

Research Methodology Note

Urban Refugees and Sustainable Livelihoods in Uganda: Livelihoods Programmes Mapping
UGA2205
Uganda

November 2022
Version 1.1 (amendment to V1)

REACH Informing more effective humanitarian action

1. Executive Summary (for amended activity)

Country of intervention	Uganda				
Type of Emergency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Natural disaster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
Type of Crisis	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sudden onset	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slow onset	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted
Mandating Body/ Agency	European Union Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) Foreign, Commonwealth, & Development Office (FCDO)				
IMPACT Project Code	25ANW, 25AMI				
Overall Research Timeframe	01/06/2022 to 28/02/2023 Amended activity: 01/10/2022 to 28/02/2023				
Research Timeframe for amended activity	1. Pilot/ training: -		6. Preliminary presentation: 12/12/2022		
	2. Start collect data: 07/11/2022		7. Outputs sent for validation: 23/12/2022		
	3. Data collected: 18/11/2022		8. Outputs published: 31/01/2023		
	4. Data analysed: 25/11/2022		9. Final presentation: 28/03/2023		
	5. Data sent for validation: 25/11/2022				
Humanitarian milestones Specify what will the assessment inform and when e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;	Milestone		Deadline		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Donor plan/strategy: ECHO and FCDO will use findings to inform livelihoods agenda	01/05/2023		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inter-cluster plan/strategy	__/__/__		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cluster plan/strategy: the Livelihoods and Resilience Sector Working Group (LRSWG) will use the findings to inform on the implementation of their Refugee Response Plan (RRP)	28/02/2023		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	NGO platform plan/strategy	__/__/__		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Specify):	__/__/__		
Audience Type & Dissemination Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience	Audience type		Dissemination		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing (using the IMPACT Uganda mailing list)		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (LRSWG) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Operational		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings (to donor + relevant stakeholders)		
	<input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]				

			X Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre, U-Learn website) X Dissemination through the Cities Alliance website and network
Detailed dissemination plan required	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	X No
General Objective	The general objective of the assessment is to create a better understanding of the movement of refugees between settlements and urban centres, and to inform how the livelihoods of refugee and host communities in both settlement and urban contexts can best be supported.		
Specific Objective(s)	<p>Component 3</p> <p>Map and summarize ongoing livelihoods programmes across contexts, and understand how they relate to the livelihoods situation assessed under specific objective 2¹. Even more specifically, the assessment aims to understand:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What kinds of livelihoods programming are currently being implemented across settlements and urban centres in Uganda; What (if any) the commonalities are between livelihoods approaches; To what extent the livelihoods approaches employed in livelihoods programming match the identified asset gaps and barriers under objective 2. <p><u>This amendment pertains to the activities that fall under specific objective 3. The objective itself is not changed.</u></p>		
Research Questions	<p>The following research questions will guide the assessment:</p> <p>For specific objective 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What kinds of livelihoods programming are currently being implemented across settlements and urban centres? What (if any) are the commonalities between livelihoods approaches? To what extent are identified livelihoods programmes and approaches aligned with the gaps and barriers found under objective 2? <p><u>This amendment pertains to the activities that fall under specific objective 3. The objective or the research questions are not changed.</u></p>		
Geographic Coverage	Data collection will take place in the 9 locations covered by the assessment (5 cities and 4 refugee settlements). Contrary to what was planned in the original terms of reference, data collection for the mapping will focus on the specific locations rather than the districts.		

¹ Component 2: understand the main barriers and enabling factors of sustainable livelihoods of the following groups: refugees in settlements; refugees in urban centers; host communities around settlements; and host communities in urban centers.

Secondary data sources	The key secondary sources for the amended component are as follows:					
	1. Sources that describe the livelihoods programmes being implemented in Uganda for refugees in host communities. These sources will include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and other forms of documentation published by implementing organizations. ActivityInfo – the UNHCR reporting system for organizations active in the settlements. 					
Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in camp	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in informal sites		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs in host communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	IDPs [Other, Specify]		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in settlements	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in informal sites		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in urban centres	<input type="checkbox"/>	Refugees [Other, Specify]		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Host communities in urban centres	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Refugees in Urban centres		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Host communities around settlements ²	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]		
Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Geographical #: 9 Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No ³	<input type="checkbox"/>	Group #: 0 Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes ⁴ <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other Specify] #: __ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Data collection tool(s) for the amended activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	Structured (Quantitative)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Semi-structured (Qualitative)	
	Sampling method			Data collection method		
Semi-structured data collection tool #1⁵	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purposive <input type="checkbox"/> Snowballing <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify]			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Key informant interview (Target #): 9-18 ⁶ <input type="checkbox"/> Individual interview (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Focus group discussion (Target #): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] (Target #): _____		
Data management platform(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IMPACT		<input type="checkbox"/>	UNHCR	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify]				
Expected output type(s)⁷	<input type="checkbox"/>	Situation overview #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Report #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Profile #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation (Final) #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Factsheet #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Interactive dashboard #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Webmap #: __	<input type="checkbox"/>	Map #: __
	<input type="checkbox"/>	[Other, Specify] #: __				

