



care®



CARE International in Uganda

P.O. Box 7280, 2nd Floor, Kalamu House. Plot 1B Kira Road, Kampala, Uganda. **Tel:** +256 312 258 100 **Web:** www.careuganda.org

CARE is an Equal Opportunity Employer and Affirmative Action Employer (AA/M/F/D/V) dedicated to workplace diversity. CARE® and CARE Package® are registered marks of CARE. Copyright ©2008 by Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE). All rights reserved. Unless otherwise indicated, all photos ©CARE.

**Lifesaving Shelter, Protection and
Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees in
Omugo Zone, Rhino Settlement, Arua
District, West Nile Region in Uganda**

Baseline Report

April 2019

Acknowledgement

This report was prepared by Francis Okello from Varimetrics Group Limited, an external Consultant, who was hired to finalize the evaluation process. He worked under the general guidance of Sam BT. Okello, the MEAL advisor for CARE International, Arua Field office and the MEAL and CARE NMFA2 Project Implementation Team-. We are grateful to the CARE Country Director – Delphine Pinault for providing critical oversight and guidance during this exercise. We also take this opportunity to thank the Project funder, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) for making resources available for this exercise.

The annexes of this report have been reproduced without formal editing. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of CARE International in Uganda.

Table of Content

Acknowledgement.....	1
Table of Content.....	2
List of Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Access to Lifesaving Shelter.....	4
Gender Based Violence, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Background to the Project.....	6
Context and Rationale.....	6
Scope.....	7
Approach and methodology.....	7
Respondent selection and data collection.....	7
Findings.....	7
Demographics.....	7
Training in Livelihood and Business Skills.....	10
Sources of Incomes.....	11
Most Preferred IGAs/Business.....	11
Livelihood Activities Youth Currently Involved in.....	11
Challenges Facing Youth in Businesses.....	11
Harmful Behavior and Violence against Women.....	12
Places Where Women Face Violence.....	13
Harmful Behaviors and Violence against Men.....	13
Life-Saving Shelter.....	14
Livelihoods.....	14
Based Violence, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse.....	14

List of Acronyms

NMFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PSNs	Persons with Special Needs
GBV	Gender Based Violence
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
FGDs	Focused Group Discussions
KII	Key Informant Interviews
IGA	Incomes Generating Activities
RMM	Roll Model Men
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuses
CDO	Community Development Officer
VSLA	Village Savings and Loans Association

Executive Summary

The Baseline survey for the NMFA2 project was conducted by CARE International between 11th and 18th February 2019. The evaluation was conducted in Village 5 of Omugo zone, Rhino Camp where NMFA2 will be implemented. Data collection took place over 6 days starting with 2 days of training for data enumerators and pre-testing the tools. The baseline targeted refugee settlement and the host community villages.

The evaluation relied on data collected by CARE International MEAL Team. This was quantitative and qualitative data. For Quantitative data, Semi-structured interviews were conducted at the household level using Handheld Tablets, programmed with Kobo tool. Focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs) and document reviews were conducted for the qualitative component.

The objective was to generate baseline data and assess the status quo regarding access to shelter, reported or perceived protection from GBV, sexual exploitation and abuse and coverage of Livelihood interventions.

Data was collected from 371 refugees and the report focuses at three thematic areas, to be implemented under the NMFA project – Lifesaving shelter, protection from GBV, sexual exploitation and abuse and Livelihood component targeting the general project beneficiary population.

Findings

Access to Lifesaving Shelter

Majority of respondents lived in temporary shelters constructed by NGOs when they arrived at the settlement, however, some few refugees reported living in 2 roomed semi-permanent shelters. Most refugees cook inside the temporary shelter despite complain on poor ventilation. Privacy of the provided space for bathing was inadequate. The beneficiaries were however, able to keep their shelter clean. Majority of beneficiaries have carried out some form of maintenance on their shelter, much of which involved smearing.

The temporary shelter did not meet the expectations of the PSNs and feelings of safety was low among on arrival. The baseline study finds that although the PSN feels unsafe, they perceive the temporary shelter provides security – security is protection from external threats while safety is protection from the aspect that are likely to cause harm. This means the PSNS cannot protect themselves from risk causing agents and are thus vulnerable to unintended risks. None the less, most PSNS have no desire to leave the settlement in the next three months.

