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PREFACE

The disaster frequency is showing a rising trend. In the year June 2005 to June 2006, 404 disasters associated with natural hazards were recorded in 115 countries, killing more than 93,000 people, affecting almost 157 million people and causing economic damage amounting to USD 172 billion.

Disasters have a dramatic impact on the lives of people not least on their sources of livelihood and productive assets. They leave livelihoods shattered; houses, schools and other public facilities flattened; bridges and road networks collapsed; the geography of the zone sometimes transformed.

The impact of disasters hinders the capacity of affected groups to recover in the short-term and rebuild back their assets, thus often condemning the survivors to a long dependency on relief aid. In this context, helping protecting and rebuilding the livelihoods of those vulnerable to disasters becomes an urgent priority. Support to the recovery of means of living in farming, fisheries, rational use of natural resources, wage employment in primary and secondary sectors and services, small trade, micro- and small enterprises in the formal or informal sector, etc. have to be started as soon as possible in the immediate aftermath of a disaster.

Assessing the impact of disasters on the livelihoods of people and the capacity and opportunities for quick recovery and increased resilience to future events is an important part of the response to disasters. Yet current assessment systems are often weak, uncoordinated and are not strongly linked to livelihood recovery interventions. In order to improve understanding of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, FAO and ILO have jointly developed this Disaster Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT). The LAT consists of three main technical elements: Livelihood Baseline Information (which is set-up pre-disaster); Livelihood Impact Scan (undertaken immediately after the disaster); and Livelihood Rapid Assessment (undertaken within three months after the disaster).

In the process of development, parts of this tool-kit have been tested, redefined and refined in a number of countries including Pakistan (2005 Kashmir earthquake); Indonesia (2006 volcanic eruption and earthquake in Yogyakarta); Philippines (2006 typhoon Reming); and Solomon Islands (2007 tsunami). The complete set has been tested in Bolivia and Indonesia. This process of continual learning and improvement continues, and so the current set of guidelines contained in these volumes should be seen as one stage in the development of the approach.

In this spirit, suggestions for improvement are welcomed and should be directed to: cruciani@ilo.org and neil.marsland@fao.org.

FAO Rome and ILO Geneva,
July 2007
SECTION 1:

OVERVIEW OF DISASTER LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT TOOL-KIT

1.1 Background to the development of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment

**text needs to be reviewed**

Emergencies may arise as a consequence of natural hazards, such as hurricanes and earthquakes, or may be caused by civil conflicts and wars. The nature of crises due to disasters or conflicts is such that the livelihoods in the area and even the entire local economy may be severely affected. Natural, financial, physical, social and human assets are all eroded, markets are disrupted, and these adverse effects can lead to the virtual collapse of the economic and social environment. During these crises, the international community will respond by providing emergency relief assistance (eg. food aid) hoping to save lives and reduce suffering. It is expected that satisfying urgent basic needs will help to ensure that the emergency does not become a large-scale humanitarian catastrophe. Within this framework, the overall goal of the current partnership between the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is to minimize the need and duration of relief inputs through early efforts to help protecting and restoring livelihoods: “saving livelihoods to save lives”.

The scope of the FAO/ILO collaboration includes the early phase of assessing the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods of the affected people and the joint programming of the international response for the recovery of the livelihoods and employment opportunities in rural and urban contexts, aiming at restoring local food production, supporting the recovery of (self-) employment opportunities, re-establishing trade and production networks and revitalizing local markets by reviving the demand for local services and products.

The collaboration has developed within the framework of the UN Humanitarian Response Reform carried over by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and following the adoption of the cluster approach for addressing early recovery needs. Recent disasters have evidenced a series of gaps in the UN and international response to natural disasters with regard to institutional capacities and common approaches and mechanisms for post-disaster early recovery. There is a need for a more predictable, effective, coordinated and timely response led to the identification and establishment of a to the humanitarian response. One of the clusters concerns the “early recovery”, that phase that follows life-saving assistance and relief after a disaster and precedes longer-term reconstruction and development.

The work in the early relief and recovery phase requires the emergence of strong synergies between humanitarian and developmental actors involved in the response. Common approaches and integrated mechanisms able to foster and facilitate coordination and coherence of the interventions are therefore critical. Within the Early Recovery Cluster Working Group, the support to livelihood promotion and employment creation has been identified as an essential aspect of early recovery: it is an issue to be tackled jointly with the response to basic humanitarian needs and, at the same time, is at the core of policies oriented towards the sustainable development and the socio-economic reintegration of crisis-affected groups. In order to improve the tools available to the national authorities and the international community to intervene in support to the post-crisis recovery, there is a need to improve programming tools, build capacity building and strengthen the coordination among the international agencies playing a role within this area of the response.
ILO and FAO have been assigned co-leadership in this area of livelihood and employment recovery and are responsible for the development of relevant tools, mechanisms and capacities and ensuring that they are in place within the UN System in order to enable effective interventions when a disaster occurs. Both organizations have the protection and strengthening of livelihoods in emergency situations as fundamental components of their mission and strategic plans. FAO’s expertise in farming, livestock, fisheries and forestry is crucial in emergency response and rehabilitation efforts. Its role in emergencies is indeed to protect, restore, and enhance the agricultural and related livelihoods of rural people, by strengthening their capacities and means to look after their nutritional needs. ILO has the role to address the negative impact of disasters, conflicts and other types of crisis in terms of employment, incomes and decent work conditions within the affected communities, local entrepreneurs and businesses, with a view to support them in living up to their potentials and reducing their vulnerability, by promoting employability, enterprise development, social dialogue and social protection.

On the occasion of the intervention in Pakistan in response to the earthquake that occurred in October 2005, it was found that there is a critical gap in terms of operational tools for ensuring coherence, coordination, effectiveness, to the several livelihood assessments that are usually undertaken by a variety of organizations following a disaster. The FAO and ILO therefore decided to embark on the development of an operational framework for post-crisis livelihood assessment: the Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT). Together with the relevant ILO and FAO technical units, an initial draft of the present guidelines has been elaborated. They are conceived to be applied in the aftermath of sudden-onset natural disasters and, eventually, will be revised to extend its coverage to other types of emergencies. The tool will be complemented by training materials on the LAS process, which will be developed later in 2007. For a number of “hotspot” countries the collection of livelihood baseline data is also planned.

1.2 Objectives and scope of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment TOOL-kit

1.2.1 Brief description of LAT

The Disaster Livelihood Assessment TOOL-kit (LAT) aims to provide a detailed assessment of the impact of a disaster on the livelihoods of the (especially the poor) people living in the affected area, that is used as the basis for decision-making with regard to immediate relief actions and subsequent recovery interventions. The LAT consists of three inter-related tools: the Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI), to be conducted before the incidence of a disaster, the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS), to be carried out just after the occurrence of a disaster, and the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA), to be undertaken within a timeframe of 40 days after the disaster.

Through the collection of primary and secondary data during the LBI, LIS and LRA, the Disaster Livelihood Assessment seeks to build up a good understanding of the local livelihoods situation and the way the livelihoods have been affected by the disaster. Some of the key questions which are the focus of the Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit include:

- How were people making a living before the disaster?
- What effect has the disaster had on their livelihoods?
- What coping mechanisms and livelihood strategies have different people/ households developed and how effective/ harmful are these?
- What are the opportunities for livelihood recovery within the local economy?
- What types of activities are needed for livelihood recovery of the different people/ households/ communities?
The main objective of the LAT is to provide a thorough assessment of the impact of disaster on livelihoods and to identify opportunities and capacities for recovery at household, community, and local economy levels. The LAT is intended to serve as a platform for local and central government authorities, in partnership with locally active NGOs and the international community, to take informed decisions and to focus assistance by providing a sound basis on which livelihood recovery response plans and projects can be elaborated, as well as more long-term livelihood support policies can be formulated.

1.2.2 Intended users of Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit

These guidelines on the conduct of an LAT are directed at all those involved (or interested) in the assessment of the way in which livelihoods are affected by a disaster.

More specifically the present volume 1, is meant to give a quick overview of the objectives and content of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit, and directed at those responsible with government, NGOs and donor agencies for the formulation of disaster relief and recovery interventions. It briefly discusses the concepts and instruments used, and seeks to inform the senior staff of relevant agencies on the importance and scope to base their decisions on reliable information.

The other, more practical volumes are mainly directed at the practitioners, such as the leaders (and interested members) of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment Team (see paragraph 2.3).

1.2.3 Links between the elements of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit

It is important to view the Disaster Livelihood Assessment as an integrated series of data collection and analysis exercises.

Ideally, the LAT should start with a Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI). The LBI would be undertaken before the occurrence of the disaster and provide for the contextualisation and quantification of the ‘normal’ livelihood situation of the area. This would normally be done on the basis of existing, secondary information (eg. from the Population Census, Household Surveys and special livelihood studies). The conduct of an LBI would initiate at an early stage the formation of a team to be responsible for the Disaster Livelihood Assessment and the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders in the process. It is suggested to carry out LBIs for all the major disaster-prone areas in a country. The existence of livelihood baseline information will greatly facilitate the organization of an information up-date at the time of the occurrence of a disaster.

As soon as possible after the disaster has hit an area, a Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) will take place to quickly make available information on the effects of the disaster on the local livelihoods. Essentially the LIS will consist of (i) an update of the information collected during the LBI and (ii) to complement LBI-information with more detailed information, eg. data that is more disaggregated to lower levels of geographical areas and pertains more directly to local livelihoods. While the former can still be done on the basis of (recently available) secondary sources, the latter will depend on fresh (local) data gathering, for instance through key informants. The LIS findings will be used for informing local authorities and (international) NGOs on the way local livelihoods have been affected by the disaster as well as for the preparation of project and other proposals to be presented at the (First) Flash meeting(s) and Early Recovery Donor conference(s). The LIS focuses on the need and scope for early emergency activities to safeguard existing livelihood activities to the extent possible, combined with possible opportunities for the promotion of new livelihood activities as part of relief efforts (eg. building repairs, maintenance and repair of buses and trucks bringing in emergency goods, etc.)
The third and final element of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment to gather relevant information to facilitate solid disaster responses in the area of livelihood activities concerns the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA). The RLA will take place a couple of weeks after the first hectic rush following the disaster, which means that there will be more order and time for preparations than earlier for the LIS. There may also be more opportunity for local travel to collect fresh data, especially at local level (eg. through community interviews and focus group discussions) and effectuate a more in-depth analysis. Whereas, the LIS is more geared towards initiating provisional efforts to put the affected area's economy and livelihoods on its feet through rapid rehabilitation and early livelihood recovery interventions (eg. through proposals at First Flash Appeal), the LRA offers an opportunity for a more structural approach in which recovery interventions are conceived as the beginning of activities within the framework of a medium-term development strategy for the promotion of local livelihood activities (eg. proposals at a possible Second Flash Appeal). In case such a livelihood development strategy already existed, it will be first assessed if it is necessary to modify the strategy in the wake of the disaster, and, if not, it will be attempted to design recovery activities that fall within the existing framework.

In the past the agricultural sector has usually been prioritized in the early responses to crisis, while other sources of livelihoods were underestimated by the international support. It is expected that the present Disaster Livelihoods Assessment Tool-kit will contribute to a more balanced approach in which the post-disaster livelihood recovery response, depending on the country and the specific situation of the affected areas, is articulated through the formulation of a broad Livelihood Cluster Response Plan.

1.2.4 Link with labour market information

The information collection and analysis required for the formulation of immediate and more medium-term responses to damage and destruction of livelihoods in the disaster, offers also an interesting opportunity to contribute towards the development of effective labour market information systems (LMIS).

One of the main ideas behind the Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit is therefore to make use of the information collection exercises that are taking place at the time of a disaster, to introduce (i) concepts, (ii) data collection instruments, (iii) institutional linkages, and (iv) an analytical framework, that can be continued to be used after the disaster event for the regular collection of livelihood data. Most governments have come to realize the importance of paying attention to the way in which especially the poorer sections make a living through small-scale, often small-scale agricultural and non-agricultural activities, and the need to actively promote such activities. Government agencies, as well as many NGOs and even businesses, are also involved in providing support for these livelihood activities and will be interested in pertinent data on local livelihoods.

These guidelines suggest the collection of data for the Disaster Livelihood Assessment to take place at two levels, using different methodologies. First, a general picture of the employment situation of the area(s) selected, using mainly secondary from existing data sources such as the Population Census, Labour Market and other Household Surveys. Such an employment overview would provide valuable information on the importance and role of the different sources of employment, including those of small holder agriculture and non-agricultural micro- and small enterprises (MSEs). Secondly, a more disaggregated and detailed picture of local livelihoods, making use of primary data collection techniques. Such information is important to (i) update the information from secondary sources; and (ii) complement secondary data in various respects, especially by collecting more qualitative data at local (eg. through key informants and community interviews). A major difference between the two data sets is the level: while secondary data sources tend to have only aggregated data, primary data collection usually will allow a focus at a smaller area. The
suggested instruments will seek to collect more disaggregated data from the lowest administrative levels: pertaining to a district or, if possible, settlements.

An analysis of the local labour market is an important first step in bringing clarity in the livelihoods through which the population is earning a living. It will depict the main sources of employment and incomes, by economic sector (eg. agriculture, industry or services), type of firms/units (eg. formal/modern enterprise, public services, or ‘informal’ MSE sector), status in employment groups (eg. wage or self-employment), and occupational groups. On the basis of such a general picture it will be possible to design an effective approach for the collection of complementary primary information.

These guidelines suggest basing the labour market analysis mainly on secondary sources. All countries have ‘labour market information systems’ (LMIS) in which government ministries (eg. Min. of Labour/Employment) and/or statistical agencies (eg. Central Statistical Office) collect labour market data on a more or less regular basis. Such information is, for instance, used for the formulation of labour market, sectoral and social policies. In as far as existing, such data will have also been an input in the design of rural development and MSE policies and support programmes. Unfortunately, many of the existing LMIS, especially in developing countries, display deficiencies in terms of standardization of concepts and definitions, incomplete coverage, measurement and processing errors, delays and limitations in the dissemination of findings. Often there is a lack of institutional arrangements so that the ‘info’ cycle is not harmonized with the ‘policy’ cycle (cf. Sparreboom 1999). The labour market analysis within the context of a disaster situation, together with (government) staff involved in the regular labour market data collection exercises, presents an interesting opportunity to gradually improve the existing LMIS by infusing standardized concepts and definitions, refine collection methods & instruments and streamline institutional arrangements.

The case for linking incidental information collection for disaster-related relief and recovery interventions and regular labour market information systems, is especially strong at the stage of the Rapid Livelihood Assessment (RLA), when the proposed recovery interventions are viewed as part of a medium-term development strategy for the promotion of local livelihood activities. Under all circumstances, the formulation of policies and programmes to promote MSEs and small holder farming be based on reliable statistics of the number, social background, resulting incomes of the people engaged in them. Clearly then should the institutions and, if possible, staff responsible for the development of small-scale agricultural and non-agricultural activities be involved in, or at least consulted and informed about Disaster Livelihood Assessment activities from the beginning.

1.2.5 Time frame

Within the general timeframe of a disaster and follow-up activities, the LIS takes place immediately after the disaster, so as to allow for the formulation of preliminary proposals in time for the first Flash Appeals. Since the LRA aims to yield relevant information for the design of more elaborate livelihood-related project proposals for the Revised Flash Appeals and Early-Recovery Donor Conferences, there is somewhat more time for data collection and analysis, but the results still need to be available as soon as 6 to 8 weeks after a disaster.

**Figure 1: Time frame of disaster and follow-up activities**
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1.2.6 Coordination with other assessment exercises

In most cases, immediately after a natural disaster data information will be collected and made available by OCHA and the UNDAC – which may include the results of an initial Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) where this has been done (see LAT volume 3 for details). After this, further more in-depth assessments will be conducted by a number of agencies and there will be a potential for overlap and assessment fatigue on the part of affected households. In order to minimise this, it is critical that the LRA is coordinated with other processes, through the UN Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator.

Not clear within the present LAT – it has either to be backed up with more text, or deleted:

In this regard, one particularly important process is the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) This is currently under development and it is foreseen that livelihood assessment will play an important role in the overall PDNA framework.

1.2.7 Costs of Disaster Livelihood Assessment

So far there is only a budget given for LRA – it is possible to indicate one for all 3 exercises and give a total here?

It is clearly impossible to give a definitive figure or range for the costs of a Disaster Livelihood Assessment, since much will depend upon circumstances and local conditions. One of the variables depending on those is the size of the Assessment Team. Transport, communications and field expenses are other main items.

The following budget is based on the actual costs of a LAT done after the Pakistan earthquake. The LAT team consisted of one international team leader and ** locally recruited team members. The Assessment lasted for a period of ** weeks of field work and one week for report writing.

**Table: Example of LAT Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense items</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 International staff costs:</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Internationally recruited RLA Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salaries/fees, DSA, airfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>(for 4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 National staff costs:</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Government staff salaries normally met by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) salary top-ups, fees, DSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>government, but may need some salary top-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) additional staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>for long hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg. consultants)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Out-of-station DSA for local staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible hiring of additional staff for admin translation, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vehicle hire, fuel, etc.</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>These costs can be reduced if UN agency or partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vehicles are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tents and bedding</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Sleeping accommodation may be in short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supply making purchase of tents and sleeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bags necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hotel costs during survey</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Not always necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Food and provisions</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>General provisioning for field operations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lunches, meals, snacks, water, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Office supplies, photocopying</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Allow for large amount of photocopying of forms,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td></td>
<td>checklists, responses, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Miscellaneous (eg. 10%)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Unexpected items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Main features of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment

The LAT approach has several important features, including the following:

- **Strong linkages between tools**: The three assessment stages of the LAT are closely linked in the sense that they support and feed into one another. Thus the LBI sets the pre-disaster context and defines certain questions and issues for the post-disaster LIS and LRA. The LIS will provide a first post-disaster picture, which will be further refined and developed by the LRA. The LRA itself, leading to interventions for a more structural recovery and reconstruction of local livelihoods defines the parameters to be included in the LBI.

- **Quantitative and qualitative analysis**: A key function of the LBI is to present a context within which the findings of the more qualitative and area specific LIS and LRA be placed and interpreted. Combining a more quantitative, generalisable baseline picture with the fresh updates and detailed complementary and qualitative information of the LIS and particularly the LRA, means that we can derive prevalence, gauge severity and trace processes in a way which is not possible when either quantitative or qualitative methods are used alone.

- **Livelihood opportunities and capacities as well as impact analysis**: In addition to looking at the impact of a disaster on people and their current coping strategies, the LAT approach actively identifies capacities and opportunities for recovery and increased resilience. This means that it goes further than most assessment methods.

- **Tailored to funding and programming mechanisms**: The assessment methods and stages are specifically tailored to key funding and programming mechanisms. The LIS, building on and utilising the baseline information is tailored to the first Flash Appeal, whereas the LRA, again combined with interpretation of the LBI as well as LIS, is aimed at a revised Flash Appeal and/or an Early Recovery Donor Conference. The LRA is also intended to serve as the basis for more detailed project and programme formulation missions leading into a number of and structural programming avenues, including government livelihood recovery strategies and agency specific livelihood projects and programmes.

- **A modular approach**: While the three assessment tools are related and utilised to their most powerful effect when used as a “package”, they can also be used independently. This has been done in recognition of the fact that it may not always be possible to have a full suite of elements in each given emergency situation. Thus, a LRA may be carried out even if no prior baseline information is available, or no LIS has been carried out immediately after the onset of the disaster. Likewise, a successful LIS does not depend on a pre-disaster LBI (although it would certainly benefit from one).

Figure 1 illustrates some of these features and particularly brings out the relationships between the different parts of the LAT and the various funding and programming tools:
NEIL REMEMBER TO REVIEW AND SIMPLIFY THE FIGURE

Figure 1: Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit: timeframes and relationships to funding tools.
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1.4 Assessment preparedness

In order to be most effective, the Disaster Livelihood Assessment should be integrated as much as possible into the country-level disaster preparedness systems and structures. Furthermore it should be supported by international experiences and capacities whenever relevant.

The key elements of assessment preparedness can be summarised as follows:

- **Partnerships**: The LAT cannot proceed effectively without the active support and participation of national and local governments. Furthermore, the results of LAT assessments have to be communicated in a timely and effective manner to government and donors through appropriate mechanisms and fora. The buy-in and support of government, donors, NGOs and other partners at country-level needs to be assured through awareness raising, dialogue, mutual learning and training.

- **Development of expert rosters**: The organisation of rosters of national, regional, and HQ level experts from FAO, ILO and other organisations and consultants is the key to ensuring that assessment teams can be properly led in the field.

- **Quick release financial mechanisms**: Rapid-response financial mechanisms for post-disaster assessment have to be mainstreamed into disaster preparedness by the UN and governments at country level.
SECTION 2:

INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

2.1 Institutional linkages

The Disaster Livelihood Assessment is a series of exercises to assist the national and local government (as well as the international community) in preparing for and dealing with a disaster situation. Consequently it should be integrated to the extent possible into the national Disaster Preparedness process of a particular country. It is very important that the ownership of the exercises remains, as far as possible, with the relevant government authorities.

Care needs therefore be taken to involve the government ministries and agencies responsible for (i) the disaster preparedness and responses; (ii) the collection, processing and analysis of livelihood-related statistics and information; and (iii) the formulation of strategies, policies and programmes to promote and support the agricultural and non-agricultural livelihood sector, in LBI, LIS and LRA. Some of the partners in the Disaster Livelihood Assessment process could be the following institutions.

Government ministries. The major ministries that should be involved in the LBI are usually those in charge of Planning, Agriculture, Labour/Employment, Trade and Industry, Social Protection and Women – all these ministries either deal with policy aspects of livelihood promotion or have statistical departments that can be of assistance in the collection of relevant data. Of special importance would be the agency(ies) responsible for the promotion of agricultural and non-agricultural livelihoods.

The Ministry of Finance is often also involved, as it is responsible for the government budget, oversight of micro-finance, and other functions. A Disaster Preparedness Commission, wherever it exists, should provide a key point of entry for the various government agencies and ministries.

Central Statistical Office. The CSO is the natural counterpart for building a Livelihood Baseline. A key institutional arrangement, which is desirable to make in advance, is an agreement with the Central Statistics Office of the country to work in a collaborative manner with Census and Household Survey databases, including the possibility of obtaining new tables not included in official publications (e.g. tables for specific areas at risk, or some specific analysis required in view of the purpose of the baseline). This arrangement should involve costs to cover training, extra work, capacity building and technical assistance. The capacity should be built to ensure that the baseline is maintained and updated over time.

UN agencies. Several UN agencies are involved in assisting the government to gather livelihood data, and often could provide valuable help in assembling such data. They include the UNDP, WFP, UNICEF, UNHABITAT, UNHCR, UNOSAT, possibly UNODC, and others.

NGOs. A large number of international NGOs are currently involved in various aspect of development. Many of them, like Oxfam, Save the Children or Care, are now using the livelihood approach or similar conceptual frameworks for their areas of intervention. They may provide useful information that could be used in the Disaster Livelihoods Assessment. Other international and national NGOs may also provide useful data and key informants.
2.2 Disaster Livelihood Assessment management committee

To be reviewed and expanded

It is realistic to expect that not all the government and other agencies that were flagged as important for the Disaster Livelihood Assessment can make permanent staff available for all the exercises. Most likely more junior staff will be send, or even temporary workers.

It is therefore important to organize a small committee, made up of members representing these organizations, who can be contacted to meet at relative short notice to take the necessary decisions. The leader of the Livelihood Assessment Team (see below) should also be present at these meetings.

2.3 Composition and training of the assessment team

2.3.1 Disaster Livelihood Assessment Team

As the Disaster Livelihood Assessment consists of 3 inter-related moments of information collection and analysis, it is obviously advantageous to form one core team at the time of the baseline exercise that will be responsible for the consecutive implementation of these elements.