² Data collection will focus specifically on those host community members that reside in the sub-counties that overlap with, or border, the targeted refugee settlements.

³ 1-2 KII's

⁴ Population sizes of refugees in Kampala and the settlements, and population sizes of host communities, are generally known. Population sizes of urban refugees in secondary cities are not always known, in which cases data collection will be preceded by qualitative data collection to get estimates from key informants.

⁵ Tools 5 and 6 in the original TOR are replaced by one semi-structured tool.

⁶ A minimum of 1 and a maximum of 2 KIIs will be done per location, depending on the secondary data.

⁷ Findings will be integrated into the outputs listed in the ToR, there will be no stand-alone outputs for this component.

Access	X	Public (available on REACH resource center and other humanitarian platforms)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on REACH or other platforms)
Visibility	REACH, U-Learn	
	Donor: ECHO, FCDO	
	Coordination Framework: Livelihoods and Resilience Sector Working Group (LRSWG)	
	Partners: U-Learn	

2. Rationale

2.1 Background

In [the original terms of reference](#) (TOR) for this assessment, three research components were proposed to meet the information needs of donors, United Nations (UN) agencies, International Non-Government Organisations (INGOs), and various coordination bodies regarding the livelihoods of refugees and host communities in settlements as well as urban settings. The assessment was designed in close coordination with the Livelihoods and Resilience Sector Working Group (LRWSG). The [third component](#) of the assessment and TOR focussed on mapping livelihoods programmes across the assessed locations. The findings of the mapping serve to complement the findings on the barriers to sustainable livelihoods and help identify potential gaps to be addressed.

Since the validation of the assessment TOR, further consultations have been held with the LRWSG and other livelihood actors. The consultations highlighted that the planned methodology for the mapping component (component 3) may not be best suited to the exact information gaps in the response. As a result, REACH and U-Learn decided to revise the original plan together with the LRWSG and UNHCR to ensure it makes better use of existing information and focussing on those areas where the information gaps are the most significant. In practice, this means using ActivityInfo more extensively for the settlements and Kampala and dedicating additional efforts to understanding the landscape in secondary cities.

2.2 Intended impact

As indicated in the original TOR of the assessment, the overall assessment intends to assist in donors' strategic decision-making regarding livelihoods programming in Uganda, inform programmatic decision-making of livelihoods actors, and contribute to the broader conversations around refugees that have chosen to settle in urban areas. The intended impact of the assessment is not altered in this amendment. The intended impact of the amendment itself is to make sure that the mapping component aligns with the information gaps of the LRWSG, and does not duplicate any efforts.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

In the original TOR, the [third/mapping component](#)⁸ was built on an online expert survey and follow-up key informant interviews (KIs). The expert survey was going to be a structured tool with questions regarding organizations' livelihoods projects. Following tool development and consultations with UNHCR, it became clear that much of the information was already captured in ActivityInfo. ActivityInfo is UNHCR's reporting system for all actors active in the settlements and Kampala. The new methodology detailed here removes the online expert survey and replaces it with more in-depth review of secondary data. Secondary data will consist of shared excerpts from ActivityInfo as well as various reports and articles that detail livelihoods programmes. The latter form of secondary data will be especially important for secondary cities, where ActivityInfo is not currently deployed (see section 3.3 for more details on the secondary review). Additionally, KIs will be collected in all locations to supplement the secondary data to create a comprehensive picture of livelihoods programming per the locations covered by the assessment.

In sum, the revised methodology for [component three](#) will consist of the following steps:

1. Review and analysis of ActivityInfo data related to livelihoods for Kampala and the settlements
2. Review and analysis of various (other) forms of secondary data for the secondary cities
3. Identification of 1-2 key livelihoods actors in each location based on the analysis done during steps 1 and 2.
4. Carry out 1-2 KIs per location with the actors identified in step 3.