Livelihoods

More female youth had a source of income than the male youth although the male youth comparably earned more income than female youth. Although most youth were engaged in IGA of their choice, there was minimal external support to initiate or grow the IGA. Access to vocational training or specialized training on the IGAs the youth are currently engaged in was low as does training in the various business models. The most reported source of income was sale of food aid while market vending and agricultural produce selling were the most preferred IGA / Business by both female and male youth. Majority of the respondents identified lack of capital as the biggest challenge facing the youth in doing business. The youth

also decried the lack of support from humanitarian agencies towards their businesses, thus limiting startups and expansions of existing businesses.

Gender Based Violence, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

The most commonly reported harmful behavior and violence against women was physical violence. Economic violence was most reported by PSNs while the youth identified early marriages/ forced marriage, sexual harassment and domestic violence as the most harmful behavior and violence against women. Firewood collection points, water points and home were identified as the riskiest places where women faced violence.

Introduction

CARE International in Uganda conducted a baseline study to establish the pre-intervention situation primarily on Shelter, Protection and Livelihoods for South Sudanese Refugees and host community in Omugo Zone, Rhino Camp. This baseline findings will inform project implementation approaches/strategies and decisions and provide benchmarks for assessing results and impacts of the project at the end.

Background to the Project

Rhine extension Omugo continues to receive refugees from South Sudan. A quick baseline assessment carried out by CARE and partners in February 2019 identified that Omugo is still one of the areas with needs and requires immediate support. CARE is already operational in Omugo thus allowing for the necessary rapid scale-up and complementary coverage that NMFA2 funding will provide under CARE's integrated humanitarian response program. On May 16, 2019, the UNHCR officially confirmed partners, including CARE to consider scaling up provision of semi-permanent shelters for Persons with Special Needs (PSNs) and introduction of livelihoods to address negative coping strategies by refugee girls, women and host community youth.

Overall, the project aims at reducing vulnerability of refugees and host communities by promoting human dignity, increase resilience and improve protection in Omugo Zone, Rhino Settlement. Specifically, it is expected to;

- i. Increase access to appropriate, safe and dignified semi-permanent shelters for South Sudanese refugees and host community, especially women, children and persons with special needs (PSNs);
- ii. Increase protection from GBV and sexual exploitation and abuse for refugees and host communities, particularly women and girls, and
- iii. Improve livelihoods of refugee youth, women and host community through business training and establish livelihood activities in Omugo zone.

The project targets 1,920 refugees, Youth (boys and girls between 18 and 24 years) as direct beneficiaries and 16,800 indirect beneficiaries from host communities, vulnerable households among the refugee population (estimated 50% women).

Context and Rationale

Uganda currently hosts the largest refugee population in Africa of whom 1,067,637 (representing 72.5%) are from South Sudan, 61% are children under 18 years, 37% are women and men (above 18 years) and 2% the elderly. In the recent refugee verification exercise by UNHCR and OPM (with support from implementing and operational Partners), 750,968 (representing 52%) of the total number of refugees and asylum seekers of 1,472,566 were verified.

The dramatic increase in number of refugees has left vulnerable populations in dire need of access to critical lifesaving services, including food, water, non-food items but also protection and sexual and reproductive health services, particularly for women and girls. At the same time, services particularly for shelter, GBV and livelihoods are seriously limited, and there is an urgent need to provide support in these critical sectors as number of incoming refugees continue to grow.

The Baseline survey was conducted from 11th to 18th February 2019 in Village 5 of Omugo zone, Rhino Camp where NMFA2 will be implemented. Indicators were measured to provide benchmarks for assessing changes and impacts of the project interventions at the end. The results are specific to population groups and are sex disaggregated.

Scope

The baseline targeted refugee settlement and the host community villages. Respondents were sampled from village 5 of Omugo Zone and data collection took place over 6 days from 11th to 18th February 2019 including 2 days for training for data enumerator and pretesting the tools. We focused at the thematic areas of Lifesaving Shelter, Protection from GBV, sexual exploitation and Livelihoods for the youth. The men, women, Youth and PSNs were interviewed through structured interviews and FGDs.

Approach and methodology

A mixed method approach was used. For Quantitative data, semi structured interviews were conducted at household level with the objective of generating baseline data and assessing the status quo regarding access to shelter, reported or perceived protection from GBV, sexual exploitation and abuse and coverage of Livelihood interventions. Parallel interviews were conducted involving one respondent per household. Focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs) and document reviews were conducted for the qualitative component.

