the fishing process: wife, children, extended family, hired labor

On the boat _____
 Transformation _____
 Marketing _____

Outline changes during the *Intifada*:

Production data:

Now

Fish (type)	Season	Household consumption %	Marketing (amounts* and distance from ports)	Income derived from surplus

*Only kg or MT – Food Monitor to convert

Pre-Intifada

Fish (type)	season	Household consumption %	Marketing (amounts* and distance from ports)	Income derived from surplus

*Only kg or MT – Food Monitor to convert

Reason for changes (includes inability to market, transportation to market, Israeli rules and regulations, insecurity)?

Did your income change from the sale of fishing products?

Increase Decrease No Changes

What is the impact of increase/decrease?

Are there any increases/decreases in quality and quantity? Explain

Changes in fishing methods (methods of harvesting and transformation, transportation of goods from port to markets, etc.)

Changes in marketing – through middlemen, Israeli or Palestinian, cooperatives

Women’s focus groups

Team Members:

Date:

Type of Focus Group:

Location: Name of Community _____

Urban Rural Camp

Food Availability

Is it available locally? Please specify (which foods are not available, or available in an irregular way in the locality?)

Are you receiving food aid? Yes (numbers) _____ Who from?

Food Access

Mobility –

Can you reach your source of food?

If no, what stops you from getting the food?

Frequency of difficulties?

Affordability:

What proportion of your income is spent on food? How has this changed from pre-*Intifada*?

Have you changed your food habits because of lack of money? Please explain the changes (quality, quantity). Probe on the importance of i) fall in income and ii) price increases.

Are people preparing more of their own food (making bread, making homous, etc.)

Are people relying more on gifts of food from others in their community, family?

Are people exchanging goods and services for food? (barter)

Are you raising any animals? Which? _____

Do you have a home garden? Before *Intifada* _____ Now _____

If not, do you have access to land to start one: Yes No

After feeding the household is there a surplus?

Sold : Yes No
 Exchanged: Yes No
 Gifts Yes No

Food Utilization (intra household)

Based on the normal dietary needs of the different household members If there is not enough food which members eat differently in terms of quality and quantity?

	Quality Meat, chicken, fish and Vegetables	Quantity Overall
Husband		
Wife(ves)		
Girls		
Boys		
Old men		
Old women		
Household newcomer		

Additional comments:

General:

Strategy	Ranking (in which order used)
Living off savings	
Sale of Assets	
Reduced expenditures	
Income Earning Activities	
Household Adjustment Strategies	

Specific:

Strategy	Total numbers of women in FG who use this strategy	Total No. who used strategy but is now Exhausted
Living off savings		
Borrowing/Living on Account		
From store/shop		
From creditors (banks, credit union)		
From family		
From neighbour		
From benefactor		
From water provider		
From electricity company		
From heating and fuel supplier		
Sale of Assets		
Jewellery		
Household appliances		
Tools (equipment for work)		
Cars or other vehicle		
Land		
Reduced expenditures		
Food quality		
Food quantity		
Making foods at home		
Reducing social activities		
Clothing		
Reduced health expenses		
Reduced education spending		
Pocket money for children		
Children dropping out of school		
Household maintenance		
Income earning activities		
Selling good made at home (food)		
Selling good made at home (products)		
Renting part of the family home		
Women working (where they did not before)		
Children working		
Taking part-time/seasonal employment		
Return to the land/agriculture		
Home gardens		

Begging		
Household Adjustment Strategies		
Moving to extended family		
Early marriage		
Postponement of marriage		
Living with family-husband's family		
Internal Migration		

The Role of Social Networks in Food Provision

Do you turn to someone for help when food is not available? If not, why?

Who are the different people who you might turn to for help?

How will they help?

Has the way people help each other changed from before the *intifada*?

Do people find it harder to help each other now?

Household Impacts

Are you experiencing more arguments, conflict, violence between household members?

What triggers these conflicts?

Differentiation within the community

Are some people surviving better than others? Why?

Home grown solutions

Hope. On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your feeling/hope for the future?

For yourself _____

For your family _____

For your community _____

Are there any positive impacts of current situation (e.g. more cohesive community, family, more equal distribution of goods, new skills acquisitions from taking on new jobs, etc.)

Are there any negative community impacts (increasing conflict in the community, community resolution mechanisms are replaced)

What can local agencies do to help – municipality, government ministries, NGOs, etc.