⁸ The third component of the original TOR is based on the third specific objective: 'Map and summarize ongoing livelihoods programmes across contexts, and understand how they relate to the livelihoods situation assessed under specific objective 2.'

3.2 Population of interest

The population of interest, in terms of the groups that the assessment is interested in, remains the same as in the original TOR. Overall, the assessment looks at:

- Refugees in settlements
- Host communities around the settlements
- Refugees in urban centres
- Host communities in urban centres.

The mapping data collection will take place with actors implementing projects that aim to improve the livelihoods of any of the groups listed above. There are no limits to the kinds of actors that will be looked at for the assessment. Livelihoods actors are likely to include:

- UN agencies
- INGOs
- National Non-Government Organisations (NNGOs)
- Civil society organizations (CSOs)
- Refugee-led organizations (RLOs)
- National government institutions
- Local government institutions

In terms of the locations, the mapping will not look at district-level as noted in the original TOR. The rationale for district-level data collection was the assumed lack of secondary info that specifies the exact locations of project activities. However, ActivityInfo and several of the other secondary data sources specify the exact locations of the programmes. With this information is possible to focus on the specific locations for component three, in line with the methodology of components one and two. These locations are as follows:

Table 1: Locations for data collection

Region	District	Type	Location
Central	Kampala	City	Kampala
South-West	Isingiro	Settlement	Nakivale
South-West	Mbarara	City	Mbarara
West Nile	Arua	City	Arua
West Nile	Gulu	City	Gulu
West Nile	Kitgum	City	Kitgum
West Nile	Lamwo	Settlement	Palabek
West Nile	Madi Okollo	Settlement	Rhino Camp
West Nile	Yumbe	Settlement	Bidibidi

3.3 Secondary data review

Steps 1 and 2 of the revised methodology are based on secondary data review. For this component, the following sources will be the key starting points for the investigation:

1. ActivityInfo: UNHCR will be able to share extracts from the LRSWG ActivityInfo data for the four settlements covered by the assessment and Kampala. This information will be reviewed, synthesized, and analyzed to meet this assessment's needs.
2. Baseline and endline assessment reports for projects that have been uploaded to [UNHCR's assessment registry](#) or [ReliefWeb](#).

3. General and M&E reports that describe the livelihoods programmes being implemented in Uganda for refugees in host communities. Examples of key sources:
 - a. World Vision, "[Navigating the Nexus: A brighter future for refugee and host community children in West Nile, Uganda](#)," July 2020.
 - b. Catholic Relief Services (CRS), "[Livelihoods programming in emergency response and recovery contexts](#)," 2018.
 - c. Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA), "[The impact of a graduation program on livelihoods in refugee and host communities in Uganda](#)," 2020.
4. National and district-level development and/or livelihoods plans.

All sources will be organized in a project/programme matrix to create an overview of livelihoods programmes. The matrix will further form the basis for summarizing general approaches and trends across the assessed locations.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

Primary data collection for component 3 in the revised plan will consist exclusively of KIIs with key livelihoods actors in the assessed locations. Below follows an overview of the method, sampling, tool, and triangulation strategy of the KII data collection.

Method

A total of 9 to 18 KIIs will be conducted. The exact number will depend on the number of key partners identified per assessed location. See the section below on sampling for more information. The KIIs will be conducted by members of the assessment team who have also directly contributed to the tool development and therefore do not require further training. The majority if not all of the interviews will be conducted online. Interviews may be done in person for Kampala, depending on the exact location and wishes of the respondent. If funds allow, an assessment team member may also travel to one or more of the field locations to conduct interviews. If interviews are done in person, necessary precautions will be taken to minimize the risk of COVID-19 infection, including the staff carrying masks during and using sanitizer before the interview, practicing safe distancing, and carrying out the interviews either outside or in well ventilated spaces. No in-person interviews will be done in areas with an elevated EVD risk⁹, or in a case where either the interviewer or the respondent feels unwell. For the online interviews, interviews will be done on Teams where possible. Interviews can also be conducted over the phone or using other internet-based call systems. Regardless of whether the interview is in person or online, the interviews will be recorded if consent for this is provided. The assessment team member conducting the interview will take notes throughout the interview. The notes and recording (if available) will be used to transcribe the interview immediately following the event.