Respondent selection and data collection

Stratified sampling was applied due to variation in the number of households in the blocks of village 5. Sample was allocated to the blocks using probability proportionate to size sampling (PPS). A sampling interval was computed. From each block / cluster, households were randomly selected through systematic sampling and a household member, preferably family head or any member aged 16 and above was interviewed. The enumerators interviewed every 4th household in the block until the required number for each cluster was achieved.

Six focused group discussions were conducted, each consisting between 8-12 members. One (1) FGD each with – male adults (Role model men); female adults (wives to role model men), 18-85 years; male youth; female youth, all aged 15-24 years. One (1) with male PSNs and one (1) with female PSNs, all aged 15-85 years. The discussions were audio recorded/notes taken and as such permission was sought through informed consent and clear explanations during rapport building. Similarly, 16 KIIs were conducted with OPM staff, welfare Council IIs, Sub-county chief, CDO Service providers and partners –UNHCR and Peace winds Japan among others.

Findings

Demographics

Demographics in Table I shows low completion of primary education among men, women and youth. Majority of PSNs had never attended school. More men, women and female youth were married but there were 65.6% PSNs cohabiting and 56.7% male youth who were single. Most respondents were also Christians and heads of their households. Few (3.1%) PSN lived in child headed households and the PSN households had more persons with vulnerabilities (23.4%) than any other population group. A quarter (25%) of the PSNs lived in households that were not registered as PSN households.

Table I: Demographic Characteristics

N=371	PSNs N (%)	Men N (%)	Women N (%)	Male youth N (%)	Female youth N (%)
	64	71	72	60	104
Educational level					
Never attended school	42 (65.6)	12 (16.7)	28 (38.9)	2 (3.3)	21 (20.2)
Functional Adult Literacy	2 (3.1)	3 (4.2)	3 (4.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Incomplete primary level	12 (18.8)	26 (36.6)	28 (38.9)	40 (66.7)	70 (67.3)
Completed primary	7 (10.9)	20 (28.2)	10 (13.9)	10 (16.7)	8 (7.7)
O level	1 (1.6)	10 (14.1)	3 (4.2)	8 (13.3)	5 (4.8)
Current marital status					
Single	14(21.9)	16(22.5)	12(16.7)	34(56.7)	37(35.6)
Married	8 (12.5)	53 (74.6)	44 (61.1)	23 (38.3)	50 (48.1)
Co-habiting/ Widowed/Separated	42(65.6)	2(2.8)	16(22.2)	3(5.0)	17(16.4)
Religion					
Catholic	17 (26.6)	26 (36.6)	29 (40.3)	22 (36.7)	30 (28.8)
Protestant	41 (64.1)	31 (43.7)	37 (51.4)	35 (58.3)	66 (63.5)
Muslim/Pentecostal/SDA	6(9.4)	14(19.7)	6 (8.3)	3(5.0)	8 (7.7)
Relationship with the Household head					
Head	47 (73.4)	55 (77.5)	52 (72.2)	38 (63.3)	44 (42.3)
Wife/husband	13 (20.3)	4 (5.6)	17 (23.6)	6 (10)	25 (24)
Other relationships	4(6.3)	12(16.9)	3(4.2)	16(26.7)	35(33.7)
Type of household head					
Male Headed	18 (28.1)	65 (91.5)	21 (29.2)	47 (78.3)	31 (29.8)
Female headed	44 (68.8)	6 (8.5)	51 (70.8)	12 (20)	73 (70.2)
Child headed	2 (3.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.7)	0 (0)
Household has a member with a vulnerability	15 (23.4)	16 (22.5)	10 (13.9)	9 (15)	6 (5.8)
Household registered as a PSN	48 (75)	5 (7.0)	6 (8.3)	12 (20.0)	19 (18.3)

Access to Lifesaving Shelter

Table 2 presents findings on access to Lifesaving shelter. Most respondents report living in temporary shelters constructed by NGOs when they arrived at the settlement. However, some few refugees now live in 2 roomed semi-permanent shelters of 3.5m by 5m in size with more females living with someone else in the shelter than males. 87% of respondents cooked inside the temporary shelter and yet only half feels the shelter is well ventilated presenting health risk to the occupants. Privacy of the provided space for bathing was also inadequate although the beneficiaries were able to keep their shelter clean.