The main criteria in selecting members for the LAT team are the following. Membership will in the first place be determined by the institutional linkages sought after. It would be hoped that the main government agencies mentioned earlier, and especially the CSO and the ‘Livelihood Promotion Agency’ are represented on the team. The members of the team and especially the team leader are expected to have already experience in this field and to be able to use and adapt the guidelines with minimal additional training, referring to other volumes in the tool-kit whenever necessary.

Other requirements for the LAT-team leaders include that they are aware of the need to balance time and human resource constraints and challenges against the need to produce quickly a high quality report which accurately captures the impact of a disaster on how people make a living. They are also expected to know how to lead teams in the field and have a general knowledge of socio-economic assessment and analysis techniques, including standard Participatory Rapid Assessment (PRA) techniques. It is not strictly necessary for them to be familiar with the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework.

The training materials to accompany the guidelines are currently under development. Once completed, these will serve to widen the pool of persons able to conduct a LRA.

2.3.2 Training of the Livelihood Assessment Team

Whether the training takes place as part of pre-disaster preparedness programme or after a shock, at least three days will be needed to prepare the team for conducting the RLA using semi-structured interviewing techniques. A further day may be necessary in the case of an inexperienced team and/or if certain PRA tools are to be used in the assessment itself.

In the case of a pre-existing team, it may be necessary to carry out a one-day “refresher” training for team members after the shock. All training after the emergency event should take place at or near the disaster site.

Bearing in mind the need for flexibility, the following section gives some guidelines on a possible structure for RLA training.

Planning: It will be necessary before the training to identify an area and specific villages or neighbourhoods where the Field Test can take place, which should be as near as possible to
avoid excessive travel. Permission should of course be sought from relevant authorities, including community leaders.

Translation: There may be a problem with language. The RLA will almost certainly need to be presented to key policymakers in a major international language, but it is possible / likely that this will not be the first language of most of the RLA team. If field data is collected in the local language, it will be necessary to have sufficient translation capacity to enable checklists to be translated quickly and well.

Trainees: When training takes place after the emergency event, it may be necessary for the RLA team leader to act as facilitator. Other sources of capacity building may be requested to assist in facilitating the training. Often the NGO community is one of the most obvious places to look for such assistance.

Trainees: There will be a trade-off between having one large team (or several smaller teams) which would allow assessment of a larger area (or a smaller area more quickly), and the increased difficulties that managing a larger group (or several smaller teams) would entail. For language reasons it may be necessary to recruit a local team leader. When in the field, the group should work either in sub-team pairs, or individually if the person concerned is very competent. If a pair work well together, it is normally better to keep them together, although some shuffling may be necessary where ineffective teams are observed.

2.3.3 Content of the training

The following training schedule is for three days.

DAY 1: THEORY

1. Sustainable livelihoods approach (SLA)
   • Livelihood assets: Types of assets and practical examples of Natural, Physical, Financial, Human, Social and Political capital
   • Other elements of livelihoods framework
   • Applying SLA to early recovery – the importance of linking with opportunities and capacities within the local economy.
   • Markets

2. Early Recovery interventions derived from a livelihood analysis: How are they different?

3. Case study / scenario presentation and group work:
   • Working group 1: What assets have been depleted, how households might be affected. What interventions would you recommend and why?
   • Working group 2: What are the possible opportunities created by the disaster, and what capacities can be drawn on to take advantage of these opportunities? What interventions would you recommend and why?

DAY 2: PREPARING FOR FIELDWORK

1. Data collection methods and instruments: pre-developed checklists, PRA tools (e.g. proportional piling), principles about selection of sample units in the field

2. Ways of working and behaving on survey; Sphere principles; Triangulation; Optimal ignorance and appropriate imprecision; open-ended / leading questions

3. Discuss and adapt questions / checklists in the RLA for fieldwork – ensure local relevance and acceptability
4. Plan logistics for the field test on Day 3; aim to get teams out early and get back early to maximise feedback in afternoon.

DAY 3: PRACTICAL FIELD TEST AND FEEDBACK

Morning

Teams should conduct an agreed programme as if doing the real thing – in fact the nearer to the real situation the better. Split the team into pairs and aim to conduct a full set of settlement level interviews plus a market interview: e.g. if one Focus Group Discussion (with community leaders / key informants) and 3 Semi-Structured Interviews at the household level are planned per settlement, this complete cycle should be finished and a market trader should be interviewed. In addition Teams should make notes of where they have experienced problems with the approach, checklists, or anything else.

Afternoon / Evening

Teams should gather back at HQ or wherever suitable. This feedback session should provide the opportunity to fine-tune checklists, discuss problems and issues, and make any changes to fieldwork schedules in the light of reality. Before the day has been finished, the following should have been agreed:

- Agreed checklists
- An agreed fieldwork schedule, including:
  - team members (whom is working with whom),
  - days (how many, when to finish),
  - areas, communities and markets to cover,
  - how to share information (maybe an evening meeting every night)
  - when to assemble whole dataset (final collation session and brainstorming).
- A report outline, with agreement about who writes what.
SECTION 3:

MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION

3.1 Secondary information sources

The most common sources for baseline data are: (i) population and other types of censuses, (ii) household and other surveys, (iii) special studies, (iv) risk maps and similar information carriers, and (v) institutional data and listings. A final source of information are ‘key informants’, ie. persons especially selected because of their knowledge of, in this case, local socio-economic conditions (eg. community leaders, locally-based government officials, representatives from NGO and private business).

**Box 1: Main data information sources**

(i) Census
The main advantage of a census is that it enumerates the entire statistical population. The most well-known is the Population Census which is conducted at 5-10 year intervals in almost all countries, using similar statistical categories. In many countries there is also an agricultural census, and sometimes an industrial census (covering mainly the formal sector).

(ii) Surveys
Surveys are based on representative samples. Their main advantage is that they are conducted more frequently, in the case of labour market surveys 2-4 times per year, and that the results become available within a far shorter period. There are large number of different surveys that are relevant for building up livelihoods baseline information:
- *household surveys*, including labour force and employment surveys, household income and expenditure surveys, food consumption/food security surveys
- *living conditions surveys*, housing surveys, health and nutrition surveys, etc.
- *agricultural surveys*

(iii) Special studies
- qualitative livelihood (or similar) studies on specific areas, including ethnographic studies, analysis of farming systems, community surveys, and MSE studies.

(iv) Institutional data and listings
- Membership data of institutions or organizations (eg. people covered by social security schemes)
- list of organizations in the area, especially trade unions, micro-finance and other NGOs; MSE associations, community-based organizations, religious-based organizations, self-help groups; etc.

(v) Map-based information
- risk maps, geographic information systems, satellite imagery watershed maps, agro-ecological zoning that hold statistics on health services, nutrition services, social protection programs, and other relevant activities in the area

(vi) Key informants
- ‘key informants’, ie. persons especially selected because of their knowledge of, in this case, local socio-economic conditions (eg. community leaders, locally-based government officials, representatives from NGO and private business).
Published results and access to databases. Besides using published tabulations and maps, some raw databases from censuses and surveys may be re-analyzed to obtain fresh results suited to the needs of the baseline.

3.2 Primary sources at community level
To be reviewed – useful? Then need for further description
Possibly already during the LBI, maybe during LIS, but certainly during LRA, the information collected from secondary will be updated and complemented with data from primary sources.

They main instruments for this included:
- Key Informants – at central as well as local and community level
- Community interviews
- Focus group discussions

3.3 Some methodological observations
While some of the information collection and processing instruments/ techniques are widely known (eg. PRAs, focus group discussion and Key Informants), other may not be. Some of those relevant for the Disaster Livelihood Assessment are brought together in volume 4 of this tool-kit. They include:

Small area estimations. Many pieces of data are available only for wider areas but not for specific locations at risk. In such cases, a combination of survey and census data can be used to obtain estimates for the small areas at risk. Small area estimations can be used in the following type of situation:
- It is desirable to measure a certain variable (for example: household per capita income or food energy intake) for small areas within the general area at risk, e.g. for each village, locality, neighbourhood, community or district.
- There is a recent census, and access to the census raw data is possible
- There is a recent sample survey covering the general region where the area at risk is located, but the sample does not allow for estimating small areas. The dates of the survey and the census should be close to each other and therefore comparable.
- The variable of interest is measured in the survey but not in the census.
- Major predictors of the variable of interest are present both in the survey and the census. Major predictors of income or food intake may be, for example, the following: location in urban or rural area, household size, gender and age of household head, education and occupation of the head of household, material conditions of living (housing, sanitation, etc), number of employed persons in the household, and so on.

A brief instruction on the use of small Area Estimation is found in LAT volume 4, section 5.

Rapid livelihood zoning - brief description to be prepared
Household selection – brief description to be prepared
Proportional piling – brief description to be prepared
Ranking and scoring – brief description to be prepared
Seasonal calendars – brief description to be prepared
Wealth ranking – brief description to be prepared
Weighting matters - brief description to be prepared
Weighting a sample - brief description to be prepared
Use of baseline for weighting and extrapolating results - brief description to be prepared
Beware of reported means - brief description to be prepared
Accounting for absent people & deserted communities - brief description to be prepared
SECTION 4:

SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD APPROACH

4.1 Sustainable Livelihood Approach and LAT

The LAT is conceptually underpinned by the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF). Livelihoods consist of the capabilities, assets (both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, and provide net benefits to other livelihoods locally and more widely, both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base. The extent to which a livelihood is sustainable is determined by the interaction of several forces and elements. These are set out conceptually in the SLF, as indicated in Figure 2.

The framework consists of a number of key elements as follows:

- Livelihood assets and activities
- Vulnerability and coping strategies
- Policies, institutions and processes
- Livelihood outcomes

As can be seen from the following figure, the livelihood framework contains a “core” in which assets are put into use through certain strategies and activities to produce certain livelihood outcomes. The core exits in a context characterised by existing institutions and policies affecting people, from the extended family and local community to the larger context of the national state and beyond, and the vulnerability context which describes the set of external social, economic and political forces and stresses to which people are subject.

---

1/ Based upon the SLF, the LAT focuses specifically on the productive aspects of livelihood. That is, it is concerned with the impact of natural disasters on how individuals and households make a living (their capabilities and activities for earning income and the means of sustenance and accumulation). The focus on the productive aspect of livelihood is to be distinguished from the reproductive aspect which is concerned with how incomes and other inputs into the household are used (eg in cooking and caring for children) to promote good mental and physical health of individuals within the household.


3/ The most common unit of livelihood analysis is the household, though for some purposes (such as employment) information may be collected at the level of individuals, and in other respects (such as natural resources) it may be gathered at the level of zones, villages, ethnic groups or some major or minor administrative geographical divisions.
4.2 From concepts to data collection and presentation

This framework presents a practical framework for organising the collection of livelihood baseline information. Some data are usable in their original form, but some must be processed and analysed in particular ways to yield the kind of information needed in an emergency. Therefore, to be properly prepared, the livelihood baseline would require not only the collection and assembly of information, but use of statistical and analytical skills.

Secondary sources may be available as raw databases or as processed information (in the form of reports, tables or maps). Raw databases or micro-data (e.g. original census or survey records corresponding to individuals, households or farms) allow analysts to produce new processed tables or typologies not originally available, better tailored to suit the needs of the
livelihoods baseline. Available processed information, such as standard census tables, will often be less specific, either in geographic or conceptual terms, than required by the specific needs of the livelihood assessment. Access to the micro-data or raw database is therefore an important step towards a better baseline. To manage and process such information, also, adequate human resources and statistical software are required.

The various pieces of information collected for the baseline should be assembled with the goal of qualitatively and quantitatively characterising the livelihoods in the area\(^4\), i.e. how various sectors of people in the area made a living before the disaster. This implies estimating the size of the population in the area at risk, classifying that population into major geographic and socio-economic groups, and finding out internal proportions which would be useful to make rapid estimates in the post-disaster situation. There is no exact recipe to do this, since the socio-economic realities and data availability vary widely. This text conveys only some general indications and examples, to be adapted to particular situations.

4.3 Livelihood assets

Assets refer to the resource base of people. Assets are often represented as a pentagon in the SLA, consisting of the following five categories:

- **Human capital**: labour power, health and nutritional status, skills and knowledge;
- **Natural capital**: access to natural resources, land, water, wildlife, flora, forest;
- **Social capital**: refers to those stocks of social trust, norms and networks that people can draw upon to solve common problems. It is mediated through kin networks and group membership;
- **Physical capital**: physical reproducible goods, houses, vehicles, equipment, livestock;
- **Financial capital**: monetary resources, savings, gold/jewellery, access to regular income, net access to credit, insurance.

Increasingly, it is being recognised that in addition to these five, it is important to include analysis of political capital. This goes beyond social capital in that an individual’s stock of political capital will determine his/her ability to influence policy and the processes of government. An understanding of political capital is important in determining the ability of households and individuals to claim rights to assistance after a disaster and the ability of the institutions to meet survivors’ expectations. It also has implications for the types of recommendations that come out of the Disaster Livelihood Assessment.

The following box provides two examples of specific livelihoods groups, and shows how each combines their various assets to “make ends meet”.

**Box 2: Two examples of specific livelihoods groups**

**Pastoralists in Somalia....**

The pastoralist production system in Somalia has developed in a context where the natural resource base is comprised of extensive arid lands. The main productive asset is livestock of varied species and herd composition. Mobility is the main strategy for managing livestock assets, which in turn depends on the social structure and on a strong territorial clan system that mediates access to grazing resources. Extensive knowledge about environmental management and livestock husbandry skills are part of the human capacity resource base, and are used to make decisions based on multiple choices aimed at achieving a favourable livelihood outcome.

\(^4\) It may be the case that there are established patterns of migration in response to seasonal / frequent disasters, or even normal seasonal climate fluctuations. The destination areas and the migration flows themselves also need to be part of the LBI.
Rural – urban migrants in Bolivia
Recent immigrants into poor neighbourhoods of the La Paz-El Alto urban complex in Bolivia (pop. about 2m) often keep some land or livestock resources in their area of origin in the surrounding Highlands. Household members may take turns to take care of these agricultural assets and activities in the countryside while they also engage in several occupations in their new urban residence: odd jobs in construction for adult males, children or teens doing shoe-shining, young women working as maids in well-to-do households in town, and perhaps the wife keeping a small street-side fruit-vending business. All of them may be returning to their original community for some important activity like harvests or sheep shearing.

Migration thus does not mean necessarily abandoning peasant agriculture for good, but leading a dual life in between urban and rural areas, perhaps keeping dwellings in both, when the two areas are close enough to make it feasible. In other cases, rural assets are sold or rented off, and the family moves completely to their new residence in an urban area.

4.4 Vulnerability and coping strategies

Individuals, households and communities are exposed to unpredictable events that can undermine livelihoods and cause them to fall into poverty or destitution. Some of these events have a sudden onset (e.g. earthquakes) while others develop over a longer period (e.g. conflict, soil erosion) but all can have negative effects on livelihoods.

In a disaster, the entire population may have been exposed to the same shock, but the vulnerability and resilience of people to the impact of the shock will vary. Vulnerability depends on the asset base that people have prior to the crisis and their ability to engage in various coping strategies.

Box 3: Livelihoods and resilience

Households with many livelihood assets are generally more resilient (able to withstand shocks) than households with fewer assets. Thus resilient farming households have sufficient savings to buy food when crops fail, small traders have sufficient cash to buy new stocks of raw materials after a disaster has destroyed their previous stock, pastoralists can afford to lose or sell a few animals and still have enough to build up their herds again after the emergency passes.

A coping strategy is a short-term response to threats to livelihoods. Coping strategies can be successful (in terms of protecting the ability to make a livelihood) when they are able to preserve vital assets, or negative when they are unable to do so and may lead to downward spirals of impoverishment. Any response should aim to support existing positive coping strategies and release households and communities from dependence on negative ones.

Box 4: Examples of coping strategies

Examples of coping strategies of affected populations following the Kashmir earthquake in 2005:
- Distress migration to peri-urban areas
- Selling or slaughtering animals
- Consuming crops that were either ready for harvest or had just been harvested

The magnitude of the shock, coupled with the low level of assets of the population meant that for many people these coping strategies were unable to preserve vital assets.
An understanding of coping strategies, who is involved, and the consequences and costs involved is important in analysing the severity of impact of an emergency.

4.5 Institutional context

Policies and institutions represent an important set of external factors that influence the livelihoods of different people, influencing access to assets, vulnerability to shocks and livelihood outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 4: Examples of institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Formal membership organisations</em> such as cooperatives and registered groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Informal organizations</em>, such as exchange labour groups or rotating savings groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Political institutions</em>, such as parliament, law and order or political parties;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Economic institutions</em>, such as markets, private companies, banks, land rights or the tax system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o <em>Socio-cultural institutions</em>, such as kinship, marriage, inheritance, religion or draught oxen sharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An enabling policy and institutional environment makes it easier for people to gain access to assets they need for their livelihoods. A disabling policy and institutional environment may discriminate against them, thus making it difficult for them to get access to land, livestock, capital and information.

Many efforts to reduce vulnerability to disasters have failed or proved to be unsustainable because they have not fully understood local institutions and the way they influence livelihoods. Clearly, it is important to understand which institutions are enabling or disabling for livelihood recovery, and which are the best institutional entry points for ensuring that people are reached.

4.6 Livelihood Strategies and Outcomes

*The most basic livelihood outcomes relate to satisfaction of elementary human needs, such as food, water, shelter, clothing, sanitation, health care, and others. The ultimate outcome is achieving the preservation of the household and rearing the next generation with a desirable quality of life.*

People tend to develop the most appropriate livelihood strategies possible to reach desired outcomes such as food security, good health, “well being” etc. Unstable or unsatisfactory livelihood outcomes may be the result of several factors which often interact, including low levels of livelihood assets, high degree of vulnerability to external shocks, and insufficient livelihood support from surrounding institutions (e.g. local government, markets). It is the job of the LAT to separate out the importance of these various factors in explaining the impact of a disaster on livelihood outcomes.
ANNEXES

1. Example field programme for RLA team
2. Terms of Reference for RLA team leader
3. Preparing project profiles
4. Outline of Livelihood Recovery “roadmap”
5. Typical Effects of Different Types of Natural Disaster
Annex 1: Example field programme for RLA team (to be completed)
Annex 2: Terms of Reference for RLA team leader (to be completed)
Annex 3. Preparing project profiles

Formulate appropriate recommendations/proposals for recovery at short and medium-long term, considering:

- mitigation of the current emergency while reducing vulnerabilities to future crisis
- preservation of productive assets at the household level, to prevent loss of livelihood
- strengthening of existing capacities and reinforcement of local patterns of coping with the crisis
- ensuring that most vulnerable groups are reached
- involvement of local authorities and community bodies such as councils, producers’ organizations, women associations and other relevant groups in the reconstruction process, incorporating a culture of prevention
- consultation with government bodies, social partners and international organizations and identification of linkages with relevant initiatives, implementation strategies and other operational arrangements for a quick implementation of the suggested programs.

to be reviewed and revised

Although one of the key objectives of the RLA in the short term will be to provide policy-makers with relevant information about the immediate situation to support decisions relating to provision of early recovery, there is another equally important objective, which is, alongside other damage assessment data, to provide the basis for development of longer term livelihood strategies. These will seek to reduce overall vulnerability and strengthen people’s resilience, through interventions that strengthen the institutions and processes concerned. Short-term measures will be dealing with immediate assistance and protection of people’s livelihoods. Longer-term measures will continue to look at interventions that protect livelihoods, but will further look at ways in which these can be improved and promoted, adopting the principles of ‘building back better’.

Why is a livelihoods strategy needed?

The livelihoods strategy will permit government to provide a structured and measured response to the disaster. It will provide the basis for development of a well-defined programme and a detailed workplan. This will offer a framework around which all players, including relevant government departments, can gather round, coordinate, and divide up the work. It may provide a timeline and a clear set of milestones to which implementing partners will have to adhere, and where possible, a budget. It will also provide a clear plan to attract potential donors.

What is a Livelihood Strategy?

A livelihood strategy is a medium- to long-term plan, which will provide government and its partners with the conceptual and operational framework through which it can rebuild the livelihoods of those affected by the disaster. It should be owned by government, and thus be developed closely with them. It should seek to strengthen existing institutions, and not to create parallel structures which are unlikely to be sustainable. It should build itself a clear exit strategy, to ensure that the establishment is not permanently expanded as a result. It may contain the following elements:

- Damage assessment
- SL and guiding principles for the rehabilitation context
- Institutional arrangements
- Management structures
- Vision statement, goal and objectives
- Interventions for rehabilitation and exit strategy
- M&E arrangements
- Risks and constraints
- Logical framework
- Timeline and milestones
- Technical annexes
- Budget.

Choice of elements will depend on the disaster, the information available (RLA and other damage assessments, technical surveys etc), and the government body responsible. Where there is one government body appointed for the disaster context for example in the Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority in Pakistan and the Bureau of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation in Banda Aceh, Indonesia (for the Tsunami Response), the inclusion of a logical framework and budget is feasible. However, in other contexts, for example in the government response to the earthquake of May 2006 in Yogyakarta and Central Java provinces, Indonesia, the strategy developed on the basis of the RLA and other studies is a collaborative strategy for several Ministries in each of two provinces, and the
affected districts within these provinces which in turn have their own budgets within a context of decentralisation. In this situation, the strategy provides a tool for inter-Ministry collaboration, and a basis for each Ministry to draw up its own logframe and budget accordingly, in cooperation with the other Ministries and in the context of the strategy.

**When should the Livelihoods Strategy be developed?**

The RLA team should be thinking about longer-term issues from the outset, i.e. from the design of the RLA onwards, seeking to collect information that will feed into the development of the livelihoods strategy. It may be that members of the RLA will be involved with the strategy, and this should be encouraged wherever possible, to foster continuity and institutional memory. Development of the livelihoods strategy could ideally begin immediately after the RLA has been completed, or failing this as soon as possible.

The main stages of development are likely to depend very much on local circumstances, but a possible sequence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main activities</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-strategy:</strong> RLA conducted, results published, possibly shared through workshop/s</td>
<td>4 – 5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy development with government authority/ies</strong> responsible and other key stakeholders, through a consultative and iterative process. This may involve a series of consultative workshops with government, NGOs, private business sector and community bodies</td>
<td>3-12 weeks (depends on number of Authorities responsible, language constraints, logistics etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First draft produced and circulated</strong> in the appropriate language(s) to all stakeholders for review and comment</td>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision and finalisation of strategy</strong> Stakeholder workshops in all districts/affected areas</td>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharing of strategy with donors, possibly along with supporting project concept notes</strong></td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5. Typical Effects of Different Types of Natural Disaster\(^5\)

**Cyclone / Typhoon / Hurricane**

**General Effects:**
- Some damage and many injuries; wind damage to all vegetation, electricity distribution systems and some buildings.

**Possible Secondary disasters:**
- Storm surge causing deaths and injuries, and damage to vegetation and all infrastructure along the coastal belt. Heavy rain and flooding further inland.
- Mud slides

**Likely impact on livelihoods:**
- Serious losses of household crops and livestock
- Loss of productive assets of households
- Loss of employment in damaged businesses
- Loss of employment as casual labour on farms
- Loss of trade opportunities due to damaged market infrastructure (affects both supply and demand).
- Increase in social transfer needs in the context of decreased ability to meet needs.
- Number of IDPs potentially very large
- Possible temporary work opportunities in clearing debris and reconstruction

**Seasonal Floods**

**General Effects:**
- Small number of deaths; damage to vegetation and infrastructure depending on the rate of flow and duration of flooding; erosion (harmful) and / or sedimentation (potentially beneficial – enhancing fertility).