Children's Focus Groups

Guidelines

Type of Focus Group: _____

Location: Name of Team Members: _____

Date: _____

Community _____

Urban Rural Camp

Purpose of the discussion:

This discussion aims to explore your perceptions regarding the current situation in relation to food security in your household and the community. The discussion will particularly focus on your own survival mechanisms within/outside the households. Let's try and discuss these issues.

First let's talk about life in the household today compared to two years ago (before Intifida)

General Characteristics

1. What are the main coping mechanisms in each child's household
 - Work/employment situation (What kind of work?: also probe into issue of thieving-within/outside household; begging as a source of income for themselves or because they are 'employed' by their peers to beg);
 - Education/drop out (probe into whether they have left school because of own decision or parents compelled them to do so to take 'income generating' sources)
 - Health
 - Hh newcomers
 - Household relations (probe into whether there is tension between parents and other siblings. What would trigger an argument? Are these causing children to leave home?)
2. What do you think has changed? (daily aspects of life such as transport/mobility from one place to another, food availability, clothes, games).

Food Availability

3. Do you think there is a problem with food availability in the house? Ask them to draw something (a fridge, table at meal times).
 - Ask them what they eat, and how it has changed.
4. Why do you think this situation exists (limited food availability)

Source of food

5. Where do you get your food from? (UNRWA and other assistance, shop, home production, visiting friends and relatives and gifts of food).
 - Is eating at other people's home more or less important than pre-intifada? (Try and collect information on which hhs are excluded from networks of social support)
6. What proportion of food is obtained where?

Intra-household food distribution

7. Who gets fed first and last and how much food do different hh members get?
8. Do you think that your mother/father has problems getting sufficient food for everyone in the house?
9. Do you have enough to eat of everything that is available at meal times? What are the foods that you like but you do not eat everyday? Why?
10. Has this always been like this or has it changed recently?
11. Is any of the food bartered/exchanged? If so, what for?

Elderly people focus groups

Team Members:

Date:

Location: Name of Community _____

Urban Rural Camp

Household Questions

Has your role in the family changed in the last two years? How?

Do you face special needs as an older person in the household?

Food Availability

Is it available locally? Please specify (which foods are not available, or available in an irregular way in the locality?)

Is your household receiving food aid? Yes (numbers) _____

Who from?

Food Access

Mobility –

Can you reach your source of food?

If no, what stops you from getting the food?

Frequency of difficulties?

Affordability:

What proportion of your income is spent on food? How has this changed from pre-*Intifada*?

Have you changed your food habits because of lack of money? Please explain the changes (quality, quantity). Probe on the importance of i) fall in income and ii) price increases.

Are people preparing more of their own food (making bread, making homous, etc.)

Are people relying more on gifts of food from others in their community, family?

Are people exchanging goods and services for food? (barter)

Is your household raising any animals? Which?

Does your household have a home garden? Before *Intifada* _____ Now _____

If not, does your household have access to land to start one:

If you have a home garden is there a surplus after feeding the household?

Sold : Yes No
Exchanged: Yes No
Gifts: Yes No

Food Utilization (intra household)

Based on the normal dietary needs of the different household members If there is not enough food which members eat differently in terms of quality and quantity?

	Quality Meat, chicken, fish and Vegetables	Quantity Overall
Husband / wife(ves)		
Boys / girls		
Parents / children		
Old man / rest of family		
Old woman / rest of family		
Hh permanent member / hh newcomer		

Additional comments:

General:

Strategy	Ranking (in which order used)
Living off savings	
Sale of Assets	
Reduced expenditures	
Income Earning Activities	
Household Adjustment Strategies	

Specific:

Strategy	Total numbers (of women who use this strategy)	No. who used strategy but is now exhausted
Living off savings		
Borrowing/Living on Account		
From store/shop		
From creditors (banks, credit union)		
From family		
From neighbour		
From benefactor		
From water provider		
From electricity company		
From heating and fuel supplier		
Sale of Assets		
Jewellery		
Household appliances		
Tools (equipment for work)		
Cars or other vehicle		
Land		
Reduced expenditures		
Food quality		
Food quantity		
Making foods at home		
Reducing social activities		
Clothing		
Reduced health expenses		
Reduced education spending		
Pocket money for children		
Children dropping out of school		
Household maintenance		

Income earning activities		
Selling good made at home (food)		
Selling good made at home (products)		
Renting part of the family home		
Women working (where they did not before)		
Children working		
Taking part-time/seasonal employment		
Return to the land/agriculture		
Home gardens		
Begging		
Household Adjustment Strategies		
Moving to extended family		
Early marriage		
Postponement of marriage		
Living with family-husband's family		
Internal Migration		

The Role of Social Networks in Food Provision

Do you turn to someone for help when food is not available? If not, why?