Nearly 30% more women than men have carried out some form of maintenance on their shelter, much of which involved smearing and only about 20% talked to volunteers about maintaining the shelter. Only 6.3% of PSNs reported the shelter meets their expectations. Feeling of safety is low among PSNs and slightly declined among female but improved among males when arrival and current time is compared. However, most PSNs have no desire to leave the settlement in the next three months. Perception of security provided by the shelter was high among the PSNs with over 95% of agreeing. Although the statistic on the table shows a sharp contradiction (where 70.8%) of the refugees felt unsafe on arrival), this, as clarified by

the FGDs, changed soon after settling for a short period in the camp, on average between one and two months. This show that as refugees get to learn how to live in Omugo zone, they start to feel secured.

Table 2: Access to Lifesaving Shelter

Shelter of PSN	Female N (%)	Male N (%)
	N=48	N=16
Respondents were using Temporary shelter (Tarpaulin/tents) on arrival	48 (100)	16 (100)
Temporary Shelter was Constructed by Other NGOs	46 (95.8)	15 (93.8)
Currently lives in Temporary shelter (Tarpaulin/tents)	44 (91.7)	15 (93.8)
Temporary shelter Constructed by other NGOs	48 (100)	15 (93.8)
Lives in a 1 roomed (temporary shelter)	22 (45.8)	6 (37.5)
Lives in a 2 roomed - semi-permanent shelter (3.5m by 5m)	26 (54.2)	10 (62.5)
Lives With other people in Temporary Shelter	34 (70.8)	6 (37.5)
Cook inside or outside	42 (87.5)	14 (87.5)
Shelter has Sufficient ventilation	24 (50)	8 (50)
Felt Very unsafe/Unsafe at first arrival	34 (70.8)	13 (81.3)
Now feels Safe	13 (27.1)	4 (25)
Temporary Shelter has space to bath that provides privacy	18 (37.5)	8 (50)
Able to keep your shelter clean	39 (81.3)	8 (50)
Able to carry out maintenance on Temporary Shelter	26 (54.2)	4 (25)
Has been able to do the smearing on the shelter	28 (58.3)	5 (33.3)
Talked to volunteers about maintaining shelter	11 (22.9)	3 (18.8)
Expectations/hopes been met by the shelter currently living in	3 (6.3)	1 (6.3)
PSN does not intend to move away from settlement in the next 3months.	44 (91.7)	16 (100)
Shelter provides Privacy	2 (4.2)	1 (6.3)
Shelter provides Security	45 (93.8)	16 (100)
Shelter Away from flood plains	46 (95.8)	16 (100)
Ventilation has improved	46 (95.8)	16 (100)
Has Lockable doors	46 (95.8)	15 (93.8)
Has Lockable windows	47 (97.9)	14 (87.5)
Offers protection from harsh weather conditions	47 (97.9)	16 (100)
Shelter accompanied with a latrine	47(97.9)	14 (87.5)
Shelter Latrine is disability friendly	41 (85.4)	14 (87.5)
Shelter provide security for the girls and women in	7 (14.6)	4 (25)

Livelihoods

According to Table 3, although slightly more female youth had a source of income than the male, they earned less than male youth with majority earning just UGX 50,000 or less. Less than 12% of the youth engaged in an IGA in the past one year. More male youth were engaged in IGA of their choice that females. Support to start IGA was minimal, receipt of cash grants to start business was almost unreported, and there is deep vulnerability at household levels - over 86% of the youth reported living in households with no other income earner.

Table 3: Income, IGA, and Grant/ Voucher

Income, IGA and Grant/Voucher	N	Male youth	N	Female youth
Has source of income		60		104
Yes		17 (28.3)		32 (30.8)
Average earning, (last 30 days prior to interview)	17		32	
50,000 UGX and below		5(29.4)		21(65.6)
50,001 -150,000 UGX		6 (35.3)		5 (15.6)
150,001- 300,000 UGX		5 (29.4)		4 (12.5)
Not earn anything		1(5.9)		2 (6.3)
Engaged in an IGA past one year prior to Survey	60	7 (11.7)	104	11 (10.6)
Currently engaged in an IGA of choice	7	4 (57.1)	11	4 (36.4)
Been supported to start or improve IGA	60	6 (10)	104	3 (2.9)
Respondent lives in household with no other income earner	60	46 (76.7)	104	90 (86.5)
Received cash /grant/vouchers in the last six months,	60	2 (3.3)	104	1 (1)
Report increase in asset	60	6 (10)		3 (2.9)

Training in Livelihood and Business Skills

Less than 10% of the youth received training on Livelihoods. Few youths were trained in the IGA they are currently engaged in and much of the training occurred more than 2 month ago. Access to vocational training was low as does training in the various business models.