**Possible Secondary disasters:**
- Epidemics of communicable disease.

**Likely impact on livelihoods:**
- Depending on time of year, rate of flow and depth and duration of flooding, loss of household crops
- Loss of employment in damaged businesses
- Loss of trade opportunities due to damaged market infrastructure (affects both supply and demand).
- Increased need for social transfers.

**Flash Flood or Tsunami**

**General Effects:**
- Many deaths and injuries of people and animals.
- Severe damage to infrastructure, buildings, agricultural land in the valleys / coastal areas affected.

**Possible Secondary disasters:**
- Landslides
- Epidemics of communicable diseases

**Likely impact on livelihoods:**
- Serious losses of household crops and livestock in affected areas (maybe localised in the case of flash floods).
- Loss of productive assets of households

\(^5\) This list is drawn from WFP’s Emergency Food Security Handbook (2005).
Earthquake

General Effects:
- Many deaths and injuries due to collapsing buildings
- Damage to roads, bridges, dams, water and electricity distribution systems, especially near the epicentre.

Possible Secondary disasters:
- Further damage due to after-shocks
- Fires in urban areas
- Flooding (if dams are broken or river channels blocked)
- Temporary displacement of large numbers of households

Likely impact on livelihoods:
- Rain-fed crops may or may not be affected significantly. Damage to irrigation systems can have a significant impact
- Livestock casualties could be high if livestock are housed in stone structures / in the same houses as people.
- Loss of productive assets of households
- Loss of employment in damaged businesses
- Loss of trade opportunities due to damaged market infrastructure (affects both supply and demand).
- Numbers of IDPs may or may not be large
- Possible temporary work opportunities in clearing debris and reconstruction

Landslide

General Effects:
- Death and injuries and almost total destruction of buildings, infrastructure and farm land in the direct path of the slide
- Broader disruption to marketing systems if major roads are in the path of the slide.

Possible Secondary disasters:
- Flooding if river channels are blocked

Likely impact on livelihoods:
- Crop and livestock losses will be localised
- Market disruption likely to be less than for other natural disasters
- Change in local topography and land use possibilities
- Small scale displacement of families
- Social transfers will be required.

Volcanic Eruption

General Effects:
- Death and injuries from lava flows and ash and gas releases
- Destruction of infrastructure from lava flows and ash falls

Possible Secondary disasters:
- Fires
- Landslides
Likely impact on livelihoods:

- Flooding, if river channels are blocked
- Localised crop destruction
- Permanent loss of productive land due to lava flow and pollution of soil.
- Employment losses due to damage and destruction of businesses
- Temporary work in re-building
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PREFACE

The disaster frequency is showing a rising trend. In the year June 2005 to June 2006, 404 disasters associated with natural hazards were recorded in 115 countries, killing more than 93,000 people, affecting almost 157 million people and causing economic damage amounting to USD 172 billion.

Disasters have a dramatic impact on the lives of people not least on their sources of livelihood and productive assets. They leave livelihoods shattered; houses, schools and other public facilities flattened; bridges and road networks collapsed; the geography of the zone sometimes transformed.

The impact of disasters hinders the capacity of affected groups to recover in the short-term and rebuild back their assets, thus often condemning the survivors to a long dependency on relief aid. In this context, helping protecting and rebuilding the livelihoods of those vulnerable to disasters becomes an urgent priority. Support to the recovery of means of living in farming, fisheries, rational use of natural resources, wage employment in primary and secondary sectors and services, small trade, micro- and small enterprises in the formal or informal sector, etc. have to be started as soon as possible in the immediate aftermath of a disaster.

Assessing the impact of disasters on the livelihoods of people and the capacity and opportunities for quick recovery and increased resilience to future events is an important part of the response to disasters. Yet current assessment systems are often weak, uncoordinated and are not strongly linked to livelihood recovery interventions. In order to improve understanding of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, FAO and ILO have jointly developed this Detailed Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT). The LAT consists of three main technical elements: Livelihood Baseline Information (which is set-up pre-disaster); Livelihood Impact Scan (undertaken immediately after the disaster); and Livelihood Rapid Assessment (undertaken within three months after the disaster).

In the process of development, parts of this tool-kit have been tested, redefined and refined in a number of countries including Pakistan (2005 Kashmir earthquake); Indonesia (2006 volcanic eruption and earthquake in Yogyakarta); Philippines (2006 typhoon Reming); and Solomon Islands (2007 tsunami). The complete set has been tested in Bolivia and Indonesia. This process of continual learning and improvement continues, and so the current set of guidelines contained in these volumes should be seen as one stage in the development of the approach.

In this spirit, suggestions for improvement are welcomed and should be directed to: cruciani@ilo.org and neil.marsland@fao.org.

FAO Rome and ILO Geneva,
July 2007
INTRODUCTION TO THE LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT TOOL-KIT

The Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT) consists of three inter-related tools: Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI), the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) and the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (RLA). The Tool-kit is designed for structured data collection at sudden onset natural disasters, with the intention to improve post-disaster relief and recovery interventions. The Tool-kit is planned to be expanded to cover also other types of emergencies.

The tools are designed for particular but related functions in the assessment process. Each of them can be used independently of the others, but combined use will greatly increase efficiency and (cost-)effectiveness. Similarly the tools can be executed by different people as indicated in the following table, but there are important advantages to work with a standard team. Each part may be used for different targets in terms of funding mechanisms.

**Table: Overview of Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT) instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Programming / funding target</th>
<th>When and by whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBI</td>
<td>Livelihood Baseline Inventory</td>
<td>This set of socio-economic data gives quantitative and qualitative data on key aspects of livelihood systems (populations, wealth and poverty indicators, types of livelihood activities, employment and other sources of household incomes, occupations etc.). LBI is to make clear the pre-disaster context of local livelihoods, which can be further built on during LIS and RLA, enhancing the power of these tools to make informed generalisations on the livelihood impact and opportunities presented by the disaster.</td>
<td>Provides data and information background to be immediately available after the occurrence of a disaster. It can then be used to elaborate quick briefs for Flash Appeal and Early Recovery Donor Conference, as well as to inform relevant organizations and the public. LBI information could also be used to extrapolate from when it is not possible to undertake a LIS before Flash Appeals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>Livelihood Impact Scan</td>
<td>The LIS concerns an initial ‘quick scan’ assessment of impact of disaster on livelihoods at “local level” – to be integrated into other (multi-)sectoral quick impact assessments and then fed into Flash Appeal proposal preparation.</td>
<td>LIS provides first-hand post-disaster information on the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods in the affected area. The new data are to be combined with the baseline information to give a solid basis for proposals on relief and initial recovery actions for the first Flash Appeals. Early Recovery Donor Conference, as well as other post-disaster livelihoods programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>Rapid Livelihood Assessment</td>
<td>The RLA builds on the findings of the LIS to further assessment the impact of the disaster on local livelihoods. RLA focuses especially on recovery needs, opportunities and capacities at household, community and local level. It includes the conversion of the assessment findings into response options, containing strategy outlines, programme profiles and ideas for concrete projects</td>
<td>Provides a more detailed information and rationale for strategies, programmes and projects to be submitted to Revised Flash appeal and / or Early Recovery donor conference, for funding purposes, and / or development of Livelihood Recovery Strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit, Volume One for a detailed introduction of the instruments and their relations.
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Objectives of livelihoods baseline inventory

Livelihood baseline inventory (LBI) should be seen as an essential part of national Disaster Preparedness. For this reason, it should be collected in advance, and kept updated, on areas and populations likely to suffer disasters and crisis of various sorts.

Livelihoods baseline information helps emergency workers know in advance about the population of the affected area. In the context of the normal emergency appeal timetable, and the other elements of the Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT), the livelihood baseline is intended to meet the following specific objectives:

- Providing a basis for comparison of the livelihood context, activities and outcomes for families, communities and local economies before and after a disaster
- Providing a robust basis for making quantitative estimates of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, that can feed into flash appeals. In this way, the livelihood baseline provides an important basis for the Livelihood Impact Scan (LAT volume 3) and the more detailed Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LAT volume 4).
- Providing a sampling frame for post disaster assessment surveys and for extrapolation of their results to the entire area affected.

Collecting, updating and analysing livelihood baseline information is an integral part of the general disaster preparedness function. Training for this function should incorporate the preparation of livelihood baseline information as an essential element.

1.2. Whom are these guidelines aimed at?

These guidelines are primarily aimed at data gatherers and data analysts in UN agencies, other international agencies, NGOs and especially Government officers in countries at risk of natural disasters. The guidelines give explanations about baseline data concerning different parts of the livelihoods framework, why it is important to collect information on these parts, how to do this and where relevant information might be found. The main focus is on the collection and interpretation of secondary data (both quantitative and qualitative) and manipulation of primary data found in sample surveys and censuses.

1.3. Contents of the baseline

These Guidelines lay out only a general outline of the essential contents of a useful Livelihood Baseline, intended to serve the purpose of good post-disaster assessment, to extrapolate its results, and to design a solid response for early recovery. They should be interpreted in a flexible manner in different countries, according to the local situation, especially the type and quality of data available, and the information needs in case of a disaster.

1 Whilst it is important to prepare livelihoods baseline information before a disaster hits, this may not always be possible. When disasters occur in unexpected places, baseline information must be compiled on the spot, in a much more summary way. For details on preparing a retroactive livelihood baseline, readers are referred to the LIS guidelines (LAT volume 3) and the LRA guidelines (LAT volume 4).
The contents suggested here for the Livelihood Baseline are the bare minimum data necessary, and are normally available in most countries. More information could be available, and then some additional data may be gathered in specific subjects, as will be made clear below. However, excessive amounts of data may be confusing and difficult to sort out in an emergency situation. The LBI is not a mere data collection exercise, nor an undiscriminating gathering of all information in existence: rather it is an input into the post-disaster assessment and programming phases. Only information that is useful for those phases should be included.
SECTION 2: ANALYSIS OF THE LABOUR MARKET

2.1 Household activities and employment

Livelihood strategies and activities comprise all forms of income-generation in function of household needs, including production of items for home-consumption and unremunerated domestic chores. In these guidelines attention is concentrated on the local livelihoods, i.e. the way in which the people, and especially the poor are making a living. This consequently concerns various types of employment, but also refers to other sources of incomes (eg. social and insurance benefits, remittances and pensions).

2.1.1 Livelihoods and employment

To come up with a Livelihood Baseline Inventory, these guidelines suggest to start with piecing together an overall picture of the employment and unemployment situation in a particular disaster-prone area. The Key Indicators of the Labour-Market (KILM) is an analytical framework which is exactly developed by the ILO for the collection of information and the analysis of a core set of labour market indicators².

Part of the information required for a brief analysis of the household employment and income sources can be gathered from existing secondary data. The core questions to understand the employment situation include the following:
- is the local labour force largely employed, or are large parts un- or under-employed?
- is employment in the area still dominated by farming or are large numbers of workers employed in industry or services?
- is employment in the area provided by ‘formal’ activities, such as government services or jobs in modern, medium and large-scale enterprises, or rather dependent on work in the informal economy, with large numbers in subsistence farming, income-generating activities, self-employment and micro-enterprises?
- are there special groups that suffer in particular from employment problems (eg. youth, women, minorities).

Through interviews at local and community level, a number of extra features can be added to the general employment picture:
- trends in the household assets (eg. land, human capital in the form of education and skills, access to capital, social networks) that are important for employment and incomes
- distinguishing household typologies by bringing together all the household incomes
- employment situation of special groups, including women, youth and minorities.

It is suggested that a selected number of KILM indicators form the nucleus of the employment module of the LBI. They would provide insights in the most important labour market issues.

2.1.2 Key Indicators for Labour Market (KILM)

In all countries human resources represent, directly or indirectly, the most valuable and productive resource. Countries traditionally depend on the health, strength and basic skills of their workers for the production of goods and services for consumption and trade. In recent times interest has further increased in ‘human capital’, reflecting the growing importance of the knowledge and skills of the labour force. In the situation of a disaster, initial emergency

work and subsequent recovery will require that the utmost is done to make the best use of local resources, including human resources.

(i) Population and employment

The following table brings together information on the main labour market indicators to get a good impression of the employment situation in the area.

The labour supply side is formed by the labour force, which consists of all persons (of working age) who are ‘working’, together with the persons who are actively looking for work. Essentially labour supply equals the population of working age (usually 15-65 years), minus those who are not in a position to work or not willing to work (eg. children under working age limit (15 yrs), retired persons (65 yrs and more), students (not available for work), persons full-time engaged in housekeeping, and the disabled).

Employment refers to all persons of working age who, during the reference period (usually the past week) were ‘at work’ for at least at least the stipulated time (eg. 1 hour) or, while absent (eg. because of illness) had a formal attachment to work (eg. a contract).

Unemployment, conversely, concerns all the people who did not work in the reference period, but are interested to work and actively looking for work.

Table: Population and (un)employment by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age population (15-65 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of working age not active <em>/</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (open)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-to-population ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested sources: most of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys. If such secondary data is not available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions.

Notes:
*/* Including: children under working age limit (15 yrs), retired persons (65 yrs and more), students (not available for work), persons full-time engaged in housekeeping, and the disabled.

The employment-to-population ratio (KILM 2) is defined as the proportion of a country’s working population that is employed. It provides information on the ability of an economy to create employment for its population. While in some ways more telling than unemployment statistics, it should also be realized that this ratio can be high for the ‘wrong’ reasons, eg. when a lack of educational opportunities forces students to leave school and take up work activities.

(ii) Labour force participation

The labour force of a country concerns all the inhabitants who at a certain point in time are working, together with those who are unemployed (but actively looking for work). The labour force participation rate (KILM 1) refers to the ratio of the labour force to the working age population.
The labour force participation is sometimes understated in censuses, particularly in the case for women, a number of whom either do not consider themselves ‘working’ (eg. in the case of home production), or are not keen to disclose this for tax reasons. These participation rates might be more accurately reported in specialized surveys such as employment or labour force surveys. In that case, the survey rates could be applied to census populations in order to improve estimation of the labour force in the area at risk.

(iii) **Status in employment**

Three major employment status categories (KILM 3) can be distinguished:

1) **Wage and salaried workers** (or: employees): persons in a ‘paid employment job’ as indicated by a (written or verbal) contract that gives them a basic remuneration that is not directly dependent upon the revenue of the unit for which they work;

2) **Own-account workers**: persons who hold ‘self-employed jobs’, ie. jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the good and services produced, and have not engaged on a continuous basis any employees working for them;

3) **Contributing family workers** (also referred to as ‘unpaid family workers’): persons who hold a ‘self-employed job’ (see 2) in a market-oriented establishment operated by a related person living in the same household.

Together these status groups ³ provide interesting and important insights in the employment structure. The wage/salaried workers (also known as ‘employees’) overlap to an important extent with the ‘formal sector’, usually taken to consist of established medium and large companies, together with the public sector (ie. government services and parastatals). Workers are likely to have a contract with their employer and at least some social protection.

The self-employed⁴, conversely, can to an important extent be found in the ‘informal economy’, consisting of subsistence agriculture, self-employment in income-generation activities and (self-)employment in micro- and small enterprises (MSEs). Informal sector units are based on local raw materials, use simple, labour-intensive technologies, producing modest quality goods and services for the local market, and are characterised by low productivity and hence generally yield low incomes. Many of them are not fully licensed, do

---

³ Information on another occupational category, the ‘members of producers’ cooperative’, is usually not available, for which reason it is not included here.

⁴ Except those engaged in professional services, such as medical doctors, dentists, lawyers, etc.
not pay all taxes and provide no social protection for the workers, who may work long hours under difficult conditions.

Table: Occupational categories by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Other sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Employed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing family workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Suggested sources:* most of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and possibly from Labour Market Surveys. If such secondary data is not available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions. In many countries special studies have been conducted on small farmers and on the (urban) informal sector/economy.

(iv) Employment by sector

Statistics on employment by economic sector (KILM 4) can provide clues on the development of the area: in more developed areas, large parts of the labour force have left agriculture and have been absorbed in the industrial and, more recently, in the service sector. In less developed areas a large share of the labour force, often more than half, is still engaged in (subsistence) farming and, in growing numbers, in personal and repair services.

Table: Employment by sector by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Suggested sources:* information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys if they are sufficiently disaggregated to lower levels of administrative areas (eg. - sub- districts). If not, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions.

In many countries, existing secondary data (Population Census and Labour Market Surveys) may have more elaborate information, based on a more detailed listing of economic sectors and branches, for instance following the International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities (ISIC)—either the revision 3 (1968) or Revision 3 (1990).

(v) Youth (un)employment

In both developed and developing countries large, and often growing, numbers of youth are unemployed. Many of them have left school early and could not enter into vocational training. Without education or schools it is difficult to encounter a job – except casual, lowly paid menial work. At times even university graduates cannot find a suitable job, since in many developing countries neither the government nor the modern companies are hiring. As a result, youth unemployment rates tend to be higher than adult unemployment rates - typically even at least twice as high. In recent years various youth employment schemes have been started.

For a good insight into the youth unemployment situation, KILM 9 suggests the following measurements:
1. youth unemployment rate: youth unemployment as percentage of youth labour force
2. ratio of youth unemployment rate to the adult unemployment rate
3. youth unemployment as a proportion of total unemployment
4. youth unemployment as a proportion of the youth population.

**Table: Youth (un)employment by sex in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth population (15-24 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment (open)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment rate (% of youth labour force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment as % of total unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment as % of youth population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested sources:** some of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys, i.e. when they have data disaggregated by relevant age groups. There might also have been special studies undertaken on the topic of youth unemployment, especially in urban areas. If no secondary data is available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants and (youth) focus-group discussions.

A good quantification of the employment situation of the youth will be an important input in the decision-making during times of disaster, as the youth is one of the prime groups that are counted on to assist in emergency assistance and recovery activities.

(vi) **Educational attainment and illiteracy**

Education and skills are among the most important qualitative aspects of labour. More than human resources by themselves, with growing globalisation in the form of trade liberalisation and changing consumer preferences, demands on the labour force in terms of labour productivity and product quality have further increased. Knowledge and skills acquired through education and training increase ‘human capital’.

Information on the acquisition of knowledge and skills beyond formal education is already scarce, let alone efforts of lifelong learning and career management. Educational attainment (KILM 14) is therefore based on educational statistics, which remain the best available indicator of labour force skills. The information to be collected pertains to six categories (less than one year of education; less than primary; primary; secondary; tertiary; and education not definable by level), which are choose on the basis of UNESCO’s International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED).

**Table: Education and literacy levels by sex in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- less than one year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less than primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- education not definable by level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested sources:** some of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys, i.e. when they have data disaggregated by relevant age groups. There might also have been special studies undertaken on the topic of youth unemployment, especially in urban areas. If no secondary data is available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants and (youth) focus-group discussions.
(vii) Occupational wage and salary indices

An analysis of occupational wages and earnings is interesting in relation to the following issues:
- occupational wage structure and differentials, eg. reflecting differences in levels of education, skills and type/amounts of work in different types of work
- the trends of the nominal and real wages levels
- development of wages of male and female workers/employees (‘gender wage-gap’)

The occupational wage and earnings index (KILM 16) is based on information for a selected number of occupations: field crop farm worker, labourer in construction, welder in metal manufacturing, sewing-machine operator in apparel manufacturing, sales person in grocery retail trade, first-level education teacher, office clerk, hotel receptionist, accountant in banking sector and computer programmer in the insurance sector.

In a disaster situation, information on wage and earning levels and trends may at first seem trivial, but is importance to assess a possible erosion of purchasing power of the local people in view strong prices increases after the disaster. It will also help to decide on the wage rate level of persons hired for emergency relief and recovery work.

Table: Wage & earnings index and literacy by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- field crop farm worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- labourer in construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- welder in metal manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- apparel sewing-machine operator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sales person in grocery retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- first-level education teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- office clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- hotel receptionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- accountant in banking sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- computer programmer in insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literacy level**

Suggested sources: some of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys, ie. when they have data disaggregated by relevant age groups. There might also have been special studies undertaken on the topic of youth unemployment, especially in urban areas. If no secondary data is available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants and (youth) focus-group discussions.

(viii) Levels of poverty

One of the crucial labour market indicators concerns the level(s) of poverty: what is the result of the labour outcomes for household members – irrespective of their employment and income strategy, are they earning enough for the necessary upkeep of themselves and their family members? Poverty indicates the lack of well-being of people whose living conditions are inadequate.
There are two poverty indicators in use, the *extreme poor* who are living on an average income of USD 1 per day, and the *poor* who have USD 2 per day\(^5\)

**Table: Poverty levels in Areas X, Y, Z**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts or settlements</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poverty &lt; USD 1/day</th>
<th>Poverty &lt; USD 2/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Suggested sources: Special surveys, eg. Living Condition Surveys. Difficult to estimate for key informants.*

Many countries have national, urban and rural poverty lines, which are based on nutritional requirements, basic consumption needs or minimum acceptable consumption levels.

---

\(^5\) These so-called ‘poverty lines’ are based on US-dollars at 1985 prices, adjusted for the Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) – thus not by the current exchange rate – as calculated by the World Bank ([www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)).
SECTION 3: LIVELIHOOD BASELINE DATA

After the labour market analysis on the basis of, mainly, secondary sources, the Livelihood Baseline Inventory moves to the collection of primary data to update and complement the knowledge of local livelihood activities. As was discussed earlier, the primary livelihood baseline data focuses, to the extent feasible, on smaller areas, including districts and villages/settlements.

In the following the main categories of data are described, together with data collection instruments.

3.1 Areas at risk and hazard mapping

The goal is to produce a map showing the areas at risk and the relative probability of hazards occurring in each. This requires the following steps:
1. Identify areas at risk, and (if possible) likelihood of hazards based on past experience
2. Identify administrative divisions roughly coinciding with areas at risk
3. Map the physical features of the territory (topography, water courses)
4. Map road infrastructure and other man-made structures such as cities and villages.

The main sources of information are:
- Geographical information systems (including satellite imagery)
- Ordinary cartography
- Historical information on frequency of various events

3.2 Population

Goal: Basic population tables, plus distribution on the map.
- Locate human settlements in areas at risk and put them on the map, indicating their relative size from small hamlets to towns or cities.
- Prepare tables about population in the area at risk, or most closely overlapping administrative divisions (see dummy population tables).
- If population data are outdated, indicate estimated size, if possible together with the estimated increase at least for total population in the area at risk (estimates for individual settlements may be uncertain).

The following tables should be prepared at least for the whole area at risk (or for the administrative divisions more closely approximating it). If possible, the tables should also be prepared separately for every subdivision of the area at risk (e.g. for each district, municipality or whatever other meaningful subdivision is relevant).

(i) Rural and urban population and number of households per districts

**Table: Population and Households by district in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: reference year for population data. (Example: Census year ……)
Estimated change in population since reference year to present: ±%
(ii) **Households and population by area and settlement**

**Table: Occupational categories by sex in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Tot. population</th>
<th>Av. HH-size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total

Note: A “settlement” may be a town, a neighbourhood within a town, a village, a hamlet or any other identifiable location or small area. Indicate source of data and reference date (e.g. 2001 Census). Updating small-settlement populations is not advised unless backed by fresh data.