Who are the different people who you might turn to for help?

How will they help?

Has the way people help each other changed from before the *intifada*?

Do people find it harder to help each other now?

Household Impacts

Are you experiencing more arguments, conflict, violence between household members?

What triggers these conflicts?

Differentiation within the community

Are some people surviving better than others? Why?

Home grown solutions

Hope. On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your feeling/hope for the future?

For yourself _____

For your family _____

For your community _____

Are there any positive impacts of current situation (e.g. more cohesive community, family, more equal distribution of goods, new skills acquisitions from taking on new jobs, etc.)

Are there any negative community impacts (increasing conflict in the community, community resolution mechanisms are replaced)

What can local agencies do to help – municipality, government ministries, NGOs, etc.

Focus Groups for families who have lost substantive assets through Israeli measures

Damage: house # ____ land # ____ greenhouses # ____

Value of the loss as percentage of total assets? _____

Did the participants become internally displaced as a result of loss of land or home?

Health of family members (changes) Explore issues of the psychological health of family members resulting from being victimized.

Impact on family from losses? (moving to new household, internal migration to new area)

Did you receive compensation from any source for the loss of your property?

Report of West Bank Training (Jericho 24 – 29 March)

Overview

Overall, the training achieved its main objectives. People got to know each other and importantly, began working within their teams. Had we had more time, it would have been useful to address at greater length the logistical issues and focus on familiarization with the assessment tools. Jericho, the location of the training, was a good choice, in terms of access. Everyone arrived on the day planned, although people did face considerable movement problems. The timing of the workshop – at the start of the offensive in Iraq – was unfortunate and caused considerable anxiety, although participants' fears were largely allayed as a result of our addressing security issues swiftly.

Workshop Documents

Documents used and / or produced at the workshop and available electronically include:

- training programme
- West Bank teams and contact details
- training objectives and concepts of food security
- Participatory Rapid Appraisal Training
- methodology: how to choose respondents and focus groups, numbers required
- locations' selection criteria
- security clearance form
- interviews and focus groups in English and Arabic
- transportation expense claim forms
- daily work record
- weekly planning sheet
- float receipt form
- official letter for fieldworkers explaining their work to respondents

Workshop Planning

The preparation for the training workshop could have been better. Due to the late arrival of the second socio-economist, she did not have adequate time for the preparation of the logistical aspects of the West Bank part of the assessment, such as vehicle allocation. The first socio-economist who had arrived two weeks before had focused on setting up the assessment in Gaza and as a result, little attention had been paid to the West Bank. As it was, a security clearance form was formulated at the workshop and agreed by the UNSECOORD security officer. All the team leaders filled in a hardcopy of this form on the final day of the workshop, and this document acts as a workplan outlining the week's movements for all their fieldworkers. We agreed that team leaders would liaise directly with the UNSECOORD security officer in order to reduce the bureaucracy and to save time.

The data collection problems arising from restrictions on movement were foreseen by participants but not addressed head-on by the trainers. More time could have been spent clearly outlining the security clearance procedures and developing contingency plans for instances when fieldworkers have to cancel fieldwork trips.

The interview questionnaires and focus group guidelines could have benefited from more work on their lay-out to make them user friendly. The drafting of the questionnaires and focus group guidelines was

completed by the time of the training workshop, but they would have benefited from some more attention detailing the types of answers required.

Our reporting expectations of team leaders could have been more clearly laid out with hand-outs for participants to take away with them (number of interviews and type in each location). As it was, we relied on flip charts. In addition, had the computer database been set up prior to the workshop, it would have been helpful to have its designer discuss with participants the methods for inputting information in order to help participants fill in of the questionnaires. As it is, the database will only be created and downloaded onto the team leaders computers in the week following the workshop.

Although we had prepared the stationery materials required by the teams (flip charts and felt pens etc.), it would have been better if we had all the focus group guidelines and interviews photocopied in bulk for fieldwork teams to take away with them. Due to time constraints, we were only able to provide participants with individual copies of the different questionnaires and focus group guidelines and the work plan and expense forms. However, copies were made available to participants before they started their fieldwork. Other forms required by the field works such as the security clearance forms, the members of the four area teams and their contact details were developed and given to participants during the workshop.