Table 4: Training in livelihood and business skills

Training in livelihood and business skills	N	Male youth	N	Female youth
	60		104	
Receive any training on livelihood	60	6 (10)	104	8 (7.7)
Trained by other organizations	6	2 (33.3)	8	8 (100)
Trained in the livelihood activity currently involved in	60	1(1.7)	104	2(1.9)
More than two months	60	5 (83.3)	104	2 (66.7)
Had vocational training	60	3 (5)	104	2 (1.9)
Business identification	60	8 (13.3)	104	14 (13.5)
Business selection	60	9 (15)	104	12 (11.5)
Trained in business management	60	9 (15)	104	10 (9.6)
Trained in making business plans	60	11 (18.3)	104	13 (12.5)
Trained in customer care	60	9 (15)	104	12 (11.5)
Trained in records keeping	60	8 (13.3)	104	11 (10.6)
Trained in saving	60	10 (16.7)	104	12 (11.5)
Trained in business environment	60	9 (15)	104	12 (11.5)
Trained in decision making	60	12 (20)	104	11 (10.6)
Trained in Shelf management	60	10 (16.7)	104	11 (10.6)
Trained in peer to peer engagement/awareness	60	7 (11.7)	104	8 (7.7)
Trained in conflict management	60	8 (13.3)	104	9 (8.7)
Trained in team building	60	8 (13.3)	104	9 (8.7)
Trained in gender relations	60	8 (13.3)	104	10 (9.6)

Sources of Incomes

The most reported source of income was sale of food aid which is a common practice in the refugee settlement. Casual labor was also reported in addition to other sources.

Table 5: Most reported sources of income

Most reported sources of income	Male youth	Female youth
Sale of food aid	11(44.0)	27(56.3)
Casual labor	4(16.0)	6(12.5)
Remittances	2(8.0)	3(6.3)
Other sources	8(32.0)	12(25.0)

Most Preferred IGAs/Business

While market vending and agricultural produce selling were the most preferred IGA/Business by both female and male youth, 32.3% preferred to engage in several other IGAs such as poultry farming, livestock keeping and phone selling among others as seen in Table 6.

Table 6: Most preferred IGA/Business

Most preferred IGA/Business	Male youth	Female youth
Market vending	18(16.7)	44(24.6)
Agricultural produce selling	26(24.1)	31(17.3)
Tailoring	8(7.4)	16(8.9)
Hair dressing /Barbering	6(5.6)	15(8.4)
Casual labor	6(5.6)	10(5.6)
Soap making	7(6.5)	9(5.0)
Others (Poultry farming, livestock keeping &Phone selling etc.)	37(34.3)	54(30.2)

Livelihood Activities Youth Currently Involved in

Results from Table 7 shows that youth are engaged in a myriad of businesses with agricultural produce selling as the most practiced.

Table 7: Livelihood Activities Youth Currently Involved

Livelihood activities currently involved in	Male youth	Female youth
Agricultural produce selling	11(28.9)	21(36.2)
Casual labor	9(23.7)	8(13.8)
Market vending	5(13.2)	11(19.0)
Crop farming	3(7.9)	5(8.6)
Others (Tailoring, hair dressing, poultry farming etc.)	10(26.3)	13(22.4)

Challenges Facing Youth in Businesses

Majority of the respondents identified lack of capital as the biggest challenge facing the youth in doing business. This was confirmed during qualitative interviews where in addition to lack of startup capital, the youth also mentioned stiff business competition/lack of market as the main challenges to doing business in the settlement. The youth also decried the lack of support from humanitarian agencies towards their businesses forcing many of them to resort to their meager resources to fund their business startup as one respondent noted

“I started my business without any support from NGOs...my business is small because I had limited capital to start with, my customers are also few because

we are many that deal in the same type of commodities, so it takes time for the stock to get all done” (a local business Owner in Village V, Omugo settlement camp)