(iii) **Population by sex and age group**

**Table: Population by Age group and Sex in Areas ……**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>……</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source and reference date. Age brackets should be adapted to available data. One table for each relevant area (districts, municipalities, localities)

(iv) **Households by size**

**Table: Households by size in Areas ……**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>……</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v) **Households typology**

In case household composition is available, or raw data can be re-analyzed to produce the necessary information, a table should be produced showing the various forms of household
composition. These forms may be adapted to local realities. A typical example may include
the following forms:

1. **Nuclear family**: couple with or without children.
2. **Polygamous household**: more than one wife with husband and possibly children
3. **One parent with children present** *(specify gender of parent)*
4. **Extended family**: any of the above with other relatives
5. **Composite and non-family groups**: any of the above with some non relative, or
group of unrelated persons
6. **Person living alone**

The resulting table should show the number of households of each kind, and the number of
people involved. Some of the groups may be further subdivided; for instance, couples without
children or persons living alone may be distinguished into elderly and non-elderly. The exact
categories may vary according to the country. Identification of the most vulnerable living
arrangements (such as female headed households, elderly people, etc) should be made by
combining the type of living arrangement with other variables such as age or sex of
household head.

3.3 **Livelihood assets**

Livelihood assets are durable goods and possessions used by households to generate
livelihood outcomes. They include privately owned assets, such as housing or tools, and
access to public assets such as roads or communal facilities. Some assets are tangible
goods (e.g. natural, physical or financial assets); others are intangible (e.g. human or social
capital).

Some assets are used directly by the household to produce outcomes (e.g. the household
dwelling is used by the household to provide shelter to its members), while other assets are
used first to generate income, which in turn is used to purchase goods and services that
satisfy some household need. Livelihood assets may be therefore classified into those used
to generate income (e.g. the family farm) and those applied to “domestic” uses (not directly
generating income) such the household’s dwelling.

Information available in censuses and surveys commonly refer to natural and physical
assets, and to human capital. Financial assets and social capital are seldom reported in
baseline sources with a wide coverage, but they may be studied in localized in-depth studies
if any has been carried out in the area at risk.

3.3.1 **Income generating household assets**

(i) **Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm size</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Total land</th>
<th>Cultivable (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 0.49 Ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 – 0.99 Ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 – 1.99 Ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Size brackets should be adapted to local distribution. If necessary, break down into irrigated and rain-fed.*
(ii) Land tenure

**Table: Farms and land by farm size in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land tenure forms</th>
<th>Farms Involved</th>
<th>Land Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only tenancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Physical income-generating assets

(i) Livestock

**Table: Livestock holdings in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Total owners</th>
<th>Average Head/owner</th>
<th>Total head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>......</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Workshop equipment

**Table: Private business equipment and facilities in Area X**

| Percentage of households with trading shops |
| Total |
| In the home |
| In another locale |
| Percentage of households with small workshops (furniture making, blacksmiths, welding, radio & TV repair, brickyard, dressmaking, etc) |
| Total |
| In the home |
| In another locale |
| Percentage of households with fishing boats (indicate no. large and small boats*) |
| Percentage of households owning tractor**/, trucks, lorries, pickups |
| Percentage of households owning a sewing or embroidery machine |
| Percentage of households owning wood working, metal working, welding, brick-making, car repair equipment |
| Percentage of households with other equipment or facilities generating income (specify) |

Notes:
* Only for fishing communities. "Large" or "small" as defined locally.
**/ Only for farming areas where use of tractor is relevant.

Categories to be adapted to particular cases and availability of data.
Specify source and reference date.
3.3.3 Physical domestic household assets (not used to generate income)

(i) Housing and sanitation infrastructure

| Percentage of houses with inadequate walls | Area A | Area B | .......... |
| Percentage of houses with inadequate roofing |        |        |          |
| Percentage of houses with access to safe water within 5 min walk |        |        |          |
| Percentage of houses with sanitation (WC, septic tank latrine) |        |        |          |

Note *:* "Inadequate" walls and roofs are to be defined locally in relation to local custom, climate, and likely disasters (e.g. flooding or earthquake).

Source and reference date.

(ii) Household facilities (other than water and sanitation)

| Percentage of households with electricity | Area A | Area B | Area ... |
| Percentage of households with television |        |        |          |
| Percentage of households with ground telephone |        |        |          |
| Percentage of households with cellular telephone |        |        |          |
| Percentage of households with fridge |        |        |          |
| Percentage of households cooking with wood or dry dung |        |        |          |

Source and reference date.

(iii) Vehicles (not used to generate income)

| Percentage of households with cars | Area A | Area B | Area ...... |
| Percentage of households with motorcycles |        |        |          |
| Percentage of households with bicycles |        |        |          |

Source and reference date.

3.3.4 Public and communal physical and natural assets

(i) Roads

Besides mapping all roads in the area, indicate cover, quality, practicability in bad weather, authority responsible for maintenance, frequency of maintenance.

(ii) Electricity network

Indicate whether electricity is locally generated or comes from national or regional network, origin of power (hydroelectric, thermal and combined), stability of supply, frequency of blackouts or brownouts, and geographic coverage of the network.

(iii) Water network

Origin of water supply, geographic coverage of distribution network, safety, stability.
(iv) Communal facilities

Communal silos or other shared storage facilities, and other communal facilities: covered marketplace, slaughterhouse, docks, communal pasture land or forests, etc.

3.4 Employment and income sources of households

The collection of livelihood data at district or village level provides valuable opportunities to upgrade, disaggregate and complement, the labour market information sought in section 2.

3.4.1 Sources of employment

To bring the information regarding employment up to date or to disaggregate, there is generally no need to repeat all the entire exercise as outlined in section 2. The tables below will summarize the most important labour market information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Population and (un)employment*/ by sex in Area X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age population (15-65 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of working age not active */</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth population (15-24 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested sources: most of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys. If such secondary data is not available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions.

Notes:
*/ See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.
**/ Including: children under working age limit (15 yrs), retired persons (65 yrs and more), students (not available for work), persons full-time engaged in housekeeping, and the handicapped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Employment by sector and employment*/ status in Area* Village X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fisheries **/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, restaurants, hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services (banking, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social and communal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: */ See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.
**/ If possible break down into sub-sectors (e.g. commercial, subsistence, etc.). Source and reference date.
3.4.2 Non-employment sources of household incomes

Elements of household incomes that are not immediately dependent on (local) employment can play an important role in times of disaster. In addition to incomes from various types of employment, households tend to have other ‘assets’ that yield incomes to the household budget. They include: (i) remittances from migrated household members, (ii) social security benefits and (iii) incomes from pensions and similar sources.

Community-based interviews and focus Group Discussions (FGDs) are very useful instruments to collect data on such incomes sources.

Table: Non-employment sources of household income by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- household members that seasonally migrate to work in other rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- household members ‘permanently’ migrated to urban areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- household members that have migrated to another country to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension incomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- head of the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other members of the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested sources: It is unlikely that information can be gathered from standard secondary sources. Rather one has to rely on special studies. Most likely is that the information has to be collected through interviews with key informants and (youth) focus-group discussions.

If people migrate from the area to other areas for seasonal jobs, indicate approximate number of people and season of absence. If some people keep “double residence”, working part of the year in another location on a regular basis, indicate the details of such arrangements and the number or proportion of people or households involved.

3.4.3 Household employment and incomes patterns

Households, especially extended households as found in many countries, do not depend on one single source of income. Commonly they include: salaries of household members who have a permanent job; incomes from informal activities and casual work; remittances from household/family members who have, for short or longer periods, migrated to other areas to find employment; pensions and social benefits; and, particularly in rural areas, incomes from farming. For a good understanding of the incomes situation, the resulting welfare indications and vulnerability, a typology of households may be prepared.

In a limited number of cases, when adequate secondary information from population census and labour market surveys is available, the statistical entities that have this information, can be requested for special re-processing of the micro-data to compile statistics at household level. However, in most situations the household income typologies will need to be made without substantial statistical information but with the help of key informants.

---

6 If people migrate from the area to other areas for seasonal jobs, indicate approximate number of people and season of absence. If some people keep “double residence”, working part of the year in another location on a regular basis, indicate the details of such arrangements and the number or proportion of people or households involved.
Some examples of household typologies are the following:

1. **Farming households.** (Rural) Households where the household head is a farmer and most other household members are also engaged in agriculture.

2. **Non-farm self-employment households.** (Rural) Households where the head of household, possibly with one or more household members are engaged in small-scale, possibly informal, non-agricultural activities.

3. **Public sector employment households.** Households where the head of household and/or one (or more) of the household members have a well-paid job in the public sector.

4. **Private sector employment households.** Households where the head of household and/or one (or more) of the household members operate a private business or have a well-paid job (e.g. manager) in a private sector company.

5. **Wage-work households.** Households not included in previous categories, where at least one person, but possibly more household members, is/are working as wage worker(s).

6. **Mixed employment households.** Households which rely on a combination of incomes contributed by members from different, and possibly frequently changing, sources of income, probably mainly incomes from own small plots, and/or from bouts of casual labour, and/or incomes from survival self-employment, including petty trading, and/or work in small workshops.

7. **Unemployed households.** Households with nobody employed on a regular or full-time basis.

8. **Independent households.** Households where nobody is working and the household depends on pensions, remittances and transfers, and/or property income.

The actual household types will of course depend on local economic circumstances and social-cultural traditions in the area. They should be broken down only as far as data allows and only if their number is relatively high. For instance, the group depending only on remittances should be separated from the rest when the source data contains information about remittances, and remittances are an important source of income. The typology can be altered to suit the form of particular conditions or available information in each area. It must sacrifice detail and simplify by grouping together different households based on some shared characteristics, even if they differ in others. However, often the best classifications are not feasible with the data at hand, so one has to balance the theoretically desirable with the empirically feasible.

Households in Group 8 include various possible situations and sources of sustenance: rental income, pensions, remittances, help from relatives, money interest, and so on. It should be broken down only as far as data allows it, and only if their number is relatively high, making it worthwhile (this group is usually quite small). For instance, the group depending only on remittances should be separated from the rest when the source data contains information about remittances, and remittances are an important source of income.

The value of working with household typologies is that it facilitates assessment of the impact and consequences of sudden onset disasters. Clearly the agricultural households are vulnerable for natural disasters that destroy their harvest. Independent households would be less affected by a disaster that, while hitting its own area, does not immediately affect the source of its income – provide that ways can be found to continue the actual transfer of the funds. ‘Non-farm self-employment households’ are rather vulnerable when a disaster hits the local economy.
A typical table showing the prevalence of the various types could be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment/income pattern</th>
<th>Area A % households</th>
<th>Area A % pop.</th>
<th>Area B % households</th>
<th>Area B % pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-farm self-employment households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector employment households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector employment households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-work households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed employment households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested sources: As discussed in the text, it is unlikely that this type of information will be found in ready-made form. Links with statistical entities may help, but it is most likely that the information has to be collected through interviews with key informants.

This typology can also be crossed by levels of poverty or other indications of livelihood outcome. Conditions of living and levels of poverty/vulnerability will usually vary according to employment patterns.

This example of a typology may be altered to suit the form of particular censuses or surveys in each country. Every typology of this kind must sacrifice detail and simplify by grouping together different households based on some shared characteristics, even if they differ in others. The best classifications are often not feasible with the data at hand, so one has to balance the theoretically desirable with the empirically feasible. On the other hand, simple typologies like the one above behave quite well in practice: indicators of well-being like child mortality, housing, education or sanitation normally follow a reasonable pattern with peasants on one extreme and urban employers on the other, with the rest ordered according to expectation. Wage workers or self-employed may be broken down by urban-rural residence and/or by level of education in order to get a more specific classification without getting a too long list of categories. A typical table showing the prevalence of the various types would be as follows.

3.5 Livelihood outcomes

The quality of life achieved by livelihood before the disaster can be gleaned from data about the main livelihood outcomes in the areas at risk. The quality of the next generation is one of the key issues for the quality of a livelihood, and for this subject two key aspects are child nutrition and education.

Households use family time and income to produce outcomes. Depending on the point of view, attention could be focused on the immediate outcomes of a livelihood or on more distant or ultimate outcomes. For instance, the level of income is an immediate outcome, but income is not an end in itself: it is used to purchase goods and services. These goods and services (food, shelter, clothing, transportation, medicines, entertainment, etc.) are more fundamental outcomes of the livelihood, but not the ultimate outcomes. In fact, food or shelter or clothing contribute to the satisfaction of various needs and desires and ultimately to the quality of life of household members. Thus the study of livelihood outcomes may focus on income, on goods consumed, on results achieved (e.g. good health), etc.

The following table shows the kind of outcome indicator that could be obtained to set up a baseline for livelihoods in areas at risk. Some of them are available for all people in census
or statistical records. Others require special surveys, some of them difficult to undertake, and usually available only for a regional sample and not for specific locations.

### Table: Examples of Livelihood Outcomes and their Indicators in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Monthly HH income</td>
<td>Surveys. Likely understated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food intake</strong></td>
<td>24 hr recall, dietary diversity, other techniques</td>
<td>Surveys. Time consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care access</td>
<td>Access to public health</td>
<td>Surveys, little in Pop. Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education attendance</td>
<td>Child enrolment</td>
<td>Population Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walls, roofs, floors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>WC, waste disposal</td>
<td>Population Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition status</strong></td>
<td>Height, weight, MUAC</td>
<td>Skills required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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PREFACE

The disaster frequency is showing a rising trend. In the year June 2005 to June 2006, 404 disasters associated with natural hazards were recorded in 115 countries, killing more than 93,000 people, affecting almost 157 million people and causing economic damage amounting to USD 172 billion.

Disasters have a dramatic impact on the lives of people not least on their sources of livelihood and productive assets. They leave livelihoods shattered; houses, schools and other public facilities flattened; bridges and road networks collapsed; the geography of the zone sometimes transformed.

The impact of disasters hinders the capacity of affected groups to recover in the short-term and rebuild back their assets, thus often condemning the survivors to a long dependency on relief aid. In this context, helping protecting and rebuilding the livelihoods of those vulnerable to disasters becomes an urgent priority. Support to the recovery of means of living in farming, fisheries, rational use of natural resources, wage employment in primary and secondary sectors and services, small trade, micro- and small enterprises in the formal or informal sector, etc. have to be started as soon as possible in the immediate aftermath of a disaster.

Assessing the impact of disasters on the livelihoods of people and the capacity and opportunities for quick recovery and increased resilience to future events is an important part of the response to disasters. Yet current assessment systems are often weak, uncoordinated and are not strongly linked to livelihood recovery interventions. In order to improve understanding of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, FAO and ILO have jointly developed this Detailed Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT). The LAT consists of three main technical elements: Livelihood Baseline Information (which is set-up pre-disaster); Livelihood Impact Scan (undertaken immediately after the disaster); and Livelihood Rapid Assessment (undertaken within three months after the disaster).

In the process of development, parts of this tool-kit have been tested, redefined and refined in a number of countries including Pakistan (2005 Kashmir earthquake); Indonesia (2006 volcanic eruption and earthquake in Yogyakarta); Philippines (2006 typhoon Reming); and Solomon Islands (2007 tsunami). The complete set has been tested in Bolivia and Indonesia. This process of continual learning and improvement continues, and so the current set of guidelines contained in these volumes should be seen as one stage in the development of the approach.

In this spirit, suggestions for improvement are welcomed and should be directed to: cruciani@ilo.org and neil.marsland@fao.org.

FAO Rome and ILO Geneva,
July 2007
INTRODUCTION TO THE LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT TOOL-KIT

The Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT) consists of three inter-related tools: Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI), the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) and the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (RLA). The Tool-kit is designed for structured data collection at sudden onset natural disasters, with the intention to improve post-disaster relief and recovery interventions. The Tool-kit is planned to be expanded to cover also other types of emergencies.

The tools are designed for particular but related functions in the assessment process. Each of them can be used independently of the others, but combined use will greatly increase efficiency and (cost-) effectiveness. Similarly the tools can be executed by different people as indicated in the following table, but there are important advantages to work with a standard team. Each part may be used for different targets in terms of funding mechanisms.

Table: Overview of Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT) instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Programming / funding target</th>
<th>When and by whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBI Livelihood Baseline</td>
<td>Provides data and information background to be immediately available after the occurrence of a disaster. It can then be used to elaborate quick briefs for Flash Appeal and Early Recovery Donor Conference, as well as to inform relevant organizations and the public. LBI information could also be used to extrapolate from when is not possible to undertake a LIS before Flash Appeals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>When? Time take to conduct LBI: 2 – 6 weeks (TO BE DONE BEFORE THE DISASTER) By whom? Mainly data analysts in (national or regional/local) governments/agencies, together with Universities/NGOs/UN-organizations and bilateral donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS Livelihood Impact</td>
<td>LIS provides first-hand post-disaster information on the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods in the affected area. The new data are to be combined with the baseline information to give a solid basis for proposals on relief and initial recovery actions for the first Flash Appeals, Early Recovery Donor Conference, as well as other post-disaster livelihoods programmes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>When? Duration of assessment: 1 – 7 days Usual window for LIS: within first 10 days after disaster. By whom? Ideally the same team that worked on LBI; otherwise government and UN staff, together with consultants integrated into UNDAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA Rapid Livelihood</td>
<td>Provides a more detailed information and rationale for strategies, programmes and projects to be submitted to Revised Flash appeal and / or Early Recovery donor conference, for funding purposes, and / or development of Livelihood Recovery Strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>When? Duration of assessment: 30 days Usual window for RLA: within 90 days of the disaster. By whom? Ideally the same team that worked on LBI; otherwise multi-disciplinary, multi – agency teams, with gov. participation, led by ILO/FAO livelihood specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit, Volume One for a detailed introduction of the instruments and their relations.
ACRONYMS

ILO/FAO ‘Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit

LAT - Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit
LBI - Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LAT)
LIS - Livelihood Impact Scan (LAT)
LRA - Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LAT)

Other acronyms

AEZ - Agro-ecological zone
FAO - Food and Agricultural Organisation
FGD - focus group discussions
IDPs - Internally Displaced Persons
ILO - International Labour Office
NGO - non-governmental organisation
OCHA - UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PDNA - Post-Disaster Needs Assessment
PRA - participatory rural appraisal
SHG - self-help groups
SLA - sustainable livelihoods approach
SSI - semi-structured interviews
UNAIDS - UN organization for HIV/AIDS
UNESCO - UN Education and Science organisation
UNICEF - United Nations Children’s Fund
UNDAC - United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination
UNDP - United National Development Programme
UNRC - UN Resident Coordinator
WFP - World Food Programme
WHO - World Health Organisation
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives and scope of the LIS

The Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) is primarily designed to generate a credible and well justified first impression of the current and likely impact on livelihoods of a sudden-onset natural disaster as soon as possible after the event. The LIS will feed into the Flash Appeal, which is normally issued between 3-10 days after the occurrence of the disaster.

The LIS is a follow-up to the compilation of a Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI - see LAT vol. 2), which would be expected to have been carried out before the disaster took place. If such a LBI was not conducted in the pre-disaster period, then the gathering of baseline information becomes part of the present LIS.

A specific requirement of the LIS is, building, if possible, on the LBI findings, to make available a first statistical picture and information analysis that will allow the disaster authorities to take informed decisions on emergency assistance and, subsequently, recovery actions. This is done by using the LIS findings for the formulation of the first immediate projects to be presented into the Flash Appeal.

The LIS will, moreover, constitute the basis for the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA - see LAT volume 4), which seeks to provide more detailed information and further analysis on the impact of the disaster on local livelihoods. The LRA findings will therefore be fed into the elaboration of a fully fledged Livelihood Recovery Response Plan that will be prepared for the following Appeal. In effect, this represents the start of efforts to put an area's economy and livelihoods on its feet through rapid rehabilitation and early recovery efforts. Depending on the country and the specific situation of the areas affected, this may be articulated through a wider Early Recovery Response Plan that includes agriculture and non-agricultural sectors in a Livelihood Cluster Response Plan\(^1\).

The risk of livelihood failure as the result of a natural hazard event is a function of:

- the severity of the event,
- exposure to the event and
- vulnerability to the event.

Therefore, the LIS has to be able to estimate each of these three elements. In addition, the LIS should recommend options for livelihood recovery. The LIS should therefore have severity, exposure, livelihood impact and recovery elements.

The severity of the event is measured by, for instance, data on rainfall, wind-speed, the Richter-scale magnitude (for an earthquake) etc. The degree of exposure to the event is measured by the size and location of particular geographical areas and numbers of population in such areas. The vulnerability of livelihoods to the disaster in the exposed areas/ amongst the exposed populations, will depend on livelihood types and poverty, and this will often vary according to demographic variables such as gender, age and ethnicity. Prospects for recovery will also be influenced by the actual or likely presence of external support (eg. local/ central government and local/ international NGOs,).

\(^1\) As the agricultural sector has in general been prioritised in the early response to crisis and other sources of livelihoods underestimated by the international support, the post-disaster livelihood recovery response has so far generally focused on Agricultural Recovery Plans.
1.2 **Assessment context for the LIS: the need for coordination**

In most cases after a natural disaster, an interagency assessment will be organised by the UN country team, with or without the assistance of a UN disaster assessment and coordination (UNDAC) team or an OCHA coordination team. The LIS will constitute the livelihood recovery element of the interagency assessment, and will need to be coordinated with the other aspects of the inter-agency assessment process.

One very important fact to be considered is that there will be a plethora of assessment teams in operation soon after the disaster strikes, aiming to get information as soon as possible to feed into initial assessment documents and appeals – including the flash appeal. Owing to time pressure, there will be a tendency for different teams to visit communities in the same areas. If the LIS is to include fieldwork (and it might not – see below), then it is absolutely critical that there is coordination with other actors to ensure that particular communities and districts are not overwhelmed by different assessment teams.

1.3 **Intended users of Livelihood Impact Scan guidelines**

These LIS guidelines are aimed at all those people who would normally be expected to participate in post disaster needs assessments at the country level. This may include line ministry staff, national and international UN staff, national and international consultants and NGO staff. Some of these people will be able to use the guidelines with minimal or no training, whilst others will need to be trained first. With the likely need for some training in mind, training guidelines for the LIS are currently under preparation.

1.4 **The mechanics of conducting a LIS**

There are two basic types of LIS: *with* and *without* field visits. When field visits are not possible, for instance due to extreme time pressure to produce findings before a Flash Appeal and/or when it is physically impossible to travel to the disaster area(s), the LIS will have to be based entirely on the information from the LBI, together with available information on exposure and damage by the disaster. On the basis of these two pillars, the LIS will then generate a livelihood impact extrapolation, followed by an indicative Livelihood Recovery Response Plan.

When field visits are possible, these can either be done as part of an inter-agency assessment process or as a stand-alone process. The length and depth of the field investigations will depend upon circumstances (and the budget available) and these guidelines give some options which can be adapted to individual situations. This second type of LIS draws on baseline and exposure information to derive working hypotheses about vulnerability and livelihood impacts which are then “tested” and elaborated through rapid ‘ground truthing’. In other cases, when no LBI was conducted, it will be necessary to conduct a “quick and dirty” baseline exercise as part of the LIS itself (see section 2).

Due to the time limitations and the need to produce the first reliable data and project concepts within 10 days at the most, it is advisable that the LIS then be conducted by two small teams: one team in the capital town to analyse the existing baseline data or to contact the institutions to collect available statistical data and information and the other team undertaking as many field visits as possible.
1.5 Key Elements of the LIS

As noted earlier, the degree of field investigation in LIS will depend entirely on circumstances – principally time, accessibility and budget. The following table represents the range of enquiry that the LIS may undertake. The minimal scenario when there is very little time and/or accessibility would be the secondary data and national level key informant level. The maximal scenario would involve investigations at all of the levels shown in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Secondary data and national level key informants | • Pre-disaster livelihood baseline data collection (if no pre-existent baseline).  
• Initial severity and exposure information – size of the shock(s) numbers and locations of those affected.  
• Support and recovery information - institutions, projects which may be able to offer support to affected populations.  
• Livelihood impact extrapolation (if no fieldwork is possible) |
| Provincial / District/ area level | • Impact of the disaster on the local economy, general impact of the disaster on the livelihoods of people in the area and prospects for recovery  
• Employment intensive investment opportunities |
| Business sector | • Local economy and livelihood situation before and after the disaster  
• Suggestions for immediate relief and subsequent recovery interventions |
| Market trader / shop keeper | • Current market availability and prices for essential commodities;  
• Likely availability and price trends |
| Community level key informants | • the most important livelihood activities in the community and when these take place in the year;  
• the overall impact of the disaster on livelihood activities in the community and current responses ;  
• the potential role of community groups in livelihood recovery.  
• high priority needs |
| Individuals | • the most important livelihood sources and household income before the disaster;  
• the impact of the disaster on the assets and livelihood activities of the household;  
• livelihood coping strategies;  
• the main short and longer-term priorities and needs. |

1.6 Time frame

Within the general timeframe of a disaster and follow-up activities, the LIS takes place immediately after the disaster, so as to allow for the formulation of preliminary proposals in time for the first Flash Appeals.