Workshop content

Objectives of the assessment: Setting the context for the assessment at the beginning of the training was an important exercise. The origins of the assessment and why it was different from previous studies was outlined. The discussion on the impetus for and impact of the assessment was a theme that ran throughout the training and was a subject of importance to participants. The question was raised, ‘What are we learning that we already know? Of course children can’t get the food they want now – so what?’ We discussed the merits of working with children including the fact that they can give different kinds of answers about the distribution of food within the household than adults. This discussion triggered broader questions about the political and economic impact of the report. Scepticism was voiced about the appropriateness of the humanitarian assistance that was likely to result from the report. Some participants expressed the view that increased food aid was just a way to maintain the status quo and continue Israeli oppression of Palestinians. It was pointed out that food aid was not the only type of response that could follow from the assessment. Other local level development initiatives that recognise and support household coping mechanisms could also result. In terms of the impact of the report, it was suggested that its message about hunger in the West Bank and Gaza Strip and its causes, would be political. It was also stated that the assessment was timely given that the agencies providing food assistance are running out of food. On the final day, as part of the wrapping up of the training, it was stressed that this assessment was requested by the Ministry of Agriculture and was a Palestinian instigated report. This was a strong statement adding to participants’ stake in the assessment.

Introduction to concepts: Translating concepts of food security and vulnerability into Arabic was a challenge. Many of the participants were new to concepts of food security, household livelihoods, coping mechanisms and vulnerability. It took some time to explain the differences between availability, access and utilisation, which were usefully conceived of at different levels: community, household and individual. There was enthusiasm for and interest in the idea of looking at intra-household distribution of food and differences in food intake according to age and gender. An important distinction in terms of access to food was between physical access (constraints posed by closure) and economic access (affordability).

It was stressed that one of the novel contributions of this assessment is the way it addresses deficiencies in social as well as physical and human capital as shaping vulnerability. Participants welcomed the challenge of trying to address and, to a limited extent, quantify the role of household relations and social networks in providing food security. Participants agreed about the importance of credit networks in particular and that an important aspect of vulnerability is exclusion from social networks. A second important coping mechanism that participants were encouraged to consider was reliance on agriculture. The trainer stated that while we know that rural households rely increasingly on agriculture, we were interested in finding out the extent to which urban dwellers were keeping home gardens and animals in their homes. Did some town dwellers experience a specific form of vulnerability because they do not have access to land?

Participants voiced their dissatisfaction with the concept of ‘coping’ which they stated had the connotation of acceptance of the situation in Arabic. The trainer agreed, stating that English also, coping did suggest a short term response adapting to the status quo. We agreed that ‘survival strategies’ was a better concept because it suggested that people are acting changing their situation.

Participatory approaches: More time was needed as much of this material was new to participants.

Tools of assessment: The different types of people identified for the focus groups were outlined. Participants were enthusiastic about conducting focus groups with children. The focus group made up of people on shopkeepers’ credit books caused a lengthy discussion. The trainer stated that this group would act as a comparison group and as a means to identify vulnerable people not identified through the groups identified. It would also ensure that the assessment would not rely solely on formal institutions such as ministries and NGOs that may be providing people on their lists with privileges/assistance and who may by definition not be socially excluded. Based on findings in a trip to Al Mawasi on Monday 24 March 2003, it has transpired that this was important as vulnerable groups (in this case, working poor) overlooked in our identification of groups were already appearing. These groups could be reached through the shopkeepers’ credit lists, after it was determined by consensus that shopkeepers kept these lists. There was also agreement that people cut off from credit because they have not repaid their debts constituted the vulnerable and that those with the largest credit are among the better off. However, participants doubted that shopkeepers would give fieldworkers access to these lists. They also suggested that the poorest people would be reluctant to voice their problems in a group with wealthier participants. The trainer proposed that as a solution, one of the interviews was with the shopkeeper and that he was responsible for organising the focus group, that the objectives of the assessment be clearly explained to him and that he ask people if they want to participate as they come to his shop. As a result, only those who wanted to participate did participate, and the lists remained confidential.

With regard to the interview questionnaire there was concern voiced about length of interviews with farmers and traders who would be asked the generic questions from the skeleton questionnaire together with supplementary production and supply related questions. This concern is well-founded and it was decided to focus solely on the production and supply related questions with these two groups. Vulnerable households that relied on agriculture would still be asked the generic skeleton questionnaire.

No changes were made to the questions in the focus groups or interviews. Discussion centred on how to document the answers to the questions in a way that was consistent across all fieldworkers.