Another respondent noted that;

“There is completely no support, I have seen businesses collapsing because of no support, someone has a small business but then the expenditure is more than the income”

Table 8: Challenges Facing Youth Engaged in Business

Challenges facing youth in business	Male youth	Female youth
Lack of capital	59(60.8)	104(68.0)
Lack of market	11(11.3)	15(9.8)
Lack of space	7(7.2)	10(6.5)
Long distances to the market	4(4.1)	5(3.3)
Insecurity	3(3.1)	5(3.3)
Others (Limited skills to run business, scarcity of water, Alcoholism, laziness, high costs of transport etc.)	13(13.4)	14(9.2)

Gender Based Violence, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

The baseline assessed drivers of violence on men, women, PSNs, male and female youth on sub-parameters including harmful behaviors that potentially cause violence on men and women alike, placed where violence can be faced by men and women.

Harmful Behavior and Violence against Women

The most commonly reported harmful behavior and violence against women were physical violence, domestic violence, emotional/psychological violence, drug abuse and economic violence. The PSNs had strong opinion on economic violence more than any other respondent category, seemingly because of their increased vulnerabilities and difficulty in accessing economic opportunities. Majority of the youth identified early marriages/ forced marriage, sexual harassment and domestic violence as the most harmful behavior and violence against women.

Table 9: Harmful behavior and violence against women

Most reported harmful behavior and violence against women	PSN	Men	Women	Male youth	Female youth
Physical violence	54 (16.6)	32 (16.2)	42 (18.1)	43 (16)	67 (17)
Domestic violence	38 (11.7)	44 (22.3)	38 (16.4)	25 (9.3)	41 (10.4)
Rape	4 (1.2)	3 (1.5)	5 (2.2)	13 (4.8)	26 (6.6)
Alcohol and drugs	30 (9.2)	37 (18.8)	41 (17.7)	27 (10)	38 (9.6)
Emotional/Psychological violence	33 (10.2)	38 (19.3)	46 (19.8)	20 (7.4)	26 (6.6)
Early marriages/ forced marriage	28 (8.6)	8 (4.1)	14 (6)	45 (16.7)	70 (17.7)
Economic violence	50 (15.4)	14 (7.1)	18 (7.8)	25 (9.3)	27 (6.8)
Threats of violence	22 (6.8)	10 (5.1)	14 (6)	9 (3.3)	9 (2.3)
Sexual harassment /violence	32 (9.8)	2 (1)	3 (1.3)	28 (10.4)	39 (9.9)
Others	34 (10.5)	9 (4.6)	11 (4.7)	34 (12.6)	52 (13.2)

Places Where Women Face Violence

Women faced violence from firewood collection points, at water points and from home. Violence from home could be coming from an intimate partner as well as threats of violence and abuse from close relatives. The PSNs mentioned trading areas and on the road. The women and youth considered Food distribution points, trading areas and markets as places where violence occurs. Whereas, there is little evidence on why food distribution center is a risky place for violence against women, other studies in the same settings have market places as areas where women are likely to face sexual harassment.

Table 10: Places where Women face violence

Places where women face violence	PSN	Men	Women	Male youth	Female youth
Collecting fire wood	60 (23.3)	40 (20.9)	39 (20.3)	50 (22.5)	79 (23)
Water point	53 (20.6)	42 (22)	46 (24)	38 (17.1)	57 (16.6)
At home	40 (15.6)	37 (19.4)	46 (24)	34 (15.3)	53 (15.5)
Food distribution points	13 (5.1)	25 (13.1)	20 (10.4)	25 (11.3)	37 (10.8)
Markets	17 (6.6)	24 (12.6)	21 (10.9)	20 (9)	24 (7)
Trading areas/centers	24 (9.3)	6 (3.1)	3 (1.6)	22 (9.9)	33 (9.6)
On the road	31 (12.1)	3 (1.6)	6 (3.1)	12 (5.4)	23 (6.7)
Others	14 (5.4)	14 (7.3)	11 (5.7)	21 (9.5)	37 (10.8)

Harmful Behaviors and Violence against Men

The most reported harmful behavior and violence that exist in the community against men was alcohol abuse. The youth also identified early marriage/forced marriage, threats and coercion as well as other forms of sexual abuse such as sexual harassment and sexual exploitation as the most harmful behaviors and violence against men. The strong opinion of the youth towards sexual forms of violence as the main harmful behavior and violence against men could be a reflection of their own experiences of vulnerabilities to sexual exploitation and abuse.