![Figure 1: Time frame of disaster and follow-up activities](image)

1.7 Calculating LIS costs

It would be helpful to indicate cost for LIS – text and table to be reviewed

It is clearly impossible to give a definitive figure or range for the costs of a LIS as much will depend upon circumstances and local conditions. The following budget is based on the actual costs of a LIS done after the Pakistan earthquake. The LIS team consisted of one
international team leader and six locally recruited team members. The Assessment lasted for a period of 3 weeks of field work and one week for report writing.

**Table: Example of LIS Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense items</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 International staff costs: salaries/fees, DSA, airfare</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Internationally recruited RLA Team Leader (for 4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 National staff costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) salary top-ups, fees, DSA</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Government staff salaries normally met by government, but may need some salary top-up for long hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) additional staff (eg. consultants)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Out-of-station DSA for local staff Possible hiring of additional staff for admin, translation, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vehicle hire, fuel, etc.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>These costs can be reduced if UN agency or partner vehicles are used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tents and bedding</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Sleeping accommodation may be in short supply making purchase of tents and sleeping bags necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hotel costs during survey</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Not always necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Food and provisions</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>General provisioning for field operations; lunches, meals, snacks, water, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Office supplies, photocopying, etc</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Allow for large amount of photocopying of forms, checklists, responses, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Miscellaneous (eg. 10%)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Unexpected items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: INITIAL SECONDARY INFORMATION COLLECTION

Why: To provide the basis for initial livelihood impact estimation
When: The first days after a disaster strikes
What: Available information on (i) the underlying pre-disaster livelihoods of affected populations (baseline) (ii) magnitude of the disaster, areas and populations exposed to the disaster (iii) possible sources of livelihood recovery support for affected communities.
Who: LIS team, in collaboration with others.

2.1 Pre-disaster livelihood baseline data collection

From a conceptual point of view, the first step of the LIS is to understand the pre-disaster situation in the affected area(s). In this respect there are two possibilities: an LBI was conducted for the areas affected by the disaster (see LAT Volume 2 Livelihood Baseline), or it was not. In the first case, the LIS would build on the findings of the LBI, updating the information in passing (without investing major efforts at this point) and combining it with information on the magnitude and exposure of the disaster (see section 2.3 below). In this way a first livelihood impact estimate can be derived at. When no LBI was conducted and therefore no pre-existing baseline information exists, such data has to be collected on the spot, at a “quick and dirty” manner, at the same time as the exposure and damage information.

Baseline data is needed in order to help estimate the magnitude of the impact on livelihoods. The key aspects of baseline data needed will include: population figures; "normal" livelihood activities for the area and time of year (farming, fishing, non-agricultural activities, wage and self-employment, migration, etc.) and numbers of people involved in these activities, specific types of economic activity (e.g. types of food and cash crops grown; livestock numbers; type and number of micro- and small business; home production by women; local manufacturing plants; infrastructure patterns, etc.).

The guidelines for the conduct of a LBI provides detailed information on the sources of such baseline data on local employment and other livelihoods, referring to the Population Census, Labour Market and Household Surveys, special studies, institutional data and listings, map-based information and information that can be obtained from key informants. Other suggestions for quick data collection in the immediate aftermath of a disaster include:

- Relevant UN information from agencies such as: UNDP, FAO, ILO, WHO, UNICEF and UNESCO
- Reliefweb website: [http://www.reliefweb.org](http://www.reliefweb.org)
- Existing FEWSNET livelihoods maps of the country; [http://www.fews.net](http://www.fews.net)
- National or regional disaster-preparedness plans
- Existing geographic information systems in the area, if any.

2.2 Updating labour market information

The conduct of the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) should in the first place be used to update and complement some of the labour market information gathered during the LBI. Time will have past and new statistics may have become available. The LIS is likely to zoom in at lower levels and, for instance, collect data straight from the village and community, for which no exact disaggregated labour market information was found earlier.

At the same time, the timing of the LIS (i.e. in the early days after the disaster has struck), pressure to present the findings at the first Flash Appeal will be high and there may be few
opportunities to go out for information collection and discussions with key informants. That means that not all the tabulations provided for the LBI (see LAT volume 2, section 2) can be checked and updated. Choices need to be made, and it is suggested to concentrate on reviewing the available data for the next table, which brings together a number of important key labour market indicators. They will permit a preliminary analysis of the employment situation in the affected area.

**Table: Population and (un)employment*/ by sex in Area X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working age population (15-65 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth population (15-24 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of working age not active */</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (open)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty levels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % Population living at/below USD 1/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % Population living at/below USD 2/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested sources:** Most of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys. If such secondary data is not available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions.

**Notes:**

*/ See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.

/* Including: children under working age limit (15 yrs), retired persons (65 yrs and more), students (not available for work), persons full-time engaged in housekeeping, and the handicapped.

**Table: Employment by sector and employment status*/ in Area*Village X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self empl.</th>
<th>Wage</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Family help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fisheries *<em>/</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, restaurants, hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services (banking, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social and communal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

/** See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.

/* If possible break down into sub-sectors (e.g. commercial, subsistence, etc.).

Source and reference date.

When the occasion occurs it would be worthwhile to discuss with key informants and/or gather data with respect to:

- Trends in rural (ie. mainly agricultural) and urban employment
- The developments in relation with the creation of ‘formal employment’, ie. salary jobs in the public sector and modern private companies
2.3 Initial severity and exposure information

At the same time that baseline data on local livelihoods is being updated (in case of existing LBI) and/or collected (no LBI in existence), it will be important to gather information on the magnitude and location of the disaster event(s) and the area and population exposed. This intelligence may come from the National Government Disaster Management, UNOSAT, OCHA, Press, Radio and Television bulletins will be important.

The key questions here are:

- What is the nature, extent and magnitude of the shock/crisis?
- What geographical areas have been affected?
- How have they been affected? (e.g. hectares of agricultural land destroyed, estimates of tonnes of production lost, numbers of cattle killed, factories no longer functioning, workshops collapsed and shops destroyed, areas of informal trade wiped out, and value of these economic losses).
- Which groups of people have been affected most (livelihood types) and numbers.
- What is the current information and knowledge on level of disruption to livelihood activities (including market disruptions)?
- How are people coping with the disaster?

**NOTE:** Initial hypotheses on impact can usefully be informed by the “typical effects” of different kinds of disaster shown in LAT Volume 1, annex 5.

2.4 Mapping Agency Capacity for Relief and Recovery

One other important element of initial data gathering concerns actual and possible sources of support for affected populations. This will help determine the magnitude and need for additional support through the flash appeal, as well as potential partners. Whilst an understanding of livelihoods will include likely coping capacity, this is not the same thing as mapping the actual and possible capacity of non-UN agencies to support livelihood recovery. Clearly, time will be very short and it will not be possible to compile an inventory from disparate sources, thus progress in collecting this information will depend on how centralised and comprehensive it is. Notwithstanding this, key issues and possible sources of information are indicated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / institution</th>
<th>Possible sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National disaster management infrastructure, plans and financial support</td>
<td>President’s / Prime Minister’s Office / Disaster Management Authority or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government offices. Location, staff, services provided.</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and International NGO presence in affected areas</td>
<td>National NGO council or equivalent; head offices of individual agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant area based development projects and programmes operating in affected areas</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance / Development Planning; donor agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organisations including cooperatives in affected districts, number and type</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Welfare, International NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail outlets for food and</td>
<td>Chambers of commerce, Ministry of Trade and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Examples here would include interruptions of business because of transport and communication problems, as well as forced migration and cessation of remittances from areas struck by the disaster.
| Productive input supplies (seeds, tools, livestock); food and input market infrastructure | Industry, Company head offices. |
SECTION 3: FIELD VISITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why:</th>
<th>To get a first hand understanding of livelihood impact and recovery priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long:</td>
<td>Duration of field work variable between 1 day and one week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What:</td>
<td>Selective visits to district level authorities and where feasible to (a) settlement level key informants, and (b) individual households in the affected area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
<td>Preferably as part of an interagency assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who:</td>
<td>LIS team, which would consist at least of UN staff / national consultants plus government representation. Due to time limitations, it may be necessary to split the LIS team so that part of the team stays in the capital city to gather an analyse key secondary data and gather information from key informants whilst the other part goes to the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Structure of field visits

3.1.1 Time and key objectives

The site selection and sampling process will depend heavily on time available for field visits. A minimal scenario would be a one day visit to the district / regional / provincial offices in the affected areas with a possible visit to the main market. On the assumption that the maximum time available for a field visit would be one week; that the LIS fieldwork team would be small and mobile – perhaps consisting of 3-4 trained persons; and that the time for analysis would be extremely compressed – perhaps no more than one day, the most that could normally be done would probably be no more than three district level visits plus perhaps three to five village level consultations.

In general terms, the minimal objective of the field work is to provide some degree of “ground truthing” to the working hypotheses and initial conclusions gained from the analysis of livelihood baseline, shock exposure and support and recovery information. To achieve this, it is important to strike a balance between focus on the most vulnerable areas / persons and getting an overview of the entire population affected by the crisis. If there is only one day available for a field visit, these objectives will need to be achieved entirely by direct observation and interviews with key informants at area (district / region) level. With more time, there will be further opportunities to meet the objectives through selection of sites, groups and individuals for interview.

Irrespective of the nature of fieldwork, the key questions driving the enquiry are the same as the questions driving the initial secondary information collection process (see Section 2).

- How were people making a living before the disaster? (baseline)
- What effect has the disaster had on their livelihoods?
- What coping mechanisms and livelihood strategies are different people/households likely to develop and how effective / damaging are these?
- What are the opportunities and capacities for livelihood recovery within the local economy?
- What types of activities are needed for livelihood recovery of the different people/households?

These same questions will be investigated in greater depth by a subsequent Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA – see LAT Volume 4).
3.2 Interview with key informants at provincial/district headquarters

At his level, the focus in the LIS is on using the key informants to find out as much as possible about impact on livelihoods in the area and prospects for recovery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who: Administrative head of district / province / region; government department specialists covering agriculture, livestock, fisheries, forestry, water, employment, infrastructure, small business development; NGO representatives; food retail and wholesale representatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How: Semi-structured interviewing using checklists and selected tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing: Depending on circumstances between 1 and 4 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Main topics for information gathering

(i) Baseline information

What are the main ways in which people make a living in this area? Probe for differences using relevant categories e.g.: farming, fishing, natural resource exploitation, trading, informal manufacturing and repair activities, self-employment, wage earners, remittances, migrant labour.

(ii) Impact of disaster on local livelihoods – overview

- What has been the general impact on different aspects of the local economy?
- How many or to what extent farms or crops have been flooded or otherwise damaged?
- What is the damage to fisheries? How have fishermen and their families been affected?
- Have livestock been killed by the disaster?
- How many or what proportion of shops or businesses have closed or collapsed?
- In what way have micro- and small enterprises been affected?
- Has the disaster damaged roads used to carry local produce to the market?
- Are communal marketplaces, slaughterhouses, silos or other common facilities damaged?
- Are local transportation and communication services working?

- In the light of this, which groups of people have been most affected? Where are they? Why have they been most affected? Are the most affected groups also the poorest groups?

(iii) Coping Strategies

- What are people likely to do to cope and what are they doing already? In particular:
  - How many people have left the area? How many are likely to do so soon?
  - What is the likelihood of people overexploiting some natural resource in order to survive? (e.g. cutting down trees to get wood) and why? Is there any evidence of this happening already?
  - Is it likely that people will liquidate their assets (livestock, jewellery, other assets) in order to cope? – which will be liquidated first? is there any evidence that this is already happening?
  - Is it likely that people may have to reduce food intake now or in the future as a result of the event(s) what are the precise reasons, is this happening already? Are some members of households doing so in order to feed other members (e.g. children)? – any evidence?
(iv) Livelihood Recovery Responses

- What are the initial priorities to preserve and support peoples’ livelihoods?
- What can be expected from governmental agencies and NGOs operating in the area?
- What is the feasibility of using labour based methods for initial infrastructural works (see below for more detailed questions on this topic).
- What changes are required for longer term recovery of affected populations and reducing vulnerability to similar events in future? How do we “build back better”? (include possible policy changes in your probing here).

3.2.2 Employment-intensive investment opportunities for recovery

The present LIS can be instrumental in identifying opportunities for LBT relief and recovery programmes. As part of the data collection it could pose the following core questions:

- What is the feasibility of using labour-based methods for initial work (rubble removal, road repair, house construction etc)? Can labour materials and services for these tasks be sourced locally? Which are the key sectors affected by the disaster where LBT methods could best be applied?
- What is the availability of unskilled and skilled workers? Should payment be in cash or in kind or both, why?
- Are the (national and/or local) government and private sector organizations well disposed towards the use of LBT methods? Is there a government policy regarding LBT methods? Has the government experience with LBT-programmes?
- Are there LBT programs in existence? If so, for which kind of works? Who organized them (government, local authorities, international organizations, private companies)?
- What is the system of local participation to LBT in use or foreseen? And does LBT play a role in the system of local participatory planning for priorities and programmes?

---

3 The approach is in Asia known as ‘labour-based equipment supported’ (LBES) programmes.
3.3 Most important interviews at provincial/district level

3.3.1 Interviews with local businessmen

**Objectives:** Information gathering on the local livelihoods situation pre- and post disaster. Special attention for: (i) main constraints for doing business (eg. interrupted transport routes and/or communication, lack of production inputs, difficulties in finding demand as buyers use their money for other matters) and (ii) prospects for early resumption of business activities.

**Who to interview:** Local business leaders, eg. from Chamber of Commerce, Informal Sector Associations, main local bankers, traders, manufacturers.

**Target time:** 1-1½ hours per –collective- interview.

**Key Information to be collected:**
- Under normal circumstances what are the main livelihood activities in the area? Are they based on local raw materials? On local market?
- In what way, and to what extent have these livelihoods been affected by the disaster? What are the most and the least affected? What is the exact nature of the problems – destroyed workshops and equipment, unavailability/increased prices of production inputs, interruptions in marketing, lack of demand?
- What are the main local business organisations? what are their main activities? (eg. solidarity; provision of services to members’ businesses; lobbying)? Are they still functioning? What role could they play in recovery interventions?
- What are the main suggestions for involvement of the local business sector in the immediate relief actions? And what could it contribute towards subsequent recovery interventions? Do they relate to special actions to secure adequate production inputs, ensure workspace, make available marketing opportunities, or other types of actions?

3.3.2 Interviews with traders

**Objectives:** Market availability and market prices of: (i) essential food and non-food items for consumption and (ii) key inputs for production (e.g. seeds, yarn, metal sheets). Key factors constraining / likely to constrain availability in the coming weeks and months.

**Who to interview:** As many traders as possible in time available. Try to get a spread of commodities and trader types: shop owners, market traders in local markets; wholesalers.

**Target time:** 20-30 minutes per interview.

**Key Information to be collected:**
As much of the following information as possible should be obtained from the traders interviewed. In all cases the idea is to focus on the commodities that poor people in the area use for both consumption (e.g. staple foods, basic household items like matches, kerosene, soap) and for local livelihoods (eg. agriculture and non-agricultural production).

**Core questions:**
- List of commodities that poor people normally buy
- Normal prices (for this time of year, or just before the disaster) per unit of sale
- Normal availability just before the disaster (freely available? in short supply?)
- Current availability (freely available? in short supply?) and current prices
- Likely trends in near future (eg. in 2 weeks and in 2 months) of supply and prices
3.4 Interviews at village/settlement and community level

Goals
- Establish the most important livelihood activities in the community.
- Assess overall impact of the disaster on livelihood activities.
- Identify priority needs, responses, coping mechanisms

Method:
- Introduce the entire team and the purpose of the assessment
- Keep informal and open discussions, taking notes of relevant comments

Target time: about 1 hour

3.4.1 Livelihoods in normal situation

Main ways in which people in the community normally make a living (ie. before the disaster). List main activities that people do to obtain food and income.

Which were the 3 most important livelihood/income activities? (e.g. rice farming, trading, agro-processing, transport, remittances, labour out-of-the-area...)

Main assets before the disaster:
- Natural (access to land, water, forest)
- Social (organisations, norms, family support)
- Physical (houses, vehicles, equipment, livestock, seeds)
- Human (labour power, knowledge, education, skills)
- Financial (savings, income sources, credit)

3.4.2 Effects of the disaster on local livelihoods

Examine whether the disaster has changed the ways and options of people to obtain food and money (impact on livelihoods, food and income sources, assets). Identify main affected people and groups (women, landless, fishermen, informal sector operators).

Assets affected and not-affected by the disaster (this is a key question: provide substantive time to it, examining asset by asset):
- Natural (access to land, water, forest)
- Social (organisations, norms, family support)
- Physical (houses, vehicles, equipment, livestock, seeds)
- Human (labour power, knowledge, education, skills)
- Financial (savings, income sources, credit)

Discuss coping mechanisms after the disaster (especially those related to rebuild livelihoods, food provision, income). Discuss the changes (recovery, alternative livelihoods) expected by community members in the coming months. Ask if the disaster brought about any learning for community members.

3.4.3 Community groups

Identify the way the disaster has disrupted the lives in local communities:
• Which of the main functional community groups (cooperative, women association, cultural group, etc.) have been hit hardest? Examine their type of members, number of members, level of activity. How has the disaster affected each of the main groups?
• What have the groups done in response to the disaster?
• Have any new groups been created after the disaster?
• What role every community group could play in recovery?

Inquire into the impact of the disaster on infrastructure, equipment and the local economy (Agro-processing facilities, irrigation, community storage, etc.)
• What infrastructure and equipment has been damaged? Assess type, size, users, and existence of maintenance committees.
• Infrastructure and equipment needed or desirable to rebuild livelihoods?

Most importantly, discuss with the local population their support needs and priorities for recovery responses.
• Who has given support (government, U.N. agencies, NGOs, private sector, unknown)
• What concrete, practical things should be done for recovery?
• What new livelihood alternatives would they like to explore? Why? Have they seen them working elsewhere? (goal of the question: explore new options, such as poultry, horticulture, small-scale enterprises, agro-processing)
• What do they suggest to do to be better prepared for future disasters?

3.5 Household level interviews

| Who: The minimal scenario would be one group of households in one village. If there is time, then more communities can be visited and/or individual household interviews can be undertaken. If household level interviews are possible the priority would be to focus on poorer and more vulnerable groups in the community |
| How: Semi-structured interviewing using checklists. |
| Target time: Depends on circumstances, as a rule of thumb no longer than one hour per interview. |

Note: the emphasis placed on different parts of this checklist should be informed by what was found at community and other levels. Not all of the checklist may be relevant, so it should be adapted to circumstances.

(i) Farming

(a) Crops
• Crops grown?
• Amount planted (area and quantity of seed / planting material)
• Type of seed (and fertiliser if applicable)
• Size of harvest this year (if harvested before disaster)
• Impact of disaster on harvested produce? (Stocks, access to market, price changes).
• Expected impact on harvest of different crops (if disaster comes before harvest) and reasons why.
• land tenure status (ownership, rental, share arrangements, etc).

(b) Livestock
• Did you own livestock before the disaster? Which type, how many, and what was each type used for (e.g. draught power, milk, meat, sales, etc)
• Did you sell any livestock as a regular source of income before the disaster? Which ones? How many per year? What price on average? Where did you sell them/ who did you sell them to?
• How were the animals fed?
• Have your livestock holdings been affected by the disaster? Did you lose any animals? Is the shed / stall still standing? Do you still have access to fodder?

(ii) Fishing

• Fish harvested (types)
• Equipment used
• Catch: amount and types of fish throughout the year (actual amounts – use seasonal calendar developed above to help questioning)
• Impact of disaster on equipment; fish stocks; access to market; prices; expected incomes

(iii) Informal manufacturing and repair activities

• Types of activities and number of people working in them (total and average per firm)
• Technology (eg. manual or ‘partly modern’), equipment and tools in use, skills
• Type of workshop (eg. only open air/under tree, based in house owner, informal/ dilapidated, made of bricks), accessibility (eg. in market place, by feeder roads)
• Origin of production inputs; main market(s) for goods & services produced; demand problems
• Impact of disaster on: workshop/premises and equipment; availability and prices of inputs; disruptions of regular markets and new marketing opportunities; products prices and demand; availability of skilled/ unskilled workers; repayment bank loans.

(iv) Trading activities

• In what items were household members trading before the disaster? What ambulant trading, a market stall or a permanent shop (eg. a grocery)? (please specify)
• How was the trading business affected by the disaster – interruptions of transport? unavailability of trading wares? lack of customers? inadequate working capital?
• For how long is the trading business expected to be disrupted? What is needed to restore this source of income?

(iv) Casual labouring

• What sort of casual labour work is normally carried out by each household member? In what period? Who employs them? At what daily wage?
• Is casual work found locally or does it require – temporary- migration to other regions?
• Has this work been affected by the disaster, if so, in what way? For how long is the interruption expected to last?
• Has the disaster resulted in new opportunities for casual work? In what sector? In what area? By who are the contracted? At what daily wage?

(v) Formal employment

• Are any household members formally employed, if so what job are they doing?
• Where do they work, do they commute to work every day, or migrate?
• Has this work been affected by the disaster, if so how?
• Will this work be affected by the disaster, if so how?
(vi) Remittances

- Are there any relatives or family members who live elsewhere (including overseas) and send back money?
- Where is/are that/those person(s) working, and what is/are he/she/they doing?
- Have the remittance been affected by the disaster, if so how?
- For how long will this situation last? What is needed to restore the remittances?

(vii) Other

- Pensions (share family member’s pension from formal employment)
- Government social welfare payment.
- Has this work / source of income been affected by the disaster, if so how?
- Will this work / source of income be affected by the disaster, if so how?
SECTION 4: OUTPUTS AND USES OF LIS

4.1 Livelihood impact and response matrix

One useful way of organising the information gathered in LIS is to develop a livelihood impact and response matrix (see next page). The left hand side of the matrix can serve as the main part of the table of contents for an LIS report. Information on the left hand side can be transferred easily across to a standard flash appeal response plan and project profiles.