Data processing

In terms of data processing, as it turned out, only the WFP and FAO staff had the level of English required for data inputting. The four WFP staff members were appointed the leaders in the four West Bank areas. FAO fieldworkers acted as the leaders' support assistants. The fieldworkers will give them the completed questionnaires and focus group notes in Arabic and the WFP team leader with his/her assistant was responsible for inputting the information into the database in English and sending it to the central database in Jerusalem. The inputting of data was a large work burden for the team leaders and the appointed support person. The team leader had the database loaded onto his/her computer and received long-distance training shortly after the training workshop. The database team based at Al Quds University received data electronically from each area every three days. In addition, the team leaders sent hardcopies of the completed questionnaires to Al Quds for quality control and cleaning. Logistically, it was difficult to get hardcopies of questionnaires from the areas to the central database team regularly.

In addition to processing data for the database, team leaders were required to provide short weekly summaries of the main lessons from the week's observations; surprises and problems that arose. This information was distinct from the data for the database consisting rather, of important first impressions and qualitative analysis. These reports formed the starting point for discussions during the weekly field visits of the PRA Coordinator and socio-economists.

Skills and competency of the fieldworkers

One problem is the different levels of understanding among participants of the assessment's concepts and tools. Many of the participants were new to PRA techniques. The WFP Food Monitors were confident about their ability to conduct the work required while among the UNRWA fieldworkers there was more variety in competency. One of the tasks of the socio-economists and PRA Coordinator was to provide ongoing support and training to those fieldworkers identified as weaker during the training.

Language and translation

The materials were not made available in Arabic at the training. This was partly a conscious decision to encourage the participants to discuss the concepts and their meaning in Arabic based on learning from the Gaza assessment training. However, it was also true that the translation of the documents was unfinished and of poor quality. In the end, we requested the WFP Food Monitors to translate the documents after the workshop, which they did efficiently.

While the WFP and FAO fieldworkers did speak English, most of the UNRWA fieldworkers did not. We relied on workshop participants for translation. They did their best at what was a very tiring work, but it would have been better to have translators present who were familiar with the concepts of food security.

Security fears

The training was implemented in the time frame allocated in spite of the political situation in the West Bank. However, many participants voiced their concern that the timing of the training was inappropriate due to the present political situation, which created some anxiety and tension at certain points during the training. On the second day when the bombing of Iraq started, many people wanted to go home. It was important that we listened to the participants concerns. We invited the WFP security officer and the Assessment Team Leader to come and speak to the group. They listened to the participants concerns and

outlined the process by which we could get people back to their families. In the end, all decided to stay and complete the training.

Inter and intra-agency communication

The training was unique in that it brought people from different organisations – WFP, FAO, UNRWA and UNDP – and backgrounds to work on the food security assessment. Many participants mentioned the value of getting people from different organisations to work together on this project. Participation of different agencies meant that finding ways to encourage participants to get to know each other and work together, such as ice-breakers, were very important.

The UNRWA fieldworkers were unaware of the work required by the assessment after the training. They were not told that they are expected to work six days per week until 5pm – longer than their current working week. They also became aware that they are being paid less than the FAO and WFP staff. This lack of clarity about the expectations of working on this assessment was due to miscommunication within UNRWA management. We have asked UNRWA to lay out clearly the work conditions required to the social workers. UNRWA has also agreed to pay the social workers overtime.

Duration of and amendments to the content of the workshop

Although we achieved the objectives of the training in the time allotted, the training was very short. The participants would have benefited from spending more time becoming familiar with the assessment tools (focus groups and semi-structured interviews) and working in groups on their team work plans.

Fieldwork training, involving focus groups and interviews in Jericho, was planned for the afternoon of the second day. However, this was cancelled because it was considered inappropriate given the start of the bombing in Iraq. As a result, fieldworkers did not have practice in using PRA tools before the onset of fieldwork.

Given the amount we had to cover in a short time and the cancellation of the pilot interview and focus groups, we envisaged that problems would arise in the first week of fieldwork. The socio-economists and PRA Coordinator expected to have to provide considerable ongoing training support. We planned a second meeting in approximately one week's time for half a day in order to share experience, discuss problems and identify solutions.

Outline for Jericho training

1. Objectives

Objectives of the food security and nutrition assessment

- 1) Conduct a comprehensive food security assessment in light of recent findings on the nutrition situation and food utilisation and consumption information.
- 2) To assist the Palestinian Authority and relevant development partners develop a national food security strategy and better design, target and implement development programmes and relief interventions.