Sampling

Key informants will be purposively sampled. Key informant selection will be based on which organizations appear to be the most active livelihoods actor in each location respectively. These actors will be identified during the secondary data analysis detailed above. Several criteria will be considered in the selection of actors:

- Number of projects ongoing in the location
- Size (in terms of funding and/or number of beneficiaries) in the location
- Number of past projects in the location
- Role within local level coordination systems, such as the settlement-level LRSWG

The number of KIIs per location will depend on how many relevant actors are identified per the location, and the success of the first call. A minimum of 1 and a maximum of 2 KIIs will be done per location. If there are multiple similarly relevant actors

⁹ Mission-wide SOPs for EVD are currently being developed, and will be adhered to for the data collection. Guidance provided by the government, UNHCR, and other coordinating bodies will be adhered to.

in a location, multiple KIIs may be scheduled. If one KII was completed but the respondent was not able to answer all questions, additional KIIs may be scheduled.

From the selected organizations, existing contacts will be used to reach out to a representative. Key informants may include staff from:

- The settlement/Kampala-level LRSWG coordination lead organization
- UN agencies present in the settlement/Kampala/secondary city
- INGOs present in the settlement/Kampala/secondary city
- NNGOs present in the settlement/Kampala/secondary city
- CSOs present in the settlement/Kampala/secondary city
- RLOs present in the settlement/Kampala/secondary city
- Local government institutions

Informants who are actively working in the assessed locations will be targeted, rather than staff that may be based in Kampala or the organization's headquarters.

Tools

Tool development will be based on conversations held with stakeholders so far. Additionally, further consultations will be held to validate the tool. The tool design will take into consideration the secondary data review as well as the research questions detailed in the original TOR for component 3. The questionnaire will be in Word format, and leave space for transcription and debrief notes. The tool will be specific to the assessed location, and roughly aim to cover the following:

- Most common livelihoods programmes & approaches in that location
- Eligibility/selection criteria of livelihoods programmes in that location
- Rationale for these types of programmes & approaches in that location
- Perceived effectiveness of programming in that location
- Perceived gaps in livelihoods programming in that location

Data collection

There are no training needs for this tool, as the assessment team will be in charge of developing the tool and carrying out the survey. A different assessment team member will review the interview transcripts and assure quality of transcripts. A data saturation grid will be maintained during data collection, to understand whether additional interviews should be conducted. The saturation grid will also form the basis of the final analysis.

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

As per the triangulation section above, data quality will be closely monitored during data collection. The KIIs will be analysed in MAXQDA. The transcripts will be uploaded in the software and coded on common themes. The coding system will be exported as a data saturation grid to highlight the key themes, areas of consensus, and areas of disagreement. Finally, a summary will be written per location on the secondary and primary data findings on livelihoods programming.

4. Key ethical considerations and related risks

The proposed research design meets / does not meet the following criteria:

<i>The proposed research design...</i>	<i>Yes/ No</i>	<i>Details if no (including mitigation)</i>
... Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to avoid unnecessary duplication of data collection efforts?	Yes	

... Respects respondents, their rights and dignity (<i>specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided</i>)?	Yes	
... Does not expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection?	Yes	
... Does not expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection?	Yes	
... Does not involve collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)?	Yes	
... Does not involve data collection with minors i.e. anyone less than 18 years old?	Yes	
... Does not involve data collection with other vulnerable groups e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.?	Yes	
... Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of personally identifiable information ?	Yes	

5. Roles and responsibilities

Table 3: Description of roles and responsibilities

Task Description	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
<i>Research design</i>	Senior Assessment Officer	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, U-Learn Consortium Management Unit (CMU), IMPACT HQ FSL Specialist, IMPACT HQ Cash & Markets Specialist, IMPACT HQ Research Design and Data Unit (RDDU)	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Supervising data collection</i>	Field Manager	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, IMPACT HQ RDDU	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Data processing (checking, cleaning)</i>	Data Unit	Senior Assessment Officer	Field manager, Country Coordinator, IMPACT HQ RDDU	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)

<i>Data analysis</i>	Data Unit	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, U-Learn CMU, IMPACT HQ FSL Specialist, IMPACT HQ Cash & Markets Specialist, IMPACT HQ Research Design and Data Unit (RDDU)	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Output production</i>	Senior Assessment Officer	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, U-Learn CMU, IMPACT HQ Research Reporting Unit	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Dissemination</i>	Senior Assessment Officer	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, U-Learn CMU	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Monitoring & Evaluation</i>	Senior Assessment Officer	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, IMPACT HQ Research Department	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)
<i>Lessons learned</i>	Senior Assessment Officer	Senior Assessment Officer	Country Coordinator, IMPACT HQ Research Department	LRSWG, ATWG, other relevant stakeholders (urban actors)

6. Data Analysis Plan

The KII tool planned for in this amendment can be found below. The other tools for the assessment can be found [here](#).