NB. This is not a livelihood impact and response matrix and should be reviewed/rewritten

Livelihood Impact and Response Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>LIS reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude and exposure</td>
<td>(Section numbers refer to the headings in this document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of shock</td>
<td>- Section 2.1 “Initial exposure and severity Information”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical area affected (district / provinces and general agro-ecological characteristics)</td>
<td>- Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population numbers in affected areas</td>
<td>- Section 3.4 “Community level interviews”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of damage</td>
<td>- Section 3.5 “Household level interviews”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Livelihood characteristics

| Basic means of making a living before the shock (fishing, farming, casual or steady wage earning, self employed (in commerce, small industry, transportation, etc), remittances etc – with rough proportions if possible). Pre-disaster prices of basic goods (especially food) and inputs. | - Section 2.2 “Livelihood baseline data collection” |
| - Section 3.1 “Structure of field visits” |
| - Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters” | - Section 3.4 “Community level interviews” |
| - Section 3.5 “Household level interviews” |

Livelihood Impact information

| Actual and likely impact on different types and groups of people. Specific impact on women | - Analysis of information in Section 2.1 combined with that in Section 2.2 |
| - Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters” |
| - Section 3.3 “Interview with traders” |
| - Section 3.4 “Community level interviews” |
| - Section 3.5 “Household level interviews” |

Likely coping strategies

| - Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters” |
| - Section 3.4 “Community level interviews” |
| - Section 3.5 “Household level interviews” |

Recovery opportunities and needs

| Probable role and effectiveness of markets, existing government and other programmes, local institutions. Appropriateness of labour intensive works for Initial livelihood support | - Section 2.3 “Support and Recovery Information” |
| - Section 3.3 “Interview with traders” |
| - Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters” |
| - Section 3.4 “Community level interviews” |
| - Section 3.5 “Household level interviews” |

High priority livelihood recovery interventions for affected population groups

| - Analysis of information in Section 2.1 combined with that in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 |
| - Section 3.2 “Interview with key informants at provincial / district headquarters” |
| - Section 3.4 “Community level interviews” |
| - Section 3.5 “Household level interviews” |
4.2 **LIS reporting**

The LIS should produce a very rapid report, of between 5 and 10 pages to be available not later than 10 days after the disaster, and used immediately. The key uses/outputs of the LIS are:

- The preparation of *immediate livelihood recovery project profiles* for a Flash Appeal. These profiles should consider action that can start immediately and can contribute to livelihood recovery over a period of 6 – 12 months.
- A skeleton for a *livelihood recovery strategy*. This can be fleshed out by a subsequent more in-depth Livelihood Assessment.
- Raising awareness of the livelihood impact of the disaster amongst donors, national and local government and the general public and what needs to be done about this (advocacy material).

For all objectives, the immediate response to the impact on livelihoods should point to the need to inject money into the economy and households, create short-term jobs, stop the destruction or liquidation of assets, enable markets and production to operate again, and prepare the ground for longer term recovery.

4.3 **Template and content of a 10 page flash appeal**

1. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1 PAGE)**
   
   Brief summary of:
   - the crisis
   - priority needs and humanitarian response plan
   - amount of money needed in US$
   - time span covered by this appeal (cannot be longer than 6 months)

2. **CONTEXT AND HUMANITARIAN CONSEQUENCES (1.5 PAGES)**

   2.1 Context
   - What happened?
   - Where?
   - What has happened since the onset of the crisis? (e.g. information gathered, government agrees to international assistance, Initial response by agencies, assessments done, etc.)
   - If major uncertainty exists about the evolution of the crisis, what are the best, worst, and most likely scenarios?

   2.2 Humanitarian consequences
   - Who is most affected and why? (Provide estimates, if possible, of specific groups most affected, disaggregated by sex and age)
   - What are the needs (of specific groups, disaggregated by sex and age) as a direct and Initial result of this crisis?
   - What would be the needs in the best, worst, and most likely scenarios (if major uncertainty exists)?
   - What are the priority sectors for response? (Choose only from the IASC standard sectors: shelter and non-food items; health [including nutrition and psycho-social programmes]; water and sanitation; food; agriculture; protection-human rights-rule of law; multi-sector; education; mine action; coordination and support services; and economic recovery & infrastructure.)

3. **RESPONSE PLANS (1 PAGE)**

   For each sector that the Country Team decides to include:
   - Objectives (no more than two, each of which is specific and measurable)
   - What is the strategy for achieving the objectives
   - Humanitarian actions that can be implemented within the time span of this flash appeal (maximum 6 months)
   - Expected outputs and impacts
• Project tables as per model below (please do one table for each project and leave a space between each complete table).

NOTE: In a flash appeal there is no need for the CAP-style one-page project sheet. A summary box per project like the one below is sufficient.

| Project Summary |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Project Title:** Livelihood rehabilitation through provision of productive assets |
| **Objective:** To restore and strengthen the food security and livelihoods of small holder farmers and fishing families through the provision of relevant productive inputs (seed, fertiliser, fishing gear), technical support and support to community safety net and marketing systems. |
| **Beneficiaries:** 10,000 typhoon affected smallholder farming families and 5,000 typhoon affected fishing families |
| Partners: Department of Agriculture, Bureau of fisheries, Action Aid, CBOs, local NGOs |

4. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (0.5 PAGE)

• Maximum 10 lines on how the response is being coordinated and who is responsible within the government and the UN
• Table indicating cluster/sector leads and the major humanitarian stakeholders (e.g. Government, UN, Red Cross/Crescent of the country of operation, NGOs) that are responding to the crisis in affected regions, by sector.
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PREFACE

The disaster frequency is showing a rising trend. In the year June 2005 to June 2006, 404 disasters associated with natural hazards were recorded in 115 countries, killing more than 93,000 people, affecting almost 157 million people and causing economic damage amounting to USD 172 billion.

Disasters have a dramatic impact on the lives of people not least on their sources of livelihood and productive assets. They leave livelihoods shattered; houses, schools and other public facilities flattened; bridges and road networks collapsed; the geography of the zone sometimes transformed.

The impact of disasters hinders the capacity of affected groups to recover in the short-term and rebuild back their assets, thus often condemning the survivors to a long dependency on relief aid. In this context, helping protecting and rebuilding the livelihoods of those vulnerable to disasters becomes an urgent priority. Support to the recovery of means of living in farming, fisheries, rational use of natural resources, wage employment in primary and secondary sectors and services, small trade, micro- and small enterprises in the formal or informal sector, etc. have to be started as soon as possible in the immediate aftermath of a disaster.

Assessing the impact of disasters on the livelihoods of people and the capacity and opportunities for quick recovery and increased resilience to future events is an important part of the response to disasters. Yet current assessment systems are often weak, uncoordinated and are not strongly linked to livelihood recovery interventions. In order to improve understanding of the impact of disasters on livelihoods, FAO and ILO have jointly developed this Detailed Livelihood Assessment Toolkit (LAT). The LAT consists of three main technical elements: Livelihood Baseline Information (which is set-up pre-disaster); Livelihood Impact Scan (undertaken immediately after the disaster); and Livelihood Rapid Assessment (undertaken within three months after the disaster).

In the process of development, parts of this tool-kit have been tested, redefined and refined in a number of countries including Pakistan (2005 Kashmir earthquake); Indonesia (2006 volcanic eruption and earthquake in Yogyakarta); Philippines (2006 typhoon Reming); and Solomon Islands (2007 tsunami). The complete set has been tested in Bolivia and Indonesia. This process of continual learning and improvement continues, and so the current set of guidelines contained in these volumes should be seen as one stage in the development of the approach.

In this spirit, suggestions for improvement are welcomed and should be directed to: cruciani@ilo.org and neil.marsland@fao.org.

FAO Rome and ILO Geneva, July 2007
INTRODUCTION TO THE LIVELIHOOD ASSESSMENT TOOL-KIT

The Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit (LAT) consists of three inter-related tools: Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI), the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) and the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (RLA). The Tool-kit is designed for structured data collection at sudden onset natural disasters, with the intention to improve post-disaster relief and recovery interventions. The Tool-kit is planned to be expanded to cover also other types of emergencies.

The tools are designed for particular but related functions in the assessment process. Each of them can be used independently of the others, but combined use will greatly increase efficiency and (cost-) effectiveness. Similarly the tools can be executed by different people as indicated in the following table, but there are important advantages to work with a standard team. Each part may be used for different targets in terms of funding mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Programming / funding target</th>
<th>When and by whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBI</td>
<td>This set of socio-economic data gives quantitative and qualitative data on key aspects of livelihood systems (populations, wealth and poverty indicators, types of livelihood activities, employment and other sources of household incomes, occupations etc). LBI is to make clear the pre-disaster context of local livelihoods, which can be further built on during LIS and RLA, enhancing the power of these tools to make informed generalisations on the livelihood impact and opportunities presented by the disaster.</td>
<td>Provides data and information background to be immediately available after the occurrence of a disaster. It can then be used to elaborate quick briefs for Flash Appeal and Early Recovery Donor Conferences, as well as to inform relevant organizations and the public.</td>
<td>When? Time take to conduct LBI: 2 – 6 weeks (TO BE DONE BEFORE THE DISASTER) By whom? Mainly data analysts in (national or regional/local) governments/agencies, together with Universities/NGOs/UN-organizations and bilateral donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>The LIS concerns an initial ‘quick scan’ assessment of impact of disaster on livelihoods at &quot;local level&quot; – to be integrated into other (multi-)sectoral quick impact assessments and then fed into Flash Appeal proposal preparation.</td>
<td>LIS provides first-hand post-disaster information on the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods in the affected area. The new data are to be combined with the baseline information to give a solid basis for proposals on relief and initial recovery actions for the first Flash Appeals, Early Recovery Donor Conference, as well as other post-disaster livelihoods programmes.</td>
<td>When? Duration of assessment: 1 – 7 days Usual window for LIS: within first 10 days after disaster. By whom? Ideally the same team that worked on LBI; otherwise government and UN staff, together with consultants integrated into UNDAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>The RLA builds on the findings of the LIS to further assessment the impact of the disaster on local livelihoods. RLA focuses especially on recovery needs, opportunities and capacities at household, community and local level. It includes the conversion of the assessment findings into response options, containing strategy outlines, programme profiles and ideas for concrete projects</td>
<td>Provides a more detailed information and rationale for strategies, programmes and projects to be submitted to Revised Flash appeal and / or Early Recovery donor conference, for funding purposes, and / or development of Livelihood Recovery Strategies.</td>
<td>When? Duration of assessment: 30 days Usual window for RLA: within 90 days of the disaster. By whom? Ideally the same team that worked on LBI; otherwise multi-disciplinary, multi – agency teams, with gov. participation, led by ILO/FAO livelihood specialists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit, Volume One for a detailed introduction of the instruments and their relations.
ACRONYMS

ILO/FAO ‘Disaster Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit

LAT - Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit
LBI - Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LAT)
LIS - Livelihood Impact Scan (LAT)
LRA - Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LAT)

Other acronyms

AEZ - Agro-ecological zone
FAO - Food and Agricultural Organisation
FGD - focus group discussions
IDPs - Internally Displaced Persons
ILO - International Labour Office
NGO - non-governmental organisation
OCHA - UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
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PRA - participatory rural appraisal
SHG - self-help groups
SLA - sustainable livelihoods approach
SSI - semi-structured interviews
UNAIDS - UN organization for HIV/AIDS
UNESCO - UN Education and Science organisation
UNICEF - United Nations Children’s Fund
UNDAC - United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination
UNDP - United National Development Programme
UNRC - UN Resident Coordinator
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Objectives and scope of the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA)

1.1.1 Brief description of LRA

The Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA) aims to provide a thorough assessment of the impact of disaster on livelihoods and identify opportunities and capacities for recovery at household, community, and local economy levels. In doing so, it builds up on the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) that was conducted immediately after the disaster struck and the results of which were used for project preparation for the First Flash and the Early Recovery Donor Conference.

Building on the findings of the Livelihood Baseline Inventory (LBI), as well as the Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS), the RLA will seek to come up, if possible, with more detailed and quantitative information on the way the disaster has affected the normal livelihood situation in the area, and what is the need and scope for rebuilding and even expanding local livelihoods.

The main objective of the LRA is to provide a thorough assessment of the impact of disaster on livelihoods and identify opportunities and capacities for recovery at household, community, and local economy levels. The LRA is intended to serve as a platform for local and central government authorities, in partnership with locally active NGOs and the international community, to take informed decisions and to focus assistance by providing a sound basis on which livelihood recovery response plans and projects can be elaborated, as well as more long-term livelihood support policies can be formulated.

1.1.2 Links with other elements of the Livelihood Assessment Tool-kit

Whereas the LIS focuses on the need and scope for early emergency activities to safeguard existing livelihood activities to the extent possible, combined with possible opportunities for the promotion of new livelihood activities as part of relief efforts (eg. building repairs, maintenance and repair of buses and trucks bringing in emergency goods, etc.), the LRA is more geared towards initiating efforts to put the affected area's economy and livelihoods on its feet through rapid rehabilitation and early livelihood recovery interventions.

Ideally, the LRA should be used in conjunction with a pre-disaster Livelihood Baseline Inventory. The LBI would provide important contextualisation and quantification of the ‘normal’ livelihood situation and allow for an analysis of the changes provoked by the catastrophic event in a way to be able to plan and initiate corrective measures. Comparing the present situation with the previous one in the same area (the baseline) is important to increase the credibility of the LRA and its usefulness in forming the basis of project and programme proposals. In practice, however, it may not always be possible to dispose of a baseline constructed before a disaster. In such cases, the LRA should include the collection of some baseline information in a "reactive" way.

In the past the agricultural sector has usually been prioritized in the early responses to crisis, while other sources of livelihoods were underestimated by the international support. It is expected that the present Livelihoods Assessment Tool-kit will contribute to a more balanced approach in which the post-disaster livelihood recovery response, depending on the country
and the specific situation of the affected areas, is articulated through the formulation of a broad Livelihood Cluster Response Plan.

1.1.3 Time frame

The LRA aims to yield relevant information for the design of more elaborate livelihood-related project proposals for the Revised Flash Appeals and Early-Recovery Donor Conferences, so that there is some time for data collection and analysis. To be reviewed: Typically, a RLA will take around five weeks from start to finish. Still, the results still need to be available as soon as 6 to 8 weeks after a disaster.

Figure 1: Time frame of disaster and follow-up activities

1.2 Overview of RLA process

There will be time pressures when planning and implementing the LRA, and certain compromises will have to be made. There will be trade-offs between quality of the process and the need to get results out quickly, to meet deadlines imposed by the needs of the affected populations, governments and the international community.

The timeline and to some degree the structure of the RLA will also depend on whether the assessment builds on a pre-existing assessment preparedness “infrastructure” i.e. a series of measures that have taken place before the assessment starts. These will include:

- The existence of an up-to-date roster of international and local expertise, together with institutional procedures to ensure that persons can be mobilised and released from other duties at short notice - this would allow the RLA to start more quickly.
- The existence of a livelihood baseline for the area affected by disaster - this would reduce the time spent on Phase 1 of the RLA and help in focusing the assessment.
- The conduct of a Livelihood Impact Scan (LIS) immediate after the disaster (see LAT volume 2) - this would also help focusing the RLA itself.
- Pre-existing quick release budget for the RLA, and pre-allocation of logistical support - this would allow the RLA to be started more quickly and would also reduce time spent on Phase 1.
- Pre-selected and trained RLA team members - this would reduce the time spent on phase 3 and should improve the quality of the RLA output.

In practice, of course, natural disasters can arise unexpectedly or infrequently. For example, not all disasters occur in disaster-prone countries such as Indonesia or Bangladesh. Moreover, even in these countries, disaster may happen in unexpected areas. To cater for the fact that “RLA preparedness” may not have been carried out, these guidelines will take into consideration a situation in which none of the preparatory or prior actions indicated above have been carried out.

The following figure illustrates the phasing of a RLA.

---

1/ Including Revised Flash Appeals and Early Recovery Donor Conferences.
As indicated in the figure, the implementation of a RLA includes three broad phases:

**Phase 1 - Start up: initial information collection and detailed planning.** The first phase of the RLA is characterised by an intensive period of information gathering to update the initial picture of the situation and context that was made during the LIS (otherwise the team has to revisit the pre-disaster LBI, in absence of which an entirely fresh start has to be made). All available formal and informal sources will be tried. This period will also involve a lot of meetings to sort out logistics and planning the fieldwork. This phase also includes selecting the sample area, assembling the team, deciding on the timeframe, consolidating the budget and working out logistics such as transport and lodgings etc. At the end of this period, training of the RLA team for fieldwork will take place.

**Phase 2 - Fieldwork: a picture of the situation is gradually built up,** based on information gathered through semi-structured interviews, collation and analysis of information in the field.

**Phase 3 - Report writing, presentation and dissemination.** This final stage consists of the final analysis and write up of the actual assessment, presentation to government and dissemination. Subsequently a “road map” for livelihood recovery (eg. a draft logical framework) and related project proposals can be prepared.
SECTION 2

PHASE I - PREPARATIONS

2.1 Initial Information Collection And Detailed Planning

| Why: | To improve the results of the LIS and gain a better understanding of the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods of people affected and prospects for recovery of local livelihoods |
| When: | From the start of the assessment exercise |
| What: | Available information on (i) the underlying pre-disaster livelihoods of affected populations (baseline), (ii) magnitude of the disaster, areas and populations exposed to the disaster, and (iii) possible sources of livelihood recovery support for affected communities. |
| How: | Review of secondary data, interviews with key informants at national level |
| Who: | RLA team leader with local support |

Indicative timeframe: 5 days

2.1.1 Required information

Three basic types of information are needed in this phase:
- Pre-disaster data (livelihood baseline data)
- Data on the magnitude and location of the event(s) and the populations exposed
- Possible sources of support for affected populations

This can be compiled through a combination of secondary data collection and interviews with key informants. The depth of investigation that is necessary in the RLA to develop a picture of these three elements depends on what has gone before in related assessment processes. In particular, the RLA will benefit from a pre-existing Livelihood Baseline Inventory (see LAT volume 2) and immediate post-disaster Livelihood Impact Scan (see LAT volume 3). The rest of this section will proceed on the assumption that neither a livelihood baseline nor an ILIA has been done.

(i) Livelihood baseline data

Baseline data on local livelihoods is required to help estimate the magnitude of the impact of the disaster on livelihoods. The key aspects of baseline data will include: population numbers; “normal” livelihood activities for the area and time of year (farming, fishing, ‘informal’ non-agricultural activities, wage labour, etc.), together with the numbers of people involved in these activities. Other kinds of information needed concerns: physical infrastructure (eg. roads, electricity, water and markets), availability of financial and business development services for farming and non-farming activities, and on-going (and planned) socio-economic projects implemented by government, NGOs and donors.

Key sources of such baseline data include:
- Government census data and reports;
- Official statistics for the area (from the Central or local Statistical Office, Employment Office, Market Authorities, Social Security Agency, retail and development banks)
- Statistical surveys from government ministries, universities, NGOs, UN agencies or IFIs;
- Socio-economic, political and historical studies by research groups, government or university;
- National or regional disaster-preparedness plans;
- Existing geographic information systems in the area (if any);

Much of this section is taken from section 2 of the LIS.
Clearly, it will not be possible to compile an inventory from disparate sources, thus progress mapping the actual and possible capacity of non-UN agencies to support livelihood recovery.

(ii) Initial severity and exposure information

At the same time that baseline data is being collected, it will be important to gather information on the magnitude and location of the disaster(s) and the populations exposed. This intelligence may come from many of the same sources which provide baseline information. Communication with National Government Disaster Management, OCHA, UNOSAT, WFP, Press, Radio and Television bulletins will be important.

The key questions here are:

- What is the nature, extent and magnitude of the shock/crisis?
- What geographical areas have been affected?
- How have they been affected? (hectares of agric land destroyed, estimates of tonnes of production lost, numbers of cattle killed, value of these losses, factories destroyed, shops collapsed, areas of informal trade destroyed, etc.).
- Which groups of people have been affected (livelihood types) and numbers,
- What is the current information and knowledge on level of disruption to livelihood activities (including market disruptions) ?
- How are people coping with the disaster?

(iii) Relief and Recovery Information

One other important element of initial data gathering concerns actual and potential sources of support for affected populations. This will help determine the magnitude and need for additional support through any UN appeal process, as well as potential partners. Whilst an understanding of livelihoods will include likely coping capacity, this is not the same thing as mapping the actual and possible capacity of non-UN agencies to support livelihood recovery. Clearly, it will not be possible to compile an inventory from disparate sources, thus progress in collecting this information will depend on how centralised and comprehensive it is. Notwithstanding this, key issues and possible sources of information are indicated in the following table:

---

3 Examples here would include forced migration and cessation of remittances from areas struck by the disaster.
4 Initial hypotheses on impact can usefully be informed by the “typical effects” of different kinds of disaster shown in Annex 4.
In cases where assessment preparedness has been undertaken, partners will have been pre-selected, prospective RLA team members already trained and logistical agreements already made. On the contrary, when previous preparation has not been dealt with, all these issues will need to be sorted out on the ground. This has a time implication, possibly of a couple of days. The following paragraphs therefore apply only to the latter situation. All of the following will need to be conducted concurrently with initial information collection (see Section 2.1 above).

2.2.1 Institutional partners and LRA Team

The selection of key partners constitutes an important moment. Some may be carried over from the LBI and LIS exercises. Others are standard key stakeholders in the post-disaster context. Others again are prominent players in the local environment. Key partners should be organisations who agree to cooperate and provide human, logistical and possibly financial resources for the data collection, processing, analysis and dissemination of the results. Subsequently, the identification of individuals and training of the team can take place.
With regard to the kind of partners to work with, the most relevant are: (i) UN agencies and in
particular the UN Resident Coordinator (UNRC), OCHA and UNDP, assisted by FAO and
ILO; (ii) relevant national institutions to ensure maximum government ‘buy-in’ and to have
government staff on the assessment team; and (iii) local NGOs and donor agencies.

Government should be encouraged to provide both human and where possible financial
resources. Many of the NGOs can provide human resources, often trained in Participatory
Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques. International NGOs should be encouraged to engage in
joint efforts\(^5\); they may also have their own resources. National NGOs may have lower
financial resources, but will have more experience of local conditions and terrain. It will
probably be worthwhile to approach other donors, both multilateral and bilateral, particularly
those who have an affinity for livelihoods approaches, either for human or financial support.

The most relevant key partners will be asked to propose candidates for the RLA Team.
National consultants are another possible source of recruits for the team. The aim is to have
a multi-disciplinary team with a variety of complementary skills, bringing experiences from a
broad range of backgrounds and institutions to provide varied perspectives and viewpoints.
Due consideration should be given to an appropriate gender balance of the team. At least
some of the members should speak the local languages.

2.2.2 Calculating survey costs

It is clearly impossible to give a definitive figure or range for the costs of a RLA as much will
depend upon circumstances and local conditions. The following budget is based on
the actual costs of a RLA done after the Pakistan earthquake. The RLA team consisted of one
international team leader and six locally recruited team members. The Assessment lasted for
a period of 3 weeks of field work and one week for report writing.

**Table: Example of RLA Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense items</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 International staff costs: salaries/fees, DSA, airfare</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Internationally recruited RLA Team Leader (for 4 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 National staff costs: (i) salary top-ups, fees, DSA (ii) additional staff (eg. consultants)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Government staff salaries normally met by government, but may need some salary top-up for long hours Out-of-station DSA for local staff Possible hiring of additional staff for admin, translation, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Vehicle hire, fuel, etc.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>These costs can be reduced if UN agency or partner vehicles are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tents and bedding</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Sleeping accommodation may be in short supply making purchase of tents and sleeping bags necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hotel costs during survey</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Not always necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Food and provisions</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>General provisioning for field operations; lunches, meals, snacks, water, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Office supplies, photocopying, etc</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Allow for large amount of photocopying of forms, checklists, responses, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Miscellaneous (eg. 10%)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>Unexpected items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) International NGOs like IFRC, Save the Children, Oxfam, Mercy Corps, Care among others may be available in the field and willing to collaborate.
3.1 Area and settlement selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What:</th>
<th>Choosing geographical areas and settlements for survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How:</td>
<td>zoning in conjunction with exposure information, purposeful sampling, random sampling as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who:</td>
<td>RLA team in consultation with local experts and contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1 Criteria for selection of areas for assessment

The best area for livelihood assessment through the RLA will be determined by a combination of (i) the nature of the disaster and (ii) the human, financial and logistical resources available for the exercise. In all cases, the aim is the same: to gain a holistic picture of the extent of the damage done to people’s livelihoods, and the capacities and opportunities for recovery and increased resilience, at the household, community and local area levels, in rural and/ or urban contexts as appropriate.