Training objectives

- 1) To familiarize ourselves with the tools of the assessment.
- 2) To sort out the logistics of undertaking this with so many participants and different organizations.
- 3) To get to know each other and to start operating as a team.

2. Concepts

i. Food security:

Exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food which meets the dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.'

Food Security depends on:

- Food availability (domestic, imported and food aid)
- Household Food Access (production, purchases and transfers)
- Individual Food Utilisation (distribution of food)

ii. Livelihoods:

All the capabilities, assets and activities required to make a living.

- Livelihoods is a concept wider than employment
- Food as one of many household priorities
- Importance of physical, human and social capital in meeting household needs.
- Household not a black box: power relations and social norms shape distribution (gender and generation).

iii. Coping mechanisms:

Means of survival when livelihood is taken away.

- Income Generation
- Reliance on Agriculture
- Support Networks and Living on Account
- Household Adjustment: Consumption; Size and Roles.
- Sale of Assets

iv. **Vulnerability:**

Entails the exposure to risk of food insecurity and ability to cope. The probability of an acute decline in food access, or consumption, often in reference to some critical value that defines minimum levels of human well-being.

Vulnerable Groups

Can include:

- Children, pregnant women and elderly;
- Landless, women headed households, the sick and disabled (chronic poor);
- Geographical location and access to assets (near settlement, wall, border, destruction of assets, isolation); and/or
- New unemployed.

3. How to select the focus groups and individuals for the semi-structured interviews

Focus Groups: 15 per district

3.1 Women's Focus Groups

Each district should comprise 11 focus groups in this category. It should include a minimum of 3 per distinct area (one of each for camps, urban areas and rural areas).

Shop (list of creditors): Women only. Choose a shop in the general area where you are concentrating your study. Approach the shop keeper as a first step to have a semi-structured interview with him and then ask him if he would identify from his client list a number of households that are owing to him. Keep in mind to also ask him if he would identify from that list both households to whom he no longer extends credit because of their repayment arrears and those to whom he extends small credit lines.

Chronic poor: Women only. MOSA special hardship cases, UNWRA special hardship cases, or other local organization that extends services to women.

New unemployed: Women only. We are trying to identify households where the major income earner has lost his employment in the last two years. Identified through trade unions, MOSA, other social service agencies in the vicinity.

3.2 Other groups

Elderly: Minimum of one: Groups of women and men. Identified through clubs, MOSA, other service clubs. The elderly should be those from that particular locality.

Lost Assets: Minimum of one: Women only. Identified through the municipality, local NGOs, PARC, Ministry of Agriculture, UNWRA.

Children's Groups: 8-12 & 13-16 (Minimum of one each) : Boys and girls for young group. Fieldworkers should decide about appropriateness of mixed focus groups for the older age group. Identified through schools and clubs.

3.3 Semi-Structured Interviews: 56 per district, evenly distributed between camp, urban areas and rural areas. The majority should be with the first three types: Farmers and vulnerable households.

- Farmers: men or women identified through PARC, Ministry of Agriculture
- Food Trade: men or women and can include small shop keepers, market vendors, small stalls on street corners, etc.
- Vulnerable Households - women
- Lists from MOSA, UNWRA, NGOs and should consist of a mixture of chronic and new unemployed households. These are visits to the home.
- Bedouins – women of the household

Outline for Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) training

- Concept and definition of PRA
- Concept of participation
- Historical background of PRA
- Behaviour of researchers
- Characteristics of PRA which includes
 - ✓ Multidiscipline team
 - ✓ Flexibility
 - ✓ Various tools for data collection
 - ✓ Integration with the society
 - ✓ Direct analysis in the field
 - ✓ Self criticism and non-bias
- Usage of PRA in the project cycle
- Weaknesses and difficulties of PRA implementation
- Tools and techniques of PRA which include
 - ✓ Direct observation
 - ✓ Review of secondary sources
 - ✓ Drawings and maps
 - ✓ Pictures
 - ✓ Ranking
- Semi-structured interviews
 - ✓ Definition and usage of semi-structured interviews
 - ✓ Types of semi-structured interviews
 - ✓ Characteristics of semi-structured interviews
 - ✓ Guidance on the usage of semi-structured interviews
- Focus groups
 - ✓ Concept and definition of focus groups
 - ✓ Characteristics of focus groups as a research tool
 - ✓ Guidance on the usage of focus groups