Table 11: Harmful behaviors and violence against men

Most reported harmful behavior and violence against men	PSN	Men	Women	Male Youth	Female Youth
Alcohol and drugs	55 (17.4)	44 (20.2)	41 (18.9)	29 (15.4)	61 (23.3)
Physical violence	52 (16.5)	42 (19.3)	46 (21.2)	33 (17.6)	47 (17.9)
Domestic violence	33 (10.4)	42 (19.3)	42 (19.4)	14 (7.4)	15 (5.7)
Emotional violence	35 (11.1)	38 (17.4)	47 (21.7)	13 (6.9)	9 (3.4)
Economic violence	50 (15.8)	19 (8.7)	12 (5.5)	16 (8.5)	21 (8)
Early marriage/forced marriage	27 (8.5)	11 (5)	4 (1.8)	19 (10.1)	31 (11.8)
Threats and coercion	19 (6)	6 (2.8)	12 (5.5)	11 (5.9)	10 (3.8)
Others (Rape sexual harassment, sexual exploitation etc.)	45 (14.2)	16 (7.3)	13 (6)	53 (28.2)	68 (26)

Places Where Men Face Violence

According to Table 12, men, just like women, faces more violence at home, firewood collection places, trading areas and food distribution point.

Table 12: Places where Men face violence

Place were men face harmful behavior and violence	PSN	Men	Women	Male youth	Female Youth
At home	43 (20.2)	35 (23.8)	41 (27.2)	29 (16.9)	48 (18.4)
Water points	24 (11.3)	19 (12.9)	19 (12.6)	32 (18.6)	42 (16.1)
Collecting fire wood	22 (10.3)	22 (15)	26 (17.2)	27 (15.7)	38 (14.6)
Trading areas/centers	32 (15)	12 (8.2)	7 (4.6)	29 (16.9)	51 (19.5)
Food distribution	15 (7)	21 (14.3)	23 (15.2)	19 (11)	31 (11.9)
Markets	18 (8.5)	16 (10.9)	14 (9.3)	17 (9.9)	17 (6.5)
On the road	49 (23)	5 (3.4)	7 (4.6)	11 (6.4)	9 (3.4)
Others (verification points, registration points, latrine, near school etc.)	10 (4.7)	17 (11.6)	14 (9.3)	8 (4.7)	25 (9.6)

Conclusions

Life-Saving Shelter

We find that the refugees were provided with temporary shelter on arrival, in line with the UNHCR's provision. This meets the immediate needs for accommodation and safety. The temporary shelters do not however, provide adequate spaces for bathing, an essential aspect in wellbeing of the refugees. A lack of clean space for bathing has health implications.

This is strong justification for setting up stronger, safer and accommodative lifesaving shelters for the refugees. Working with shelter volunteers is also an opportunity for integrated support to the refugees

Livelihoods

Access to cash grants, vouchers and other startup funds are still limited. We find that the sale of relief food was most common source of income among females. This is likely to affect household stock of food and may subject affected household to food insecurity and hunger, a situation which likely increases vulnerability such as SEA, exploitative laboring, and other forms of abuses. The sizes of the IGA being implemented by the youths are generally very small scale, attributable to limited start-up capital. Market vending and selling agricultural produce are most preferred forms of IGAs.

Findings show that in all forms of IGAs / businesses, female youth engaged more than their male counterparts. The trend illustrates a gender dynamic in which female youth and women generally take more responsibility in ensuring economic wellbeing and livelihoods for families in refugee situations.

Based Violence, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

Physical IPV and domestic violence is the most reported form of violence against men and women. Violence was reportedly most perpetrated at home, firewood collection points, food distribution points and road sides.



care®



CARE International in Uganda

P.O. Box 7280, 2nd Floor, Kalamu House. Plot 1B Kira Road, Kampala, Uganda. **Tel:** +256 312 258 100 **Web:** www.careuganda.org

CARE is an Equal Opportunity Employer and Affirmative Action Employer (AA/M/F/D/V) dedicated to workplace diversity. CARE® and CARE Package® are registered marks of CARE. Copyright ©2008 by Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE). All rights reserved. Unless otherwise indicated, all photos ©CARE.