All other things being equal, the degree to which a holistic picture of impact can be obtained will obviously be different in the case of a disaster with a large and diffuse impact (eg. a tsunami), than one with a more geographically focussed impact (eg. a land slide). In the latter case, it will be easier to be more comprehensive and therefore to come up with a representative assessment. Where there is large and diffuse impact, it will be more challenging to achieve representativeness, and it may be necessary to complete the findings of the RLA with extrapolations derived from the LBI. It should be noted that even with relatively geographically contained disasters, the livelihood impacts may spread well outside the actual disaster site due to market disruptions and forced migration. The RLA should also attempt to capture these broader dynamics.

Livelihood “zones” In most rural areas, a useful starting point for sampling is to divide up affected areas into livelihood “zones”, within which people share broad common livelihood-sustaining activities and goals. In settled rural areas it is often straightforward to derive livelihood zones as these are often closely related to agro-ecological zones (AEZs). Such AEZs often have been delineated by the Ministry of Agriculture, in collaboration with development partners. It should be made clear, however, that AEZs are not the same thing as livelihood zones, as the former do not capture the full range of factors that influence livelihood patterns (so for example it is possible to have more than one broad livelihood group within an AEZ, in separate or overlapping geographical areas). More fundamentally, livelihood zoning is usually on the basis of AEZs is generally not relevant for non-agricultural activities. Moreover, such zoning is likely to be much more challenging and may not be possible in peri-urban or urban areas. If neither up-to-date livelihood zones nor AEZ zoning has taken place, a rapid zoning can be undertaken (see LAT volume 5).

IDPs In addition it is important to consider the post-disaster dispersion of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). If the RLA is taking place a month or more after the disaster, it is possible that IDP camps have already been set up and these will have their own evolving livelihood patterns and may consist of people who have migrated from different livelihood zones. They should be treated as distinct areas within a broad geographical zoning.

Exposure to natural disaster: As noted above, in some cases it will not be practicable to develop livelihood zones. This may be the case if the disaster strikes peri-urban and urban

---

6/ Household selection is covered under Phase 2 of the RLA.
areas. In these cases, the primary stratification criterion may be severity of impact, as indicated by extent of damage to communal and personal physical assets such as roads, buildings, electricity, water and telecommunications. In this way, it may be possible to divide areas into (for example) “high exposure”, “moderate exposure” and “slight exposure”, clearly stating the criteria for classification. In any case, even in rural areas where livelihood zoning would be possible, sampling of population settlements should also be influenced by degree of exposure to the hazard (see next sub-section).

### 3.1.2 Sampling of Settlements

Depending on where the disaster has struck, the RLA may have to cover urban, peri-urban or rural areas or some combination of the three. This fact has implications for sampling methods.

In general terms, once a zoning scheme has been worked out the next step is to choose representative settlements within each zone. This consists of two stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Box 1: Sampling of settlements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Define an overall sampling frame</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sampling frame is the list of the overall number of settlements within an area affected by the disaster, from which the sample is drawn. In an urban or peri-urban setting, the settlements may be different neighbourhoods (including slum areas). In rural areas they will be villages or hamlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Selection of settlements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once the list has been drawn up then sample settlements will need to be selected. Depending on the size of the zone, and the degree of exposure to the event, a decision about the number of settlements to select within it will need to be made. This will depend totally on the geographical magnitude and severity of the problem, accessibility, human resources and time available. After these factors have been taken into account and an overall sample size decided upon, one way of proceeding is to select settlements at random within each zone (adjusting for severity of exposure to decide on size of sample within each zone) and then to use the knowledge of local people to ensure that obvious biases are avoided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3

PHASE II - FIELDWORK

3.1 Methodology

| What: | The LRA builds up on the findings of the LIS and LBI. It includes fieldwork at zonal, district, community and household levels; collation and analysis of information to be done “as you go” in the field. |
| How: | Semi-structured interviewing is the core tool. A variety of other tools may be used if time and expertise permit. Templates are important for collation and analysis of data in the field. |
| Who: | RLA field teams. |
| Indicative timeframe: | 14 days |

3.1.1 Driving questions

Using the sustainable livelihoods framework as a guide, the RLA fieldwork is intended to answer the following questions:

- Under normal circumstances what are the main livelihood activities in the area? Are they based on local raw materials? On local market? How much competition is there?
- What are the main sources of financial services for livelihoods: (rural) banks, NGOs, savings and credit unions, money lenders? Are they locally available?
- What are the main sources of business development services: skills training, Business Plan preparation, marketing assistance, business information, technology support, counselling? Are they locally available?
- What are the most and the least affected livelihoods? Are they found in particular areas/settlements? What are main coping strategies of owners and workers?, How effective / damaging are these?, Has the situation already started to improve, or is it still getting worse?
- In what way, and to what extent have these livelihoods been affected by the disaster: destroyed workshops and equipment?, workers who have died, wounded, departed? unavailability of production inputs? increased prices of materials, intermediate goods, manpower?, disrupted transport or communication?, interruptions in marketing? lack of demand since people have to buy food at much higher prices?
- What are the main local business organisations? what are their main activities? (eg. solidarity; provision of services to members’ businesses; lobbying)? Are they still functioning? What role could they play in recovery interventions?
- What are the priorities for assisting the people to get back to work: repair/reconstruction of stores and workshops?, supply of production inputs?, amounts of credit for repairs and stocking up supplies?, restoring regular transport and communications?, skills training for participation in emergency relief operations?
- What are the main suggestions for involvement of the local business sector beyond the immediate relief actions? And what could it contribute itself towards subsequent recovery interventions? Do they relate to special actions to secure adequate production inputs, ensure workspace, make available marketing opportunities, or other types of actions?
- What are the opportunities and capacities for vulnerability reducing livelihood recovery within the local economy (“building back better”)?
- What types of activities are needed for vulnerability reducing livelihood recovery of the different people, households and communities (“building back better”)?
3.1.2 Levels of inquiry

In order to get answers to these questions, fieldwork is conducted at five levels:
- District / area
- Local market
- Community (rural village and/or urban/ peri-urban neighbourhood)
- Intra-community gender groups
- Household

At each level, different but complementary questions are asked. This is because certain individuals and groups will be best placed to give information on certain aspects of the disaster sequence and/or livelihood framework and it is important to tailor questioning with this in mind. Ideally, the RLA team should be divided up, so that different individuals or pairs focus on different levels or types of questioning, with pairs coming together during daily analysis sessions to compare notes and triangulate.

At district level the focus will be on understanding (i) how different institutions and organisations serving the needs of local communities have been affected by the disaster and what are the prospects for recovery and (ii) getting an overview of the impact on livelihoods in the area. One specific issue looked at this level is the functioning of local labour markets.

In addition to these district level discussions, interviews are conducted with the business sector, to inquire about usual way in which the people in the area earn their income and the impact of the crisis on this, and market traders, to find out how the markets for essential food and non-food items are working in a particular area and how these have been affected by the disaster.

At the local community level, group interviews will be used to get a general picture of the impact of the disaster on how people make a living in the community and to establish how the community is sub-divided into groups (depending on circumstances this could be in terms of wealth groups/ ethnic groups/ livelihood types/ degree of exposure to the disaster). Gender focus group discussions should also be held within communities, with groups of men and women being interviewed separately.

At household level, questions will be more specific, and will focus on assets and the coping strategies being used by men and women, girls and boys as a result of the disaster.

The core tool in the RLA is semi-structured interviewing (SSI) using checklists. SSI is used at each of the levels of district/sub-district; market; community/settlement, gender group and household level. Depending on time and expertise, additional tools may be used to supplement the SSI questioning (see LAT volume 5).

The following table highlights the types of information gathered at the different levels of the fieldwork.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Secondary data and national level key informants | • nature, extent and magnitude of the shock/crisis  
• geographical areas have been affected  
• groups of people have been affected (livelihood types) and numbers, current information and knowledge on level of disruption to livelihood activities (including market disruptions) |
| District / area level                       | • impact of the disaster on key (public, private, international) organisations and enterprises in the disaster affected areas  
• general impact of the disaster on the livelihoods in the area  
• impact of the disaster on local labour markets |
| Market trader / shop keeper                 | • availability, demand for and cost of essential food and non-food items  
• effects of the disaster on local production of goods and especially services (eg. MSEs) and local trade (eg. retail and wholesale activities) |
| Community level key informants             | • the most important livelihood activities in the community and when these normally take place in the year  
• the overall impact of the disaster on livelihood activities in the community, together with current and proposed responses  
• the potential role of community groups in livelihood recovery  
• high priority needs of local consumers and producers  
• identification of most and least affected groups in the community |
| Gender FGD                                 | • disaster impact on men and women - as consumers and producers |
| Households                                 | • most important pre-disaster assets and household sources of livelihood  
• the impact of the disaster on these assets and livelihood activities  
• livelihood coping strategies  
• the main short and longer-term priorities and needs in the community |

### 3.2 Interviews at District Level

**Goals:**
1. To complement the data collected from secondary sources and enhance the understanding of the impact of the disaster on the people living in the affected area and especially on their livelihoods, together with more general impact on the labour market
2. To take stock of response readiness, capacity and intentions of key (public, private and international) organisations that support productive livelihoods in the disaster affected areas
3. To identify the need and scope for early recovery activities, together with possible strategies and actors/ partners.

**Method:**
Convene meetings with representatives of several types of key organisations — to get cross fertilisation of views and triangulation. If this is not possible, different key informants will need to be interviewed separately. Expand?

### 3.2.1 Interviews with local government

A first port of call would be the local authorities, to inform them of the LRA exercise and inquire in which way they would want to link with it. They may also have pertinent information and might be helpful in organising the visits to the communities. The interviews should take 1½-2½ hours.

**Core questions:**
• What are the main ways in which people make a living in this area? Probe for differences using relevant categories and try to link to the categories contained in the livelihood baseline e.g.: smallholder farming; government services and modern firms;
informal sector activities such as trade, repairs and manufacturing workshops; casual and seasonal labour; migrant labour and remittances; pensions, etc.

- What are the main difference between men and women in terms of making a living?
- What has been the impact of the disaster on how people make a living in the area?
- Which groups have been most affected and why? Specifically:
  - By geographical location
  - By gender
  - By gender of household head
  - By sector, trade or occupation
  - By wealth or socio-economic status
  - By age (young children, elderly)
  - Other factors (health or handicaps, ethnicity, etc)
- What are the immediate priorities for support?
- What role should be played by each institution, and what resources supplied, in the early recovery phase?
- What changes are required for longer-term recovery of affected populations and reducing vulnerability to similar events in future? (e.g. diversification of livelihood base; changes in agricultural and/or MSE policies; labour migration issues; improved infrastructure; better living conditions – education, health, housing, etc.)

3.2.2 Interviews with NGOs and other local organisations

As it will almost certainly not be possible to interview each individual organisation affected by the crisis, it will be necessary to talk to representatives of types of organisations. The following is a list of 11 types of organisations that should be targeted (some may be combined). If all were to be interviewed the process could take a number of days, so it will probably be important to prioritise. At a bare minimum, it will normally be important to talk to local government officials. The interviews should take 1-1½ hours.

Potential key organisations:
- District government (local administration, including heads of relevant line agencies)
- Special created government agencies to cope with the crisis
- Traditional leaders
- Business organizations’ leaders
- NGO groups (local and international) and civil society organizations
- Private sector groups: shopkeepers, produce traders, input suppliers, transporters
- Religious organizations / groups
- Community-based organizations
- Women’ organizations
- Youth organizations
- Disabled organizations (both general advocacy and specific service providers)

Core questions:
- Who are your clients?
- What kind of activities do you normally carry out to support local livelihoods?
- What information you have about the ways in which the disaster has affected the livelihoods of your clients? How are they coping? Do you have any kind of statistics or analysis?
- How has the disaster affected your activities, and how are you coping with this?
- What are the prospects for recovery of your organisation / enterprise?
- What assistance is needed for your recovery in the short term?
- What changes are required for longer term recovery of your organisation and reducing vulnerability to similar events in future?
3.2.3 Labour market investigation at District Level

Owing to its important role as a determinant of livelihood status, the impact of the crisis on the local labour market deserves special attention. During LRA, essentially the same kind of information should be collected as during LIS – only more effort, time and resources should be spend to ensure a proper understanding of the local/regional labour market in relation to livelihoods, especially of the poor.

Table: Population and (un)employment*/ by sex in Area X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working age population (15-65 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth population (15-24 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of working age not active */</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (open)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty levels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % Population living at/below USD 1/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % Population living at/below USD 2/day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested sources: most of the information can be obtained from the latest Population Census and Labour Market Surveys. If such secondary data is not available, the information could be collected through interviews with key informants, community-based quick scans and focus-group discussions.

Notes:
*/ See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.
**/ Including: children under working age limit (15 yrs), retired persons (65 yrs and more), students (not available for work), persons full-time engaged in housekeeping, and the handicapped.

Table: Employment by sector*/ and employment status**/ in Area* Village X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self empl.</th>
<th>Wage</th>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Family help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and fisheries ***/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce, restaurants, hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business services (banking, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social and communal services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: */ If no detailed sectoral information is available, collect data for agriculture, industry and services
**/ See LAT volume 2 for a further explanation of the terms used.
***/ If possible break down into sub-sectors (e.g. commercial agriculture, subsistence farming, etc.).
Source and reference data.

At the same time, one should be realistic and not expect that all key informants have clear cut answers to these questions. They are not familiar with to the categories used and often have, at best, partial information. It happens sometimes that estimates have been convincingly made, turned out to be way off the mark. Continuously checking of information received is therefore important.
Potential key informants for this exercise include:
- Ministry of labour officials if available
- Relevant local government officers
- Representatives of small business organisations
- Chamber of Commerce
- Representatives of trade unions and employers federations
- Local leaders

Core questions on employment and labour market issues:
- Under normal circumstances, at this time of year, what are the most important ways in which households generate an income through their labour?
  \textit{Depending upon circumstances; prompt with the following:}
  a) Unskilled agricultural labour (specify own plots or working for others)
  b) Self-employment in non-agricultural income-generating activities
  c) Casual jobs as unskilled labour in or outside farming (specify)
  d) Petty trading (eg. ambulant trading, market stalls, small groceries)
  e) Work in manufacturing and repair micro- and small enterprises
  f) Employees in modern sector (special public or private sector)
  g) Seasonal labour migration
- Roughly what proportion of households in the district/settlement would be engaged in these kinds of work? (proportional piling or similar method can be used here)
- How many man, women and youth in the district/settlement cannot find work?
- Are the children normally going to school? Up to what age? How do the get work skills (Vocational Training Centres, as apprentices)? Do they find work when they finish? Or do they leave the district/settlement?
- What would be the normal rate of payment for such work? How are they now?
- Are there differences between men and women, girls and boys as to the types of work done and the payment received? – specify
- How many of the households in the district/settlement are extremely poor [less than USD 1 per day] and how many are poor [less than USD 2 per day]? How many households can be considered rich?
- What has been the impact of the disaster on all the above employment issues? (proportions of households engaging in different types of labour; unemployment; wage levels and poverty; differences between men, women, girls, boys)
- What does this impact mean in terms of livelihood outcomes such as food security, ability to send children to school, ability to afford health care?
- What would be the most effective ways to improve the employment situation in the district/settlement in the short- and medium-term?
- What are new interesting opportunities for employment creation after the disaster?

3.2.4 Interviews with the business sector

Next it is suggested to hold interviews with the business sector. They make good key informants on the usual way the people in the area earn their income and the effects that the crisis has had in this respect.

Core questions on local business development:
- Under normal circumstances what are the main livelihood activities in the area? Are they based on local raw materials? On local market?
- In what way, and to what extent have these livelihoods been affected by the disaster? What are the most and the least affected? What is the exact nature of the problems – destroyed workshops and equipment, unavailability/increased prices of production inputs, interruptions in marketing, lack of demand?
• What are the main business organisations in the areas and what are their main activities (eg. solidarity, through mutual insurance and credit mechanisms; provision of services to members’ businesses - specify; lobbying on behalf of members with local or national authorities)? Are they still functioning? What role could they play in recovery interventions?
• What are the main suggestions for involvement of the local business sector in the immediate relief actions? And what could it contribute towards subsequent recovery interventions? Do they relate to special actions to secure adequate production inputs, ensure workspace, make available marketing opportunities, or other types of actions?

3.2.5 Interviews with market traders/ shopkeepers

Interviews with market traders and shop keepers is useful to get a good understanding of the availability, demand for and cost of essential food and non-food items and the effects of the disaster on individual retail and wholesale businesses.

Method: maybe we need to indicate method for the other types of interviews?
Interview wholesalers and retailers, and try and get a spread of market stall traders and shopkeepers. As a rough rule of thumb, try to get at least 3 interviews from each group in a town (3 x 4 groups = 12 interviews); there may only be 1 shop in a small village, but get at least 3 interviews from different small villages in the same area. The interview should not take more than 30 – 40 minutes per interview.

Core questions on trading and transport:
• What are the main items that you normally sell? Approximately how many traders/ shop keepers like you were there in this town/ village/ neighbourhood before the disaster?
• How many of those are still operating now?
• Where do you normally get your supplies from? Have the supplies been affected, and, if so, how: agricultural fields destroyed, wholesalers of non-food items affected, supply routes closed, increased supply prices?
• Roughly how much would you purchase per week or month before the disaster? How much do you purchase now?
• If they say there have been fewer people buying, ask what the reasons are. (People have lost income; migrated…)
• How do you usually get the goods from your supplier to your business? (Have own transport? Hire private transport/ use buses? Wholesaler delivers?)
• How much did transport cost before the disaster? How much does it cost now? Why has it changed?
• Do you have normally any (paid) workers in your business? How many? Are they still working now? if not why not?
• In relation to what you the main items that you sell, roughly how much of each item would you be selling per day (max. – min., use local units of price or quantity)?
• How many are you selling now after the disaster? What are the reasons for differences between now and normal times?
• Ask for current and pre-disaster retail prices of key food and non-food items. Note that for many foods, multiple varieties will be available; ask what type poorer people most commonly buy, and then use that consistently. The list will need to be tailored to suit the local circumstances.
3.3 Interviews at Community Level

After the interviews in the district centre (or regional/rural headquarters of the area concerned), the information collection as part of the Livelihood Rapid Assessment (LRA) moves to the micro-level: the villages, settlements and communities. Opportunities to do so will depend on possibilities to travel (in spite of the disaster), availability of transport (and thus budget), and time. Generally such visits are of prime importance: in spite of all the interviews at district level, first hand impressions and information are important input to the creative process of putting forward suggestions for short- and medium term suggestions and proposals.

3.3.1 Community Focus Groups Discussions

A relative effective way of getting information at community level, is to form focus groups to which all community key informants have been invited: community leaders, head master/principal of the local schools, director of the bank, most important trader, representatives of government ministries/ agencies (eg. agricultural extension, basic services, education, environment, etc.).

Goals:
1. To establish the most important livelihood activities in the community and when these take place in the year
2. To assess overall impact of the disaster on livelihood activities in the community and explore current responses
3. To identify the potential role of community groups in livelihood recovery
4. To understand current responses and high priority needs
5. To take stock of the suggestions and proposals at community level for relief and recovery interventions.

Method:
• Get together a group of 6-12 people who are well informed about the socio-economic aspects of the community
• Introduce the entire team and the purpose of the assessment, emphasizing that the community will be informed about the outcomes and involved in the follow-up
• The whole discussion should not take more than 2 – 3 hours.

Discussion on livelihood sources:

First, establish the manner in which the community members earned an income before the disaster:
• Make a list of the ways in which people in the community normally make a living
• Ask which activity was most important to people in the community, them second, etc.
• Find out the seasonality of different activities, focussing on the most important sources of food and income. USE SEASONAL CALENDAR if possible (see below for details).

Then, second, establish the effects of the disaster:
• In what ways (if any) has the way that people obtain food and money been affected?
• Which groups have been most affected and why? (by trade or occupation; by gender; by gender of household head; by age group; by wealth or socio-economic status; by geographical location (within the area of the community); by ethnicity; other factors)
• What changes are expected over the coming months and why?
Next, thirdly, inquire about the **social fabric of the community:**

- Ask what functional community groups or organizations are there, how long established, what they do, how many members, how active, etc. (examples: religious groups/ churches; ethnic groups; business organisations; cooperatives; sports associations; women’s and youth groups; self-help groups; other)
- Who participates in the different groups?
- How has the disaster affected the different groups?
- What role could local organisations play in the immediate post-disaster recovery and longer-term rehabilitation?
- Have any new groups been created after the disaster?, what are these groups doing? (eg. self-help groups set up by the community; distribution committees set up by external international NGOs).

Finally, use the community discussions to find out **what happened after the disaster:**

- Ask about responses so far: from government, UN and humanitarian agencies, etc. Who has received support, what was it, has any group been missed out?
- What are the immediate high-priority needs amongst the different groups in the community? How should existing responses be improved?
- What concrete and practical things should be prioritised for longer-term recovery of affected populations and reducing vulnerability to similar events in future?

### 3.3.2 Interviews At Household Level

**Goals**

1. To establish the impact of the disaster on livelihood assets, activities and outcomes at the household level
2. To find out how the household is dealing / coping with the damage / loss of assets;
3. To establish what are the main short and longer-term priorities, needs and opportunities.

**Method:**

1. Recommended that RLA team members work in pairs;
2. Interview head of household;
3. Introduce the team and the purpose of the assessment;
4. Ask questions on the following topics.

**Target time:** 1.5 - 2 hours

**Interviews with individual households:**

First, gather information about the **household itself:**

- After the introductions, start the interview with something along the lines of: “We want to understand your life and ways of making a living before the disaster and then compare it with the situation now so that we can see the changes that have come about as the result of the disaster”
- Before the disaster, how many people resided in this household (only those who cook and eat together - not the extended family), what was the age and gender of each member; if some member normally worked for some time at some other location (seasonal migration) count that person as a member.

Then, secondly, inquire about the **human capital** of the household:

- Ask about the education level of the household head and other adults in the household
- What skills did people possess in the household (farming, carpentry, teaching etc)
- Ask about school attendance for children of school age (usually 7-14).
• Ask about health, was anyone sick or mentally handicapped in the household? In what way has the disaster affected the health of the household, any injuries, illnesses, deaths?
• What impact has this had on the household’s ability to make a living? (e.g. fewer people able to work in the fields / increased care burden on women / loss of employment / interruptions of work in own business-es)
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact with regard to livelihoods?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

Next, thirdly, inquire about the ‘natural capital’
• Before the disaster, what was access to land, water, forest, fishing resources before the disaster? (land owned / cultivated, proximity of fresh water, proximity and availability of forest products, accessibility to fishing areas?)
• What has been the impact of the disaster on access to these natural resources?
• What do these changes in access mean for the ability of the household to make a living?
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

Then, fourth, ask about the household’s ‘physical assets’ and about ‘infrastructure’
• Before the disaster, what kinds and levels of productive assets were accessed by the household? (e.g. livestock – types and amounts; tools for agricultural and non-agricultural production such as hoes, irrigation infrastructure, shops, sheds, fishing gear, bicycles).
• What has been the impact of the disaster on access to these private physical assets?
• What do these changes in access mean for the household’s ability to make a living?
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

• Has the disaster had any impact on the household’s housing situation? – physical damage? ability to access building materials?
• Has the disaster had any impact on access and use of roads and transport facilities?, public water and sanitation supplies?
• What do these changes in access mean for the ability of the household to make a living?
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

Next, fifth, inquire about the ‘financial assets’ of the household – before and after the disaster:
• Before the disaster, what were the main sources of access to finance for the household:
  – formal credit? – sources, types, amounts
  – informal credit? – sources, types, amounts
  – savings – in cash and kind (e.g. livestock)
• What has been the impact of the disaster on access to these flows and stocks?
• What do these changes in access mean for the ability of the household to make a living?
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

Then, six, inquire about the ‘social capital’ of the household – before and after the disaster:
• Under normal circumstances, which are the sources of support that households expect to be able to call on for assistance in hard times (clan members, family members, self-help groups, credit and savings groups, church groups, community leaders etc), and what kinds and levels of support would these sources be expected to provide? (e.g. cash – including remittances, food, seed, labour, access to other resources)
• Under normal circumstances what are the obligations of the household to provide support for others? To whom would support be provided, how much and in what forms (e.g. cash, food, labour, access to other resources)
• What has been the impact of the disaster on these sources of support and obligations?
• What do these changes in access mean for the ability of the household to make a living?
• What strategies are being used to cope with the impact?
• Are these strategies sustainable / not sustainable – why / why not?