RQ #	RQ	SUBQ #	SUBQ	Group	Tool	QQ #	Questionnaire QUESTION	Probes	Key disaggregations
-	-	-	-	Consent	ID	0	<p>Hello, my name is [...] and I am working with IMPACT Initiatives and Ulearn. We are doing an assessment on livelihoods barriers and enabling factors of refugees and host communities in settlements as well as in several urban centres. As part of this assessment, we are doing a review of livelihoods programmes that are being implemented across these locations. Findings from this exercise will be compared to findings from our household-level data collection. This is not an impact evaluation by any means. Instead, the objective is to try identify any potential gaps in programming to help livelihoods actors' decision-making.</p> <p>We intend to ask questions regarding your organisation as well as livelihoods programming generally in the location. Your name, nor your organisation, will be quoted in any outputs. Outputs instead will consist of summaries of livelihoods programmes in each location covered. Are you willing to participate?</p> <p>May I record this interview for transcription purposes? The recording will be deleted after finalized transcription.</p>	-	-
3 . a & 3 . b	What kinds of livelihoods programming are currently being implemented across settlements and urban centres? &	1	What are the most common kinds of livelihoods projects and approaches that are being implemented in each location?	Projects	KI	1 . 1	What kinds of livelihoods projects is your organization currently implementing in this location?	What are the objectives? What kinds of activities are you doing? What is the timeline?	Location
					KI	1 . 2	In this location, which other organizations or actors are implementing livelihoods programmes?	Which are the largest organizations? Are there any local organizations active?	Location
					KI	1 . 3	What kinds of livelihoods projects are these other actors implementing in this location?	What kind of objectives and	Location

What (if any) are the commonalities between livelihoods approaches?						activities are the most common?		
				KI I	1 . 4	Are there any common approaches between the livelihoods projects that are being implemented in this location?	Are there any common activities among projects? Are there similar focus areas (e.g., agriculture, private sector engagement, skilling, etc.)? Are there overlapping theories of change?	Location
	2	What is the rationale for the kinds of livelihoods programmes that are being implemented?		KI I	2 . 1	What do you think is the rationale for the most commonly used approaches for livelihoods programmes in this location?	Why have donors and organisations chosen to implement these kinds of livelihoods programmes? What are the assumptions and theories of change behind these livelihood programmes?	Location
	3	What kinds of eligibility/selection criteria are being employed for livelihoods programmes?	Eligibility criteria	KI I	3 . 1	For the livelihoods projects your organisation is implementing, what eligibility or targeting criteria do you use to select beneficiaries?	Are there particular groups targeted? Are factors such as income, duration of stay, other form of assistance taken into consideration in the targeting?	Location
				KI I	3 . 2	For the other actors implementing livelihoods programmes in this location, what kind of eligibility and targeting criteria do they employ?	Are there particular groups targeted? Are factors such as income, duration of stay, other form of assistance taken into	Location

							consideration in the targetting?	
				KI I	3 . 3	Within this location and considering all livelihoods projects that you are aware of, are there any groups that remain underserved or excluded?	What kinds of groups, if any, fall outside of the eligibility criteria of implementing organisations?	Location
	4	What is the rationale for the kinds of eligibility criteria that are being employed?		KI I	4 . 1	What do you think is the rationale for the eligibility criteria that are used for livelihoods programmes in this location?	Why are beneficiaries selected in this way?	Location
	5	How effective are livelihoods programmes perceived to be?	Effe ctiv ene ss	KI I	5 . 1	Do you think that the livelihoods projects that are being implemented in this area are able to meet the livelihoods needs of the population?	Are the projects effective?	Location
	6	What are the perceived gaps in livelihoods programming (if any)?	Gap s	KI I	6 . 1	Do you think there are any gaps in livelihoods programming in this area?	Are any groups not being catered to? How sustainable are projects?	Location
				KI I	6 . 2	In your opinion, how could livelihoods programming be improved in this location?	What kinds of approaches or project do you think would be beneficial to filling any gaps you may have identified?	Location

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

See original [TOR](#).