Next, seven, list any formal income and commodity transfers that benefit the household and note the way they have been affected by the disaster:
• Does the household normally receive income or commodity transfers from formal institutions? – this would include the state, NGOs, UN. What are the types of transfer (e.g. pension, food aid, how much and how often?)
• After the disaster, have there been any changes on the levels or amounts of resources being received from these channels?

And finally, eight, inquire into the needs of the household in the wake of the disaster and suggestions to deal with them:
• What concrete and practical things can be done to assist households to get back on their feet immediately –
  – To restore their livelihood (means of living)
  – To restore their quality of life (shelter, health, food, etc)\(^7\)
• What concrete and practical things should be prioritised for longer term recovery of the household and reducing vulnerability to similar events in future? (PROBE FOR POLICY CHANGES AS WELL AS STRENGTHENED ASSETS). Include not only the restoration of prior situation but also training in new skills, developing new enterprises, protecting against future similar disasters, etc.

Note: Get people to prioritise and quantify these. PROPORTIONAL PILING AND RANKING AND SCORING METHODS ARE USEFUL HERE.

3.3.3 Gender Focus Group

Objectives:
To understand how the crisis has affected gender roles and what are priorities for support post-crisis.

Method:
Take two groups, one male only and one female only, ideally 6 – 12 persons in each group

Target time:
One – two hours

It is recommended that where possible a group of women and a group of men are interviewed separately in each community visited. Selection of the groups can be done

\(^7\) Get people to prioritise and quantify these. Proportional piling and ranking and scoring methods are useful here.
randomly or through the community level key informants. Those participating in these group interviews are in effect gender key informants. They will be asked to speak on behalf of all the men and all the women in the community.

- What has been the impact of the crisis on income earned, jobs done and productive assets owned by women and men?
- What are the demographic changes as a result of the crisis, including
  - Numbers of female-headed household *de facto* and *de jure* (reasons for and changes, such as death, migration, etc. of male head of HH)?
  - Numbers of single male headed households?
  - Numbers of child-headed households?
  - Increased burden for grandparents to look after children and find income source?
- For female-headed households, have the following factors changed?
  - Land tenure arrangements (can female-headed own land, etc, what happens to access to land of the household when women are without husbands?)
  - Access to income earning opportunities and social networks without male partner (positive, negative, reasons?)
  - Dependency ratios (Number of extended HH members under the care of the female-headed HH)
- What are the ways in which men and women are coping with the current situation?
  - Married men and women living together with children
  - Single men with / without children
  - Single women with / without children

What would be the most appropriate ways to support men and women to get back on their feet so that they can earn a livelihood and feed themselves and their dependents?

- Married men and women living together with children
- Single men with / without children
- Single women with / without children

### 3.4 Information Collation and Analysis in the Field

As the RLA progresses, it is important to capture relevant data right from the start of the fieldwork and to keep the analysis, if at possible, up-to-date on a daily basis. One way to do this is to develop information grids for the different lists with questions, eg. using computer spreadsheets. Different grids will be necessary for the different lists. By having one uniform grid for each list, it is easier to analyse information from different organisations, communities and households.

An example of such a grid for the household level checklist in one community is given below. Here, the columns consist of key livelihood related issues/questions and in the rows different households in the community. The example concerns an information grid for one village/community:

---

8/ A matrix similar to this was used in a RLA carried out shortly after the Pakistan earthquake in 2005.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household number and type</th>
<th>Main source of livelihood</th>
<th>Key impact of disaster on assets</th>
<th>Coping strategies</th>
<th>Current outcomes</th>
<th>Priority needs Short-term</th>
<th>Priority needs Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| HH1: well – off in valley, away from main land slides + cracks | Remittance 60% Milk sales 20%, Crop sales 20% | -Hum.Mortality: nil  
-An. Mortality:  
2 milk cows  
-Buildings damaged 30%  
-Land/teraces damaged 50% | Reliance on remittance – now 90%  
-Rebuilding from own resources  
-Use own food stocks | -Resilient and soon in position to help others  
-Remedial shelter before winter | -Rebuild shelter before winter  
-Restock - Land levelling - Terrace repair |
| HH 2: Poor on middle slopes, affected by land-slides | MSE sales 30% Migration 20% Sale of own labour 50% | -Hum.mortality:  
1 HH head killed  
-An. Mortality:  
-Work oxen killed  
-Buildings destroyed  
-Main home badly damaged | Reliance on government handouts and neighbours’ charity  
-Migration to camps for winter | -Heavily traumatised - Food insecure | -Food  
-Rebuild shelter before winter - Livestock support - Skill development - Marketing support for MSEs |
| HH 3: very poor  
HH4: middleclass | | | | | |

It is important to ensure that data grids like this one, are updated every day when the team meets to brainstorm. It may be a good idea to have one person whose sole responsibility is to keep such matrices up-to-date, spending survey days entering data from the previous day’s notes. These grids will be important during analysis. It will be necessary to decide on the key issues/questions for the columns prior to commencement of the survey, and this will to a large extent dovetail with, and be dictated by, the question checklists.

When the survey is finished there will be a large amount of raw data in the matrices that will need to be summarised, and analysed. The following sections give some guidance on how to do this.
SECTION 4

PHASE III – INFORMATION ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

What: Conducting detailed analysis of all the information gathered, preparing a report and
     disseminating the LRA findings
Who: Entire survey team, supervised by team leader
Indicative time frame: 10 - 12 days

4.1 Analysing the data

When conducting analysis, it is helpful to bear in mind three or four key tips:

- Arranging different sources/levels of information and triangulating
- Looking for trends, interactions and dynamics and developing the “story”
- Treating outliers as important – not to be “smoothed out”

4.1.1 Arranging different levels and triangulating

By the end of the fieldwork, the information will have come from different levels:

- Contextual information from the initial trawl of secondary data and discussion with key
  informants at national level. This will include secondary baseline information.
- Assessments of the impact of the disaster on key institutions operating at the district
  level and an overview of the district wide social and economic impact of the disaster
  on people’s lives
- Market trader/shopkeeper interviews for market analysis
- Community level socio-economic and disaster impact overview
- Gender focus groups
- Specific information on the impact of the disaster at household level and prospects
  for recovery and intervention

It is important to place the information at the lower geographical areas into the context of the
higher levels, both in terms of the sequence of the later report writing and for the purposes of
triangulation.

4.1.2 Key trends

The livelihoods of different groups are always linked. In a rural economy it is usual for the
poorer groups to be providing labour for the richer groups. The rural labour market is
normally a vital part of the community economy, generating income and food transfers which
activate formal and informal input and output markets and flows of people and commodities.
As a result, disruptions to labour markets normally have multiplier effects, and it is important
to understand and capture these in the analysis.

It will be necessary to look for trends and interactions, aggregate data around them, and
summarise what has been found. This process will allow the analyst to capture the “story”
 ie, the key threads of the impact of the disaster on different types of people, and how they
are coping. In all of this, it is tempting to exclude “outliers” on the basis that they do not fit in
to a general trend. Such a practice is unwise as such “outliers” may represent a specific
asset, household or livelihood type which has been particularly resilient or vulnerable to the
disaster. As such it will deserve some focus.
Patterns in the data will probably already have become apparent during the course of the survey, and it is unlikely at this stage that there will be any surprises. Some issues to bear in mind while analysing and seeking trends:

- There may be trends for a given household type (e.g. “wealthy” wealth group or a “moderately affected” household) within a particular geographical area (e.g. within a LHZ/AEZ; or within 1 km of the flooded area). For example, all the landless poor in the highland irrigated AEZ of the area hit by the volcanic eruption and earthquake in Yogyakarta immediately lost a vital source of wage income due to the destruction of the irrigation system in the upper slopes.
- Trends may be clearly evident by geographical area - i.e., people of all kinds losing more of a particular kind of asset just because of their physical location. For example, in the Pakistan earthquake, high altitude groups lost more livestock, as animals were inside in colder temperatures, and in Yogyakarta, people in the Bayat area were badly hit by loss and damage to fisheries and aquaculture.
- Alternatively trends may be observed within certain population groups, regardless of physical location relative to the disaster event. For example, the poorest may be more affected and vulnerable to destitution as they are unable to migrate;
- There may be, fourth, obvious trends within a particular asset across all types of households and across widely differing areas (rural, urban, highland, lowland), eg. where all groups have experienced a loss of roads, clinics and schools. In the Pakistan earthquake all but one hospital in Muzzafarabad district was destroyed and 80% of schools over a wide area were destroyed.

Templates for collating information in the field such as that indicated earlier will be an important tool to help with this kind of analysis

4.2 Outputs and Uses of the RLA

The immediate output of the RLA should be an accessible and solid report of about 30 pages (excluding annexes). This should clearly delineate the impact of the crisis on the ways that people make a living, and should indicate strategies for recovery that “build back better”, ie. in which way(s) the resilience of households, communities and local economies can be increased in the face of future crises.

In addition to the report, it is helpful if there would be a “road map” for livelihood recovery including relevant project profiles. Elaborate??

4.2.1 Use of the RLA information

The key uses of the RLA are:

- To initiate and support the preparation of livelihood recovery project profiles for presentation to the government, local organisations and the international community. These may be prepared for a Revised Flash Appeal or an Early Recovery Donor Conference, or may indeed be submitted directly to government and NGOs to be financed partly or fully from its own resources.

- To provide the basis for development of a livelihood recovery strategy ((or possibly the upgrading of the existing livelihood promotion framework) for affected areas. This should be linked with follow-up actions with other related interventions, in such a way as to assist the national/ local authorities and other stakeholders to take informed decisions and formulate programmes and policies
• To provide the basis for advocacy material directed at decision-makers and the general public so that the longer-term livelihood impacts of the crisis are properly understood.

4.2.2 Contents of the RLA report

The next table gives some guidance on the contents of the RLA report, together with an indication as to which parts of the RLA itself should be generating the required information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box: Outline for LRA Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of the disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Magnitude and exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of shock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Geographical area affected (district / provinces) (general agro-ecological characteristics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Description of area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Population numbers in affected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Livelihood characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Basic means of making a living before the shock (farming and fishing, self-employed and MSEs in different sectors, wage earning in modern sector, casual work in or outside agriculture, migrant labour, remittances, etc. – all with rough proportions). NB. All data to be disaggregated by gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Livelihood Impact information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis of the impact of the disaster on the livelihoods (types of livelihoods most/lest affected) (different types and groups of people affected) (differentiated impact on men and women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Description of the coping strategies with regard to the livelihoods (differentiated for men and women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Needs and opportunities for recovery of local livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Probable role and effectiveness of markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing government and other programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National and local institutional framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Priority for livelihood recovery interventions (disaggregated by affected population groups) (key priorities: most affected, those with largest potential for catalytic livelihood recovery; men and women)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the information required for most parts of the RLA report will come from multiple sources. These sources will not always agree. Therefore, there will be a high premium on weighing the evidence, cross-checking, using judgement and triangulating.

4.2.3 Target audience

In general terms the following agencies and organizations are the main target audience for the dissemination of the RLA findings:
- National and local government: disaster authorities, sectoral ministries and agencies
- UN Agencies: Early Recovery Cluster (UNDP), OCHA, specialized agencies (FAO, ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF, WFP, WHO), as well as bilateral donors
- NGOs: international, national and local NGOs
- Agricultural and business organizations: Farmers Association, Chamber of Commerce, MSE Associations, Informal livelihoods network
- Community organisations: farmers groups/organisations, CBOs, SHG, coops, women’s and youth groups
- Labour and employers organisations
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1. KEY PARTICIPATORY TOOLS *(to be completed)*

Different tools are relevant at different levels and stages of the RLA process. The following table gives an illustration of the types of tools that can be used at different times in the RLA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Relevant tools</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. District/sub-district</td>
<td>Core tool: Key informant interviews</td>
<td>Start with government, and work with them wherever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Settlement /community</td>
<td>Core tools:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus Group Discussions with community leaders (semi-structured)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economic / exposure grouping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming and livelihood calendars</td>
<td>Detail on predominant livelihood or farming systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportional piling</td>
<td>Useful to establish proportions of hhs in different groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset mapping</td>
<td>Identifies community assets using asset polygon / hexagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other tools</td>
<td>Can help establish overall nature/severity of damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Household</td>
<td>Core tool: Semi-structured interviewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asset mapping</td>
<td>Identifies household assets using asset polygon / hexagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportional piling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking and scoring for income and expenditures</td>
<td>Triangulate with asset mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies / life stories</td>
<td>Good for in-depth “human” detail – good for advocacy purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking and scoring for coping strategies</td>
<td>See and ask how people are filling gaps in livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking and scoring to identify and prioritise needs</td>
<td>First identify then prioritise perceived needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other tools:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venn diagram and / or “mental map” for institutions and policies</td>
<td>Looks at institutions, scope and magnitude of their interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerability and resilience timeline</td>
<td>Plots vulnerability against time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food consumption patterns/meals per day for livelihood outcomes</td>
<td>Mapping livelihood rebuilding goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. IN-DEPTH EXPLANATION OF KEY TOOLS

2.1 Rapid Livelihood Zoning

Rapid Livelihood Zoning is a tool for RLA planning – particularly in rural areas. If there are no pre-identified AEZs or LHZs within which to work, it is possible to develop these in a rapid and participatory way, using secondary data and key informants. It will be important to assemble as much relevant data as possible, including available maps and studies covering the area affected by the emergency event, and initiate a discussion around different livelihood patterns in different parts of the affected area(s).

One useful way to get discussion going is to focus on issues such as:
Altitude and topography
Population density
Social and ethnic groups
Main sources of food and income – livelihood activities (this may include types of employment; crops grown – main cash crops, food crops, livestock types).

**Figure**: Livelihood zones

Through this process, spatial livelihood pattern distinctions will become clear. Experience in Malawi and Zambia has demonstrated that if carried out with knowledgeable informants and with (very basic) maps, rough but adequate livelihood zoning can be prepared in a matter of a couple of hours. The process of developing the zones results in the generation of a lot of useful information, which can help contextualise the affected area(s) and can be used later on for the purposes of triangulation.

2.2 **Household selection** – to be completed

2.3 **Proportional piling** – to be completed

2.4 **Ranking and scoring** – to be completed

2.5 **Seasonal calendars** – to be completed

2.6 **Wealth ranking** – to be completed
3. QUANTIFYING QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

3.1 Weighting matters

Findings from the RLA cannot be purely qualitative. The process of recovery programming requires numbers, both absolute numbers and proportions or ratios. Studies that cannot provide them run the risk of providing only anecdotal evidence to be used for illustrative purposes only. The time pressure to complete a RLA calls for rapid methods and this has consequences in terms of the precision by which findings are reported and the representativeness of samples drawn. Thus practitioners are also frequently forced to use ad hoc or purposive samples that are small in size and not selected by strictly random methods. However, even in an approximate manner, results must be expressed in a quantitative way, and this section provides some directions in this regard.

The various pieces of information collected may refer to realities of different size. For instance, if one community has 80% poor, 15% medium wealth and 5% better-off households, the sample of 3, 2 and 1 households interviewed in that community should be weighted accordingly to avoid giving too much weight to the wealthy and too little to the poor. In such a sample of six households, the poor are represented by 3 cases (50%) when in reality they are 80%, and the better off have 1/6=16.6% when in fact they are only 5% of the community.

The same is valid for communities and zones. If each of two zones have been represented by three communities, but one of the zones is much larger, the three communities from that zone should receive more weight in any assessment of the global situation.

Even if the sample for the RLA is not strictly random, ignoring the weighting issue (i.e. giving every unit the same weight) compounds the problem and amplifies any bias in the study. It is therefore recommended that totals for each major zone and for the total disaster area are obtained with due regard for weighting.

3.2 Weighting a sample

To obtain an average for a zone, each particular household, community or sub-zone should be adequately weighted. The general principle is using as weights the ratio between the percentage in the population and the percentage in the sample.

Example: A disaster area has been divided into three zones (Z₁ to Z₃). In each zone there were various number of communities, with varying population, of which just a few communities (and a few households in each) were actually interviewed. The following tables show the symbols used in general, and a particular set of numbers as an example. The first table show the calculation of weights for individual communities within an area composed of different zones. In this particular case there were three zones with a total of 180 communities (villages, neighbourhoods, or whatever), and three randomly selected communities were visited in each zone.
The 30 communities in zone 1 represented 16.6% of all communities in the disaster area, but the 3 selected communities in that zone represent 33.3% of all selected communities, so that those 30 communities are over-represented. Their true weight is restored by giving them a weight of 0.5. On the other hand, the 90 communities in Zone 3 are under-represented: they make 50% of all communities but are represented by only 33.3% of the sample communities. Their appropriate weight is 50/33.3 = 1.5.

Suppose something has been investigated in all these zones, e.g. average size of households, with averages of 3 in zone 1, five in zone 2, and seven in zone 3. A simple average will yield a mean size of five, but a weighted average would require multiplying each zone figure by its weight, and dividing by the sum of weights. This gives a more accurate result:

$$y = \frac{3 \times 0.5 + 5 \times 1.0 + 7 \times 1.5}{0.5 + 1.0 + 1.5} = \frac{17}{3} = 5.66$$

This calculation has used the average for each zone, but this average itself has to be computed from the size of individual households in the sample of communities selected for each zone, and this sample should also be weighted. The following table shows how to compute the weight of households across communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Total existing</th>
<th>Total sampled</th>
<th>% population</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 1 sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 1</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 2</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 3</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 1</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 2</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 3</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3 sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 1</td>
<td>k = 1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 2</td>
<td>k = 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community 3</td>
<td>k = 3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, the weighted average for zone 1 is obtained by giving households in each community a different weight, depending on the that community having been over- or under-
represented in the sample. Thus in Zone 1, the households in the 1st and 2nd communities in the sample receive a weight of 0.8, while those in the third community receive a weight of 1.5. In each case, the weights represent the percentage of the community in the zone total, divided by the percentage of the community sample in the zone total sample.

The final weight of a household in the total sample is the product of the two weights: one derived from the selection of households within communities, and another derived from the selection of communities within zones. Thus, for obtaining an overall average, a household in the first community of zone 1 should receive a weight of $0.5 \times 0.8 = 0.4$, the first correcting the over-representation of zone 1 in the sample of communities, and the second correcting for the over-representation of community 1 within zone 1.

Application of weights to produce zonal or overall averages or percentages is easy. It can be done with a spreadsheet, by including a column of weights in the calculation. It can also be done with a standard statistical software like SPSS or others, in which cases (households or communities) may be weighted and the weights used automatically whenever a statistical procedure is applied.

3.3 Use of the baseline for weighting and extrapolating results

Having a good baseline provides grounds for giving adequate weight to a rapid assessment findings. On the one hand, it gives basis for giving each finding a correct relative weight, as in the examples above, correcting for under- or over-representation in the sample. On the other hand, it provides the basis for extrapolation to the scale of the whole area or population, thus allowing for estimates of the total size of the affected population, the total number of jobs lost or livelihoods destroyed.

The weights used for absolute extrapolation are slightly different than the relative weighting used above, but based on the same principle. The general principle is defining a weight as $N/n$, where $N$ is the size of the relevant population and $n$ is the size of the relevant sample. Since $n/N$ is the sampling ratio, $N/n$ is just the reciprocal of the sampling ratio. For instance, if 30 communities exist and 3 were selected in a zone, the absolute weight is $30/3=10$. This would multiply every result by 10, amplifying the results to the scale of the total number of communities in the zone. Averages should be computed by dividing those totals by the sum of such weights, exactly as before. And when samples are multi-step (a sample of communities and a sample of households within selected communities) the final extrapolating weight of households is the product of the partial weights: $(N/n_i) \times (N_{ij}/n_{ij})$ where $N$ is a population size, $n$ a sample size, “$i$” indicates the ith zone, and “$ij$” indicates the jth household within the ith zone.

3.4 Beware of reported means

Sometimes an average about households is gauged from a report obtained from key informants, community elders or focus groups. However, this averages or means may be biased. People, including community focus groups, tend to report on the mode (the most frequent value or values) and not strictly on the mean. They tend to omit considering the extremes. For instance, when reporting on the mean size of farms they tend to forget the huge influence of a few large farms on the mean, and report on the average size of all other farms, i.e. the most frequent sizes. Thus in that example the reported “mean” farm size, multiplied by the number of farms in the community does not equal total farm land, because large farms were ignored or understated when reporting the mean size. The same goes for incomes, number of children, and other very unequally distributed variables.
3.5 How to account for absent people and deserted communities

If some randomly selected communities are found to be deserted, they should be counted as deserted, to estimate the percentage of deserted communities in the disaster area. However, after having made this estimate with the original number of selected communities, some new community may be substituted to achieve the desired number of communities in the sample. Likewise, deserted households found in the sample should be counted, to estimate how many people have deserted the disaster area within communities that are still populated. However, after making this estimate, other households may be interviewed to achieve the desired number of interviews.

4. SMALL AREA ESTIMATION

A Small Area Estimation (SME) proceeds as follows: using the sample survey, estimate the value of the variable of interest for each household in the relevant areas or zones as a function of a set of predictor variables. The predictor variables are chosen so that they exist both in the survey and in the census.

One typical way of predicting the variable of interest through predictors is using linear regression, estimating an equation like the following:

\[ Y = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + \ldots \]

where \( Y \) is the predicted value of the variable of interest in a certain household (e.g. household per capita income, or household per capita food energy intake), \( X \) is the value of a predictor for that particular household (e.g. household size, or the gender of the household head), and \( b \) is the regression coefficient of that predictor, i.e. the expected increase in \( Y \) for each unit increase in the \( X \) predictor.\(^1\)

Since sample sizes could be relatively small, the number of variables in the equation should be limited. Otherwise the estimated values of the \( b \) coefficients would not be statistically significant. Only the most significant variables should be retained in the equation.

Once a predictor equation has been found in the survey, use the equation to predict the variable of interest in the census, using the census data for predictors for each small area within the relevant regions or zones. This involves two steps:

**First step: Individual (person or household) prediction:**
In the example above, take the census database for the area at risk and apply to each household the equation calculated from the survey. This would yield an estimated household per capita income (or an estimated household per capita food energy intake) for each household.

**Second step: Aggregate small area estimation**
Since these individual estimations may not be very reliable, they are normally used to estimated some aggregate characteristic of each small area, such as the percentage of households below the poverty line, or the percentage of households with insufficient food calorie intake. These aggregate indicators for each small area are expected to be more accurate than the individual predictions produced by the equation for each household.

---

1 Binary variables, like the gender of the household head, are coded 0 or 1 depending on the gender. When the predictor is a multi-category variable, like the building materials of walls, each category (except one) is converted into a dummy variable coded as 1 or 0 depending whether the household has or has not that particular category (one category is omitted because it would be redundant). In this kind of equation the income is usually replaced by its logarithm, because the predictors are supposed to cause a proportional, not an absolute income increase.